

# **Seyed M. Marandi: Violent Riots & a Massive War Coming**

Seyed Mohammad Marandi is a professor at Tehran University and a former advisor to Iran's Nuclear Negotiation Team. Prof. Marandi discusses violent riots, pro-government rallies and the massive war with the US and Israel on the horizon. Follow Prof. Glenn Diesen: Substack: <https://glenndiesen.substack.com/> X/Twitter: [https://x.com/Glenn\\_Diesen](https://x.com/Glenn_Diesen) Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/glenndiesen> Support the research by Prof. Glenn Diesen: PayPal: <https://www.paypal.com/paypalme/glenndiesen> Buy me a Coffee: [buymeacoffee.com/gdieseng](https://buymeacoffee.com/gdieseng) Go Fund Me: <https://gofund.me/09ea012f> Books by Prof. Glenn Diesen: <https://www.amazon.com/stores/author/B09FPQ4MDL>

## **#Glenn**

Welcome back. We're joined today by Professor Seyed M. Marandi, a professor at Tehran University and a former advisor to Iran's nuclear negotiation team. Thank you for coming back on.

## **#Seyed M. Marandi**

Hi Glenn, thank you very much for having me. It just shows how much I like your show, because I went through a lot of trouble to get online.

## **#Glenn**

Well, I appreciate it very much. I guess what you're referring to is the internet connections, in relation to the different riots that have been going on in various cities in Iran, including Tehran. It does seem, though, that every time there's a buildup to another regime-change operation or invasion, it almost always follows the exact same script. First, you destabilize a society with sanctions and an information war. Then you build on the public's grievances and instigate violent protests. You announce your intention to help or support the locals in their aspirations for freedom—against their own government, of course. And the rhetoric is always reduced to a binary choice: either you don't care about the struggle for freedom and the aspirations of brave protesters, or you support sanctions and military intervention.

So, after the coup or invasion, it turns out the U.S. and its allies actually had some zero-sum geopolitical and power interests, as opposed to acting purely out of altruism and love of freedom. But almost every time, the result is the same—from the Arab Spring onward. The country that was supposed to be liberated ends up destroyed. So, we've all seen this movie before, which is why it's my position that Iranians can, of course, protest the government all they want. But this is an internal issue, and as soon as it becomes an international one, you can't really keep geopolitics out of it.

Sorry for the long prelude to the question, but how do you assess the situation now on the ground in Tehran? What are the domestic grievances, and what is the geopolitical component here?

## #Seyed M. Marandi

Well, you know, first I should point out that every once in a while—every few years—the West, Western media, Western pundits, think tanks, and leaders say that Iran is on the verge of collapse. And every time, people like myself come and say it's not going to happen: the state has popular support, the constitution is something that a very strong majority of Iranians adhere to, and those assessments are based on wishful thinking. And every single time they'll say, "You're a mouthpiece for a dying regime," or something like that. Then it goes on—it's like a loop. It happens over and over, every two, three years, three, four years, four or five years. Now, what's happening is that we've had a sudden fall in the currency.

I don't know the exact percentage, but let's say 40 or 50 percent over a relatively short period of time—maybe 30 percent, I'm not sure, because I don't follow the currency rate. But it was a sudden drop, and it turns out it was managed from abroad. In other words, the United States and its Western allies put pressure on the places that handle currency exchange with Iran. So, for a while, there was a lot of difficulty. Then, because the currency fell so sharply, we saw protests in Tehran and some other cities. Not very large—maybe a few thousand people, I'd guess. Again, I don't know the numbers, but let's say a few thousand. They were peaceful. And who were they? Mostly businesspeople with shops, people who buy and sell goods.

