

Israel ATTACKS Iran? War Now IMMINENT as Trump FOLDS | Seyed M. Marandi

Seyed Mohammad Marandi discusses the mounting reports of an imminent Israeli attack on Iran despite Trump signaling toward a major retreat in the war. What comes next is shocking and will change the Middle East forever.

#Danny

Welcome back to the show, everyone. As you can see, I am joined by Saeed Mohammed Morandi, joining once again to break down the latest developments. So first, we have Israel attacking Iran. Well, that is what Israel is telling CENTCOM. They informed CENTCOM, the Israeli military did, Commander Admiral Bradley Cooper of CENTCOM, that Israel does not need approval nor support from the U.S. to wage war against Iran, adding, "We are currently making preparations to start the war." Israel is preparing for a unilateral strike on Iran as it concludes that the U.S. is no longer willing to finish the war on its own terms. This is according to Channel 13 in Israel.

Israel—well, on that last point, they may have somewhat of a point. Donald Trump has quietly admitted defeat, according to The Wall Street Journal, signaling he's willing to end the war on Iran without a nuclear deal if the Strait of Hormuz simply opens—a humiliating retreat from his demand for unconditional surrender. At least this is per U.S. officials in The Wall Street Journal. Now, this is being complicated by Iran's conditions, which I know, Professor Marandi, you have talked about, which have been released by Iran's Supreme National Security Council, outlining new conditions for the reopening of the Strait.

It not only includes a permanent end to the war, the lifting of the U.S. naval blockade and the withdrawal of U.S. forces from the region, lifting of sanctions, the frozen assets given back, war reparations, but also an end to the U.S.'s threats of military action and all conflicts, including Palestine, Lebanon, and Yemen. So, Professor Morandi, given these developments, what do you make of this report of Israel attacking alone? We've heard this before. How seriously are Iranians and Iran taking this?

#Seyed M. Marandi

First, I should point out that these are not new conditions by Iran. These are within the framework of the MOU. But in the MOU, Palestine, Yemen, and Iraq aren't named, but it says all fronts. So now Iran is becoming more specific, and Iran has, at the negotiating table, brought up Gaza and Palestine. And the Iranians and Dr. Ghalibaf, who is the chief negotiator, did tell different Palestinian delegations that Gaza and Palestine are a part of the Iranian demands. But with regards to the

United States refraining from threatening Iran, that's actually explicitly said in the MOU. The statement yesterday that came out of the Supreme National Security Council basically means that the MOU has to be fulfilled in full.

In other words, the Iranians are not going to allow the Americans to interpret it in their own way, in a way in which Trump would like. So they spelled out what, you know, they said what the region means. The region means Palestine. And it didn't even say Gaza. It says Palestine. It says Yemen. So if the United States wants normalization, that's the only way forward. They have to stop exterminating Palestinian children. And they have to stop the siege and slaughter of the people of Yemen, which has been going on for well over a decade now. And the Saudi regime, they've carried out a genocide in Yemen, not dissimilar to what the Israeli regime did in Gaza, with the support of Trump and the United States, both before and after Trump's first term in office. So that's no longer acceptable.

They can no longer starve women and children in Yemen, regardless of what the Saudis may want, or Iran, or the Israelis and the United States, who are all clear allies. The Iranians are saying that the starvation siege in Yemen has to come to an end, and, of course, the same in Iraq. The U.S. and the Saudis have no right to bomb the Iraqi people whenever they like. So they've made that very clear, that this will no longer be tolerated. And this has to be sorted out in any potential deal with regards to the Israeli regime. The Israelis have no ability to wage war against Iran and come out with any success. They'll fail. They'll swiftly fail. The Iranians are prepared to destroy the regime with their missile capabilities.

They'll overwhelm them, and their missile capabilities are enormous. And the Iranians have destroyed the radar defenses that the Americans have created across the region to help Israel, in the Persian Gulf, in western Saudi Arabia and Jordan, in northern Iraq, which will make it a lot easier for Iranian drones to strike their targets. But the Israeli regime will need the United States for any war because the Americans would have to refuel their jets, just like they did during this war and just like they did during the 12-day war. So if the regime attacks Iran, the United States will have to be involved. And if it is involved, that means they're waging war against Iran, and they will receive a military response. But if the Americans don't get involved, then the Iranian firepower will overwhelm the regime very swiftly.

Even with U.S. support, the same will happen, but it'll be much worse without the Americans. So I don't think that's the real issue. The real issue is the fact that the United States continues to pose a threat to Iran, and it has not removed any of its forces. And these American soldiers are in the region despite the extraordinary heat of the Arabian Peninsula and the Indian Ocean and the Gulf of Oman. They've been stuck here for six months at least now. There is a belief that the United States could carry out attacks in the days ahead. And so if anyone thinks that the war is over, they're naive. There's a possibility, despite the shortages that exist, despite the fact that the munitions of the U.S. military are very low in some key areas. But we have to remember that the Israeli regime and the Zionist lobby, they still are extremely powerful in the United States.

