“YOU’RE The Evil Monster!” Mohammad Marandi vs Alan Dershowitz on Iran | Plus Netanyahu Spokesman

Govornik: Piers Morgan Show
Izvor: https://minbarlive.com/videos/you-re-the-evil-monster-mohammad-marandi-vs-alan-dershowitz-on-iran-plus-netanya

> Piers Morgan moderates a heated debate between Israeli spokesman Doron Spielman, Iranian academic Mohammad Marandi, and lawyer Alan Dershowitz following Vice President JD Vance's failed 21-hour negotiations with Iran. The discussion exposes the vast gulf between U.S.-Israeli demands (nuclear non-proliferation, Strait of Hormuz access) and Iran's conditions (sanctions relief, war reparations, retained uranium), with no substantive agreement reached.

SAŽETAK

This debate analyzes the stalled Iran War negotiations and the competing strategic narratives presented by key stakeholders. Doron Spielman, Netanyahu's newly appointed international spokesman, frames the conflict as preventive action against nuclear-armed Iran, arguing that military intervention has delayed Iran's nuclear capability by years and prevented catastrophe. He claims the U.S. and Israel are 'fully coordinated in battling evil' and positioned to negotiate or escalate as necessary. Mohammad Marandi contests the entire premise, asserting the war is based on lies, that Iran has never pursued nuclear weapons according to the IAEA and U.S. intelligence since 2003, and that the conflict represents aggression by 'Zionist' and American regimes. He argues Iran has heroically resisted without nuclear weapons while the U.S. supports genocide in Gaza. Alan Dershowitz defends preventive military action as justified—drawing parallels to failing to stop Nazi Germany in 1935—and contends that delaying Iran's nuclear program by years represents success even without decisive victory. The debate escalates into accusations of genocide, media control, and anti-Semitism, with fundamental disagreements on Palestinian rights, Israeli legitimacy, and Iran's intentions leaving both sides unable to reconcile their 'bright red lines.' Morgan observes that even bringing the debate to an end proves impossible, underscoring why a 21-hour negotiation produced only a vague memorandum.

KLJUČNE PORUKE

Vice President JD Vance's 21-hour negotiations resulted in a Memorandum of Understanding so vague both sides claimed victory while agreeing to nothing substantive, with the U.S. demanding nuclear guarantees and Hormuz access while Iran demands sanctions relief and retained enriched uranium.

Doron Spielman argues military action has set back Iran's nuclear program by years and prevented imminent acquisition of weapons, framing this as preventive success comparable to stopping Nazi Germany in 1935, though he acknowledges the conflict has not achieved initial stated objectives.

Mohammad Marandi contends the entire war is based on fabricated nuclear threats, citing IAEA findings, U.S. intelligence assessments since 2003, and testimony from officials like Tulsi Gabbard and Joe Kent that Iran poses no nuclear threat, and frames the conflict as aggression driven by Israeli and Zionist interests.

Alan Dershowitz defends preventive war as justified by historical analogy to 1935 Germany, arguing that even partial nuclear delays constitute important 'calibrated successes' and that the alternative—Iran with nuclear capability—would be catastrophic, though he acknowledges the current situation lacks clear resolution.

The debate reveals unbridgeable disagreements on Palestinian rights: Marandi calls for a single state where Jews, Christians, and Muslims have equal rights; Dershowitz initially resists this, eventually proposing Palestinians become citizens of an independent Gaza state separate from the West Bank, which Marandi characterizes as evasion.

Marandi argues Western control of propaganda and media obscured Palestinian suffering until October 7th and the South African ICJ complaint exposed Israeli genocide, and contrasts Iran's principled refusal to develop nuclear weapons despite U.S. pressure with Israel's nuclear arsenal and U.S. support for 'brutal regimes' globally.