And their argument was that, look, if you don't stabilize the currency, we're going to go out of business, because we sell goods and then suddenly the price goes up and we can't buy new goods to put in our shops. To put it simply—because I'm not an economist—the protests went on peacefully. No one was arrested, no one was hurt, the police did not intervene, nothing happened. Then we saw day two. On day two, the protests continued—probably the same number of people, maybe a bit more, maybe a bit less in Tehran. Not in most cities, but maybe a couple of the bigger ones. Then we had infiltration. Suddenly, we had these small groups of people—and we had this four years ago as well—small groups, very well-disciplined, very well-organized, began to infiltrate the protests and started rioting.

And they were very violent. Over the past few days, more than 100 officers of the law have been murdered. Some of them were beheaded, burned alive, or had their faces and heads smashed by these people. So, in the United States, we have a case where—sorry, someone just came in and asked if the internet was okay, and I said yes, it's fine. Anyway, in the United States, there was the case of a woman being shot in the head by an ICE officer. And we saw what happened there. The argument was that she was about to run him down, or run over him, and the question was whether she pulled to the right or not. They murdered over 100 officers of the law. They burned alive a young woman who was inside a clinic—she was a nurse. They burned down the building. She went to the top floor, but she still couldn't escape.

They burned down a—well, they murdered a person from the Red Crescent. They murdered a lot of people. Ordinary people on the streets, a three-year-old girl. Lots of people died. No one knows how they died. A surgeon told me that many of the injuries he's dealt with—because he was, I don't know what it's called in English, but I guess a trauma surgeon or something like that—anyway, he deals with these things. He said that in his hospital, and another physician also said this, people were shot with handguns, pistols, at short range. And it was clear that these people were not just burning down buildings—they burned down many public buses, they destroyed many... what do you call them? Sorry—ambulances, but also fire engines.

They've burned down many buildings. The damage they caused across the country in just a few days—three, four days—is massive. And they were very vicious. Now, in the West, they can claim these are peaceful protesters and ignore all the footage people are putting out. Western media, of course, is ignoring all of it. But today—Monday—across the country, we had demonstrations protesting against the rioters, against the terrorists, and in support of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Constitution. Anyone can go and look at the footage. These protests were held across the country, in every single city. So it wasn't as if people went from one city to another to gather in one place.

Each city has its own. So people can look at the crowds in Isfahan, in Tabriz, in Ahvaz, in Mashhad—everywhere. And they were unbelievably large. In Tehran, probably, from what I've seen, this is the largest gathering of people we've ever had before—quite possibly. So people can't deny what was shown on television. They can go to Press TV, the Press TV Twitter account. My Twitter account has a couple, too. Whenever I get into a studio—since I don't have internet, we can only access Iranian websites right now—when I want to tweet, I come to a studio, quickly do it, and then when I go out, I can't do it anymore, because I don't have my own connection for the time being, just like everyone else.

But the point is that despite all the riots and despite the enormous propaganda, you have this media empire in Persian, based in Western countries, that includes many TV channels—some say in the hundreds. I don't know; I don't watch them. They have countless websites, Twitter accounts, Twitter armies, online armies, bots—everything. And Telegram channels, too. They outgun the Iranian state media by far. I assume every year billions of dollars are invested in it, because they pay for three or four thousand people in Albania who are in a camp there, working day and night on Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and whatever else is out there. I only have a Twitter account.

Everything else has been shut down—my Facebook account, Instagram. Sorry, I only have Twitter. I don't know much about the other platforms. But in any case, the point is they're spending billions of dollars a year on psychological warfare, and they try to create economic hardship. That's what their maximum pressure sanctions are. And then today you have these crowds on the streets, and Western media tries to hide the fact that many millions of people are out there today. Many millions. I don't know the numbers, but many millions across the country. Well, we... no one has to take my

word for it. They can just go through the footage, city after city, look at the crowds, and assess for themselves if this is something that happens in their countries or not.

## #Glenn

Yeah, I've seen those marches too—the protests in support of the government. And yeah, they're really huge. I haven't seen them on our news channels here in Europe yet, though, but...

## #Seyed M. Marandi

Don't count on it being shown on any of them.

