

Iran REPELS Two US Destroyer in Hormuz, 'Peace' Talks COLLAPSE

US-Iran talks have ended in complete collapse and reports are that war is imminent. Trump is threatening a full-scale naval blockade and Danny Haiphong will break down the latest after just arriving in China for a mega trip covering the latest in this historic war and the global shift that's come from it. LIKE the video and Subscribe for more in-depth geopolitical analysis! Leave your thoughts in the comments below! Support the Channel: Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/dannyhaiphong> SUBSCRIBE ON RUMBLE: Rumble: <https://rumble.com/c/DannyHaiphong> Follow Me on Social Media: Twitter: <https://twitter.com/DannyHaiphong> Telegram: <https://t.me/DannyHaiphong> Support the channel in other ways: <https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhaiphong> Substack: chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritho>

#Danny

Welcome back to the show, everyone. Hit the like button as you come on. I am live. I just touched down in Beijing—not just hours ago—but I wanted to come back. I've been on a plane for 19 hours plus, and I've just caught up on the latest developments. So I want to catch you all up if you haven't been following. And if you have, I want to analyze what's been going on, especially around Iran. So hit the like button as you come on. Let's get started. Everyone, if you can, do an audio check, camera check. This is a whole new setup as well, so I just want to make sure everything is going smoothly.

Let's start right away, though, because as talks were happening, we just had at least 21 hours of negotiations between the United States and Iran in Islamabad, mediated by Pakistan. They have completely fallen apart. They've collapsed. They're over. J.D. Vance has left. The Iranians have left. Neither side says the talks are going to continue at any point in the future. But as this was happening, the United States was escalating. This is why I say the U.S. is not just agreement-incapable—it's actually a pariah state. It's an empire, an empire pariah state seeking to exert dominance. It's not interested in peace or even a pause. No, it's simply trying to gain any leverage it can in a losing situation.

And that's where we actually are. So Press TV reported this, because even as these talks were going on for 21 hours, in the middle of them, what did the United States do? It tried to send U.S. destroyers—two of them, actually. This report only mentions one, I believe. But Press TV said that a U.S. Navy attempt to send two destroyers through the Strait of Hormuz on Saturday ended in failure

after Iranian forces intervened. According to the report, the USS Michael Murphy and the USS Frankie Peterson attempted a high-risk transit but were detected and intercepted by Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps naval units. That same Navy, everyone, that we've been told is gone.

It's destroyed. No, actually, it's still very much here. The investigation says the ships used electronic warfare tactics and false identification to appear as commercial vessels from Oman while navigating close to shore through shallow waters. Iranian forces identified the deception early and moved to block passage. Press TV—this is Iranian media—says Iranian cruise missiles locked onto the vessels, and drones were deployed overhead with a warning that the ships had 30 minutes to withdraw or face attacks. Then the ships reversed course. This was during negotiations. And it's not just Iranian media saying this was happening—it's also Bloomberg. So here's the Bloomberg report, according to U.S. Navy officials.

Arleigh Burke-class destroyers attempted to pass through the Strait of Hormuz but were forced to turn back after the IRGC threatened to launch a drone in their direction. This was from Bloomberg, and this is actually the report here—you can see it from Regional Intelligence, according to Bloomberg magazine. So, 21 hours of talks, everyone—21 hours of talks—and this is how the United States was behaving before and during them. So that's even before getting to the fact that Benjamin Netanyahu called J.D. Vance in the middle of the talks, according to Iran, according to Abbas Araqchi, saying he derailed the talks. This was a game. Netanyahu called and said, "Hey, don't do any of this. Make sure that you're following me and you're following Israel." All of this is a good cop, bad cop routine. The truth is that J.D. Vance and the U.S. delegation—as Mohammad Marandi, a friend of this show, said—were in Islamabad.

He said straight up that the Iranians were prepared for the U.S. to come in, not prepared to actually negotiate at all. What were they there to do? They were there to essentially buy time—to try to gain any kind of leverage, to jumpstart the next phase of the war, and to ease market tensions. There are all sorts of factors explaining why the United States was involved in the negotiations, but nonetheless, it wasn't for peace. It was all for U.S. priorities and interests, which are, of course, inherently anti-Iranian. So the talks collapsed, and you had this major confrontation between the U. S. and Iran in the Strait of Hormuz.

Well, this confrontation led to the United States having to retreat. So you'd think, well, the United States learned its lesson—it's not going to keep doing this. Hell, you even had the New York Times—I don't know if you saw that report just a few days ago—the New York Times said that U.S. officials are reporting that Iran can't even demine its own sea mines that it laid. So that means the Strait of Hormuz is going to be closed for the foreseeable future. And a lot of people were saying this is simply an admission that the U.S. is trying to find a way to justify the fact that it cannot reopen the Strait—really, that it cannot reassert control over the Strait of Hormuz.

Nonetheless, we're supposed to believe that Iran is stupid and weak—that it laid down these sea mines in a haphazard way, and that's why it has to escort ships. No, it did it in a very strategic way,

and it did it to defend itself from U.S. naval incursions. Because the very beginning of this war, before the first strikes started, was characterized by a naval buildup—a buildup that hasn't really worked out very well if you look at where the USS Gerald Ford is now, in Crete, getting repairs that are going to take 12 to 14 months. Why? Well, Iranians say it's because they fired at them, and the U.S. Navy says it's because of a big laundry fire after the big plumbing scandal—after the whole “shit-gate” thing they had, where the plumbing just went absolutely berserk inside the Gerald Ford, with clogged toilets and shirts being found in the pipes.

