

Seyed Marandi: Total War - Attacking Nuclear Plants, Desalination & Infrastructure

Seyed Mohammad Marandi discusses the targeting of nuclear plants, desalination plants, critical infrastructure, and the civilian population. Trump has given Iran 48 hours to open the Strait of Hormuz (capitulation), otherwise the US will destroy Iran's energy facilities. Then there will be no limits on Iran's response, and the consequences will be global. The future of global stability will be decided over the next few days. 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 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 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 again by Professor Saeed Mohammed Marandi, a professor at Tehran University and a former advisor to Iran's nuclear negotiation team. Thank you, as always, for coming on the program. We see that these are quite troubling times. Israel has attacked the nuclear power plants at Bushehr and Natanz, and Iran has retaliated against the city of Dimona, where the Israelis have their own nuclear facilities. This was not an attack on the nuclear plant itself, apparently, but... it does seem that we could be moving toward a de facto nuclear war if this new trend continues—attacking nuclear facilities with the risk of nuclear fallout.

And making matters worse, we see that Trump gave Iran an ultimatum of 48 hours to open the Strait of Hormuz—essentially to capitulate. Otherwise, they would start hitting Iran's largest energy fields. And we see that the Iranian military headquarters, if I've got this right, warned that if the U.S. carried through on these threats, they would knock out the energy facilities and desalination plants across the Gulf states, which would essentially mean the end of those states. So we're looking almost at total war here. I was wondering if you could give me your assessment of what's happening, because this seems like uncontrolled escalation at this point.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Well, thank you very much for inviting me, Glenn. It's always a pleasure to be on your show. Yes, but we have to keep in mind—and I know your audience knows this—that Western media, for some reason, pretends as if this were not the case. The war began with U.S.-Israeli aggression about eight

or nine months ago, and every attack was met with a response. In other words, the Iranians are retaliating; they're not initiating anything. So the attack last night on the Israeli regime and on buildings linked to their nuclear program was in response to their strike on an Iranian nuclear facility.

And Iran's response to the escalation has already been seen by all of us. When the Israeli regime, with U.S. coordination—there's no doubt about that—struck Iran's vital gas installation in the south, the South Pars gas field, the Iranians swiftly responded and destroyed significant parts of Qatar's gas facilities, particularly its LNG facilities, as well as Saudi and Emirati energy facilities. The reason Iran did that was to make sure the United States didn't go further. And then we saw Trump post on social media that the Israeli regime wouldn't do this again.

Of course, he then made threats against Iran, but that was basically to cover this retreat—this attack he wanted to back down from. But of course, Trump is Trump. He says one thing now, and then literally an hour later he'll say something very different. So his promises that the Israeli regime will not strike again don't mean anything to the Iranians. They will always, when it comes to the United States, plan for the worst—especially when it's Trump. You recall, before the war, we had this discussion about whether there would be a war. I always said that Iran is planning for the worst. It doesn't care what Trump says. The same is true now.

So now Trump is making another threat—that he'll destroy Iran's vital infrastructure and target its electrical power plants. He already made that threat before, and Dr. Larijani tweeted that if that happens, as you pointed out earlier, there will be massive retaliation. And nothing happened back then. After Iran's response to the attack on the South Pars gas field, it's clear what Iran is going to do if the United States actually carries out this threat. And that would mean the world would head toward a global economic catastrophe—something I've been saying for many years. Before COVID, I actually had an interview on Press TV that went viral at the time.

I said exactly what we're now seeing. If Iran's vital infrastructure is destroyed, Iran will destroy everything on the other side of the Persian Gulf, because these regimes are all engaged in warfare against Iran. They've allowed the United States to use their airspace, their bases, even land outside those bases. They not only allow jets to fly over to bomb Iran, but they also allow tankers to refuel those jets. They do everything necessary to kill Iranians. So they are fully complicit.

A strike targeting Iran's key and vital infrastructure is a strike against the Iranian nation—and, of course, a major crime against humanity. But in the West, that doesn't mean anything, because after Trump's threat last night, we didn't see any Western media say this is outrageous or that it's a threat against over 90 million people. No, because Western media collectively are Epstein-class controlled. So it doesn't matter if it's The Guardian or Breitbart—they're all the same when it comes to empire. This means that if he carries out this attack, the energy crisis will become permanent and the global economy will collapse. And that would have implications beyond my imagination.

