

Seyed M. Marandi: Morocco Invades Spain?

The U.S. Disciplines Its Proxies

Prof. Seyed Mohammad Marandi is a former advisor to Iran's nuclear negotiation team. Prof. Marandi discusses the 60,000 Moroccans storming into Spain and the possible encouragement from the US and Israel to reward Morocco and punish Spain. Buy merchandise: <https://diesen-shop.fourthwall.com/en-nok> Glenn Diesen clip channel: <https://www.youtube.com/@Prof.GlennDiesenClips> 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](https://www.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, everyone. Professor Saeed Mohammad Marandi joins us again, a professor from Tehran University and also a former advisor to Iran's nuclear negotiation team. So thank you for coming back on the program.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Thank you very much for inviting me, Glenn. It's a great pleasure being with you.

#Glenn

I want to start off with a bit of a different topic today, yet still related to what we usually discuss. That is, we see that somewhere between 50,000 and 60,000 Moroccans stormed across the border into Spain, or more specifically, the Ceuta Spanish territory in North Africa. And this is, well, from the video footage we see, they're arriving in trucks, and it seems very much coordinated, as it would have to be. I was wondering, how do you make sense of this? Because you see some EU diplomats as well saying that this was obviously organized by the Moroccan government, which is seen then as a way of contesting the sovereignty of this territory. So again, it does have huge political significance. It's not merely, you know, refugees, essentially.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Yes, I mean, the issues between Morocco and Spain aside, the timing, I think, is very important. The threats made by Trump, by Netanyahu, against Spain, and how Spain will pay the price for its policies, and the scenes that we've seen, which clearly show that this is something that's being done

systematically and in a very organized manner, I think it just shows that this is not something that was just natural, and it had very much to do with the fact that Spain is pursuing policies that are a bit different from the rest of Europe and the rest of the countries that are called the collective West by some friends. Of course, others would say that the Spanish government doesn't do nearly enough. But in any case, what it has done has created anger among senior pro-Israeli politicians in the West. And it's widely believed that this is a punishment for its policies.

#Glenn

Yeah. Well, I saw that earlier this year you had people like Mario Diaz-Balart, one of Marco Rubio's top allies, and also an influential member of the U.S. Congress because he has several congressional positions where he, among other things, oversees foreign assistance funding. Again, he's been very vocal on this issue, and he was making the point that this Spanish territory should not be considered a geographical territory of Spain, but the territory of Morocco. And again, this isn't his principled position or views on history or morality. He accompanied it by some strong comments that Morocco is proving itself to be a loyal ally while Spain is not. So it just seems that, given the animosity towards Spain, vis-à-vis the way of wanting to reward Morocco for its—what's a polite word? Not obedience, loyalty—does it fit within a wider context or a way for the U.S. to reward those who remain loyal, essentially making the alliance system more valuable?

#Seyed M. Marandi

Well, you know, first of all, Morocco, the regime, the king, is a very close ally of the Israeli regime. And throughout these last three years, while the world has turned against Netanyahu and Zionism and the Israeli regime, he has remained very close. And although all those countries in the region that had ties with Israelis continue to have ties, in his case, he's more like the UAE, in that the relationship has not seen any signs of strain, nor has the regime been trying to at least distance itself from military relations at a time when the Israeli military is carrying out these massacres. So this is definitely in the eyes of... I mean, I don't have... but I think it is widely believed that this is to punish the Spanish government for its policies that are much more in line with global public opinion and, I would imagine, European public opinion in criticizing the Israeli regime.

And this is to hurt Spain or the current Spanish government. I think, though, that—and again, I can't say for certain, because during the past few months, my focus has been very much on Iran because of the war—but I think the problem with this policy or this behavior of the United States, the Israeli regime, is that it further exposes the Israeli regime for what it really is. Tucker Carlson, for example, has been saying that, and he has huge influence, but also a lot of insider knowledge. He is not an ordinary journalist. Many ordinary journalists are bright, they're smart, but he has insider information. He has a lot of access that we don't have. And he says that the Israelis have been seeking the destruction of Europe. They have no love for the Europeans.