Morgan observes that Israel has become historically unpopular globally, with 50 percent of Americans supporting Netanyahu's arrest for war crimes and two-thirds holding negative views of Israel, yet the debate demonstrates that fundamental disagreements on historical narrative, regime legitimacy, and Palestinian representation make negotiated resolution extremely difficult.

ČLANAK

The Opening Exchange

Piers Morgan opened the discussion by presenting a stark framing of the current geopolitical situation. He noted that Vice President JD Vance spent 21 hours negotiating with Iranian officials in what has been characterized as the first failed attempt at ending the Iran war. The resulting Memorandum of Understanding was successful only insofar as it remained vague enough for both sides to claim they achieved their objectives while agreeing to nothing substantive.

Both nations have articulated rigid "bright red lines" that appear irreconcilable. The United States demands a guarantee that Iran will never acquire a nuclear weapon and seeks to recover all of Iran's enriched uranium. Additionally, the U.S. wants the Strait of Hormuz to remain permanently open. Iran, by contrast, is calling for the complete lifting of all sanctions, the removal of proxy militias from international designation, reparations for war damage, and ratification of its control over the Strait of Hormuz. Iran also insists on retaining its enriched uranium.

Doron Spielman's Position on Netanyahu and Trump

Doron Spielman, the newly appointed international spokesman for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, addressed the characterization that the war has been unpopular and costly. Morgan had noted that the conflict has depleted U.S. munitions, inflated gas prices, shattered alliances, and emboldened the Iranian regime it sought to remove. Spielman responded by contextualizing the relationship between Netanyahu and Trump, emphasizing that this represents their eighth meeting since Trump's reelection. He stated that the two leaders are "fully coordinated in battling evil," referring specifically to Iran.

Spielman characterized Iran as "objectively evil," citing recent executions of protesters in the streets, the killing of over 50,000 people, and the firing of ballistic missiles across the Middle East. He framed Netanyahu and Trump as standing "alone with nobody else's help" against this threat, drawing a historical parallel to Churchill and Roosevelt confronting Hitler—though situating this moment as preventative action in 1938 rather than response after 1941 or 1942. According to Spielman, this moment would be remembered in history as an example of "two men of incredible bravery, bravery and courage."

The Question of Victory and Progress

Morgan pressed Spielman on concrete outcomes, noting that the conflict has not achieved its stated objectives. The war was initially predicted to last two to three weeks, then five to six weeks, and has now extended nearly five months. The war aims and predictions that Netanyahu made to Trump in the White House Situation Room before the conflict began have not materialized. The Islamic Revolutionary

Guard Corps (IRGC) remains in control, the Iranian people have not risen up, the previous Ayatollah has been replaced by his son described as even more hardline, and the Strait of Hormuz has become a powerful tool for the Iranian regime—functioning almost as a nuclear weapon in terms of its strategic leverage.

Morgan pointed out that Iran has been firing missiles in retaliation for being attacked, and that the overall effect has been to embolden the Iranian regime rather than weaken it. He questioned how any of this constitutes victory and asked how the conflict could end.

Spielman's Nuclear Prevention Argument

Spielman responded by reframing the question around nuclear prevention. He argued that if a nuclear attack had been prevented, this should be considered a success. He stated that had Israel and the United States not intervened in June 2025, Iran would have been armed with a nuclear weapon by December 2025, January 2026, or February 2026. In that scenario, he argued, the discussion would not be about the Strait of Hormuz but about Iran threatening the world with nuclear weapons. Gas prices would not stabilize at $88 or $120 per barrel but would reach thousands of dollars per barrel. Iran would have fulfilled its stated intention to destroy Israel and would be threatening the United States. Spielman noted that Iran has been burning pictures of President Trump in the streets and calling for his death, and that Iranian operatives have allegedly been sending people into America with threats against the president.

Spielman concluded that preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon represented "the greatest military success, Pierce, possibly in the 21st century."