And they can push Trump towards war. I mean, it's not difficult to imagine them pushing Trump towards war. Again, they are the ones who pushed him in the first place. We all recall how Joe Kent, in his resignation letter, said that Iran was not a threat to the United States. Iran was not developing a nuclear weapon. This is about the Israeli lobby and the Zionist lobby and the Israeli regime. Well, the Zionist lobby and the Israeli regime haven't gone anywhere. So the threat of war continues to exist, and the Iranians are preparing themselves. In fact, I think that there's going to be a change in the Supreme National Security Council shortly. Iran is prepared for war. Doesn't mean it will happen, but Iran is prepared for it.

#Danny

Well, I was going to ask you, Professor Rani, as you were talking about the U.S. striking in the coming days, I was going to ask you whether you believe that these reports about Israel pushing the United States once again, or claiming that they are going to unilaterally strike—I find that a very interesting word to use, given that it literally outs the fact that Israel and the U.S. are coordinating on the war against Iran.

But at the same time, I'm wondering how much you think that this is either plausible deniability, meaning that the United States will strike in the coming days using Israel as a cover, or is it the fact that, yeah, Israel actually is seeing that the United States wants to get out of this and the terms are highly insufficient. Iran just said they're not even talking to the U.S. right now, so the terms are obviously highly insufficient to Iran. So it's quite the quandary for the U.S., but I wonder how much you see this as Israel pushing the U.S. back into strikes or the U.S. just using this as plausible deniability to then rip whatever it has left in Asia and elsewhere to keep going with the war.

#Seyed M. Marandi

It's difficult to say. I don't have an answer to that question. We all recall when Rubio, at the beginning of the war, basically said, "We fought for the Israeli regime. The regime wanted to launch a war, so we got involved in the war." So that could easily happen again. The United States is very obedient to the Israeli regime and the Zionist lobby. And Trump has been the most obedient of all U. S. presidents. So it's hard to say. What I do think, though, is important to remember is the Iranian threat that if the United States launches attacks on Iran's infrastructure, Iran will wipe out the infrastructure of the countries that are complicit in this war. And, of course, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the Emirates, Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, the Emirates—or Iran, Kuwait. I think I said them all. I'm not sure. And perhaps even Oman.

They're all, and of course the Israeli regime, they're all complicit in this war. So they're all a part of this war. They're all partners in crime. Sometimes I see these trolls and bots online saying that Iran is striking the Arab countries. This is where the United States is waging its war from. And they are funding—you know, I may have told you this before—the Arab regimes in the Persian Gulf, they are

funding the war. They pay the United States for those bases. It's, you know, you would think it's the other way around, that, like, the United States goes and takes this piece of land, and then they pay rent and they use that base. No, these countries, they pay for all the costs. So they are paying for a big chunk of the war expenditure, whether it's the Emirates or the Qataris or the Saudis or the Bahrainis or the Kuwaitis.

And in the case of Jordan, it's probably just handed over free to the United States because Jordan is extremely obedient to the Americans. So they are all part of this war. They will suffer the consequences. But it's not only going to be their problem. If their infrastructure is destroyed, that means their countries will collapse. And that includes Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia won't survive. I don't think it'll survive. And when that happens, I think it's pretty clear that the global markets will crash. Because when people wake up and see these sites burning in the news, that will bring a panic to the markets. There's no way that anyone is going to be able to talk up the markets or manipulate the markets then.

So even if the Strait of Hormuz is open, then that doesn't make a difference anymore because there'll be nothing left to export or import. So we have to always keep this in mind, that the Iranians have—I mean, this is their deterrence. Iranians did not start the war. They did not escalate, but they're the victims. But this is deterrence. If Trump actually does go and try to exterminate the Iranian people and to wipe out the civilization and to destroy the infrastructure so that the state would collapse, then have no doubt that Iran will destroy those regimes that assisted the United States. The only difference is that Iran will not collapse, but those regimes definitely will.

And that will bring down the global economy, and then many, many governments will come down, including many U.S. allies beyond these countries. So it's not—you know, this is a very, very serious situation. But again, we don't know if the United States is going to do this or not, but they have not removed anything from the region. All of their assets are in place. And of course, Iran is building up its defenses. It's building new missiles, new drones. It's expanding its underground cities, missile cities, drone cities. It's preparing for a potential land offensive. They are preparing, but that doesn't mean the United States won't carry out another war of aggression.

#Danny

The fact that you stated earlier, that the Gulf states are paying for the U.S. to essentially militarily occupy their countries and use them as basing stations for war, is an astounding one. And people should understand this from the standpoint of sovereignty, that these states don't have sovereignty. This was back in 2020 during the first Donald Trump administration. Right toward the end, CNN reported that Saudi Arabia had paid a half a billion dollars in one sitting toward the cost of shouldering and having U.S. troops in their country, back when there was an increase in U.S. troops stationed there, about 2,000 more. So, I mean, just that alone.