And so, this sort of behavior towards Spanish—the Spanish government because of its policies, the language that we're seeing from Netanyahu's son, from Israeli officials, from Trump, and the way in which this was carried out at this particular time, I think shows that the Israeli regime has no regard, or its supporters have no regard, for the European governments and European sovereignty. And they will do what they feel is necessary to get their way. That's how they function in West Asia. That's how they behave in Lebanon. That's how they behave in Gaza, the West Bank, towards Iran. They bomb countries. They slaughter leaders. They wipe out communities without shame. And so, pursuing such a policy against Spain shouldn't surprise anyone.

#Glenn

No, it is—yeah, and I saw the comments by Tucker Carlson as well, that this is—obviously Europe is—not just Spain, but Europe in general is also a target. Of course, he has become very critical of Israel for very good reasons over the past years. But obviously Trump has been very vocal in his desire to punish Spain. He's been talking they should be kicked out of NATO. We should, you know, put a blockade on all trade. He hasn't made, well, direct threats about stripping it of territory.

But you see this kind of—some of these ideas, you know, that loyal allies should be elevated while the disobedient ones should be punished. It seems like a wider issue now in that region, as the alliance system is obviously fractured or weakened in the Middle East due to—well, the U.S. made a target out of its allies. We also see the deal now being made with Saudi Arabia, a nuclear deal that is linked directly to Israel as well. That is, you know, they have to normalize relations with Israel. Then essentially they get to sideline all international rules and have a nuclear program with not, you know, these strict inspections and restrictions. I was wondering, how do you see this, and how does it affect?

Iran, because I saw a journalist make the question during this press briefing: why should Saudi Arabia be allowed to have this program but not the Iranians? And the answer was quite straightforward. It's, well, we will get—that is, America will get—preferential deals in, you know, commercial deals out of this before anyone else, and this is America first. Also, Saudi Arabia is an ally; Iran is not. So essentially, this should be how the world is structured. Those who bow to the empire, they will get special treatment. Those who do not, they will not even have the rights within the Non-Proliferation Treaty, such as having a civilian nuclear program. How do you see this impacting, I guess, proliferation in the wider region?

#Seyed M. Marandi

You're absolutely correct. In the case of Saudi Arabia, though, it's, I think, a combination of two things. One is this mentality that you rightly pointed out, but it's also the interests of the Israeli regime that prioritize even America First here, because Trump, ultimately, or the U.S. government, is like a magician. First, they negotiate the deal for, I presume, many months, if not years. And then at

the last moment, after everything has been agreed upon, like a magician, you know, now you see it, now you don't. You can't have this deal unless you recognize the Israeli regime. So even there, the Israeli regime's interests are prioritized over those of the United States. But that aside, U.S. policy has been like that everywhere. I mean, Greenland, Canada, the hostility that the United States has shown through its trade war with the Europeans—Trump does not see or does not view Europe with respect.

And perhaps to a degree, that is also in line with Israeli policy because, as Tucker Carlson points out, Israel hates the Europeans. And so when you look at how the Trump White House behaves towards Saudi Arabia, it's with these twin components: one, America First, but then Israel First above America First. Then I think it sort of helps one, or at least for me, it helps me better understand U.S. policy towards Spain. It has to be obedient to the United States. But first and foremost, it has to support the Israeli regime and its policies. And the United States and the Israelis are willing to go very far to harm countries. No country knows that better than Lebanon or Yemen or Iran or Syria in that regard. They're willing to go very far and to be very ruthless if you do not obey orders, the demands of this class of people.

#Glenn

It's often pointed out, especially in political economy, though, that a hegemon, which is very comfortable, where power is truly concentrated, it can be seen as a generous, and not just a generous, but a benign hegemon, because it can give some collective benefits. It can be quite generous to allies. You saw especially the U.S. towards the Europeans after World War II, its frontline states, being able to build them up effectively. However, there's always the warning that once the hegemon is declining, it will... Again, the main objective is to hold on to hegemony, and then it will have to take on a very different character. That is, it would begin to extract more from its allies. It would use them as instruments, probably against rival states which are rising, and all the rules of the past are essentially thrown out the window.

