



IRAN:

View from the LEFT

Aug 2026

NO.80

Word of the Month: The Mecca Pact

By: Majid Siadat

On 7th August 2026, a defence pact was signed between Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and Turkey in Mecca. Similar to the NATO pact, it declares that any attack against one signatory will be considered an attack on all three. What is the significance of this agreement?

It is said that the negotiations to achieve this pact took two years. Egypt, too, participated in these negotiations but has not explained why it declined to sign the final document.

Each of the three signatories brings unique strengths to this pact. Turkey possesses the second-largest military in NATO and has a strong military industrial base, especially in drone technology. Pakistan is the nuclear-armed power of the trio, while Saudi Arabia is its cash-rich member.

It is a matter of speculation in some quarters whether this pact can develop into the kind of single coordinated military force embodied by NATO. But the reader should be aware that, for years, thousands of Pakistani soldiers have been training the Saudi military and one squadron of Pakistani jets (Chinese-manufactured) is stationed in Saudi Arabia. There are also thousands of Turkish forces in Qatar

There are plans to hold joint military exercises, though details haven't been made public. The pact appears to be a work in progress.

Its key significance seems to be its long-term political ramifications. This pact has been signed in the midst of the US/Israeli war against Iran. Does it imply a gradual disengagement of the US from the Middle East, with this agreement a key element of what might fill the vacuum?

A strategic "pivot to Asia" remains the US administration's top international priority, focused on confronting China.

Meanwhile, the Arab Gulf states are not happy with the ongoing outcome of US efforts in defending Arab lands against Iranian missiles and drones, compared with American efforts in defending Israel. The Arab governments were told the US bases would defend them. In fact, these countries have been targeted exactly because of those - very expensive - bases.

The Middle East is evolving. New actors will appear on the scene. Prominent US strategic initiatives, such as the Abraham Accords "peace plan", will be sidelined together with some current actors, such as the UAE. Meanwhile, other countries further afield, such as India, are already concerned about the ramifications of this pact.

The most crushing sanctions campaign or a Path to Peace?

Mehdi Ebrahimzadeh

Iran is facing a complex and decisive moment. The war waged by Israel and the United States against Iran has inflicted heavy human, economic, and infrastructural losses on the country, while domestic pressures imposed by the Islamic Republic have simultaneously added to the burdens on people's lives. In this situation, the United States is seeking to place

maximum pressure on the Islamic Republic's economy by imposing sweeping sanctions and threatening countries and companies that assist Iran. This policy could be described as a form of "felt-mat



treatment”, a gradual, continuous, and escalating pressure intended to wear down the government and force it to retreat.

Alongside the intensification of economic pressure, there are also signs of efforts to find a diplomatic way out. Consultations between Pakistani officials and Iranian authorities, and the possibility of a proposal to end the blockade and lift sanctions in exchange for reopening the Strait of Hormuz and halting attacks by Iran’s proxy forces, could be part of these efforts. The United States appears to be seeking, alongside threats and maximum pressure, a way out of the crisis and toward an agreement. The fundamental question is whether the Islamic Republic will pursue this opportunity with a measured decision, or once again, as after the liberation of Khorramshahr, choose continued confrontation over a ceasefire and agreement.

Continued economic pressure will place increasing strain not only on the government but also on the Iranian people. By contrast, ending the war could create greater space for people to advance their social and civic demands, something that would likely concern the government and hard-line factions. As a result, the divide between factions seeking an agreement and de-escalation and those advocating retaliation and military confrontation could deepen. Despite all these difficulties, ending the war and preventing further erosion of the country should be the priority. To overcome this crisis, Iran needs a foreign policy based not on perpetual confrontation but on engagement with all countries, including the United States, and on sustainable, democratic, and justice-oriented development.

Read More:

<https://bepish.org/fa/node/14365>

■ **As Long as the Islamic Republic and Tyranny Exist, There is Also the Risk of Imprisonment and Execution! On the Occasion of the Anniversary of the Massacre of Political Prisoners in the Summer of 1988**



The 1988 massacre of political prisoners in Iran was an organized political crime carried out on the orders of Ayatollah Khomeini and enabled by the institutional and ideological structure of the Islamic Republic. The Left Party of Iran argues that the logic behind that massacre has never disappeared: repression, imprisonment, torture, and executions have continued through later periods, including the protests of 2018, November 2019, the “Women, Life, Freedom” movement, and January 2026. While the Islamic Republic bears primary responsibility, the democratic opposition has also failed to consistently unite in defence of victims. Political and ideological divisions have often prevented a common response, allowing repression to continue and perpetrators to act with a sense of impunity.

