SUPPLEMENT
TO
IRAN REPORT

ON THE ALLIANCE OF THE OCTOBER LEAGUE (M-L) WITH THE SHAH OF IRAN

50¢

Preface

.In late August, 1975 the Iranian Students Association in the United States (ISAUS), held its twenty-third annual convention in which close to 1200 ISA members and supporters took part.

One of the important questions discussed in this great gathering was the question of the October League (M-L). Following a comprehensive discussion of the O.L.'s positions on the Shah of Iran, the national liberation struggles of the Omani people led by the Popular Front for the Liberation of Oman

(PFLO), and the role of the two superpowers, i.e., US and USSR, in the Persian Gulf area, the convention adopted the following resolution:

II

THE CALL in futile attempts, tried opportunistically to coverup its capitulationist, reactionary positions on the regime of the Shah and the movements of the peoples of Iran and Oman under the guise of defending the People's Republic of China, a country which everywhere and in every respect has advanced correct policy and militant class struggle and which has given highest priority to the struggle for annihilation of imeprialism and all reactionaries as well as giving selfless support to all liberation movements.

III

The 23rd convention of I.S.A.U.S. hereby declares as false and condemns the capitulationist reactionary positions appearing in THE CALL, organ of the October League (M-L), [Oct. 74, May 75], regarding the hated puppet regime of Pahlavi, the peoples' movements in Iran and Oman, as well as the

World Confederation; positions which praise the reactionary regime of the Shah and U.S. imperialism, and are in line with their propaganda; positions which are nothing less than dragging into mud the principles of the peoples' movements in Iran and Oman and those of the World Confederation, and declares further that all cooperation with the O.L. organization and all ties existing heretofore [between ISA and O.L.] shall be ceased until complete abandonment of said positions by the O.L.

IV

The 23rd convention of I.S.A.U.S. hereby directs the I.S.A.U.S. secretariat to send a comprehensive article in English to anti-imperialist organizations and the progressive press, and, to send an article in Persian to Confederation chapters and groups in order to explain I.S.A.U.S.'s positions and to refute the reactionary positions of the O.L. in this sphere, and by doing so, advance the struggle against the above mentioned reactionary capitulationist positions and propaganda.

The ISA decision came as a result of the O.L's persistent opposition to the principles to which the liberation movements in Iran, Oman, and other

Persian Gulf [PG] countries have resolutely adhered, and which, moreover, have been staunchly supported by all progressive and revolutionary forces throughout the world.

In order to further clarify ISA's positions, and to expose the reactionary nature of the positions so feverishly propegated by the O.L., we shall briefly deal with the issues involved (keeping in mind that a more comprehensive analysis of the complex questions at hand requires a far greater discussion, a task which we shall take up at another time).

I.S.A.U.S. 23rd ANNUAL CONVENTION RESOLUTION ON THE OCTOBER LEAGUE (M-L)

I

THE CALL, the political newspaper of the October League (M-L) in persisting in and developing its erroneous positions on the Shah's regime, and in opposition to the movements of the peoples of Iran and Oman, today clearer than at anytime in the past, has depicted the outright reactionary puppet regime of the Shah as a regime making progressive moves, and, has appraised the policies of the traitor Shah, (which are implemented by orders of U.S. imperialism), as "struggle against the two superpowers," and has attacked the movement of the heroic people of Oman with such slanders as calling the heroic people's movement in Oman a "puppet" of the Soviet superpower and claiming it to be "in the service of the aims" of this superpower. THE CALL, not only utters such slanders against the Omani people's movement, but in continuing its opposition to this movement, it condemns the activities of the World Confederation and anti-imperialist forces in the U.S. as "activities of those who want to "disarm Iran in the

face of daily increasing warmongerings of the two superpowers." In justifying the regime of the Shah of Iran and by class-collaboration with it, THE CALL, goes further and depicts regimes like that of the Shah of Iran as "allies of the U.S. working class in the Middle East" and appraises our organization's struggles as attempts to split the U.S. working class and such allies, while attacking our organization. What we have outlined is only a part of THE CALL's reactionary, counter-revolutionary positions in justifying and whitewashing the Shah's regime, this running dog of U.S. imperialism, and in dragging into the mud the positions of the Omani and Iranian people's movements and the struggles of the Confederation and U.S.'s anti-imperialist forces.

O.L. Attacks the ISAUS

In May, 1975, ISA came under attack in an article published in the O.L's monthly political newspaper, THE CALL, entitled: "On The Intrigues of Joseph Waller and the R.U.".

In that article were were appraised by the authors as "sectarian wreckers", feverishly launching "unprincipled attacks" on the O.L. and others in trying to "destroy" an anti-imperialist coalition being formed in Florida. The readers of THE CALL article were told that the ISA and other organizations opposing O.L.'s stand, while engaging in "red-baiting," had formed a block based on "opposition to the struggles of the Third World peoples and countries" as a result of which the ISA helped "wreck" the all-Florida anti-imperialist coalition.

The readers are "informed," moreover, that "instead (?!?)" of pushing for a coalition directed at imperialism, the ISA opted for struggling "against the governments of 'reactionaries' (note the O.L.'s 'scientific' position: reactionaries in quotes!!!) in the Middle East who today are increasingly standing up to the bullying and domination of the two biggest imperialist superpowers, the U.S. and the Soviet Union." The ISA, furthermore, is also said to have been "led into an anti-communist block,"

by putting forth a line which the O.L. claims is "intended to split the U.S. working class from its allies in the Third World." (THE CALL, May, 75, emphasis added here).

To those who are unfamiliar with the ISA, it may seem that the O.L. is referring to a gang of saboteurs set up by the imperialists in order to strike blows at the revolutionary movement in the U.S.; to wreck the international solidarity which so closely binds the American people with all of the world's oppressed, the Middle Eastern peoples in particular.

