



BOLSHEVIK MESSAGE

No. 5

Paper of the
"Supporters of the 'Unity of Communist Militants' – abroad"

October 1983

The Communist Party of Iran has been formed

The constituent congress of the Communist Party of Iran was recently convened in the liberated areas of Kurdistan and successfully concluded its work with the formation of the Communist Party of Iran.

On the occasion of this momentous event in the history of the proletarian movement in Iran, we would like to offer our warmest communist greetings to all the delegates who successfully fulfilled this immense task, despite a massive campaign by the oppressive machinery of the Iranian state to crush the communist and revolutionary movement in Iran.

Our warmest salutations to the Peshmarga comrades of Komala, without whose armed struggle the convening of this congress would have been impossible.

Our comradely greetings to thousands of communist prisoners who have not yielded to the most severe and barbaric tortures in the dungeons of the Iranian regime and whose courageous resistance has been moral backing to the convocation of the congress.

Our greatest respect to the dear memory of tens of thousands of fallen communists who fought and gave their lives in the struggle for the formation of the Communist Party of Iran and the emancipation of the working class.

And our warmest congratulations to the communists and workers of the world for whom the end in the dissension of one of their world battalions will strengthen their common struggle.

As we received the news of the formation of the Communist Party of Iran at the last moments before going to press, we are unable to provide in this issue of BM our readers with any of the resolutions and documents of this congress, but nevertheless we shall endeavour to make them available at the speediest possible time.

An interview with comrade F. Partow, member of the Editorial Board of Kargar-e-Komonist

The following is the first part of an interview carried out recently by the Bolshevik Message with comrade F. Partow, member of the Editorial Board of Kargar-e-Komonist (The organ of UCM). The second part of this interview will be published in the next issue of the paper.

Bolshevik Message: We can now say most definitely that Komala and Unity of Communist Militants are two well-known organisations in the world communist movement. Can you tell us a little about the way these organisations drew closer to each other?

Comrade Partow: Everything started from the Second Congress of Komala. Now, nearly two years after the Second Congress, we must say that this Congress was a turning point not only in the life of Komala but also in the life of the whole communist movement of Iran, for Komala itself is the most important organisation in the communist movement of Iran.

The Second Congress of Komala was held in a his-

torical situation. If the victory of a general anti-monarchist movement had given rise to the growth and blossom of populist views and organisations which rested on the non-class, popular, and petty-bourgeois critique of the capitalism of the epoch of imperialism in the dominated country, the continuation of the

Inside

- Kurdistan and the Social-Imperialism of the ICC P. 5
- 80 political prisoners executed in Tehran P. 9
- Letters P. 9
- World News P. 11
- News from Kurdistan P. 12

← class struggle between the working class and the whole bourgeoisie led to the disintegration and break-up of these views and organisations. Quite diverse currents, incongruous class interests and classes, along with their antagonistic socio-political tendencies, had merged together and combined in a general revolution and an anti-monarchist struggle. This could not but give rise, for however short a period, to the growth of those views which relied not on the exposure of the contradictory interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, but on concealing them, not on the necessity of the all-sided independence of the working class, but on merging it with the people as a whole, and not on the communist party, but on Popular Fronts. But after the February Uprising the antagonistic class interests began to reveal themselves: on the one hand, the liberal-bourgeoisie and a large section of the petty-bourgeoisie began to wrest all the gains of the February Uprising and prepare the desirable conditions for confronting the economic crisis, establishing "order", and repairing and consolidating the organs of suppression of the bourgeoisie. And on the other hand, the workers and toilers who had laid hopes in achieving improvements in their economic and political life, as a consequence of the overthrow of the monarchy, resisted the offensive of the capitalists. As to why the resistance of the workers did not end in an all-round offensive against the bourgeoisie, in going beyond the gains of the February Uprising, and in another uprising, has been extensively analysed in the texts of our comrades and you have already translated these texts. My purpose in referring to the polarisations after the February Uprising is to show the objective bases of the disintegration of petty-bourgeois views and organisations. It was in the context of these objective conditions that the majority of the organisation of People's Fedaiie Guerrillas and the majority of Razmandegan, officially joined the bourgeoisie, and the attempts of the remnants of these organisations to revive the more or less militant, old line of their organisations, ended in defeat.

This reality had also reflected itself in Komala as a communist organisation with open populist tendencies and had created conflicting positions in relation to the most important questions facing the working class and the communist movement. But at the same time Komala was engaged in a national-democratic movement and was leading this movement to a certain extent. This national-democratic movement, as a part and continuation of the Iranian revolution, had itself become the subject of serious changes to the extent of open class polarisations. Two years after the new period of the national struggle in Kurdistan, the question confronting Komala was whether the workers and toilers which had an active presence in the revolutionary movement of Kurdistan should be seeking merely to create particular bureaucratic and diplomatic relations with the central government - as is stated in the programme of the Kurdistan Democratic Party as the representative of the Kurdish bourgeoisie - or whether, in the context of the struggle for autonomy, the Kurdish workers and toilers should fight for the negation of the domination of the central government, for the disbanding of the bureaucratic-military organs of suppression, for democracy, and for bringing about economic and social developments in their own interests. This question, although not in exactly the same terms as I put it, but as a general line, had given rise to intense discussions and conflicting stands.

Thus like all the populist organisations, Komala had been confronted with a historical choice: the proletariat or the bourgeoisie, communism or apostasy and opportunism? The Second Congress was not the initiator of these conflicts or their later exacerbation, but their terminator. It was before the Second Congress that two diverging viewpoints had taken form over the most important practical and theoretical

2 questions concerning Komala, i.e., propaganda and agitation, organisation, the aims and policies governing the revolutionary movement in Kurdistan, the organisation of mass sovereignty, and the question of unity and communist party. One of these viewpoints was the old view of Komala, i.e., the same viewpoint over which Komala had first taken form. The second was a Marxist view, having grown and developed in the critique of and in the struggle against the first view. It had evolved, found legitimacy, and matured, not only on account of the critique of the short-sightedness and impotence of the first view, but by virtue of its strength in putting forward practical alternatives against the first view, and in clearing the road in regard to the most important and urgent questions of the struggle. The documents of this intra-organisational struggle are now part of the treasures of revolutionary Marxism and I am sorry to see that, that part of the discussions which were published in Komala's organ - Pishro - under the title of "From the First Congress to the Second Congress" have not yet been translated into any European languages. It is true that we have now left behind two determining years and compared to that period we have made many theoretical advances, but these series of articles can help our comrades internationally to have a correct picture of the communist Komala.

The Second Congress of Komala was the official victory of the second view, of revolutionary Marxism, over populism. The Second Congress made a categorical critique of populism and stood for its rejection from the ranks of Komala. This Congress reaffirmed the urgent necessity of forming the communist party and the role of a communist programme in the way of the party unity of all communists, and stressed Komala's commitment towards this end. This Congress succeeded in assessing the true place of the revolutionary movement of Kurdistan from the standpoint of the interests of the proletariat. The Congress also put forward new tactical positions. I must stress that I do not mean that the resolutions of the Congress were correct in their entirety, but I have in mind the fundamentals and the essential orientation of these resolutions.

