

# Seyed M. Marandi: U.S. Attacked World's Largest Gas Field

Seyed Mohammad Marandi argues that Iran has declared economic war after the US and Israel attacked South Pars, the world's largest gas field. Marandi is a professor at Tehran University and a former advisor to Iran's Nuclear Negotiation Team. 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 are joined today by Seyed M. Marandi, a professor at Tehran University and a former advisor to Iran's nuclear negotiation team, to discuss this new round of very dramatic escalations in the war against Iran. Thank you very much for coming back on.

## #Seyed M. Marandi

Thank you, Glenn. It's always a great pleasure to be on your show.

## #Glenn

Well, as I said, there seems to be a very powerful round of escalation. First, we heard about the attack on the Bushehr nuclear power plant. It didn't hit the nuclear reactor, but it was close enough to raise concern about what could happen in such an attack in terms of nuclear contamination. We've seen further assassinations of Iranian leaders, and of course, the most recent—breaking news over the past two hours—seems to be this attack on the southern parts of Tehran, which is the largest natural gas field in the world. I mean, I guess Iran has many ways of retaliating. How are you assessing this situation? Where do you see this heading?

## #Seyed M. Marandi

Well, there are a number of things. One is that Iran has a very strong chokehold on Trump and the Trump regime. That is, of course, the Strait of Hormuz and the vulnerability of Saudi Arabia. Even though it exports a portion of its oil through the Red Sea, Iran can block that with missiles and

drones. It's doing the same with regard to the Emirates and the portion of oil they export from outside the Persian Gulf. So this is a very difficult situation for Trump. And as he admitted earlier, he didn't think—or his administration didn't think—it's not clear to me exactly where the fault lies.

They didn't think Iran was going to attack U.S. assets in the Persian Gulf region or shut the Strait of Hormuz, which I find extraordinary. You and I, and many others, knew quite well that such a thing would happen—we've been discussing this together for maybe a couple of years. So when this happened, Trump, of course, made many bold threats. He saw they weren't working, and despite saying that Iran was "obliterated" again, he called on the entire world to help him open the Strait of Hormuz—and everyone said no. Obviously, Iran hasn't been obliterated. Iran's navy, almost the entire wartime fleet, is hidden in tunnels everywhere.

And they will enter the Persian Gulf, the Gulf of Oman, and the Indian Ocean when the time comes. They're speedboats with missiles, and Iran's missile and drone capabilities seem endless. They haven't hit any of the underground bases, and they've failed to do anything about Iran's production capabilities. So Trump is in a very difficult position. On the other hand, the Israeli regime wants escalation. From what I'm seeing in Iran, operational control has shifted from the United States to the Israeli regime. So it's the Israelis leading the war—they're the ones choosing the targets, and the United States has agreed to cooperate in striking them.

So it may not make a huge difference, but it is significant. I think the Israeli regime, and probably the United States, may want to escalate to see how far Iran will go. That's one possibility. I think they'll soon find out that Iran is willing to go to the very end and will fight to the finish. So this experiment is a foolish one. Some believe the Israeli regime wants the total destruction of oil and gas assets in the Persian Gulf region, and it's possible that Trump will go along with it. In any case, Iran is going to climb the escalation ladder if that's what the U.S.-Israeli coalition does.

So I think ultimately the big issue is that the United States is stuck with the Strait of Hormuz, and Iran really holds all the cards. Now the Israelis are assassinating people. They may continue to do so or have some successes, but it's not going to change anything. The Iranians have a very sophisticated state structure. They have many experts and people who are well acquainted with matters of state. So if one person is martyred, someone else will replace him. It's a loss, without a doubt. Dr. Larijani—I've never worked in government, but I encouraged him to go to China.