But once things are looked at in their true light, the O.L.'s attacks find much more meaning. The fact is, that the O.L. isn't simply attacking the ISA (although it tries hard to go out of its way to single out ISA's Florida Chapters as the villains -- as if their political line is decided locally), but that in reality it is attacking the democratic, anti-imperialist, revolutionary movements of the Middle East in general, and those of Iran and Oman in particular. More on this later.

Insofar as the O.L. has launched such attacks we are concerned more about their content, and we shall for now ignore the O.L.'s style of work. It should be noted in passing, however, that the O.L.'s

"self-criticism" regarding its style of work (THE CALL, June, 75) indicative of its fear of being exposed for its line of outright opposition to liberation movements in the Persian Gulf area. This will also be dealt with later on.

O.L. and the Nixon Doctrine

Battered by the rising revolutionary movements of the peoples of the world, and having suffered heavy defeats at the hands of the heroic Indochinese peoples, U.S. imperialism was weakened to an unprecedented degree. Adding to this the severe economic crisis raging all over the capitalist world and the worsening internal situation, U.S. imperialism was no longer enjoying an uncontested leadership of the imperialist camp by the end of the 60's and early 70's.

On the contrary, the U.S. was now facing two formidable opponents: the revolutionary movements of the people of the world being led by third world peoples, and the intense inter-imperialist rivalry for world hegemony. Though different in nature, nonetheless both these forces proved such threats to its interests that the U.S., from a position of weakness, was forced to come up with a new strategy to safeguard its crumbling empire. Such, in short, were the conditions which brought about the necessity for adopting the Nixon Doctrine.

The principal feature of this new strategy was the creation of regional gendarmes whose primary mission would be to suppress people's revolution in

defense of U.S. interests. The carefully selected U.S. lackeys entrusted with such vital responsibilities were, moreover, given the task of checking further expansion by U.S. rivals, particularly the newly risen Soviet superpower.

In the PG, this policy was applied in its most classic form, and the Shah of Iran -- the most reliable U.S. puppet in the region -- was chosen as the gendarme for this area. Getting ahead of the Zionist state of Israel, Iran has now become the key military, economic, and political base for the U.S. in the Middle East.

This fact is openly admitted by the regime's propagandists. In a report delivered to the annual conference of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, held recently in Sweden, Mr. Shahram Choubin states, "[The] Nixon Doctrine, decline in the responsibilities of the British empire, and decentralized international system has caused regional countries to gain more influence.

". . .this means that Iran will be increasingly more dependent on the West for technology and materials. The likely increase in the West's influence, which will result from this phenomenon, and its monetary benefits which manifest themselves in the sales of arms, will be counterbalanced by its increased

dependence on Iran for providing security for oil and the separation of the question of availability of oil and the prices of oil." (Kayhan, airmail edition, Oct. 22, 1975, emphasis added here).

The regime's lackeys, like Mr. Choubin, are shouting from roof-tops and exposing the glaring fact that the Iranian regime is no more than a two-bit U.S. puppet. But what has the O.L. to say about all this? We are told in THE CALL (Oct., 75) that the Iranian reaction is an "independent" regime "deepending" its "opposition" to imperialism (U.S. Britain, etc.), and especially to the Soviet Union! What is more, all this the O.L. contends, is done in "defense" of the Iranian people's national interests. This, needless to say, comes as surprising news to us, not to mention the 32 million Iranian's who have seen nothing but savage oppression and ruthless plunder from the 22 year despotic reign of the O.L.'s "anti-imperialist" hero. It is also somewhat of a shock for the peoples of the Mid-East, the Omani and the Palestinian in particular, to hear that the Shah they have so staunchly fought against as a tool of U.S. aggression and the main regional defender of Israel, has suddenly turned out to be the O.L.'s knight in shining armor! Let us examine

more closely some of the Shah's moves, and how the O.L. reacts to them:

Shah and the Oil and the O.L.

Between 1970-71, when the progressive sector of OPEC was first beginning to put forth demands for raising oil prices and had not yet fully established its position, the Shah tried to sabotage this move and force the progressive countries to lower their demand. Finally in 1971, due to the Shah's threats of boycotting OPEC, the original demands were lowered by half. After this period, the U.S.,(which was facing deepening economic crisis and competition with Japan and the Common Market [E.E.C.]), began using oil as a tool to push its economic difficulties onto its rivals and in this way consolidate its position on the world market. This reactionary move of the Shah's coincided with the program of the progressive countries who at all times wanted to defend their resources from imperialist exploitation.

In a pamphlet published by the Organization of Arab Students in the U.S. and Canada, entitled "The Kissinger Mid-East Peace Trap," we find a similar role being played by another U.S. puppet (and O.L. ally), King Faisal of Saudi Arabia:

"A closer look at the oil embargo reveals that it was reluctantly called by King Faisal, who had originally pledged to keep oil out of politics, quite late during the (October) war. The more militant Arab states put Faisal in a situation where not to go along with the embargo could have cost him his throne. To say the least, the possibility of sabotaging the oil wells and disrupting production was very real. Luckily for Faisal, however, he found out that a limited oil embargo would not be too inimical to the interests of his patrons: the U.S. oil companies. By declaring a limited embargo, Faisal was able to kill four birds with one stone:

"1. He was able to establish some patriotic credentials in the Arab world, which would make it easier for Sadat and others to slide into his leadership.
"2. He was able to save the oil wells from more militant actions such as sabotage by individuals or groups or nationalizations by states.
"3. He helped bring up the price of oil by cutting supplies for a short controlled period which created hysteria in the West, while the oil corporations cashed in on fat profits at the expense of Western consumers. In many cases 100% profit hikes were reported.
"4. The U.S. hegemony was re-established at the expense of Japan and Western Europe. The U.S. which had found itself toward the end of the Vietnam War facing a harsh competition from its fellow capitalist states

could now slow down their growth and re-establish its position vis-a-vis their products on the world market. It also meant an absorption of the suplus Euro-dollars that floated around Europe, also as a result of the Vietnam War (they were now converted into petro-dollars). At the same time, Europe had to return politically to the U.S.'s fold if it wanted oil." (page 8).