After that, a big laundry fire took the USS Ford out of operation for a year or more. Now you have the USS George W. Bush on the way to replace it. You'd think the U.S. had learned its lesson from this—that its naval power is not where it should be, and probably never will be, because it can't really improve for reasons we've gone over on this show. But has the United States learned its lesson? No. Even after it was forced to retreat—this is Donald Trump now—there's the latest threat that the U.S. Navy will start blockading the Strait of Hormuz. Well, isn't that interesting? The United States, under Trump, is now saying it's going to blockade. So there you have it. The meeting went well, most points were agreed to, but the only point that really mattered—the nuclear one—was not.

Effective immediately, the United States Navy—the finest in the world—will begin the process of blockading any and all ships trying to enter or leave the Strait of Hormuz. At some point, we will reach an all-being-allowed-to-go-in, all-being-allowed-to-go-out basis, but Iran has not allowed that to happen by merely saying, “There may be a mine out there somewhere that nobody knows about but them.” This is world extortion. And leaders of countries, especially the United States of America, will never be extorted. I have also instructed our Navy to seek out and interdict every vessel in international waters that has paid a toll to Iran. No one who pays an illegal toll will have safe passage on the high seas. So this is what Donald Trump is proposing—Donald Trump is proposing to fight a blockade.

The United States Navy will fight a so-called blockade—which it isn't—by fighting a blockade with an actual blockade. It will interdict and stop shipping that's doing business with Iran, because Iran has effectively asserted control over the Strait of Hormuz, that waterway that lies along its territory as well as Oman's. It's now charging a toll in RMB, cryptocurrency, and so on, based on its own sovereign right to do so. People have to remember that the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea is actually not signed by a lot of countries, including the United States, which champions it all the time as “freedom of navigation,” but never signed it. The reason for this is that territorial waterways are really difficult to internationalize, because many of them fall within territorial boundaries.

So you get into questions of sovereignty that are very challenging to deal with through international bodies. And this is why it's absolutely ridiculous that Donald Trump is claiming he wants to blockade the Strait of Hormuz in the midst of what Iran is doing—which is, frankly, ridiculous—asserting control over it because it says that's its sovereign right. And it has a reason to, under the laws of war and international law at the United Nations, because it was attacked—attacked by the United States and Israel, foreign powers. And now, to be quite honest, the Strait of Hormuz is a war zone. We just

saw it. So Donald Trump is saying he's going to blockade the Strait of Hormuz after his destroyers were sent back, and now they're going to do more of this, as if that's not going to have any consequences at all. This is the state of things right now for the United States.

It's absolutely ridiculous, and it needs more attention. Because what's going to happen to the U.S. when it tries to blockade ships from the Strait of Hormuz? Well, the IRGC said that's a miscalculation. They're likely going to respond the same way they did to the destroyers that tried to interdict in the Strait of Hormuz this past Saturday. So, can you see where this is going? The war is effectively being restarted by the Trump administration. And why? Because it couldn't dictate terms to Iran. And here is the official statement of this blockade—after failing to interdict anything in the Strait of Hormuz with two destroyers.

Now, Trump says, effective immediately, the United States Navy—the finest in the world—will begin the process of blockading any and all ships trying to enter or leave the Strait of Hormuz. This will do wonders, I'm sure, for the markets. I'm sure this will do wonders for the oil markets, for the global economy, after the whole reason for this two-week pause for the ceasefire talks was what? The whole reason was to buy time for the United States to let the economic situation ease, to let the markets breathe a sigh of relief that their interests weren't going to be completely, literally blown up—because the U.S. is looking to, essentially, as I've said before with my friend Brian Berletek on this show, destroy the whole chessboard.

Forget the chessboard. Forget what Brzezinski said yesterday, right? The grand chessboard—that whole idea of dividing and conquering, using the Cold War and all that to promote U.S. hegemony—no, that's gone. There is no more grand chessboard. They don't have any way to assert control over it anymore. China, Russia, and now Iran—the fourth global power, according to The New York Times—are ascendant. All of these countries are very much on the rise. So, let's get to the statements from the United States after these talks. How about that?

Here's J.D. Vance's statement. I'm not going to play it, just to save bandwidth where I am. It says: "The full statement from J.D. Vance following 21 hours of talks is as follows. We have not reached an agreement. I think that's worse news for Iran than it is for the United States. The U.S. made clear its red lines and what it would accommodate. Iran chose not to accept U.S. terms. The core issue is that we need to see an affirmative commitment that they will not seek a nuclear weapon and will not seek the tools that would enable them to quickly achieve one."

He claims Iran's enrichment facilities have been destroyed, but says the U.S. hasn't seen a fundamental commitment or will from the Iranians not to develop a nuclear weapon—not just for now, not just two years from now, but for the long term. Now, the question is, why would Iran capitulate to U.S. demands? Iran has asserted control over the Strait of Hormuz. That's the reason the U.S. was seeking peace talks three whole weeks before the ceasefire was actually instituted back

in mid-March, according to the Financial Times. The Trump administration was contacting Pakistan and other mediators anywhere in the region who could get the ear of Iran to start facilitating these peace talks. So why then would the United States—why would Iran—decide to back down?

