

greetings, and thank you for inviting us to participate in this interview. It should be noted that due to the detailed and analytical nature of the responses to the important questions you have raised, the text could have become excessively long; therefore, we have attempted to answer them as concisely as possible. For further reading on this subject, you may refer to the organization's website, which is also available in Turkish.

With renewed thanks.

Iranian Fedayian Communi

April 2026

1.What is your position and stance under the current war conditions in the region? Do you expect the regime to collapse during this war process, and if so, how does this shape your strategy of struggle ?

Answer: The current state of war is a continuation of the policy (the "New Middle East" map) that US imperialism and Israel have been pursuing since the era of George W. Bush. In their efforts to implement this policy, they have slaughtered millions of innocent people in Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, Palestine, Lebanon, and elsewhere. In recent years, considering global developments and the emergence of several rivals that have confronted the United States with a crisis of hegemony—particularly to counter the expansion of China's influence in Asia, Africa, and other countries around the world—they have accelerated this process.

On the other hand, the crisis of the capitalist system has intensified. Peaceful competition in the markets fails to provide the necessary profit margins for corporations and conglomerates. In this situation, the major powers are engaged in fierce competition to redivide spheres of influence and to secure access to commodity markets, cheap labor, natural resources, transit routes, trade corridors, and oil and gas pipelines. Emerging economic powers have appeared that challenge the unrivaled dominance of US imperialism and the power of the dollar. The US seeks, by resorting to arms, fueling regional conflicts, and exploiting numerous fault lines in various regions of the world, to encircle China—its greatest rival—and thus preserve a unipolar world led by the United States.

The war of powers is now centered in Iran. Meanwhile, the Islamic Republic and the Netanyahu regime, as regional actors, are trying to secure the maximum share for themselves amidst these global developments. While countering internal threats, they aim to become the supreme power in the region and be recognized as such. Netanyahu's goal is to achieve dominance over the region as a hegemonic force by erasing the Palestinian question, through military aggression against Syria, Lebanon, and now Iran, thereby realizing the Promised Land (from the Nile to the Euphrates). At the opposite pole, the

regime of the Islamic Republic of Iran has also been striving to expand its influence to the Eastern Mediterranean by organizing and equipping proxy forces in the region, entirely at the expense of the working people of Iran.

After Lebanon, Syria, and Iraq, it is now Iran's turn. If Iran collapses or faces civil wars, the target for US imperialism and its allies will be Afghanistan, followed by the expansion of the crisis into Central Asia right up to the borders of China.

Of course, war creates new conditions that are unpredictable. The US and Israel initially calculated that with a blitzkrieg and the assassination of the regime's leaders, the Iranian people—the vast majority of whom despise the Islamic Republic due to its anti-popular policies over the past forty-seven years—would not rise up to defend it, and the regime would lack the power and capability to survive. Then, in the best-case scenario, they would install their own puppet opposition in power. However, after one month and the relentless bombardment of cities, infrastructure, and people's homes, we see that the regime has disrupted these initial calculations by adopting the tactic of attacking US interests and bases, thereby regionalizing the war.

Now, unlike the wars in Gaza, Syria, and Lebanon, the damages and consequences of the war have directly impacted people living in the US, Europe, and other parts of the world, expanding their protests against the warmongering policies of their respective governments. In Iran as well, there is a continuation of, on the one hand, relentless bombings by US imperialism and the Israeli regime, and on the other hand, the ongoing suppression of the masses, the arrest and imprisonment of social movement activists, alongside severe economic pressure and displacement.

Given all that has been said, the collapse of the regime is not a short-term prospect. In the best-case scenario, they will reach a compromise with the US; in the worst-case scenario, one must expect an expansion of the war, and even the outbreak of civil and proxy wars.

Under such circumstances, not only do revolutionary conditions not prevail in Iran—and indeed cannot prevail—but the war has completely shattered the economic and social fabric. The social movements that were on the rise prior to the war have been pushed to the margins in the current climate. Undoubtedly, when conditions change, they will return to the scene once again.

2. How do you evaluate the current situation in Iran in light of Lenin's theory of "revolutionary defeatism"? Can we speak of a revolutionary situation today, and if so, what are its fundamental dynamics ?