The Shah's policy of national betrayal and treachery, however, was even more blatant. The despot not only refused to participate in the embargo, but increased Iran's oil production in order to supply Israel in its predatory war effort. The Shah's position being different than Faisal's, (ruling a non-Arab country) while providing for all the needs of U.S. imperialism (and selling oil to Japan at $17 per barrel), also proved useful in becoming a component part of overall U.S. oil strategy in that period. In other words both Faisal and the Shah, while in appearance taking two opposite stands, were in effect carrying out two aspects of the same policy, i.e., U.S.'s move to fish in troubled waters. Needless to say, the imperialist propaganda machinery was hard at work all during this time to generate anti-Arab American-chauvinist sentiments among the American people under the guise of the "Energy Crisis". The huge profit reaped by the

oil monopolies during this period is all too evident to need any proof,(aside from which the whole of U.S. economy received a short term boost as a result of severe setbacks for Japan and European economies.)

It should be noted here, however, that by no means was the embargo totally orchestrated by the U.S., or that the whole affair strengthened the imperialist system. Quite the contrary, the wave of Arab nationalism and the progressive move of certain nationalist governments, Libya, for example, provided the original initative of the embargo. The U.S. however, found this move to coincide with its interests and set it's puppets (Faisal and Shah) to implement what was briefly outlined above. Furthermore, despite the short term gains made by the U.S. economy and its oil monopolies, as the prices were driven up this served to aggrevate the already deepening world economic crisis, thus weakening the whole system, the U.S. included.

What is critical here, however, is that the O.L. by covering up the particular role played by U.S.'s puppets, and particularly the Shah's downright reactionary involvement, and, by portraying the OPEC as one monolithic block, in effect jus-

tifies U.S. policies and refuses to expose U.S.'s role in further intensifying its exploitation and plunder. By praising the Shah as the Iranian people's "national leader" who took the "lead" in "opposing" U.S. imperialism in "defense" of the Iranian people's national interests, the O.L. is in fact drumming up support for the puppet of its "own" bourgeoisie.

One of the Shah's many "progressive" moves, according to the O.L., is his opposition to the Soviet Union, which is currently involved in fierce contention with the U.S. to gain hegemony in the Persian Gulf area. This "anti-imperialist" move is a complete farce; the gas was given away by the Shah at a price far below the international market. None of this was any "trick" by the Soviets to "fool" the Shah. Both sides knew very well the exploitive nature of the deal, and it wasn't the first time the Shah has concluded such plunderous treaties. The Soviet government would buy cheap gas to sell dear to energy thirsty Europe,and the Shah would get a much publicized "steel-complex". A pure and simple, unequal, plunderous agreement concluded under the conditions of U.S.-U.S.S.R. collusion.

But once the contradictions between the two

reactionary superpowers began to heat up and contention between the two became the primary aspect in their relationship, as if by magic, the Shah was suddenly "awakened" to the fact that the Soviets were taking the gas at a very cheap price.

It was at this time when, because of heightened U.S.-U.S.S.R. contention, the Shah began to clamour about the gas deal. A new round of negotiations were taken up and the Soviets agreed to pay more for the gas, keeping intact the plunderous nature of the agreement.

This is what the O.L. calls "defense" of the Iranian people's national interests by the Shah. It is for this that the people of Iran, according to the O.L., "must unite" with their "beloved national leader."

If this isn't enough, there is yet the question of the petrodollars generated from the Shah's "anti-imperialist" struggles to be considered. The Iranian government received approximately $20 billion in each of the last two years in oil and natural gas revnues. One would think that the Shah, whose "independence" is so loudly praised by his O.L. friends, could at least use a part of that money for the "defense" of national rights and resources of the people he's supposed to be "leading," or that he would perhaps attempt to feed some of the 32 million destitute Iranians. But this didn't happen. The O.L.'s "national" hero showed his true colors, (not to the O.L., of course), by spending every penny of that huge revenue sum in the interests of U.S. imperialism, while not forgetting to also pay tribute to the Soviet Union by signing a $3 billion pact financed by the same money.

To begin with, the $10 billion were used to buy more arms so as to further strengthen the Shah while, at the same time, giving a huge sales boost to U.S. arms manufacturers who were suffering from the post-Vietnam War slump. Then a huge "aid" spree was begun to benefit various U.S. related companies or ruling class factions tied to the U.S. in different Third World, as well as imperialist countries: $2 billion went to England, $5 billion to France (in a nuclear-reactor deal with a company, 45% of whose stocks are owned by the Westinghouse Corporation, "You Can Be Sure"). Then 25% of Krupp Steel Corporation stocks (Hitler's main arms manufacturer) were bought. A 30-story building in New York's Rockefeller Center is being built with this same money. And Grumman, as well as other U.S. companies, have also received a "generous" chunk of the "Royal" petrodollars of "His Majesty," the Shah, while $3 billion went to Italy.

This was how the Shah strengthened his "unity" not only with the "Second World," but (and the O.L. doesn't want to talk much about this) also with the "First World," i.e., the two superpowers.