The Timeline Contradiction

Morgan then challenged what he perceived as a contradiction in the narrative. After the 12-day war a year ago, which was deemed a spectacular military success, President Trump declared as a fact that Iran's nuclear program had been set back by decades. Yet now, Spielman was claiming that within eight months the threat of imminent nuclear acquisition and use had returned. Morgan asked directly: "Who's lying here? Who's telling the truth?"

Spielman clarified that he is not a spokesman for the president but stated that Trump has good instincts and that both the president and Prime Minister Netanyahu are united on the outcome: Iran will not have a nuclear weapon or the ability to manufacture one. He did not directly address whether the earlier statement about setting back Iran's nuclear program by decades was inaccurate.

Spielman then detailed what he called Operation Midnight Hammer. He stated that Israel conducted operations for 11 days, with the United States joining on the 12th

day, causing what he described as "irreparable damage" and stopping Iran from having a nuclear weapon at that immediate moment. However, he noted that as soon as the fighting stopped, Iran did not change course. Instead, Iranian authorities eliminated protesters—killing 50,000 people—and immediately resumed developing their nuclear program. Spielman argued that this behavior prompted President Trump to conclude that if Iran's intention was to return to nuclear development, then the situation required finishing the job.

Spielman recounted that Trump presented two options: negotiation (which he described as the "easy way") or military force (the "hard way"). Spielman stated that both he and Netanyahu have been clear that however Trump chooses to proceed, they agree that Iran cannot have a nuclear weapon. He warned that if Iran acquires nuclear capability, the United States cannot simply disconnect and assume safety, as Iran is building ballistic missiles capable of reaching American coasts. He compared the situation to giving "an arsonist" a torch and asking him not to start fires—an analogy he said would be unthinkable in the context of protecting one's own family and therefore should not be acceptable for global security.

Morgan's Assessment of Current Reality

Morgan countered that nothing attempted so far has worked, and that this is self-evident. After nearly five months of conflict, the regime remains intact, the IRGC is in control, the population has not risen up, Iran is using the Strait of Hormuz as it sees fit, attacking Gulf state neighbors with what appears to be impunity, and possesses clearly functional ballistic missiles given their repeated use. Morgan stated that despite repeated claims that Iran's navy, air force, and missile capabilities have been eliminated or severely depleted, the evidence suggests otherwise.

Morgan argued that Iran appears to be gaining the upper hand because controlling the Strait of Hormuz gives it leverage over the global energy market. He suggested that Iran may not have fully anticipated the strategic value of this leverage in practice, but that it has proven to be a massive factor. This control, he argued, introduces economic and political imperatives into the equation. With midterm elections approaching in the United States in November and elections in Israel, Morgan noted that Iran understands that political imperatives may shift the situation if they maintain pressure until then. He concluded by saying he sees no sign of the revolution Spielman aspires to, that the regime appears fully in control, the enriched uranium remains hidden, and there is no clear victory in sight—unless Spielman could articulate a specific pathway to victory and timeline.

Spielman's Response on Strategy and Tactical Mistakes

Spielman acknowledged that he could respond to each point systematically and explain why the regime has been set back, discuss ballistic missiles, and address the

Iranian command and control structure, which he claimed has degraded to the fourth tier. However, he chose instead to focus on what he identified as Iran's biggest tactical mistake: playing their hand before acquiring a nuclear weapon.

Spielman argued that Iran has now revealed that it can control the Strait of Hormuz and potentially bring the world to its knees through financial crisis. However, they played this strategic card before possessing nuclear weapons. Spielman posed a hypothetical: if Iran had possessed a nuclear weapon three weeks away from development in June (as he characterized it), and if that enriched material is not removed, they would never have revealed their Hormuz strategy. Instead, they would have accepted negotiated terms and slowly built their nuclear capability in secret. If they had eventually acquired a weapon, they would have held the entire world hostage by then deploying the Strait of Hormuz strategy. Spielman concluded: "We understand who they are."

