

Trump CAVES to Humiliating Iran Deal, USA SURRENDERED | Larry Johnson

Former CIA analyst Larry Johnson joins the show to discuss the bombshell US-Iran MoU deal just signed and why it amounts to a historic humiliation for Trump & the US empire. Larry's blog: <https://sonar21.com/> FOLLOW ME ON RUMBLE: <https://rumble.com/c/DannyHaiphong> FOLLOW ME ON TELEGRAM: <https://t.me/dannyhaiphong> SUPPORT THE CHANNEL ON PATREON: <https://www.patreon.com/dannyhaiphong> Support the channel in other ways: <https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhaiphong> Substack: chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritofho> Follow me on Telegram: <https://t.me/dannyhaiphong> #iranwar #iran #trump

#Danny

Welcome, everyone. Welcome back to the show. It's Danny Haiphong here. As you can see, I am joined by Larry Johnson, the former CIA analyst, now geopolitical commentator and analyst. Larry, good to see you again.

#Larry Johnson

Man, where's Colonel Wilkerson? We've sent him away on vacation. Yeah, I feel like I'm only half here.

#Danny

Oh, Larry squared. Only one is here now, but we'll make do with you, Larry. And so I'm grateful for you being here as Colonel Wilkerson gets a well-deserved rest. Everyone, hit the like button — that helps boost the program. But let's get started right away here, Larry, with the humiliation, the defeat, the absolute catastrophe as it is being described all across the Western mainstream media, U.S. mainstream media, U.S. elites, the political class, and Zionists all coming together, deeming this Iran deal or the U.S.-Iran Memorandum of Understanding a complete and utter disaster.

Now, Mosab Projeshkin published on his X account the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding, the official terms. And while it may be a little hard to see here, there are 14 points across two pages. The six points are only shown on the first page. Some very notable things here — Lebanon is included in the deal, Iran is now saying — and this is, I think, a big part of why there's a lot of humiliation talk going on — that they will actually strike Israel and begin closing the Strait of Hormuz again if Israel does not stop its attacks on Iran.

And there's also this very interesting feature of the deal where it says the Islamic Republic of Iran will conduct dialogue with Oman to define the future administration and maritime services of the Strait of Hormuz. And, of course, there's a controversial 300 billion U.S. dollars that the United States will undertake with its regional partners to boost investment in Iran for reconstruction. So, Larry, this is being seen as a massive deal. I have a lot of videos I want to play on these reactions and posts. But first, to you, what exactly happened here? The signing was pushed up. This happened yesterday, June 17th, very late. What's going on here?

#Larry Johnson

Well, let's first note the tremendous irony that Donald Trump was seated in the Palace of Versailles in France where he signed this document. The last time they had a signing ceremony there was about 108 years ago, and Germany was brought in and humiliated and forced to sign surrender documents for the First World War. So I don't know if Trump's staff was aware of that, if they actually had that historical memory, or they just thought, hey, this is a pretty cool-looking place, let's sign it here. So there's that irony. I'd like to go back to that document because I think the most important, most consequential part of that document is the first paragraph, number one. Because when you read the penultimate sentence where it says—and here, let me blow up my... yeah, I can read it also as well.

#Danny

Okay, I got it there.

#Larry Johnson

Yeah, the key is ensuring—so it says that Iran and the United States, they are going to undertake from now on, this is their obligation, and one of those obligations is ensuring the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon. Now, is Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon a violation of their territorial integrity? Bet your ass it is. Is it a threat to the sovereignty of Lebanon? Absolutely not. So what this document, what this does, is essentially the United States is giving Iran tacit approval to do whatever is necessary to oust Israel from southern Lebanon. So if Iran was to attack Israel directly... that might be a problem.

But under the terms of this agreement, Iran can launch missile after missile at the Israeli units and collaborate with Hezbollah to defeat and push the Israelis out. I'm stunned that that got in there, but there it is. But we also, I guess, need to concede that the guy who should win the Nobel Peace Prize out of this for making this possible is Bibi Netanyahu. Were it not for Bibi, man, this thing wouldn't have happened. If Bibi had simply kept his hands to himself, had not attacked Beirut or the suburb Dahieh a week ago, more than a week ago, Iran wouldn't have felt compelled to retaliate and was getting ready to retaliate. And Donald Trump intervened and said, don't, please don't.