Perhaps this question will come up that why out of all these populist organisations, only Komala raised the banner of revolutionary Marxism, without vacillation and in a coherent manner? Apart from the theoretical and practical traditions of Komala, one must consider two important and interconnected factors. From its inception, Komala did not consider Russia as socialist and the Party in Russia as communist. Furthermore, Komala also had definite criticisms about Stalin. From the practical aspect, Komala had tried, in the early 70's up to the arrest of its leaders, to turn towards the working class and organise the workers. In 1978, when Komala regained its organisational coherence, it participated in the revolutionary movement of the Kurdish people without any vacillation, and became practically the revolutionary wing of this movement. This situation compelled Komala to seriously endeavour for clearing the way of this movement and for representing the interests of workers and toilers in this movement. And when, as a result of class polarisations in the revolutionary movement of Kurdistan, the openly populist theories revealed their sterility and restrictive character, the practical - and not verbal - revolutionism of Komala made it to advance and remove the old barriers and to turn to the only theory of the conditions of emancipation of the working class, i.e., revolutionary Marxism. The actual, and not verbal revolutionary character of Komala had given to it the attitude of not regarding its theoretical positions as a particular set of principles which would mark out its differences with the "rival" organisations, but of understanding them in their only Marxist meaning, i.e., as a guide to action. In such a process, Komala broke up the last bulwarks of populism and became the banner-bearer of revolutionary Marxism. This revolutionary character of Komala had made it not to be a sectarian organisation; not to regard the interests of its organisation as the →

← most supreme; and not to place the organisational interests higher than the revolutionary theory. So it was possible for Komala, that once it recognised the existence of communist views and positions outside its own organisation, to proclaim this loudly. This would not only not weaken it but would strengthen it. The whole course after the Second Congress demonstrates this truth. An organisation which ended the Second Congress with the most intense criticisms of itself, has now become more coherent and much stronger.

On the same question you may compare the Second Congress of Komala with, for example, the Second Congress of Peykar. This Congress too was being held at a time when as a result of the objective conditions which I mentioned, as well as the vindication of the emptiness of the old views of Peykar, and the struggle of the UCM against populism, the act of sitting between two stools had become impossible and the conflict between the two views had appeared in the Congress, in a conditional and limited way. But the congress not only did not recognise this conflict but tried to cover it up; not only did not affirm the legitimacy, growth and development of revolutionary Marxism, but tried to dissolve revolutionary Marxism in its own traditional views, and thus resorted to an impossible task. At that time we had declared: "populism is in deadend"; but Peykar's Congress not only did not recognise this deadend but closed its eyes to it. And this was because for Peykar positions served not as a guide to action but as a justification of the *raison d'être* of Peykar, as an organisation separate from other organisations. The positions of Peykar were the means for "demarcation" with other organisations and not for changing the outside world on the basis of these views. Therefore for Peykar theory was important so long as it served the growth and expansion of its own organisation. The class nature of the positions and their practical-organisational meaning were the last to matter for Peykar.

In any case, after the Second Congress the central committee of Komala invited our central committee comrades to a joint session. The conception of our comrades from the resolutions of the Second Congress of Komala was that Komala had itself come to hoist the banner of revolutionary Marxism and therefore the task which faced our comrades was that they should try so that Komala makes this move in the most resolute and coherent manner. The first session of the meeting of the two organisations was devoted not to the usual formalities of such meetings and not to "promises" about "joint action", but to the criticism and examination of the resolutions of the Second Congress of Komala. These criticisms were reflected at the level of the organisation of Komala and were approved by the central committee and the majority of the members of Komala. This was a beginning to a series of comradely discussions between the two organisations for which the programme was the basis. Following this process, the sixth organisational conference of Komala, which was held in September 1981, considered the Programme of the Unity of Communist Militants the only existing communist programme in Iran and assigned a number of the central committee members of Komala to carry out the necessary discussions with the representatives of the central committee of the UCM, in order to draw up the draft of a joint programme. The outcome of these discussions was the first draft of the joint programme which was distributed inside the two organisations in December 1981. Having considered the criticisms of the comrades of Komala and UCM and also the critical views of the other organisations about this programme, the final text of the draft was drawn up and once again referred to the two organisations. The "Programme of the Communist Party" was

3 passed in the Third Congress of Komala in which the representatives of our organisation were also present. The competence of our representative comrades for making probable amendments in the text of the final draft and also for its final adoption in the name of the organisation of UCM, had already been approved by the members of the organisation.

The Programme of the Communist Party is not only theoretically and politically more coherent and more advanced than the Programme of the UCM but is also expressive of a new stage in the life of our communist movement. A stage in which revolutionary Marxism has developed into a socio-political movement. The Programme of the Communist Party demonstrates that the most influential and the most authoritative communist organisation of Iran has been transformed from the subject of polemic of revolutionary Marxism into its banner-bearer. With the adoption of the Programme of the Communist Party a determining step towards the formation of the Communist Party of Iran, i.e., the task which the revolutionary Marxism had placed on its agenda from the outset, had been taken. Now we had to go further than the Programme and concentrate all our efforts on the question of the actual formation of the party. In response to this task a plan by the name of the "Plan of Formation of the Communist Party" was prepared and approved by the two central committees, and a joint committee, by the name of the "Coordinating Committee of the Forces of the Programme of the Communist Party", was formed at the leadership level of both organisations. In addition, it was necessary that our organisation, the UCM, recognises the tasks corresponding to the new stage of the life of the communist movement and becomes politically and organisationally armed for accomplishing these tasks. Our first organisational congress was convened during September and October of last year in response to this necessity, and with the most comradely assistance of the various sections of Komala in the liberated areas of Kurdistan. In a number of sessions of our Congress, comrades from the Political Bureau of Komala were present; also the message of the Political Bureau of Komala played an important role in the seriousness and consistency of the Congress.

As the resolutions of our Congress have been translated into a number of languages I will not talk about them, nor about the extra-organisational role of the Congress. But so far as it relates to your question, I will point out that our Congress recognised the two organisations of Komala and UCM as two organisations belonging to a single party current, and in a resolution which was passed unanimously, called for unity with Komala, and for party unity as the highest expression of this. In addition, this resolution placed particular tasks before the whole organisation, in relation to Komala.

After the Congress, the text of all the discussions was given to the comrades of the central committee of Komala. The views of the central committee comrades of Komala about our Congress have been presented in the editorial of Pishro No.5. But the most immediate results of the Congress, which at the same time stemmed from its most important achievement, i.e., the "Critique of Populist Style of Work and the Presentation of Communist Style of Work", was the alteration and concretization of the plan of action for building the communist party and the necessity of fundamentally transforming the methods of practice of the two organisations. As a corollary to the discussions of the style of work, which explained the fundamentals of communist practice as being part of our communist identity, all aspects of our activities had to be transformed. Also taking into account the role of communist practical principles as the key to the formation of the party in the specific conditions of the present development of the communist movement of Iran, it was necessary, in the work of building the party, →

Down with the Islamic Republic regime !

to go beyond the previous plan and propound another plan with a schedual, accountable, and relying on advanced organisations. The Second Plenum of Komala, held in January 1983, besides making a critique of Komala's Style of Work, also approved a comprehensive plan of action for forming the party. A committee, by the name of the Organising Committee of the Constituent Congress of the Communist Party, set up at the leadership level of Komala and the UCM, is responsible for carrying out this plan of action. It must be pointed out that before the declaration of the results of the Plenum, our central committee comrades were informed of the discussions of the Plenum and its final sessions were in fact the first formal session of the two central committees, with the presence of all the central committee members.

Now the two organisations, together with the Organising Committee have taken important steps forward in response to their tasks. I would also like to add that Komala and UCM have joint activities in many practical arenas, which I cannot elaborate on because of the repressive conditions prevailing in Iran. As you see it is a long time since we have gone beyond a theoretical and programmatic unity and now we have consensus of views on the fundamental aspects of communist activity too.

BM: A committee by the name of the Organising Committee of the Constituent Congress of the Communist Party has been recently formed in Iran, between Komala and the UCM. Could you tell us a little about the tasks of this Committee and the progress which it has made so far?