And, well, that's what we're seeing now, that the declining hegemon is getting uglier. But it's also not just rewarding good allies, but also punishing the bad ones—sorry, punishing the bad, disloyal countries. And, yeah, of course, Spain is here on top of the list. But within the Middle East, we see that—how does the U.S. deal with its Gulf states, its proxy states, which no longer follow its rules? I mean, I saw this report now of a Qatari LNG tanker going towards Pakistan being blocked by the U. S. because it used the Iranian corridor. In other words, it didn't follow its rules, making deals independently of the United States, and even loyal allies which participate in attacks on Iran are now punished. How severe do you think this is? It will probably have some effect, though, on their calculation, I assume.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Oh, yeah. I mean, you're absolutely correct. And in our region, the United States is increasingly becoming intolerant. It's been like that for a very long period of time, especially under Trump. But the case of Qatar and Pakistan is very interesting, in that Iran has said it will not allow ships to travel through the Strait of Hormuz unless it goes through the Iranian-designated corridor. That was something that was agreed upon in the MOU. The Iranians were supposed to manage the Strait of Hormuz during the period when the MOU was being implemented. And of course, the Americans then decided to violate the MOU and create their own corridor with the help of Qatari, Saudi, and Kuwaiti governments.

And that's what led to the fighting that we have again, the renewed fighting, because that was a violation of the deal. The Iranians for days warned them not to do this. They ignored Iran. And like all the other articles of the MOU, the United States continued to violate Article Five, and we are where we are now. But it's interesting that Qatar only wanted to do was get its LNG ship out of the Persian Gulf and to Pakistan, both allies of the United States. Pakistan has been working closely with the United States. The Pakistani government was involved in Egypt when Trump implemented, or declared, that ceasefire with Gaza, despite the fact that it was a one-sided deal that benefited the Israeli regime.

And Qatar, of course, has been hosting U.S. forces and assisting the United States in bombing Iran. And all they did was use the Iranian corridor. And as far as I know, the Iranians are not receiving anything, any fees from ships at the moment. Until the two months finish, the Iranians have no, from what I understand, have no plans to take fees. So all they did was use the Iranian corridor to send the ship from Qatar to Pakistan, but the Americans blocked it. And now the ship is being held by the United States. So the United States has punished both Qatar, which has been faithful—Trump's plane gift from Qatar—Pakistan, a faithful ally to Qatar, but the United States behaves in a very ruthless manner towards allies, in line with what you were saying a few minutes ago.

#Glenn

Yeah, well, several weeks ago, we saw Oman being in talks with Iran about finding some way of organizing or managing the strait together to avoid conflict. And Trump's response was, well, if they make a deal with the Iranians, we will blow them up. That is Oman. It is quite... It shouldn't be funny, but it kind of is. I mean, this is how you talk to friendly countries. And, well, it kind of shows that it is, you know, a difficult time for the U.S. because the whole world order was organized around their global primacy. And, you know, it is slipping, and they're looking for new ways of, I guess, shoring up that power. So... You know, not advocating what they're doing, but one can see the difficult position they're in.

And, well, in general, the key problem of the MOU and the Iranians even administrating the Strait of Hormuz is that, again, it would be more power or administration over the international system, which is now out of U.S. control. And I think, yeah, that's probably why they can't accept it. But now

it appears that they might be heading towards massive strikes. We see these talks about shutting off all electricity across all of Iran, and again, Trump has a big mouth. He talks a lot. But it does appear from some of the force buildups and activities that this could be the direction they're going. I was just wondering, how do you see the developments now moving forward? Again, no crystal ball, just the possibility.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Well, again, I think all of this makes sense when you look at them together. What the United States is doing to its European allies is not in the interest of the United States. Even as the United States is declining, its ruthlessness is only going to hurt the relationship in the long run. But also, this policy is at least partially, in this case mostly, influenced by the Israeli regime. So the United States is sacrificing its relationship with at least part of Europe because the Israeli regime wants this. In other words, because Spain has been pursuing bad policies, according to Trump, policies that have to do with the U.S. war against Iran and policies that have to do with the Israeli regime's behavior in West Asia.

So the United States is willing to sacrifice for the Israeli regime. Also, in the Persian Gulf, Qatar, which is a client regime and is obedient to the United States, and the United States has benefited from these countries in the Persian Gulf more than any other country by far. I mean, the wealth that comes from oil and gas, most of it goes to the United States. I mean, China is a distant second. The trade relationship with China is probably greater, but when you include the amount of money that they put into your stocks and bonds and the stock market, and the relationships and the support that they give to the West, there's just no comparison. These countries are of great benefit to the United States.