I can think of horrible things—hundreds of millions of people on the move, starvation, the collapse of industry. I can think of many, many things. But it will be because of Trump. And if Iran is forced to destroy that key infrastructure, then it doesn't matter if there's an end to the hostilities and Iran allows the Strait of Hormuz to stay open, because there will be no oil or gas to go through it, and no tankers to carry that energy, petrochemicals, or anything else. So we are where we are. But I just want to stress that Iran didn't push us here. Iran's threats are being made so that the United States doesn't do anything stupid. I mean, this whole war is stupid. It's barbaric. It's inhumane.

And it is fully supported by the West and its regional proxies. As we saw, Erdogan, Sisi, Abdullah, Jordan, and these regimes in the Persian Gulf condemned Iran for retaliating against U.S. assets in the Persian Gulf. They didn't even mention the Israeli and American war of aggression on Iran, because they're in the American camp. The U.N. Security Council also condemned Iran and refused to even acknowledge this assault on the country. So Iran is on its own. It has to carry out its threats of retaliation; otherwise, the United States will bomb Iran and destroy asset after asset. Vital infrastructure throughout the country will be destroyed. The only way to stop it is to have deterrence—and for that deterrence to be used after credible warnings are given. And that is where we are right now.

#Glenn

I also saw that the G7 came out with a statement condemning Iran for retaliating—and, as you said, no mention of the second surprise attack, the destruction of Iran's civilian energy infrastructure, or any reference to international law. It was just condemning Iran for retaliating. And yeah, I saw you also made a comment that if the situation were reversed, it would be absurd—like if China were putting missiles in Canada, launching them at the United States, and then somehow Canada declared neutrality afterward.

I mean, it doesn't really make much sense at all. But nonetheless, Iran can't strike the U.S. mainland. And the rule appears to be that Iran isn't allowed, according to those same rules, to attack the ones who are actually attacking Iran. So it's an interesting effort to dictate the rules of this war. But as you suggest, it's not actually working. So, is this an accidental escalation that's gotten out of control? Or do you see it as deliberate on Trump's side—him essentially saying, unless Iran either capitulates, which is basically a ceasefire, or accepts our terms, we're going to keep climbing the escalation ladder?

Because the whole assumption is based on the idea that the U.S. has escalation dominance. That means the U.S. can push it to a certain level of pain where Iran would have to be the one to fold first. But how do you see this going? Because we're not at the end stop, obviously—we're rushing up quite quickly. And the nuclear power plants—I found this just extraordinary. What would happen if

Israel and the U.S. destroyed a nuclear plant, a reactor, and there was some nuclear fallout like Chernobyl? How do you see the war going then? Is this essentially the top of the escalation ladder, or how would Iran respond—do a tit for tat—if that happened?

#Seyed M. Marandi

The Iranians believe that if there is escalation, they'll be the ones in control, because there are far more assets on the other side of the Persian Gulf for Iran to destroy. The implications for the West would be far greater than what the West could do to Iran. Iran has been sanctioned for decades, and it will slowly rebuild whatever vital infrastructure is destroyed. But when the global economy collapses—and the U.S. economy collapses—I think that would be an unprecedented situation for the American people. I think that would destabilize the United States and bring Trump's presidency to an end. But in any case, that's hypothetical right now. What I think is probably going to happen is that the Iranians, as we've discussed, have no faith in international bodies.

We also saw that during the 12-day war, when Iran was condemned by the West after being attacked, the UN Security Council refused to take any action. But let's say the Israeli regime strikes the nuclear power plant in Bushehr, along the Persian Gulf. That radioactivity would contaminate the Persian Gulf, and thus it would contaminate oil and gas. So the Israeli regime itself—or the Americans—would be destroying the global economy with that single move. And as I said, if the global economy collapses, that's the end of the U.S. empire. The world will blame the United States and Zionism, first and foremost, for this catastrophe. The Israeli regime will not benefit in the long term either. It would also be devastated by the collapse of the global economy, but more importantly, by the collapse of its sponsor.