And ultimately, when he went, he asked me to go with him. When he came back, he asked me to take care of the China dossier for him. So for a couple of years, until he left Parliament—he was the Speaker of Parliament, of course—I was in charge of the dossier on his behalf. As a volunteer, I didn't receive any salary for this. He was an excellent man, very smart, very dedicated, a very moral person. It's a major loss, and I was very fond of him. He was very polite, highly educated. But everyone can be replaced by someone else, and martyrdom itself boosts the morale of society. It

awakens society further, as we saw today on the streets during his funeral, and during the funeral of the victims of the U.S. attack on Iran's naval ship that was unarmed and participating in a naval ceremony in India.

So I don't see any success of major substance, because obviously you can't say an assassination is not a success—but it's not going to achieve the results they're seeking. In fact, it's going to have the reverse effect. As we saw with the martyrdom of Ayatollah Khamenei, it really mobilized the nation in a way I've never seen, even during the 1980s. I've witnessed things in Tehran personally, and I've seen images and videos unlike anything before—people on the streets, huge crowds. I was there on Friday. And then the U.S.-Israeli coalition bombed the people demonstrating on the streets. You murder a person, and you don't even hear about it in the Western media. But no one ran away.

I'm sure you've seen images of it, and many of your viewers have too. It's on my Twitter account. People are steadfast, and they've been mobilized. The United States had a plan to carry out terror attacks last night, and riots, as they did a couple of months ago. It failed completely. There were people on the streets throughout Tehran and across the country, and they couldn't do anything. On the whole, I think the war is going very well for Iran. It's painful. They've murdered many people, including schoolchildren. They've bombed hospitals. Today they bombed key infrastructure. None of this makes us happy—it's painful. When they murdered Dr. Larijani, they killed all the neighbors in that apartment block. But the United States and the Israeli regime have failed so far.

## **#Glenn**

Well, what is their likely retaliation? Because I watched a spokesperson recently—about 20 minutes ago—talk about how the energy infrastructure of those who participate in this will now, I think he said, "burn to ashes." But we're also seeing some incoming strikes on the capital of Saudi Arabia. I was curious, though, what's the likelihood that Yemen could actually be activated to close down the Red Sea in response to this escalation? Because there's an important strait there, of course—the Bab el-Mandeb, if I'm not mispronouncing it.

And, you know, essentially also the narrow strait, which can be used to cut off access to the Red Sea. This is quite a critical maritime corridor as well, because with the Strait of Hormuz blocked, this is basically the only access to Saudi Arabia on the western coast. So, do you see this as a possibility, or what kind of retaliation—again, I know the government doesn't tell you what they're going to do—but what kind of retaliation do you think is realistic here?

## **#Seyed M. Marandi**

Well, the government has said they will strike oil and gas facilities in the Emirates, Qatar, and Saudi Arabia. I think by the time you see this video, that retaliation will probably have taken place. We're already hearing that there was a strike on Qatar and on Saudi Arabia. Apparently, the strikes on Saudi Arabia targeted jet fuel depots for the U.S. Air Force, because the Saudis are deeply involved

in this, and it's becoming increasingly clear that they're encouraging the Americans to carry out these strikes against Iran. In the case of Yemen, they've said they will enter the war, and we'll have to see when that happens. Obviously, things depend on how the escalation develops.

In Iraq, the resistance is striking U.S. assets, but it could do much more. It's the same issue with Iran—Iran can strike much harder. Iran is moving up the escalation ladder based on U.S., Israeli, or what I would call the Epstein coalition's actions. For example, today when they struck Iran's infrastructure, the gas installations, that was something Iran had to respond to. Iran doesn't want to create a global economic meltdown. This war was imposed on Iran. And as we saw Joe Kent resign and basically say what we've been saying all along—that Iran was no threat, and that it was the Israeli regime and the Zionist lobby that pushed the United States to war, a war that's not in U.S. interests at all.

So Iran is responding to aggression, and it has shut the Strait of Hormuz to put pressure on the United States, its proxies, and its allies. But if the United States moves to destroy Iranian territory or key installations, then Iran will do the same. And then we will definitely move into crisis mode with regard to the global economy, because later on, even if there's an end to hostilities and Iran's demands are met, if there's no oil or gas due to the damage or destruction of the installations, and if there are no tankers, then what's the use? The global economic crisis will be permanent—or at least it will last for many years.

