



Sepidar
Woman Iranian Party

Weekly magazine

Friday, April 10, 2026

Appreciation for the Invitation of Crown Prince Reza Pahlavi to the Swedish Parliament

By: Sepidar Woman Iranian Party

Sepidar – Women’s Iranian Party, as a registered political organization in Sweden, would like to express its sincere appreciation for the Swedish Parliament’s invitation to His Imperial Highness Crown Prince Reza Pahlavi as a prominent figure of the Iranian opposition.

We consider this invitation a meaningful and important step toward recognizing the aspirations of the Iranian people and supporting the fundamental principles of freedom, democracy, the rule of law, and the right of nations to self-determination.



We would also like to extend our gratitude to the Sweden Democrats and the Christian Democrats for their responsible and forward-looking role in facilitating this invitation. This initiative reflects a

clear understanding of the current developments in Iran and the importance of engaging with forces advocating for a democratic transition.

Furthermore, we appreciate all individuals involved in making this event possible. In particular, the consistent efforts and dedication of Mr. Charlie Weimers deserve special recognition. His commitment reflects strong support for democratic values and the legitimate aspirations of the Iranian people.

Sepidar – Women’s Iranian Party hopes that such initiatives will contribute to strengthening international solidarity with the people of Iran and support the transition toward a free, secular, and democratic Iran.

REZA PAHLAVI

Riksdagsgrupperna för Sverigedemokraterna och Kristdemokraterna har äran att arrangera en sammankomst för kronprins Reza Pahlavi.

Det är efter en officiell inbjudan från Nima Gholam Ali Pour, Magnus Berntsson och Arin Karapet, som kronprinsen tackat ja till att besöka riksdagen och hålla ett tal.

SAVE THE DATE

DATUM 13 APRIL 2026
 TID 11:00 - 12:30
 LOKAL SVERIGES RIKSDAG, LOKAL MEDDELAS SENARE



Weekly magazine

Sepidar
Woman Iranian Party

Friday, April 10, 2026

The Geneva Conference on Iran's Future; March 28, 2026

By: Vida Tehrani

If a meeting on Iran's future is held with the participation of political and social activists, it is only natural to expect media coverage.



Yet the Geneva Conference on Iran's Future on March 28, 2026, remained, curiously, in relative silence. That silence may prove more significant than the event itself. The gathering brought together a diverse range of voices—from political activists to academic and social figures.

Alongside them, the presence of grieving mothers, victims, and political prisoners added a deeply human dimension to the event; a reminder that discussions about Iran's future are not merely theoretical.

What makes this conference noteworthy is not only the composition of its participants, but the perspective that shaped it.

Across the discussions, a common thread was evident: the need for convergence, the necessity of moving beyond fragmentation, and the search for a point of unity capable of bringing different forces together. Within this framework, the name and position of Prince Reza Pahlavi have increasingly drawn attention as a central figure for fostering such cohesion.

The central question now is this: why did such an event fail to receive the attention one might expect?

In a world where even the smallest events quickly gain visibility, the limited media coverage of a conference of this magnitude is striking.

Perhaps the reason lies in the fact that certain narratives have yet to find their place within mainstream media. Or perhaps some voices are only heard when echoed by others—while many, unfortunately, were either unaware of the conference or not invited.

This reality may have weakened the path toward collaboration and convergence—a path that, one hopes, is still being defined, however gradually.

Everything begins in places that are not yet at the center of attention. And perhaps that is precisely where closer attention is needed.



Weekly magazine

Sepidar
Woman Iranian Party

Friday, April 10, 2026

Why Family Compliance Fails to Prevent the Execution of Political Prisoners

By: Salomeh Kia



In many cases, the families of political prisoners in Iran, under intense pressure from security institutions, are compelled into silence, performative compliance, or even endorsement of official narratives. This compliance is not born of consent, but rather of threat, fear, and a desperate attempt to save their loved ones. Yet experience has shown that even such cooperation offers no guarantee against execution.

Within the structure of the Islamic Republic, many political cases are decided not on legal principles but on security and ideological considerations. In such a system, preserving the regime takes precedence over all else—even human life. Therefore, if security bodies determine that executing an individual carries political or deterrent value, family cooperation becomes irrelevant.