But the United States is willing to humiliate them, to harm them, like with the Saudis and the nuclear deal, or when Trump said that Mohammed bin Salman can kiss his behind in front of, I think it was at least, a large number of Saudis in the audience. All of these are harmful to the United States, but if you look at a broader picture, there's the Israeli element everywhere. Everywhere you look, there's Israel. And with Pakistan too. I mean, Pakistan is in deep trouble. The economy is not doing well. The Pakistani government is, as I said earlier, a close ally of the United States. Trump and the leadership in Pakistan are friends. But the United States behaves like this simply because the United States is hostile towards Iran.

And, of course, its hostility towards Iran is because of Israel. The Israel-first element in U.S. foreign policy is hurting the United States at a time when the United States is on the decline, and it's only making things much worse. And it prevents the United States from managing the decline. The United States could behave very differently and manage this decline in a way that it still preserves a lot of its global influence in the face of its rivals, or its chief rival, let's say China. But it chooses not to do so. But, to a very large degree, it's because of the Israeli regime across the Mediterranean and West Asia. In the case of Iran, it's the same thing. The United States prioritizes Israel.

It's willing to constantly speak about crimes against humanity. You and I were supposed to speak last night, and I proposed to leave it for this morning to see if the United States does carry out those mass airstrikes that they threatened to carry out and that Western journalists have been told about. We've been told throughout the last few months that Iran would be wiped out, that the civilization would be wiped out, that Iran would be obliterated, that Iran would be sent back to the Stone Age. And no doubt this is destroying the United States' image across the world, just like the genocide in Gaza, or the genocide in southern Lebanon and the ethnic cleansing there, or the dirty war in Syria.

All of this has to do with Israel. If you remove the Israeli element from U.S. foreign policy, the relationship between the United States and countries across this, and the populations across West Asia, North Africa, and Southern Europe, would be very different from what it was, or from what it is today. So I just think that it's clear as day that the Israeli regime is a burden to the United States. It is destructive, a very destructive element in U.S. foreign policy and in the United States being able to preserve its power. But in general, the Iranians have a policy of ignoring what Trump says.

They're not going to get back to the threats of major strikes against Iran from the very beginning. During the 40-day war, when things began to go south, the Americans, and Trump in particular, began to make these threats against Iran. At first, he thought he would win the war very easily. It was, you know, unconditional surrender. That was the demand. And then after a week, maybe two weeks, it became clear that this was not going to happen. And then gradually it became clear that actually it was Iran that was winning the war. And back then, we have to remember, the United States did not have the shortages that we're hearing about today. The shortages of interceptors and missiles, they weren't being discussed.

The United States was firing missiles and using interceptors without any fear of shortages, but they still lost the war. And that's why I think that today, when they speak about these shortages, that is significant, if this is an accurate assessment of the situation. But still, without the shortages, the United States failed against Iran. But so back then, in any case, Trump began threatening Iran. And that didn't force Iran to change its position. Obliterating Iran, wiping it off the map, sending it back to the Stone Age, erasing the civilization—he couldn't make Iran budge. And as we saw over the past few days, the threats that have been made against Iran to destroy its electrical power grid, to destroy its bridges repeatedly.

These threats have been made. And then last night, we've been told that they're very close to carrying out this operation. And of course, it's the weekend, so we were waiting to see what he'd do. But it didn't shift the Iranian position. And that is because the Iranians are determined, no matter what happens, come what may, that whether the United States starts bombing Iran's critical infrastructure—you know, there was talk of destroying Tehran's electrical power plants—that means leaving a city of, what, 14, 15 million people, depending on the time of day, without electricity, hospitals without electricity. That would mean many infants would die, children would die. That would create enormous hardship for ordinary Iranians.

The same Iranians that, by the way, the Americans pretended that they wanted to save from the evil regime. But ultimately, we saw that, A, the Iranians did not shift their policy, and they remained committed to their position. That means that if the United States had carried out the strikes last night against Iran, Iran would have continued to fight. What it would have done would be to strike back at Iraq, Kuwait, the Emirates, the Israeli regime, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Qatar, and so on, for the role that they've played in this, and perhaps Oman too, and perhaps Jordan, for the role that they played in this destructive war.