As for the "unity" with the "Third World," "His Highness" has also made "great" strides. $1 billion went to Sadat of Egypt, another of O.L.'s friends (remember reactionaries in quotes!!), who, incidentally proved his worth in the recent Egypt-Israeli "peace" agreement designed to set the stage for "liquidation" of the Palestinian question. $2 billion went to Afganistan and many millions more to Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, Syria, Senegal, -----. Need we say more? Need we mention that the Shah was so busy pleasing the U.S. imperialists that he even spent some of the oil revenues of the years to come? That he is going to borrow close to FOUR BILLION DOLLARS in the next few months in order to take care of his over-expenditures? That he has already borrowed $700 million dollars from the World Bank (to which he had earlier given $1 billion)?!

Has the O.L. taken into account all this treachery by the regime? Or is it that the glitter of the "Royal" petro-dollars in Shah's hands have blinded the O.L. to the ultra-reactionary nature of this faithful puppet of U.S. imperialism? Why is it that

the O.L. has not uttered one word in condemnation of the Shah's $22 billion economic agreement with the U.S. concluded last spring?

Thus far, we have only briefly examined the economic policies of the regime in the sphere of oil. There are many other aspects which deserve attention, namely the regime's, or better said, the U.S.'s plan for an "Asian Common Market," as well as the Shah's internal economic policies. However, we shall leave the analysis of those questions to some other time, for what was outlined above is alone ample proof of the Shah's consistent implementations of the economic aspect of the Nixon Doctrine -- a policy that the O.L. shamelessly defends. Let us, then, take a look at how the Iranian government is carrying out the U.S.'s policies regarding the military aspect of the Nixon Doctrine.

Shah's Militarism Defended by the O.L.

Much the same as Thailand's role as a U.S. base of aggression against the victorious liberation struggles of the peoples of southeast Asia, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia in particular, the Iranian regime has become the most important military base for U.S. aggression in the Middle East.

In implementing the military aspect of the Nixon Doctrine, the U.S. government began in 1968 to set the stage for turning the Shah's regime into a powerful military power in the Persian Gulf, and later in the whole of the Middle East.

Joseph Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Easter and South Asian Affairs, in his June 3, 1973 report to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, stated: "From our point of view, we have a very clear cut policy, and if there is one area we have looked at very carefully in the last four years it is this Persian Gulf area, because we anticipated the British exodus and we asked ourselves. What is it that the U.S. can do consistent with the Nixon Doctrine to make a major contribution toward stability in the area without, ourselves getting directly involved, because this is an area obviously in which we have a very, very significant political-economic strategic interest."

> "What we decided was that we would try to stimulate and be helpful to the two key countries in this area -- namely, Iran and Saudi Arabia -- that, to the degree to which we could stimulate cooperation between these two countries, they could become the major elements of stability as the British were getting out. . . ." (Our Emphasis.)

Regarding Shah's policy in the Persian Gulf, the same report states:

> ". . .Iran would be exercising a kind of power comparable to that of Persian Gulf Policeman, a role which would be widely interpreted as serving as an agent of American interest in the Persian Gulf. This is exemplified by our increasing willingness to sell arms to the regime which it will employ to carry out these purposes." (p. 65, 7-23-73, Our emphasis).

In a Newsweek interview during the same month, the Shah said: "The Nixon Doctrine, that is what we are doing."

However, while the U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf is quite clear, the propagandists of the Shah and his imperialist bosses try to portray a different picture. In keeping with the aim of this neo-colonial policy, (that of giving the semblance of U.S. non-involvement), they propagate the lie that developments in this region are due to the moves of local forces and not to the U.S. It is for this reason that, while establishing himself as the Gendarme of the Persian Gulf, the Shah tries to pacify the growing anti-imperialist revolutionary movement of the people of Iran and the world in their struggle against imperialism and its running dogs, by claiming to be "independent," "nationalist," "anti-imperialist" or even "anti-superpowers." Moreover it is based on these lies that the Shah tries to

justify the purchase of close to $20 billion in mainly U.S. armaments during the past 5 years. O.L., instead of attacking the Shah and U.S. imperialism, turns against the people's revolutionary struggles in defense of the Shah's massive arms buildup.

THE CALL, October, 1974, states: "Here in the U.S. the R.U. and its student groups try to organize demonstrations demanding that Iran be disarmed and left weak and defenseless against the growing superpower war threat."

Let us pause for a moment to further grasp the O.L.'s "profound" analysis of Persian Gulf politics. The "poor" Shah, who is being "bullied" by the superpowers, needs more arms to continue this "relentless" struggle to "safeguard" Iranian people's national interests. And anyone presuming to oppose such moves is leaving the O.L.'s ally "weak and defenseless." How clever! U.S. imperialists are arming the Shah to the teeth with the most sophisticated U.S. weaponry so that the Shah can "defend" Iranian people's national interests in opposition not only to the reactionary, expansionist government of Soviet Union, but also against the U.S. What nonsense! Those who really struggle against the very system that breeds war, i.e., the anti-imperialist and revolutionary movements, are attacked by the O.L, while those who

are preparing to launch such wars, are so staunchly defended. Instead of burning with rage, at the frenzied arming of the Shah, arms which are being used at this very moment to slaughter the people of Oman, O.L. unashamedly supports this militarization.

The O.L. calls attention to the superpower war threat, a danger that is currently looming over the world and against which all progressive and revolutionary forces must devote an important part of their daily struggles. Yet O.L.'s clamour about its struggle against the threat of war comes in the same breath as its defense of the Shah's militarization. Is it only the Soviet Union that is preparing for such a war? Is the other superpower, i.e., the U.S., "peaceful" imperialism? Or, is it that the other superpower is also preparing for war? To make a lot of noise about the danger of a new world war, while, as in the O.L.'s case, covering up the fact that the U.S.'s militarization of Iran is an integral part of the two superpowers' war preparations, is nothing more than double talk. The defense of the Shah's arms build-up is a defense of U.S. aggression and war preparations in the Middle East and the Indian Ocean.