Spielman then outlined the current approach. He stated that both Trump and Netanyahu prefer a negotiated solution if possible. According to Spielman, Netanyahu told him directly that if the president can resolve the situation through negotiation without requiring Israeli military personnel, aircraft, or other regional deployment, Israel prefers that outcome. However, if negotiation fails, Israel is prepared to escalate and deploy whatever military options are necessary. Spielman explained that the current strategy is to "stretch this as long as we can" with hope that someone in Iran might prioritize the Iranian people and a path toward positive change might emerge. He expressed skepticism about whether negotiation is possible but indicated that if it fails, military escalation remains on the table. He emphasized that President Trump and Israel have demonstrated they possess options and are prepared to deploy them if necessary.

Netanyahu Interview Request and New Spokesman

Piers Morgan begins by noting that he has interviewed Prime Minister Netanyahu three times during his career but has attempted weekly to secure another appearance on Uncensored since October 7th without success. He addresses Doron Spielman, Netanyahu's newly appointed official spokesman, asking whether an interview with the Prime Minister might now be possible. Spielman, who has been in the position for only one week, expresses uncertainty about what might convince Netanyahu to appear, but agrees to pass along the message that the show has an open schedule whenever Netanyahu could make time.

The Debate Framework

Morgan introduces the two primary discussants: Professor Mohammad Marandi from Tehran University and lawyer, scholar, and author Alan Dershowitz. Morgan expresses hope that the discussion will remain civil and addresses Marandi first regarding the

current state of the conflict. Morgan observes that despite various opinions about the Iranian regime, Iran appears to be holding out capably against the combined military might of the United States and Israel, nearly five months into the war.

Marandi's Assessment of the Conflict

Marandi asserts that contrary to what he characterizes as a "love fest" with the Israeli spokesman, both the Washington and Tel Aviv regimes have failed utterly in their war of aggression against Iran. He contends that the war was based on a lie, citing multiple sources as evidence that Iran has never sought nuclear weapons. Marandi references statements from the International Atomic Energy Agency, which has never indicated Iranian nuclear weapons ambitions; U.S. intelligence assessments since 2003 acknowledging Iran was not seeking nuclear weapons; Tulsi Gabbard's sworn testimony that Iran was not pursuing nuclear development; and Joe Kent's resignation letter, in which the anti-terrorism official appointed by Trump stated that Iran posed no nuclear threat to the United States.

Marandi further argues that Joe Kent identified the Zionist lobby and the Israeli regime as the true drivers of the conflict. He claims that the United States has failed repeatedly—in the 40 days of war, in the 12-day war, in the 40 days of battle, in siege warfare, and in recent aggression—and will continue to fail in the future. According to Marandi, the United States, under pressure from Zionists, is pushing the global economy toward catastrophe, warning that continued escalation could trigger a global economic depression.

Dershowitz's Historical Analogy and Nuclear Prevention Argument

Dershowitz responds by drawing a parallel to 1935 Germany, when the Versailles Treaty violations and German rearmament could have been stopped through preventive war by England and France. He argues that while such intervention would have been messy and time-consuming, it would have ultimately saved 100 million lives lost to Nazi Germany. Dershowitz asserts that a rational person must assume Iran would develop nuclear weapons if capable of doing so, and he references Trump's view that Iran would likely use such weapons, either directly or by providing them to terrorist groups.

Dershowitz contends that the United States and Israel can prevent a catastrophe by limiting Iran's nuclear capabilities. He argues that previous military actions have already set back the nuclear program by an unspecified period—months or years—making the threat no longer imminent. While acknowledging the messiness of the situation and the lack of clear resolution, Dershowitz maintains that the outcome is preferable to the alternative of an Iran with nuclear weapons. He references the mistake made with North Korea's nuclear development and emphasizes Iran's stated

policy of using every available weapon against the United States and Israel. Dershowitz concludes that this war, despite its lack of a final victory, may prove to be the most important conflict since World War Two in preventing an even greater catastrophe.