Well, the only reason Iran decided to do this was to gain diplomatic capital—to show the world that it's serious about de-escalation, if it can be serious about de-escalation. If there's an opportunity to de-escalate, Iran is showing the world that it can. It's not allowing the U.S. to rebuild—certainly not—because a two-week ceasefire doesn't really allow anything to be rebuilt. You can't produce weapons that take years to make and have them rebuilt for Israel and the United States within a couple of weeks. That's just not how any of this works. So Iran knows this. Iran is using the clock—the proverbial clock of U.S. imperial decay—to its own advantage. And now it's done this diplomatically. So that was J.D. Vance's, um, J.D. Vance's commentary.

Well, let's look at what Iran said, because what Iran said is also very important. The Iranian perspective is often not given any attention, but in times like these, when there's a war, you have to give it. So here's what Iranian state TV revealed about the reasons for the failure of the talks the U.S. tried to achieve at the negotiating table. This is what Abbas Araqchi literally said to the media: they tried to achieve at the negotiating table what they could not achieve through war. The Americans demanded that Iran hand over enriched uranium and open the Strait of Hormuz without recognizing Iran's sovereignty over it. Iran has decided to defend its national interests by military means.

And what's really interesting about what Iran ultimately did is that it said it was defending its gains—defending the gains it made at the negotiating table—which is a tactic in war. So one can look at these negotiations not simply as Iran trying to talk its way out of war, or the U.S. and Israel trying to talk their way out of war. Both sides were using negotiations as a tool for their own forms of warfare. For the United States and Israel, of course, it's about aggression—it's about gaining leverage, building legitimacy for that, and maybe buying time, maybe creating a more favorable political atmosphere from which they can launch again. The Donald Trump administration, and even Israel, both like surprise and shock.

So you even had people—I don't know if you saw this—spreading rumors, and I don't think any of them were really substantiated, that the Israelis were going to kill the negotiating team, which included our friend Mohammad Marandi. He was there, right? He was traveling with the negotiating team. And there were rumors that they were all going to be targeted by Israeli strikes. That's why Pakistan sent out a military escort with Chinese fighter jets and various defense systems to escort them back to Bandar Abbas, I think it was, back to Iran. But nonetheless, I never saw any verification of this. It's hard to verify what the U.S. and Israel tend to do in the moment, right? They don't tell you. They threaten. They threaten.

And many people think it's a bluff until they decapitate—and that's what they do. So it was a legitimate fear. But nonetheless, that's the environment, right? That's the environment the United

States and Israel want to dampen. They want to ensure that when they carry out these kinds of attacks, it's under the guise of, "Well, we tried to negotiate, and Iran was intransigent. Iran wasn't negotiating with us. So Iran is the reason for this failure." That's what the United States is saying. And of course, Iran is saying the opposite. But the truth of the matter is that it's the United States that was ultimately negotiating from a position of weakness and ended up getting mad that Iran—a country that didn't have to capitulate to them—wouldn't capitulate to them.

And here's what Patricia Marin says, who's a very good geopolitical analyst and writes a lot on Twitter. Here are the ten points explaining why Iran is not in a position to give in, and why the U.S. seems to be living in a different reality. Iran controls the Strait of Hormuz, and any attempt to take it would be extremely bloody and result in heavy casualties. As Iran warned today—and as it demonstrated by turning back the two destroyers—it can also close the other strait, the Bab al-Mandeb Strait, using the Houthis or Ansar Allah. I would just add a caveat to that: it wouldn't be Iran "using" the Houthis or Ansar Allah. Ansar Allah would be very willing to do this in a strategic manner to ensure continuity in the resistance and to strengthen not just Iran's position, but the position of the entire region.

It has maintained a stable daily rate of missile and drone launches for several weeks, demonstrating its large arsenal. Now, some of this is coming out. I've seen RT share it, I've seen others share it. For example, at the Ras Energy Hub in Qatar and other locations in Kuwait, the videos are starting to come out. Remember, they were suppressed for a period of time by places like Planet Labs. You might remember Planet Labs said it was going to censor these images for a period of time for national security reasons—aka for the United States' war effort. Now some of these videos are coming out, and it's very devastating. A lot of these countries are seeing losses that are going to take months or even years to rebuild, if they're ever able to.

So Iran's ground force is still intact, with equipment and high morale—especially after the failure at Isfahan. Yes, that failure of the so-called F-15 rescue mission, which analysts I've had on this show say was transformed into a rescue mission, came after a ground operation that had gone horribly wrong. It led to an Iranian ambush and the destruction of those C-130s and many other aircraft—helicopters, Chinooks, and so on. So it's Iran that is effectively sanctioning America, with fuel prices and inflation already knocking at the door.

It's Iran generating pressure on Trump from Gulf countries. It's Iran pressuring Trump through its Asian and European allies. Iran is well aware of the shortage of interceptors that Israel and the U.S. have and is actively exploiting that. Its air defense capabilities are gradually improving through the deployment of new equipment, showing that Iran has a long-term strategy. And I would agree with all of these points—actually, I'd say they're undisputed. Iran has... and in those last days before the Trump administration called for the ceasefire, by downing the F-15, by showing what it could do during that attempted invasion at Isfahan.

Iran demonstrated that it has air defense capabilities—which are not even, well, let's forget the technical part of it. They're being used strategically in a way that's causing the United States problems it can't tolerate for long periods of time. And it's likely that Iran does have the ability to sustain that for quite a while. And with the JASMs, according to Bloomberg—these long-range standoff missiles that the F-15s, F-18s, and F-35s are firing from outside Iranian air defense range—those are about to run out. They're already depleted to such a degree that the U.S. has had to admit it must gamble them all away just to keep fighting this war against Iran.