They said, you know, okay, what do you got to offer us if we don't? And Donald Trump made them offers, you know, they just couldn't refuse. So, immediate blockade lifting, the return of some of the frozen assets. So Iran, you know, Iran had five red lines. And those red lines were lifting of sanctions, unfreezing assets, lifting the blockade, recognizing Iran's control of the Strait of Hormuz, and fifth, the end of the war in Lebanon, you know, permanent ceasefire. They got all that. All that. And several of us were saying from the outset that they would not negotiate. Those were not areas where they would make concessions. And lo and behold, they didn't. So, yeah, watching the melt.

And were it not for Bibi, if Bibi hadn't done that, you know, Donald Trump might still be arguing with Pozhetsky over those terms. But because Iran was prepared to act and to hit Israel hard, that, you know, made this deal possible. But the other thing that happened about the same time over that weekend, Donald Trump was briefed. Now, Pepe, our friend Pepe Escobar, he got it that it was—we don't know if it was Chris Wright, the Secretary of Energy, or someone at the CIA—but they briefed Trump on what, if this war continues and the Strait of Hormuz is not opened immediately, there is going to be a massive economic crisis. The Strategic Petroleum Reserve will be empty, and this could torch off a global depression, and Donald Trump would be remembered in the same way that Herbert Hoover was for the Great Crash of the 1930s.

And I'll tell you what, that scared Donald Trump. That's why all of a sudden you saw him yesterday, and he said it. You know, Pepe's source said it was going to be mid-August. Trump yesterday said four weeks. So somewhere between mid-July and mid-August, we're going to have this crunch. Now, the unfortunate thing for Trump is, you know, they're going to sign this agreement, say, okay, Strait's open, everybody come use it. But that's not how it's going to work. Because number one, you've got a lot of those tankers that have been filled with oil that are sitting out there, you know, in the heat and all. And they may not be in good condition to be able to offload that oil first. Their hulls are encrusted with barnacles. Those need to be cleaned off because it's going to impede their ability to travel efficiently and at speed.

Those that are sitting empty and need to be loaded, it's not clear that all the oil wells are back online. And in some cases, it takes weeks for those to get online. But the most important and potentially delaying factor is any mines that have been laid in the Persian Gulf. The Pentagon, Department of War—aka Department of Defense—told Congress in April that it would take up to six months to clear the straits and the Gulf of the mines. So, you know, when we put all that together, even though Trump has said, okay, hey, we're now going to work forward on this peace deal with Iran, the strait's open, and it's really only open effectively for Iranian ships. The other ships that have come out of, say, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, UAE—those may be delayed.

#Danny

Great synopsis, Larry. And I just want to say, first off, it is pretty historic. Look, the U.S.'s word—I mean, Israel is not even involved in this other than being what some call the spoiler. I would just say being Israel, in terms of being unable to admit when to even just take a breather here. But

Israel—what we see in this document, and you outlined some of the points you reviewed—but the totality of it is pretty remarkable, given that you can probably say all 14 of the points, other than maybe a few touches here and there about this, like, you know, reopening the Strait after, whatever it is, 30 days, 60 days—everything else is Iran.

Everything else is terms that Iran really wanted to see put into paper and eventually turn into what will be a more comprehensive deal once, I guess, these negotiations are through, if they get to that point. So we can't trust the U.S.'s word, of course. We can, you know, we can expect—even Pete Hegseth said—they're already violating the first part of the clause because Pete Hegseth said Trump, at times, has said that they are going to bomb Iran again if this doesn't work out. That kind of signals that the U.S. is wanting to continue aggression. But nonetheless, these points, I think, have to be seen as indicative of the panic. There's some real truth to the panic here that we're seeing by the Zionists, by the media, the neocons.

It is a pretty damning admission of defeat here. Now, I want to play some of these clips. So here is one of Donald Trump. He had a disastrous presser, a disastrous presser that really, I believe, Larry... Actually, let me play a different one here. Really, actually felt—you know, I always call Trump the id. Sometimes what he says means absolutely nothing, and he's just lying through his teeth. And other times when he's talking, he is talking about a real situation that just cannot be changed. And regardless of his true intentions here, Trump says literally exactly what you just mentioned about the oil crisis. He admits they probably didn't want him to say this, that these reserves were about to run out, and that's why this deal, in large part, was made.

