

🇬🇧 English (Safe publishable version) — Message No. 57 (SHAMA)

In our living and passionate land, the gallows still stand, and blood still flows.

Our covenant is with the great nation of Iran, the great nation of Iran.

The key to our chronic stagnation is that, despite our deep cultural and national foundations and our immense natural and human capacities, we have fallen into a vicious cycle: “fleeing from a snake into a dragon,” moving back and forth between “a ditch and a well,” and wasting the energy and time that could have been spent on progress. Now, after the loss of many of our compatriots, we present the following points:

- 1) It is as if we are still living 1,400 years ago: then, to escape Yazdegerd III and his coercive forces, we turned to Umar ibn al-Khattab and the invading armies and laid down our shields at Qadisiyyah; today, to escape Ali Khamenei and the forces acting under his authority, we turn to Trump and Netanyahu.
- 2) Unlike that era—when identifying “friend” and “foe” was easy—today the agents of repression and foreign-linked actors are so intertwined that separating them, and therefore determining each one’s share in these crimes, has become extremely difficult. The deposed leader has acknowledged “thousands” of deaths, while some sources have cited figures above 23,000. The point is this: even if one assumes that all casualties were caused by hostile foreign actors, under the legal principle that the *primary cause can outweigh the direct perpetrator*, the principal responsibility still lies with Ali Khamenei, who is viewed as the main architect of the conditions that enabled these tragedies.
- 3) In the midst of an unequal, multi-front, hybrid struggle against our people—one that demanded decisive and competent leadership—some naïve voices and certain media amplifiers insisted on promoting an ineffective figure as “commander,” with a predictable outcome.
- 4) An army that, under Article 144 of the Constitution, carries the description of being “ideological and of the people,” chose neutrality—or worse—at a moment of mass violence and did nothing.
- 5) A force that was supposed to protect the “achievements of the revolution” appeared instead as an instrument of repression.
- 6) A judiciary that was meant to be independent and to protect individual and social rights, uphold justice, restore public rights, and expand lawful freedoms, has been transformed into a tool of punishment. Instead of correcting its own failures—particularly its duty to ensure constitutional compliance—it chose submission.
- 7) The central question is: did we not know that confronting such a repressive and fundamentalist system is not a game, but a full-scale, hybrid struggle requiring capable leadership and disciplined coordination? Did we not know this deposed leader has many coercive actors at his disposal—and that such actors may remain a challenge in the future as well? Did we not know foreign intelligence networks have deeply penetrated the system and may commit atrocities to provoke external escalation against our country? And did we not see reports—including those attributed to Haaretz—

claiming that coordinated campaigns using fake accounts and AI-driven propaganda were being used to portray certain figures as “saviors”? How long will we accept unstructured protests where anyone can introduce any slogan and steer the movement in any direction? If—by estimates—more than five million people have participated, what justification can there be for halting the movement amid such unprecedented bloodshed?

8) In the current dangerous, decisive, and revolutionary-crisis situation, the National Council of Iran’s Revolution—drawing inspiration from Dr. Mohammad Mossadegh—considers this struggle a national, ethical, and human responsibility that does not depend on “authorization” or “mandate.” To improve the prospects of success, it emphasizes:

a) Because “this shared pain is never cured separately,” constructive interaction between the great nation of Iran and the Council is an unavoidable necessity.

b) Public moral and material support for the Council is essential so that:

- on one hand, it can counter foreign propaganda and provide accurate information and analysis;
- on the other, backed by national legitimacy, it can pursue effective international engagement and make clear that the era of imposing leaders on Iran has ended—opening a new chapter based on mutual respect and balanced interests.

c) Its strategy is grounded in nonviolence, with two clarifications:

- first, as in any serious nationwide movement, unity of direction, organization, discipline, strategy, logistics, communications, and resources must be addressed;
- second, the concept of lawful self-protection is treated as distinct from aggression.

d) The proposed operational approach is civil disobedience and broad-based strikes—especially in revenue-generating sectors—alongside financial non-cooperation (including refusing payments and transactions with state-linked entities) and opposition to unjust laws that violate lawful freedoms and fundamental rights (such as the so-called “hijab and chastity” law).

e) It commits to addressing the shortcomings that contributed to past failures: lack of planning and roadmap, stop-start mobilization, weak continuity, lack of discipline and organization—problems often linked to the absence of credible leadership. The Council pledges, with the people’s cooperation, to correct these weaknesses and guide the national movement toward success, honoring the sacrifices made.

f) It does not accept any solution other than ending the Islamic Republic’s rule, arguing it is neither reformable nor tolerable and that its continuation accelerates national decline—especially under conditions resembling a “failed state.”

g) While preferring a peaceful transfer of power, it does not rule out legal accountability processes.

h) Based on the failed experience of nearly half a century of religious rule, it proposes a future grounded in secularism, democracy, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a return to national identity and an Iranian ethos of compassion, and a message of peace and friendship to the world—while affirming that the final decision belongs to the people of Iran.

i) Iran’s territorial integrity and independence are the Council’s red lines.