Answer: The nature of the war regarding which Lenin proposed the theory of the defeat of one's own government differs from the nature of the current war. There, two alliances of capitalist, imperialist countries had entered into war with each other. The peasants, who constituted the majority of the population, were facing famine and starvation; major parties were present in the political arena, and the Bolshevik Party had tens of thousands of members and field activists at its disposal, while the labor movement and other revolutionary movements were very strong. A revolution had just taken place in

Russia, and following the February Revolution and the formation of the provisional revolutionary government, many advocated for the continuation of the war against Germany in order to defend the achievements of the democratic revolution; among them, the Kerensky government, the Mensheviks, and the right-wing SRs [Socialist-Revolutionaries] deemed it necessary. In opposition to them, Lenin put forward the policy of *revolutionary defeatism* and wrote in the *April Theses*: "...there is an inseparable connection between capital and the imperialist war... ending the war through a truly democratic peace, one not imposed by violence, is impossible without the overthrow of capital...".

In such a context, revolutionary defeatism was not an abstract slogan, but a response to an objective situation: a war between imperialist powers, severe economic and social attrition, and the existence of an organized revolutionary force capable of transforming the dissatisfaction of the masses into directed political action. In other words, this policy rested on three pillars: a war that was inherently imperialist and between rival states; a profound crisis within society that had shaken the continued survival of the system; and the presence of a revolutionary alternative rooted in the working class.

If we generalize these components to the current situation in Iran, we are confronted with a scenario where, although there are some general similarities at the level of international contradictions, there are serious and decisive differences in terms of the alignment of social forces and organized revolutionary capacities. The military attack on Iran by US imperialism and the Israeli regime occurred for the second time in recent months while they were engaged in negotiations. The outcome of the latest negotiations was evaluated positively by both the UAE Foreign Minister and US representatives, who were waiting to resolve technical matters in the next meeting, when the aggressive attack began. It became clear that all these negotiations and claims were nothing more than a deception.

This situation demonstrates that the logic governing this war, rather than being subordinate to diplomacy, is comprehensible within the framework of macro-imperialist rivalries and the reconfiguration of the balance of power on a global scale. Inside Iran, however, unlike Russia in 1917, we are not yet facing a revolutionary situation in the strict sense of the word. Lenin points to three conditions to define a revolutionary situation: the inability of the ruling classes to maintain their rule in the old way; the intensification of suffering and poverty among the lower classes; and a significant increase in the activity and activism of the masses. Although some of these elements are observable in Iran, they have not yet reached a level of density and cohesion where one could speak of an *actual* revolutionary situation.

War, instead of immediately leading to the radicalization of social movements, has in the short term resulted in fragmentation, more severe repression, and the suspension of many forms of organization. On the one hand, economic pressures, the destruction of infrastructure, and widespread insecurity have worsened the living conditions of the masses; on the other hand, the security and military atmosphere has further restricted the possibility of collective and organized action. This is precisely the point where the fundamental difference from the Russian experience becomes apparent: the absence of an organized political force with deep roots in the working class capable of transforming dispersed grievances into a coherent revolutionary project.

Nevertheless, this does not mean a lack of potential dynamics. At the heart of this very crisis, important elements are taking shape: the deepening of the rift between the state and society, the erosion of political legitimacy, the expansion of poverty and inequality, and the accumulated experiences of struggle in recent years. In the medium and long term, these factors can turn into the foundations of a revolutionary situation, especially if accompanied by the reconstruction and strengthening of independent forms of labor and social organization.

From this perspective, referencing Lenin's theory of revolutionary defeatism without considering historical and objective differences can lead to a dangerous oversimplification. What matters today is not the repetition of a historical formula, but a *concrete analysis of concrete conditions*: understanding how the current war can simultaneously strengthen reactionary trends while also providing the grounds for deeper dissatisfaction. The main question is not whether the exact same policy should be repeated, but rather how, under these concrete conditions, one can avoid falling into the trap of either pole of the war—whether foreign imperialism or domestic despotism—while keeping the horizon of an independent, class-based intervention open.

3. How do you assess the position of certain leftist circles that support the regime in the name of anti-imperialism, as well as the accusations of “collaboration with imperialism” directed at regime opponents? What do you think is the correct revolutionary stance today?

Answer: None of these groups comprehend the actual situation. The economic and social conditions, as well as the productive forces in the world, have undergone significant changes compared to previous years and the era of anti-colonial struggles. The capitalist system, which is highly globalized and intertwined, constitutes the dominant relations in all countries. Therefore, conflict and competition to maximize profit and dominate resources, raw materials, cheap labor, and consumer markets are the laws of capitalism, especially for imperialist countries. If, in the course of this competition and these conflicts, wars and violent clashes are resorted to here and there, they possess no progressive, revolutionary, or emancipatory content, and neither side's actions can be considered just or deemed a struggle against imperialism.