And that would, of course, lead to a global economic depression because the shortages that have now accumulated in the global market, especially with regards to oil, have reached very close to a tipping point. But if people suddenly, in the morning, see images of fires raging across the region, and electrical power plants destroyed, and desalination plants destroyed, and oil and gas facilities destroyed, that would cause immediate panic on the markets, and no amount of manipulation would work anymore when the markets would collapse. And I think that a global economic depression would be inevitable, and it would come and strike very swiftly.

But in addition to that, we also have the image of the United States that I was speaking about earlier being further destroyed across the world because of the Israeli regime. So to strike Iranian critical infrastructure or to threaten to strike Iranian critical infrastructure is something that has been normalized. People are hearing about it every day. That's not helping the United States. That's destroying the United States. Whether one believed in the U.S., whether the U.S. hegemony was benign or not, the image of the United States under Obama, under Clinton, even under Bush, or Reagan, was very different from what it is today.

Back then, especially under Obama and Clinton, the United States was, by many, seen as a benign power. I didn't see it that way at all. I don't see any fundamental difference between Obama and Trump, but that's a different issue. But back then, if you look at global public opinion and how the United States was viewed across the world, it was very different from what it is today. And that soft power was of immense importance to the United States, even when confronting Iran. Glenn, one of the achievements of the United States against Iran was being able to convince younger people—or not all younger people, but a significant proportion of younger people—that the United States was not the problem.

The problem was Iran. And that soft power reached its height with Obama. I mean, Bush came in and wrecked the U.S. image, not unlike Trump, but wrecked the U.S. image, and then Obama came to power, and the U.S. image was restored. And many, many young people, students of mine, acquaintances of mine, were impacted and believed that the United States was a benign hegemon. Trump has destroyed that. That has been utterly wrecked, and I don't see it among Iranians, of course, but across the world. And that, by destroying that soft power—and of course Gaza, you have to include Gaza and all these other issues alongside this—the destruction of this soft power has enormous consequences for the United States.

So again, all of this goes back to Israel and the Israeli regime, that the Israeli regime, regardless of what you think of the United States, it has been nothing but a burden to the empire, and it has done nothing but damage to the United States. It is not an asset, whatever they may say. It has wrecked the United States financially. From an economic perspective and from a soft power perspective, it has utterly demolished the United States. I see that in Iran. And I think that when you look at polls that are taken by American institutes across the world, it's clear as day that this is the case.

#Glenn

The soft power issue, I think, is becoming evident already. And what do you say about the Iranian youth? I heard similar comments from Russia, that often, well, many youth or even liberals often assume that, well, if just one of the problems of the ongoing tensions with the U.S. was Russia, if they would change some of their ways, then a lot of the conflicts will go away. I don't think anyone believes this anymore today, that it's not the internal character of the state. It is the hegemonic ambitions of the United States that put very strong limitations on its ability to have a relationship with states that don't bow to everything.

I know at least in Russia, it's popular to make the point that America doesn't have allies; it has vassals. And, you know, it's making that point itself now, though, I feel, especially in the Middle East, but not only. And on the soft power issue, you see, what the U.S. can do to leaders is one thing. That is, you know, you see Trump, he can threaten Spain in front of people like Mark Rutte or Friedrich Merz, and they say nothing. So they will prioritize, you know, appeasing the United States. But this kind of, as you said, the whole point of soft power is, yes, you can have an obedient political class, but below, besides this, you see something very different.

You see these politicians collapsing in the polls. You see a population growing very skeptical of the United States. So again, it's not sustainable. I mean, for God's sake, the U.S. can even threaten to take Greenland, and they will still show up to, you know, bow to Trump. It's quite, it's quite incredible to see your own leaders not just ignore national interest, but all signs of dignity. But, yeah, what I wanted to ask, though, is, you know, when you have front lines—sorry to interrupt, Glenn, sorry to interrupt—but it's like if you're with the empire.

