

We Are the 99%



Editors: Zohreh Mehrjoo & Kian Azar

Editor's assistants:
Faramarz Skandaryan & Peyman Afshar

Contact Us:
iran.cyo@gmail.com

13.11.2011

No. 03



<http://cyo-iran.blogspot.com/>

International Journal Of Communist Youth Org

"Fighting For Our Future"

"The Basis For Socialism is the human being, Socialism is the movement to restore man's conscious will "

What We Stand For, And What We're Against

We want a world where Prosperity and welfare is public, and freedom and true equality of the citizens is the basis for every social effort. A humanly world worthy of the modern mankind. We want a world full of happiness and joy, in which the humanity is not threaded and freedom is not slaughtered. A world as such, must be created. The contemporary history on one hand, is the history of the working class and the freedom-loving peoples' effort and struggle to change the world, and on the other hand, is the history of Violence and suppression being exercised by the Capitalism, governments, its other various organizations, and the reactionary forces of religions and nationalism, for the perseverance of the current situation. This is a battle between Capitalism and Socialism. In this battle, the workers' struggle for socialism has always been associated with freedom and welfare, and the despotism of capitalism, with poverty and exclusions of personal and social rights. We despise exploitation and inequality, discrimination and injustice, Poverty and deprivations, Misogyny and the political and economical exclusion of the people."

The Power of Our Decision

Active dialogue with Adélie a student activist from the Occupy Vancouver Movement.

Prepared By: The International Committee of Communist Youth Organisation

1) Tell our readers a little about yourself first.. how old you are, what do you do, when and how did you get involved in the political activism? 1) My name is Adélie Houle-Lachance, I am a student at Capilano University and an editor for the Capilano Courier, the student newspaper at the university. I am 21 years old, and I got involved in political activism when I was in high school through the Peace Committee. We would organize small gatherings every weekend to promote world peace and compassion towards citizens of the globe, and we would also attend marches and rallies for peace keeping, social justice and environmental issues. I later went on to work with Greenpeace Canada in Vancouver and when I entered Capilano University I was active in the Social Justice committee for two years.

2) Q: How and when did you get involved in the Occupy Van?



What is your role?

A: I got involved with the Occupy movement in Vancouver on the day that it started, October 15 2011. I marched with everyone, listened to the speakers, danced to the music, and assessed for myself an idea of what the movement was all about. When I saw that there were definitely here to stay, I decided to be present with the movement and with the individuals who were organizing it. I started by helping out here and there, and really saw how the movement burgeoned from the ground up. I finally found my place with Food Not Bombs, the radical organization that organizes the food tent at the camp.

Continued on page 2

**All Power
to the 99%**

"Let's Unite Against Capitalism We Believe A Socialist Alternative Is Possible"

Continued from page.1

They are a great movement, with some anarchist roots, who have for mandate to distribute vegetarian and vegan food to communities. They are conscious activists and their way of carrying out change is through food. There is so much food in the world, resources are not what we are lacking – rather we suffer from a misdistribution of those resources. So FNB collects food in many ways (not always through purchasing) and redistributes it to anyone in need. FNB will often be found at gatherings or movements such as Occupy Vancouver, where they have set up a food tent and the volunteers are constantly feeding occupiers and passer-bys all day long. I volunteer with FNB by serving food, cleaning, organizing the pantry, making



food, and just by giving my energy and presence. We get 80% of our food through donations from the community, and we buy items with donation money, and we also salvage some food in good healthy condition from dumpsters around the city.

Q: What is your assessments of the movement so far? What has it achieved? A: Since it started on Wall Street (NYC) in September, the Occupy movement has expanded and reached out all over the world. There is an occupation in almost every major city around the globe. Lately, especially in Vancouver, the occupy movement has gotten a lot of media criticisms saying that it isn't truly accomplishing anything. However, it is important to keep in mind that Occupy is a decentralized movement, meaning that there is no leader with a specific agenda. The internal structure of the movement is built on a consensus decision-making model, and people who attend the General Assembly vote on policies and proposals that the different committees prepare. This is a long process, and often requires a lot of energy and debate. This means that sometimes, things move

slowly and it seems as though no progress is being made. The reality though, is that