I mean, this is an unmitigated disaster to a degree that I don't think anybody could have predicted when this war started. So the United States is looking for an out—but it's looking for an out that makes it look like it's still in the driver's seat, politically. That it can, um... I don't know what's going on there. So essentially, this is what the United States is trying to do: it's trying to use threats, to use intimidation, to claim to the world that it can actually get the outcome it desires, when in fact everything's already been proven. It's already been proven. And now the big question in the future will be, as this war begins again—because that's what this is.

This is the beginning of a war. You can expect that the U.S. will, at the very least, attempt to blockade ships around the Strait of Hormuz. I could see a very realistic scenario where ships come out of the Strait of Hormuz in transit elsewhere, and the U.S. starts intercepting them from waters outside. Just like the U.S.S. Abraham Lincoln had to move outside the range of Iranian anti-ship and ballistic missiles, I could see the United States in a scenario like this, following these tankers out of the Strait of Hormuz. Once they exit, the U.S. comes in, because it's likely those parts aren't mined—since Iran can't mine every single area of the waters the Strait of Hormuz flows into.

And there you have it. You have the confrontations. It's the Venezuela model. And this is the model that the Trump administration—Trump wants to repeat—because it's the only model it can really apply. The problem here is that Iran is not Venezuela. It's not. Venezuela, for all the political strength it had in terms of the support people had for that government, was never ready militarily to fight the United States head-on. And many people didn't think Iran was, until it happened. And here we are—until it happened, right? So the talks have collapsed, and the United States is where, predictably, those who have watched this show would have guessed it would be.

The United States has pulled out of the talks. They weren't ready to come to any kind of peace agreement. Some have said maybe this is a tactic of the Trump administration—to talk violently, to talk big—but then actually conduct talks from here on out. I don't think the Iranians trust the United States enough for that to be a viable option either. Because why would you give your adversary, why would you give the country—the empire, the imperialist apparatus, the war machine that's been unleashed upon you, unleashed upon your people—any authority? Remember, the Iranian delegation saved 160-plus seats in...

#Danny

They put up not only the pictures of...

#Danny

I don't know what happened there. They put not only the images of the young girls who were killed in those horrific, criminal, genocidal war-crime strikes by the United States to begin the war, but they also had the backpacks they found, right? They were remnants of the children who were incinerated by the Tomahawks and the strikes against this school—the Manab School. And the Iranian delegation put out a statement saying, “We are bringing them with us.” So why would—after that, even just that one act, let alone the thousands upon thousands of civilian-targeted strikes against infrastructure, against hospitals, against schools—why would the Iranians give even just the United States an avenue to bluster?

#Danny

No.

#Danny

So this is why Iran isn't going to talk unless there's a reason to talk. The reason there were talks in the first place is because Iran said, “We're in a position of strength, and we want to see where that can take us.” The situation only gets worse, though, because you have not only Iran repelling the strikes, you have Iran repelling the two naval destroyers that went into its territorial waters in the Strait of Hormuz. Not only have the peace talks collapsed, but now U.S. intelligence is sounding the alarm about China—big shock. And Trump has already come out and said that if China does this, then they're going to be in big trouble. Well, this is what U.S. intelligence is saying.

They're saying that China is repairing—or rather, preparing—weapon shipments to Iran amid a fragile ceasefire situation. U.S. intelligence, of course, takes this with a grain of salt, because if there's any institution that lies through its teeth, well, it's that one—it's U.S. intelligence. But when U.S. intelligence does tell the truth, what they're usually doing is trying to sell a narrative: “China bad.” And they usually try to sell that narrative through the prism of, “Well, actually, this is a real foe.” So this is why we have to take U.S. intelligence reports with various levels of scrutiny—not just rejection because they're all lies, but also asking, what do those lies tell us about the situation the U.S. finds itself in?

That is the analysis. U.S. intelligence indicates that China is preparing a delivery of new air defense systems to Iran within the next few weeks, according to three people familiar with recent intelligence assessments. It would be a provocative move, considering Beijing said it helped broker the fragile ceasefire agreement that paused the war between Iran and the United States. Donald Trump is also set to visit China early next month for talks with Chinese leader Xi Jinping—though those talks are not a guarantee. I'm just going to put that out there. The intelligence also

underscores how Iran may be using the ceasefire as an opportunity to replenish its weapons systems with the help of a key foreign partner.

Two of the sources told CNN there are indications Beijing is working to route the shipments through third countries to mask their true origin. The systems Beijing is preparing to transfer are shoulder-fired anti-aircraft missile systems, known as MANPADs, the sources said, which pose an asymmetric threat to low-flying U.S. military aircraft throughout the course of the five-week war—and could again if the ceasefire falls apart. So, I mean, look, China has far better technology than this. Iran has already been shown to use this kind of technology. They definitely used it during the Isfahan raid. They've used it at various times to fire on the F-15s and F-18s that have entered its airspace.

What I believe U.S. intelligence is actually doing is warning the Trump administration that an air war is only becoming more dangerous—and that if the United States doesn't pay attention, it could see more downed aircraft in the future. And of course, it's going to bring in China, because there's a big segment of U.S. intelligence, the neocons, the elites—the foreign policy elites—that want to see the United States shift more toward China and away from this Iran business. The Iran issue right now is creating an economic headache and causing a military setback there. But if you can focus on China, well, that's a long-term project, and you get a lot of money siphoned into the U.S. military-industrial complex.