The O.L. claims that the Soviet Union is "the

most aggressive and dangerous imperialism in the Persian Gulf area." This is a complete distortion of reality. While it is true that the Russian expansionists are increasingly stepping up their attempts to gain influence in the area, and, that they use their foothold in Iraq, and Afghanistan to this end, by no means is it correct to reduce the role of the superpowers to the intrigues of the Soviet Union. Is the U.S. any less aggressive or dangerous for having dumped close to $50 billion (Newsweek) in arms in Iran and Saudi Arabia during recent years. At a time when the U.S. is the dominant economic, political, and military power in the PG, pointing to the Soviet Union as the main contradiction of the people's of the region, while at the same time covering up U.S.'s role in the area through outright unconditional support of the Shah, is nothing but defense of U.S. hegemony vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. This analysis of O.L.'s can only end in pacification of anti-imperialist struggle and support.

What is even more disgusting is that the O.L. not only depicts the new Russian Tsars as the main enemy, but relies on the reactionary countries of this region to carryout "anti-imperialist" struggles against this reactionary state. By contending that the main force opposing the two superpowers in the

region are the countries of PG, O.L. "forgets" that the principal forces fighting, not only the two superpowers but all imperialism and reaction, are the liberation movements, which constitute the main trend in the area. The O.L. tries to limit the extent of revolutionary struggle by the masses, to the Shah's "anti-imperialist" moves, and this in effect propagates a reliance on one superpower to fight the other.

For when O.L. opposes our just slogan "No More Arms to The Fascist Shah!" it is in effect asking the Pentagon to speed up delivery!!

That is how the O.L. defends the military aspect of the Nixon Doctrine!

Shah's Politics Defended by the O.L.

In pursuit of the U.S.'s economic and military interest, the Shah has also been given the task of developing political alliances to strengthen U.S. hegemony in the area. This task is particularly important at this time, for the Soviet Union is also engaged in similar activities to further its own interests in this period of raging U.S.-Russian contention in the Middle East. The Soviet Union's infiltration into the Middle East and the South Asian sub-continent has also been cause for great concern

in Washington.

The Russian's influence in Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, India, Bangladesh, etc., in the last few years has shown a declining U.S. strength in the region. Moreover, the world-wide exposure of Israeli Zionism and its dwindling influence, expecially among the African countries, was another important factor in the weakening of the U.S.'s domination in the region as compared to the 50's and the 60's.

Facing such Russian expansionism, particularly at a time when due to the great victories of the Indochinese peoples and the growing political consciousness of the people's of the Third World, the U.S. was more and more being exposed and isolated, and the American monopoly capital began increasingly to use the Shah to win over some friends for the U.S.

It was from this standpoint, that the reactionary Iranian regime began engaging in political maneuvers in opposition to the Soviet Union. The Shah's refusal to join the counter-revolutionary Asian Collective Security Pact (a Soviet plot designed to expand and consolidate its hegemony in Asia as well as to encircle revolutionary countries -- the People's Republic of China in particular), must be viewed in this context. As a matter of fact the Shah not only

rejected the Soviet proposal, but began a campaign of his own under the cover of the notorious "Asian Common Market."

The Shah's anti-Russian Asian Common Market is a U.S. plan to incorporate several Mid Eastern South Asian countries into a single economic,political, and military pact designed to safeguard and further expand U.S. markets. This, of course, in accordance with the U.S.'s policy of giving an appearance of non-involvement, is being carried out under the guise of "His Majesty's leadership." The Shah's extensive travels to the countries in the region in the summer of 1974 were conducted to achieve these reactionary aims.

During the 1974 trip, the Shah made a lot of noise about "opposing the superpowers," and that "his" proposal offers "mutual economic benefit," "security," and "peace" to the countries of the region. He also clamoured about the "need for mutual defense" so that there would be no "need for the presence of the two superpowers" in the area. (Our emphasis). That is, the Shah and his cohorts would provide for "security" of all, therefore the U.S. would not be needed. However, anytime things got out of hand certainly this "need" would arise again, with the Shah being the first to call for the U.S.'s presence!

But what does the O.L. conclude from all of this: The Shah is "opposing" the Soviets from a "progressive," "national" stance, for which not only the U.S. working class, but also the Iranian people, should be "grateful." There is no need to prove that the O.L. defends the Shah, for that is clearly admitted by the O.L. itself. What is important here, however, is to grasp that such support is in fact the defense of U.S. hegemony vis-à-vis Soviet expansionism and hegemonism. In short it is the position of RELIANCE on one superpower to fight the other, for which there is only one pure and simple description: reactionary.

There are, of course, many other maneuvers that the Shah has engaged in to defend U.S. imperialism; maneuvers which have received the O.L.'s blessings. But, from what was shown above, it is clear that the O.L. also defends the political aspect of the Nixon Doctrine.

O.L. and the Persian Gulf area Liberation Movements

From a position of defending the Nixon Doctrine under the guise of support for the Shah's "anti-imperialist" moves, the O.L. has sunk to a position of developing outright hatred for the revolutionary movements of the Persian Gulf area. O.L.'s reactionary stance in this sphere has found its most vivid expression in its open, as well as indirect, attacks on the liberation struggles in Oman and Iran. Let us briefly examine the way the O.L. exercises its "internationalism" in each case:

O.L.

A Pitiful Cheerleader for Shah's Massacre of Omani Revolutionary Masses

Ten years ago (on June 9, 1965, to be exact), the heroic armed uprising of the people of Oman was launched. The decade that followed witnessed the proliferation of a national liberation war against the reactionary regime of Oman and its imperialist bosses: Britain and the U.S.