In numerous instances, the state uses families as instruments of pressure—extracting forced confessions through threats against relatives, compelling silence in media, and preventing international awareness. These

concessions, however, are typically one-sided; once the authorities achieve their objectives, no commitment is made to spare the prisoner's life.

Iran's judiciary lacks genuine independence and, in political cases, effectively operates under the authority of security institutions. As a result, even when families cooperate, the final decision is made outside the framework of judicial justice.

The execution of political prisoners—even when families remain silent—sends a clear message to society: no one is safe. This approach is designed to instill widespread fear and suppress the emergence of protest.

In many accountable systems, family pressure and public opinion can influence judicial outcomes. In the Islamic Republic, however—particularly in political cases—decision-makers do not consider themselves accountable to society. In some cases, family silence even enables the state to carry out executions without significant media cost.

The compliance of prisoners' families is not a sign of consent, but an act of desperation. Yet within a system where justice is subordinated to politics and security, such efforts often prove futile. Execution, in this context, is not a judicial ruling, but a tool of survival and control.



Weekly magazine

Sepidar
Woman Iranian Party

Friday, April 10, 2026

A Power Without Courage; Europe's Failure in the Test of the Islamic Republic

By: M.H. Labafbashi

On the eve of military confrontation between the United States and the Islamic Republic, the European Union sought to present itself as a decisive global actor through strong rhetoric. The designation of the Revolutionary Guard as a terrorist organization appeared, on the surface, to reflect such resolve. In reality, however, the decision was less the result of a coherent strategy than a reactive and symbolic gesture toward the United States—one unsupported by either the means of enforcement or the will to bear its consequences.



With the outbreak of conflict, the gap between assertion and capability quickly became apparent. Several European governments initially spoke of the necessity of military action, but as tensions escalated, their tone shifted. Contradictory positions—from implicit support to outright condemnation—revealed a lack of coherent foreign policy and a tendency toward strategic confusion at critical moments.

This retreat extended beyond rhetoric. In practice, key European states refused military cooperation with the United States. Restrictions on base access, closure of airspace, and abstention from operational participation all signaled a gradual withdrawal—not from strength, but from concern and lack of preparedness for the realities of war.

A central indicator of Europe's weakness lies in its reliance on external security. An alliance long defined under the American security umbrella finds itself unable to act independently when required. As a result, Europe shifted from shaping outcomes to minimizing its own costs—even at the expense of policy coherence.

Domestically, this vulnerability is equally evident. Concerns over the activation of networks linked to the Islamic Republic within European territory, and the risk of internal instability, played a key role in altering positions. The fact that European governments chose retreat over preemptive confrontation raises serious questions about the effectiveness of their security structures. If an external actor can influence European foreign policy through indirect threats, it points to deep structural fragility.

The energy crisis triggered by tensions in the Strait of Hormuz further exposed Europe's vulnerability. Sharp increases in energy prices and fears of shortages led many governments to abandon their initial positions. This response highlighted the extent to which Europe's political independence is tied to economic variables—and how external shocks can reshape policy direction.

Ultimately, what emerges is a portrait of Europe caught between claims of power and the reality of weakness. An entity that speaks of values and principles, yet retreats under security and economic pressure. This trajectory not only undermines Europe's international credibility but also demonstrates how far it remains from becoming a truly independent global power.



Weekly magazine

Sepidar
Woman Iranian Party

Friday, April 10, 2026

Safe Home, Anxious Mind; The Psychological Burden of Iranians Abroad

By: Azadeh Sharafi

After a long, exhausting day, I sat in a café, drinking coffee, lost in thought. Then I heard a familiar sound—Persian being spoken nearby. A few people, energetic and loud, were discussing their shopping, ordinary everyday matters. But after a sentence or two, the conversation gradually turned to politics—to war, to Iran. Moments later, it returned to ordinary topics, but only briefly. Soon enough, politics resurfaced: Iran, war, the future.

In every sentence, there was an undercurrent of concern and analysis. Even when the subject was entirely non-political, their minds seemed to drift back, almost involuntarily, to the same point. At first glance, the scene may appear ordinary—but it reflects a familiar psychological state among many Iranians abroad.

Politics, crisis, and the future persist as a constant, underlying layer in their minds. Geographic distance, relative safety, and the structure of daily life do not necessarily create psychological distance from these pressures.