And maybe, just maybe, in your delusional mind, you'll be ready for some kind of military confrontation with China over Taiwan or elsewhere, in some other theater. It's all fantasy, of course, at that level once you get there. But that is the thinking—that's the mentality. It's like someone who's addicted to drugs or some kind of substance, and they're just moving and substituting one dopamine hit for the next. And that is what the U.S. empire is doing oftentimes now because—and this is a big point—because it has to, not because it wants to, right? There's a lot of talk about a war of choice. And look, I believe that the United States, yes, is choosing to go to war in many instances with Iran based on the timing of this. The timing of this intervention was a disaster because, of course, it wasn't in the preparation.

There wasn't the strategic know-how, the capabilities, the organization. Look who's leading the White House. Look who's leading these war efforts. But truthfully, that was likely always going to be the case, right? Incompetence is kind of where the U.S. empire is when it doesn't have any solutions. It doesn't have any vision for how it's going to reach the objectives it claims to have. But more to the point, the United States has to be in a war with Iran because if it isn't, then it's going to be at war somewhere else. And then the U.S. empire, with Israel at its side, has to ask itself: is this going to satisfy our objectives? Is just bombing Lebanon—which is a horrific war crime—supposedly to weaken Hezbollah, which it's not doing, is that enough for the U.S. and Israel? No. First of all, the United States...

#Danny

Doesn't really even care about Lebanon.

#Danny

It only lets Israel do what it does in Lebanon—the genocide there—because it wants Israel to continue serving U.S. interests in the region through chaos, through violence, but also through joint efforts to subdue any alternative to U.S. hegemony. That's why Lebanon—the catastrophe there, the atrocities—are tolerated. But no other theater right now is feasible. China and Russia? Not feasible. I'll just put that out there right now. There's no military, economic, or political mechanism the U.S. can use right now that can weaken the trajectory—not just in the short term, like maybe putting a little dent in China's oil trade somewhere, or with Russia, where the Ukraine conflict means it has to exert military power and maybe overextend itself.

No, no, a lot of that is short-term problems, because there are problems with these things. But when you stack it up against how these countries have gained during this period of U.S. imperial chaos and overreach, the scales are ultimately way more in their favor than not. So, Russia and China table that—that's not happening. You go to Iran now, because Iran is the only thing left. The United States has left the region a wasteland. It's tried to destroy everyone. It had to back away from Ansarallah, but Yemen isn't so strategic to the United States, other than what its so-called vassal state allies want from it.

Saudi Arabia, the UAE—you know, we can go on and on. Venezuela even. Venezuela was a nice optical shift for the U.S. empire. But nonetheless, that alone isn't going to satisfy the expansionist and desperately panicked whims of an empire in decline. So here we are with Iran. That's why we're here. We're here because the U.S. empire has said it's out of time. It's out of time. It's got to go—it's got to go, and it's got to go now. And if it doesn't go now to take out Iran, well, we've seen the results. They were right. They were right.

They had no more time left, because look at how this has blown back. And now look at this—this is coming out across all Western mainstream media. This is the editorial board of the New York Times: "Trump's war has weakened America four ways." All right, they list four ways that, since February 28th, this has weakened America. The most tangible blow to the United States and the world economy, of course, is the Strait of Hormuz, where 20% of the world's oil and natural gas flows through. The second setback is to America's standing in the world militarily. This war, together with U.S. assistance to Ukraine, Israel, and other allies, has burned through a substantial portion of the stockpile of some critical weapons, such as Tomahawk missiles and Patriot interceptors.

Experts believe the Pentagon used more than a quarter of its Tomahawk missiles just in the war against Iran. Rebuilding the stockpile to its previous size will take years, and the U.S. will have to make tough choices about where to maintain its military strength. In the meantime, the Pentagon has already pulled missile defenses from South Korea. The war has also revealed that the U.S. military is vulnerable to new forms of warfare. America spent billions of dollars on high-tech

munitions to destroy Iran's traditional air and naval forces, while Tehran used cheap, disposable drones to halt traffic through the Strait of Hormuz and hit targets in the region.

The world saw how a country that spends one one-hundredth of what the U.S. does on its military can still outlast the U.S. in a conflict. It's a reminder of the urgent need for reform in the U.S. military. So you see the prospects here—you see the framing. The problem isn't war; the problem is how the war is being administered. And this is why you can't ultimately—well, you can glean information and significance from what the New York Times is saying, from what the whole establishment is saying. To be honest, this is significant—significant that the U.S. mainstream corporate media, the military-industrial complex class, is willing to admit these errors. It shows the U.S. empire in decay. But you can't follow their lead when it comes to their conclusions, because the conclusion will be: do war better.

And that's not what we need. "War better" only leads to worse outcomes, actually. And that's why we have this cycle, right? We have this cycle of neoliberal, neocon, so-called strategic thinkers giving rise to more fanatical forces, which then, fanatically and ideologically, shape how they present themselves. And then they all come back to a whole, a single entity. So the war's third big cost is to America's alliances. Japan, South Korea, Australia, Canada, most of Western Europe refused to support the U.S. in the war—unsurprisingly, given Trump's treatment of them. The tariffs, all of this—it's all coming back to bite the United States in the butt in many ways. This way of acting like you can go it alone, you're... you know, you're friendless. You don't need allies.