although there may not be any specific and direct actions being taken to implement immediate change, the actions that are being taken will have repercussions in the future and will create change on a long-term level. From what I have experienced so far, Occupy is a space that allows for people to express themselves, connect with others who are like-minded, create community and support each other. This is so important, because our society here is so segregating and self-expression is not especially encouraged. It can be hard sometimes for people to make sense of what their thoughts are for their world, but when they are surrounded by other people who have similar ideas, it can be very empowering. Because Occupy is in so many places, each movement varies from city to city. Each city is going to have different issues that need to be addressed, different minds taking on leadership roles, and a different environment to live in. All these things mean that each Occupy is slightly different, which is a great thing because it means they are personalized, specific to what needs to be changed, and gives people a sense of belonging and ownership. In Vancouver for example, Occupy has been very present in showing its colours throughout the preparations for the municipal elections coming up in mid-November.

Q: How do you see the future of it? Where should it go? What is it lacking? A: Occupy is not going to last forever, but the ideas and inspirations that come out of it will have repercussions for times to come. It is important for those who are involved in setting up the structures and those who put a lot of heart into growing the movement to not be attached to it. Change means that we cannot hold on to what has been already created,

we must be progressive, accepting of new situations and adaptive. If Occupy would be to remain as what it is now, nothing would come out of it. Those who are involved need to find a way to take these ideas, these plans, these proposals they are coming up with, out of the movement and onto the game field. Especially for those of live in the tent city, it's easy to get comfortable and forget about the bigger picture. This is counter-productive. The movement needs to evolve, and eventually grow out of Occupy to become something bigger and truly change-provoking, whatever form that may take.

Q: What is your vision for the world? What kind of world do you want? A: This is a hard question, because in a lot of ways I feel that my visions for the world are very idealistic, and I have a hard time finding a balance between ideals and what is actually feasible and practically applicable. In an ideal world, globalization would stop, governments from other countries would stop interfering in the affairs of other countries, capitalism would end, free trade would end, we would move away from oil consumption to sustainable and renewable



energy sources, centralized governments would no longer stand, and instead we would live in small local villages, take care of one another as a community and live simply... Some call it anarchism, some call it counter evolution or de-growth... Whatever the name, I feel that many of the problems we face today would not exist if we focused on local community and lived in consequence of each other, redeveloped our connection to nature and stopped seeing ourselves as having power of the natural forces of this world. Technology and capitalism makes us believe that we can live separately from our environment, and that we are above/ have control over it... This is such an illusion. We are one,

Continued on page 3

"Socialism Is the Only Solution to the Problems of Human Today"

Interview with Hamid Taqvaei

On Arab Spring

Maryam Namzие: Hi! You're watching TV International with Maryam Namazi. In this week's program we're going to be discussing the Arab spring. We've got the brilliant Hamid Taqvaei in the studio with us this week to discuss this issue. Welcome Hamid Taqvaei.

Hamid Taqvaei: Thank you.

MN: Last week we talked about the 99 Percent in the protest world wide. Is the Arab Spring linked to what we're seeing in Wall Street, in London, and across the world?

HT: Of course it is linked! First of all because the root of both movements is the same, and that's the whole economical situation in the world: the economical crisis. One of the main slogans of the revolution in Egypt was bread, was the question of unemployment, the question of poverty and you see that the same thing is happening in the West now. That's one thing that connects those two, the other thing is that even the form and the method of protest is very similar. I mean the whole idea of occupying Wall Street comes from Al-Tahrir Square in Egypt. And it's not only Egypt and New York, of course. Every other places in the world we had that idea of occupying streets and claiming that streets belongs to us, you know. With idea of occupying comes idea of controll. We have to take controll, we people, we 99%, we have to take every-



thing in our own hands, you know. That idea is a new idea you can say, and it is the basic idea in the Arab Spring, in the Middle East revolutions and in protests in the West. In Spain we had the same thing three months ago, in Paris we had the same thing, in Sol Square, people of Spain said streets belongs to us. It's not simply a demonstration, it's not one day protest and go home. It's going out, come to the street and remain there. Take controll of the whole situation.

MN: It's interesting when you talk about the similarities. There's also been a lot of

opposition to parliamentary democracy in protest that we see from Wall Street and across the world. Whereas the Arab Spring protesters often being portrayed in the media as pro-democracy movements and that's often the label that given to protesters...

HT: Yes, I know...