From a psychological perspective, this can be described as a form of chronic cognitive load—a state in which the mind remains continuously engaged with a source of stress. News, social media, and even casual conversations reinforce this engagement, preventing the mind from fully exiting a state of alertness. As a result, concentration, processing ability, and even the capacity to enjoy the present moment are diminished.

Through conversations—or even by reading social media posts—one can detect signs of a heavy psychological burden: a feeling akin to guilt. Guilt for experiencing relative safety while others—friends, family, compatriots—live under more unstable conditions. This feeling can dull joy, sometimes pushing it to the margins entirely.

This state is often accompanied by a sense of helplessness. Many are engaged in some form of effort or concern—often through social or political activity—yet remain aware that they lack direct control over events. This gap between high mental engagement and low control is a key driver of psychological exhaustion.



The effects of such pressure manifest in various ways: chronic anxiety, sleep disturbances, reduced motivation, and even a form of social fatigue—where individuals gradually lose the energy to connect or engage.

Yet there are ways to mitigate this burden—simple, but requiring awareness and consistency. Regulating exposure to news is one of the most important steps. Setting specific times for following developments—and avoiding them early in the morning or before sleep—can help the mind disengage from constant alertness. Maintaining connections with trusted individuals, creating safe spaces for dialogue, and engaging in activities that restore physical calm—such as walking or exercise—also play a crucial role in restoring balance.

Ultimately, the experience of Iranians abroad is a reminder that geographic distance does not necessarily equate to psychological distance. What unfolds on a broader level can deeply and persistently shape daily life. The first step, perhaps, is simply to recognize and acknowledge this pressure—because when ignored, it quietly erodes quality of life.



Engineered Conflict or Genuine Divide

By: M.H. Labafbashi



Recent developments surrounding media attacks on Mohammad Javad Zarif and Hassan Rouhani have once again raised a fundamental question: are such disputes within the Islamic Republic indicative of genuine fractures in the power structure, or are they part of a carefully engineered scenario designed to manage public perception? Historical patterns suggest that the answer lies in a complex combination of both—real divisions guided within a controlled framework.

Since its inception, the Islamic Republic has operated through dualities such as “field and diplomacy” or “hardliner and moderate.” These binaries do not necessarily reflect genuine opposition within the ruling system, but rather a division of political roles. Figures like Zarif and Rouhani serve as channels of engagement with the outside world, while security and military institutions maintain ideological pressure. This arrangement allows the system to project seemingly contradictory yet ultimately complementary messages.

A classic example can be found in the conflicts between Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and the Larijani brothers. These disputes escalated publicly into accusations, corruption claims, and even the release of controversial recordings in

parliament. Yet none of these tensions led to structural collapse. Instead, they resulted in a redistribution of power within the same system and the gradual elimination of uncontrollable elements.

Another example is the nuclear agreement. During negotiations, Zarif was presented as a flexible diplomatic figure, while hardline media simultaneously applied domestic pressure. This duality enabled the system to extract concessions while maintaining its ideological base. When conditions changed, the same structure quickly shifted to undermine the agreement—without the core of power bearing the political cost.

In the current case, the use of figures such as regime-aligned eulogists to attack Zarif is equally significant. These actors function as unofficial mouthpieces, capable of expressing extreme positions without generating direct legal or political accountability for the state.

That said, genuine divisions should not be overlooked. Economic pressures, social crises, and the costs of foreign policy have led segments of the ruling elite to consider the need for change in direction. In contrast, factions aligned with the Revolutionary Guard view any retreat as a threat to ideological survival. This conflict of interests creates a real foundation for division, even if its expression remains controlled.

Another key function of these disputes is the management of public opinion. In times of growing dissatisfaction, highlighting internal conflicts can divert attention from structural issues. It also allows the system to channel discontent toward a controlled internal adversary.

Ultimately, the Islamic Republic has demonstrated over four decades a high level of skill in simultaneously leveraging real conflict and the appearance of conflict. Accurate analysis, therefore, requires acknowledging both dimensions: real fractures rooted in political and economic realities, and the engineering of those fractures for survival and reproduction of power.

In the end, this system—along with its leaders and supporters—must be removed from positions of power and held accountable in a court of law. There is no path of escape for any of them, neither through staged disputes nor through claims of alignment with the people and the nation.