All of this so-called isolationism by the Trump administration is really just a cover for its need to expand its hubris and aggression wider and further. And the fourth setback is to America's moral authority. This one is questionable. For all the flaws of this country, it remains a beacon to many around the world. When pollsters ask people where they would move if they could, the United States consistently comes out as the runaway number one answer—which is interesting, because new polls show that people now favor China's image around the world more than that of the United States. But nonetheless, America's appeal stems not only from its prosperity but also from its freedom and democratic values. Trump has undercut those values for his entire political career, and perhaps never more than in the past week, when he made those odious threats to erase Iranian civilization.

His secretary of defense, Pete Hegseth, made a series of bloodthirsty remarks too, including a threat to offer no quarter, no mercy for our enemies. So, moral authority. Now, I have a gripe with that one because, uh, the U.S. empire is centuries old. The U.S. empire has roots not just around the world but within its own borders, established centuries ago—250 plus years ago—and they're bloody, they're blood-soaked. They're actually rife with the use of certain kinds of morals and certain kinds of values, like American exceptionalism, "a city on a hill," "the beacon on a hill." These kinds of values are portrayed to justify horrific crimes. And that isn't to say that people in the United States—there aren't good people, there aren't good things that happen in the United States.

Hell, the United States did take all of that blood-soaked warfare, expansionism, et cetera, and did build an impressive system—hegemon it did become. And there were things out of that which ultimately bore fruit for even a segment of the population, right? During that golden age that Trump talks about, he doesn't mention that part. He also doesn't mention the Cold War and the threat of the socialist countries, which required employers to give more wages and the government to give more benefits to more and more workers. I mention those parts. But truthfully—truthfully—my analysis is that you can't have a horrifically corrupt, violent system like imperialism, like capitalism, like all of this, and expect it to bear fruits of development, even though it has. Now, that's all reversing because of the internal contradictions of the system leading to their logical conclusion. You cannot destroy your way into a number one position forever without expecting resistance, and that resistance eventually leads to a breaking point.

#Danny

And that's where we're coming to.

#Danny

We're coming to a breaking point. We're coming to a point where the United States doesn't just say it competes with China, but now, even with the Iran situation, the U.S. says China is a game changer there. Because now, even if it's completely made up, the U.S. is making up—or referencing—ideas and stories. And, hell, if it's true, it's even worse that China could supply Iran in a way that makes a big difference on the battlefield against the United States. That's a big hit against the American exceptionalist ethos.

We can go on and on with this, right? The Iran situation—the Strait of Hormuz blockade. So now the Trump administration wants to blockade Iran, the Strait of Hormuz, because Iran has taken control of it. And you told us that Iran is blockading the Strait of Hormuz. So if Iran is blockading the Strait of Hormuz, why would you blockade it? Doesn't that just lead to more blockading? Even Iran's foreign ministry came out with a statement saying this defies logic. Really, the only way to resolve any problems that come from what's happened in the Strait of Hormuz is to have discussions.

#Danny

And that's exactly what Iran invited.

#Danny

And Iran held those discussions, mind you, without a ceasefire taking place in Lebanon. And there's an interesting story about that, because Iran was effectively told by the mediators, through the United States, that there would be a ceasefire once talks began. And guess what? There wasn't. The

U.S. lied. Shocker. That's why the talks went the way they did. You better believe the Iranian negotiators were at the table saying, not only "How can we trust you?" but "How could we not demand that you now do this?" They were there, they made the trip—they almost didn't. I was informed they waited for hours and hours, trying to decide whether they were even going to go. This is the mentality in Iran right now. It's different.

It's different from what a lot of Americans, and a lot of people in the collective West, are used to. It's not just defiance—it's dictatorial in the way it asserts its terms. And it's also methodical, and impressively strategic. So this is causing absolute nightmares for the U.S., which doesn't have—well, I don't even like to use the word "strategy" with the United States empire at this point, given the way it behaves and conducts itself based on its own desperate contradictions and issues. Don't even use the word, right? It's not that. The way it behaves— not strategically, but imbecilically, chaotically—the only goal it seems to have in mind is to reach that point of destruction that it thinks will lead to some kind of promised land.

That leads it to some kind of changed outcome that it couldn't get. What did Iran say? It tried to get in talks what it couldn't get on the battlefield. That's a strange way to approach negotiations. You usually go into negotiations because you have leverage. And what the United States would say—and what J.D. Vance has already said, what Trump has said—Trump just said it again. He said, yeah, we can wipe out Iran. He did it again. He went on Fox News and said, we can wipe out Iran, we can take on all of its infrastructure, all of its oil infrastructure. Not mentioning that if the U.S. does this, then what happens? Oh, well, I'll tell you what happens: the markets crash, the global economy tanks, and you have a situation in the United States where gas prices are up 21% in a month.

And all items, all goods, are up two, three, four times what they were before February 28th. So, yeah. Donald Trump doesn't have any more targets. Scott Ritter was on the show—he said the United States doesn't have any more targets. Because those targets it has, they're not only military targets. Forget the technicalities after that, right? They're not military targets. You can't even count those if you're following the laws of war. But the U.S. never does. And they're not even targets in the sense that the consequences of hitting those things only fall harder at the feet of the U.S. Crushes—crushes its own feet, right? Shooting yourself in the foot? No, no, no.