During this period, the revolutionary people of Oman, headed by the Popular Front for the Liberation of Oman (PFLO), waged a bitter, heroic struggle that succeeded in liberating more than 90% of the

province of Dhofar. Before liberation, the Omani people lived under one of the most backward, reactionary regimes in the world. Slavery was widely practiced, and the people were denied even such "luxuries" as listening to the radio, wearing trousers or eyeglasses, practicing medicine, playing soccer, ... Beginning literally with sticks and stones, a few guns captured from the enemy, under the able leadership of the PFLO, the movement grew into a mighty force which took under its wings around 200,000 people in the liberated areas.

Slavery was abolished, land distributed among the masses, schools were set up, women achieved equal status, public health care was provided. . . ., all as a result of the determined war of liberation waged by the masses and led by the P.F.L.O.

The revolution so petrified the imperialists and their puppets that, in accordance with the Nixon Doctrine, U.S. imperialism began to launch an aggressive war by proxy -- through the Shah of Iran -- so as to strike a fatal blow to the movement, and to regain the liberated territory in support of the reactionary sultan of Oman, Qaboos.

The official Iranian invasion of several thousands in troop strength, was launched on December 20, 1973, and was backed by Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and

Britain (all of whom provided troops as well as material in hopes of quickly crushing the revolution.)

The aggression, however, met with one defeat after another. The Omani people repelled each enemy attack, and mobilized one and all to strike severe blows to the aggressive troops of the Shah. Their struggle was so effective that the Iranian regime was forced to bring in even more troops, 30,000 at one point.

Revolutionaries throughout the world rose in defense of this sacred struggle by putting forth the slogan: "LONG LIVE THE PFLO, SHAH'S TROOPS OUT OF OMAN."

The O.L.'s position however was quite the opposite! THE CALL (Oct. 1974) stated: "The U.S.S.R. is also backing organizations in Oman which work closely with the Revisionist Tudeh Party in Iran and with other pro-Soviet organizations. . . .to lay the groundwork for Soviet expansion in the Gulf. The R.U. spreads the lie that China supports these organizations and that in fact they are being led by 'Maoists.' They use films made years ago, before the Soviet domination of these groups to try to mislead the people of this country." (Our emphasis).

What treachery! Who is in fact "misleading the people of this country," and who is propagating the same reactionary propaganda as the U.S. and the

Shah's regime, if not O.L.? The Shah claims that he is "protecting" Oman from "subversive" activities "instigated" by the Soviet Union. O.L. shamelessly confirms such ridiculous propaganda by publicizing that this movement and its leadership are "dominated" by the Soviet Union. The O.L. hails the Shah's aggression against the Omani people by claiming that the revolutionary PFLO is trying "to lay the groundwork for Soviet expansion in the Gulf." But O.L. doesn't dare to utter such reactionary trash about other similar liberation struggles (Vietnam or Palestine, for instance), for it knows that by doing so it would be booted out of the movement in no time. Yet since the Omani struggle is not yet as well-known, the O.L. thinks it can get away with its counter-revolutionary propaganda.

The Omani revolution led by the PFLO, is the forerunner and an inspiration to the revolutionary movements in the Persian Gulf region. It enjoys not only the unconditional support of all revolutionary organizations and forces of the Iranian people's movement, but is also fully backed by all revolutionaries in the Arab world and in particular by the heroic Palestinian resistance movement. In its sacred fight against imperialism and reaction, the PFLO has been given support by The Peoples Democratic Republic of

Yemen, Albania, Vietnam, and the People's Republic of China.

The lies propagated by the O.L. that China doesn't support the Omani people, are thinly veiled attacks on revolutionary China through the claim that it refuses aid to revolutionary struggles of oppressed peoples. As late as January, 1975, the representative of the PFLO (who was then attending the 16th annual convention of the World Confederation of Iranian Students in Frankfurt, West Germany), emphatically refuted the kind of distortions being peddled by O.L. regarding China. The July, 74, issue of Saut Al-Thawra (Voice of the Revolution, PFLO's political organ) published a message of solidarity to the PFLO from the Chinese ambassador to the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, and in its October, 74, issue of the same paper carried the PFLO's message of solidarity to the Chinese people and government on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of their revolution. The message forcefully expounded on the firm fraternal relations which exist between the PRC and thepeople of Oman and the revolutionary movement in the Gulf.

Revolution in Oman is a nightmare to O.L., and it would rather defend the puppet Shah against the heroic Omani people. But even if we take O.L.'s position on the PFLO to be "true" (just for the sake

of argument), how does the O.L. justify an invasion of one country by another? Is that not a defense of an unjust predatory war? No matter how O.L. twists and turns, its stance toward the Omani people and their leading revolutionary organization, the PFLO, amounts to no less than vile reaction.

On the Iranian Revolutionary Movement

The regime of the Shah of Iran, representing the reactionary landlord and comprador-bourgeois ruling classes of Iran, serving the interests of imperialism as a whole, and those of the U.S. in particular, is the mainstay of imperialist domination and the bulwark of reaction not only in Iran, but in the Persian Gulf region as a whole. The Shah is the main defender of the U.S. interests and hegemony in opposition to primarily the mounting wave of national liberation movements, and secondarily the hegemonism of the expansionist Soviet superpower in the region.

Such is the rock-like principled position of the whole of the Iranian revolutionary movement. It is based on the just position that, as its primary and most immediate goal, the revolutionary move-

ment in Iran is resolutely struggling to overthrow this fascist regime and imperialists of every color and hue, the U.S. in particular. And in this struggle, the international revolutionary movement has given full, unconditional support to the oppressed masses of Iran. The O.L., however, has not only refused such support but, has consequently become so audacious as to deny support entirely.

