

سپیدار حزب زنان ایران

**We are the Sepidar,
standing tall while our roots reach ever deeper.**

We become a sheltering canopy.

We endure both frost and scorching heat.

In mourning broken branches,

we do not bend in defeat;

instead, we rise again, renewed, and in bloom.

SEPIDAR
WOMEN'S IRANIAN PARTY

Managing Editor: M.H. Labafbashi



From Düsseldorf to Iran's Future

By Ali Soltani

The Iran Prosperity Project conference in Düsseldorf was not merely an economic gathering. It delivered a message to Europe that the day after the Islamic Republic does not have to mean chaos and destruction; it can mark the beginning of one of the greatest economic, strategic, and historic opportunities in the region.



The Iran Prosperity Project conference was held today in Düsseldorf, Germany, with a focus on connecting a free Iran with a free Europe. Its agenda ranged from trade and investment to technology, industry, infrastructure, rule of law, human capital, civil society, and Iran's economic reconstruction. With hundreds of participants, more than twenty speakers, and specialists from a wide range of fields, the conference carried a clear message: the future of Iran after the Islamic Republic can no longer remain only a political discussion. A future Iran will require economic planning, legal institutions, investment, professional management, and networks of Iranian and international expertise—and preparation must begin now.

The true significance of the Düsseldorf conference, however, goes far beyond its panels and speakers. Europe has spent years approaching fundamental change in Iran with caution and, at times, fear of the costs of transition. Short-term instability, shifts in Middle Eastern power dynamics, energy concerns, migration, and security risks have all contributed to hesitation among some European governments. But this is only half of the equation. Europe must ask another question with equal seriousness: how much has the continued existence of the Islamic Republic already cost the West, and what opportunities could a free Iran create?

For forty-seven years, the Islamic Republic has isolated one of the region's largest and richest countries from major parts of the free global economy. International

investors have been kept away from a market of nearly ninety million people. European companies have lost opportunities across major Iranian industries, access to modern technology has been restricted, and countless highly educated Iranians living abroad have been unable to freely return, invest, and contribute their expertise to their homeland. The successful completion of the Lion and Sun Revolution could reopen these doors. From oil, gas, and renewable energy to automotive manufacturing, transportation, healthcare, pharmaceuticals, technology, artificial intelligence, tourism, environmental restoration, agriculture, and infrastructure, a free Iran could become one of the region's largest opportunities for investment and development.

This is also where the Iran Prosperity Project and the role of Crown Prince Reza Pahlavi during the transition become especially important. One of the questions repeatedly raised by Western governments has been: "What comes after the Islamic Republic?" The answer cannot simply be regime change. When planning already exists for rule of law, investment security, a free economy, energy, technology, infrastructure reconstruction, and the return of Iranian human capital, a practical answer begins to take shape. The Lion and Sun Revolution, whose path toward success is already taking shape, is not only about ending the Islamic Republic; it is about returning Iran to freedom, prosperity, rule of law, and full engagement with the world.

More conferences of this kind can help break one of the most important barriers in the West: fear of change. European governments, businesses, and investors should understand that supporting Iran's transition is not merely a moral or political decision; it can also be a long-term strategic investment. Every major revolution brings costs and aftershocks, but Europe should not calculate only the costs of several months or years of transition while ignoring the benefits that could follow for decades. A free Iran could return fully to global energy markets, expand regional transit routes, create millions of economic opportunities, and become a reliable European partner.

Europe must also calculate the cost of preserving the status quo. For decades, the Islamic Republic has generated security crises, regional instability, hostage diplomacy, migration pressures, energy disruption, and geopolitical tension affecting Europe. These costs should not be considered normal simply because they have continued for years. If European leaders fear the consequences of the Islamic Republic's fall, they should also ask what another ten or twenty years of the Islamic Republic would cost. A free and stable Iran could become a producer of stability rather than a producer of crisis. That is the calculation conferences such as the Iran Prosperity Project must increasingly bring to Western policymakers and private-sector leaders.