Comrade Partow: The formation of the Organising Committee was part of our general plan for the formation of the Communist Party of Iran. So I must explain the plan which the communists in Iran are now following for the constitution of the party. As I said earlier, believing that the formation of the communist party - the united party of the working class - was the urgent and imperative task of the communists, we answered the question of what the first step in the way of the formation of the communist party was, by insisting on the necessity of drawing up and putting forward a communist programme, opposed to all bourgeois and petty-bourgeois programmes. We believed that organisational unity without an ideological unity was not unity but a short pause in the dispersion. We considered ourselves quite justified to laugh at all those attempts, of the kind of the "Unity Conference"*, whose real objective was which organisation rallies which others around itself. In contrast, we demanded that the bases of a firm proletarian unity be presented and concretised, and ourselves resorted to a purposeful ideological struggle for reaching a communist programme in the context of difficult conditions and under a rain of accusations, plots and ridicules. In your first question I referred to the way revolutionary Marxism developed in Komala and to the course of development of the Programme of the UCM into the Programme of the Communist Party - the programme around which the communist party must be formed. But I must here mention a fundamental point. The advance and evolution of revolutionary Marxism did not take place in vacuum; rather, our every step forward was attended by a struggle against revisionism and its defeat, in particular populist revisionism, which we considered the most important obstacle in the way of the formation of the communist party. At the time of the adoption of the Programme of the Communist Party, the state of the forces claiming to be Marxist was as follows: The most important parties and currents which

* A conference held shortly after the February Uprising in 1979, among a number of populist organisations, as a preparation for forming the Communist Party of Iran. - Its conditions of entry were a set of abstract positions, and the Conference itself collapsed soon afterwards -BM.

4 openly supported Russia had all joined the bourgeoisie and turned to its police appendages. The two seemingly separate currents of Tudeh and Aksarriat* not only did not claim any revolutionaism, but officially considered themselves the defenders of the Imam's Line.** The pro-Chinese currents had joined the liberal-bourgeoisie, and the most important of them, the Ranjbaran Party, was the organiser of the office of the then president, Bani Sadr. These currents took up the banner of opposition against the Islamic Republic, together with the liberals, only when the latter had been expelled from the state organs. Despite their insignificant quantity, the Trotskyists had succeeded in showing the full practical meaning of Trotskyism. These organisations praised the savage attacks of the Black-Hundred bands as an expression of the hostility of the Islamic Republic with bureaucratism, and fraternally cooperated with the Islamic Societies in the factories, schools, and offices, which had no other role but spying and plotting against militant individuals and those opposed to the Islamic Republic, as expressions of non-bureaucratic institutions.

Most populist organisations had disintegrated and a large section of them had turned to apostasy, academicism, and passivism. The most important achievement of populism in Iran was the appearance of numerous circles, each of which was trying to re-discover Marxism through their study and researches on Hegel and Feuerbach. But at the same time, many circles had appeared, as a result of the break-up of these organisations, which wanted and tried to be faithful to the cause of the proletariat. A section of these had declared its joining to the ranks of revolutionary Marxism. If we refer to the O.I.P.F.G. (The Minority) and the organisations around it, then our picture becomes almost complete. By the analysis of our comrades at that time, the survival of these currents was only because of their backwardness and the depth of influence of populism within them. The later crisis of these organisations and the many splits resulting from their crisis, vindicated the correctness of our assessment of the state of these organisations.

As you see, in the spring of 1981 two fundamental poles had taken shape among the forces claiming to be Marxist. On one side, it was us, the forces of the Communist Party Programme, and on the other side were the forces which officially and publicly defended the bourgeoisie and which spoke in the name of Marxism. And it seemed that the formation of the Communist Party depended essentially on the unity of all the forces supporting the Programme of the Communist Party. So, in the first step, for the purpose of creating an all-round coordination among the forces of the Party Programme, by means of exchanging the gains of these organisations and circles with each other, by creating a division of labour, and by the removal of the barriers in the way of forming the party, such as the ability to defend the Programme of the Communist Party, the critique of the programme of others, etc, and also through other urgent tasks, the drawing up of the Plan of Formation of the Party and the formation of the Coordinating Committee of the Forces of the Party Programme were placed on agenda.

The First Congress of the UCM, by stressing the principles of communist practice as part of our communist identity and an aspect of the all-round class independence of the working class, correctly did not recognise the mere acceptance of the programme as sufficient for forming the party. It declared that for party unity the possession of both single views and united practical principles was necessary. So the practical formation of the party, with respect

* The "Majority" section of the Fedaiien which split from the main organisation in July 1980 -BM.

** I.e., the "line" of Khomeini and the Islamic Republic regime -BM.

KURDISTAN AND THE SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM OF THE ICC

It is some time that the International Communist Current (ICC), in particular the section in Britain, in the continuation of its attempts to challenge the views of Komala and Unity of Communist Militants (UCM) and to save its idealist, semi-anarchist, and in practice, chauvinist positions, has devoted many pages of its papers for confronting our views. This is not the first time that the ICC has tried to negate our views by resorting to high-sounding and hysterical phraseology, as well as to the distortion of our views. In our previous pamphlet about the opportunism of the ICC(1), we showed that in spite of its 'left' phraseology, in the economic sphere it depicts a moderated picture of imperialism; in appraising the driving power of the revolutions, it considers the degree of economic development not the class struggle; and on the attitude towards the national-democratic movements it falls into a chauvinist position.

Behind the attacks of the ICC against us, lies the narrow interests of petty-bourgeois who have been frightened and offended by our presence in the international political arena, and who can already see the perspective of their own political demise, as a result and in spite of the growth of the revolutionary Marxist party current in Iran. A growth which is not at all restricted to Iran but is part of an immense and worldwide movement which the international proletariat has begun for its emancipation, in the context of an acute world crisis. This apprehension of the ICC is really understandable for us; but as Marxists who are concerned about the interests of the working class and not of other classes, the greatest "consolation" that we can offer to these petty-bourgeois is to let them know that they are not alone in their apprehension, and in their hostility against us. As well as the official bourgeoisie and its Islamic regime, the currents and circles remaining from the bankrupt populist organisations in Iran, too, are completely on the side of the ICC in their hostility against the revolutionary Marxist current in Iran. And the bankruptcy and morass these currents have sunk into is the doomed end of the road on which the ICC has just stepped.

ICC knows that Komala and the UCM, and revolutionary Marxism in Iran as a whole, have not appeared accidentally. The birth of revolutionary Marxism in Iran has been just one of the consequences of the extensive struggle which the proletariat has now begun to wage on a world scale, and on this path it is going to free itself from the grips of all those bourgeois and petty-bourgeois currents, claiming to be Marxist, who for years have held its movement under the influence of their own low and reformist aims. ICC knows that in Komala and UCM it is not dealing with bankrupt Stalinist and Maoist currents, which were the off-shoots of the decades-long degeneration of the Comintern at the international level, but with currents which have resolved to rescue Bolshevism from beneath the rubbles of this same degeneration and defeat; which have explicitly set their aim the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism in complete differentiation to state-capitalism; and which have defined their task, active participation in the world revolution of the proletariat, and the formation of a new Communist-International. ICC knows that the growth of this current internationally would mean the greater bankruptcy and degeneration of semi-anarchist currents which by their seemingly radical and left, but in fact empty and hollow, phraseology try to bar the proletariat from a real and practical struggle for its aims. ICC knows all

these and these are the reasons for its hostile position against us.

One of the questions which the ICC has seized upon to try to refute our views and practice as a whole is the revolutionary movement in Kurdistan which as we have explained previously(2) is a just movement with a long history. It is the movement of an oppressed nation for gaining a right which has been trampled on by the successive central governments in Iran, one after the other. Its specific feature, which at the same time demonstrates that it is not an above-class movement, is the presence of the Kurdish proletariat at its leadership. This is how the ICC views this movement:

"... like all national struggles in this epoch, the 'Kurdish revolution' can only be [i.e., according to the theories of the ICC, even if the reality is something else -BM] a moment in the ruthless battle between imperialisms large and small."