In typical opportunist lip-service, the O.L. states, "We have great confidence in the Iranian masses and the millions of oppressed peoples in the Third World. They will certainly organize themselves, take up arms, and when the time is right, overthrow any and all classes which stand in the way of their efforts to establish people's rule." (THE CALL, October, 74, Our emphasis.) What outrageous demogogy. "When the time is right," O.L. will support the revolutionary movement in Iran, but for now, since it has decided that the time is not right, O.L. will cozy up to the Shah, begging the reactionary puppet to arm himself to the teeth, while opposing the Iranian people's movement and their struggle to overthrow this running dog of U.S. imperialism.

In order to justify its own reactionary stance on the question of the Shah and the Iranian

people's central aim to overthrow his regime and imperialism, O.L. states: "Since Iran (i.e., the Shah has begun standing up to their advances, the Soviet revisionists have filled the pages of Pravda and TASS with calls for the overthrow of the Iranian government." (Ibid.) What O.L. in fact wants to say, but is afraid to openly admit, is that the Soviets want to "over-throw" the regime of the Shah, and that anyone proposing the same is also working in the interests of the Soviet Union!!

It is a fact, of course, that ever since the contention between the two superpowers has intensified in the Persian Gulf area, (as well as in the whole world), the newly arisen Russian superpower has begun to make such a move, and the Russian's reactionary mouthpiece and fifth-column, the "Central Committee of the Tudeh Party of Iran (CCTPI)" has begun to make noise about their "struggle" for the "overthrow of the regime." But if no one else, at least O.L. should know that by their very nature, neither the Soviet Union nor its Iranian agents, the "CCTPI", want to rid Iran of its reactionary ruling classes or imperialism. What they in fact want is, to lead the movement into reconciliation with these very same reactionary ruling classes. O.L. refuses to expose tactics employed by the Soviets and their

local agents for what they are: attempts to mislead the movement into believing that the U.S.S.R. is still a revolutionary socialist country and that to gain freedom and independence the people of Iran must rely on the new Tsars in the Kremlin. Instead the O.L. attacks the revolutionary movement in Iran for having displayed its irreconcilability with the U.S. and the Shah's puppet regime by demanding its revolutionary overthrow. Much as it may displease the counter-revolutionary "CCTPI" and their Russian bosses, the Iranian revolutionary movement will never rely on the Soviets to struggle for the overthrow of their main enemies: U.S. imperialism and its puppet regime. But neither shall our movement adhere to the line the O.L. prescribes for the Iranian people, i.e., reliance on the Shah and the U.S. in the struggle against Soviet plunder, expansionism, and hegemonism. This is nothing short of what the "CCTPI" wants our movement to adopt -- class collaboration. In fact the only difference between the line that the O.L. puts forward on this question and that of the "CCTPI", is their preference of one superpower over the other. The revolutionary movement in Iran, relying on the lessons of our people's 75 year democratic, anti-imperialist struggle (as well

as the experiences of the international revolutionary movement) will of course heed neither call to unite with and rely on any of the two superpowers. Our movement will instead take advantage of the extremely favorable international situation while relying on the revolutionary masses to defeat reactionaries and imperialists one by one, and gain genuine independence and democracy.

In light of O.L.'s attacks on the ISA for having proposed that opposition to Shah and other Middle Eastern reactionaries (those O.L. calls "reactionaries" in quotes) be included in the Florida anti-imperialist coalition, while calling us "anti-communist," with a "rotten stand" "intended to split the U.S. working class from its allies in the Third World. . ." we can only guess at the slanders it has in store for the revolutionary forces inside Iran. But then, having the Shah as an ally, O.L. cannot but hate revolution and revolutionaries in Iran.

In dealing with O.L.'s above mentioned positions, it should be clearly understood that under no circumstances do we consider O.L.'s utterances to have any connection with the People's Republic of China. Taking the lead in revolutionary struggle against imperialism and the two superpowers in particular, revolutionary China is the bastion of

revolution whose unremitting struggle against all enemies of the people of the world has served as an inspiration to all who strive for the revolutionary transformation of the world. O.L. has opportunistically attempted to hide its class-collaborationist line on the questions involved under the guise of defending People's China. The "CCTPI" agents of Soviet superpower have long tried to slander China by claiming that it "preaches class-collaboration" by using positions such as the O.L. has taken as "examples." But such slanders against China by the reactionary "CCTPI" arise precisely from the revolutionary nature of that great country, and the more such attacks are made by these Soviet lackeys the more they will be exposed for their reactionary, fascist nature.

O.L. and the ISAUS

Earlier we mentioned that we find the O.L.'s "self-criticism" (THE CALL, June, 75) its fear of being exposed. For although O.L. launched an open attack on our organization, (the first time in its May, 75, issue of THE CALL), this hasn't been the only time that the ISAUS has been subject to such vicious slanders by this organization.

"Here in the U.S. the R.U. and its student groups try to organize demonstrations demanding that Iran be disarmed and left weak and defenseless!!! (our emphasis.)". One should ask: Who are those student groups but the ISA? Although it is true that we receive invaluable support from not only the RU, but all the revolutionary American, as well as, Third World organizations, who is it that takes the lead in organizing demonstrations as well as other forms of struggle against the fascist regime of the Shah.

Elsewhere in the same article O.L. states:

> "That is in fact why, instead of giving real support to the Iranian people's struggle and to the people of the Third World, they try to speak for various Third World organizations in the U.S. and use them. . . . (our emphasis.)

If O.L. thinks that the ISA is "being used" by others, why doesn't it come out and openly say so? Why all

these innuendos about the ISA being dominated by this or that group? This is vicious slander which has always been hurled at the ISA and its parent organization, the CIS-NU, by the regime's propagandists and U.S. imperialists. In a statement to the U.S. Congress, Representative Larry McDonald stated, "However, during the 1970's, the Maoists Communists of the Revolutionary Union - RU- became the major U.S. 'anti-imperialist' influence in the ISA." (Congressional Record - Extensions of Remarks, E2670, May 22, 1975). No doubt the O.L. has never heard of this Congressman McDonald. Nonetheless, its open, as well as its indirect attacks on our organization cannot but help the reactionary propaganda of the Iranian regime and its U.S. masters. The ISA as well as the CIS-NU are independent anti-imperialist, anti-reactionary organizations of the Iranian student movement and while uniting with all progressive and revolutionary forces in common struggle, we have always taken our own independent stand on all questions. Statements to the contrary, be they direct or indirect, cannot but serve to distort the truth about our organization and our struggle.