MN: Would you agree that the protesters are pro-democracy...?

HT: No, I don't. I don't think that you can call them pro-democracy as such. They are against dictatorship for sure, but it doesn't mean necessarily that they are pro-democracy. They are pro-freedom. People want to be free but these days democracy identifies itself with parliament and elections. It's not a very attractive idea overall, you know, because people in the Middle East think that: ok, say in Greece they had parliament, there



was election, and you see the situation. Even in the West, in the US, in the Western Europe, parliaments are very busy with passing laws against people, you know, with the policy of cutting all the social services, and so on and so forth. So it's not very attractive. Every Egyptian would think: parliament for what? Parliament to do what? Something like Greece? Spain? We want unemployment? We need austerity measures? Of course not. Fifty years ago we couldn't say that. In uprisings against dictators, like in the revolution that we had in Iran thirty something years ago, people wanted democracy as such. It made sense somehow. But these days nobody is for democracy.

MN: It seems though if you are not for parliamentary democracy then you're not for people's participation in society. That's the image that's been given. What would be an alternative then? If people aren't able to vote what else they could do?

HT: The alternative is taking shape already. The alternative is people with their committees, with their councils. People are gathering in these sort of organizations in their protests everywhere.

. As I said before, with the idea of occupying streets comes the idea of controlling the society. People saying we can do this. It's possible. Especially with the new technology, with the Internet, with the social media, and so on people think that it's doable, it's possible. We can do that. We can take the controll in our own hands. As one of those activists in Sol Square in Madrid said "Our dream doesn't come out from the ballot box". It means that people know that it is not just the question of free election. It's a question of being free in every days life to decide about everything and to take controll of everything. And people know that parliament is not going to do that for them. Parliament is busy with saving bankers and do something with the capitalist bancrupsy in everywhere. So that situation brings with itself the idea of taking controll, taking everything in our own hands...

MN: But the right to vote is still important, doesn't it? I mean people have died for the right to vote and even in the sense where they're

Continued on page 4

Continued from page.2

not only with nature but also with each other. There is no us and them, we each share the same consciousness and are mirrors of one another. My ideal world is one of true equality, self-expression, unity, respect, peace, spiritual evolution, and unconditional love.

Q: How do you picture yourself? What are you going to do for that?

A: It all comes down to daily individual actions, big or small, being conscious, mindful of our decisions and the power they have, and also of our thoughts... Our thoughts are what shape our reality, we must take back control of our minds and realize how powerful we really are. As individuals, we can accomplish just about anything. As a community, we are even stronger. We must focus on community development, and empower each other to be conscious active actors in every moment, not only when an occupation takes over a part of our city.

Fighting For Our Future

Iran's universities news of the week:

Widespread student protests against the "Food, unfavorable condition" at the "International University of Qazvin".

The jail sentences of Bahareh Hedayat and Majid Tavakoli were increased by six month. Mahdieh Golrooye, was sentenced to a further six months imprisonment, at the court rehearing.

Peyman Aref, the student activist, was arrested and sent to the Evin prison of Tehran.

Confirmation of six months prison sentence for Ali-akbar Mohamadzadeh, the student of "Sharif University".

Death of a nursing student at the dormitory of Iranshahr university, as a result of electric shock.

Death of another student at Tehran university street.

The last handwritings of Zia Nabavi: "Jail and review of thoughts in politics".

ok, it didn't work, go for the other party which is the same almost with just new faces...

MN: Going back to this issue of people's participation, revolution is one way in



which people do participate. Some people though believe that it's a failure. Revolutions are failure. They failed and they're helping to actually bring Islamism to power, even in places where they didn't have power in the Middle East and the Northern Africa. What would you say to that?

HT: Actually I think those revolutions are against Islamism as well, because Islamists have no role in them. You know, Islamism is a very well known movement and everybody knows what it is about. After September 11, we had Islamism in one pole, in one camp, and we had Neo-Cans and the militarism on the other, and everybody knows what they stand for. Islamism is for going back to Sharia laws, anti-Western values, or in fact anti-civilization tendencies, going back to "our own" culture, Arab culture or Islamic culture, women with Hijab with no rights at all, anti-Semitism ... that sort of thing. That's Islamism. Political Islam is based on those goals and those values. But in those revolutions in Egypt, in Tunisia, in Syria there is no trace of such goals and tendencies. In Syria for example you have an uprising totally against Islamism, because Beshar al-Asad is a leader and a symbol of political Islam in the region. In Syria Islamism is in power. In Egypt, in Tunisia, in everywhere, in Libya even, we have revolutions that are not about those values. Those revolutions have already declared that they are for freedom, they are for bread, they are for human dignity. So they have nothing to do with Islamism. I know that some Islamic groups, like the Islamic Republic of Iran, they try to say these are an Islamic revolutions or revolutions in Islamic countries, revolution against the West, and that sort of thing. But people in the street don't say that. We don't see any slogan against the "Great Satan" for example...