And Donald Trump at that time also was boasting that Saudi Arabia literally put a billion dollars into the U.S. Treasury directly in order to, you know, make good on these huge agreements that he had with the Gulf states, which were simply, you know, mafia-like agreements between these states. But, Professor Morandi, despite this, you know, Israel—what gives Israel the confidence to make these statements to the media about attacking Iran unilaterally, given that Iran has already gone through what seems to be a very strategic campaign to decimate the layer of defenses that were protecting Israel at one time, particularly the most important one, which was Jordan and the air defenses that were there? Those are essentially gone and are not likely to come back in any significant way anytime soon. So what gives Israel the confidence to make these threats, do you think?

#Seyed M. Marandi

I don't know how confident they really are. I'm pretty sure that Netanyahu knows what this will lead to. But he is a desperate person. He wants to remain in power. I think the elections in the Israeli regime are maybe a week before the elections in the United States. So we have about two and a half months left till their elections. And he wants to—look, he'll do anything to remain in power. These could be threats just to increase confidence among the population, which clearly believes that they lost the war.

We know from polls that I think roughly 90% of the Israeli population believes that they lost the war against Iran. So perhaps he wants to strengthen morale, boost morale perhaps. This is an attempt to intimidate so that the regime and the United States could gain concessions. I don't know. I mean, I have no idea, but perhaps it's also being said to push the United States towards attacking Iran. Again, going back to what the U.S. Secretary of State said at the beginning of the war, that the Israelis were going to attack, so we decided to attack too. I think that's more or less what he said.

#Danny

Yeah, well, here's the poll that you're referring to. 90.2% of Israelis believe Iran emerged as the winner after this war. And this was back during the original signing of the memorandum of understanding back in June. So, yeah, not a lot of morale on the Israeli side, at least on the settler side of things around this war. Well, speaking of Saudi Arabia, Professor Morandi, what do you make of the latest round of strikes in this counter-siege by Yemen?

There are incredible reports right now of Yemen not only hitting Aramco again in Jizan, their oil refinery, but also now hitting gas, the Saudi Aramco buried gas plant in Al-Jubeil, Saudi Arabia. So, major escalations there, and no sign that Saudi Arabia is tapping out just yet. So what do you make of this, especially in light of this so-called Mecca NATO, whatever the hell it's supposed to be, agreement between the three countries—states, you call them backstabbing states—Saudi Arabia, well, Pakistan, a little more complex, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Pakistan? What do you make of all this?

#Sayed M. Marandi

We know that the Saudis consider Yemen to be their backyard, which is, of course, not something that Yemen accepts. Yemen is an ancient civilization. It is a civilizational state. It's been around far, far before Saudi Arabia ever existed, many times over, many, many times over. So the Saudis have tried to starve Yemen since 2015 and slaughter them into obedience. What they did to Yemen in 2015, with the green light of Obama—not Trump—what they did to Yemen was not dissimilar to what the Israeli regime did to Gaza. And this was one of the great crimes of our time. And the only difference was that the genocidal attacks were carried out in silence. There wasn't much news. They were bombing schools. They were bombing school buses. They were bombing funerals.

I think in one funeral, they killed, like, hundreds of people. They starved the population. American ships and other ships in the Red Sea, they would block boats from taking food or medicine into Yemen. I recall one former U.S. official, or someone affiliated to the—I think he was military—saying that he was on a ship in the Red Sea and they stopped the boat, and it was full of medicine, and the American Navy dumped it into the sea—the medicine—which was destined for Yemen. But that's what they were trying to do. It was, you know, another Gaza. But the only difference was that Yemen, being larger and much more capable, it had the armed forces of Yemen, and Ansar Allah were able to fight back and resist. And the Saudis had the same support that they have now. The collective West was supporting them.

We all recall what they were doing. And then the region was supporting them. All of these countries, all of the countries in the region, of course, except for Iran, they were supporting Saudi Arabia and the Emirates in carrying out this genocidal war. Of course, a couple of years later, after Saudi Arabia and the Emirates imposed a siege on Qatar, Doha distanced itself, and so did Erdogan, because he and the Qatari regime are bound to one another. So then later they distanced themselves. In fact, I remember I was on Al Jazeera a couple of times at the beginning of the genocidal war in Yemen, on a show called Inside Story, twice. And then after that, I was no longer invited on Al Jazeera for a very, very long time. Sort of like in Syria. In Syria, it was the same. They stopped inviting me.

They banned me for a while. And then after Yemen, it was the same. So everyone was on board with this murderous assault. Well, back then, Yemen was weaker than now, and Saudi Arabia was stronger. And Saudi Arabia was wealthier. And Saudi Arabia wasn't facing the circumstances that it is facing today. So if any country assists Saudi Arabia in this war, it's not going to make it any better than it was back then. And back then, ultimately, the Saudi regime failed. When Yemen began to develop its own missile industry and its drone industry, they had smart young engineers, very smart and dedicated people. Of course, Iran helped, but the Yemenis, they made it an indigenous industry and they built their own underground bases.