#Seyed M. Marandi

You are going to go down with the ship. So the Europeans, of course, it's not just Trump. It was also Biden. The policies that they pursued against Iran, the policies that they pursued against Russia, the policies that they pursued against China, they've all served to weaken Europe during the past few years. And the decline of Europe is even faster than that of the United States. But also look at our own region. The United States has sacrificed all these countries that it has been, as Trump would say, milking for all these years. Why? Because of their obedience. In other words, their obedience to the United States has served to weaken them and destroy them, as we're seeing in this war. And then in East Asia as well, the United States uses Japan, it uses Korea, it uses other countries as tools

against China. Yet, for example, in the case of Korea, they forced the Koreans to purchase THAAD missiles.

And it was a very problematic policy, controversial policy, that was pursued by the Korean government. And then once they were installed, the United States took it away and gave it to the Israelis. So the Koreans paid the political price and the financial price, I assume, and obeyed U.S. policy, but they were harmed anyway. So the United States shows by being a U.S. ally, you're not helped, you're harmed. And then the United States imposes laws with regards to the production of chips and also policies with regards to industry that show no regard for allies like Korea or for Europeans. So it seems that if you stick with the empire, you're the loser. You get hurt. You suffer as a result. You're not benefiting from being subordinate to Trump or the Trump regime or the United States.

#Glenn

Well, this is, yes, a problem with declining hegemony, though. It has a strong impulse to use the frontline states as instruments to take out its rivals, again, essentially push them into war. But it seems like the frontline states then have two possibilities and competing impulses of their own. That is, one, they can go closer to the U.S. for protection from the conflicts they've been pushed into. And you see the U.S. was the main instigator of the Ukraine war, yet the Europeans now lean completely into the U.S. for protection. You see some of this same logic among some of the Gulf states. The alternative is then to distance a bit from the United States as the source of the conflict. But then, again, these are mutually exclusive.

And I was wondering, how do you see this now in West Asia? Because you probably saw this open letter being signed by hundreds of Jordanian politicians and public figures. It was making the point that they should distance themselves, or at least ask the U.S. troops to leave the country, because it was bringing havoc to the country. And again, Jordan has—the demographics suggest that a revolution would be possible, that not everyone is happy with the government policies. And vis-à-vis what's happening in Kuwait, where they're just looking the other way and they could essentially be destroyed as a consequence, absorbed into Iraq. So I was wondering, how do you see this, especially with Jordan? Because it often doesn't pop up in the news as often as the Gulf states, I mean.

#Seyed M. Marandi

It is going to be—I think we're reaching a breaking point, and it's unclear when this is going to happen. But as time goes by, all of these governments that are loyal to the United States, allies of the United States, across our region and North Africa, things are going to become increasingly difficult for many of them to continue with these policies. They are authoritarian. They are police states. And they have support from Western intelligence agencies to preserve power. But when we go back to the so-called Arab Spring, or the awakening, that happened after an incident in Tunisia,

which led to the uproar across the region, I think back then, I think it was clear how fragile many of these regimes were.

And of course, the oil- and gas-rich countries in the Persian Gulf, they tried to manage this wave of popular discontent by destroying Libya and then destroying Syria and turning attention away from their own authoritarian regimes. And of course, this was in line with the interests of the empire in the long run. But I think the situation today is far more fragile than it was back then. And while the United States and Western journalists and Western diplomats like to think that all is well in these countries, the amount of discontent is enormous. You can sort of tell, and this is not scientific, but you can tell from the comment sections in mainstream Arabic media owned by these dictatorships. Qatar has a huge media empire. Saudis have a huge media empire. The Emiratis have a huge media empire.

They may be different from one another, but they all are aligned with the United States. They're all aligned with broader Western interests. But when you look at popular opinion in the Arab world, they are siding with the resistance. They side with the Iranians. They cheer the Iranians when the Iranians fire missiles at U.S. assets in these countries. So obviously, the sectarianism that these countries promote, the racism that these countries' media outlets, these empires—not just like Al Jazeera or Al Arabiya or Sky News Arabic or anything like that—they have literally thousands of different types of media outlets to use, and cultural centers or so-called religious centers that they use to build their narrative. But you still see that people are cheering for the resistance for the most part. And that is, I think, a huge sign of discontent. And that's going to be a major problem.