Rebuilding Iran Amid the Continuation of Reactionary Forces?

By: M.H. Labafbashi

Since the 1979 uprising, the economic and strategic trajectory of the Islamic Republic has evolved in a way that has resulted not only in developmental stagnation, but also in the gradual erosion of the country's critical infrastructure. Even without adopting strongly political narratives, economic data indicates that the continuation of this trend could push Iran to a point where the cost of reconstruction resembles that of a war-torn nation. Declining investment, infrastructure depreciation, capital flight, brain drain, and dependence on unstable oil revenues all point to a path that, if sustained, leads toward a "scorched earth" outcome—one in which rebuilding the country would require immense resources and a prolonged timeframe.

The reality is that the combination of costly foreign policy and inefficient economic management has effectively turned Iran's natural advantages into liabilities. A country with one of the largest oil and gas reserves in the world has, instead of becoming an economic power, experienced negative economic growth in multiple years. For example, according to data from the International Monetary Fund, Iran's economy recorded several years of negative growth between 2012 and 2020, while countries in the region maintained steady positive growth. This gap is the direct result of decisions whose consequences are visible not in rhetoric, but in measurable economic outcomes.

One of the most critical indicators of this condition is the high level of structural corruption. According to reports by Transparency International, Iran ranked 149th out of 180 countries in the 2023 Corruption Perceptions Index. This ranking reflects a very high risk of corruption in the allocation of public resources. During the 2010–2020 decade, only a handful of major corruption cases exposed within the country revealed more than 10 billion dollars in misallocated funds. However, if these cases are extrapolated to the broader economy and systemic corruption is taken into account, economic estimates suggest that resource losses due to corruption during this

decade may have reached approximately 80 to 120 billion dollars, based on an average exchange rate in 2015.



In addition to domestic corruption, the opportunity cost of sanctions has inflicted far greater damage. In 2011, prior to the intensification of sanctions, Iran's oil exports stood at approximately 2.5 million barrels per day. Assuming an average oil price of 100 dollars in 2012, Iran's potential annual revenue could have reached:

$$2.5 \text{ million} \times 100 \text{ dollars} \times 365 \approx 91 \text{ billion dollars per year}$$

However, between 2013 and 2015, exports declined to around 1 million barrels per day, representing a revenue loss of approximately:

$$1.5 \text{ million} \times 100 \text{ dollars} \times 365 \approx 55 \text{ billion dollars per year}$$

Over this three-year period alone, more than 160 billion dollars in revenue was lost. During the second phase of sanctions (2018 to 2021), with average oil prices around 60 dollars and exports dropping below 500,000 barrels per day, annual losses



Weekly magazine

Sepidar
Woman Iranian Party

Friday, April 10, 2026

were estimated at approximately 40 to 50 billion dollars. In total, over a decade, the cost of sanctions to Iran's economy can be conservatively estimated at between 500 and 600 billion dollars.

A third major factor is the outflow of capital and human resources. According to estimates aligned with World Bank data, Iran has one of the highest rates of skilled migration in the world. If only 300,000 highly skilled individuals have emigrated over the past two decades, and the economic value of each individual over their working lifetime is estimated at a minimum of 1.5 million dollars—based on productivity averages in developed countries around 2020—the resulting loss of human capital would amount to:

$300,000 \times 1.5 \text{ million dollars} = 450 \text{ billion dollars}$

This figure is separate from financial capital outflows, which in some years have exceeded 10 to 20 billion dollars annually.

At the same time, substantial resources have been allocated to military and nuclear programs. Although exact figures are not publicly disclosed, international analyses estimate that Iran's nuclear program cost between 100 and 150 billion dollars between the 2000s and 2020. Missile development and the expansion of underground infrastructure may have added tens of billions more. In total, the direct and indirect costs of these sectors can be estimated at approximately 150 to 200 billion dollars.

When these figures are combined—sanctions (approximately 550 billion dollars), corruption (around 100 billion dollars), and military expenditures (about 180 billion dollars)—the total approaches 830 billion dollars, a figure equivalent to several years of Iran's gross domestic product.