There will be a global economic depression. The United States began this aggression—the U.S. regime, the Trump regime, the Israeli regime—and its proxies in the region are all complicit. The Iranians shut the Strait of Hormuz to put pressure. But if the United States starts attacking Iran's key installations or infrastructure, or if the Israeli regime does, it doesn't make a difference to us—Iran will respond in kind. And since these Arab regimes host U.S. bases, allow them to use their airspace, their air bases, and their territory to fire missiles toward Iran, like HIMARS missiles, they have no reason to complain whatsoever.

## **#Glenn**

Well, we see these U.S. troops that have been sent to the region, and some are talking about putting boots on the ground. I'm not sure whether that means on Iranian soil or if it's intended to open up the Strait of Hormuz. It's also not unrealistic that they could be used to invade Yemen, maybe to make sure that this strait—while keeping the Red Sea accessible—is kept open. How are you assessing this? Do you think the U.S. could go that far, actually sending troops on the ground?

## **#Seyed M. Marandi**

Well, Iraq and Yemen are not small countries with small populations. And Yemen today is much more powerful than it was a year ago, when the United States waged a war against it and lost after seven weeks. And by the way, let's remember that during the seven-year-long genocidal war carried

out by the Saudis and the Emiratis against Yemen—with the support of the entire region except for Iran—and Turkey and Qatar also supported the genocide in Yemen until the Saudis and the Emiratis turned against Qatar, and then Erdogan and Qatar tilted away from them. But the entire West and the region were all supporting the genocide in Yemen. And after seven years, it failed. What brought the Saudis to accept the ceasefire? When Yemen targeted Saudi oil installations and oil exports. If Yemen could do that four years ago, I think it was.

## **#Seyed M. Marandi**

It can end the Saudi oil exports that go to the Red Sea, and it can also shut the Red Sea. So Yemen has these capabilities, and I'm sure its missile and drone capabilities are more of a threat today than they were back then to the U.S. Navy. I don't see a scenario where the United States can send its troops—what, a few thousand, maybe two, three, four thousand—and make any real difference. And it's even more implausible with regard to Iran. But let's say, hypothetically, that the Americans somehow, with this small group, take the Strait of Hormuz. They've already underestimated Iran's missile and drone capabilities, obviously. They keep saying they've destroyed them all, and Iran keeps firing missiles and drones. But let's say they take the Strait of Hormuz, and the Iranian armed forces, which have been preparing for such a scenario for 25 years, fail to dislodge them.

What difference is it going to make? Ships have to come into the Persian Gulf. Iran—if anyone looks at the map—controls half of the Persian Gulf. They could strike missiles at ships from anywhere. And the missiles Iran fires aren't launched from the coast; they're fired from hundreds of kilometers inside the country. So they can take the Strait of Hormuz, and Iran can still destroy whatever it wants—whether it's ships or installations—as we're seeing right now. Or if they want to go all the way to the north of the Persian Gulf and take Haraka Island—it's a flat island—then the Iranians can hammer them on that flat piece of land. They'll take large casualties, but still, they're not going to open the Strait of Hormuz for trade.

There won't be any oil. The only thing that will happen is that, through escalation, you're going to have more tankers destroyed and more oil and gas installations destroyed. So ultimately, when this ends—and it will end at some point—it'll end in failure: U.S. failure and Israeli failure. Then there won't be the oil they're trying to bring back to the market. And every day that goes by, Glenn, you have, what, 15 or 20 million barrels a day not being sent to the market. The shortage is growing by the hour. They can manipulate the market for a few days or maybe a couple of weeks, but then it's going to hit them very hard. And of course, it's not just oil.

It's gas. And of course, it's not just gas—it's fertilizer and petrochemicals. It's also imports and exports, because these Arab family dictatorships are huge consumer markets. The United States and the Europeans have massive assets in this region—trillions of dollars. They've invested all sorts of money in these consumer societies. The losses to the United States come through the rise in energy

prices, the shortage of energy and fertilizer, and the destruction of their assets. A lot of the weapons the U.S. sells go to these countries, and they don't even know how to use them because they don't have competent military forces. It's only, what, 350,000 or 400,000 people.