For "concrete support" from O.L. we get lip service. "The R.U. is fond of pointing out the un-

democratic nature of the Shah's regime in Iran. . . . This fact is, of course, true and the revolutionary and democratic forces of the peoples of these oppressed nations will topple feudalism and autocracy in the course of anti-imperialist struggle, because these reactionary factors hold back the initiative of the masses." Elsewhere in the same October, '74, THE CALL article we read:

> ". . .we have always joined with and given support to the patriots and communists of every country who face repression as well as the laboring people of every country who struggle for their just needs."

During the month of September, 1974, just one month before this statement was printed, the ISA held nationwide demonstrations in six major U.S. cities in protest to the cold-blooded murder of 14 Iranian workers by the fascist regime (13 of whom were shot down while picketing, another was tortured to death). The O.L. was nowhere to be found in that struggle.

Later on during May, 1975, there were again large demonstrations of up to 2,500 people in Washington, D.C., San Francisco and Houston on the occasion of the Shah's U.S. visit. The highly successful campaign widely exposed the Shah's aggression against Oman,and the plight of Iran's 40,000 political prisoners, 9 of whom had been killed in February after enduring

eight years of savage torture. One of the 9, Bijan Jazani, was one of the most respected of our new revolutionary movement (who had been extremely influential in founding the new revolutionary movement in Iran). Again not a word from the O.L.

In fact, in the period between September 1974 and August 1975, during which the ISA initiated and led close to 60 demonstrations, a nationwide hunger strike, and many other activities on a variety of questions relating to the lives and struggles of the Iranian people, there was not even one instance where the O.L.'s ("...we have always joined with and given support to the patriots and. . . ") much promised "concrete support" materialized. Not even a "friendly" letter of "criticism" (considering O.L.'s line on Iran) to the Shah for his having butchered communists, revolutionary moslems, etc., etc. But then, the reasons for this are quite clear already. It is either us, or the Shah, and the O.L. has apparently chose the latter!!

Some Concluding Remarks

We examined the Nixon Doctrine and its concrete application to the Persian Gulf, the question of the Shah's oil policies, and his militarism. We also dealt with the issues concerning the revolutionary movements in Oman and Iran, and O.L.'s relations with the I.S.A. No doubt, as we stated in the beginning, a great many questions were touched on quite briefly and many others were not dealt with at all. Yet, from what has already been said it is quite apparent that O.L.'s positions on the questions discussed here are, to say the least, a complete distortion of reality.

O.L.'s Right, reactionary positions, dished out under the cover of struggling against the two superpowers, end up in its objective alliance with one superpower against the other. Such positions, moreover, compel O.L. to oppose revolutionary movements in the Persian Gulf area (those in Oman and Iran, in particular) and to preach class collaboration by calling for reliance on the Shah's "anti-imperialist" struggle to gain independence and democracy.

Here in the U.S., through its defense of the Shah, O.L. is objectively defending its "own" bourgeoisie's Nixon Doctrine. The ultimate effect of

such a stance is nothing but pacification and the disarming of the revolutionary masses of the American people in the face of the new tactics taken up by the U.S. imperialists to achieve precisely those aims.

O.L.'s refusal to support the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of Iran, Oman and other Persian Gulf countries stems from the reasons we outlined above. And in this respect, the attacks the O.L. has launched on the ISA, both in print and in the U.S. anti-imperialist movement, are self-explanatory.

In step with the increasing struggles of the national liberation movements in Iran, Oman and the Middle East as a whole, and, considering the immense importance of these struggles within the international revolutionary movement, more and more there is a need for public opinion to become aware of who is the enemy and who is the friend of the oppressed peoples of the area; to unite with the masses to oppose the imperialists, and their lackeys. This is particularly important at this time when the international situation is experiencing great turmoil, creating conditions favorable for the people and unfavorable for their enemies. Revolution is the main trend in the world. It reflects the intensification of the irreconcilable contradiction that exists between

the camp of the people and the camp of reaction. But contradictions within the enemy camp, and particularly between the two superpowers, are also intensifying, singalling the danger of a new world war. The former serves to inspire even more struggle and the latter should be a warning to all revolutionaries to strive harder to arm the masses with such consciousness as to carry out resolute struggle against such a danger. An integral part of such consciousness is to expose the role played by agents of imperialism. Agents who by posing as "independent" governments "opposing" the two superpowers (a fight that is clearly being carried out by certain countries), are in fact striving to confuse the masses and disarm them in carrying out revolutionary struggles, while, at the same time safeguarding the interest of imperialism and undermining genuine anti-imperialist struggle. The regime of the Shah of Iran is nothing more than that. Anyone aspiring for revolution in the world, has the responsibility of pointing out these facts to the masses of people, and guarding against the pitfall of relying on one superpower to oppose the other, while forgetting the main enemy of the two international gangsters: the people. This is a task that has been very conveniently "forgotten" by the October League!!

For Comments and Further Information please contact

I.S.A.U.S.
International Relations Secretary
P.O. Box 14181
Houston, Texas 77021

I.S.A.U.S.
International Relations Secretary
P.O. Box 4002
Berkeley, California 94704

IRANIAN STUDENTS ASSOCIATION

IN THE UNITED STATES (I.S.A.U.S.)

Member of the Confederation of Iranian Students (National Union)