Now consider a hypothetical scenario: the removal of the Islamic Republic, the Revolutionary Guard, and their supporting structures; the lifting of sanctions; the release of frozen Iranian assets estimated at between 100 and 150 billion dollars; and the attraction of 30 billion dollars in annual foreign investment. Under such conditions, even if the country were in a scorched earth state, reconstruction would be entirely feasible from an economic standpoint.

The first step would be the revitalization of the oil industry. The cost of fully modernizing fields, equipment, and infrastructure using current technology—based on comparable projects in the

Middle East during the 2020s—is estimated at around 100 billion dollars. This investment could increase oil production to more than 4 million barrels per day within 3 to 5 years. Assuming a conservative oil price of 70 dollars per barrel in 2025, annual revenue could reach:

$4 \text{ million} \times 70 \text{ dollars} \times 365 \approx 102 \text{ billion dollars per year}$

The next phase would involve rebuilding critical infrastructure, including electricity, water systems, transportation, and communications, at an estimated cost of 250 billion dollars. The housing and modern urban development sector, including the construction of millions of residential units to contemporary standards, would require approximately 200 billion dollars. In total, comprehensive national reconstruction under a scorched earth scenario would cost roughly 550 billion dollars.

Assuming continuous operations across three eight-hour shifts and the integration of foreign capital and technology, this reconstruction could be completed within a timeframe of 5 to 8 years. In other words, a country that has lost hundreds of billions of dollars in resources could be rebuilt with a smaller amount.

This comparison reveals a stark but clear reality: the resources lost over past decades were not only sufficient to prevent this outcome, but could have positioned Iran as one of the leading economic powers in the region. Even in the most pessimistic scenario, the cost of rebuilding the country remains lower than the cost already paid for the destruction of its opportunities.



Weekly magazine

Sepidar
Woman Iranian Party

Friday, April 10, 2026

A Bloody Chessboard at the Borders; Barracks Silence The Honor of the Army Lies in Its Courage

By: Leila Kharazi

In the spring of 2026, Iran's political configuration has shifted from "civil resistance" to "hard confrontation." The country's political atmosphere has been shaken by two startling developments—signals that the dynamics of regime change have moved beyond street protests into a phase of national mobilization. Yet in this bloody chessboard, the pieces appear arranged in such a way that the threat is felt not only from the front, but from behind as well.

Donald Trump is not a politician who admits defeat or weakness; he has always been inclined to claim victories as his own. However, his blunt remarks on April 5 and 6, stating that "we sent weapons, but the Kurds took them for themselves," were not a simple admission—they amounted to a striking disclosure. These statements indicate that the arming of the Iranian population is not a rumor, but a logistical reality for which the costs have already been paid. The bitter truth, however, is this: the weapons that were meant to serve as instruments of defense for women and young people in Iran's central cities—against violent repression—have been blocked at critical border points by groups that prioritize factional interests over national freedom. This represents a clear act of betrayal at the borders against the broader objective of regime change.

Citizens in Tehran, Isfahan, and Mashhad have every right to ask: why should the means of legitimate self-defense be seized and stockpiled at the borders?



At precisely the same time that this arms deadlock persists, Prince Reza Pahlavi, in a series of statements—particularly his message on April 7—adopted a tone that sent shockwaves through military institutions. By invoking legendary figures such as Ariobarzanes and Surena, as well as patriotic commanders like Jahanbani and Khosrodad, he directly challenged the honor and courage of the army.

Referring to the presence of the regime's proxy forces—such as the Popular Mobilization Forces, Hezbollah, and the Fatemiyoun Brigade—operating within Iran, he issued what amounted to a historic ultimatum. His message is clear: at a time when the borders are compromised by opportunistic dealings and national territory is influenced by foreign-backed actors, "barracks silence" can no longer be interpreted as neutrality; it carries the implication of surrender and a betrayal of national identity. He correctly identifies that when weapons are stalled at the borders, it is the army's sense of duty and honor that must either open the way for the people or take action itself.

Why, then, does the army remain inactive? Field analysis suggests that the military body is



Weekly magazine

Sepidar
Woman Iranian Party

Friday, April 10, 2026

experiencing a form of deliberate paralysis. On one hand, it fears confrontation with the Revolutionary Guard; on the other, it faces intense pressure from ideological and political oversight structures. The reality, however, is that the army's silence today effectively signals permission for transnational militant actors to intensify repression.