(Kurdistan - another imperialist bloodbath, World Revolution No.63, our emphasis)

which is completely in line with its official position set out in its Platform:

"In a world divided up amongst the imperialist blocs every 'national liberation' struggle, far from representing something progressive, can only be a moment in the continuous conflict between rival imperialist blocs in which the workers and peasants, whether voluntarily or forcibly enlisted, only participate as cannon fodder."

(p.8)

In the same article, the ICC tries by finding probable formal similarities between the revolutionary movement in Kurdistan and the national movements which have been utilized by bourgeois and imperialist forces to their own ends, to show that the movement in Kurdistan is imperialist and the organisation leading it (Komala) is a guerrilla organisation, and thus save its theory at any cost.

But if for the ICC the revolutionary movement in Kurdistan and its justness or unjustness is a theoretical problem which is to be settled on paper, this is by no means the case for the Kurdish workers and toilers who are engaged in this struggle. The struggle of the Kurdish toilers for the right to determine their own destiny, their resistance against the bombing of their towns and villages, the massacre and deportation of their families, the daily arrests of their militants, etc., is not a theoretical question whose legitimacy is yet to be proved. Their struggle against the Islamic Republic regime is not a problem of theory, but an objective and practical question which confronts them in their daily existence. The Islamic Republic, representing the bourgeoisie of the oppressor nation, has infringed upon the legitimate right of the Kurdish nation to freely determine its own destiny, by resorting to the most odious of crimes and to the most reactionary methods. The Kurdish nation, and the Kurdish workers and toilers at the head of it, has risen against this oppression and is resorting to a revolutionary struggle to achieve this right. By calling this movement imperialist, the ICC sides with the Islamic Republic regime against the Kurdish workers and toilers. By calling this movement imperialist, the ICC is warning the Kurdish workers and toilers that if the Islamic Republic regime bombs your towns and villages, sends your militants before the execution squads, carries out wholesale massacres of your populations, dispatches its army and the Pasdaran of capital to occupy Kurd-

istan, and organises the Black-Hundred bands against you ... you have no right to defend yourselves, you have no right to resort to an armed revolutionary struggle against the Islamic regime, you have no right to demand that you yourselves should determine your own destiny, ... because, firstly, your struggle is a guerrilla war, since it is led by an organisation which can only be a guerrilla organisation, and secondly, by struggling against a bourgeois and imperialist force you will become a prop in the hands of another rival imperialist power! This is the whole counter-revolutionary essence of the position of the ICC against all national movements in general, and the Kurdish movement, in particular, which is revealing itself here in such an explicit and clear fashion. It is the intrinsic chauvinism of a petty-bourgeois which in the name of defending proletarian interests and the indivisibility of the international proletariat, stands by the side of the bourgeoisie of its own oppressor nation. Lenin calls the socialist of the oppressor nation who fails to advocate the freedom of the oppressed countries to secede and fight for it, an "imperialist and a scoundrel." (see the "Discussion on Self-Determination Summed-Up", part 7), and at the same time guards against any nationalism of the workers and communists of the oppressed nation by setting their duty to always insist on the 'second word' of the formula, i.e., the voluntary union of the workers of the oppressed nation and those of the oppressor nation. He demands that the communists of the oppressed nation always preserve the independence of the proletariat in the national movement, even if in rudimentary form, and try to achieve the leadership of that movement.

Against the thesis of the International group (in which Rosa Luxemburg was a founding member) that "National wars are no longer possible in the era of this unbridled imperialism", Lenin writes:

"One of the main features of imperialism is that it accelerates capitalist development in the most backward countries, and thereby extends and intensifies the struggle against national oppression. That is a fact, and from it inevitably follows that imperialism must often give rise to national wars. Junius, who defends the above quoted 'theses' in her pamphlet, says that in the imperialist era every national war against an imperialist Great Power leads to the intervention of a rival imperialist Great Power. Every national war is thus turned into an imperialist war. But that argument is wrong too. This can happen, but does not always happen. Many colonial wars between 1900 and 1914 did not follow that course. And it would be simply ridiculous to declare, for instance, that after the present war, if it ends in the utter exhaustion of all the belligerents, 'there can be no' national, progressive revolutionary wars 'of any kind', waged, say, by China in alliance with India, Persia, Siam, etc., against the Great Powers."

"To deny the possibility of national wars under imperialism is wrong in theory, obviously mistaken historically, and tantamount to European chauvinism in practice: we who belong to nations that oppress hundreds of millions in Europe, Africa, Asia, etc., are invited to tell the oppressed peoples that it is 'impossible' for them to wage war against 'our' nations!"

(Lenin, the Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution, Collected Works, Vol.23, pp. 77-78; single emphases are ours).

In the same way the ICC which denies that there can be any revolutionary national-democratic wars in the imperialist epoch, in practice aligns itself with the chauvinist bourgeoisie of the oppressor nation. Instead of unconditionally recognising the right of

6 the oppressed nation to self-determination - even if the oppressed nation decides to secede -, instead of educating the proletariat of the oppressor nation in the spirit of internationalism and fighting any great-nation chauvinism in its ranks, instead of inviting the workers of the oppressed nation not to choose secession - since this would damage the unity of the different sections of the proletariat - but to fight shoulder to shoulder with the workers of the oppressed nation for their joint class aims: the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism; and instead of strengthening all genuinely revolutionary national movement through supporting the proletarian currents in those movements, ..., instead of all these, which are the bounden duties of the Marxists of a nation which oppresses others, the ICC, like all petty-bourgeois who cannot at any cost part with the chauvinism of their "own" bourgeoisie, calls on the workers and toilers of the oppressed nation to lay down their arms lest they become tools of imperialist rivalries! This is the official position of the heads of the Islamic Republic regime, the Hezbollahi Black-Hundreds, and the leaders of the Tudeh Party, in relation to Kurdistan.

It is the official stand of the White House, of Mr. Andrejev, and hundreds of other bourgeois parties and politicians throughout the world. And you gentlemen of the ICC, if you want to at least preserve your human integrity, stay out of this real class war and let it run its own course. For the Kurdish proletariat, as for us, it is not all decisive from what possible "well-intentioned" position you start and finally sink to this morass. Whatever the case may be, the justified verdict of the proletariat of Kurdistan would be this: Messrs. chauvinist petty-bourgeois! By such propaganda, you have become the loud-hailers of the imperialist bourgeoisie and the appendage of its Islamic regime!

In another attempt to 'refute' the views and practice of Komala and the UCM, ICC describes as 'frontism' our attitude towards the Kurdish revolutionary movement and the leadership of the masses in that movement by Komala. This is how the ICC puts it:

"Thus the UCM/Komala, with their talk of revolution and communism, have played a considerable part in dragooning the Kurdish masses into a new bourgeois front, a proto-state which is, like all similar set-ups, the agent of a wider imperialist alliance."

(Kurdistan - another imperialist bloodbath).

This is another example of the distortions carried out by the ICC about us. Because the ICC is passing off as a 'bourgeois front' something quite different which they reject in principle, i.e., the necessity at certain moments in the class struggle for the proletarian organisation to resort to a change of tack, to compromises and to joint actions, even with bourgeois parties! The whole purpose behind this proceeding is, as we shall see later on, to justify its own absolute pacifism and inactivity in the class struggle.

Any Marxist whose revolutionism is not merely confined to empty declamations on the side-lines of the class struggle, knows that the class struggle is an objective and real struggle which, like all real phenomena, has its own complexities and peculiarities. It is replete of moments of offensives, defensives, retreats, etc., on the part of the classes involved. Furthermore, the proletariat is not often the only force facing a specific enemy. Other classes and strata also fight alongside it, for reaching their own ends, against a particular and common adversary. And the exigencies of such a struggle can enforce on the proletariat a certain degree of joint actions and compromise with other forces in the opposition, without the proletariat losing its independence by an iota, or becoming diverted from its final aims for a moment (provided that it does not violate the prin-

For the Revolutionary Democratic Republic of Iran

principles governing such actions). The important point in these joint actions is the specific aim for which the alliance is held and also the conditions which make such actions permissible. What are the conditions for the participation of the proletariat in joint actions?

