

An interview with comrade F. Partow (part two)

This is the second and final part of the interview carried out recently by the Bolshevik Message with comrade F. Partow. It should be noted that this interview was completed before the recent formation of the Communist Party of Iran and therefore contains references to the future formation of the Party. This and similar points in the text must therefore be considered in the light of the above information.

BM: What is the place and importance of the Kurdish movement in the Iranian revolution and its role in building the Communist Party of Iran?

Comrade Partow: Earlier I talked of the polarisation of the national movement in Kurdistan. At present two different programmes for this movement, two forms of self-determination, which are represented by two influential organisations in the Kurdish national movement, have been put before this movement.

The first programme which in the final analysis wants to bring about some changes in the legal and bureaucratic relationships between the autonomous government of Kurdistan and the central government, is a liberal programme which has been put forward by the Kurdistan Democratic Party. This party has repeatedly displayed its compromising and inconsistent character on the specific question of self-determination, as well as its anti-democratic character.

The second programme is the Programme of Komala for the Autonomy of Kurdistan. This programme which is based on the voluntary union of nations, has put forward certain demands, in the context of the struggle for self-determination, all of which are based on the Programme of the Communist Party. The Programme of Komala for Autonomy stands for soviet democracy, universal arming, unconditional political freedoms, equality of men and women, the separation of religion from the state, the most advanced welfare demands for workers and toilers, and many other democratic demands.

I should draw your attention to two points. Firstly, this programme is not a theoretical document, but the programme of a mass organisation for this movement. Relying on this programme, Komala is today participating in the Kurdish national movement, and to the extent that it has been able to insist on this programme, in opposition to the programme of the KDP, it has attracted the revolutionary elements in the Kurdish movement towards itself. Secondly, as a mass movement, the Kurdish national movement has its own peculiarities for victory. Though it is true that the escalation of the general movement in Iran, will provide very favourable conditions for the victory of this democratic movement, but this movement can reach its aim, i.e., self-determination, without the Islamic Republic regime having been overthrown in a revolutionary way - this being, of course, the precondition for the victory of every really democratic and mass general movement. The self-determination of the Kurdish nation, in whatever form and based on whatever programme, is dependent on the defeat and withdrawal from the Kurdish regions, of all the suppressive forces of the Islamic Republic or any other bourgeois state. The defeat of these forces, based on mass organisation and mobilization in the Kurdish regions, and the achievement of a particular balance between the military forces of the two sides is quite possible. I stress that it is possible, not that it is certain or the best situation. In the first step, the defeat of the suppressive forces of the Islamic Republic in Kurdistan, will create very favourable conditions for the escalation of the general movement in Iran, from the standpoint of political, military, and propaganda balance. In the second step, the acceptance of the Programme of Komala for the Autonomy of Kurdistan, as the best form of self-

determination, by the people of Kurdistan, will create a new balance of class forces between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in Iran, in the region, and hence in the world. A really revolutionary and a really democratic Kurdistan would be the best support for a victorious democratic revolution and for the all-sided class independence of the working class. A revolutionary Kurdistan would be the advocate and symbol of revolutionary democracy led by the communists, and a bastion for material and moral support for the class struggle of the working class. The extensive mobilization of Kurdish workers in party organisations, the existence of party schools, propaganda and agitational organs corresponding to the conditions of today, publications which with the best form of organisation call the working class to socialism, the incomparable increase in the strength of the communists in carrying out their class tasks relying on the democratic atmosphere of Kurdistan in contrast with the oppressive conditions in Iran, ect, ect, are those immediate facilities which are placed in the service of the socialist proletariat. These are not just pleasant, but unrealisable, dreams. The four-year course of the revolutionary struggle in Kurdistan has not only been a practical proof for these aims - who can forget the role of the revolutionary movement of Kurdistan in giving a bitter punishment to Khomeini and Bani Sadr on the morrow of the 19th August 1979? - But this is not all. Today, in the liberated areas of Kurdistan in our mass propaganda, we can present the Marxism of the Manifesto to the workers and toilers of Kurdistan. Today in Kurdistan we organise workers in communist cells. Through our publications and the Radio Voice of the Iranian Revolution, which is broadcast from Kurdistan**, we introduce Marxism to workers and toilers and call on them to get organised in their class organisation. Today the liberated Kurdistan is a base for communist activity throughout Iran. The most important organisational sessions, congresses, conferences, and seminars are held in Kurdistan. The revolutionary Kurdistan is a refuge for communists and revolutionaries who due to blows suffered by their organisations have been forced to leave their arenas of activity. But the range of our activities are not limited to the liberated areas. The Radio Voice of the Iranian Revolution** can be heard in many parts of Iran. Those publications of ours which are published in Kurdistan are not kept in Kurdistan but are sent to the various parts of Iran. You have to also bear in mind that the considerations due to secret work do not allow me to explain the various aspects of our activities in Kurdistan. Today in Kurdistan we are not just fighting, but try to carry out economic, social, political and cultural changes in the lives of Kurdistan's toilers on the basis of the Programme of Komala for the Autonomy of Kurdistan. Today we must organise mass sovereignty in Kurdistan, intervene in the productive relations, improve the techniques of production, organise revolutionary education, try the traitors and criminals, ect. You see that already, in a very limited, but indispensable, way, we are faced with the same questions which will confront the working class on the morrow of the revolution. These matters have not only promoted revolutionary Marxism theoretically, but have allowed our movement to have, as well as military commanders, also prominent agitators, propagandists, and organisers. →*