At this moment, Iran's army stands at one of the most critical junctures in its history. It observes that weapons intended for the population are being blocked at the borders, while at the same time the regime relies on non-Iranian forces to suppress its own citizens. In this bloody chessboard, the army cannot indefinitely remain a mere foot soldier of a decaying system.

There is no longer room for doubt. The regime stands at the edge of collapse, weapons have reached the borders, and the voice of the opposition leader has penetrated deep into military barracks. The issue is not a lack of equipment; it is the absence of national will among those who wear military uniforms, yet have allowed the country to become a staging ground for militant actors.

We, at Sepidar Weekly, issue this warning: if the army does not return to its oath of loyalty to the nation, and if the status of the blocked weapons in Kurdish regions remains unresolved, history will pass a harsh judgment on those who, at a decisive moment, chose humiliation over honor. The regime is approaching its end; the army must decide whether it wishes to be buried alongside tyranny in the graveyard of history, or to stand with the defenders of freedom in shaping Iran's future.



Weekly magazine

Sepidar
Woman Iranian Party

Friday, April 10, 2026

Ceasefire or Grand Trap? Trump's Hidden Game to Hunt the Shadow Centers of Power in the Islamic Republic

By: M.H. Labafbashi

A ceasefire in any war is typically perceived as a sign of de-escalation or even an end to conflict. Yet in the complex equations of geopolitics, a ceasefire can just as easily mark the beginning of a new—and potentially more dangerous—phase. In the context of tensions involving the Islamic Republic, the United States, and Israel, a fundamental question arises: does a ceasefire signal retreat, or is it part of a deeper strategic design? To answer this, one must closely examine the behavior and decision-making patterns of key actors, particularly Donald Trump.

Trump is not a figure inclined to accept defeat or frame it as compromise. Throughout his political record, apparent retreats have often been accompanied by a shift in narrative rather than substance. Therefore, if a ceasefire emerges, it is more likely to represent not the abandonment of an objective, but a recalibration of methods to achieve the same goal. This perspective strengthens the hypothesis of a “tactical ceasefire.”

Contrary to common assumptions, variables such as oil prices or volatility in global markets are not necessarily decisive factors in such decisions. If the objective is a broader security or strategic gain—and in this case, it appears to be—these costs are often

deemed acceptable. As such, a ceasefire should not be interpreted merely as a product of economic pressure, but rather analyzed within a broader strategic framework.



On the media front, statements by figures such as Pete Hegseth may form part of a broader narrative operation—one aimed at normalizing the situation and reducing public sensitivity. Meanwhile, entirely different objectives may be pursued behind the scenes, objectives that do not necessarily align with public messaging. At the same time, the role of Benjamin Netanyahu cannot be overlooked. Israel's security doctrine has consistently emphasized preemption and the neutralization of threats at early stages. Within this framework, a ceasefire may serve as an opportunity for intelligence reconfiguration and more precise identification of key targets, rather than a halt to operations.

One of the central hypotheses in this analysis focuses on “hidden individuals within the power structure”—those who are not publicly visible, yet function as primary decision-makers. If this assumption holds, a ceasefire can operate as a strategic trap: creating a sense of relative security to draw these actors out of the shadows, enabling their identification and neutralization. In this context, even limited military movements or targeted operations



Weekly magazine

Sepidar
Woman Iranian Party

Friday, April 10, 2026

may serve purposes beyond their stated objectives. Such actions can provide a pretext for intelligence presence, data collection, and the establishment of operational networks within a country. In this scenario, war is not a direct confrontation, but rather a component of a sophisticated intelligence game.

Finally, the positions of Crown Prince Reza Pahlavi also merit attention. By emphasizing political transition and the role of the people, he seeks to outline a path distinct from purely military scenarios. However, the simultaneity of these positions with developments on the ground reinforces the question of whether Iran's political and security landscape has entered a new, multi-layered phase.

In sum, a ceasefire should not be viewed merely as the conclusion of a crisis, but as part of a more intricate design—one whose ultimate objective may not be immediate change, but rather the identification and targeting of the true centers of power operating in the shadows. The central question remains: if this analysis is correct, who are the ultimate targets of this game? Almost certainly, they are not the figures currently visible or frequently named in public discourse.