Morgan's Challenge to Dershowitz's Claims

Morgan challenges Dershowitz's assertion of success, noting that Iran still possesses all its enriched uranium with no indication of surrender and that its chances of developing nuclear weapons appear unchanged. Morgan points out the contradiction between Trump's assurance that the 12-day war would set back Iran's nuclear program by decades and the subsequent launch of a full-scale war just eight months later based on the claim that Iran was about to deploy nuclear weapons. Morgan argues these positions cannot all be true simultaneously.

Dershowitz's Response on Calibrated Success

Dershowitz acknowledges Morgan's point as accurate but argues that the program has been set back considerably nonetheless. He notes that while Iran retains enriched uranium, it is currently buried and inaccessible due to satellite surveillance by Israel and the United States. He describes the current centrifuge situation as facing significant difficulties and reframes small victories in nuclear prevention as very important. Dershowitz suggests that observers often mistakenly assume a decisive outcome with one side winning and one losing, when in fact "calibrated successes" are possible and preferable.

Dershowitz estimates the nuclear program has been set back by probably a couple of years rather than months or decades, and he emphasizes that the threat is not imminent. He notes that unknown factors, such as the fate of Pickaxe Mountain, may lead to further action due to its potential nuclear weapons production capability. He frames this as an ongoing battle that will not conclude in five weeks or five years, with the goal being to ensure Iran never develops nuclear weapons under any circumstances. Dershowitz challenges Marandi, noting that if Iran genuinely has no desire to develop nuclear weapons, the Iranian representative should welcome coming to the negotiating table with an airtight agreement to prevent such development, thereby achieving peace.

Marandi's Personal and Historical Counterarguments

Marandi shifts to personal attacks, characterizing Dershowitz as "genocide's spokesman" and referencing allegations about Dershowitz's association with Jeffrey Epstein's connections. He criticizes Dershowitz for being unable to tolerate the words of a layman despite being a lawyer, describing this as a sign of weak argument. Marandi reiterates his characterization of Israel as a genocidal regime, citing South

Africa's International Court of Justice complaint against Israel as evidence of genocidal intent.

Morgan interrupts to clarify that he asked the Israeli spokesman tough questions and treated him with the same respect he is offering Marandi, urging the Professor to avoid personal attacks and focus on substantive debate. Morgan notes that he has repeatedly asked Marandi in their numerous interviews to say one critical thing about Iran's government, a request Marandi consistently refuses, which Morgan finds telling. Marandi responds that his regime is "infinitely superior" to the genocidal Israeli regime and that Iran did not, as Israel allegedly did, disconnect life support from infants in hospitals.

Marandi then shifts to the history of chemical weapons use, stating that his country suffered chemical weapons attacks with U.S. support during the Iran-Iraq War and that he personally survived two such attacks. He recounts that Iran's leader refused to produce chemical weapons despite military and political pressure, declaring it immoral. Marandi criticizes Dershowitz for raising concerns about Iranian weapons of mass destruction while the United States used nuclear weapons twice, and he references Israel as a nuclear power. He notes that a significant percentage of young Jews in the United States, according to polling data, believe Jews and Palestinians should live together in one state with equal rights—a policy he aligns with Iranian positions.

Gaza and Broader Humanitarian Critique

Marandi asserts that despite propaganda and lies, people are awakening to the reality of Gaza. He references Ronald Reagan's 1982 characterization of Israel's invasion of Lebanon as a Holocaust and argues that current events in Gaza are far worse. He cites casualty figures, stating that hundreds of thousands have died as a result of the war, not only from bombing and sniping but from illness and lack of medicine imposed by what he describes as a "filthy regime." He argues that Dershowitz and others refuse to acknowledge the genocide occurring in Gaza while antagonizing Iran, Palestine, and Hezbollah to distract from Israeli actions.