#Donald Trump

Now, if I did the opposite, if I went out and continued to bomb them for another four, just bomb the hell out of them, I'd get bad press on that. No, there's nothing I can do. But what this does is it allows the ships to go. If we keep bombing, those ships won't be going. And you're talking about \$500, \$600, \$700 million a day. That's a lot of money. A lot of money. That's why the world is okay. It's liquid. It's fine. Also, we run out of reserves in about four weeks. You know, there are reserves all over the world, and we would really run out. And there would be a time when you wouldn't be able to get it. And you want to see deadlock? So for all those so-called geniuses that want to show me how smart they are, ask them why didn't they blow up General Soleimani?

#Danny

So that's some partisan shtick there at the end. But Larry, I mean, the gist of that was oil reserves are going to run out, no activity through the strait if we keep on it, not possible to continue. That, to me, I mean, that's the definition of admitting you lost.

#Larry Johnson

Well, yeah, look, a few of us were saying from the outset that the shutdown of the Strait of Hormuz, which meant closing off about 20% of the world's oil supply, shutting down about 20% to 25% of the world's liquid natural gas production, which then directly impacts the production of helium—because my understanding is the helium is trapped in with the natural gas and it's separated out when they pull the LNG out of the ground—and then the urea and sulfur with their connection to fertilizer as well as other critical industrial applications, and the helium, its role for both medical equipment but also, more importantly, for the production of computer chips.

And that's relevant because right now people are talking about AI building data centers. Why do they call them data centers? Because they're filled with computers, and those computers need computer chips. So at a time when these companies are having to invest money in computers and the price of computer chips is going up, that's going to mean the price of their overall operations—they're just going to have more money flowing out of their pockets than in. So really significant economic consequences. And everybody pretended that, even Trump, we don't care. Who cares? We don't use the Strait that much. Boy, that was a lie. So this critical economic artery has been shut down. And then the United States doubled down on it by trying to impose a blockade.

It was really only partially effective simply because the United States didn't have enough ships to actually be able to mount a full-on blockade. But now, one of the ways the United States and other countries coped with this cutoff of oil supply was by drawing upon their strategic reserves. And in the case of the United States, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which they started filling up back in 1983 or 1984. And what's being said now is it's at the lowest level since then. So since they started filling it up, you know, 43 years ago, they're now down to those levels. I saw a news report on Monday of this week that said it was 360 million barrels left. But then I was with another show, Capital Cosm, a guy named Danny Haiphong runs it, like you.

And he looked it up immediately online, and actually the last data from June 5th showed it at 349 million barrels. Well, that works out to roughly 16 days of oil, 17 days of oil. And once that's exhausted, if you don't have another source or supply to make that up, you know, your economy shuts down. So it's not just the United States that was facing this. And that's, you know, when Donald Trump was informed of this, I guess he panicked. That's probably the only way to put it, because he didn't realize how, you know, they'd been lying to the American public, lying to themselves perhaps all along, that it was Iran that was on the verge of collapse. No, it's our own economy.

#Danny

Well, we can continue on this descent of humiliation to humiliation for Trump and the United States around this deal. Because, again, I want to stress that I don't believe the United States' word when it comes to, you know, negotiations. I think history shows that we can't. But I think there's also something to say about the particular circumstances you just outlined, and why Donald Trump and the administration are talking the way they are now. So let's go into some of the things he said in his

presser in reaction to this deal. A lot of the very justifications for war with Iran are beginning to crumble. These are things I have not heard, actually, Trump say. Wait, wait, wait.

#Larry Johnson

Let me stop. Beginning to crumble?

#Danny

Yeah, yeah. They've imploded. They've imploded. And they were always lies. I mean, they're always based on lies. You know, we've been over this on the show. The whole nuclear scare of Iran was always just a justification for war. But now even Trump, at the heels of this deal, is contradicting all of it. And here is one example of this.

#Donald Trump

We've been pretty tough on that. You know, it is a little hard, though, when you say that somebody wants it, other people have it.

#Danny

And he's talking about enriching uranium and nuclear energy.

#Donald Trump

Other adjoining states have it, and you're not letting them have it for purposes of electricity or things like that. It's always a little tough. You have to use a little common sense, please.

#Danny

So that's a far different position than what we've heard Trump say basically his entire political career. Here is what he had to say about Iran's ballistic missile program.