Ultimately, the Düsseldorf conference was not only about Iran's economy. It was about changing the West's understanding of Iran's future. If Europe still sees only the cost of the Islamic Republic's fall, it has read only half of the balance sheet. The other half is the cost of keeping the current system alive and the enormous opportunity that could emerge once Iran is free. The Islamic Republic separated Iran from the world; the Lion and Sun Revolution can reconnect Iran with the world. For Iranians, its success can mark the beginning of freedom and national reconstruction. For Europe, it can open the door to one of the greatest economic and strategic opportunities of the coming decades.



The Collapse Puzzle: When a Crisis Reaches the Point of No Return

By M.H. Labafbashi

The economic crisis of the Islamic Republic is no longer a temporary problem or the result of a short period of external pressure; a combination of accumulated weaknesses, increasing sanctions, and war has brought Iran's economy to a point where the collapse of the national currency is directly intertwined with people's daily lives. In recent days, the dollar exchange rate on the free market has surpassed two million rials, while Washington has simultaneously intensified its economic pressure. The U.S. government is now seeking to put pressure not only on the Islamic Republic's sources of revenue, but also on its financial networks and intermediary countries. However, the significance of this pressure lies not only in the dollar figure; the chain of collapse becomes complete when declining government revenues lead to the collapse of the national currency, the collapse of the national currency leads to inflation, inflation leads to businesses shutting down, closures lead to discontent, and discontent turns into a social and political crisis. Therefore, the point that must be closely monitored is not merely the exchange rate, but the connection between the economic crisis and social behavior.



However, no economic crisis alone brings down a government. What can transform an economic crisis into an existential crisis is a social or political shock that connects several separate crises simultaneously. A society that has endured years of inflation, corruption, repression, and declining purchasing power may, in response to a specific event, enter a stage where the issue is no longer merely high prices or poverty, but rather the question of the "continuation or end of this structure." Under such circumstances, what becomes important is the speed at which the crisis moves from one sphere to another: an economic crisis creates a social crisis; a social crisis destroys legitimacy; and the destruction of legitimacy deepens existing divisions at the center of power. This is precisely why the Islamic Republic, alongside economic pressure, is focusing on security control and preventing scattered discontent from turning into a widespread movement.

In this context, strikes and the closure of businesses can be an important indicator for determining whether the crisis has moved from the economic stage to the political stage. The closure of a single shop is not, by itself, a sign of collapse; however, when rising costs, declining purchasing power, and instability of the national currency cause parts of the market to see continued operation as no longer viable, the economy begins to generate disruption from within. Recent reports have described severe pressure on Iranian business owners and the market following the collapse of the rial. The significance of this lies in the fact that, unlike scattered protests, a strike can turn separate grievances into a shared issue. If the livelihood crisis leads to widespread closures and then connects to social protest, the government is no longer facing merely

an economic indicator; it is facing a society in which part of its economic cycle is no longer functioning according to the previous rules.

Under such circumstances, the role of Iranians abroad is, above all, meaningful in maintaining the connection between Iranian society and the outside world. Documenting human rights violations, bringing the voice of Iranian society to the attention of international media and institutions, exposing the government's financial and propaganda networks, and preventing the normalization of the Islamic Republic's conduct can help maintain political and diplomatic pressure on the power structure. The purpose of such pressure should not be to punish the Iranian people; on the contrary, any policy that places greater pressure on ordinary people while leaving the government's financial channels open could have the opposite effect. What should be restricted is the power structure's ability to finance its machinery of repression, circumvent sanctions, and rebuild its financial resources. Washington is now also expanding its efforts toward sanction-evasion networks and the Islamic Republic's sources of revenue.

From this perspective, the direction of U.S. policy in the coming weeks will be decisive. The Trump administration is now focusing on economic pressure rather than an immediate return to the previous agreement, and has even announced that there is currently no direct dialogue taking place with Tehran. This policy could be extremely costly for the Islamic Republic, but there is also a risk: an agreement that merely releases part of the government's financial resources without addressing the root causes of the nuclear, missile, and security crises could give the corrupt Islamic Republic an opportunity to rebuild itself. Therefore, the issue is not simply "negotiation or no negotiation"; the issue is whether any potential agreement will extend the life of the existing structure or make the path toward transition easier.