The regime that enables the Israeli regime to behave in this manner would be severely damaged. And already, across the West—and in the United States in particular—animosity toward the Israeli regime is rising. We see the resignation of Joe Kent and his subsequent interviews. We see the polling and the growing anger toward the Israeli regime. And if, of course, this war continues and energy costs keep rising, anger toward Trump, Netanyahu, and the Israeli regime will rise with it, because Americans will know who to blame. They started the war; it was unprovoked—especially since Trump campaigned on ending the forever wars. Of course, he campaigned on a lot of other things too, and he didn't carry out almost any of them. They've seen the files and so on, so I don't see a situation where the United States can have escalation dominance.

I think the Iranians have that escalation dominance. And more importantly, if we have escalation and Iran destroys the assets on the other side of the Persian Gulf, those regimes will fall. That will be the end of them. We still haven't seen the axis of resistance escalate either. We see Hezbollah fighting very effectively in southern Lebanon and hitting the Israeli regime very hard, but the resistance in Iraq is still striking at U.S. assets without really showing its hand. And of course, in Yemen they've said they're going to enter, but they haven't yet. The Iranians have much more up their sleeves than what they've shown so far.

And I think the very fact that all U.S. estimates have been wrong about the number of missiles and drones that Iran has, and so on, shows that they really have no idea what Iran can do. And at the same time, we have to take into account that the Iranian people are fully supportive of the war. Every night, huge crowds gather across the country. These people don't get tired—they go out every single night, on the streets, during the day, during Eid prayers, under airstrikes, missile strikes, under rain and snow.

They've shown how steadfast they are. This is not a country that the United States can defeat. And these are circumstances where the world's energy markets are fully dependent on energy coming from the Persian Gulf and the Caucasus. Because if the war expands, have no doubt that oil and gas assets in the Republic of Azerbaijan will be destroyed too. Have zero doubt. They will be finished, because the regime in Azerbaijan—another family dictatorship—is allied with the Israeli regime and the United States. So it is antagonistic toward the Iranian people. We'll have to add that to everything else. This is not a winnable war for the United States.

So will Trump escalate, or will he back down? I don't think anyone knows. I mean, I don't think he's predictable. I don't think even Trump knows. I don't think anyone around him knows. He can go either way, and whichever way he goes, he could still do a U-turn—but the damage will be done. So if he strikes, let's say, an Iranian electrical power plant, Iran will probably do much greater damage to the other side, because it has to make sure the message is received. Then he may back down, or maybe he won't even attack. Or maybe he'll further escalate. Who knows what he'll do? But regardless of what happens, I think things are going to get worse.

And then we have the added issue of the U.S. preparing itself to invade Iranian territory, and I think that would be equally disastrous. Because if the United States takes Iranian territory, that would be an escalation, and it would damage Iran's vital infrastructure. And then Iran would have to retaliate against those Arab dictatorships, U.S. assets there, and other assets, because those regimes are complicit in the war. So as we move forward, all I can see is escalation—unless the Trump regime declares victory and walks away, like with Yemen. But even then, Glenn Diesen, even then, a lot of damage has already been done, and each day that goes by, there will be further damage.

But even if Trump walks away, Iran is not going to accept a ceasefire. The facts on the ground will have to change. Iran will make sure that neighboring countries are no longer a threat to it. It will also seek compensation—either through the Strait of Hormuz or by using oil to directly force these regimes to pay for the damage they've done to the Iranian people and for all the deaths caused by their complicity. I have no doubt that walking away won't be a simple solution either. It's not as if the United States declares a ceasefire and Iran immediately opens the Strait of Hormuz. That's not going to happen.

#Glenn

Well, Trump going back and forth—one example would be the Strait of Hormuz—because he did indicate that, well, it's not our problem, we'll walk away. You know, it's the countries of the region that should take care of this. We're already done. And then, of course, the following day, he makes this threat of what is essentially total war: either open it for eight hours or we destroy everything. I mean, this is... yeah, as you say, it's a bit all over the place. This happens within a few hours in between. Those are completely different positions. But when he came out with that first tweet, I thought, again, it's very strange. This is how wars are declared now—by tweets. But I thought that this was an off-ramp.

