

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



The Ali Khani Square Case, Isfahan

By Saloome Kia, Human Rights Department

Following the events of 8 January 2026 (18 Dey 1404) at Ali Khani Square, located between Malek Shahr and Kaveh in Isfahan, authorities of the Islamic Republic announced that four Basij members had been killed at the scene.

In the aftermath of the incident, 59 individuals were arrested. According to information released regarding this case, 23 of those detained, despite reportedly having no involvement in the deaths of the four Basij members, were nevertheless sentenced to between five and ten years of imprisonment solely to complete the case file.

In addition, 12 defendants in this case were sentenced to death. Reports indicate that these death sentences were upheld by the Supreme Court of Iran on 5 July 2026 (14 Tir 1405), and the case was subsequently referred to Branch for the Enforcement of Judgments of the Revolutionary Court in Isfahan for implementation.

The prosecutor in this case is Mohammad Nakhjavan, while the presiding judges are Mohammad Barati-Darcheh and Mohammad Tavakkoli (also known as Vakili). Mohammad Tavakkoli previously served as the judge in the well-known "Khaneh-ye Esfahan" (House of Isfahan) case. Individuals Sentenced to Death

- Alireza Sepahi, born 2001 – sentenced to death four times
- Abolfazl Sepahi, born 2002 – brother of Alireza Sepahi – sentenced to death three times
- Qaem Hosseini, born 2005 – sentenced to death twice
- Gol-Mohammad Mohammadi, Afghan national, born 2002 – sentenced to death
- Shervin Bagherian, born 2007 – sentenced to death twice
- Erfan Esfandiari, born 2007 – sentenced to death
- Amirhossein Safari, born 1998 – sentenced to death
- Amirhossein Maleki, born 2006 – sentenced to death
- Ali Dashti, born 2006 – sentenced to death
- Abolfazl Ebrahimi, born 2007 – sentenced to death
- Alireza Raeisi, born 2004 – sentenced to death
- Amirhossein Ebrahimi Analouchch, born 2006 – sentenced to death twice

Following the official confirmation of the names of those arrested, the execution of Erfan Esfandiari and Gol-Mohammad Mohammadi, two defendants in the Ali Khani Square case, was confirmed. Their executions were carried out on 19 July 2026 (28 Tir 1405).

According to the latest official and unofficial reports, as confirmed by domestic news agencies including Fars News Agency and IMNA, as well as reports received by Iran International, the two prisoners were executed approximately ten days earlier. Erfan Esfandiari's body was reportedly buried secretly in a remote cemetery without his family's consent and without allowing a public funeral ceremony in Isfahan. His family was reportedly forced to sign security pledges prohibiting them from holding any memorial service.

Several days after these executions, despite prior warnings from security forces that two prisoners would be executed each week, the names of two additional prisoners reportedly appeared on the execution list Abolfazl Sepahi and Amirhossein Safari

Amirhossein Safari: A Disabled Young Breadwinner Facing Execution



Amirhossein Safari (27 years old), one of the defendants in the Ali Khani Square case, faced an imminent risk of execution while reportedly being deprived of even the most basic rights afforded to prisoners.

According to reliable medical records and verified information, Amirhossein suffered a serious traffic accident several years ago that resulted in the severing of nerves controlling one of his arms from the cervical spinal region. His arm has permanently lost sensation and function. Given this severe physical disability, serious questions have been raised regarding his alleged ability to commit the crimes attributed to him. Nevertheless, the judicial authorities reportedly disregarded the available medical evidence and sentenced him to death.

Amirhossein had also lost his father and was the sole breadwinner of his family. According to available information, he was neither a political activist nor had he committed the crimes alleged against him, yet he became one of the defendants in what has been described as a hastily constructed judicial case.

The Ali Khani Square case, involving 59 defendants, was heard by Branch One of the Revolutionary Court of Isfahan, presided over by Judges Barati and Tavakkoli, in only three brief court sessions. According to reports, the proceedings were conducted without adequate opportunity for defense, with court-appointed lawyers, and relied heavily on confessions allegedly obtained under torture.

Death sentences were issued against 13 young defendants, including minors and young adults, and these sentences were subsequently upheld by the Supreme Court.