As we saw when the Americans launched their war against Yemen because Yemen was supporting the people of Gaza, and the Americans failed. So these young men, and perhaps women, I don't

know, they began firing at Saudi oil assets, and Saudi Arabia was forced to end the war and accept a ceasefire. But ever since then, they've continued to impose a siege on Yemen. And when an Iranian commercial airline was taking a delegation back from Iran, the delegation that was taking part in the funeral of Ayatollah Khamenei, the martyr, they bombed the airport. As the Iranian plane was moving to land, a commercial plane with an ordinary crew of men and women, that outraged Iran. And of course, it was an act of war against Yemen. So everyone should be siding with Yemen instead of collaborating with Saudi Arabia.

I mean, no country created a coalition with Saudi Arabia over Gaza, over Lebanon, over Syria. I mean, look at Syria right now. They've occupied huge parts of the southern part of the country. Where is the coalition to push back the Israelis there? Or in Lebanon, where the Israeli regime is occupying the south of the country. And as we speak, they're destroying all the forests. They're burning down all the forests in southern Lebanon. They are destroying the villages that go back hundreds of years, and now they're destroying the whole environment, everything. They're turning the southern part of Lebanon into a wasteland. Where's the Saudi coalition for them? Where's the Saudi coalition for the West Bank? So it's only for the enemies of the United States that these coalitions are built. Must be some coincidence.

#Danny

Yeah, well, you know, some have remarked, Professor Morandi, that what could be happening right now is some kind of strategy of tension, because you have the United States, on the one hand, constantly leaking to the media through these anonymous officials that they want to get out of the war, but they only really care about the Strait of Hormuz and they want to do some kind of basic trade with Iran. And Iran has made it very clear, as has been the case since June and since before June, that the MOU terms and now expanded terms are the ones that Iran will take.

And then you have Saudi Arabia, on the other hand, and Israel all engaging in their own kind of either aggression or both a combination of aggression and, you know, just out-and-out warmongering, as we see against Yemen. So do you—many people believe that the United States and Donald Trump is trying to TACO out of this, but the landscape doesn't really support that. So how do you see the landscape? TACO out of the war. TACO out of war. Oh, TACO. TACO. Yeah, TACO. Yeah, yeah.

#Seyed M. Marandi

I thought you said talk them out of.

#Danny

Oh, no, no, no, no, no. That's my Boston accent there. TACO out of war. But the landscape, again, seems to not support this despite all of the reports. So how do you see this overall landscape?

Because now it does include Turkey and Pakistan. They're in this so-called Mecca Defense Pact. But the landscape doesn't support what Iran had said about it, which was they support independent security alliances and whatnot. That can only be positive. But the landscape looks like, actually, the U.S. is constantly trying to push its vassals and its proxies to take on more war. What do you make of this?

#Seyed M. Marandi

I don't think, I mean, if you mean this Saudi-led coalition with this pact, I don't think it's all that serious. It's, I mean, Yemen today bombed, in retaliation, Saudi Arabia. There hasn't been any response from Turkey, or the Turkish Air Force has not bombed Yemen yet or anything like that. So I, for the moment, I don't think that's really serious. It's not going to look good. I mean, there's a lot of criticism of what Turkey did in Turkey because of the nature of the Saudi regime and because of the broader regional political and military situation. So I don't see that really as a big issue. Although I do think that the chances for war between, I mean, an active war assault by the United States is quite possible.

I'm not saying it's probable because I don't know, but I do know that people here are taking the situation very seriously. And of course, the United States, as usual, they have their assets based in Saudi Arabia, in the Emirates, in Kuwait, in Bahrain, in Qatar, in Oman, in Jordan. They have a lot of the radar installations, as I said, were destroyed, although the ones in Turkey continue to function. And then there's the Israeli regime. And also assets are stored in countries outside of the region as well for possible attacks. So it's impossible to really say what will happen because Trump is Trump. And even though it may sound reasonable for him to end the war and to just implement the MOU as he promised to do, that's not how Trump functions, and that's not what the Israeli regime and the Zionist lobby want.

And, you know, as we've discussed this before on multiple occasions, every day that goes by, the global economic situation deteriorates. It's been moving more slowly than I thought four or five months ago, but it's still moving in that direction, especially now that the Red Sea is closed to Saudi oil. I mean, the strait, the Bab al-Mandab Strait, is closed, and the Saudis are being attacked in retaliation to their attacks. That has cut their oil exports even further. And the Emirates is not exporting oil either right now. So the situation is worsening rapidly, but more slowly than at least I anticipated, like, two, three months ago.