If we make an approximate analytical assessment of the current situation, the severity of the economic crisis could be estimated at around 90 percent, external pressure at 85 percent, the legitimacy crisis at 90 percent, the division at the center of power at around 70 percent, and the risk of social discontent turning into a widespread crisis at around 65 percent; these figures are not statistical forecasts, but rather measures for comparing the intensity of the variables. Under such circumstances, another determining factor is the behavior of the broader power structure. Crown Prince Reza Pahlavi has repeatedly emphasized that forces within the government structure should not stand against the people and can instead stand alongside the nation. The significance of this view lies in the fact that the collapse of a system does not necessarily occur when all of its institutions disappear; sometimes the decisive point comes when part of its own structure is no longer willing to pay the price for preserving the existing system. On the other hand, while Iran's economy is under unprecedented pressure, the Islamic Republic still retains the ability to suppress dissent and use alternative commercial networks; therefore, the crisis is deep, but collapse is still neither a certain nor an automatic outcome.

But every crisis acquires historical significance when we are prepared for the "day after." Iran cannot, after the end of the Islamic Republic, once again fall into a power vacuum, competition among armed groups, or another ideological government. For this reason, having a clear roadmap for the transition period is of vital importance; a roadmap in which Crown Prince Reza Pahlavi can play a central role as the leader of the transition, while the "Iran Prosperity Project" can provide a framework for governing and rebuilding the country during that period. This project focuses on preparing the necessary structures for the emergency period and moving toward a system chosen by the people. But one principle must be clear to everyone: no one should impose the final form of government on the Iranian people in advance. The purpose of the transition period is to bring Iran to a free, transparent, and non-ideological choice by the people; a point at which Iranians will decide the future of their country and the form of government. From this perspective, Crown Prince Reza Pahlavi is not the end of this journey, but a bridge from the Islamic Republic toward the free choice of the Iranian nation. For many Iranians, he is the last feather of the Simurgh for restoring Iran's freedom, territorial integrity, and grandeur; but according to Crown Prince Reza Pahlavi's own statements, ultimate power must ultimately return to the ballot box and the will of the people. Today, the issue is that we must be able, both inside and outside Iran, to complete the chain of the regime's collapse and accelerate the downfall of the Islamic dictatorship in Iran.



When the Aryamehr Generation Left, the Mullahs Remained: The Story of Murdering Talent in Iran

By Leila Fathali

Pahlavi Iran had a dream: to become the Japan of the Middle East. That's why he built Aryamehr University, brought the best professors in the world from MIT and NASA to Tehran, and gave scholarships to Iranian students to return and build Iran. In those days, being an engineer in Iran meant pride, meant future.



The Islamic Republic, for 45 years, has done one job very well: turning that same university into a factory for assassinating talent. Today, the Iranian elite is either in Evin prison or in the long line for a Canadian visa on Bokharest Street. This is not migration anymore; this is a systematic expulsion of brains. It is revenge against Iranian intelligence.

The statistics of a disaster that can no longer be hidden speak for themselves. According to the official report of the Iran Migration Observatory in 2024, more than 63% of all students and graduates have declared that they would leave Iran tomorrow if conditions were met, and among the top 1000 ranks of the national entrance exam, this terrible number reaches 89%. The Medical Council shamefully announces that nearly 2,000 specialist doctors leave the country every year, and the migration of nurses has grown by 300% in the past year. The Central Bank confessed in a confidential report that the exit of these elites' costs Iran's economy more than 150 billion dollars annually, equal to the country's entire oil revenue.