At dawn on 28 July 2026 (6 Mordad 1405), the death sentences of the above-mentioned individuals were carried out.



Weekly magazine

Sepidar
Woman Iranian Party

Friday, July 31, 2026

The End of Impunity for Criminals

By M.H. Labafbashi

Today, the death penalty still exists in the laws of approximately 50 to 55 countries around the world, and in some of these countries it continues to be carried out. Countries such as the United States, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Kuwait, Egypt, Japan, Singapore, and several others have judicial systems that provide for the possibility of imposing the death penalty under certain circumstances. By contrast, in many democratic countries, including those in Europe, capital punishment has been abolished. This legal difference among countries is significant because, in cross-border cases, judicial cooperation, the extradition of criminals, and the jurisdiction of courts are governed by domestic laws and international agreements.



Over the past four decades, the policies of the Islamic Republic have repeatedly created crises and tensions with other countries. Following the 1979 Revolution, the United States came into conflict with the Islamic Republic over the hostage crisis, attacks against its forces in the region, and the regime's military and security programs. The Arab states of the Persian Gulf, including Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Qatar, and Kuwait, have also faced security threats, attacks by groups aligned with the Islamic Republic, missile and drone attacks, or regional tensions at various times. With the opening of judicial cases in the future, it is possible that some of these countries, in instances where they consider themselves direct victims of specific actions, may seek judicial review of the role played by responsible individuals. In simple terms, it is possible and likely that convicted individuals could be transferred to a country that retains the death penalty and be sentenced to death there.

However, the most important cases concern the crimes committed against the people of Iran. Those who, during protests, crackdowns, and security operations, killed unarmed civilians will certainly be found responsible before an independent court and will have to answer for their actions. Those who gave the orders to kill, those who pulled the trigger and

fired, and those who issued death sentences against innocent people through unjust judicial proceedings cannot hide forever behind an organizational title, a military uniform, or a government position.

Under international law, the principle of individual criminal responsibility is well established. Pursuant to Article 25 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, individuals may be held criminally responsible for the commission of international crimes. Furthermore, Article 7 of the same Statute defines crimes against humanity as including acts such as murder, torture, unlawful imprisonment, and the systematic persecution of civilians when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against a civilian population. Therefore, a change of government or the loss of political power does not, in itself, eliminate an individual's criminal responsibility.

The future Iran will be founded on the rule of law and democracy and may adopt an approach fundamentally different from that of the Islamic Republic. The position advanced by Crown Prince Reza Pahlavi is one of opposition to the death penalty and support for a judicial system based on human rights. However, abolishing capital punishment does not mean forgiving crimes or creating impunity. Punishments such as long-term imprisonment, confiscation of assets derived from criminal activity, disqualification from holding public office, and the permanent recording of criminal convictions remain lawful mechanisms of accountability.

Alongside domestic courts, judicial cooperation with other countries may also arise in certain cases. If an individual is accused not only of domestic crimes but also of crimes committed against the citizens or interests of another country, that country may, under its own laws, applicable treaties, or principles of jurisdiction, request prosecution or seek the extradition of the accused.

Therefore, those who today believe that the end of the Islamic Republic and the absence of the death penalty in a future Iran would mean the end of accountability are mistaken. Justice in a free society is not administered through anger or revenge; it is administered through law, evidence, and the courts. But this does not mean forgetting. Those who have participated in crimes against the Iranian people or in acts of violence against other countries may continue to face judicial proceedings for many years after their time in power has ended. History has shown that political power can fall, but responsibility for human actions endures.



Weekly magazine

Sepidar
Woman Iranian Party

Friday, July 31, 2026

Ghezel Hesar: Symbol of the Islamic Republic's Execution Machine

By Leila Fathali



While prisoners in Ghezel Hesar Prison go on hunger strikes in an effort to make their voices heard by the global community against the surging wave of executions, the Islamic Republic continues to use the death penalty as a policy to instill terror and silence any opposition. For years, Ghezel Hesar has stood as one of the most prominent symbols of carrying out execution sentences in Iran—a prison whose name, for many families of victims, evokes memories of last visits, waiting, and grief.

In recent years, numerous reports by human rights organizations have shown that a significant number of executions in Iran have taken place at Ghezel Hesar. Many of these cases pertain to drug-related charges, alongside political and security prisoners facing the threat of execution. Human rights institutions have repeatedly expressed deep concern over the lack of due process, forced confessions, and restricted access to independent legal counsel for many accused individuals.