How are they going to use all those jets they bought? Those jets are basically bribes. And then there are the kickbacks and commissions involving Western senators, their business partners, the royal family, and all that. The same is true in other countries. So the losses to the United States are multidimensional. And, of course, the petrodollar takes a hit. As things stand, I don't see the United States finding a way out—they're only digging themselves deeper into the hole. And the world is going to blame them. I mean, what Joe Kent says is recognized across the world, so people are going to blame Zionism and Trump for the misery they're beginning to impose on the international community.

## **#Glenn**

Yeah, the resignation letter of Joe Kent—it's been read tens of millions of times online now. It's quite extraordinary that essentially the second in command there would be the one to resign and put this out. It does show that the narrative of this war isn't going well. But I think what you referred to as panic is probably correct, because this began looking like Trump genuinely thought it would be another Venezuela—quick in and out—attack by the end of the weekend before the stock markets opened and have your victory speech ready. But the government didn't fall, and the army didn't collapse.

So there seems to be uncertainty about what other cards can be played. We've seen reports that Trump was quite upset that there are no military options to open up the Strait of Hormuz. But it does seem that, as one often does in this kind of situation—preparing a proxy to fight on your behalf—this has been attempted. The Gulf states appear to have resisted so far, at least. They don't want to get into a direct fight with Iran. Azerbaijan looked for a moment like it might take a more direct role, but then they pulled back. The Kurds, who were armed by the CIA, also apparently got very concerned.

I'm not sure if they were ever ready to go, or if they just didn't want to bet on the losing horse. But even the allies of the US—NATO and those in East Asia—they didn't want to join in on this mission. I'm not sure how they would have done it, but there was talk of a convoy to try to open up the Strait of Hormuz. The latest thing we're seeing now, at least from what we read in the American media, is some pressure on Syria to enter Lebanon—that is, to take advantage of the chaos and assist Israel, meaning Jolani's government, to help Israel essentially get rid of Hezbollah in Lebanon. How do you see this scenario, or the likelihood of it being initiated and even succeeding?

## **#Seyed M. Marandi**

Well, first, Glenn, I want to say something, and then there are a number of things we have to unpack here. One is that, you know, people in the West, in the mainstream, they've always fallen into two types. One says, "Let's go and take them out," and the other says, "They're bad, but this is not a good idea." In my opinion, they're all the same. And the reason I say this is that—I won't name names—but one of your guests who came on a few days ago was that sort of person. He said something dishonest about Mahsa Amini. He said that she was murdered. There's no evidence of that. The footage is out, and the medical report clearly indicates that she had a condition. She was not beaten. There's no evidence of that.

And just like the tens of thousands of people who claim that Iran killed tens of thousands of people—these are all lies. Those who repeat those lies are making the case for war, and they're complicit in it. They have blood on their hands, every single one of them. And it's unforgivable. I'm glad that you invite all sorts of people; I'm just trying to make this point because I want people to know that those in the United States and the mainstream—it's like with Maduro. Those who say, "Maduro is a bad guy," they have blood on their hands. Because instead of saying, "No, we're the bad guys for bombing boats in the Caribbean, we're the bad guys for murdering a hundred people and then kidnapping the president," they say, "Yes, he's a bad guy." No—you're the bad guys.

And so these people who repeat these lies—I think usually they just want to be relevant in the mainstream, or some of these leftists, European leftists. In the Global South, they're not like that at all. But in Europe, they're very hostile toward Iran. They have this old, irrational hatred, because for some of these people, the only revolutionary movement can be their own. And so, obviously, the Islamic Revolution of Iran is "medieval and backward and evil," and the mullahs, you know, they're crazy and they suppress women and all that nonsense we've been hearing for 47 years. But for the last 18 or 19 days, ever since the beginning of the war, we've seen millions of people on the streets.