That is, as you suggest, if the U.S. wants to get out of this, it can simply declare victory and go home, as it did in Yemen. But the problem, of course, is the Strait of Hormuz, because, well, as you said, this won't be opened—you know, this will take on a very different format. And so I thought, when Trump tweeted that this is not our problem, that the countries of the region should worry about it, it doesn't really work that way either. Because, as you suggest now, Iran is already setting up, it seems, selective access—or essentially nationalizing the strait—by deciding who can transit. And as you suggest, it could have different functions. For some countries, it could be a way of compelling the Gulf states to pay reparations for the damage they've done to Iran in this attack.

It can be, you know, compelling them to expel the U.S. bases so this won't happen again. Some have suggested as well that it could demand countries stop trading their oil in U.S. dollars, which would then dismantle the petrodollar system that links the U.S. military to the region. So there's a lot Iran can do, but this all requires Iran to have that selective access to the Strait of Hormuz to end this decades-long campaign against it. It doesn't seem clear to me where the U.S. will actually go from here. But one of the things they will do, it appears, is send troops to the region. We see now the 82nd Airborne apparently on the way, and we're seeing these B-52 bombers with bunker busters heading out. So it's... what is it that you expect now over the next two days?

#Seyed M. Marandi

Well, the United States has been using bunker busters regularly, and it's been bombing Iran for 22 days now. There's nothing more they can really do. As I said earlier, Iran has escalation dominance. Iran still hasn't shown its hand, nor has the axis of resistance collectively shown theirs. The United States can attempt to take territory, but Iran will destroy assets on the other side of the Persian Gulf. More importantly, Glenn, the armed forces of the resistance in Yemen, in Iraq, and of course in Iran are far greater in number and far more competent than the military forces in the U.S. camp. I mean, Qatar doesn't have a real standing army, nor does Bahrain, nor the Emirates, nor Kuwait.

And Saudi Arabia has already shown its incompetence. So what if ground forces—if the United States uses ground forces—then what about them entering Kuwait and moving into Saudi Arabia from the north, and from Yemen to the southwest, pushing toward the north and the east? Who's going to stop them? And then, simultaneously, you'll have Iranians striking all those key oil and gas installations and vital infrastructure in retaliation. How is the United States ever going to win that? It'

s an impossible scenario for the United States, and it would be a colossal defeat. What we're seeing right now is a president in the United States who has completely discredited the country because he's lied so many times, been deceptive so many times, and contradicted himself so many times.

Nothing he says means anything anymore to anyone. Not that the United States was an honest entity before Trump. I mean, we signed a nuclear deal with Obama, and he violated the deal from day one. The violations were systematic and grew more aggressive until Trump became president and ultimately tore up the deal. But Trump is in a class of his own. So even if Trump signs a piece of paper saying, "OK, we're finished, we'll walk away, the war is over," that will mean nothing to Iran. The facts on the ground will have to change before Iran moves in a different direction, because Trump has zero credibility.

#Glenn

Well, regarding what you said, we don't yet know the cards that Iran has to play. There's a lot of uncertainty. Again, this is why many countries, or many people—regardless of their feelings toward Iran—warned against this war. There are too many unknown variables. You know, it's not like previous wars where America could control all these factors. But one of them, of course, would be the missile range. We don't know much about Iran's missile range. This could be problematic if the Europeans deepen their involvement in the war. As you said, this axis of resistance—we don't know if Yemen will come online and shut down the Red Sea. We see that Iraq is now—well, the European troops are withdrawing from Iraq, which is interesting because the Iraqi parliament had previously voted for foreign troops to leave.