Marandi contends that people are waking up globally to these realities despite efforts to obscure them. Morgan then interjects to note that Israel has never been more unpopular globally, particularly in the United States, where 50 percent of Americans support arresting Netanyahu for war crimes and two-thirds hold negative views of Israel. Morgan adds a personal observation that Israel's current government includes figures like Ben-Gvir and Smotrich, people whose inclusion in government he views critically.

Defense of Israel and Preventive Military Action

The speaker begins by clarifying his personal positions: he is not a supporter of Ben-Gvir or other Israeli figures he considers extreme, but he is a proud Zionist and supporter of the nation state of the Jewish people. He emphasizes that Zionism is the national liberation movement of the Jewish people and argues that Israel is the only non-colonial state in the Middle East, whereas all other states in the region were established by colonialist regimes. He further contends that Israel fought against colonialism for self-determination after the First World War.

While acknowledging he would not vote for certain Israeli politicians, the speaker makes a historical argument about the unpopularity of preventive wars. He draws a parallel to 1935, suggesting that if Winston Churchill had been Prime Minister and attacked Germany, he would have been deeply unpopular. The speaker argues that history cannot predict the future, and thus it takes enormous courage to engage in preventive military action. He cites examples of unpopular but ultimately justified wars—the Revolutionary War, the Second World War—and suggests that figures like Benjamin Netanyahu, Ronald Reagan, and George Washington demonstrated this kind of courage. He frames the current conflict similarly, arguing that engaging in an unpopular war requires the same resolve that was needed to confront Adolf Hitler.

Comparison of Atrocities and Historical Justification

The speaker then confronts his opponent with a direct question about Iran's treatment of protesters. He asserts that Iran murdered as many as 50,000 innocent protesters in cold blood and asks whether this constitutes genocide. He challenges his opponent to admit that this comes closer to genocide than anything Israel has been accused of doing in self-defense following the October 7th attacks. He emphasizes that Iran has killed "many, many, many thousands of people" and demands a yes or no answer.

Escalation of Rhetoric and Personal Accusations

His opponent responds by shifting the timeline, asserting they are in 1942, not 1935 or 1939, and directly accuses the speaker of being part of a Nazi regime carrying out a holocaust in Gaza. The opponent calls the speaker "the evil monster" and frames Israel as a colonial power. He argues that Israel's leadership consists of Ashkenazi Jews from Eastern Europe—Poland, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia—and claims they came and "slaughtered" Palestinians, taking their land.

The exchange becomes increasingly heated, with the opponent refusing to allow the speaker to respond. The opponent accuses Israel of celebrating rapists in prison and claims that Israel's actions constitute an ongoing genocide. He references deaths from disease and lack of food and medicine among Palestinians and asserts that the speaker and those like him are responsible. He further claims that Western media is

controlled by people aligned with the speaker's views and that this media suppresses coverage of Palestinian suffering.

Iran's Position and Regional Conflicts

The opponent frames Iran's opposition to Israel as principled resistance to genocide and ethnic supremacy. He argues that for 47 years, Iran's only "guilt" has been saying no to genocide. He accuses the speaker's regime of supporting "the apartheid and genocidal regime of Israel" and of supporting brutal regimes across Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. He contrasts this with Iran's stated opposition to ethnic supremacism, ethnic cleansing, and colonization, and claims that Iran advocates for Palestine as a land where Jews, Christians, and Muslims live as equal human beings.

The opponent also makes accusations about bombing a synagogue in Tehran, claiming this was done because it was not a Zionist synagogue. He accuses the speaker of hating Jews who are not Zionists and characterizes him as an anti-Semite. He asserts that the speaker has no right to "slaughter and rape and murder."

Political Implications and Democratic Governance

The moderator then shifts the discussion to domestic American politics. He notes that if Donald Trump loses control of the House and Senate in midterm elections, he would become a lame duck president and would likely suffer a loss in the general election, allowing Democrats back into power. He suggests this political reality could end the conflict regardless of what Trump, Netanyahu, or others desire, within roughly two years due to American political dynamics.

