

**Neither a New Guadeloupe nor Chaos
and Social Collapse — Long Live the
Independent Proletarian Struggle!**



Internationalist Voice

During the protests of 1978–79, the Western bourgeoisie concluded that the Shah’s regime was no longer capable of retaining power, and that continuing bloody repression would, rather than creating stability, increase the risk of radicalisation of the mass movement—particularly the labour movement. Given Iran’s geopolitical position, the need for a controlled transition was placed on the agenda: a transition aimed at preserving the army, the state apparatus, and the capitalist structure, preventing Iran from drifting out of the Western sphere during the Cold War, and containing the threat of communism and the self-organisation of the working class.

In this context, although Khomeini was not the Western bourgeoisie’s preferred choice, he was practically the only viable alternative. He was staunchly anti-communist, wielded extensive popular influence through religion and the network of mosques, and was capable of controlling and diverting strikes, the labour movement, and the emerging workers’ councils.

In pursuit of this goal, in January 1979 the leaders of the four main Western powers at the time—the United States, Britain, France, and West Germany—held a conference on the island of Guadeloupe. The aim of the conference was to prevent the spread and intensification of class struggle and to ensure a controlled transfer of political power: a transfer in which authority would shift from the ‘suit-wearing’ bourgeoisie to the ‘turbaned’ bourgeoisie, without challenging the foundations of the capitalist order or the mechanisms of ruling-class domination.

For some time, Western countries—led by the United States and, in particular, Israel—have sought to exploit social protests in Iran and steer them in accordance with their imperialist objectives. The protests, which began on 28 December 2025, despite all their weaknesses and ambiguities, had not, for a while, resulted in widespread repression or a bloodbath.

However, following a call by Reza Pahlavi—Israel’s proxy and the son of the Shah’s repressive regime—for 8 and 9 January 2026, ultra-reactionary forces, suspicious gangs, and adventurist elements—the so-called ‘black

forces’ of the protests—directed the demonstrations towards their reactionary objectives. In the aftermath, the disgraceful Islamic bourgeoisie, by resorting to brutal repression, turned the protests into a bloodbath.

Nevertheless, the full depth and scope of this tragedy remain unclear to anyone; all that can be said is that “the news was horrifying”¹. Alongside genuine reports, a large volume of fake news is also circulating to serve reactionary objectives. At the same time, Western media, operating within the framework of the imperialist interests of the Western bourgeoisie and to promote the alternatives favoured by Western powers, are engaged in shaping public opinion, playing a significant and decisive role in this process.

Although this bloodbath and massacre were carried out directly by the disgraceful Islamic bourgeoisie, the crime cannot be reduced merely to the repression of a dictatorial regime. This massacre is the result of the convergence of internal repression with forces and currents that steered the protests towards reactionary objectives and created the conditions for the intervention of the machinery of oppression. From the son of the Shah’s repressive regime and the ‘black’ gangs, to the right and left of capital, who, in the name of “revolution”, issued commands for conquest and adventurism; from gangster democrats to Trump and Netanyahu, all share responsibility for this tragedy.

Communist left has previously emphasised that even Western democracies were complicit in crimes such as the Auschwitz genocide. In an earlier article², we also demonstrated that all states, including Western democracies, bear responsibility in the Gaza massacre. We now explicitly declare that any force which, in any way, facilitated the entry of the Islamic bourgeoisie’s machinery of repression into the protests is complicit in this massacre.

¹ As the true scale of the crimes committed becomes clearer, and once the haze of propaganda, fake news, and imperialist and reactionary exploitation lifts, a consolidated, analytical, internationalist perspective—based on the independent interests of the working class—will be presented regarding these protests.

² [Gaza Genocide: A Product of Global Capitalism’s Organized Barbarism](#).

Western gangsters removed a jihadist like Abu Mohammad al-Julani —once the subject of a \$10 million bounty—from the status of a militant fighter, conferred political legitimacy upon him, dressed him in a suit, and welcomed him as a “head of state” on a red carpet in Europe and even at the White House.