Throughout 2024 and 2025, multiple reports emerged detailing mass executions carried out at Ghezel Hesar—reports that sparked widespread reactions from human rights groups and civil activists. These findings once again drew the international community's focus to Ghezel Hesar's role in enforcing capital punishment.

Today, the hunger strike by Ghezel Hesar prisoners is not merely an isolated protest by a few inmates; it is a outcry against the cycle of violence and the deprivation of human life. This action represents

a desperate attempt to draw global attention to the plight of individuals who could lose their lives at any moment.

For decades, the Islamic Republic has weaponized capital punishment to sow fear throughout society. Numerous international bodies, including the United Nations and human rights organizations, have repeatedly urged an end to executions in Iran. The right to life is the most fundamental human right, and no government should ever use the death penalty as a tool for societal control or the suppression of dissent.

Now, more than ever, the international community must listen to the voices of striking prisoners and the families of those on death row. Silence in the face of executions is tantamount to disregarding the intrinsic value of human life. Defending the right to live is defending human dignity—a right that must never fall victim to repression, intimidation, or political agendas.





Weekly magazine

Sepidar
Woman Iranian Party

Friday, July 31, 2026

National Justice Seeking Against the Gallows

By Leila Kharazi

The tyrannical regime's reckless and hasty resort to execution tools and the issuance of vindictive sentences in recent weeks are clear signs of the system's deep fear of a new wave of popular uprisings. The judicial repression machine, aiming to create terror and atmosphere of closure in society, has engaged in case-building against protesters and political prisoners. However, the awakened and unified response of civil society proved that these worn-out strategies have lost their efficacy before the nation's will. The confrontation between structural violence and brave resistance has pushed public opinion to a new turning point of justice.



In this context, the pioneering role of women and justice-seeking families, alongside the resistance of prisoners in civil campaigns like Tuesdays No to Execution, has completely invalidated the regime's security equations. Courageous mothers and wives who, despite continuous threats from repressive institutions, have become the voice of the defenceless, stand as moral assets and peerless symbols of national resistance. This astonishing solidarity inside prisons and its extension to society show that the public will to halt the execution cycle has turned into a roaring, irreversible movement. Society will no longer remain silent before life-depriving punishments.

On the other hand, exposing legal contradictions and security pressures in trial procedures has thoroughly destroyed the claimed credibility of the ruling judiciary domestically and internationally. Show trials and ordered sentences are issued solely to boost the declining morale of the repressive

apparatus, but in practice, they deepen public disgust and national solidarity. Society's rage against these systematic injustices has turned into a motivational force exposing the regime's anti-human nature. The Iranian nation understands well that the root of all these crimes lies in the total illegitimacy of the existing structure.

Our vision in Sepidar is anchored on the principle that defending the right to life and fighting the execution apparatus form the fundamental pillar of justice-seeking in Iran. Civil society, particularly enlightened and progressive youth, clearly understands that pushing back the regime's execution machine requires continuous civil pressure and media exposure. The Iranian nation will not allow the usurping regime to sacrifice the country's youth to ensure the survival of its collapsing structure. This human solidarity has built a strong fortress against the security overreach of judicial organs.

Along this path, the transparent positions and guidelines of the national leader, Crown Prince Reza Pahlavi, as the axis of convergence for democratic forces, serve as a decisive warning to perpetrators of crimes. He has repeatedly emphasized that no sentence depriving protesters of life holds legitimacy, and all involved in the execution machine will face fair trial in free tomorrow's Iran. According to the national leader, abolishing execution and establishing the rule of law are the primary conditions for moral and legal reconstruction. This message keeps the hope for justice without vengeance alive.

The international community and global human rights organizations must also move beyond formal expressions of regret and adopt practical measures against Tehran's execution structure. Silence and tolerance toward a regime using death penalty as a tool of political terror and civil suppression betray universal human rights values. The time has come for international bodies to place the regime's diplomats and repressive organs under comprehensive sanctions, referring the crimes of its leaders to international courts.