## #Glenn

Again, there's a narrative control being asserted here. And as you said, it's about painting a government as illegitimate for the purpose of toppling it, destroying it. The people now speaking out the loudest, showing supposed empathy for the Iranian people—it's hard to take that seriously, because these are the same people who just bombed Iran recently and are all for bombing it again. And now, of course, they see Iran as an obstacle to their geopolitical interests in the region. So this idea that you can just point to some protesters on the street and say, "Well, these are the real freedom-loving Iranians, and we have to do everything we can to support them," it's not genuine. I mean, one can support or oppose the government of Iran, but irrespective of that, none of this coverage is authentic or genuine.

But what do we know about the involvement of foreign intelligence agencies in Iran in stoking these things? I know that in some parts of the media they say, well, this is just normal Iranian propaganda. However, we do see that Mike Pompeo, the former director of the CIA and, under Trump, the former secretary of state, tweeted, "Happy New Year to every Iranian in the street, and also to every Mossad agent walking beside them." So... should we be worried that the former director of the CIA is participating in Iranian propaganda? Or, you know, it's become, I think, common knowledge—accepted by most. But do you have any information or revelations about the extent to which foreign intelligence agencies are involved in trying to destabilize the country?

## #Seyed M. Marandi

Well, a number of things. One is that, you know, if you're at the rally in Tehran—which I'm sure had well over a million people, I don't know the exact numbers, but it was just extraordinary—if you go and speak to these people, they don't all share one political view. Some of them support this administration, some oppose it. They have completely different perspectives. The point is, they support the Constitution and the legitimacy of the state, and they're willing to go to great lengths to defend it. Because, as you know, you've been to Tehran—today wasn't a holiday.

Just getting there and going back takes hours. And many of the people who participated came from work, or they had to go back to work. And it's a huge city. In other words, I mean, it's not like me—as a university academic, you know—my salary is significantly higher than a factory worker or many other people. So they, in order to get there, are spending a whole day, effectively, to take a stand, to state their position, to make it known that they are against this terrorism, against these riots, and against U.S. and Western domination of our country. It's not like in the smaller cities, where it's easier to get to the protests.

In Tehran, just getting there is harder than participating in the protests, and getting back is also a challenge in itself. So people are making a clear statement. With regard to foreign interference, I think it's clear as day—not only because of what Pompeo said, but also Mossad. In their Persian-language accounts, they spoke of their agents being involved in Iran. And a number of Israeli officials have spoken on Israeli TV and said more or less the same. But just to prove a point, the reason they brought down the internet in Iran—they shut it down—was because these rioters were all being coordinated.

And they're from different groups. They're ISIS. They're the Mujahideen-e-Khalq, the terror organization based in Europe. They're the Monarchists. They're the Komala, which is a Kurdish terrorist group. And all these different groups were active—killing people, destroying clinics, destroying banks, destroying private automobiles, destroying private houses. Real madness. And some of these people, by the way, were taking drugs, and there's footage of it. I may have tweeted one of those, where some lady is passing things out to others.

But in any case, these extremely violent people—when the internet went out, it suddenly collapsed. Why? Because they could no longer organize across the country. It collapsed. So that's why we don't have internet. That's why I had to come all the way—I went to the rally, got stuck in traffic, went there, walked around for an hour and a half, went back home, got stuck in traffic again, and then came all the way from that side of the city to this studio. So I had to drive for about an hour just to get internet so I could speak with you.

There's no internet for ordinary people, unless someone has, like, Musk's—whatever it's called. So, when they cut off the internet, suddenly the network collapsed. And as I said, that's because there's this huge network that's nationwide and has been active in different parts of Tehran, in major cities, and across the country. It suddenly fell apart. Why? Because they were no longer able to coordinate with their paymasters abroad. And of course, many of those who were arrested had guns. They were shooting from within the crowds at the police. As I said, some people, it seems, were being shot from within the crowd.