The proletarian party or organisation can resort to alliances on the condition that:

- 1) it recognises the temporary and conditional character of such actions and has no illusions that tomorrow it may find itself in opposition to its allies of today;
- 2) the specific and concrete objective for which the joint action is organised is a tactical aim for which the proletarian party is fighting anyway, independently of the existence or non-existence of an alliance for this purpose. It is an objective, which like every other, subordinates the interests of sections or stages of struggle of the proletariat to the interests of the whole international proletariat;
- 3) it always upholds and defends the independent class identity of the proletariat even, and especially, during the period of the alliance. This means that the proletariat will not accept any restrictions and concessions on its programme, and will not rally under other programmes or a programme which is an average of the positions of the participating forces; such a programme will be wholly to the advantage of the bourgeoisie, not the proletariat;
- 4) it is not deprived of the right of independent propaganda and agitation during the period of the joint action even if this propaganda is directed against the forces who are participants in the alliance.

Any temporary alliance which is held in breach of these conditions, would be against the interests of the proletariat and a treachery to the proletarian cause. It would no longer be a conditional and temporary alliance for the purpose of achieving certain particular aims but the dissolution of the rank of the proletariat in the ranks of other classes, and the abandonment of its communist programme; not a temporary and conditional compromise, but a historical and class compromise. The same compromise and treachery which was committed by the degenerating International and which drove the international proletariat to class conciliation with its class enemies, the bourgeoisie. The world communist movement must once again re-define the communist principles which govern the tactics of the temporary alliances of the proletariat with other political forces, in complete differentiation with opportunism, and in the tradition of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. Such distinction must also be made with views which in the name of avoiding the danger of lapsing into opportunism, and for retaining their theoretical purity, and by hanging on to lifeless and universal formulae, justify their pacifism and inactivity, and in practice become barriers in the way of the struggle of the proletariat for its emancipation; a struggle which necessarily passes through numerous turns and twists and practical difficulties.

"Political activity is not like the pavement of Nevsky Prospekt' (the well-kept, broad and level pavement of the perfectly straight principal thoroughfare of St. Petersburg)", Lenin quotes N.G. Chernyshevsky, the great Russian socialist of the pre-Marxist period, in his brilliant pamphlet, "Left-wing" Communism - An Infantile Disorder.

In the same pamphlet Lenin devotes a large section to the critique of the isolationist views of the German Left, and in reply to their statement that

"... All compromise with other parties ... any policy of manoeuvring and compromise must be emphatically rejected,"

writes:

"It is surprising that, with such views, these Lefts do not emphatically condemn Bolshevism! After

7 *all, the German Lefts cannot but know that the entire history of Bolshevism, both before and after the October Revolution, is full of instances of changes of tack, conciliatory tactics and compromises with other parties, including bourgeois parties!*

"To carry on a war for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie, a war which is a hundred times more difficult, protracted and complex than the most stubborn of ordinary wars between states, and to renounce in advance any change of tack, or any utilisation of a conflict of interests (even if temporary) among one's enemies, or any conciliation or compromise with possible allies (even if they are temporary, unstable, vacillating or conditional allies) - is that not ridiculous in the extreme? Is it not like making a difficult ascent of an unexplored and hitherto inaccessible mountain and refusing in advance ever to move in zigzags, ever to retrace one's steps, or ever to abandon a course once selected, and to try others?"

Such a protracted and difficult struggle is already going on in Kurdistan where Komala, as the communist force which is leading an important and extensive section of it, has to resort to compromises, "utilisation of conflict of interests among its enemy", and to joint actions with other main forces in the opposition, such as the KDP. This includes cooperation in cultural and medical fields in the liberated areas (where unlike the places the ICC is stationed, there are not National Health Service facilities!), and joint military operations at the battle-fronts (whenever such actions are possible and necessary). And none of these actions have prevented Komala from exposing KDP as the representative of the Kurdish bourgeoisie, preserving the independence of the Kurdish proletariat from other classes involved in the national-democratic movement, fighting against all narrow-minded petty-bourgeois nationalism, educating the Kurdish proletariat in the spirit of proletarian internationalism, and making it conscious of its international and class interests. Komala has demonstrated all this in practice not only in relation to the proletariat of Kurdistan but the whole of Iran. And the practical move by Komala for the complete political and organisational unity of the proletariat in Kurdistan and the rest of Iran and the formation of the Communist Party, is the highest expression and evidence of this.

Now any force which is prepared to sink to such childish levels as to proclaim that these actions are not necessary or permissible (which as we have shown demonstrates, at best, a lack of political maturity) must try to show that such joint actions by Komala do not further the proletarian cause but hinder it; do not strengthen the proletariat in Kurdistan but lead to the loss of its independence. Otherwise the objections of such people will always remain just high-sounding phraseology.

Those who try to frighten us from participating in the revolutionary struggles - and not only participating in them but trying to secure their leadership - by pointing out to the dangers of such participation, must bear in mind that:

"There is not, nor can there be, any form of struggle, any political situation, that does not involve dangers. If there is no revolutionary class instinct, if there is no integral world outlook on a scientific level, if (with due apologies to our friends of the new Iskra) there are no brains in the head, then it is dangerous to take part in strikes - it may lead to Economism; to engage in parliamentary struggle - it may end in parliamentary cretinism; ..."

(Lenin, Collected Works, Vol.8, p. 301).

Those make no mistakes who do not practice. But Marxism is not the science of university research, but the science of practice; a practice for the emancipation of the working class and the transformation of the whole world. And those who in the name

from P.4

to the fact that identical programmatic views already existed, would now depend on the second link in the chain, i.e., the possession of united practical and organisational principles by all the forces supporting the Programme of the Communist Party. In the light of such an understanding we concluded that the communist party is not the result of the algebraic summation of the organisations supporting the Party Programme; rather, the constitution of the party must be expressive of a new quality in the communist movement. In our view, the party is such an organisation which is the symbol and defender of the all-round independence of the working class. These views of ours and the criticisms we have on the Voluntarist and Economist conceptions of forming the party, have been explained in the article "What the Formation of the Communist Party of Iran Depends Upon"* in "Towards Socialism" No.5.

On the basis of this understanding we concluded that the formation of the communist party does not depend upon the uniformity of all the circles and organisations which support the Programme and all their organs, from top to bottom, in the various dimensions of communist activity. Such an all-sided unity is not our point of departure for forming the party but one of its results. Our starting point and plan for forming the party is not organisations but cadres who beyond any organisational interests, are endeavouring to build another organisation, have the ability and experience to organise a new organisation on the basis of Leninist principles, and have the authority to call their respective organisations to join the party on the basis of its new principles. This would enable the party to withstand, from the very start, all the backwardness and defects of the existing organisations. Thus the constituent congress of our party would not be the session of the representatives of the various organisations for discussing the ways of merging their organisations, nor the official naming ceremony of a party which has long been practically formed. Rather, it would be the session of founding a new organisation on the basis of the Programme of the Communist Party, the Leninist Principles of practice, and new organisational organs, which from the very start practise on the

* See Translation Series No.14 for the English translation of this article -BM.

Please send your financial contributions to:

B.M. BAYAN
C/A 03952940
50-41-07
National Westminster Bank
40 Oxford Street
W1 Branch
LONDON W1A 3BB

We, the SUCM-abroad, take full responsibility for all the translations, articles, news, etc., in the Bolshevik Message.

To contact SUCM in different countries, write to:

- B.P. NO.23, 75660, PARIS, CEDEX 14, FRANCE.
- POSTLAGERKARTE, Nr. 055266 B,1 BERLIN 120,W.GERMANY
- BOX 39110, ATLANTA, GA 30318, U.S.A.
- I.S.F., BOX 1609, 75146 UPPSALA, SWEDEN.
- BOX 99, 434 CORN EXCHANGE BUILDINGS, HANGING DITCH, MANCHESTER, M4 3EY, ENGLAND.