#Danny

Yeah. And then with the economic situation, it is kind of a desperate one, in that it seems like the United States is taking every measure, not just emptying its reserves, but also working with various countries, especially in Asia, to try to also weather this. So that explains some of the slowing there. And with the weapons crisis and the defense systems crisis that have been talked about for days and days now, the United States does just continue to pull from places. I think a lot of the big crisis

about the shortages for the U.S. empire is that the longer it goes against Iran, these dreams of some kind of confrontation with China and Russia, which were always, I think, incredibly fantastical and catastrophic to even consider. But nevertheless, there are many neocons who want this.

So the United States has been actually pulling air defense systems and all of that and shipping them to their base in West Asia. And that's what explains why the U.S. can continue to start these smaller acts of war rather than not be able to at all. So, you know, I wonder what you have to say about this, Professor Morandi, this notion that, you know, the longer the U.S. tries to defeat Iran, the more incapable it is of expressing and meeting its own interests as an empire outside of Iran, meaning these other countries that the United States has ire toward and, of course, has a deep desire to weaken and destroy.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Well, it was Robert Kagan, right, in *The Atlantic*, who wrote that article saying that this was the biggest defeat of the United States ever, bigger than Vietnam for a host of reasons. Well, that was before the last chapter of the war. That was before the United States resumed the war after it violated the MOU. And this last chapter didn't go well for the United States. In fact, it was worse than the 40 days of fighting because Iranian missiles and drones were hitting hard everywhere. And the United States was not achieving any success in the Strait of Hormuz, was attempting to open the strait. So the situation today for the Trump regime is worse than when that article was written.

And this is draining U.S. wealth. It's draining U.S. military capabilities. All these military assets that have been gathered in the region, they're not being protected in ideal conditions. A lot of this high-tech equipment is in a very humid and very hot environment. And these bases were not built to store all this, especially since the bases which did exist, they're all destroyed now. So, in the height of summer, the United States is storing its equipment in conditions that are not ideal. And the Americans have to constantly bring new equipment, and planes constantly go back and forth. And, of course, they can't use ships for the Persian Gulf anymore because the Iranians won't allow it.

So instead of bringing goods by ship, they have to send them by plane. So the costs for the U.S. military are enormous. And of course, meanwhile, the rest of the world is—the Chinese are building their infrastructure, and the Russians—the pressure on Russia has decreased because the United States is focusing less on Ukraine. So it's fighting in West Asia and in Ukraine on multiple fronts. The Chinese, meanwhile, are watching and definitely very happy to see the United States decline in its strength. And the world blames the United States and Israeli regime for this whole catastrophic episode, which no one knows when it's going to end or how it's going to end.

So nothing, I mean, this has been—you've discussed this before, and your audience can describe the situation better than I. They're all politically aware. But every day that goes by, things just get worse for the United States. And by the way, and by the way, now you have to take Japan into consideration, the bond market. And then, you know, Trump, when he came to the Persian Gulf

region, he was expecting these countries to— From the beginning, he wants to milk these countries as much as possible. And he wanted these countries to contribute to the AI industry in the United States and send trillions of dollars to the United States.

Well, not only are these countries not making any money to send to the United States—the Emirates, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain—but also because of the situation, they're going to have to start withdrawing money from the United States. They're going to have to start selling bonds. And there are indications that they are already doing this. And these are societies that are, you know, they consume a lot more than any other country. I mean, more than any other Asian country or African or European country, they consume a lot.

And so the expenses, the amount of money that they'll need to withdraw, is going to be huge. And the longer this situation continues, the more difficult it is going to be. Some of them have more, but some of them don't have all that much. The Saudis are not as wealthy as many people think. They've wasted a lot of money in the genocidal war against Yemen. They wasted a lot of money on those mega projects, The Line, and all these other foolish things. And of course, all of these countries have royal families that take their billions upon billions of dollars. So this is not good for the United States.

#Danny

Yet we still have this narrative. I'll just pull up Christian Zionist fanatic and U.S. envoy to Israel, Mike Huckabee. I feel like this narrative is coming up more and more now that Iran is very, very weak, and—but, and then there's always a but. Now, here is what he said to Fox News today.

#Speaker 1

The Iranian regime is weaker than it has been in 47 years. The infliction of harm to them and of pain to them is not something that is imagined. Their ability to produce a nuclear weapon has been greatly set back. But their missile capacity, unfortunately, has grown. And in one year, they went from being able to deliver a ballistic missile from 2,000 kilometers to over 4,100 kilometers. That puts their capacity to touch any city in most of Europe: London, Paris, Berlin, Rome. All of those cities are now in the sights of Iran.

#Danny

So Iran is in a worse position than in the last 47 years. Yet it has very, very powerful missiles. And you have now—this is the latest report from The Washington Post—that the Pentagon is pressing defense firms to build weapons faster as the Iran war of aggression depletes stocks, saying—and this is from Deputy Defense Secretary Steve Feinberg—telling weapons manufacturers that waiting years for the buildup of munitions and the completion of munitions production is just not going to cut it. So, Professor Morandi, what do you make of these contradictions?