#Donald Trump

So we'll be working on a parallel effort with the Gulf nations to address non-nuclear issues, such as the conventional ballistic missiles, which we'll be talking about and supporting. I mean, they have to have some because other people have some. You've got to have some. Somebody said you shouldn't give them one. And I have guys — I like some of these guys — but I don't think this. I don't think they're smart.

#Speaker 1

Sir, you shouldn't let them have any missiles.

#Donald Trump

I said, well, what am I going to do? Am I going to let Saudi Arabia have missiles, but they can't have any?

#Larry Johnson

Yes, sir.

#Donald Trump

It doesn't work that way, you know. It doesn't work that way. And missiles aren't the problem. Missiles, they hurt a little location, but they don't blow up the planet.

#Danny

So, again, I mean, this has the Zionists absolutely mad, not to mention his commentary on Israel, which I'll play in a second. But, Larry, your reaction to this? Because in this person, I mean, even just his performance there is absolutely—it's kind of humiliating. You know, I always say that Trump is kind of the anti-American exceptionalist president because he just goes off and doesn't follow protocol or etiquette or any of these things. What's your reaction to these statements? Who was he imitating?

#Larry Johnson

It was that—was that Pete Hegseth? Right. Was that Marco Rubio? Um, General Admiral Cooper, you know. So I don't think he was just making that imitation up. I think someone actually said that to him, and then he pushed back. It's a stunning—I'll call it a reversal. And, you know, as I said earlier, thank you, Bibi Netanyahu. Were it not for you, buddy, this wouldn't be happening. Now, the reality is the United States was caught, and this is called biting the bullet to get yourself out. It may be painful, it may be embarrassing, but at least it's going to cauterize the wound. You're going to stop bleeding. Before, we were bleeding, and the bleeding was going to continue, and we didn't have a way to stop it.

I verified now, so up until a couple of days ago, I think it was about the time that they decided, okay, we're signing, we're going all in on this now. The military's crisis action teams, they're called CATS. They have one there at the Pentagon, near the National Military Command Center. They had others at scattered bases, at CENTCOM, at air operations out at Andrews. Those are all shut down now. They used to be running 24/7, 12 hours on, 12 hours off. You know, it's brutal, brutal shift work. They're back to regular 9-to-5, all of those soldiers, sailors, Marines, Air Force officers, and

enlisted personnel. I think it's called Combat Air Command. Let me see. I had the name specific. Yeah, Air Combat Command. That's it.

So they're the only ones who are working 24/7 right now because they're scheduling all this aircraft that we had forward-deployed, and it's going to be called a reverse air bridge. It's all flying back in this direction. So that's why you know that this is another sign that this agreement is dead-ass real. Because if this was just a ploy to lull the Iranians into a false sense of security so we could blast them, you wouldn't be turning—they wouldn't be ordering all this combat aircraft out of the area. And that's also going to send a message to Netanyahu: basically, you know, you want to continue poking the Iranians in the chest, go ahead. But we're not going to be there to back you up. So, you know, you want to go, you want to get into a bar fight, go ahead. See, you know, see what you can do out of that.

#Danny

Yeah, and even if at some point in the future the United States says, okay, well, we'll bomb again, we'll blockade again, all of this—now, with what you just said, it'll take a significant amount of time. You can't just say you're going to do that. If you've taken those forces away, you have to put them back in place.

#Larry Johnson

It'll take a couple of weeks. It'll take more than a week to do it.

#Danny

Which is not particularly advantageous when you have an opponent that has already shown that that's far too much time to stop anything that Iran would do to retaliate. Let me get into some of that, because now with this deal, as you said, the world can thank Netanyahu and Israel for speeding up this deal. We see the Trump administration—well, I don't take much stock in rhetoric. At the same time, if there are particular steps being made right now to solidify this deal and to make it real, we have to believe that this panic has some basis to it. And some of this has to do with the fact that Trump and now J.D. Vance—I'll play two different segments—are really going after Israel. They are obviously not happy about the Lebanon situation. And then we can see from the reactions from prominent Zionists that the Zionists are not happy with the Trump administration. First, Donald Trump and Vance, and then I'll show a bit of the Zionist panic.