** On this day Khomeini appointed himself the Supreme Command of the armed forces and ordered a full-scale offensive against Kurdistan -BM.*

*** And now also the Radio Voice of the Communist Party of Iran, which was set up after the formation of the Communist Party on 2nd September 1983 -BM.*

←
As you can see, for us it is not a child's dream that instead of our present small transmitter the large transmitter of Mahabad and Sanandaj falls into the hands of the working class; that the proletariat makes use of the television; that the party publications are published not by elementary instruments but by the most advanced techniques; that the revolutionary soviets embrace not a small area but millions of masses; that instead of the present armed organisation which is directly in the service of the working class, millions of Kurdish toilers become armed; that ... No, these are not dreams, but realisable aims. But, these are not ripe fruits ready to be picked. Their achievement depends on supporting the revolutionary movement in Kurdistan and the representatives of the workers in this movement, i.e., Komala, and also active participation in this movement. The victory is not certain but is possible. In my view, it is the internationalist task of all communists throughout the world to support this movement and Komala, in exactly the same way as Komala leads this movement from an internationalist standpoint.

BM: But internationally, the democratic movements such as the revolutionary movement in Kurdistan have not received the active and principled support of the communists. Could you tell us your views about this attitude?

Comrade Partow: The problem of the comrades is understandable. The examples of China, Albania, Vietnam and many other movements demonstrate that the participation of the communists in the democratic movements has led not to the communists putting their imprint on these movements, but these movements - which are essentially bourgeois-democratic - putting their imprint on the communists and their parties. The participation of the communists in the democratic movements has practically resulted in these parties turning their backs against proletarian internationalism; has resulted in the uninterrupted revolution being put aside and the "people's democratic republic", or whatever name that is given to a bourgeois republic, taking the place of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It has resulted in the contradictions inside the people - the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie - being regarded as non-antagonistic; and state-capitalism being presented as socialism, and so on. Should we therefore conclude that the active participation of the communists in these movements and their endeavour for leading them is wrong?

So far as it concerns the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, the answer to this question is negative. They have written heaps of material to prove that the proletariat is the advanced fighter of democracy; that without democracy, transition to socialism is impossible; that democracy necessitates the destruction of the bureaucratic-military machinery; that the bourgeoisie is no longer the advocate of democracy; and that the working class must endeavour, at the head of all the oppressed, for a mass revolution and for achieving democracy as the pre-condition of transition to socialism. The idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the democratic revolution and in all the democratic movements is one of the greatest teachings of Lenin. We have included this principle in our programme and defend it.

If any comrades are opposed to these teachings they must say so clearly. They must show where the mistake of the Bolsheviks and Lenin lies. Or the comrades may show by their assessment of the balance of class forces at the international level that if for example the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the democratic revolution was valid at the beginning of the Twentieth Century, now it is no longer valid. No doubt we will welcome such discussions. Marxism is not a dogma for us, and Lenin not an idol. But we expect the comrades

5 to understand our situation. Democratic movements and the Kurdish movement are not the products of our imagination. We have not labelled the polite nagging and oppositions of the bourgeois as a democratic movement. The national movement of Kurdistan is a revolutionary and mass movement in which the workers and toilers of Kurdistan have a determining role. This demands that communists put forward clear and realisable tactical guidelines, and our expectations are that our comrades positively suggest tactical guidelines to us.