Every night, as we speak, Glenn, there are huge crowds in Tehran—huge crowds across the city. And we all saw the footage of men and women standing their ground under missiles. That's not a people who hate the regime. That's not a people who—people willing to die under airstrikes but still stand their ground. That's not a people who believe that Mahsa Amini was beaten to death, that the mullah regime is killing women all the time, or that they're slaughtering tens of thousands of people. Iranians know better what goes on in their country than these people who live in Europe and the United States and basically lie about Iran because it serves their interests.

But in any case, the point I'm making is that, for me, those who say Maduro is evil, the Cuban regime is evil—but "let's not do this"—no, they are evil, and so are their governments. And if they have intellectual honesty, they'll point the finger at their own governments and leave Cuba alone, leave Venezuela alone, leave Hezbollah alone, leave Iran alone. It's none of their business. But to get back to the question, I think what we're witnessing is a completely new situation. For the first time, the empire has failed not only at regime change—it's failed to even take a country, because we've always been told that the United States lost the war in Iraq.

It lost the war in Afghanistan. It lost the war in Vietnam. But in the case of Iran, it hasn't even been able to take the occupied parts of the country. After weeks of battle, with a huge coalition—the collective West behind it—all these regional regimes are with them: Azerbaijan, the Persian Gulf states, Turkey under Erdogan. He transports oil; AWACS jets fly over Turkish airspace to gather intelligence against Iran. And U.S. bases are involved as well. They're all working against Iran. But they failed. Why? Because the Iranian people support the Islamic Republic of Iran—today, yesterday, two weeks ago, two months ago. Today they're more mobilized, more united.

And a lot of those—the minority that was rioting, that small group on the streets that the West glorifies, exaggerates, and lies about—a lot of them have changed their positions. Because now they see that the West, which claimed to be democratic and supportive, well, basically, they were kids. They were first-year university students, second-year students, even 11th- or 12th-grade high school kids. But now they see that the West is bombing schools, bombing hospitals, and their whole worldview has been shattered. So now, I'm not saying all of them, but many of them are on the streets like everyone else. And I have my own anecdotal examples of that.

So that's why the Republic of Azerbaijan would never dare attack Iran. I mean, look at the images of people on the streets in Tabriz, in Ardabil, in Urmia, in Marand—another Azeri city. They would take over the Republic of Azerbaijan in a week. They'd overthrow the regime, the Iranians. And the same is true with these Kurdish terrorist groups, because the Iranians have warned the semi-autonomous Kurdish government in northern Iraq that if you allow these people—these terrorists—to attack us on behalf of their masters, the CIA and Mossad, because that's what these groups are, they're owned by Western and Israeli intelligence agencies, then we will destroy you.

And so will the Iraqi resistance. And then there will no longer be an autonomous Kurdish government in northern Iraq. So they stood back—they stood down. Jolani, if he tries to do anything against Lebanon, first of all, he's shown his true colors. Everyone now, unless they're utterly sectarian—ignorant sectarian people, you know, Wahhabi, Takfiri, Salafi types who close their eyes to the truth and just support these terrorists, even though they know the Americans were controlling them and the Israelis were allied with them—everyone knows who Jolani is now. He's a U.S. asset.

If he attacks Lebanon, the Iraqi resistance will move into Syria, and Iran will destroy him and his commanders with drones and missiles. We don't need the long-range drones and missiles we use to strike Israel; we can do it with shorter-range ones—different classes of missiles and drones—just like what we're doing in the Persian Gulf. So I don't think he's going to do that either. Ultimately, the United States has failed to use terrorists inside Iran. They might try something in the days or weeks ahead, but it will fail. Even if one person is killed, they'll make a big deal about it.

And, you know, the Western media will say all sorts of nonsense—Fox News and all that—but they'll fail. The same is true in all these other arenas we've been talking about. So the United States is stuck. All they can do is assassinate, and that only creates more determination. It makes the Iranian leaders angrier and more adamant that they must defeat the enemy, because these are friends,

national figures. People will seek revenge when they kill more people. I just posted about a woman who was hit by a missile nearby—she panicked, and then another missile hit her. So, you know, people see these clips in Iran.