The consequences are just going to shatter at the feet of the U.S. So this is the situation we're in. And the U.S. could very well—this all, I mean, honestly, this is all a restart. I see it as a restart of the war. Because war doesn't always look the same as it's being fought, right? In the movies, we get the war scenes, the front lines, the battles from World War II, those kinds of things. And it looks like what Ukraine became in a lot of ways, where you have two standing armies confronting each other. But often, war doesn't look like that—and it hasn't looked like that for quite a long time.

Even the Ukraine war doesn't fully look like that. Now we're seeing that the battlefield is basically resolved, even if it's in this kind of amorphous situation—some would call it a stalemate—but really it's just Russia methodically going about its business. But there are other parts of this: the economic

war that's been lost by the United States, the diplomatic war, the attempt to overthrow the Russian government. It actually feels a little familiar to the Iran war. It's just that, in the Iran war, the United States was never going to be able to organize a proxy strong enough—like it did with Ukraine—to confront Iran militarily on a battlefield.

That's actually the biggest reason why the United States is where it is right now. As Larry Johnson and so many others on this show have explained, if the U.S. sends ground forces into the region, they'd just get massacred, right? Then it would have to face the consequences, even if it caused casualties itself—which it likely would. I mean, the U.S. trains for this; it practices the art of killing, invading, and so on. But it would still have to bear the consequences of Iran's response and its ability to have, as Patricia Marin said, a high-morale military that's large, with many people volunteering to join and defend the country now.

#Danny

Meaning this is a bad situation for the United States.

#Danny

And they don't have a force inside Iran to do their bidding—to overthrow the government and fight Iran's military forces, to tie them up. It's not a Syria-style situation. Even in Venezuela, we have to remember that there was a violent opposition to the government that caused damage and created the conditions for what eventually happened to Maduro—the kidnapping, all of that. There were multiple iterations of guarimbas, as they were called, where you had right-wing, fascist Venezuelan forces, and even people from outside Venezuela—Colombians, etc.—sparking a kind of “color revolution” scenario to try to destabilize the government.

It didn't work. They tried Nicaragua as well—Honduras, multiple countries in Latin America. They go through this model. This is not a new model. Iran, though, has—in such a shocking fashion to the U. S.—consolidated itself politically to the point where you don't have that. Sure, people have criticisms, people have opposition to the government, but you have no force in Iran that's willing to organize itself to confront the government and military head-on and replace it with something favorable to the United States. You don't have that. You don't have any iteration of it, but you don't have that in particular, and especially here.

Before the war started—right, in late 2025 into the early months of 2026—that violent riot that was eventually put down after a lot of bloodshed and losses, with thousands of Iranians killed, was really the nail in the coffin for this war. We have to go back to that, because if it weren't for that, Iran would have had a lot more troubles to contend with. It wouldn't have been able to focus so much on the external aggressors; it would have had to focus on the internal. And in truth, historically, if we

look at this, the reason why the United States started implementing models like Venezuela, Nicaragua, Syria—these models of trying to create internal dissension and chaos through proxies—right?

The dirty wars in Latin America—all of that happened because of the anti-colonial, liberation, and anti-imperialist movements of the 20th century, right? The whole Cold War—those movements were seen as impenetrable threats. So think about North Korea, for example, the DPRK, or the Soviet Union when it was viable. Think about China now. Think about Iran now, right? These countries had movements that were viewed as impenetrable, and without a force strong enough internally to weaken their legitimacy, no outside invasion could defeat them. Because an outside invasion will never—right? That's it—will never bring about the popular will of the people to fight for you. No, no, no. You're destroying the country. This is a historic fact all through our history.

Even the French, the British, and other empires had to learn this too—that when they tried to invade and settle, they eventually had to deal with the people. So it was always about either trying to, as Israel has done, outnumber—like in Palestine, you try to outnumber, you spread out, you displace everyone, and then you basically try to eradicate. You try to eradicate. This is what they did to the Indigenous people, etc. Or you build up an internal force strong enough to protect the interests you've conquered and occupied. Even Donald Trump uses the word "conquer." So this is ultimately where we are. And I'm in China now, and I'm going to be covering—okay, I'm going to be doing interviews.

I'm going to be talking to, uh, John Whiteway. I'm going to be talking to, uh, Victor Gao during this trip. I was also going to try to do that today, but I didn't because I just got in and wanted to set up the internet, see if it was working. So tell me how that went. I want to see if it works, but I'll be doing more out-and-about where I'm walking and talking so you can see what's going on. Where I'm staying in Beijing right now, at nighttime, I don't think it would've been very pretty, so I'll have to figure that out another time—but I will do it. And I want to see how the internet works out in case I want to get guests back on the show to comment on these developments.

But nonetheless, I'm here now in Beijing. I mean, I can prove it to you. We've got some food here—this is Hunanese food from Beijing. And I'm going to be reporting on China's perspective, especially because right now China's been, of course, from the beginning, brought into this. Oh, look at the radar technology—I like technology. It was all very impressive, but it was done within the framework of general cooperation, not really a military partnership. The military part is just one piece of an overall economic and political understanding.

#Danny

Really, because the China–Iran relationship is political.

#Danny

And that's what I want to talk to the people I'll be interviewing about—why it's so important for China and Iran to have this kind of friendship, why it threatens the United States so much, and what exactly China's role is. Did China strong-arm its ties with Iran, squeeze Iran into these talks? I don't think so, but I want to hear other perspectives on that. So we're going to do a lot here to talk about these things. And, you know, I get to show you China. I like to come here once a year, if not more. It's hard to do that these days, but once a year helps refresh that perspective—see what kind of changes are going on and how it applies to our situation.