MN: But there's a danger of Islamism taking power...

HT: Yes, always there is a danger. As far as Islamism is there as a political power, of course they do whatever they can to take power in those new situation that is created by revolution. But they had nothing to do with the revolution. Do you know what I mean? Moslem Brotherhood which was a very strong party in Egypt, even they had members in parliament in Mobarak's time, in that revolution they are nowhere. You don't see them at all. Of course, sometimes they make some comments or something, but people are not for, say, Sharia law in Egypt. You don't see that trend, you don't see that movement.

MN: Thank you very much. We will going to end here. If you have any comments on this, do contact us. I just want to end with something that a Tunisian was say-



ing in a rally for secularism. They said we didn't overthrow Bin-Ali who told us we couldn't say a lot of things to have someone come on and tell us that the rule of God doesn't allow to say other things, and that secularism is an important value that they fighting for, as Hamid Taqvaee says. Send us your comments. Hope to see you again next week. Until then have a good week. October 28, 2011

Brief Introductions:

Hamid Taqvaee is the leader of Worker-Communist Party of Iran who was elected by the party's central committee in the 4th congress of the party in the autumn of 2003.

Maryam Namazie has been a member of the Worker-Communist Party of Iran since 1995 and a member of the Party's Central Committee since 2000.

Continued from page.3 occupaying Wall Street , people are still voting .?..

HT: Yes, the right to vote. But look, there's a difference between the direct democracy and parliamentary democracy. I mean you vote and you elect somebody to do something and you think you are in charge or having control. That's the second part which is missing, you know. In every parliamentary democracy, you elect some people for four years and you have no control whatsoever. They gone; they do what ever they want for four years...



MN: They do exactly what they said that they're not gonna do...

HT: Yes, because they need your vote they say whatever you want and after election they do whatever they want! Election promises are equivalent with lies. They just lie or do whatever they need to do to just take your vote and then they go on with their own policies, the policies of those one percent. 99% elect some "one percent" parties or parliament members or whatever, and then they go on with their own policies and after four years people come out with that

"It Is Time To Understand Marx"

An interview with Mary Gabriel

Mary Gabriel is the author of ["Love and Capital, Karl and Jenny Marx and the Birth of a Revolution"](#) (Little, Brown and Company), a finalist for the 2011 National Book Award.

(CNN) -- There are few philosophers whose very name provokes more violent responses than Karl Marx.

His stern face, framed by a mass of grey hair, symbolizes for many Americans the costly battles of the 20th century: battles against communism, socialism, and authoritarianism fought in defence of democracy and free-market capitalism. As successive generations of Americans waged those fights, the philosophical disputes at the core of the conflicts embedded themselves into the American soul. So much so that when the "evil empire," whose seeds sprouted from Marx's doctrine, died as a result of the revolutions of 1989, the ideological battle did not. Though the Soviet Union is but a memory, and that other communist behemoth -- China -- has mutated into a capitalist autocracy, the spectre of Marx himself remains as potent as ever in 21st century U.S. political discourse. Since 2008 especially, with the fall of financial markets and the rise of Barack Obama, the charge "Marxist" has been hurled like toxic sludge against politicians seen as ready to redistribute wealth (to the advantage of most Americans), expand social safety nets, or ensure that all children receive a good education. Critics say these steps are merely the first along a slippery slope that inevitably ends in outright state control. Amid these warnings, the communist horrors of the 20th century float like dark apparitions, reminding us of the bad old days. But I wonder how many of those who invoke the name of Marx in order to stifle political debate, actually believe their own propaganda. Or are they conjuring up a convenient bogeyman at a time of great uncertainty. Do they raise Marx's image in order to deflect attention from slightly warmer bodies (Marx has been dead for 128 years) in positions of political or economic power who are actually more pernicious? I also wonder whether those who use Marx's name, and those who tremble at the thought of him, actually know much about the man. Are they reacting to Karl Marx or those things