The main problem with these types of approaches is that they still analyze the situation using the logic of an era in which a section of the national bourgeoisie in certain countries could play a relatively independent role in opposition to classical colonialism. Today, however, under the conditions of globalized capitalism, various factions of the bourgeoisie—even those in political conflict with the major powers—are integrated into the global network of the division of labor and capital accumulation. Hence, reducing any geopolitical confrontation to an "anti-imperialist front" is not only inaccurate but also politically misleading. This perspective, instead of employing class analysis, defines the position of forces based on state alignments and ultimately leads to tailing one of the poles of power.

On the other hand, the accusation of "collaborating with imperialism" leveled against the regime's opponents has often become a tool to discredit any form of independent critique and struggle. This

leveling of accusations, particularly in wartime conditions, serves a political function: disarming social forces and closing the space for any independent action. Opposing a despotic and capitalist government by no means implies alignment with foreign intervention. These two levels must be analytically separated from one another.

Therefore, today, the struggle against imperialism is not separate from the struggle against domestic capitalism. Any approach that suspends one of these two in favor of the other practically contributes to the reproduction of the very same relations of domination. Supporting a state simply because it stands in opposition to the US or the West means ignoring the relations of exploitation and repression within that society. Conversely, reducing the struggle against domestic despotism to a reliance on foreign pressure or intervention is equally dangerous, as it ties the fate of the society to the projects of external powers.

In our view, the correct position is, first and foremost, to condemn the aggressive attack on Iran by US imperialism and the Israeli regime, even though the ruling regime in Iran is also capitalist—and of a brutal kind—which, by merging religion and the state, has deprived the masses of the working class and the toiling people of the most basic freedoms, including the right to organize and form parties, and has intensified gender, national, and class discrimination. However, this is only the starting point, not the end of the position.

Moving forward, this position must also transform into a proactive orientation: defending the political independence of the working class and social forces, striving to rebuild forms of independent organization, and simultaneously confronting war and domestic repression. In wartime conditions, the pressure to align with one of the two poles increases, but it is precisely under these conditions that maintaining this independence acquires even greater importance.

In other words, the revolutionary position in today's conditions does not lie in supporting either side of the war, but rather in striving to shape a third social and political pole capable of representing the interests and demands of the lower classes. This means negating both dominant logics: the warmongering logic of imperialism as well as the repressive logic of the established states. Without such a horizon, critiques are either reduced to justifying the status quo or transformed into tools serving external projects.

4. What is the current status of your relations with Kurdish political parties in Rojhilat? Do you consider building alliances or a common struggle with socialist-oriented forces, and how do you relate the national question to class struggle?

Answer: Historically, we have had relations with Kurdish political parties that were sometimes friendly and sometimes tense. We have repeatedly come to the negotiating table to shape a specific struggle for specific goals. Unfortunately, despite the presence of leftist and communist forces in Kurdistan, nationalist currents have the upper hand. Because they lack genuine support for the rights of the working class and the toiling people—who constitute the majority of society and whose demands become more radical with the growth of their class consciousness—they do not, in practice, possess

strong backing among the toilers, especially women. They primarily consider the issue of eliminating national oppression as the central axis of their struggles.

Furthermore, the Kurdish bourgeoisie, contrary to what some may believe, has an unbreakable bond and shared interests at heart with the bourgeoisie of other countries and the world, and it has no interest in advancing the national question except to extract concessions from established states. Therefore, these seemingly large and historic parties are forced to rely on imperialist and reactionary regional states to achieve their own goals. It is clear that a party claiming to seek independence, by resorting to foreign powers, calls its very national foundation into question and ultimately transforms into a tool in the hands of other states. The history of Kurdistan provides ample examples and evidence of this.

Today, championing the right to self-determination and the elimination of national oppression, just like class oppression and gender discrimination, is the responsibility of the working class and the toilers, not the domestic bourgeoisie. This is particularly true in a region like the Kurdistan Region, for instance, where even if a government apparatus has been formed, it is not the bourgeois class but rather tribal and clan leaders who rule.

In this regard, a distinction must be made among the political forces of Kurdistan. Hence, we have long had good relations and joint collaborations with the leftist and socialist parties of Kurdistan. Even now, our proposal to them is that, in line with long-term goals, the formation of a revolutionary front is the most appropriate path for cooperation; within this collaboration, theoretical problems can also be resolved, putting an end to the current fragmentation.

