

🇬🇧 English (safe publishable version) — Message No. 58 (SHAMA)

“Double Injustice”

Worse than killing is when the killer mourns the victim. Just as Yazid claimed to mourn Husayn, Khamenei, too, seeks to present himself as the bereaved and the avenger of thousands of martyrs—insulting the people’s intelligence and humiliating the nation.

Grieving people of Iran,

One question:

We can endure the grief of losing our loved ones—but can we also endure being humiliated by Ali Khamenei, whom we regard as responsible for our martyrs’ deaths?

We had said the only way out of the two-ended deadlock—humiliating “unconditional surrender” or a “devastating war”—was a national uprising, under conditions of urgency and necessity.

We had said the deposed leader has no ability to create meaningful relief in people’s livelihoods, will not step aside, and that his remaining option is repression—so the nation must be prepared for an all-encompassing struggle.

We also said the country is in a “revolutionary-crisis” condition, and that success requires capable leadership; we urged people to treat their public presence as a disciplined civic mobilization to strengthen resilience and coordination.

Now, after the death of thousands of innocent compatriots: if we cannot defeat the perpetrator, should we not at least hold him accountable?

Those who have fallen—did they not perform a “Husayn-like” act of sacrifice? And if we who remain do not perform a “Zaynab-like” act of testimony and steadfastness, do we not, in effect, normalize injustice?

This is the story of “blood and message.”

If we suffer a setback on one front, must we surrender all fronts and raise a “white flag,” or should we change operational tactics and continue from other fronts?

According to the deposed leader’s claim that the mass killing of “thousands” was the work of “foreigners” who came from outside, how can Iran’s armed forces bear this shame—that after years of loudly proclaimed power, “foreigners” could come, kill our people, and leave?

Were these not the same forces that once removed more than “half a ton of top-secret nuclear documents” from the heart of Tehran and delivered them to Netanyahu?

For decades many religious citizens have lamented “if only I had been with you” and condemned not only the oppressor, but also those who “heard oppression and, by silence, consented to it.” Does silence today amount to consenting to the crimes of the “Yazid of our time”?

Besides Mr. Pezeshkian, is there anyone who does not know that Ali Khamenei—while lacking the required legal and religious qualifications—seized the nation’s power through betrayal and fraud, and turned a wealthy country into one afflicted by widespread poverty?

Besides an unworthy and complicit Assembly of Experts, is there anyone who does not know that he falls under all three conditions cited in Article 111 of the Constitution—meaning his authority is void and he is, in their view, disqualified?

Aside from those so-called reformists who are “partners of the thief and companions of the caravan,” is there anyone who truly wishes for the survival of a system of injustice, ignorance, corruption?

If we “submit” to the deposed leader, will war not occur—or will it instead encourage renewed aggression by Israel and the United States?

Even if we accept the humiliation, will bread return to our tables?

Will we again—rather than seeking a capable commander with a roadmap and disciplined organization—follow an ineffective figure and repeat the old mistakes?

We repeat our previous proposal: if the people engage in nationwide, broad “strikes and civil disobedience” for only 99 days, we will be among you on the 100th day. We have repeated this tactic for years because, given the government’s financial and economic bankruptcy, it is more effective and minimizes risks—so that thousands more are not added to the long list of martyrs.

The National Council of Iran’s Revolution believes that the endless cycle of holding seminars, conferences, and congresses to appoint managers for the national revolution will neither produce national legitimacy nor deliver timely responsibility. Even if capable individuals were identified, given the unprecedented speed of developments, their role would likely be “medicine after death.”

For that reason, one year ago—based on analysis and anticipation of today’s dangerous conditions—the Council was formed as a precautionary measure. It has issued roughly sixty messages and statements before and during events. Yet despite its political, legal, and organizational capacity, its success in advancing the “diplomacy of the national revolution” and guiding it toward victory depends on the moral and material support of the great nation.

**Grieving people of Iran: a storm of fragmentation and collapse is approaching.
This storm needs a captain.**

Proud people of Iran

Long live Iran

National Council of Iran’s Revolution

1404/10/29