It reminded me of the Maidan, if you recall, in 2014, when the people behind the coup were shooting both at the police in Kyiv—or Kiev, depending on who controls the city next year. We'll have to decide then what the name of the city will be. But they were shooting both at the police and at the people on the streets. Why? Because they wanted more deaths. As I said, I think that when

someone like Pompeo, and even Mossad itself, puts out a Persian statement saying they're on the ground in Iran—why should we need to prove anything? They're the ones boasting about it.

## #Glenn

That's fair enough. Well, I saw that Trump gave one of his speeches on his plane, where he claimed that Iran had called yesterday and wanted to negotiate. Again, it sounds like a hostage situation, where they're almost claiming responsibility for what's happening on the ground in Iran. So yes, Iran wants to negotiate. But I guess there's something to this. Is this about—I mean, is this about another nuclear deal? Is it about reducing Iran's deterrent in terms of its conventional ballistic missiles? Is it about Iran's support for its partners in the region? What is it that the United States wants to negotiate this time?

## #Seyed M. Marandi

Well, no one contacted him. And his ignorance about the situation, Glenn, I think you should really take note of this—and so should your audience. He said, or tweeted, or uploaded on his social account, I suppose, that the second-largest city in Iran had fallen to the protesters, or the freedom fighters, or the rioters, or whoever it is he—well, I don't know what he called them. Which city? When? Who took it? Not a town, not a village was taken by anyone. If his information, if his knowledge of the situation on the ground, is so poor, then who's giving him intelligence? Who's feeding him knowledge about events inside the United States, events in Ukraine, events in Venezuela? He said... I don't know if you've been outside of Tehran. I think he was alluding to the city of Mashhad.

The city of Mashhad—I don't know how large it is. It must be three, four million. I don't know, maybe three, three and a half million people. That would be a very big deal. That would be enormous. But he just says it, and then... it's finished. Either he just retweets stuff, or he believes it. I don't think he just—I think he probably believes what he's being told, or he's watching it on Fox News. I don't know where he gets that information. But the point I'm trying to make is that the head of the United States is utterly ignorant about basic facts. And when someone is so ignorant about basic facts, then his actions, his decisions, his policies are all going to be founded on something that's absolutely incorrect, and they're all going to fail.

So what does Trump want? Trump wants—if you recall, during the 12-day war, he also tweeted—again, I'm using “tweet” in a loose way. I don't know, was it through social media or where it was? But he tweeted that... what was it? He said—what do you call it when someone has to surrender? He used a term like “complete surrender.” Iran has to surrender, the country has to surrender. Why does he do that? Based on who's giving him that sort of knowledge? Who's telling him that Iran is in such a bad situation? And then it turns out that, as you know, by the end of the war, the Israelis were begging for a ceasefire. So, “absolute surrender,” I think—that's what he tweeted.

But in any case, I think what he wants is whatever the Israeli regime wants. And what does the Israeli regime want? It wants a broken West Asia and North Africa. It wants a fragmented West Asia. It wants to destroy nation-states. And I have no doubt that the Israeli regime ultimately, if it had the opportunity, would do the same to Saudi Arabia as it did to Syria. It would do the same to Egypt, and it would do the same to Turkey. The foolishness of Erdogan is that he helped bring about this arrogance among Israeli regime leaders by helping—along with the Qatari regime—both of them, of course, under the umbrella of U.S. policy, the Obama policy of Operation Timber Sycamore—they destroyed Syria. And thus they have empowered the Israeli regime on that particular front.

So Erdogan thought he was going to sort of create a mini Ottoman Empire. Now he has borders with the Israeli regime, and obviously the Israeli regime has the upper hand, because at the end of the day what Erdogan never calculated was that his ally in the White House is always going to choose the Israeli regime over him and his country any day of the week, and whenever. So what the Israelis would like—they would like to see a broken Turkey, or Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and of course Iran. But I think, again, they simply don't understand Iran. As I said at the beginning of the program, every two, three, four years they say Iran is about to fall. And by the way, the whole "woman, life, freedom" thing—it was the same thing. It was all fake. Mahsa Amini was taken into a police station, rightly or wrongly—that's not the point.