8 basis of these principles, not giving them verbal recognition alone. The changing of the starting point for forming the party, from the unity of organisations to the role of the advanced organisations and cadres, is the most important difference between the present plan of action and the previous Plan For the Formation of the Party.

With this picture of the Constituent Congress of the Communist Party of Iran, the various aspects of the tasks of the Organising Committee of the Congress become apparent. This Committee has to prepare the most suitable conditions for the convocation of the Congress. In this course, it has to re-train the cadres and organs of the organisations supporting the Party Programme, and acquaint and commit them to Bolshevik principles of practice; it has to organise the necessary instruments for party activity, draft the necessary documents for adoption in the Congress, prepare the practical requisites of convening the Congress, make the necessary contacts, and determine the time and place of convening the Congress, etc. This is the main aspect of the Organising Committee's activity, which is essentially oriented to this aim that when convening the Party Congress, the joining of the organisations supporting the Programme would have been facilitated in the best way, whether from the viewpoint of the functioning of the organs or from that of their line-up.

But at the same time, the formation of the party is not a domestic affair. We believe that the formation of the Communist Party is a new stage in the life of communism in Iran, and therefore the party must be built before the working class and all the forces claiming to be Marxist. So the Organising Committee is duty-bound, on the one hand, to call on all communists to practically join the process of forming the party and to carry out the necessary discussions with them, preparing, at the same time, the necessary facilities for these discussions. And on the other hand, to demonstrate to the working class and all communists that those opponents of the Communist Party of Iran which claim to be Marxist, are not communist or defenders of the interests of the working class; but practically and theoretically they impede the class unity of the Iranian proletariat. The Organising Committee is also duty-bound to report to the Constituent Congress the attitude of the forces claiming to be Marxist, in regard to the formation of the party.

In connection with these tasks, the Organising Committee has so far successfully held the Preliminary Seminar of the cadres of the organisations supporting the Party Programme, has directly contacted all the forces claiming to be Marxist, which are in Iran at present, and has asked for their views. It has prepared some of the necessary documents for presentation to the Congress, and has taken steps towards the formation of the organs and instruments of party activity.

To be continued.

Comrade Partow is the author/co-author of many articles of which the following have so far been translated into European languages:

- 1- Anarcho-Pacifism: Peykar with the Wooden Sword (F. Partow & N. Javid) - Available in English.
- 2- Why Mojahedin Are Offended By the Formation of Communist Party (F. Partow) - Available in English, German, and French.
- 3- Communists, Mojahedin, and Religion (F. Partow) - Available in French.
- 4- What the Formation of the Communist Party of Iran Depends Upon? (F. Partow & M. Hekmat) - Available in English.

LETTERS

To the "Supporters of the 'Unity of Communist Militant' -abroad"

...Concerning that struggle [which took place in May, June and July in Liege -BM], we have noticed your note "Once Again Belgian Workers, Once Again Militancy" in your Bolshevik Message nr.3, p.11. This note requires some comments.

The "free shopping" protest did not exactly happen as you describe it. It was an "action" organized by the "socialist" union FGTB. Some women went in the shop and filled their baskets. When they arrived at the cashier, they just said "Oh, We cannot pay as our wages have not been paid"; they left the goods in the shop. The TV and the press were there as they had been invited by the union. (In that circumstances, any illegal action which would have gone further than what the union had foreseen, was made impossible). Many workers refused to participate in this "action", because they felt that it was simply ridiculous. Some women even said: "We know that if we have no money, we shall not be able to pay for the goods! We shall just look like being stupid." For them, solidarity means something else than compassion. They do not want to have other workers snivelling about their situation; they want that the others fight with them. The only material result of that "action" was that some workers of the shop gave cigarettes and water for those who were on a hunger strike. As you can see, this "action" was just a caricature of what could be a true class action. But the struggle in Liege did not go far enough as to take the form of direct action you mention in you paper. This "action" took place on July, 13; the union had decided to stop the strike at the end of June (though the wages were not paid yet).

The hunger strike was not a sign of the force of the workers, on the contrary! It began on July 3, as workers were not able to oppose the decision of the union to stop the strike, and were not well-organized enough to go in for the direct action. This hunger strike was a sign of defeat: as the bourgeoisie did not pay them the wages and so was having the workers being hungry, they just stopped to eat anything at all! This hunger strike was then no sign of RESISTANCE to the bourgeoisie's policy.

These were just two remarks that we wanted to do about your note. The highest points of the struggle are to be found in other actions, as the violent disruption of the functioning of a local democratic institution, for instance. In our article, all those problems will be dealt more deeply, with particular insistence on the bourgeoisie's policy of scarcity and the possible proletarian response to it.

Salutations Communistes,
La Fraction Communiste .

We thank the comrades of the Fraction Communiste for correcting our report on the news of the "free shopping" protest by the Belgian workers in BM No.3. However, our intention in giving coverage to this news was mainly to project the growing combativity that a part of European workers has demonstrated against bourgeois austerity; to confront the claims made about the stagnation of the class struggle and the defeat of the working class in Europe; to point out that it is not lack of militancy by the workers which makes them submit to the unions, but lack of communist leadership which leaves them confused and impotent, in the face of bourgeois attacks on their

80 political prisoners executed in Tehran

The Islamic Republic regime of Iran has once again demonstrated its reactionary nature by executing 80 political prisoners in the Evin prison in Tehran. Among them was comrade *Bijan Chehrazai* a member of Komala.

This massacre is the logic of a capitalist regime which in order to save the system it is defending has to resort to the most barbarous methods. It is the need of the decadent capitalism of this epoch to smash all signs of democracy and freedom and establish complete political reaction throughout the world.

Since coming to power in 1979, the Islamic Republic regime has done all in its power to suppress any form of resistance and protest by the people, in the service of capital and imperialism. It has done all in its power to crush democratic rights such as freedom of belief, expression, demonstrations, and strikes. During these 4 years, by attacking the opposition political organisations especially communists and revolutionaries, by arresting and executing communist and militant workers, it has demonstrated to workers and toilers its determination to exercise its naked dictatorship against them, at any cost.

Arrests, executions, and torture are the order of the day in Iran. And the execution of the 80 political prisoners - 30 women and 50 men - on 22nd July 1983 is the continuation of the atrocities of the Islamic Republic regime.

We call for the freedom of all political prisoners in Iran and an end to repression. We call for the freedom of speech, belief and expression throughout Iran. And we stress that the most resolute and consistent achievement of such freedoms will only be possible through a democratic-revolutionary republic. A republic which must replace the Islamic Republic after its overthrow; the republic of the people's armed soviets!

The condemnation of this latest crime of the Islamic Republic is the duty of every organisation, group or individual who stands by the necessity of defending the basic freedoms and democratic rights in the society.

DEATH TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC REGIME!

FOR THE FREEDOM OF ALL POLITICAL PRISONERS IN IRAN!

Our address:

**BM Box 3004
London WC1N 3XX
England**

living conditions, and to illustrate the new forms which the class struggle in Europe is taking on, and the need for their purposeful generalization. All these at the same time, belong to a more general and a deeper discussion about the attitude of the communists in the metropolitan countries towards the elementary and daily struggles of the proletariat and their tasks in relation to these struggles, which we shall deal with in the future issues of the BM. Meanwhile, we remain anxious to read your article about the news of the workers' struggle in Liège.

BM

from P.12**PEOPLE OF BANEH INTIMIDATED BY THE REGIME**

On 7th August, the regime's forces entered the village of "Aloot" and started to intimidate the people of that area. The village was under the fire of the regime's forces which caused damage to the houses, and injured some people. The Peshmargas of Komala and KDP attacked the regime's forces and after a heavy battle forced them to retreat.