Well, they wouldn't leave, so it begs the question of whether they'd actually be allowed to return after this whole thing is over. You know, I'm doubtful. But also, if Iran hits the desalination plants in the Gulf states, as has been suggested, what are the consequences—especially for the desalination plants? Or if this ends up involving nuclear targets, are there any other cards? Because you mentioned Azerbaijan. To be honest, it hadn't really entered my mind yet that this could also start there. I know the relations are antagonistic, and I know they're an important energy hub for Azerbaijan, especially for the Europeans, to skirt both the Iranians and the Russians. But what other cards do you think Iran may play as we continue up this escalation ladder?

#Seyed M. Marandi

Well, the Aliyev regime in Baku is sandwiched between Iran and Russia, and he doesn't have many friends in Moscow or in Tehran. So, of course, that's not good news. In Iraq, the Iraqi resistance—if, as I'm guessing, we move toward escalation—they'll take northern Iraq and end the Kurdish local government there permanently, because it's been so closely associated with Mossad and the CIA for all these years. The Iraqi resistance can easily move into the Arabian Peninsula. Iran would be able to destroy vital infrastructure in retaliation for any escalation, given their role in this. And then there's Yemen—they can shut the Red Sea.

They can permanently end the remaining Saudi oil exports, and they can also move toward the Persian Gulf region. Iran can destroy these regimes as they advance, so you'll no longer see any of these ruling families in those countries. I think that would coincide with a global economic collapse like no other—it would be far worse than 1929. If right-wing Europeans and MAGA people in the United States are unhappy about immigration, then they should beware: the number of people moving in their direction from Africa, Latin America, and Asia will probably be twenty- or thirty-fold higher, and that will happen at a time when their own economies are collapsing.

The only reason people will be moving in that direction is because that's the traditional path they've been taking for years, due to all the wars and crimes committed across these different continents. So it looks very dark—no doubt about it. There's no way to make this look anything but catastrophic. Even if Trump is reined in, even if he's removed from power before taking the final step of targeting Iranian vital infrastructure, the damage already inflicted on the world is very significant. And it will play out even if it ended today—which it won't.

Iran will not accept a ceasefire. As I said, the facts on the ground will have to change. But even if, hypothetically—miraculously—Trump had a heart attack right now and the vice president took over and said, "OK, we're ending this," a lot of damage has already been done. Iran's demands will have to be met. The global economy will suffer. And every day that the war continues, even at the current level, the catastrophe for the global economy keeps growing. Any escalation will make it far worse. So there's no good news on any front. And since Trump is a lunatic—he's abnormal, he's unstable—as long as he's president, no one can predict tomorrow.

#Glenn

Regarding the refugee issue, I always hear the argument, you know, "Why don't Muslim countries accept Muslim refugees? Why do none of them do so? Why do they always go to Western countries?" I think it's lost on many people that the country in the world that takes the most refugees is Iran. I hear this so often—it kind of blows my mind. I think Turkey is in second place. But still, this is almost presented as an inconvenient fact. It's very strange. I don't know where these perceptions come from. But of course, if this whole region blows up, then Iran won't be in a position to host refugees from this. If anything, you might have Iranian refugees as well.

So it's very... you can see the problems piling up, and the same people who always warn against more refugees are the ones who always cause them. It's very strange. They cheered on the destruction of Libya and Syria, and then they cry out when all these refugees come into Europe. But I guess my last question is about another arena—or area—where the Americans could escalate, which is by bringing in their proxies. They've pushed very hard; we see now some reports that Saudi Arabia is considering joining more directly. But of course, they've been pressured very heavily. You've seen Lindsey Graham more or less threatening Saudi Arabia—if they don't fall in line and join in, there will be consequences for them. We saw the Kurdish proxy thing fall apart.

The Azerbaijanis didn't join. But in this latest tweet—because Trump sends a lot of them—he warned the Europeans, you know, “Why aren't you sending your soldiers and your ships?” And then, essentially, yeah, he was indirectly threatening NATO, saying, “Well, this is just a paper tiger then.” Then he comes with this next threat, which is a very direct ultimatum, where he basically writes, “Either you send your troops to fight Iran, or we will take Greenland.” This is, you know, the alliance of values. But it is interesting—how do you see this? Do you think it's likely the Europeans, for example, will join in? Or the Saudis? How do you see this playing out?