formed to reflect the state he had supposedly envisioned. I knew of the atrocities committed by those said to be his followers. I had not, however, been properly introduced to the man himself. What I discovered was not what I expected. Karl Marx was a middle-class philosopher, economist, and journalist (whose main employer was a New York newspaper). He was also flawed in the extreme. He drank excessively, behaved shamefully in his home life, and worked obsessively, though he produced little that earned him money or recognition during his lifetime. These flaws, however, made him more interesting because, despite being in a state of near constant personal crisis, he was able to accomplish what he set out to do -- he changed the world. Marx began his opposition activities as a youth in Prussia against an absolute monarch who could not see, or perhaps chose not to see, that society was changing. The industrial revolution was spreading eastward and Prussian businessmen were eager to expand with it. But the old system of government would not allow for such progress. The king would not allow the democratic reforms that were the handmaidens of the new industrial order. This was Marx's first battle, to expose the contradictions between the centuries-old monarchical system and the world as it existed in the first half of the 19th century. **According to Marx, it was only natural that as the means of production changed -- in this case a move from an agricultural base to an industrial one -- society would be altered. And if, as he believed, a government's sole function was to serve the people, then government must also change.** Marx saw this social evolution as inevitable. It only became revolution when the kings and their minions refused to reform. By the 1850s, the industrialists had gained political power after revolts across Europe in 1848 caused kings to view proto-capitalists as allies against radicalised lower classes. The wheels of industry were humming, as were the halls of finance, where a new breed of speculator was born, addicted to risk in his quest for ever greater profit. Marx quickly recognized that capitalism would institutionalise social and economic instability. The system's inherent hunger for new markets, new consumers, new and cheaper methods of production in order to increase the flow of capital would result in a destructive system of boom and bust. After each cataclysm, he predicted, the number of capitalists at the top of the pyramid would be smaller, while the base of disaffected workers grew. Gradually even the middle class would be included. Marx believed that industrial capitalism had also created a new system of repression and exploitation. Politically and

socially men were no more equal under this new order than they had been under a monarchy. Rights belonged to those with money and property; those with only a strong back or skilled hands could not even vote. Financially, those filling the ranks of the industrial workforce were arguably worse off. There was evidence aplenty to support Marx's assessment. He lived in London, the richest city in the world. And yet as great as was its wealth, much greater was its poverty. In



Marx's neighbourhood, some people rented a space in a bed and called it comfort. Others paid for a few inches on a stairwell and called it home. Marx summed up the situation saying, **"There must be something rotten in the very core of a social system which increases its wealth without diminishing its misery."** "This is the field where Marx's ideas grew. He famously spent year after year in the British Museum Reading Room, trying to understand this new system, predict its course, and, finally, offer an alternative. Throughout the 16 years before he produced his greatest literary work *Das Kapital*, Marx's family lived in near continual destitution. Their sole consolation was that they believed Marx's work was noble and important, and that their suffering was small compared with the majority of people who sacrificed their lives so someone else could live in luxury. *Das Kapital* and Marx's other political-economic writings were only one aspect of his work. He was also an organizer and educator. Through various small groups, he tried to teach workers, who had neither formal education nor viewed themselves as a political force. The courses included language, literature and history, but mostly politics and economics. **Marx was convinced that the only way to successfully change society was to educate the population so that it could eventually lead itself.** In 1864, the most important of his many organizational endeavours was born, the International Continued on page 6

A Better World Programme of the Worker-communist Party

Part 1

Social and Intellectual Basis of Worker communism

A better world :

To change the world and to create a better one has always been a profound aspiration of people throughout human history. It is true that even the present-day so-called modern world is dominated by fatalistic ideas, religious as well as non-religious, which portray the present plight of religious as well as non-religious, which portray the present plight of and actions of people themselves reveal a deep-seated belief in the possibility and even the certainty of a better future. The hope that tomorrow's world can be free of today's inequalities, hardships and deprivations, the belief that people can, individually and collectively, influence the shape of the world to come, is a deep-rooted and powerful outlook in society that guides the lives and actions of vast masses of people. Worker-communism, first and foremost, belongs here, to the unshakable belief of countless people and successive generations that building a better world and a better future by their own hands is both necessary and possible.