But are we not closing our eyes to the defeated experiences of the past, by emphasising the place of the democratic movements, the democratic revolution and the role of the proletariat and communists in them? No, we are not. Not only have we not overlooked these experiences, but the study and critique of these experiences and the parties involved in them have made us more committed in defending Lenin's viewpoint.

In my view, the opportunism of the above-mentioned parties did not start with their participation in the democratic movements. These parties were either directly under the supervision of the Comintern, or, after the defeat of the Comintern, they were the inheritors and carriers of the traditions of the Comintern. But except for a short period at the beginning of its formation, the Comintern defended an opportunist policy throughout the world, and these parties were in the first place influenced by this international opportunism and not by the democratic movements [in which they were participating]. Overlooking this fact, criticizing participation in these movements instead of the policy which the Comintern-affiliated parties followed in these movements, condones the Comintern and, at best, makes a critique of a local opportunism instead of an international opportunism. The critique of the mere participation of the communists in the democratic movements and endeavour to take their leadership, which is a Leninist position, implicitly forgives the anti-Leninist position of the Comintern.

But issuing the verdict of non-participation of the communists in the democratic movements, is not the proletarian alternative to the opportunist policy of the Comintern. National-revolutionary movements confronted the Comintern as a reality. On the basis of Lenin's theory of imperialism, these movements are inevitable and their persistence in the whole of the Twentieth Century is expressive of the correctness of Lenin's theory. The existence of many mass movements with democratic demands, indicates that these movements are not based on illusions; that the lack of political and civil rights, women's oppression, national oppression, religious oppression, and the most savage dictatorships, are the realities of these societies; that masses in large numbers, including the workers, rise to struggle against these oppressions. To understand these realities it is enough to leave aside the parliamentary apathy of Europe, study these movements as they really are, and once again acquire the scientific theory of the objective necessity of these movements as seen by Lenin.

Now the question is posed in this way: with respect to the fact that workers and toilers have an active role in these movements and in many cases are the determining forces of these movements, should the greatest efforts be made in order to gain the hegemony in these movements and thus overcome the half-heartedness and treachery of the liberal bourgeoisie and lead these movements to victory, or, by refusing to participate in these movements, to let the strength of the workers become props in the hands of the bourgeoisie? (Do we need to repeat these ABC?)

If we do not take part in these movements as a communist organisation and a communist party and do not try to achieve their leadership, keeping our hands well off the ground lest they become soiled with the dirt of

→ P. 8

For the Revolutionary Democratic Republic of Iran !

from P. 5

the democratic movement, we may remain a virgin organisation which continuously boasts about its theoretical virginity and the absence of opportunism in its weak ranks, but this has nothing to do with the working class. In that case the workers have been placed under the leadership of the bourgeoisie and have tail-ended it. And those who pride themselves of their virginity are not political parties but word-monger circles. If we want to be communist, i.e., if we want to be the organ of the political leadership of the working class and not a literary circle, which is investigating about the ideal conditions of an ideal movement of the proletariat for socialism, then we must lead the working class which is extensively involved in these democratic movements, and by securing the hegemony of the proletariat over these movements, by realising a consistent democracy, prepare the most favourable real conditions for advancing towards the dictatorship of the proletariat. We must defend the Leninist position in the democratic revolution against the opportunism of the Comintern, the Popular Fronts, and the Anti-Fascist Fronts, etc.

But there is no doubt that we are not thus entering a battle in which our victory is assured. It is possible for our party to be influenced by the narrow-mindedness of these movements; it is possible that we will lapse into nationalism and opportunism. Very well, if we have no self-confidence, if the first confrontations with the bourgeoisie frighten us, if we are such a weak party that the potential danger of lapsing into opportunism has made us passive, we must say this loud and clearly, and instead of theorizing passivism, overcome these weaknesses. Such a party, a party which under the pretext of the danger of infiltration of the bourgeoisie in its ranks and of lapsing into opportunism, refuses to participate in these movements, must not claim that it is leading the working class for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the setting up of socialism, when the resistance of the bourgeoisie has become ten-fold. I believe that refraining from the proletarian support and leadership of the democratic movements under the pretext that the communist party will be in danger of losing its class independence, and thus leaving the proletariat in the hands of the bourgeoisie without any struggle, is, from the practical standpoint, as opportunist as the policy of the Comintern which with its "Popular Fronts" sent the proletariat behind the bourgeoisie.