Reza Pahlavi (the son of the Shah’s repressive regime) and other reactionary forces and figures are also awaiting a similar scenario: that the same Western powers—particularly the US–Israel axis—will bring them to power as replacements for the current rulers.³ Today, the “black” gangs and factions also hope that the same imperialists will, this time, replace the “suit-wearing” bourgeoisie with the “turbaned” bourgeoisie. These criminals expect that, because ties and bow ties replace beards, the transfer of power will be easier and that another “Guadeloupe” will be repeated in history.

Nevertheless, although these factions and gangs are seeking to play a role similar to that of Hay’at Tahrir al-Sham, and even some groups—despite their grandiose claims of revolutionary and freedom-loving intentions—are in practice advancing reactionary objectives, the reality is that Iran’s political landscape, the nature and influence of the Islamic repressors, and, most importantly, the conditions and position of the working class in Iran are in no way comparable to those in Syria.

The disgraceful Islamic bourgeoisie is comparable neither to the Pahlavi monarchy, nor to Syria, nor to Venezuela; rather, we are confronted with an ideological government which, precisely because of its ideological character, will not easily step aside. Only under conditions in which class struggle expands, becomes organised, and manifests itself in an acute and independent form will the overthrow of the Islamic bourgeoisie be less bloody.

³ Recent demonstrations abroad in support of Reza Pahlavi, held under the banner of Israel and able to attract a significant number of participants—whereas previously pro-Pahlavi gatherings were typically limited to a few dozen—indicate the support and backing of states and circles that, within the framework of their imperialist objectives, are seeking to promote alternatives.

Otherwise, any adventurism by reactionary forces—regardless of their form, name, or apparent orientation, whether in the guise of direct servitude to foreign powers or relying on their support—will inevitably lead to extremely bloody repression and will, in all likelihood, pave the way to an imperialist war.

For this reason, we avoid using the term “civil war”⁴ and instead speak of an “imperialist war”. The term civil war carries a positive connotation and is usually applied to a revolutionary conflict within the borders of a single country. By contrast, the situation described involves a war that is not only imperialist in nature but, given Iran’s ideological and ethnic composition, also has the potential to spread to other countries.

In society, widespread protests and workers’ strikes were taking place: from industrial workers to pensioners, from teachers to healthcare staff, and other sections of wage labour. However, following recent developments, the labour movement gradually became overshadowed by street protests, subsided, and was further weakened.

Only the working class, aware of its class identity and interests, and organised as an independent social force, can prevent the repetition of power transfers like that of 1978–79, the reproduction of scenarios such as a “new Guadeloupe”, and even the dragging of society towards imperialist war and social collapse. It is only through this path that the filthy Islamic bourgeoisie can be overthrown in a revolutionary manner—from below and by the hands of the working masses themselves.

Emphasising the independent struggle of the working class—from a class standpoint and with class objectives—not only prevents the working class from once again becoming the cannon fodder of bourgeois projects and new

⁴ Communist left, for example, regard the developments in late 1930s Spain not as a civil war in the classical or revolutionary sense, but as an imperialist war. Although the term ‘civil war’ is sometimes used descriptively or through inaccuracy, their intention is never to refer to a revolutionary war or a struggle between two hostile class camps; rather, their emphasis is on the imperialist nature of the conflict.

“Guadeloupes”, but also makes it possible to challenge the capitalist system itself and to offer an alternative rooted in the interests of the majority of society. For this reason, our struggle must be conscious, independent, and solely directed towards our class interests; not in the service of transferring power between different forms of bourgeois domination. We must fight solely and exclusively for our class interests.

The Future Belongs to the Class Struggle!

Long Live the Independent Workers' Struggle!

F.A.

19 January 2026

E-mail:
contact@internationalistvoice.org

Homepage:
www.internationalistvoice.org

Twitter:
https://twitter.com/int_voice

Telegram:
<https://t.me/intvoice>

The Internationalist Voice Already Published!