The speaker responds by defending democratic governance. He acknowledges that in a democracy, voters choose what they want, and that while a Democratic takeover is possible, it represents a political risk—similar to what happened in Great Britain after Churchill's wartime leadership, when voters removed him from power. However, he argues that principled, Churchillian politicians do the right thing regardless of political implications. He maintains that the correct course of action is to ensure Iran does not pose a nuclear threat to the world.

Accusations of Anti-Semitism and Media Control

The speaker then directly addresses statements made by his opponent, accusing him of claiming that Jews control the media. He demands that his opponent repeat this statement on record. When the opponent resists and instead pivots to discussing young Jews in the United States, the speaker insists on clarification, asking how many times he visited Epstein's island—an accusation the opponent makes in return.

The speaker responds to these personal attacks by explaining his legal career. He states he was a lawyer for Palestinian students, for Nazis in Skokie, Illinois, and for hundreds of indigent people. He argues that as a lawyer, he is proud to have represented people others dislike, including President Clinton, Ted Kennedy, and others. He says he would be willing to go to Iran and represent people who were executed because they could not get lawyers for their role in demonstrations.

Specific Cases and Legal Arguments

The opponent challenges the speaker on recent executions in Iran, and the speaker responds with specifics. He states that two people were executed yesterday, and he has tweeted footage of this. However, he clarifies that these individuals burned four police officers alive and stabbed them before their execution. He indicates he will retweet this information after the debate. The opponent characterizes the executions as unjust, while the speaker provides context about the armed insurgency and suggests that Israel and the United States provided weapons that killed hundreds of police officers during two days of armed conflict. The opponent asserts that the Israeli regime itself has admitted to involvement in this armed insurgency, citing Channel 14 of Israeli media as evidence.

Vision for Regional Change

The speaker expresses hope for United States and Israeli cooperation to topple the Iranian regime and replace it with a democratic government where all people can vote and have free speech. He frames this as an ideal outcome that should have occurred in 1935 when nations had the opportunity to stop fascism. He argues that a similar opportunity exists now to achieve peace by replacing what he calls the "Nazi regime" in Iran with democracy. He acknowledges this will not happen overnight or quickly but expresses confidence that the good people of Iran will eventually rise up against their leaders and establish real democracy.

His opponent counters by accusing the speaker of being a genocide supporter who backs an ongoing genocide in Gaza. He claims that Palestinians die daily and that Western media—controlled by people aligned with the speaker—refuses to report these deaths. He reiterates that Iran, Hezbollah, and Yemen's guilt consists solely of saying no to genocide. He broadens his criticism to include the speaker's alleged support for brutal regimes globally and frames American hostility toward Iran as stemming from Iran's principled opposition to ethnic supremacy and colonization.

Debate on Freedom and Representation

The opponent challenges the speaker's assertions about Iran's lack of freedom of speech, inviting him to visit Iran to witness free speech firsthand. He references a book titled "Going to Tehran" and accuses the speaker of becoming angry when

confronted with information that contradicts his narrative. He argues that free speech does not truly exist in the United States either, pointing out that people lose jobs and have futures destroyed when they speak against Israeli actions. He contrasts this with his claim that Iran allows speech that the United States suppresses.

The moderator then attempts to redirect the conversation back to the professor, indicating that further discussion is to follow.

Core Agreement on Ending the Conflict

Piers Morgan opened by suggesting there was at least one point of agreement between his guests: a desire for the war to end sooner rather than later. Both guests acknowledged this, though they framed their positions differently. One guest stated the desire for justice, while emphasizing that what would end all wars in the region is a single outcome: Palestine as a land where Jews, Christians, and Muslims live as equal human beings. This guest contended that the other participants would never support or accept such a vision.