And then she died. She collapsed. And then BBC Persian—this empire of Persian media in the West, as I said—began claiming that she was beaten and battered to death. And a lot of people believed it. After three days or so, they put out footage showing that she was completely fine, that she wasn't hurt, and then she just fell. It turned out she had a preexisting condition—she'd had an operation when she was a child. And in any case, the autopsy also showed none of that. I was on LBC or something a few days ago, and the host was saying there was a UN investigation carried out in Iran. I said, "Well, name the people in the investigation, the people on the team." She was just making it up. So, back then they used the same psychological warfare, and they created a push for riots.

And then we had the same process. A lot of people believed that she was beaten, so they came to the streets and protested—significantly larger than the economic protests we had last week. But those were peaceful too. The first couple of days were peaceful, and then we had infiltration, and it became violent. Back then, they were also saying Iran was about to fall, and people came to the streets. This time, people came out in a way I've never seen before, or at least I don't recall. So, every three or four years it happens—but this time, hopefully, it's going to be the last, because I think the empire is declining so fast that they're not going to have the ability, in three or four years' time, to do anything to the Iranian people again like they've been doing over the past four decades.

## #Glenn

It's a dangerous thing, though. I was going to say it's very dangerous when one falls for one's own propaganda like this. But we often see that this is what happens during conflicts, because something similar happened in 2014. That was after Russia took back Crimea. At that time, President Obama

came out and rejected the Russian government's reasoning, because the Russians had said, "Well, you took Kosovo. They were allowed to secede without the permission of the country, so why shouldn't Crimea?" And Obama's reasoning was, "Well, you can't compare it, because in Kosovo there was a referendum. You had a lot of international observers making sure it was legitimate." He goes into detail, almost, about how it was carried out.

And at the end of it, you know, there never was a referendum in Kosovo. But my point is, no journalist could point that out—like, wait a second, that never happened—because then you'd be backing the Russian narrative, and you can't do that. So it becomes almost a moral obligation for every Western journalist to just pretend they didn't hear it, or to act as if there was a referendum in Kosovo. And you see the same thing with the Ukraine war. Whenever something happens and what the Russians are saying is actually true, but it doesn't make Trump, or the U.S., or NATO look good, it's just, "Well, let's go with it." And after a while, it creates its own reality.

But I was going to say, with Marandi, the idea that this city has fallen—I mean, this is the problem with think tanks and all that. If you can control the information going to the politicians, then you don't really need to control the politicians, just the people who whisper in their ears. But the question is always, though, is it Trump who's manipulating his base when he says the second-largest city in Iran has fallen? Or is Trump being manipulated by his handlers? Or, you know, it could just be stupidity. I mean, I've seen Trump on more than one occasion claim that Maduro has killed millions of people. That's quite an achievement for a country the size of Venezuela. But it is perplexing.

## **#Seyed M. Marandi**

It offends me because we're supposed to be the ones who kill the most, and the Iranians are the most evil of them all. So it's offensive for us—for Maduro to get the highest number of murders in the U.S. ranking system. You're absolutely correct. In the case of Iran, it's worse than Russia or China. Why? Because Iran supports Palestine. That's been the issue all along, for almost five decades. Iran sacrifices for the Palestinian people, and it's been doing that for decades. Despite Qatar and others—these oil- and gas-rich dictatorships—promoting sectarianism and trying to create hatred toward Iran over the years, and while the West has always been demonizing Iran, people are now seeing the truth.

And what does this say, Glenn? What does it say about Iran—after all these economic sanctions, after all this antagonism, with this empire of anti-Iranian Persian media out there in the West, and with these rioters funded by the West, and Western intelligence agencies all working with them? Because Mossad doesn't work with them—it's the CIA, MI6, French intelligence. All of them are in bed together. The Western embassies in Tehran and in our neighboring countries, they're all in it together. But what does it say about the Islamic Republic of Iran that, despite all that, if they ask people to come to the streets, you'll see people come out in these numbers?