And the rage grows. The anger grows. Today I was at the funeral—a huge crowd for Dr. Larijani and the naval officers. And I'm not a government official; I'm just at the University of Tehran, but people see me online. I'm rarely on Iranian television, yet they come up to me and say, "The leaders should protect themselves more." They say they're too courageous. You saw on Friday, on Quds Day—Jerusalem Day—the rally supporting Palestine. Dr. Larijani was on the streets, the president was on the streets, the head of the judiciary was doing an interview when the missile hit. He didn't even blink. The foreign minister was there, and so on.

And of course, the U.S. Secretary of War called them all rats hiding in their holes, but people saw the reality. They know who the real cowards are. So, you know, people were telling me they thought I had access or could tell the leaders not to come out on the streets, not to come to the funeral. They were demanding that the leaders not attend the funeral. Literally hundreds of people said this in one way or another. I was just walking through the crowds, and people were stopping me the whole time. This is a nation that's united. They can assassinate, but it's not going to help. It's only going to make things worse for them. They can bomb Iranian infrastructure, critical infrastructure.

Iran is going to hit back, and that's only going to complicate matters further. Because, as I said, if the United States meets Iran's demands, then the Strait of Hormuz can be opened, and after a period of time, the flow of oil, gas, and petrochemicals can go back to normal. But if key infrastructure in Iran is destroyed, then it's going to be destroyed in those regions where they have their bases. So the problem is going to become very long-term. That's not a solution either. Trump is stuck in a hole, and Netanyahu put him there. The Zionists put him there. The Zionists, Netanyahu, and the Epstein class have created a global crisis.

## **#Glenn**

Well, it's interesting what you said about the political left and all that. You see, I made a point earlier—not here, but elsewhere—that after the Cold War, especially, you saw these new conservatives on the right who aspired to security through hegemony or empire. They more or less engaged in this unholy alliance with the political left under the idea of a liberal hegemony: by dominating, we'll elevate the role of democracy and human rights around the world. So now all conflicts are framed as humanitarian.

And then suddenly you see the former—people who used to advocate for peace on the left—now saying, well, peace means we can't support those authoritarians. So that's why Maduro, the Russians, Iran—they're all "regimes," and they're delegitimized and can never be supported. But as you suggested, once they're denounced, they've already, indirectly, made the case for war. Even when you tell people on the left that it's about liberating women, suddenly they're on board with

war. You also see this with the Ukraine war. On the political left, the people who traditionally are the first to take up the cause of peace—they're not talking about diplomacy.

They're not talking about dialogue, mutual understanding, or peace. They're talking about how to send more weapons, how to shut down, you know, the opponent's media. And yeah, that's essentially what they're talking about. The whole concept of peace has been perverted to a large extent. I like Jeffrey Sachs for this reason. He went to speak at the UN Security Council—this was before the attack on Venezuela—and he began by saying, "I'm not here to discuss the character of the Venezuelan government. That's beside the point. We're talking about what the U.S. is planning to do." And he wanted to put that whole thing aside, because once you get into that—either you support this and we condemn you, or you also condemn and then make the case for war.

He just swept the whole thing aside. But I wanted to ask about something you said. You mentioned that if the U.S. meets the demands of Iran—and I did see the Iranian foreign minister say that Iran does not want a ceasefire, it wants a political or peace settlement. So peace is not the same as a ceasefire. And again, we've heard similar arguments coming from Russia as well: a ceasefire is a temporary pause that allows the enemy to regroup, replenish, and get back to fighting, while a peace settlement would address the underlying causes and actually find a solution. So what is the solution? What are the demands that America must meet? I mean, what is Iran's opening position, and where do you see possible compromises coming in?