The statement argues that remembering the 1988 massacre must go beyond annual commemorations and instead serve as a lesson for building unity against future repression. Families of victims and political prisoners have played a crucial role in preserving historical memory and demanding truth and justice, and they deserve the support of democratic forces. Complete political agreement is not necessary; what is essential is a shared

commitment to opposing executions and torture, defending prisoners' right to life, and resisting political killings. The Left Party therefore calls on democratic parties, organizations, and independent activists to unite around these basic principles, arguing that ending the Islamic Republic's repression requires a united struggle between democratic political forces and the Iranian people.

Read More:

<https://bepish.org/en/node/14364>

■ The U.S. Military's Attack on a Wedding Ceremony in Sirik County Is a Clear War Crime and Must Be Condemned



According to reports and information received as of this moment, five people have been killed and 68 injured. In a pre-emptive effort to deflect responsibility, similar to the human tragedy in Minab, where 168 innocent elementary schoolchildren lost their lives, and the

Lamerd stadium incident, the United States military has repeatedly refused to accept direct responsibility for these crimes, using the pretext of "conducting investigations" to delay matters and mislead public opinion.

"Coordination for a Secular Democratic Republic in Iran" calls on the Secretary-General of the United Nations, as well as other human rights organizations and international bodies, to unequivocally condemn these actions that are fueling the crisis and to take immediate measures to stop this war of aggression and the killing of civilians.

"Coordination" expresses its deepest sympathy and condolences to the honourable and grieving people of Bandar Kuhestak and calls on all Iranians across the country to express their full support for their compatriots in southern Iran, who today find themselves on the front lines of the harm and aggression inflicted by the U.S. military.

While condemning the war and the aggression by the United States and Israel against Iran, "Coordination" also opposes the war and war-mongering by domestic and foreign actors and rejects the continuation of this devastating war. Efforts to return to the Islamabad Memorandum of Understanding, with a full commitment to its terms and the establishment of peace, are considered to



be in the national interests of the Iranian people.

A Coalition for a Secular Democratic Republic in Iran

What Did Iran Gain from Bishkek

Roza Roozbehan



The Bishkek summit was not a diplomatic defeat for Iran, but neither was it the major victory some in Tehran have portrayed it as.

The Shanghai Cooperation Organization condemned the military attacks on Iran and called for the crisis to be resolved through political and diplomatic means. For Tehran, this was valuable political backing at a time of intense international pressure.

But the limits of that support are clear. The summit produced no security guarantees, military assistance, sanctions relief, or concrete economic measures to protect Iran from U.S. pressure. Even the final statement stopped short of explicitly naming the United States and Israel. The organization's members have different strategic interests and are unlikely to accept the costs of a direct confrontation with Washington on Iran's behalf.

China and Russia remain important partners for Tehran, but they also pursue their own national interests. This is why Iran's "Look East" strategy cannot realistically substitute for a balanced foreign policy or resolve its confrontation with the West.

Perhaps more revealing was President Masoud Pezeshkian's message that Iran remains prepared to return to an interim agreement with Washington if the United States fulfills its commitments. Even Tehran's position on freedom of navigation through the Strait of Hormuz was linked to U.S. compliance.

That message may be more significant than the summit's anti-American rhetoric. It suggests that, despite its growing ties with China and Russia, Iran still recognizes the importance of diplomacy with Washington in reducing tensions and addressing sanctions.

The summit's longer-term initiatives on logistics, nuclear security, and green technology, along with Pezeshkian's proposal for monetary, insurance, and energy mechanisms within the SCO, could eventually strengthen the organization's independence from Western economic systems. But there is a long road between political declarations and effective institutions.

So, what did Iran really gain in Bishkek?

Political support, diplomatic space, and another opportunity for engagement—but not sanctions relief, economic recovery, or a security guarantee.

The real test now is whether Tehran can turn that diplomatic space into de-escalation, an agreement with Washington, and tangible economic benefits. If it cannot, Bishkek will be remembered less as a strategic breakthrough and more as a symbolic diplomatic success.

IRAN: "View from the LEFT" is published monthly for those interested in the Left Party of Iran's perspective on current issues.

IRAN: View from the LEFT may occasionally contain news from Iran that the media might not have drawn attention to.

[**https://bepish.org/englisch**](https://bepish.org/englisch)

The Left Party of Iran - International Affairs

[**International@leftpartyiran.org**](mailto:International@leftpartyiran.org)