

## Interview with Sarah Archin | IRIB

### **1. Do you see this war just as a military conflict with political interests, or do you interpret this war as a civilizational battle with a historical and theoretical background?**

First of all, thank you very much for your invitation to talk here on IRIB

In my view, what we are witnessing is a military conflict with economic, political, and cultural implications; a conflict that can be understood within the historical framework of U.S. imperialism and, at the same time, within the cultural context of historical Western colonialism and its claims of Western supremacy –that includes the Zionist entity Israel–. I do not share Huntington’s views on the existence of a “clash of civilizations” between East and West; cultures may be different, but they are not closed systems; cultures can engage in dialogue and cooperate, building bridges, creating common interests, and forming alliances among themselves. For me, Huntington’s narrow vision served as a tool for U.S. imperialism by contributing to the demonization of many non-Western countries as radical enemies of the so-called West.

In my opinion, with his aggressive foreign policy, Donald Trump embodies an extreme form of imperialism: the United States is a declining empire that has abandoned its former soft power strategies and concentrated its hard power on two fronts. The first is what he called the “Donroe Corollary” of the Monroe Doctrine: total control of the Western Hemisphere through military intervention or brutal means in South American countries, and even the attempt to seize Greenland. The other front is China, the United States’ true political and economic adversary. One of the reasons for the U.S. war against Iran has to do with the fact that China is a trading partner of the Islamic Republic—for example, in the oil market. Trump wants Iran’s resources in the purest imperialist style and, at the same time, wants to strike a blow against his adversaries.

Returning to the historical and theoretical context of this war, what we are witnessing is a shift in the balance of power across the entire world system—in Wallerstein’s terms. The world is moving away from U.S. hegemony toward a multilateral world with multiple centers of power. For many analysts—myself included—it is clear that Iran, with its incredible resistance against the United States, has become a key political actor on the world stage.

### **2. : Despite the UN's failure to enforce peace, what value does it still have? How can the international community stop hegemonies from acting aggressively?**

From 2023 we have been witnessing a rapid process of delegitimization of the UN, a process based on the inability of this international institution to mediate or intervene to promote peace effectively in different war scenarios or conflicts around the world. While the UN was a highly flawed institution before the date I mentioned (think about, for instance, the limits of the Security Council integrated by five countries: China, France, Russia, UK and the USA), since Israel’s genocide in Gaza all UN’s internal contradictions have intensified. Contradictions that have increased, in my opinion, with the imperialist aggression of the USA and Israel against the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Well, the UN has become the world’s “good moral conscience,” but a useless conscience due to its inability to uphold a balanced application of international law—a set of rights that seems to function only selectively for certain hegemonic powers. I am not saying that we should belittle or underestimate the current role of the UN as a whole, because it still carries a global diplomatic weight, but we might ask ourselves: Where are the UN sanctions against Israel for committing genocide in Gaza? Where are the sanctions against the US for its illegal attacks on Iran, for illegally kidnapping Nicolás Maduro in Venezuela or the inhuman blockade of Cuba? And where are the

sanctions against Israel for destroying southern Lebanon? I am not referring to statements or speeches, but to economic and political sanctions.

Therefore, if we want to address and limit, from an international and multilateral perspective, the aggressive powers of hegemonic countries such as the United States, we have two options. The first is to promote a difficult process of reforming and democratizing the UN, since the current global situation and the balance of power are entirely different from those of 1945. We need a democratic reformation of the institution without veto rights, with a drastic expansion of the Security Council to include new voices and countries from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, a strengthening of the powers of the General Assembly, and a genuine defense of multilateralism. Without this, the law of the strongest will prevail. The second option is to build an alternative international partnership of countries, likely starting with a global dialogue with the Non-Aligned Movement, but including a whole set of countries that are not represented in it. This dialogue could lead to a new multilateral and more balanced institution, an institution that could exclude or isolate nations that commit genocide or act violently against other partners.

### **3. The US expected a quick victory for Trump, but Iran has resisted for 40 days. How do you assess Iran's position in the current global power balance?**

Well, let me be clear here: Donald Trump has lost the war against Iran in the terms he planned. Donald Trump expected some kind of “blitzkrieg” war, and neither the USA nor Israel have achieved their objectives. Let me say that the war against Iran is not only an imperialist but a Zionist war, fueled by the colonial desire of expansion of Israel –we have to remember the Zionist idea of the Great Israel–. Regarding Iran, the Islamic Republic has demonstrated a powerful military warfare and a very well planned use of its strategic resources and capacities, for instance the control of the Hormuz Strait –a corridor through which 20% of the world's oil passes. On the other hand, and after social internal conflicts and turmoil, we have seen the support of the population of the current governmental structure and massive demonstrations in defence of the sovereignty of their territory and nation.

Despite the destruction caused by the war, Iran's influence on the global political balance has grown. Iran has emerged as a key political actor due to its military capacities, its energetic resources and its renewed geopolitical relevance as a consequence of the war. Of course, the alliance with Russia and China is important in this regard. If you let me make a comparison or analogy, Iran seems to be a new Vietnam for the USA. But now in a phase of decline of the imperial hegemony of this country. In fact, we are living in a Post-American world, and that's partly a consequence of the war of the USA against Iran. Let me give some brief examples: the NATO has not supported the actions of Trump, and western countries, like Spain, have condemned the attack on Iran. So, we have to understand this war as a test on USA's hegemony, and they are failing to remain the hegemonic center of the world. Horrible war crimes, like the killings of Minab School, have weakened any credibility or trust in them.

If we want further proof of America's decline, we need look no further than the Strait of Hormuz: on Sunday, Trump threatened to impose a blockade and destroy any ship that crossed the strait, but so far many oil tankers have passed through it. Tehran has now decided to open the Strait of Hormuz during the ceasefire. I hope this ceasefire is a step toward peace.

**To end:**

I think we're facing a war that's very, very unpopular around the world. Every day, Donald Trump has to tell the media that he's "won the war," but this is clearly at odds with reality: that's not happening.