But statistics are not just numbers, these are the lives of the children of this country. The first example is the complete team of the 2023 Math Olympiad. Ten of the smartest kids in Iran who won the gold medal of the World Math Olympiad and

raised the flag of Iran, none of them are in Iran today. All ten left with full scholarships to the US and Canada. The Islamic Republic could not even keep one of them, while during the Pahlavi era, such kids were directly hired by ministries and given organizational houses. The second example is Sara, a 27-year-old genetic engineer from the University of Tehran who ranked 8th in the national exam and got her master's degree with a GPA of 19. For two years in the university laboratory, they told her that because you do not observe the hijab, you have no right to work with the equipment, and they cut her research budget and told her to go write your thesis on Islamic medicine. She now works in a cancer lab in Germany with a salary of 4,000 euros per month and says I wanted to make medicine for Iran, they didn't let me.

The great exodus of oil and computer specialists is the next bitter chapter of this story. The third example is the story of more than 500 senior oil and gas engineers who studied at the Abadan Petroleum University, which is a legacy of the Pahlavi era. South Pars is the largest gas field in the world, half of which is ours, and Iran should have made wealth from it, but because the Islamic Republic humiliated the engineer, today all those 500 people work in Doha for Qatar Gas. With our own hands and with our own brains, we made Qatar the richest country in the world. The fourth example is Ali, a 31-year-old programmer from Sharif University who built an app with 2 million users. During the Pahlavi era, the Shah himself would have awarded him, but in the Islamic Republic, the filtering army filtered him and then told him you must give 70% of your company's shares to a company affiliated with us. He closed his company and now in Dubai he has built the same app for an Emirati company and says I didn't want to be a soldier, I wanted to be a builder.

Empty hospitals and the difference between two worldviews is the last act of this tragedy. The fifth example can be seen in Imam Khomeini Hospital in Tehran, where in one ward, out of 12 residents, 9 have migrated in one year. A nurse with 15 years of experience who earns 18 million Tomans a month and is beaten every day in the hospital, why should she stay when in Germany she earns 3,000 euros a month and is respected? During the Pahlavi era, we imported doctors from America, today we export doctors to America. These two periods must be put side by side to understand the depth of the disaster. During the Pahlavi era, when an engineer returned from America, a red carpet was laid for him at Mehrabad Airport because he was going to build a refinery and his salary was more than a minister. The Shah said brains are the crown of the country. In the Islamic Republic, when the same engineer returns, he must first go and pledge, then they check his beard, and then they make an illiterate Aghazadeh his boss. Pahlavi gave wings to the elite, the Islamic Republic clips their wings. One wanted to make Iran like Japan, one wants to make Iran like Gaza, and the result is clear.

And in the end, it must be said that the only way to salvation is to return to the Pahlavi path. This brain drain is not natural, it is political. As long as the university is a place for ideology and not for science, as long as the elite is humiliated and the Aghazadeh is encouraged, this exodus will continue. Iran was only once in its contemporary history a destination for the world's elites, and that was the Pahlavi era. For Sara and Ali not to leave, and for the next Olympiad team to stay and win medals for Iran, we must return Iran to that same path. A path where expertise matters, not commitment, where science matters, not ideology, and where Iran matters, not Gaza and Lebanon. As long as the Islamic Republic exists, the brain drain will continue, and only with the return of the monarchy and the Pahlavi path will these airports turn from a line of leaving to a line of returning.



Weekly magazine

Sepidar
Woman Iranian Party

Friday, September 4, 2026

The End of Tyranny's Maneuvers Under Siege

By Leila Kharazi

The renewal of strikes, explicit threats, and the intensification of severe international pressure on the military and economic lifelines of the tyrannical regime indicate that the crisis has entered an irreversible stage. A ruling system that sought to guarantee its survival for years through nuisance maneuvers, diplomatic extortion, and creating artificial regional crises now finds itself in the tightest possible siege. The consequences of this heavy confrontation exposed the total failure of defense strategies and the absolute global isolation of the regime. This situation serves as a clear warning that the tools of imposing costs on the international community can no longer save this decaying structure.



The collapse of defensive lines and the helplessness of decision-making bodies against transnational pressures are the direct result of domestic delegitimization and the complete rupture between the people and the government. A society suffocating under agonizing inflation, systemic repression, and resource looting feels no connection to the regime's costly adventures. The recent military confrontation proved that the tyrannical system lacks even the capacity to protect the country's vital infrastructure, with its only skill being the execution of violence against defenseless citizens within borders. This deep divide revealed the system's ultimate deadlock facing external threats.