Years ago, we put forward a slogan that today has almost become the discourse of the left: the struggle against national-gender-class oppression, and we established this as the basis for unity with activists fighting against national oppression. Because today, in the oppressed regions of Iran, it is not only national oppression that the masses suffer from, but they also suffer from gender oppression as well as class oppression or exploitation. The socialist movement, in order to integrate the class struggle with the elimination of national oppression, must—in addition to other demands—put forward these three points as its pivotal demand and organize the struggle around them in the national regions.

5.What is the current condition, social influence, and strength of the alliance of leftist, communist, and progressive forces you are part of? What is your level of organization among the working class and oppressed groups, and how are your practical activities developing?

Answer: We are Fedaian. The history of our struggles, both during the Shah's regime and under the Islamic Republic, is imbued with sincerity and self-sacrifice for the ideals of freedom and socialism. Although we have certainly made many mistakes, honesty and truthfulness have always been among the defining

characteristics of genuine Fedaiian, and it was precisely for this reason that they earned the trust of the masses. The fact that these principles were later abandoned by many pretenders is not the subject of this interview, but we, the communist Fedaiian, have strived to remain loyal to them. Therefore, we attempt to share a glimpse of the existing reality with you and the esteemed readers of your publication, and due to the constraints of this interview, we are compelled to touch upon them briefly. As Lenin noted (paraphrased), searching for and identifying mistakes and weaknesses, openly acknowledging them, and striving to correct them is not a sign of weakness, but rather the strength of any proletarian party.

We must confess that even though the demands of society and the revolutionary movements are leftist in nature, and leftists and communists possess a greater objective ground for growth and expansion compared to other opposition groups in Iran, this potential has not been actualized. There are numerous reasons for this, which we do not have the opportunity to delve into here, but you can familiarize yourself with our analyses on this matter by referring to the organization's publications.

Setting these aside, the severe repression of the left and communists during the Shah's era—while religious factions were given a free hand to propagandize, agitate, and organize—was followed by the implementation of an even more brutal policy of repression by the Islamic Republic, which massacred thousands of cadres, leaders, and members of leftist organizations. Subsequently, their resistance in regions like Iranian Kurdistan and later Iraq, the purging of remaining leftists from schools, universities, government offices, etc., the regime's absolute domination over the destiny of the people, and the driving of the remnants into exile and the prolongation of this period of exile—all of this not only severed the organic link between the leftist vanguard and the working class and society, but also confronted any attempt at reorganization with immense security challenges. This historical process has specifically led to a generational rupture, severed the transmission of struggle experience, and weakened the social and organizational networks of the left.

Despite all this, the left has attempted—notwithstanding financial constraints and a shortage of necessary cadres—to strengthen revolutionary movements and amplify their voices to the world through propaganda, agitation, and participation in struggles both inside and outside the country, to the extent of its capacity in the ongoing struggles. Furthermore, efforts have been made to rebuild ties with working-class, student, and other social milieus, although these efforts have not yet reached a level of stable, nationwide organization. Consequently, the left is not yet capable of exerting a meaningful impact on social developments under the current conditions, and this gap between objective capacity and organizational capability remains one of the central issues confronting us.

Regarding the collaborations and alliances that have taken place thus far, they have undoubtedly had their achievements as well as flaws. However, the most significant problem is what we mentioned earlier: in the absence of an organic link with the working class and social movements, the gathering together of a number of organizations and parties with differences—differences for which there are no long-term resolutions except through field struggle in connection with the masses—does not solve the problem. It is incapable of facilitating organizational expansion and the mobilization of forces in the arena of struggle. To put it more clearly, alliances that are purely organizational and formed from above, without relying on a living social base, quickly suffer from attrition and cannot play a decisive role.

We hope and are striving to find a practical solution to this. By synthesizing the specific current conditions of Iran and the level of the masses' struggles, we have proposed the formation of a **revolutionary front** (to review our analyses and articles on this, please visit the organization's website, which is also available in Turkish). This entails an alliance of leftist, socialist, and communist parties and organizations, alongside revolutionary movements such as those of women, students, oppressed and exploited nationalities, teachers, leftist artists, intellectuals, and others, under the umbrella of a revolutionary front. Its aim is the revolutionary overthrow of the Islamic Republic regime and fundamental changes to the economic and social structure of Iran, based on councils (shoras) and popular organs. If this front is to transcend the level of a mere slogan, it must

be able to consolidate itself in the real arenas of struggle, in strikes, protests, and social networks.