You see, I am not denying this danger; the danger of lapsing into opportunism exists for us or any organisation which wants to lead a real mass movement. And the way to avoid this danger is to admit its existence, preserve permanent vigilance and endeavour continuously to purge the ranks of the party. We, for our part, have fought against such tendencies in our ranks and our First Congress was an important step in this direction. But we know that attempts to keep the purity of the ranks of the communist party is not a local and national affair. We are internationalists and stand for the formation of the International, the international party of the proletariat. But the absence of such an organisation under the present conditions does not change the international character of our struggle. Thus our hands are sincerely extended towards all our comrades throughout the world and we are ready to discuss all questions related to the world programme and tactics of the proletariat and the questions concerning the programme and tactics of the Iranian proletariat. We are already counting on the positive and effective role of the international communists on the communist movement of Iran and the Communist Party of Iran, and hope that our comrades throughout the world give assistance in every respect to the growth and development of the revolutionary Marxism in Iran. But at the same time we expect our comrades to understand us, and consider our real conditions. We are in a situation where most polemics have an immediate practical meaning for us. Therefore we expect that these comrades talk to us in our own way. If they see any mistakes in our movement, they should criticize these explicitly. But they should not

8 just say what must not be done but should also try to tell us what must be done. I believe this is the most effective way for deepening and developing revolutionary Marxism in Iran as a front of the international class struggle of the working class. This is the internationalist task of all communists throughout the world. Those comrades who in dealing with our urgent tactical problems, despise us, only point out the dangers; instead of productive attitudes towards our programmatic and tactical positions, search microscopically to find nationalist vestiges in our organisations; and instead of supporting the fraternal relationships between us and Komala and our joint efforts to overcome circlism and build the communist party, reproach us; these comrades, regardless of whatever good intentions that they may have, are calling us to pacifism and circlism. Such attitudes do not strengthen revolutionary Marxism, but weaken it. I accept that in introducing the various aspects of revolutionary Marxism in Iran, in particular in introducing Komala as an advanced organisation of revolutionary Marxism, we have not done enough. But fraternal relations require that our comrades in the different countries, ask for more information, documents and literature in the international languages, instead of making judgements on the basis of limited facts.

Let me return to the question of the tasks of the communists in relation to the democratic movements. The refusal of communists to support democratic movements specifically, and the democratic revolution in general, does not merely lead to an isolationist and passive policy.

The communists of the metropolitan countries, the communists of a handful of oppressor nations declare that they do not support national and democratic movements, i.e., movements against despotism and the violation of all democratic rights, including the right of self-determination of nations, i.e., the struggle against the most favourable conditions of imperialist exploitation; that not only do they not support them but consider them reactionary. What does this mean but submission to the imperialist bourgeoisie and lapsing into social-imperialism. Consider the ICC for instance. This is a typical example of a wind-bag, theory-maker, and at the same time, social-imperialist circle. The whole so-called theoretical efforts of this current, from new innovations about imperialism, which are only the repetition of very old absurdities, to discussions about the geography of the proletarian revolution in the present conditions, which is the explicit reflection of imperialist chauvinism and boasting about the progress of the West and the backwardness of the East, are only the embellishing of imperialism and covering up its contradictions. For example, the ICC considers the revolutionary movement in Kurdistan an imperialist war. Does not the ICC know that only the most reactionary defenders of capitalism, in their most rabid propaganda, say so? Does not the ICC know that not only the liberals but some of the present heads of the Islamic Republic admit that the Kurdish nation is fighting for its rights? Does not the ICC know that the continuation of four years of revolutionary struggle against the most violent of suppressions has today been an expression of non-confidence in and non-submission to the bourgeoisie, and the symbol of resistance against it, not only for the Kurdish workers but for the Persian workers too? It either knows or does not know. This makes no difference in the objective place of the attitude of the ICC towards a revolutionary and just movement, the practical support for which is the permanent task of the communists, i.e., joining the chorus with the most reactionary capitalist organisations in Iran, in the region, and hence the whole world.

I need not stress that I am not calling for the defence of every national movement. Democratic movements, including national movements, can become tools in the hands of compromisers, liberals and other reactionaries. For example, today the KDP has influence in the Kurdish national movement, or the PLO has an important role in the Palestinian national movement. No communist has the right to defend these forces under the pretext of defending the right of nations to self-determination.