For people in Jordan to make such statements under such a government shows how unhappy they are. And often things seem very normal on the surface, yet many, many things are happening underneath the surface. And again, when the so-called Arab Spring happened, no one predicted it, or very few people predicted it. But it was a time when things were moving forward apparently very normally, and then within a very short period of time, you had chaos from the Arabian Peninsula to West Asia to North Africa, and the Israelis were terrified. And they did manage it ultimately, the West, but they only made the situation in the region worse. In other words, they kicked the can down the road by wrecking much of West Asia and North Africa, but they did not solve the problem for the empire.

And I think today things are far more dangerous for the United States and the Israeli regime, far more dangerous than they were back then, especially because they are now increasingly on the decline, and therefore their ability to maintain hegemony is much more limited than before, as we saw in this war. The war with Iran, I think, was clear, or is clear, in that it shows for the first time the United States has been seen as incapable. I mean, we know that the United States failed in Iraq and in Afghanistan, largely, by the way, due to General Soleimani and the policies of Iran, which supported the resistance in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Despite the huge differences with the Taliban, the Iranians helped the Taliban expel the United States. And even some—the Persian speakers or the Shias, the Hazaras, the Uzbeks, and others—some of them became very angry with Iran. But Iran believes that the priority is to defeat the empire, just as its policy in Syria was to defeat the empire. Back in Syria, some of these people became very sectarian and believed that Iran was pursuing a policy, a sectarian policy, but it wasn't. They were supporting the United States and using a sectarian policy in their support of the U.S. policy. But in Syria and in Afghanistan, Iran was pushing back against the empire.

So the United States' failure in Afghanistan and Iraq, it was clear, and of course Iran played its role. But this defeat is very different from the defeat that the United States experienced there. Here, the United States never got anywhere near Tehran. The United States was never able to overthrow the government or take huge amounts of territory and then ultimately failed because of the costs or because of the difficulties that it faced. The United States was defeated as a power on the battlefield, as we would read in wars of the past, where two countries would fight against one another and the aggressor failed. This is another example, but in this case it's the superpower, it's the hyperpower, it's the country that everyone feared across the world.

So I think that this weakens the United States enormously. It makes, therefore, those regimes that the United States supports and backs much more vulnerable, not only because of the damage that has been done, but because these regimes lose confidence in the United States. And it's the United States that keeps them in power. So when you see people in Jordan unhappy with policy, I think that's a very bad sign for the government because the government has been weakened. People are angered by seeing the government supporting Israel. And on the other hand, the government looks and sees that the United States, the hegemon, is not the power that it thought it was.

#Glenn

Well, on the topic of Jordan, though, we saw one of the reasons why Trump was all angry again and wanted to bomb all of Iran, take out its electricity, was because of the attack Iran did on the bases in Jordan. Now, for Trump, he framed it as, you know, we were negotiating with the Iranians and they were not honest. They attacked us out of nowhere. I didn't know the negotiations were, you know, ongoing or serious at all. But it appears that, you know, the source of the anger was that Trump had decided, okay, now we're going to stop the bombing, so Iran also has to do it. The idea that Iran can only retaliate proportionally to what the U.S. is doing. I guess, well, if I was Iranian, I would be worried about being too predictable in this way, because then you cede all of the escalation control to the Americans. I was also wondering how you interpret that event because, uh, it's, uh, well, or, you know, we can take Trump's word on it, but, uh, how do you see this?

#Seyed M. Marandi

Well, in the West, they say this is a surprise attack. And Trump was saying this surprise attack, not that it was carried out in secret, but meaning that it was, like, something unexpected, something that shouldn't have happened. It was not normal for this to take place. But that's not a meaningful assessment. The United States waged war against Iran, and we are at war. The United States had restarted the war after violating all of its commitments in MOUs, attacked Iran for 30 days, and then suddenly stopped for three days. The United States doesn't dictate when there's a ceasefire and when war starts. There is no ceasefire between Iran and the United States.

And of course, as we speak, the United States has imposed a siege on Iranian ports and on the Strait of Hormuz. So that's an act of war, and it's an act of war directed at ordinary Iranians. So the Iranians have been very clear that when they struck the U.S. assets in Jordan, that it is their right and that they will continue to do so whenever required. It came at a time when the Israeli regime and Netanyahu and Trump were to talk and to take decisions, with regards to what the Iranians were sending a message to the United States and the Israeli regime that we are confident in our position. We will attack whenever we think it's appropriate.