8 KURDISH REVOLUTIONARIES EXECUTED IN SAGHEZ

Once again, the Islamic Republic regime showed its true reactionary and capitalist nature by executing 8 Kurdish revolutionaries on 3rd August 83. Among the executed was "ALI GHADERZADEH" one of Komala comrades who had previously been tortured in the Evin prison for 7 months.

NORTH KURDISTAN: CONFRONTATION OF PESHMARGAS AND THE REGIME

On 19th August, at the early hours of morning, the forces of the regime started an extensive attack on 2 villages in the north of Kurdistan and took control of them.

Some units of Komala Peshmargas, the "Bargiri Hez" (mass Resistance force) and KDP Peshmargas confronted the forces of the regime. The battle between the regime's forces and the Peshmargas continued till 6pm. In this battle one of the Komala Peshmargas and a number of KDP Peshmargas were killed. As a result of the use of heavy guns in this attack by the regime's forces, a number of people were killed and injured.

WORKERS IN SANANAJ SAY "WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE!"

On 18th August 83, in a rally held by the people of Sanandaj a number of workers made speeches in exposing the Islamic Labour Law and demanded the right to form unions. They decided to have a second rally the following day and chanted "Workers of the World Unite!" Pasharans attacked the demonstrating workers on the pretext that the demand for the formation of unions and the slogan "Workers of the World Unite" are communist demand and slogan and workers were collaborating with Komala. They arrested ten workers but faced protests by other workers who firmly told them: "If one of us is to be arrested, you must take us all". Pasharans tried to disperse the crowd but faced resistance and the struggle continued.

from P.11

The main cause of the dispute is the same as everywhere: the capitalists' attack on the living standard of workers. The workers went on strike when the firm decided to withdraw the allowances on travel and canteen facilities. The management reacted by sacking all the striking workers, and later announced that it would re-employ only 1600 out of the original 2300 workforce and this on the condition that they accept the new harsher working conditions, which would not only remove the firm's subsidies on travel and canteen facilities but would limit the next pay claim to 4½ per cent!

As always the unions stepped in on the side of the management and tried to effect a compromise between the workers and the capitalists. They came up with a "package deal" which if accepted would mean the re-employment of the workers, but under the harsh working conditions demanded by the firm! The 2000 workers refused to even discuss the deal agreed between the firm and the unions, unless they were all first re-instated.

This is the kind of militancy and consciousness which the workers everywhere must follow so that they not only resist further retreats being imposed on them by the bourgeoisie, but use their already-acquired gains as springboards for their future struggles.

from P.7

of Marxism, and under the pretext of avoiding 'activism' and the dangers of the class struggle, refrain from practicing their communist tasks, and from participating in and leading the struggle of the proletariat, and the toiling masses which will join it, against the bourgeoisie, only pay lip-service to the revolution. ICC typifies such a force and as we have shown throughout this article, it only talks about revolution and internationalism without doing anything about them. And that is not all. ICC, by renouncing the right of nations to self-determination and labelling all genuine manifestations of the struggle of the proletariat and toiling masses for democracy and socialism, as imperialist and reactionary, takes its righteous place by the side of the most reactionary circles of the imperialist bourgeoisie, and its accomplices.

Are we not, therefore, justified in saying that the ICC is a petty-bourgeois chauvinist circle, with many words, but no action?

Amir

NOTES

- 1- See the pamphlet "ICC: opportunism behind 'left' phraseology"
- 2- See in particular the article in BM No.3 entitled "Kurdistan and the Communists".

**ICC : Opportunism Behind
'Left' Phraseology**

Supporters of the Unity of Communist Militants, Britain
April 1983

Contributions

We would like to thank the following for their donations and contributions:

- Nesa (Britain) For her assistance in typing
- Alfonso (Italy) A contribution of 30,000 Lire
- Michel (Italy) A contribution of 20,000 Lire
- Caterina, Dario, Valentina (Italy) A contribution of 10,000 Lire, each
- Anna, Josef. R. Vasdi, Mrco, Anna Rita, Fabrizio, Alberto, Mehdi (Italy) A contribution of 5000 Lire, each
- Comrades in Sweden A contribution of 4730 Kronas
- M.A., Masoud (Sweden) A contribution of 200 Kronas each
- M. Soltani (France) A contribution of 200 Franc
- F. Maryam (Norway) A contribution of £300
- Rashid (Britain) A contribution of £ 20
- Sahand (Britain) A contribution of £ 10
- P. (Britain) A contribution of £ 9
- Pejman, Toraj, Varoj (Britian) A contribution of £ 7 each.
- Saeed (Britain) A contribution of £ 5

WORLD NEWS

BELGIAN BOURGEOISIE RESORTS TO ROYAL PROCLAMATION TO BREAK THE STRIKE

★ In an angry and spontaneous response to the austerity measures that the Belgian bourgeoisie has prepared for workers in its government-proposed budget for 1984, more than 800,000 workers in Belgium went on strike.

The new austerity measures include, inter alia, more salary cuts, lower welfare benefits and many other attacks on the living standards of the Belgian workers.

The mass strike broke out after the rail workers in Charleroi walked out on Tuesday 13th of September. News till 17th September was that for the fourth day running the country was without transport and other public services. Post offices were shut, as were many schools and local government offices. Broadcasting services were interrupted and all underground, bus and tram services were halted. About 100 ships were blocked at Antwerp because the workers of the lockgates were on strike too!

Under such conditions, when a massive strike by one section of the Belgian proletariat had brought the whole country to an almost stand still, the bourgeoisie put aside the democratic mask of its dictatorship and challenged the working class by its openly repressive laws and means. The government ordered a royal proclamation according to which any worker refusing to return to work was liable to imprisonment.

Unfortunately, in the absence of a truly communist leadership which could organise and educate the workers through this strike to the possible extent of going beyond this economic demands and consciously striving to question the very basis of such laws and proclamations and the organs enforcing them, i.e., the capitalist system and its state, many workers gave up the strike and returned to work.

The Belgian workers have indeed shown their great potential for adopting radical forms of struggle against the bourgeoisie. They have demonstrated their combativity through the heroic strikes of the steel workers 2 years ago, and their running battles with the police in front of the Parliament building in Bruxelles. And a more recent instance has been the joint struggle of the firemen and the dustmen who fought the army and made it retreat. (see BM No.2)

It is up to the Belgian comrades to make sure that this present wave of workers' struggle will not be led astray and aborted by the unions and the revisionists of all colours. Let the Belgian bourgeoisie tremble at the spectre of the workers gaining communist consciousness and organisation!

BRAZILIAN WORKERS AND TOILERS STEP UP THEIR STRUGGLES

★ Workers and their families, in Rio de Janeiro alone, have confiscated the commodities of 100 supermarkets in less than 2 weeks. As the Guardian of 16th September 1983 reports:

"The ransackings are impressive in their mixture of efficiency and violence. They always take place in the middle of the night. The crowd concentrates in front of the target in a matter of minutes, sweep aside any resistance, and break in. In several cases policemen were stoned and even shot at. The whole thing is over in less than 10 minutes."

We report this news with delight since it is an indication of the fact that in the largest country of Latin America, which has a population of over 100 million and is so close to the mainland of American imperialism, the proletariat and toilers are showing

11 such a readiness to fight the miseries of capital. However, it is not in Rio de Janeiro alone that such "ransackings" are taking place. It is a common practice in almost all cities of Brazil which too accomodate many of the draught-stricken and dispossessed peasants. In the state capital of Fortaleza which houses nearly 300,000 of such dispossessed peasants, similar events have been a frequent occurrence. Sao Paulo has not remained unscathed either and there too the dispossessed semi-proletarians have adopted tactics similar to those of their class brothers and sisters in Rio de Janeiro. This shows that in a capitalist country, whether dominated by imperialism or itself an imperialist country, the effects of the crisis, the attacks of the bourgeoisie on the standards of living of the workers to produce greater profits, and the fight-back of the workers against all this, necessarily embraces the whole working class and assumes a general character.