←
Communists are duty-bound to defend national-revolutionary movements, and the criteria of a national-revolutionary movement are clear. In my view, the proletarian position towards these movements is the unquestionable defence of the right of self-determination, support for the revolutionary leadership of these movements, and the consistent exposure of all the compromising and reactionary forces and organisations involved in these movements. From this same position, I consider the support of all communists for the revolutionary movement in Kurdistan and its revolutionary representative, Komala, as an unbreachable duty.

BM: What is the significance and role of the Communist Party of Iran in the international movement of the working class? And also, what are the key questions on which the formation of a new Leninist international depends?

Comrade Partow: Of course, one cannot talk at length about the significance of a party which has not yet been formed. Once the party is formed, once it has fulfilled its international duties, only then, and if it is necessary, must one talk about the significance of our party. Obviously it does not mean that we have no conception of the international position of the move we are making and of the tasks which our commitment to the Communist Manifesto assigns us.

We are internationalists and consider Iran as only one of the fronts of the class struggle of the world working class. We also believe that the Iranian proletariat is a battalion of the world army of labour. But the Iranian working class is not just an ordinary battalion. The Swiss, Swedish, and Bhutan's proletariats too are battalions of the world army of the working class. The significant point about the Iranian working class is that due to a set of economic, social and political conditions, it is nearer to the conquest of political power. This point alone is sufficient to draw the attention of the communists to Iran. But at the same time one must note that Iran is not Iceland, Seychelles or New Zealand. The Middle-East today is the focus of the most acute imperialist confrontations. Moreover, Iran has hundreds of Kilometers of common border with a powerful imperialist state - Russia. This strategical position of Iran, whilst showing the difficulties of the struggle which the Iranian proletariat has before itself, is also indicative of the significance of that struggle. Therefore, the establishment of a workers' government in Iran will have a determining effect on the balance of class forces at the international level.

On the role that the Communist Party of Iran can play in the growth and consolidation of revolutionary Marxism, I should point out that this party is being formed in the context of four years of acute class struggles. Four years, each of which, as Marx says, teaches the working class as much as twenty years. During these four years, the Iranian proletariat has been able to test the real nature of all the major classes and parties, the relations between the interests of these classes, their ultimate and immediate aims, and their methods of practice. The Iranian working class has left behind an insurrection and has confronted the different diversities of the class struggle: open struggle, secret struggle, peaceful struggle, war of resistance, parliament, the reactionary Iran-Iraq war, the transformation of the semi-democratic conditions into repression and so on; and along this path it has gained valuable experiences.

But these experiences have been gained at the cost of many mistakes and the lives of thousands of workers' leaders and communist revolutionaries. Our internationalist task obliges us to prevent the working class of other countries from going through this bloody and painful course. Revolutionary Marxism in Iran has paved the last four years with militancy. We have developed in opposition to the different forms of revisionism and opportunism, and have gained many achievements on this path. Our internationalist task obliges us to present these gains to the world working class.

9 The obstacles we have left behind during this period, are the present or even the future obstacles of a vast section of the world proletariat. We must help in the elimination of these obstacles with the least possible casualty. In order to be able to accomplish this aspect of our internationalist tasks in a planned, continual, and disciplined manner, we must form the Communist Party. Conversely our party organisation will enable the Iranian working class to learn the last word of revolutionary Marxism at the world level without itself being compelled to re-discover the discovered in isolation from its other world class detachments.

I will now deal with the second part of your question. We belong to a process of class re-awakening of the working class at the world level. We believe so not because we ourselves have reached certain perceptions and would like to generalize them in an arbitrary fashion, but because the objective world conditions demonstrate the necessity of this process. The crisis of capitalism has been going on for years and there is no sign of its receding. Unemployment, continuous attacks on the living standards of workers, the intensification of political oppression, militarism and the threat of a world war, all demonstrate the various aspects of this crisis. On the other hand, revisionism which is the most important and effective factor in the survival of capitalism in the world has reached its determining dead-lock. The bourgeoisie's abandoning of reformist mystifications, and ever greater recourse to force and suppression against the workers, has driven revisionism to an impasse. Moreover, the open rivalry of Russia for redividing the world, its endeavour to subjugate other weaker nations and the consolidation of the yoke of slavery in the old dominated countries, the intensification of oppression in Russia, and recourse to the most brutal methods to suppress the protest movements in the Eastern bloc, demonstrate the weakening of the ideological influence of the Russian imperialist bourgeoisie on the world proletariat. The Three-Worlds theory and the shameful defence by the Chinese bourgeoisie of the suppression of the protest movements in the imperialist-dominated countries, has abandoned the relative influence of the so-called Mao Tse Tung thought to the archives of history. The booming era of anarchist and Blanckist agitations has come to an end, too. The disintegration of tens of such organisations throughout the world displayed for the hundredth, and not the last, time the intrinsic sterility of petty-bourgeois revolutionism. This set of conditions compels millions of workers throughout the world to think about the way out of this system of oppression and exploitation, and the enquiring mind of these millions of workers is the indepletable source of the nourishment, development and blossoming of revolutionary Marxism, the science of emancipation of the working class.