## **#Seyed M. Marandi**

Well, first, I just wanted to say—because I was thinking, I was really laughing inside—whenever these people talk about Iran or Venezuela, they always start with, "Oh, do you support the war?" And first, for five minutes, they have to badmouth Iran and say, "Well, Iran is really evil. They're really bad people. They're horrible. I don't condone anything, it's disturbing—but I don't support war." And then the same with Maduro. And, you know, when I look at Iran's neighborhood and when I look at the West, I mean, it's Iran that's opposing genocide, while the West supports it. The regional countries are all U.S. proxies. But anyway, I think, first of all, this is not just going to be about Iran.

Iran has said that its allies in the region have to be included in any cessation of hostilities. Why do we oppose this ceasefire? Just as you said, we've done this before. We had a ceasefire—they regrouped and attacked us again. We were negotiating, they attacked us. We negotiated again, they attacked us again. And doing a deal with the Americans, especially under Trump, is just meaningless. Nothing he says means anything. A piece of paper that he signs is just a worthless piece of paper. So the facts on the ground have to change. First of all, it has to include Iran's allies across the region. Second, the facts on the ground have to change. What do I mean by that?

It means that the Persian Gulf must be restructured. The security of the Persian Gulf has to be organized in a way that Iran no longer feels threatened by the United States. These countries cannot

be used as platforms to attack Iran. And if the Israeli regime attacks Iran, there have to be consequences. So there has to be change on the ground. Pieces of paper are worthless. And then there's the issue of reparations—Iran will demand reparations. The security of the Persian Gulf in the future will be different from the past. These Arab family dictatorships, if they last, will have to deal with a new reality. And they will be severely weakened. They are already severely weakened.

The Emirates will never again be the Emirates it was three weeks ago. That's gone. All those billionaires—they're not coming back, which is a good thing. I mean, in a sane world, there shouldn't be any billionaires. But, you know, anyway. They won't be coming back. And the same is true for the rest of these tiny regimes in the region. So, you know, Iran is here to stay. And after almost three weeks, we've seen that the Americans are incapable of defeating Iran. Ultimately, the United States is going to have to—well, Iran is prepared for a very, very long war. And as we speak, Iran is producing more missiles. I don't know if it's producing more drones, because it doesn't even have space for drones.

## **#Glenn**

All of its underground bases are full.

## **#Seyed M. Marandi**

They are more than prepared to go on for years. This is not a war that the United States can win. We fought Saddam Hussein for eight years, and people in Iran are now prepared. Before the war, everyone was worried about what would happen. Now that there's a war, people say, "Let's do it. Let's finish it. Let's defeat them. We have to win this." Everyone understands that a ceasefire is useless. People on the streets know this because this wasn't twenty years ago—it was nine months ago—and both were unprovoked. In other words, people in Iran, just like people across the world, recognize that the United States is... I mean, unless someone watches Western mainstream media, especially Fox News and those other crazy ones—Newsmax or whatever they're called.

I just did an interview with one of them—I don't remember his name. They were crazy. But anyway, unless someone watches that sort of nonsense, everyone knows that negotiating with Trump is useless. So the facts on the ground will have to change so that Iran and its allies feel secure in the years ahead. The Israeli regime can't just bomb Lebanon whenever it wants, despite having a ceasefire. It can't just kill people—Gazans, Palestinians in Gaza—every day just because it feels like it. So the facts on the ground have to change. It has to be inclusive, and there have to be reparations. There may be other issues, and of course, they can negotiate those in different ways. But ultimately, Iran is not going to accept a situation where it can be attacked again in a few months.

## **#Glenn**

I had a thought about what you said—the obligatory condemnation of the opponent. I've been in many interviews and debates, and it almost always starts with the same question: "Do you condemn Putin? Do you condemn Iran? Do you condemn Hamas?" You know, that's the opening question. It's very clever, because if one hesitates, it's already implied—well, you know, there's this false dichotomy. Either you align yourself with the moral posturing of the interviewer, or you're with the other side. And if you fail to say yes to that opening question, you're not allowed through the gate as someone legitimate, someone they can actually listen to.