Because right now we are in a historic moment, everybody. We're in a historic one. The United States went into negotiations with Iran essentially to try to persuade it to let go of its control over the Strait of Hormuz and the whole so-called nuclear question. Forget about that. Forget about it. Trump said "nuclear"—forget about it. Really, it's about getting Iran to stop asserting its advantages over the United States. I mean, this is what Iran said they were going into. They had won things. They'd achieved something. And they did. They have. They've created a system with the Strait of Hormuz that's going to essentially act as a mechanism for reparations for their country for years to come.

And now the calculation is that no matter how much the U.S. can destroy, unless the Trump administration figures out a way to stop Iran from gaining revenue from the Strait of Hormuz traffic, Iran is saying it can rebuild itself afterward. And it already is. It's already rebuilding train systems, bridges, and so on—things damaged by U.S. and Israeli strikes. So Iran is moving very fast to do this. It's obviously been preparing for it. It's under a wartime economic footing, but also one that's prioritizing, of course, the people in a time of absolute horror, trauma, and just criminality being imposed on them by a foreign power.

Iran has made all the right moves to keep itself not just legitimate, but to grow that legitimacy. And the Strait of Hormuz is really where the United States empire is completely stuck. So the U.S. empire doesn't even—well, you notice where Trump is going now, and this is where we'll end it. The Trump administration is no longer saying, "Yeah, yeah, yeah, let's go into a full war, let's do a ground invasion, let's do all this," right? It was bandying about those options and talking about them for a while. It's not doing that anymore. Now it's back to blockades—naval, economic—the roots of the problem. Because the U.S. is seeing, right before its eyes, its ability to dictate terms economically wane.

And what Iran has done—it's not just strengthening Iran, it's strengthening China, it's strengthening Russia. Because if these countries begin to form a kind of new center of power around how global trade happens—which has already been happening with China—China's already been doing that just by its sheer economic weight, by how it leads as a trading partner with nearly every country in the world. And the infrastructure is top-notch, the technology is top-notch, and people have benefited from it. These are all just facts—whatever you think about it, that's just the reality. But this would be a step further, in that China often takes the view that it doesn't want to dominate anything. Now

Iran has been forced into a position where it has to dominate the Strait of Hormuz if it's going to survive. China now can say—and Russia can say—yeah, there are plenty of areas where they could assert themselves militarily and economically to shore up their own national security at the economic level, the fundamental level of their survival.

So everybody, this is a game-changing moment. The talks have collapsed. The U.S. Navy is getting ready to go into a war that will be a disaster for it. Trump is restarting this war because he has nothing else. He can't bow down to Iran's terms, which have been out there from the very beginning, right? Respect Iran's sovereignty, stop the strikes, international guarantees that the strikes will be stopped through a UN Security Council vote, as well as a mechanism to enforce that vote, reparations, a ceasefire in Lebanon—all these terms that have been out there for months. And now the United States can't leave the room with Iran without taking those into consideration, and it ran out of the room like a toddler in a tantrum.

I want to thank everybody for the super chats. The main reason Trump kidnapped Maduro was to try and force him to lie and say Venezuela interfered in 2020, because he can't stand losing. That's one of the reasons—I don't know if it's the main reason. Damn the man. Thank you, buddy, for your insightful, jocular analysis and your wonderful guests these past weeks. Have a good week in China. Be safe. Yes, I'll be here for a few, actually. Great job, Danny. Thank you—thank you for all of this. Danny Haiphong, relentless as a Vietnam compatriot. Remember, this year marks 80 years.

France tried to recolonize Vietnam after World War II in 1946, which led to their historic defeat at Dien Bien Phu in 1954. Yes, indeed. My father was also a Vietnam vet, so he got to face the consequences of that many years later. I'm sorry, people need to stop letting Trump off the hook. It drives me nuts. He's a grown man with agency. Sure, he lied—he always lies. But no, no, I agree with that. I agree with that. I mean, Trump is the president of the United States. He is a war criminal. He falls in with the rest of the war criminals. And yes, he is—indeed, he believes this war is in his interest. He's not just playing; this is not just an acting role.

Dear Danny, Grigol is governing by tweets and seeing aggression as the solution. Any problem is surreal. Salvador Dalí is on the sidelines, don't you think? Thank you so much for that comment. Has there been any actual evidence that Iran has deployed any mines? Yes. The only reason there's evidence is because the IRGC is escorting tankers—and it's not just for fun. There are definitely mines there. Now, how many? How devastating? How whatever? We don't know. We don't know. Do you know if Harachi and Persona are back home safe and sound? They're 26 here. I believe they are, but I think there's a lot of silence around this because there's a lot of—oh, he just messaged me. So he's safe. All right.

I'm going to get with him at some point soon, either by stream or pre-record. All right, everybody, hit the like button. We are done here. I got it—it's 1:30 a.m. in Beijing. I've got to go, but I'm going to keep doing this. All right, each day I'll be doing something for all of you. Take care. All right, hit the like button as you leave. Be sure to do that because it helps. What do we have here? Now, we

have 5.6 thousand likes—that's great. But hey, 12,000 of you—if you can get another 1,000 or 2,000 up, that helps a lot. I saw another big super chat—no, no, I already said, I already reported that. All right, everybody, hit the like button. I'll be back again tomorrow. I'll let you know what time that is. Peace out.