On the other hand, Iranian public opinion, with complete vigilance, has separated the regime's adventurous calculations from the true, long-term national interests. The Iranian nation understands well that the continuous shadow of war and insecurity stems directly from the existence of the absolute guardianship structure and its destructive regional policies. The only pathway to end this ongoing crisis and

restore stability to the country lies in the total rejection of religious tyranny and its replacement with a law-abiding national governance. The people will not allow the ruling system to shed responsibility for ongoing economic and security disasters through playing the victim.

The accumulation of internal crises intersecting with severe external pressures has brought about the complete paralysis of the regime's executive and financial apparatuses. The choking of the system's respiratory arteries and the deprivation of its maneuvering power have paved the way for deepening protests and strikes across various societal sectors. The conscious resistance of different social strata demonstrates that the regime's repressive capacity is severely deteriorating under dwindling financial resources and international isolation. These unique circumstances have tipped the balance of power in favor of the national will for fundamental change.

In this context, the wise stances and strategic guidelines of the national leader, Crown Prince Reza Pahlavi, depict the homeland's salvation pathway amidst the flames of war and repression. He has repeatedly emphasized that the path to severing tyranny's grip and preserving Iran's territorial integrity rests on relying upon the nation's will, democratic solidarity, and a planned transition. According to the national leader, safeguarding national assets and preventing further destruction requires transitioning power to the people and establishing a responsible national government. This bright horizon has cleared ambiguity from the path of struggle.

The international community must also realize that temporary solutions and military confrontations without addressing the Iranian people's core demand cannot produce lasting stability. Free governments, rather than bargaining or remaining in pure confrontation, must recognize the Iranian nation's national will for regime change as the sole solution to end regional turmoil. Cutting off the repression machine's financial access and explicitly supporting human rights and democratic transition represent the bare minimum expectations of civil society from global powers. The ultimate responsibility for all current pressures and threats lies with the usurping structure holding Iran hostage.

The tomorrow of Iran's freedom will mark the end of war threats, the dark shadow of sanctions, and living under constant anxiety. With the fall of this mafia and anti-Iranian system, the country will reach the safe shores of stability, peace, and economic reconstruction. Under the shadow of its national leader, Crown Prince Reza Pahlavi, Iran will reclaim its honorable and secure status in a peaceful region, directing national energy toward prosperity. The spring of justice and national sovereignty is near, and tomorrow's light will permanently erase the darkness of war and tyranny.



August 25: A Wound in Iran's Historical Memory

By Azadeh Sharafi

August 25, 1941, stands as one of the darkest days in Iran's modern history. On that day, in the midst of the Second World War, British and Soviet forces entered Iranian territory, placing the country's national sovereignty before one of the greatest challenges it had faced in modern times. Iran had declared its neutrality in the war, yet its strategic geographic position, oil resources, and vital transportation routes made the country a crucial point in the calculations of the Allied powers. From that moment onward, Iran was forced to pay a heavy price—not by its own choice, but because it found itself caught between the great powers of the era. The consequences extended far beyond the military sphere, affecting the political, economic, and social life of the Iranian people.



To understand the significance of August 25, one must first look at Iran in the years preceding it. Following the First World War, Iran faced a weakened central government, widespread insecurity, the rise of local power centers, and extensive foreign interference. Under such circumstances, the creation of a strong central state and the formation of a disciplined national army were among the country's most pressing necessities. During his reign, Reza Shah undertook a far-reaching project of state consolidation, establishing a unified national army, expanding roads and communications, promoting modern education, and building modern governmental institutions. The purpose of this transformation was to create a state capable of exercising authority throughout the country and to move Iran beyond the fragmentation and political weakness of the past.