If you fail to do this, then you're morally suspect. You can't be—you're already compromised. You're now a Putinist or a total apologist, or whatever words one would use. Again, it's clever, because it forces a choice: either you're weeded out—so now we can't listen to you—or you have to buy into the premise. And if you buy into the premise, if you condemn, then you're essentially saying which side is the goodie, which is the baddie, which is legitimate, which is illegitimate. And it also implies when the conflict starts. No one would start an interview by asking me, "Do you condemn the past decades of Israeli treatment?"

"Do you condemn U.S. bombing?" This isn't how it's intended—it always goes one way, and it's manipulative, but very effective. People have a hard time getting past that starting line. Just a final question, though. I forgot who it was—there was a spokesperson, I think from the Iranian government, or maybe it was the foreign minister, I get things mixed up now—who said there's no going back to the way things were in terms of the Strait of Hormuz. How do you interpret that? I'm not sure if you heard it, but will the waterways, the accessibility, be conditioned in the future? What do you think was meant by that? Sorry, a lot of speculation.

## **#Seyed M. Marandi**

No, no, no. I think you're right. I think the foreign minister said that. I think others said it as well. I don't think it was just him, but I do vaguely recall him saying it in an interview recently. But, I mean, he's been doing a lot of interviews, and he's been doing a pretty good job. Actually, some people say to me that he does a smirk—and apparently I'm known by some for my smirk—and they say he does it better than I do, so I should be jealous. Thank you. I haven't watched many of his interviews. I've seen bits and pieces because so many things are happening and the internet connection isn't great. But I think, from what I'm hearing and from the bits and pieces that I've seen, he's been doing a really, really good job.

I think what they mean is that there will be some sort of control by Iran, and there will probably be a financial element to it. Whether that will be part of a compensation mechanism or something else, I don't know. But again, we're not going back to where we were before. These regimes in the Persian Gulf have harmed us for a very long time. When Saddam Hussein invaded Iran under

Western pressure—they encouraged him. The Soviets also helped him, but the West pushed him toward war. When he invaded, those same regimes in the Persian Gulf funded the war. They gave him hundreds of billions of dollars—maybe \$200, \$250, \$300 billion, something like that.

## **#Seyed M. Marandi**

In today's dollars, it would be much more. He was able to purchase chemical weapons from the Germans, and they helped him build a huge chemical weapons capability, slaughtering so many Iranians. I mean, one of the really hypocritical regimes is the German regime. It's never apologized, never paid compensation. Once, a number of German MPs came to Iran and visited our university. Someone asked me a question during the session, and there was this woman from the Green Party who was bad-mouthing Iran. I said, "Excuse me, I'm a chemical weapons victim. Will you apologize for what you've done to me?" She couldn't say anything. And afterwards, two or three of the other MPs came to me and said, "These people are crazy."

The Green Party. Back then, I thought the Green Party would be different, because I didn't know European politics that well. This was, like, 2009. Yeah, it was 2009 when that delegation came. Anyway, those chemical weapons—well, a lot of the funding came from those countries. They supported Saddam Hussein. We forgave them after the war and normalized relations. And then they began building bases. Those bases were used in the previous war against us—to help the Israelis defend themselves and the Americans defend the Israeli regime, with radar systems and support for their offensive actions against Iran. And, of course, the U.S. attack on Iran.

So we have many grievances. But after this war, Iran is not going to allow these regimes—these family dictatorships, if they remain in power—to behave like they did before. That's just not acceptable. It won't happen. And of course, Iran holds the cards. Ultimately, the United States will have to leave. This cannot go on forever. And when they do leave, these regimes will have to recognize that they must behave like ordinary countries, not with the arrogance they had before—just because they had gas and oil wealth, were dictatorships, and had American bases there, they thought they could behave any way they wanted. That's no longer going to be acceptable.

## **#Glenn**

I know things aren't easy over there in Tehran right now, so I really appreciate you taking the time to speak with me. Thank you, take care, and stay safe.

## **#Seyed M. Marandi**

Thank you very much, Glenn. I do what I have to do, and I'm grateful for all the great work you do.