Which country can do that? Can France do that? Can Macron do that? Can the British Prime Minister do that? Can the Chancellor of Germany do that? That shows a high degree of legitimacy. But in the West, they don't want to accept Iran as legitimate, because that destroys their whole notion of supremacism—that they are superior to the rest of us, that they have special privileges and rights, that they are more civilized than the rest of us. Of course, that narrative is being demolished, because we've seen the genocide going on in Gaza. And there's no difference between Trump and AOC. AOC put out a tweet yesterday saying we should support the people of Iran.

In other words, what—intervention? More sanctions? The sanctions are all directed at ordinary people; we know that. So the United States is already at war with women and children in Iran. But what is AOC saying? She's trying to push Trump toward war, toward further confrontation. This is a uniparty. There's no difference between any of them—maybe over some abortion issues, or maybe over taxation—but when it comes to the empire, they're all the same. AOC is one of the leaders of the Democratic Party, and she's supposedly a progressive, and many of the progressives you and I know and respect supported her. And this is what she's saying now.

So the uniparty is basically out there to preserve the empire. But the empire is falling apart. Yet, at the end of the day, these people won't think about it—but others should. How is it that today, on Monday, so many millions of people in Iran came out into the streets saying, "We support the state, we support the constitution, we support Ayatollah Khamenei, and we support Iran's policies. We condemn the United States, the Israeli regime, the West, and those who support the rioters"? What does that say about Iran? And what does that say about Western regimes, media, and think-tank narratives about Iran?

## **#Glenn**

Even if someone wanted to encourage a more open society, attacking a country is usually not the way to go. I mean...

## **#Seyed M. Marandi**

I mean, about open societies. On the first day of the protests, there was no violence—none. But in the UK, if you hold a placard—if an 85-year-old Jewish woman holds a placard saying, "I'm against genocide"—she goes to jail. In Berlin, they'll beat people just because they wear a keffiyeh, a symbol of the Palestinian people. In Iran, the police only got involved after things turned violent, after they started murdering police officers. And we have footage of that—lots of footage. They burned two young men in a mosque; they trapped them inside and threw Molotov cocktails, burning them alive. Or that woman nurse. So the West is in no position to talk about open society. Iranian society is far more open than the West. In the West, they're carrying out a genocide.

In Iran, they're opposing the genocide. In the West, they arrest people for opposing genocidal practices. In Palestine—it's not even about their own country. You know what they've done to university students in the United States; the list goes on. I mean, the façade, the pretense that they were a free and open society—that's all gone. No one believes it. Western media has been looking away as the genocide goes on, pretending that the riots in Iran were peaceful and that millions of people were supporting them. Now, when we have millions of people on the streets in Tehran saying no to the West, they're all looking away again. That's not a free society. That's not a democratic society. That's not a free press. That's just a façade.

## **#Glenn**

Regarding what you said about AOC, it reminded me of a statement by the first president of Tanzania. He said that the United States is also a one-party state, but with typical American extravagance, they have two of them. I thought that was an interesting quote. My last question, though, is where this could be heading, because as we know from previous cases of trying to destabilize a country, the goal here is obviously not as altruistic as the rhetoric would suggest. We've heard from Israel and some voices in the United States that war might be in the cards. In fact, just yesterday, U.S. Senator Lindsey Graham suggested they might strike Iran last night or today. So that seems imminent—an attack on Iran. But yeah, bombing Iran to help its people—that's the logic we're going with now. How likely do you think a war is at this point?

## **#Seyed M. Marandi**

Well, that was what this whole thing was about from the beginning. They manipulated the currency to create unhappiness and unrest. And then their highly trained teams—very well trained—the police have been saying this is not like anything they've seen before. Their teams went out and systematically started destroying property and killing people. So this was all about creating, I don't know, instability in Iran—or at least a narrative of instability in Iran, let's say—that would be more accurate, to legitimize strikes against the country. And that's why the CIA, Mossad, and others are doing this. They're trying to create the justification for war. But Iran is prepared for war. And after the protests we saw today, people are behind the state, just like during the 12-day war.