The Trans-Iranian Railway, roads, the expansion of the state administration, the creation of a modern army, and the development of educational institutions were among the most important transformations of that era. These achievements must be viewed within the historical circumstances of the time: Iran was a country that needed a powerful central government and strong national institutions in order to safeguard its territorial integrity. One of the most important legacies of Reza Shah's reign was, in fact, the emergence of a new conception of the Iranian state and nation—a unified Iran in which a strong central government, a national army, and modern institutions could replace the fragmentation and weakness of earlier decades. From this perspective, August 25 was not merely a military event; it was a defining moment that revealed the immense difficulty of preserving Iran's independence in the face of the great powers.

On the morning of August 25, 1941, Soviet forces entered Iran from the north while British forces advanced from the south. The Iranian army was unable to sustain prolonged resistance against the invading forces, and large parts of the country soon came under foreign military control. For the Iranian people, the reality was unmistakable: foreign

armies had entered their homeland—a country that had declared itself neutral in the war. The occupation came at a time when Iran was still undergoing political and economic reconstruction, making the consequences of the foreign presence particularly severe for Iranian society.

Iran's importance to the Allies went beyond its geography alone. The country's transportation networks, particularly its railway and road systems, provided a vital corridor for the movement of equipment and supplies to the Soviet front. Iran consequently became one of the major logistical routes supporting the Allied war effort and was later described as the "Bridge of Victory." Yet behind this phrase stood a reality that was far less triumphant for the Iranian people: a country that had chosen not to participate in the war had been transformed into a corridor for foreign armies, while its population was left to bear the economic and social consequences of the occupation.

The occupation of Iran soon developed into a political crisis as well. The presence of foreign forces and pressure from the occupying powers placed Reza Shah in an increasingly difficult position. On September 16, 1941, he was forced to abdicate, and his son, Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi, succeeded him on the throne. Thus, one of the most consequential periods in modern Iranian history came to an end under circumstances in which Iran's future was no longer determined solely by Iranians themselves. Reza Shah left Iran, but the project he had initiated—building a modern state, creating a national army, and strengthening the country's infrastructure—did not disappear with his departure. Its effects continued to shape Iran in the decades that followed.

For this reason, August 25 should be remembered as more than simply a date on the calendar. It is a reminder of the importance of independence and territorial integrity, and of the fact that no nation can build its security and sovereignty solely upon the goodwill of foreign powers. A country determined to control its own destiny requires a strong government, a capable military, a resilient economy, national infrastructure, and, above all, a shared national determination to preserve its unity. The experience of 1941 demonstrated that when Iran is politically or militarily vulnerable, its strategic geography and importance can become, instead of an advantage, a source of foreign intervention.

In Iran's historical memory, Reza Shah cannot be separated from the emergence of modern Iran. During a critical period in the nation's history, he pursued the consolidation of the state, the creation of a unified national army, the development of infrastructure, and the modernization of Iran's institutions, establishing a new image of a strong and centralized Iranian state. Whatever historical debates may surround that period, one fact remains clear: Iran in the early twentieth century needed a powerful central government to overcome decades of weakness and fragmentation, and Reza Shah pursued that transformation with remarkable speed and determination. The legacy of that era can still be seen in many of the institutions and structures that subsequently formed the foundations of modern Iran.

Today, remembering August 25 should not be limited to recounting the tragedies of the past. History has value when it provides lessons for the future. August 25 reminds us that Iran's independence, territorial integrity, and national security must stand at the heart of any political vision for the country. If Iran is to ensure that it will never again be vulnerable to the will of foreign powers, it needs a strong state, a capable military, national unity, and a system of government whose first responsibility is to Iran itself. From this perspective, a strong and united Iran, grounded in a national and powerful monarchy, can serve as a symbol of the country's historical continuity and as a safeguard of its independence and national dignity—a monarchy devoted to Iran, its territorial integrity, and the future of generations to come.

August 25 remains a wound in Iran's historical memory—a wound that must never be forgotten. Yet Iranians are not destined to remain prisoners of the past. The lesson of that day for future generations is clear: Iran must be strong enough that no foreign power can ever determine its destiny in place of the Iranian people. A strong, united, and proud Iran, rooted in its history and national identity, deserves a future in which the country's independence is not merely an aspiration, but a lasting reality.