At the same time, we consider the unity of communists around a common program for the establishment of socialism in Iran to be essential. Under the existing conditions of our society, given the weakness and dispersion of communists across weak and ineffective organizations, no communist and revolutionary program—no matter how correct—can be implemented in practice. Therefore, alongside uniting around a political front to bolster currently existing revolutionary movements—as a correct tactic aligned with realities on the ground—we also consider the unity of dispersed communists under a proletarian program to be necessary for strengthening the labor and communist movement. We are simultaneously striving towards both of these goals.

6. What are your relations with the international socialist movement? What kind of line of solidarity and common struggle do you aim to build with leftist forces both regionally and globally?

Answer: As you know, we have long had international relations and collaborations with revolutionary and socialist parties and organizations dating back to the era of the monarchical regime; this includes ties with Turkey, Palestine, Latin America, Dhofar, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. These relations in that era were part of an internationalist horizon that understood the class struggle on a global scale, formed on the premise that capitalism is not merely a national phenomenon, but a global system.

During subsequent developments—including the collapse of the Soviet Union and the ensuing changes, the significant shifts in the positions of former communist and socialist forces, the general dominance of a kind of counter-revolution and despair in the public atmosphere, as well as our own weakness and incapacitation following the defeat of the 1979 uprising and being subjected to prison, torture, massacres, and exile, which was accompanied by the disintegration of the fabric of many organizations—these international relations also often became unnecessary, fruitless, or encountered difficulties. In fact, just as we faced organizational rupture internally, our ties at the international level also suffered

from attrition, and a portion of the left's internationalist capacities was weakened.

Nevertheless, we have always tried, and continue to try, to mend some of these severed ties, and we particularly consider unity and cooperation with revolutionary currents in the region to be essential. This necessity does not stem merely from a political or historical inclination, but is rooted in the very nature of contemporary capitalism. Capitalism today is an intertwined global system; transnational production chains, multinational corporations, global financial markets, and neoliberal policies imposed by international institutions have created conditions where exploitation in one country is directly linked to exploitation in other countries. Under such circumstances, the struggle against this order cannot remain confined within national borders.

From this perspective, international solidarity is not a moral slogan, but a material and strategic necessity. As Marx emphasized, capital operates globally, and if workers remain enclosed within the framework of national borders, they will always be one step behind capital. Today, this reality has become far more objective. A worker in Iran facing privatization, temporary contracts, the suppression of organizing, and job insecurity is, in many cases, confronting the exact same policies and mechanisms experienced by workers in Turkey, Iraq, Egypt, or even European countries. These commonalities provide the possibility for the formation of genuine and effective bonds.

Within this framework, regional relations hold special importance for us. Countries in the region, particularly Iran's neighbors like Turkey and Iraq, are not only geographically close, but also share significant similarities in terms of their economic structure, their position in the global chain of capital, and their forms of political repression. The experiences of struggle in these countries—ranging from workers' strikes to forms of organizing under repression—can be instructive for us, and conversely, our experiences can also be shared with leftist forces in those countries. This exchange of experience, if pursued consciously and in an organized manner, can lead to practical synergy; this includes coordination in campaigns,

joint statements, or even simultaneous pressure on specific policies and institutions.

At the same time, these relations can play a crucial role in breaking the imposed isolation. Governments attempt to reduce social struggles to an "internal issue" and prevent them from being seen on a global level. Linking with leftist forces in the region and the world provides the opportunity to raise repression as an international issue and increase its political costs for governments. We have seen examples of this type of solidarity in the international support for workers and imprisoned activists in Iran, which demonstrates that even limited connections can be impactful.

However, we do not consider regional relations a substitute for a global horizon; rather, we see them as a bridge connecting us to the global labor movement. Our goal is to shape a network of solidarity in which leftist and labor forces can share their experiences, learn from one another, and exhibit more coordinated responses against the common policies of global capitalism.

Therefore, strengthening regional and international relations is not a marginal matter for us, but an integral part of the strategy of class struggle. We strive to rebuild and expand these ties to the best of our ability, even though we are still a significant distance from the desired level. But without this international horizon, the struggle at the national level will inevitably face serious limitations, and the possibility of breaking through the cycle of repression and isolation will become all the more difficult.