Freedom, equality, prosperity

Clearly, everyone's image of an ideal world is not one and the same. However, throughout human history certain ideas have always come to the fore as the measures of human happiness and social progress, so much so that they are today part and parcel of the political vocabulary worldwide as sacred principles. Freedom, equality, justice and prosperity are the first among them. Precisely these ideals form the intellectual foundations of worker communism. Worker-communism is a movement for changing the world and setting up a free, equal, human and prosperous society.

Class struggle: proletariat and bourgeoisie

However, worker-communists are not a bunch of utopian reformers and heroic saviours of humanity. Communist society is not a fantastic design or recipe conceived by well-wishing know-alls. Worker-communism is a social movement arising from within modern capitalist society itself, a movement that reflects the vision, ideals and protest of a vast section of this same society. The history of all societies to date has been a history of class struggle. An uninterrupted, now open and now hidden, struggle has been going on between exploiting and exploited, oppressor and oppressed classes in different epochs and societies. This class struggle is the chief source of social change and transformation. Earlier societies were built on a complex hierarchy of classes and strata. For all the variety of occupations and the extensive division of labour in it, the present

society as a whole is organised around two main opposing class camps: workers and capitalists, proletariat and bourgeoisie. The opposition of these two camps is, at the most fundamental level, the source of all the multiplicity of economic, political, intellectual and cultural conflicts going on in the existing society. Not only society's political and economic life, but also the cultural, intellectual and scientific life of humanity today - areas which appear to be independent domains standing above and independent of classes - bear the imprint of this central alignment in the modern capitalist society. The camp of the proletariat, of workers, for all the variety of thoughts, ideals, tendencies and parties in it, represents the will to change the system in favour of the oppressed and the poor. The camp of the bourgeoisie, again for all its various strands of thought, political parties, thinkers and leaders, stands for the preservation of the status quo and the protection of the capitalist system and the economic and political power and privileges of the bourgeoisie, in the face of workers' drive for freedom and equality. Worker-communism emerges out of this class struggle. It belongs to the camp of the proletariat. Worker-communism is the revolutionary movement of the working class for overthrowing the capitalist system and creating a new society without classes and exploitation.

Continued from page.5

Working Men's Association. Its goal was to connect workers and trade unions throughout Europe and America to protect their rights in the face of an increasingly powerful capitalist system, whose tentacles had spread beyond individual nations and were encircling the globe. Marx recognized the workingman's greatest power was his number. Marx died in 1883, before his books gained a wide readership and before the workers he had been fighting for took their places in government as representatives of labour and socialist political parties. It had taken decades of struggle -- largely non-violent -- for this to occur. But Marx knew the path to progress would be slow, and that

ultimately the best way to re-balance society was through the ballot box. **He also believed, however, that the working man had the right to revolt if those in power tried to deny him such political expression -- free speech, free assembly, freedom of the press -- and the vote.** Marx's actual vision for a government of the future was vague, which no doubt is why it has produced so many variants. But he believed ultimately mankind would naturally evolve out of capitalism and socialism, and embrace a communist society in which government was no longer necessary at all. It is a utopian dream that has occurred nowhere -- least of all in the countries most associated with his name. Today, many people know Marx only through the crimes of the former communist countries. But Marx's ideas also helped give birth to mainstream political parties in Western Europe -- Britain's Labour Party, Spain's Socialist Party, France's Socialist Party, and Germany's Social Democratic Party. And yet, for some reason in America, these parties are generally not considered part of Marx's legacy. In the United States, we have been taught to fear Marx for so long that we have forgotten those parts of his philosophy that have become integral to our own lives -- from free education to the right to bear arms. **In fact, the era in modern American history that was most "Marxist" was the 1950s, when union membership was high, personal wealth spread more equitably, and the gap between the rich and poor relatively slim.** I came away from my Marx project believing that rather than demonising Marx, it is better to understand him. If his name is used in political discourse, it should be done in the manner of other great thinkers: as a source of ideas. Whether or not we agree with him, there are lessons to be learned from Marx. To believe otherwise is to ignore a man and a period of history that are crucial to understanding our own.

Freedom And Equality Complete Each Other