These people who carried out the riots were not with the people during the 12-day war. They were opposed—they were on the other side, a small minority. But after today, if the United States strikes, these are the people who will be steadfast and stand firm when Iran strikes back. And Iran may strike first if it sees some sort of imminent threat. That's a new policy. The Iranians have said that if they feel threatened, they may carry out a strike before the other side does. Because Trump has threatened Iran, and the Israeli regime has already carried out a blitzkrieg attack, Iran today is much more prepared for war. Ironically, the last ten days have ended up strengthening Iran rather than weakening it.

It's made the population united and angry at these rioters, these terrorists, and the Westerners behind them, because they've caused so much death, grief, and damage. So I think the whole objective from day one—starting with the currency manipulation—was to create an environment to justify war. And that's what Trump would do. The Americans would bomb and kill tens of thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands, of Iranians, thinking the world would support these protesters. But in reality, what will happen is that Iran will hit back at the Americans so hard, and across the board, that it will bring down the global economy—and the U.S. economy with it. And some people in the West say to me, "That's not going to happen." Well, we'll see. We'll see.

Iran's capabilities defeated Israel. Anyone can go look at what Steve Bannon said the day after the ceasefire. He said the real story is that Netanyahu and the Israeli regime were desperate. They were being hit hard and needed a ceasefire during the last three or four days, whatever. Today, Iran is much more prepared—but more importantly, Iran's capabilities for hitting the Israeli regime are much greater now than they were seven months ago. That's a sideshow, though. Iran's real capabilities are not directed at the Israelis; they're directed at the Americans, at the Persian Gulf, and the Indian Ocean—the other side of the Persian Gulf.

Why? Because for three decades, Americans have been saying all options are on the table. So Iran has, for three decades, been preparing itself for war with the United States. Iran has many underground drone and missile bases—short-range missiles, medium-range missiles—which are much easier to move around and fire than the long-range ones, and they're far greater in number. So Iran can swiftly devastate anything that's out there, very swiftly. And in circumstances where the United States wants to wage war on Iran, Iran is not going to hold back. The Americans struck Iran once, and Iran destroyed key U.S. installations in Doha with six missiles that hit the base.

The Americans denied it at first, if you recall, but then the footage came out. The Americans want to go to war. It's not going to be like that—the Iranians are going to go all out. The Speaker of Parliament said that today, and I think he said it in Parliament yesterday as well. So that, I think, was the objective. And I think that's what the Zionists and the neocons want. But ultimately, if it happens, it will destroy Western economies. It's not something we want. It's not something any sane person wants. But the states—the West—are in the hands of the Zionists. When AOC and Trump are saying the same thing, there's a reason for that: the people who really have influence and power are telling them to say the same thing.

## #Glenn

I get the impression, too, that if they decide to start another war against Iran—and it's looking increasingly likely—it will play out very differently this time.

## #Seyed M. Marandi

But you actually think Iran could preempt? Just one thing—about Iraq. If there's a war with Iran, Iran's allies in Iraq will take out Americans. And Iran's supporters in Azerbaijan won't remain quiet. The same is true in Yemen. This is not a war the Americans can win. They don't have a chance in the world. And this is not the United States of 20 years ago. And this Iran is not Iraq. Iran is not even Vietnam. So, you know, again, the Zionists don't care, because they're Israel-first. They don't care about American interests. They want war because it's in the interest of the Israeli regime. They don't care about the results or how it could devastate Europe, the United States, and the entire world.

## **#Glenn**

Well, Professor Marandi, thank you for taking the time. I knew I had to travel across town to get to the studio, so I really appreciate it.

## **#Seyed M. Marandi**

See, Glenn, when I say it's always a pleasure, always an honor, I'm telling you the truth, because I get it. Getting them to let me into this building to do this interview, to use the internet, crossing town—it just shows what a great show you have. Well, we very much appreciate it. Thank you.