We're not intimidated by any means, and that we will take the initiative whenever we think necessary. And also, the United States had gathered troops in Jordan. They had gathered assets there, which Iran saw as a threat. And so Iran struck them to deter that threat against Iran. So again, that's sending a message to the United States that you cannot just gather your troops and your equipment and threaten Iran, and Iran will just sit back and wait until you strike first. No, Iran will not wait because we are at war, because the war has already started, because there's no ceasefire, because you're waging war against us, so we will carry out this attack.

But I think what this does more than anything else, it just shows how confident Iran is about its position. Iran is not going to just wait until the Americans strike and then strike back. Iran does this for moral reasons and religious reasons. Iran cannot start wars, and so it hasn't started wars. But in this case, the war is already—there is war. We are at war. This is not a ceasefire. But Iran, by not waiting for the United States to initiate a new phase of the military conflict and striking first, I think it's showing a large amount of self-confidence. And we saw that in the last 24 hours.

Many people were expecting the United States to carry out a serious strike on Iran last night and to take out our electricity. And if they had done so, maybe you and I wouldn't have been able to have this conversation right now. But it didn't change the Iranian position. The Iranians said, "If you strike, we will strike back." So it shows Iran's confidence. And the strikes on Jordan, again, show Iran's confidence. And militarily speaking, it weakened the United States. The two strikes on Jordan were very effective, and they took out key assets of the United States, which would have been needed for an air operation against Iran. Okay.

#Glenn

Now, I often make the point that this illusion of escalation control, something the political West had throughout the hegemonic era, is possibly the greatest danger there is now in terms of miscalculations that will spark wider wars, be it against Iran or with Russia. Anyways, I want to thank you for taking the time on the weekend.

#Seyed M. Marandi

And just one final point. I know I'll keep this very short, but just one final point. And another miscalculation was with regard to Yemen. Striking the Yemeni airport has led to Yemen striking back at Saudi Arabia. And then Yemen has said that, okay, we are not going to accept the siege on our women and children anymore. And so they've imposed a counter-siege on Saudi Arabia. Now, Saudi Arabia can create a coalition of countries, which, of course, would be an immoral coalition because it's the Saudis that have carried out genocide against Yemen, the Saudis who have imposed a siege for many years against the women and children of Yemen.

And this coalition is assisting the Saudis in continuing this barbaric policy. But it's going to fail, and the Saudis are harming themselves at a time when the Persian Gulf is closed. They cannot leave the Persian Gulf because of the Strait of Hormuz and the conflict between Iran and the United States. They need the Red Sea. So they provoked Yemen, many say with encouragement from the United States. And that has backfired. And then, even though it was Yemen that took credit for bombing Saudi oil installations, the Saudis, because they didn't want to strike back at Yemen, because they were afraid that the Yemeni armed forces would again strike more oil and gas targets, they went and bombed Iraq.

They retaliated against the Iraqi people and killed a large number of people. And that has created outrage across Iraq. And now the Iraqis are saying they're going to retaliate. So this is, you know, the miscalculation, whether on the battlefield with Iran or with regard to the people of Iraq or the people of Yemen. I mean, the miscalculations that the empire and its proxies are—I think—acting as catalysts that will bring down the empire and will ultimately bring down those proxies. And we're seeing it at multiple levels and across the region.

#Glenn

I think the assumption was always, in the hegemonic era at least, that is, how many of the states bombed was, well, that these were essentially bloody-nose attacks. That is, we'll bomb you a little bit, but if you try to push back or defend yourself, then we'll be really angry. So this, you know, schoolyard bully approach, where, you know, just sit there while I punch you a little bit, and then it won't get any worse. And you see Trump always leaning into this: "Oh, now I'm really angry. If they dare to do this or that, then I'm really going to destroy them."

But as long as one doesn't shy away from pushing back, it doesn't work anymore, it seems. And I think, you know, I think ultimately it could be good for the United States as well, as a lesson to learn

that, you know, it has to adjust to the new reality, the new distribution of power. Same with Europeans, pretending you're living in the unipolar moment when you're already in the multipolar world. It's incredibly destructive. So, you know, hopefully there will be a steep learning curve and it will all come out better at the other end. But as I said before, thank you for taking time out of your weekend. So thanks again.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Thank you very much for having me. It's a great pleasure, Pat.