Competing Visions of Equality and Rights

When pressed directly, Alan Dershowitz stated he accepted completely the principle of people in every part of the world living as equals without regard to religion. However, when Morgan asked whether Dershowitz would accept that all Palestinians living in the West Bank and Gaza would have equal rights to Israelis brought from Europe and elsewhere, Dershowitz initially hesitated before answering "no."

Dershowitz then clarified his position by stating that the vast majority of Israelis come from Arabic and Muslim backgrounds from North Africa, not exclusively from Europe. He identified these communities as Mizrahi Jews, distinguishing them from Ashkenazi Jews. He maintained that he believed in complete equality for everybody, but when pressed on whether Palestinians in Gaza and the West Bank should have the right to vote and citizenship with the inability to be removed from their homes, Dershowitz pivoted to saying he thought they should be citizens of an independent state in Gaza, presented as a separate entity rather than part of a unified Palestinian state.

The other guest pressed Dershowitz on this distinction, pointing out that he was avoiding a direct answer. The guest emphasized that Palestinians in Gaza are refugees from Palestine who were expelled from their homes, not native to Gaza itself, which was only a small village 50 to 70 years ago. He noted that many Palestinians in the West Bank were similarly not originally from that territory, and compared this to populations displaced across the broader region in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Egypt.

Historical Context and the 1947 Partition

Dershowitz responded by referencing the 1947 UN partition of what was then called Palestine. He explained that the partition divided the territory into two areas: one where there was a majority of Jews that could become a Jewish state, and another, much larger area of Arab land that could become a Palestinian state. According to Dershowitz, Palestinians would have had a completely free state in the West Bank and Gaza under this arrangement. He attributed the failure of this two-state solution to Palestinian leadership, specifically naming Haj Amin al-Husseini as a Nazi-aligned figure who rejected the partition and attacked Israel in what Dershowitz characterized as a genocidal war. He argued that this rejection and attack caused people to leave their homes and abandon their villages, and that Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion had wanted to welcome Palestinians and maintain them in their homes. Dershowitz maintained that because "we can't go back in time now" and circumstances have changed, he continued to advocate for complete equality for everybody moving forward.

Post-October 7th Legal and Propaganda Arguments

The other guest responded by thanking Dershowitz from a legal perspective, arguing that the narratives and arguments being presented "worked before October the 7th" because the West controlled propaganda machinery and centres of knowledge, leaving most people unaware of the truth. However, he contended that this changed after October 7th and the South African government's complaint to the International Court of Justice (ICJ). According to this guest, the South African complaint demonstrated the genocidal intent of the Israeli regime, and subsequent events showed it carrying this intent into action. He urged viewers to search online for the South African complaint to the ICJ to read it for themselves and see the quotes from Israeli leadership.

Morgan's Closing Observations

Piers Morgan called a timeout on the debate, noting to viewers that it was now probably clear why negotiations between the parties had taken 21 hours and why the war continued to rage. He expressed appreciation that both guests had at least agreed on certain points. The other guest interjected a final statement that Iran did not attack the United States, and that the United States was sacrificing the world for what he called an "ethno supremacist regime."

Morgan concluded by saying "all I can say is good luck" to the negotiating teams trying to bring the war to an end, noting that even bringing the debate itself to an end was proving completely impossible. He thanked both guests for their time. Dershowitz thanked Morgan for having him, after which Morgan closed the segment and pivoted to information about the show's independent status and subscription channels.

#Iran nuclear negotiations #U.S.-Israel-Iran military conflict #Preventive military action and international security #Palestinian-Israeli conflict and rights #Strait of Hormuz and regional leverage #Propaganda, media control, and historical narratives #Genocide allegations and international law

Generated by MinbarLive — Knowledge Library · https://minbarlive.com/videos/you-re-the-evil-monster-mohammad-marandi-vs-alan-dershowitz-on-iran-plus-netanya