The tomorrow of Iran's freedom will be the day gallows, security case-building, and imposed mourning come to an end. With the fall of this corrupt, anti-human structure, the rule of law and human dignity will replace systemic violence, and true justice-seekers will guide the homeland toward sustainable justice. Under the shadow of its national leader, Crown Prince Reza Pahlavi, Iran will transform into a fair country free of discrimination and execution, where the right to life is the most sacred principle. The spring of justice is near, and the light of truth will erase the darkness of repression.



The Peace of the Graveyard: Another Name for Peace?

By Azadeh Sharafi

Which Is the Greater Evil: War or the Continuation of State Killing? Is war always the ultimate moral evil? Contrary to popular intuition, this question has no simple answer. In ethics and political philosophy, many of the most consequential decisions are not made between absolute good and absolute evil, but between competing evils. Sometimes the real choice is not between war and peace, but between war and the uninterrupted continuation of executions, torture, repression, and the systematic destruction of human lives. If "peace" means that every night another young person is hanged, protesters are met with bullets, and the machinery of state repression continues to operate without restraint, can it still be called peace? Or is it merely the silence of a graveyard?



This essay examines a difficult but unavoidable question: Is an unconditional rejection of every form of military intervention always the morally superior position when confronting a regime that has transformed violence into the very foundation of its survival? Or can such a stance, in some circumstances, contribute to the perpetuation of an even greater evil? When Peace Becomes Another Name for Atrocity.

The assertion that "war is always an absolute evil" may be emotionally compelling, but it is neither self-evident nor universally accepted within the tradition of moral and political philosophy. None of the major thinkers in the ethics of war—from Augustine and Thomas Aquinas to Michael Walzer—have defended such an absolutist position. The central question has never been whether war is tragic; it undoubtedly is. The real question is whether refusing to wage war necessarily produces less injustice.

This is precisely the starting point of Just War Theory. The tradition does not celebrate war; rather, it argues that when a grave and organized evil cannot be stopped except through the use of force, military action may become morally justified. Protecting human beings from widespread atrocities has long been regarded as one of the core moral foundations of this tradition.

Michael Walzer, in *Just and Unjust Wars*, develops this argument further. He contends that, under certain circumstances, inaction itself becomes a form of

moral complicity. Condemning violence in the abstract is insufficient when faced with systematic crimes against humanity. One must also ask what the moral cost of inaction is—and who is forced to bear that cost.

Utilitarian ethics arrives at a similar conclusion from a different direction. What determines the morality of an action is not its appearance but its consequences—specifically, the amount of suffering it prevents or produces. If refraining from intervention allows executions, torture, political repression, and mass human suffering to continue indefinitely, while intervention has a realistic prospect of ending that cycle, then an absolute opposition to all military action is no longer self-evidently the ethical position. It, too, demands moral justification.

The difficulty is that many people have elevated peace into an unquestionable ideal, as though peace possesses moral value regardless of the conditions under which it exists. Yet a peace sustained by executions, prisons, torture, and bullets is not genuine peace. It is merely the tranquility of a graveyard. A government that relies upon fear, violence, and systematic repression for its survival benefits from the absence of external intervention because every additional day grants it more time to imprison, execute, intimidate, and dismantle civil society.

Under such conditions, the slogan "No to War" becomes morally incomplete unless it also answers a more difficult question: How, then, should the machinery of repression be stopped?

Political morality cannot be reduced to slogans. It requires a comparison of consequences. If one course of action permits ongoing atrocities while another—despite its undeniable costs—offers a genuine possibility of ending them, then both alternatives must be evaluated according to the same ethical standard. Neither should be granted moral immunity simply because it bears the label of "peace."

No reasonable person longs for war. Yet neither should a responsible person sanctify peace to the point where it becomes a shield behind which crimes continue unchecked. When people are executed night after night, when peaceful demonstrators are shot, and when repression has become the permanent policy of a state, the essential moral question is no longer whether war is tragic. That much is obvious. The real question is this, which is the greater moral wrong; the continuation of systematic state violence, or an attempt to bring it to an end?

Ethics is rarely about choosing between perfect good and absolute evil. More often, it requires choosing between competing harms. In such circumstances, our moral responsibility is to support the course of action that is most likely to reduce human suffering and expand human freedom.