#Seyed M. Marandi

Well, before that, I should also point out the petrochemical and fertilizer crisis that's looming. That's no less significant than oil or LNG—if not more—especially if there's a global economic collapse and agriculture becomes even more important than it is now for the survival of literally billions of people. As you were explaining Trump's recent writings, I was thinking about the last days of Hitler and his ranting and raving. It's not all that dissimilar. I think basically what we're seeing is an empire collapsing. And there's really no room for maneuver for Iran; we can't show the kind of flexibility we showed in the past.

And we were very flexible. When the Israeli regime bombed our embassy, our response was not that severe. And yet the Europeans and the West condemned us—or supported the Israelis for bombing our embassy. When General Soleimani was murdered in Iraq, as he was going to meet the prime minister of Iraq with an official invitation, the Iranian response was there, but it was not equal to what the United States did—or what the Qataris did, because those drones came from Doha. And during the 12-day war, which was a victory for Iran, Iran accepted a halt in hostilities. Some thought that Iran should have continued.

I personally think Iran did the right thing, because immediately, as we discussed earlier, Iran prepared for a bigger war. They knew something larger was coming, and they wanted to adapt quickly. And that's why—well, not incidentally, but that's why, and I can say this to you—I don't think it's a problem to mention that the number of launchers Iran has lost in the last 22 days is far, far less than what it lost during the 12 days. It's been a huge achievement. That's just one change. I mean, a lot of the strikes on Iran basically hit empty buildings because Iran was prepared.

Lots of changes were made, so I think Iran did the right thing. But in any case, in all those previous instances—the murder of Martyr Ismail Haniyeh and the other atrocities carried out in Lebanon and Iran by the Israeli regime—the Iranian response has always been, I think, mild and aimed at preventing escalation. But now there's no room for maneuver anymore. The Iranians will go all the way. This is a fight for survival. We've been as flexible as possible, but now there's no more room for flexibility. So we will go toe-to-toe with the Americans.

As we go up the escalation ladder, I think there's no doubt that the Americans—the Trump regime—will continue to fail to keep up. With that collapse, I think Trump's presidency will end. I don't

believe the Americans can use the Kurds; if they try, the Kurdish terrorists, the Iranian Kurds, don't support the United States. Mossad, the Israeli regime, and the Iraqi resistance in Iran will take that area. If they could have done it already, they would have. These terrorists—or Azerbaijan—if they get pushed too hard... I mean, if you look at the rallies and demonstrations across Tabriz and in Azeri cities—Tehran is a half-Azeri city—they'll just walk right over Aliyev's regime. They'll just take it. So I don't see the U.S. really having any options. There are none that will work well for the United States.

And ultimately, Glenn Diesen, Iran is very happy with its current borders. But if the United States tries to change those borders, I'm quite confident that Iran will grow larger and take new territories. That's how the war will end. So it would be smart for the United States not to move in that direction. And while all this is happening, the United States is calling on the Europeans—you know, they've already isolated Iran—but they're threatening the Europeans, the world, and Iran over the Strait of Hormuz. Meanwhile, Europe is already losing the war in Ukraine. As the situation in our region grows more violent and dangerous, and as the price of energy rises, Russia becomes more empowered and Europe grows weaker.

#Seyed M. Marandi

So the Russians will be able to push more swiftly into the territories, probably take Odessa as well, and dictate the terms. The Europeans are not in a position to do much about the Israeli regime and Trump's demands. At the end of the day, Trump is willing to sacrifice everything—the world—for Zionism and for the Israeli regime. Now, is it because he's done bad, horrible things to little girls? Is it because of the hold that the Adelsons have over him? Is it because of a host of different issues? Is it because of his son-in-law and his daughter? Or maybe he's been convinced that, being a person with no morality near the end of his life, as he grows very old and increasingly erratic, he's been given some sort of mission. Who knows what this somewhat insane person wants to do? But Iran, as I said earlier, is preparing itself for worst-case scenarios.