#Seyed M. Marandi

Well, he is genocidal, and he is the person who said that if the Israeli regime takes all of the region, that's fine. In other words, if the Israeli regime takes Jordan and parts of Egypt and Syria and Lebanon and parts of Saudi Arabia and parts of Iraq and parts of Turkey and creates Greater Israel, that's fine. And, of course, the methods would be the same as we see in Gaza, the methods used. And the United States would be fully supportive. So, you know, we are dealing with real evil forces, real evil when it comes to the elites in Washington. But, I mean, we've been hearing this, that Iran is on the verge of collapse.

It's weak. And at the same time, we also hear that Iran is becoming more dangerous, which is, you know, how can it be both at the same time? If Iran is falling apart, then how can it become more dangerous to the rest of the world? But this is something that we've been hearing for decades, and that Iran is weak, it's collapsing, it's imploding, it's unpopular, the people hate it, and then it's a growing threat and it's dangerous to the entire world. I mean, how can it be both at the same time? But this is the narrative that we've been hearing so often. I remember when I critiqued

#Seyed M. Marandi

A couple of some of these memoirs, these fake memoirs on Iran that were written. And I wrote a couple of articles that were published. I addressed these issues. And again, in that book, *Going to Tehran*, which I advise viewers to purchase and to read, it goes into detail about many of these myths about Iran. So this is nothing new, what he says. This is something that has been, especially on mainstream media, this has been said since I was a teenager.

#Danny

Yeah, and now there are a lot of narratives and debates about the actual status of the war in Iran. But nevertheless, there are two that come to mind. One says, well, if the United States is correct in saying Iran is so weak, well, why can't it complete the war? Why can't it end the war on terms that are favorable to it? And the other is that the United States actually wants this kind of prolonged, endless war, which will hopefully lead to regional chaos. And if it can't defeat Iran via regime change, it can make the region just that much more complicated, rife with issues, and therefore weaken Iran that way via isolation. But again, what do you make of this kind of debate? Because I think some of it has to do with the denial of maybe Iran's more favorable position than it was before the war, despite sacrifices, which of course have to be acknowledged. But what do you make of this?

#Seyed M. Marandi

Well, if the United States wants to destroy the region, it would damage the U.S. economy. I don't see how that would bring about a global economic depression. I don't see how that would contribute to U.S. strength or stability at home. And, of course, you know, these countries in the region, they

are there to be milked. If there is no milk, then that doesn't benefit the United States either. The United States makes a lot of money from the Persian Gulf. The largest trading partner of these countries is China because, of course, China produces goods and the United States doesn't produce anything. But they purchase weapons, which they don't know how to use, obviously.

But also all of their excess money, almost all of it, goes to the United States. And some of it goes to Europe, but it goes to buying assets in the United States. And a lot of them are bonds, stocks and bonds. And a lot of them go into U.S. bank accounts. So the United States benefits a great deal from these countries. And they're all allies of the United States. None of them do anything that harms U.S. interests. It's the exact opposite. I mean, as I said earlier, the U.S. bases in the region are all paid for by these regimes. And the Americans, they use their jet fuel, expensive jet fuel, for free. I mean, it's amazing how much money they spend.

And under these circumstances, where there is war, the expenditures are much higher. So, you know, these countries are contributing a great deal. So I don't believe that that's true. I think what the United States wants to do, and the Israeli regime, is to undermine Iran, because Iran is the only country that supports the Palestinian people. No one else, no other country cares. You know, Turkey transports oil to the Israeli regime even throughout the entire genocide. So Erdogan obviously is, you know, and all of these countries participated in that sham in Egypt, and they endorsed Trump's ceasefire in Gaza, the fake ceasefire. And they all praised Trump and whitewashed his crimes.

And since then, 1,400 Palestinians have been slaughtered. And none of these countries who are guarantors of sorts, none of them have protested. None of them have, I mean, none of them have built a coalition of any sort to support the Palestinian people. So none of these countries are working in a way which harms U.S. interests. They've done their best to serve the United States. And Trump has spoken highly of many of these people. He said of Erdogan, for example, that he was, you know, he was always there for me. He's more loyal. He said that in Egypt. He said he's more loyal than the other NATO countries during the NATO conference in Turkey.

And of course, he said the same about the leaders of Saudi Arabia and Qatar and the Emirates, and how fantastic they've been during the war and how much they've helped the United States in its genocidal bombings of schools and hospitals and apartment blocks across Iran. So, you know, I don't see that as a valid argument. If these countries are destroyed, the U.S. economy becomes hit very hard. And I think, as I said, there will be an economic depression. Would that create stability in the United States, or would that create instability in the United States? So I don't buy that argument.