The booming era of revisionism and opportunism has ended and the era of class re-awakening of the working class has begun. But this awakening will not come on its own, and is dependent on the consciousness of the communists to the features of this era and to the new tasks corresponding to this new era. For example if in the period of the boom and domination of international opportunism, i.e., in the days of the supremacy of the Comintern and the Cominform and the indisputable dominance of the so-called Communist Party of Russia, the set of conditions prevailing at the time compelled the communists, even at the expense of turning into small organisations, to defend the principles of Marxism, submission to this conduct under the present conditions and, worse still, its theorization, is an unpardonable mistake. If during the period of the offensive of opportunism, the defence of the past revolutionary tactics against new (relative to that period) opportunist tactics was necessary, in the present period the revolutionary tactics of the proletariat must be put forward positively. If in the past period, the exposure of the bourgeois nature of the Russian state was necessary, today this is not enough, and a programme for its overthrow must be put forward. In my belief, this is the necessary condition for the formation of a new proletarian International. The communism of the →

from P.9

Manifesto can and must enter the period of offensive and in the first step present to the world working class a programme for the overthrow of the world bourgeoisie in all its forms. A programme which is not only based on the fundamental tenets of Marxism but sums up the experience of the last over 60 years of the class struggle of the working class; a programme which is not only an indictment against capitalism but is against revisionism too. Today, an important section of the polemics of the communists throughout the world must be based on the international programme and tactics of the working class. But our tasks for the formation of the International are not limited to a theoretical struggle. The International is not the academy of the science of emancipation of the working class; it is the highest political organisation of the working class and its formation too is a new stage in the process of the class consciousness and all-sided class independence of the world working class. Hence the rejection and disintegration of the present opportunist parties, and practical and organisational confrontation with the influence of these parties on the working class of different countries is the internationalist duty of all communists. To talk of the International and internationalism and to leave in practice the proletariat to the opportunists and revisionists does not befit the real internationalists. What is the organisational form of confronting this opportunism and revisionism? I don't intend to give a formula. The formation of national parties may not be correct because of a collection of economic, social and political conditions in this or that region; it may be appropriate to form a communist party which has the task of organisation of the proletariat in several countries and in a region which is uniform economically, socially and politically. These points could be discussed but what I am insisting on is the need for immediate, planned and untiring practical confrontation with the opportunist parties. To the extent, that the communists have been able to reject the revisionists and rally the working class under the banner of revolutionary Marxism to the same extent they have not only armed a part of the proletariat for seizing the political power but have brought the world proletariat nearer to the formation of its international party.

The collection of the objective conditions has put a promising perspective before the revolutionary Marxists. There exist new conditions for setting up workers' governments and the International. At the present moment, everything depends on the understanding and adoption of the numerous tasks resulting from this new era; all depends on us communists becoming more disciplined, more organised and more political.

In order to meet the needs of the world proletariat which is awakening, in order to organise the working

class, in order to consolidate revolutionary Marxism throughout the world, in order to establish the closest relations among these organisations, in order to achieve the internationalist programme and tactics of the working class, and up to the formation of International, there is a world of tasks to be accomplished. We must set to work!

Contributions

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

- Nahid (Britain) For her artistic assistance.
- Alfonso (Italy) A contribution of 10,000 Lire.
- Hamid (Italy) A contribution of 5,000 Lire.
- Sahand (Britain) A contribution of £10.
- F (Z) (France) A contribution of 2000 Franc.

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

Our address:

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

SUBSCRIPTIONS

	<u>6 issues</u>	<u>12 issues</u>
U.K.	£2.00	£3.50
Oversieas	£3.00	£4.50

Each issues 35p (p&p including)

Make cheques or money orders payable to B.M.Bayan.
Send to: BM Box 3004, London, WC1N 3XX, England.