This news of the struggle of the Brazilian workers and toilers and the direct revolutionary actions they have resorted to is another confirmation of the validity of Lenin's theory of imperialism. The export of capital from the metropolises has led to the export and expansion of capitalist relations in the dominated countries, i.e., countries which are, for the whole bourgeoisie, the spheres of production of super-profits through the exploitation of the cheap labour-power of the working class. Thus the workers and the labouring masses in these countries are already living under the most impoverished conditions. So in times of crisis, as the one we are currently going through, the crisis finds its most intense expressions in the dominated countries and the masses which however have no room to retreat are drawn into a revolutionary struggle, in response to the offensive of the capitalist class, even as far as questioning the very existence of the capitalist relations. However this does not all mean that the metropolitan countries can escape the effects of the world crisis. The response of the workers in the metropolitan countries against the all-sided attacks of the bourgeoisie to reduce the living conditions of the workers, and their growing militancy, is an evidence of this truth. (see for example the news of the Belgian workers' struggles in this issue of the paper).

The other significance of this news is the massive and direct participation of the families of the workers and toilers in these struggles. The same report informs us that:

"Most of the ransackers are women, some of them coming with their children. It is obvious that whatever the nature of the spark, the ransackings have become a last resort of desperate people."

Which once again demonstrates that the working class is not a class confined to the factory, but a social class which is militant by virtue of its objective existence. And the work of agitation, propaganda, and organisation by the communists among workers must extend to these sections of the workers too.

WORKERS CLASH WITH POLICE IN SCOTLAND AND REFUSE

THE UNION/MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT

★ On 29th August 1983 police and picketing workers clashed outside the Highland Fabricators platform yard at Nigg in Easter Ross. Hundreds of workers sacked from the yard on August 20th blocked the road to stop coachloads of workers re-hired by the firm entering the yard. According to the law, there could be only 6 pickets at a time, but the 500 angry sacked workers totally ignored the notices given by the police and surged across the road pushing aside all the police officers.

→ P.10

LONG LIVE PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM!

News from Kurdistan



THE INTERNATIONAL ROAD OF URUMIA-SALMAS

TAKEN OVER BY THE PESHMARGAS

On 9th August 83, Komala Peshmargas took control of this International road and after arresting some of the regime's personnel, began to talk to the people (in Turkish and Kurdish) about the revolutionary movement of Kurdistan and exposed the counter-revolutionary nature of the Islamic Republic regime.

PESHMARGAS CAPTURE A REGIME'S BASE

Komala Peshmargas succeeded in capturing the base of "Morvarid". They also attacked a regime's patrol group in another nearby village and killed a Pasdars. Following the capture of the base, the regime's forces arrested and imprisoned a number of the residents in the village. However, those arrested did not give up resistance and after a few days they were all freed.

ADVANCEMENT OF PESHMARGAS IN THE BANEH-SARDASHT ROAD

At dawn, the Peshmargas of the "Karikar Hez" took control of a section of the Baneh-Sardasht road where a number of enemy's bases are situated. A number of the regime's forces were killed and the regime could not escape the attack even with the reinforcement forces. At least 20 of the regime's forces were killed.

REGIME'S BASE NEAR SANANDAJ CAPTURED BY THE PESHMARGAS

On 21st August 83, after a heroic battle, Komala Peshmargas took control of the regime's base in the village of 'Arndan' 3km from the Sanandaj base.

NORTH OF KURDISTAN: PESHMARGAS ADVANCE, THE REGIME RETREATS

On 18th August 83, the Peshmargas of Komala took control of the Urmia-Salmas road (International) and talked to the people about the revolutionary movement of the Kurdish masses, the situation of the revolution, and exposed the nature of the Islamic Republic regime. The Peshmargas were confronted by the regime's forces, but facing the constant firing of the Peshmargas, they had to retreat. A number of high ranking officers among the regime's forces were killed.

PESHMARGAS' OFFENSIVE AND THE PEOPLE'S SUPPORT

On 19th August, a few units of Komala Peshmargas entered the town of Bookan and took control of several areas. They were involved in a battle with the regime's forces, as a result of which 25 of the regime's forces were killed and only one Komala Peshmarga was injured who was transported to Komala's hospital. Throughout this battle the people actively and bravely supported the Peshmargas.

★ ★ ★

During the last two months the Islamic Republic regime has attacked several towns and villages in Kurdistan, killing many people and destroying their houses. The attacks which have all met the reciprocal offensive of Komala's Peshmargas have been mainly in Marivan, Divandareh, Baneh, Saghez, Sardasht, Mahabad, Bookan, and some other regions in the north of Kurdistan.

KAL-KOSHCH (BANEH) UNDER HEAVY BOMBARDMENT

At 12 o'clock at night on 12th August 83 an extensive and heavy artillery attack by the regime started from the village of "Darehgazan" and the heights in that area, towards the strategic area of KAL-KOSHCH. Komala Peshmargas took an offensive position against this attack and a heavy battle started, as a result of which, more than 200 of the regime's forces were killed despite the arrival of reinforcement.

→ P.10

It is four years since the escalation of the revolutionary movement of Kurdistan. Four years pass since the beginning of an intense class struggle by the workers and toilers in one part of the world.

The new period of the revolutionary movement of Kurdistan which took shape in connection with the nationwide revolution in Iran has been transformed into the main front of the continuation of the revolution. Since the Uprising, the revolutionary movement of the Kurdish people has been repeatedly successful in crushing many attempts by the Islamic Republic for the complete suppression of this movement.

The massive military attacks of the regime in Kurdistan is the reflection of the reality that the Iranian bourgeoisie and its international allies (Western and Eastern alike) have realised that the maintenance of their interests in Iran and the region lies in suppressing this revolutionary movement. The Islamic Republic has not refrained for one moment, from suppressing the revolutionary movement of the Kurdish people. Only recently, during its Spring offensive, the regime mobilized about 200,000 of its armed forces to Kurdistan. The execution of the 59 civilians of Mahabad on 2nd June 1983 and other grotesque crimes such as mass executions, imprisonment, deportation, intimidation, forceful arming of the people, and the daily bombardment and mass destruction of towns and villages are all part of the measures carried out by the present regime of the bourgeoisie to suppress the just struggles of the Kurdish workers and toilers.

However, despite all the propaganda news of the regime about the "complete suppression" of the revolutionary movement in Kurdistan; despite the worldwide silence about this movement, it has advanced and gained mass support.

The Spring offensive of the regime which was one of the most intense attacks of the regime against Kurdistan and is still continuing on an extensive front, has been heroically and resolutely resisted by Komala's Peshmargas. In several towns and villages the Peshmargas have destroyed the regime's bases and confiscated large quantities of ammunition. The advances have been mainly in Marivan, Saghez, Kamyaran, Sardasht, Bijar, and some other towns in the north and the south of Kurdistan.

The following is just some of the events which took place in Kurdistan during the months of August and September 1983. These show the great determination of the Kurdish workers and toilers to fight against one of the most brutal and reactionary capitalist regimes in history, and resist its attacks which have been continuing for more than four years.

The following news about Kurdistan have been extracted and compiled from the communiqués of the representative of Komala abroad, comrade Yosef Ardalan.

KOMALA PESHMARGAS TAKE CONTROL OF THE

"SORSOR" AREA

On 4th August 83, several units of the "Showan Hez" Peshmargas took control of the "Khasan-Gawshan" road in the "Sorsor" area of Kamyaran, for 12 hours. During this operation, the Peshmargas bombarded a personnel carrier of the regime and killed all those inside and took possession of a quantity of ammunition.

Victory to the Revolutionary Movement of Kurdish Masses !