#Danny

Yeah, and the long-term instability also leads to perhaps the exact outcome that is transpiring right now, which is that eventually resistance does happen, and now Iran is representing the highest expression of that. And it's not going well in many respects there, including this breaking news, I guess we could call it, that Barak Ravid, as I call him, our favorite Unit 8200 Mossad reporter for

Axios, says that Trump tells him that he is going full Gen Z and is now low-keying it on Iran, signaling he's prepared to allow economic pressure on Iran to oust President Rouhani. How can you translate that? What does that even mean, to let economic pressure on? Does that mean that the United States is just going to keep the blockade and sanctions and all of that, you know, in perpetuity? And how would Iran respond to that?

#Seyed M. Marandi

The Strait of Hormuz will remain closed. And yes, I think that's what he is saying, that this is the path: that he won't attack Iran, but he'll just maintain the siege, which is, of course, an act of war. It's directed at ordinary Iranians to starve them. Remember, during the first siege that lasted over two months, you saw American senators come on TV saying Iranians are hungry. They were taking such pleasure in the notion that the Iranians had no food. I mean, this is the sickness of the Epstein class. But that failed. You know, the United States ultimately, they signed the MOU. And it's really interesting, Danny, really interesting. Have you heard any media outlet?

Maybe they are saying that, but I have not read anything in the New York Times or Washington Post, any other media outlet, or any American think tank, saying that the United States should go back to the MOU. I mean, it's a deal that was signed by Trump. It was a deal that the United States committed itself to. And it began to violate it from day one. They refused to tell the Israelis to leave. They refused to hand over Iran's stolen assets. They refused to lift the sanctions on Iran's oil exports. They removed them and then reinstated them after just, like, a few days. They continued to threaten to destroy Iran, which was a violation of the deal. The United States, they expanded the sanctions regime during the implementation of the MOU, a violation, a clear violation.

Then they created this route in the Strait of Hormuz, this corridor. That was a violation of Article 5, which led to the United States attacking Iran again because Iran was blocking it. In collaboration with the Saudis, the Emiratis, and the Qatari regime, they created this corridor, whereas in Article 5, it said that Iran has to manage the Strait. What the Americans wanted to do was violate all the terms of the agreement, then undermine Iran in the Strait of Hormuz, and win when they lost that agreement on the battlefield and in siege warfare. And Iran, of course, was not going to accept that. So the Iranians kept threatening them and saying, "This must stop." And then ultimately, when they didn't, the Iranians struck three of their ships owned by these three countries.

And the Americans restarted the war because they knew that this conspiracy had failed. But the point is that you don't see the New York Times saying, "Go back and implement the MOU." You don't see the Washington Post saying that. You don't see pundits saying that, because none of them believe that the United States needs to abide by commitments. The United States is above the law. It can sign a piece of paper today and wage war tomorrow. It can negotiate today and secretly plan for war tomorrow. You know, this is not just an issue of Trump. The whole political establishment of the United States is lawless. It is, you know, they helped create the law of the jungle. And that worked in Venezuela, but it didn't work with Iraq.

#Danny

Yeah, and I'm pulling up this New York Times article that was published today about the so-called demands by Iran, saying they complicate efforts to reopen the Strait. And you already noted, Reserati, that this so-called list of demands are simply more, maybe fleshed-out, more specified demands, parts of the Memorandum of Understanding. There's actually nothing that they—maybe other than, "Don't threaten us," but that is part of—"Don't threaten us" is also in the MOU.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Not to threaten Iran is in the MOU. That is one of the articles that they violated. And when Iran spoke of Lebanon, Iran said, "the entire region." It didn't name Palestine. It didn't name Yemen.

#Danny

It didn't name Iran.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Yes, it said all fronts, exactly. So now they named them. So it's nothing new. But the problem with the New York Times and all these other media outlets is that, for them, why should the United States be bound to any agreement? Why should the United States abide by its commitments? Iran is complicating things further by demanding that the United States...

#Danny

The U.S. signed it. Yeah, the U.S. signed it. That's the thing. It's one thing, even if you want to be as subjective and anti-Iran or whatever as the Western mainstream press, like the New York Times, will always be, as long as they're organized in the way they are to be, you know, mouthpieces of the war machine. But the fact is that Trump signed the thing. The United States signed the thing. It was an agreement. Now, you know, I think, of course, we both know, and a lot of the audience knows, that the United States doesn't follow papers. It doesn't follow agreements. It doesn't follow international law. Yes, that is 100% true. But nevertheless, even so, it would be 100% objective to say that the United States should probably just look at the MOU again and go back to it if it's to end this war, rather than framing it as complications now, Iran complicating efforts.