Once this principle is accepted, sweeping declarations such as "war is always wrong" can no longer substitute for serious moral reasoning. There are moments in history when refusing to intervene is not an act of peacemaking but an act of surrendering innocent people to those who perpetrate violence against them. At such moments, the burden of moral justification falls not only on those who advocate intervention, but equally on those who argue for inaction.



Cognitive Disorders and Focus in the Diaspora: A Neuroscience Perspective and Practical Solutions

By Mahshad Fadaei, Health and Well-being Department

Many members of the diaspora community share a common experience these days: "I can't concentrate," "it's as if my brain is constantly tired," "I can't focus the way I used to." This experience is often accompanied by self-blame, when in fact it is a fully explainable neuroscientific response to the chronic stress of crisis, not a personal weakness.



Among all mental functions, perception, memory, language, decision-making, attention, and focus are the most sensitive and the most resource-intensive, which is why they are among the first areas to be damaged under the pressure of crisis. In this state, the amygdala becomes overactive and overrides the prefrontal cortex's normal control over attention; the result is a vicious cycle: the mind unconsciously locks onto threatening stimuli (attention bias), the nervous system remains in a state of constant alert (hypervigilance), intrusive and repetitive thoughts form (rumination), and ultimately the cognitive resources needed for everyday focus are depleted, which in turn generates more anxiety and reactivates the cycle.

For the diaspora, there is an additional layer: constant, uninterrupted exposure to crisis news through social media. Research has termed this state the "reticent diaspora": a constant oscillation between the need to know and the effort to protect oneself from emotional harm; endless scrolling through bad news (doomscrolling) gradually produces emotional numbing and even a collapse of compassion, which further intensifies this cycle of declining focus.

The good news is that this capacity can be rebuilt. What follows are seven practical, evidence-based solutions that can be started today, without the need for specialized intervention.

Solution one: mindful media hygiene. The goal is to transform our relationship with information from a compulsive, uninterrupted state into a conscious, controlled one: setting two or three specific times a day to follow the news instead of endless scrolling, turning off frequent instant notifications, choosing a few credible news sources instead of drowning in the vast emotional content of social media, and practicing a short daily digital disconnect, even half an hour. These techniques are not just about reading less news; they restore a person's sense of control.

Solution two: retraining attention against threat cues. Attention Bias Modification is a clinical, tested technique in which a person, in the presence of a threatening stimulus and a neutral stimulus, consciously and repeatedly directs attention toward the neutral stimulus, much like training a muscle. Clinical trials have shown

that this method can significantly reduce symptoms of depression and anxiety. Its simple everyday version is this: when your eyes lock onto bad headlines, consciously shift your attention for a few seconds toward something neutral or positive.

Solution three: containing rumination with cognitive-behavioral techniques. Rumination, unlike ordinary worry, is the endless repetition of a thought without arriving at a solution, and it is precisely this repetition that consumes our limited cognitive resources. Two simple techniques help: designating a specific daily time slot for worry itself, so that intrusive thoughts occurring outside that slot are deferred to that same time; and cognitive distancing, meaning turning "I am in danger" into "I am having the thought that I am in danger", a small linguistic shift that transforms a thought from an absolute reality into an examinable mental event.

Solution four: structured cognitive rehabilitation exercises for focus. Unlike the previous two techniques, which target a specific reaction, cognitive rehabilitation aims to rebuild overall focus capacity, similar to physiotherapy for the brain. The key here is short, frequent exercises rather than long, one-off sessions: for example, starting with five minutes of uninterrupted focus on a simple task and gradually increasing this period week by week. Mindfulness practice, noticing when the mind wanders and consciously bringing attention back without self-judgment, strengthens this same skill. Evidence shows these exercises simultaneously reduce the severity of depressive symptoms as well.

Solution five: sleep. A significant percentage of adults' report that poor sleep directly affects their focus and memory. During sleep, the brain consolidates the day's information and recalibrates the neural networks responsible for attention; when sleep, which is frequently disrupted during crisis and ongoing anxiety, is insufficient, the brain simply has no opportunity for this restoration. Prioritizing sleep is a direct prerequisite for any other effort to rebuild focus.