#Glenn

It does appear, though, that we're in the early stages of a third world war, because this has to spread somehow if these escalations—which now seem impossible to avoid—keep unfolding. You can see the desperation setting in across Europe. Zelensky has announced that he's discussing with the Europeans the idea of confiscating Russian oil on ships—not just seizing the ships, but actually taking the oil. Because, you know, this is a useful war, which is... yeah, well, you don't have to get into that, but this is how this kind of insecurity and escalation is happening at a time when Russia itself is reconsidering everything.

That is, there's immense pressure in Moscow now after the attack on Iran, where they're saying, you know, why aren't we behaving more like Iran? We should have... The British don't think twice about launching Storm Shadow missiles into Russian cities. They would never dare do this if we took a

page out of Iran's book—that is, actually have a proper deterrent, to make countries fear attacking Russia again. So it appears that, at the same time as the Europeans plan for another round of escalation, there's a lot of pressure on Russia to say, no, this is where we have to draw the line.

And push back in a big way. I don't think Putin, no matter how popular he might be, has that much ability to push back against the pressure building up. So, you know, you can see things getting really out of hand here in Europe as well. And as you mentioned, we talk a lot about desalination plants—that is, the water, the energy fields—which, of course, energy is everything. But the fertilizers too, because the Europeans blocked fertilizers from Russia and Belarus from reaching world markets. And now, of course, with the entire Middle Eastern region shutting down, this is going to be a huge food crisis.

I mean, if you were to predict how conflicts would spread and be cautious about these unknown variables, there's really no way anymore to predict where this is going to go, because this will impact every corner of the planet—when energy is short, when food is short. Every sensitive region of the world could then descend into chaos. It's so irresponsible. And yet, when you look at the media, they still hold on to the narrative that, well, we're there to, you know, liberate Iranians. No one questions why the Epstein class, as you call them—why they're endowed with this mission to "liberate little girls." It's insane. But I don't know, where do you look to as the main concern of where this could really just, you know, spiral out of control on a global scale? I mean...

#Seyed M. Marandi

I don't think the West really recognizes—nor does Western media recognize—how discredited they are and how widespread support for Iran is across the region and across the world. In Arab countries, they're cheering Iran on as it bombs these Arab family dictatorships. As it hits U.S. bases or U.S. assets, people across the region are cheering. And around the world, people are supporting Iran. The West has lost its influence. It's only able to maintain control—mind control—over parts of its own population, mostly older people. But it's difficult. I mean, it's impossible to say, because each of these variables is very big. They have huge consequences—whether it's oil, gas, natural gas, or Russian oil—each of these elements can create its own global catastrophe.

And now we have a combination of all these factors, and we have an insane and highly unpredictable person in the White House. The only thing that, I think, can lead the world toward disaster is the arrogance of the West. And that's how, even though the fear is beginning to show, that Eurocentric, American exceptionalist mindset—very similar to Zionism—that idea that "we are above and beyond." What was it that Madeleine Albright once said? Something like, "We stand taller and look further than anyone else." That kind of arrogance prevents them from even contemplating the fact that they're on the verge of collapse, that everything is on the verge of coming to an end—everything as we knew it. But if that realization kicks in, perhaps the worst can still be prevented. I'm not a betting man, but it's not something I'd bet on if I were.

#Glenn

Well, I guess over the next few days—two, maybe three days—it looks as if much of the future of global stability will be decided. So I'm not too optimistic either. I wish we had leaders with a bit of common sense and, ideally, a spine and some moral compass before they take us down this path. But... no, yeah, unfortunately, I share your pessimism. But thank you, as always, for taking the time. And yes, stay safe.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Thank you very much. Although I should add that I am optimistic about the future. But these are very dark days, and they can become much darker. In order to end this evil empire and this ethno-supremacism, there has to be resistance. And I think ultimately it will bear fruit. Who knows if I will live to see that, or if others will. I mean, I already have a bounty on my head, as you know, on X, and they refuse to remove it. What's extraordinary about it is that there's paid—what do you call it—participation or something like that. But I'm optimistic. I think that at the end of this dark tunnel, there is light. And all evil empires—all empires—are evil, no doubt. And this evil empire, when it falls, will create hope for the future. But sadly, since empires are brutal and lash out and fail to accept their decline, it will be painful for people across the world, across our region, and across the West.