So it's quite—I mean, it's quite stunning. I think we're going to continue to see this dance, as we've seen with all wars. The mainstream media loves to pretend, when it's partisan and convenient, to oppose wars when it's not popular to hold on to them and to defend them. But once there's any opportunity to do so, they do so, and they try to find more sophisticated ways to do that. Somebody

in the audience said, Professor Morandi, that they're sending love and prayers to you and me, and that they received the two books you recommended, *Manufactured Crisis* and *Going to Tehran*. Excited to read them. That's from Smogs Clefani.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Well, I would also advise him or her to, because I couldn't hear the name properly, but to also purchase Alastair Crooke's book, *Resistance: The Essence of the Islamist Revolution*. And if it's available, Peter Osborne's book, *Dangerous Delusions*. It's a small book, but these are all good books. But I'm glad that—I'm very glad that your viewer showed interest, and I hope that the book is of use.

#Danny

Well, you've been putting in hard work for us, Ronnie, because you get book recommendations all the time. And so I hope that people do take heed and start to look for some of these.

#Seyed M. Marandi

And the thing is, these are books written by—I mean, they're not Iranians. They're not, you know, they're not terrorists and evil people like myself. These are, like, people who, you know, are in the West, you know, people who worked in the White House, or Alastair Crooke, who was in government, and Peter Osborne, who's a well-known journalist in the UK, and Gareth Porter, who is also a well-known writer. And so, you know, I just say that so that, you know, no one would say, you know, this is propaganda.

These are all people who, you know, who've worked in the West, who studied in the West, who grew up in the West, and who've been, in some cases, a part of the political establishment. It is their writings. And so it's more difficult for Iran's antagonists to criticize when it's—if it was written by someone like me, they'd say, "Oh, you know, this sinister Marandi, the terrorist and the spokesperson or the mouthpiece or, you know, the whatever of the regime. You know, of course he would write this." So, yeah.

#Danny

I'm sure the audience is waiting with bated breath for your book, whenever that's going to come out.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Actually, I was writing a book on Iran, and then the war began and everything changed. I did a series, if you recall, on Al Mayadeen TV, which was from some of the material from the book that I

was working on. And I did a series called Demystifying Iran, which I think you put a link to under this video. But when the war started, it's just—everything changed. I've become very busy and overloaded with other things.

#Danny

Well, Professor Marandi, hopefully things do settle down again, because I'm sure people are very interested in that work whenever you're able to get back around to it. But I want to thank everyone. It says, "Justified Misogyny." Okay. "It was our pleasure to host the Iranian soccer team during the World Cup, sending love and prayers from Mexico." That's very nice. Very nice comments. Thank you for that, and thanks for all the Super Chats.

#Seyed M. Marandi

The Mexicans were very nice to the Iranian team. Very nice. And so were the Americans, even though the U.S. government was very hostile, and they tried to undermine them any way they could. But the people in the stadium were rooting for Iran, which says a lot. But at the end, I wanted to remind everyone to always remember Gaza. Every day they're killing people in Gaza. They're killing kids. They're starving them. Kids with special needs who can't eat certain things, they're intentionally preventing those foods from getting in so that those kids would die. People with different diseases who, under normal circumstances, could live ordinary lives.

They prevent their medicines from getting in so that they die because they want to cut the population. So the airstrikes and the sniping and all that aside, they're also killing people in multiple ways through disease and other things, and starvation for those people who can't eat certain foods and have to have a special diet. They intentionally try to starve these people and succeed in doing so. So we should always, always, always remember Gaza every day and keep reminding people of the genocide so that the pressure builds against the Zionist regime, the Zionist lobby, and more people wake up to what's really going on.

#Danny

Yeah, we have—I'll put it in the video, not the video description, but the chat now. There's still also so many prisoners, Palestinian prisoners, political prisoners, dying in prison. Yeah, dying. So there's a link now in the chat of a good org that's supporting prisoners as well. And this comes after reports, as you're aware, that Israel is not even following the flimsy, if not outright insulting and counterproductive, so-called 15 points, so-called end-of-the-Gaza-war process, whatever that Board of Peace, whatever that thing is.

Israel has just announced that they are not going to even acknowledge that. So once again, this is something that's going to be a big problem for a long time, given the U.S.'s just outright support for the genocidal regime. So do that. Check that out. And yeah, this was a great show, Professor

Morandi. Thanks, Barton. I want to thank everyone who gave a super chat. By the way, I pulled all of you up. This one was really funny: "Low-keying it is exactly what a boomer would say, JB 44421." That's really funny. But yeah, hit the like button. So thanks to Gabriel Super Chat. Thanks to the moderators who moderated.

You can hit the like button to keep the show going after we are done here. In the video description below are also all the places you can support the show: Patreon, Substack, and much more.

Tomorrow I am back with our mutual friend Patrick Henningsen, 2 p.m. Eastern Time, August 10th, for another live update. So be there. And, oh, I got another super chat here to pull up. Kevin, thanks so much. All right, well, take care, everybody. Professor Morandi and I are going to go. He has an appointment to make, so we're going to head out of here. Thanks so much. Hit that like button, and I'll see you again next time. Bye-bye. Bye.