Solution six: rebuilding a sense of control in daily life. A large part of the chronic stress of crisis comes from the feeling that "nothing is in my hands." A predictable daily routine sends the brain a message that part of life remains predictable; breaking large goals into small, achievable steps builds a small proof of capability each time; and consciously focusing on what is truly within our control, rather than on events beyond our reach, saves mental energy from being wasted.

Solution seven: social support. Social support is not just a good feeling; it directly affects the body's stress axis and lowers stress hormone levels. Sharing our mental burden with others, through conversation or participation in group activities, frees up some of the resources that were being spent on rumination and hypervigilance, and reduces feelings of loneliness.

One final important note: what has been described may be mistaken for adult ADHD, but they differ fundamentally: ADHD is a stable pattern present since childhood, whereas the decline in focus caused by crisis is a situational reaction that did not exist before the crisis. If symptoms persist even after implementing these seven solutions and a relative improvement in circumstances, specialized evaluation is the logical next step.

Focus does not disappear; it returns with intentional care. There is no need to start all these solutions at once; starting with one and gradually adding the rest is a realistic and effective path. And this path should not be walked alone; the diaspora community, through participation and mutual care, can carry a large part of this burden together.



The Week of the Pahlavi Monarchs; History Cannot Be Executed

By Ali Soltani

Every year, during the Week of the Pahlavi Monarchs, Iranians pause to remember two figures who, for many, symbolize the birth of modern Iran: Reza Shah the Great and Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi. Their legacy is closely associated with national modernization, economic development, infrastructure, industrial growth, educational expansion, women's advancement, a modern military, and Iran's emergence as one of the most influential countries in the Middle East. What many describe today as the foundation of contemporary Iran was built during an era defined by construction rather than destruction, confidence rather than fear, and a vision for the future rather than political revenge.



For more than four decades, however, the Islamic Republic has attempted to reduce that entire period to a single word: SAVAK. Its propaganda has consistently sought to erase the achievements of the Pahlavi era by presenting a one-dimensional narrative of Iran before 1979. Yet history cannot be rewritten forever. A new generation "one that never experienced the Pahlavi era firsthand" is increasingly comparing the realities of today's Iran with the historical record and reaching its own conclusions.

Nowhere is this comparison more striking than in the treatment of political dissent. Recent months have witnessed the execution of young Iranians following controversial judicial proceedings, reports of limited access to legal representation, accelerated trials, and widespread condemnation from international human rights organizations. In the author's view, the Islamic Republic no longer treats execution as an exceptional legal

punishment; it has transformed it into a political instrument designed to intimidate society, silence opposition, and preserve its own survival. Every gallows erected sends a message intended not only for one prisoner, but for an entire nation.

From the author's perspective, the difference between the era of Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi and the Islamic Republic is not simply a difference between two political systems; it reflects two fundamentally different approaches to governing a nation. Critics of the monarchy have long focused on political imprisonment during that period. Yet, in the author's opinion, what Iran faces today represents a far more systematic use of fear, where executions and harsh punishments have become central tools of state control. For this reason, the author believes that these two periods cannot be fairly treated as historical equivalents.

A government that depends on executions, intimidation, and widespread repression to maintain power reveals not strength but insecurity. If a state truly enjoys the confidence of its people, why must it rely on gallows and fear to survive? According to the author, the Islamic Republic fears not merely its political opponents but the awakening of Iranian society itself. The noose has become a symbol of a government struggling to preserve authority through intimidation rather than legitimacy.

This is why the Week of the Pahlavi Monarchs carries significance far beyond commemorating two historical figures. It represents two competing visions of Iran's future. One sought to build roads, industries, universities, national institutions, and international respect. The other, in the author's view, has left behind prisons, executions, economic decline, international isolation, and the departure of millions of talented Iranians seeking opportunities elsewhere. Today's generation increasingly measures these two paths side by side.

History cannot be rewritten through propaganda, nor can truth be hanged from gallows. Nations ultimately judge governments not by slogans, but by the legacy they leave behind. In the author's view, Reza Shah the Great and Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi will be remembered for building a modern Iran and restoring national dignity, while the Islamic Republic will be remembered for repression, executions, fear, and the systematic erosion of hope. Perhaps that is why, nearly half a century later, the names of the Pahlavi monarchs continue to inspire respect among many Iranians. History, unlike authoritarian governments, cannot be silenced—and it certainly cannot be executed.