#Donald Trump

And you'll see that when you see the agreement. But it's appropriate that we release the agreement. And we did send a copy to Israel, by the way. They've been a good partner. Again, I think they could do better with respect to Hezbollah. I'm not saying they shouldn't protect themselves. I'm

saying when two drones are shot into the desert and drop harmlessly, you don't have to knock down buildings in Beirut. They could behave better. And frankly, they could do a better job. I love them as a partner. They were terrific. They could do a much better job with Hezbollah.

#Danny

So there's one. And then here is J.D. Vance to the New York Times, in terms of reacting to Israeli opposition to the deal.

#JD Vance

Yeah, you've seen people in their system, Ben-Gvir and Smotrich, who have attacked the deal. And I guess my response to them would be, what is your exact proposal? And you're a country of 9 million people. You can't just kill your way out of solving every single national security problem that you have. Look at what...

#Danny

So that's J.D. Vance. And in terms of Zionist panic, I think there's only one person you need to look at, especially in the media, because I think he really represents the most vitriolic elements of the Zionist cabal, so to speak. And here's Mark Levin literally saying the quiet part out loud: it's time for a change in strategy. We should consider slow-walking the enemy, building up our munitions, our oil reserves, get the price of gasoline down, get through the midterms, then knock them—Iran—out, instead of rushing to a deal, building up their oil industry, and transferring billions abroad to them, etc. So, uh, and that's the nice way of saying what a lot of the pro-Israeli lobby types in the U.S., and of course the Zionists all around the world, are saying. Your reactions there?

#Larry Johnson

Yeah, no, I mean, remember, Trump was honored as being a Jewish president. The Zionists who now accuse him of being a traitor—he's an American citizen, albeit of German heritage, but an American citizen and president of the United States of America. And he has not betrayed the United States. The Israelis think he's betrayed them. Well, guys, he ain't president of Israel, even though he's talked about wanting to go run there. And the previous great popularity for Donald Trump, that's evaporated now. I think colonoscopies get a higher rating. So, you know, they're upset that he's calling out their murder.

And their genocide. That was, again, another big surprise. As he noted, you know, Hezbollah fires drones that don't kill civilians. You know, I was on with another popular podcaster on X, Mario Nawfal, and I said, hey, Mario, look up—you know, I think he's well connected with Elon Musk, so I

assume he used Grok—I said, ask Grok this question: how many Israelis has Hezbollah killed since 1982? And Grok comes back, less than 1,100. Less than 1,100. I said, okay, Grok, how many Palestinians has Israel killed since 1982? Grok comes back.

#Larry Johnson

Well, over 80,000. It's actually, the number's 90,000, and that doesn't include the bodies that are buried under the rubble in Gaza. So what you're saying is that here we have a nation, Israel, that has killed 90 Palestinians minimum—men, women, and children, civilians—for every dead Israeli that has died at the hands of what they call a Hezbollah terrorist attack. Just in sheer weight of numbers, we can tell who the terrorist is, who the perpetrator of the greatest violence is, despite the attempts to blame that on Hezbollah. It's certainly not Hezbollah. Nobody wants to hear it, but don't believe me. Just check it out, everybody. You know, type it in. See what the answer comes up. It's not going to come up and say Hezbollah has killed thousands and Israel has only killed a few.

No, it's just the exact opposite. So, you know, we're at a potential watershed moment for the entire Middle East conflict because, again, part of the other backstory is that a lot of this initiative, what brought this to pass, was Russia and China working through Pakistan, with China in the lead and then Pakistan taking over the process of shepherding these negotiations through to get to this document. And it is, as part of that effort, the discussions are underway with Egypt, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Pakistan to create, let's call it, an Islamic defense force for the Middle East that will be there to protect and ensure the security of the countries of, you know, West Asia, the Middle East.

And that means that Israel is going to finally—they will face a united Muslim front, Arab and Persian. So, you know, that's going to keep Israel up at night as well. Now, they've got a choice: stop their racist genocide, stop their, you know, dismantle their apartheid state, and behave like a normal state and protect the human rights of citizens regardless of whether they're Jewish or not. And then Israel might have a chance to survive. If they don't do that, I think the very survival of Israel will come into question at some point, because as Vance correctly noted, 9 million people—you can't kill your way to victory or peace.

#Danny

Well, we can confirm. I'll just quickly, for the audience, confirm these Grok numbers. So I asked the question: how many Israelis has Hezbollah killed since 1982, and how many Lebanese and Palestinians has Israel killed? So that number gets bigger. So here we have 1,500 Israelis. You correctly noted there for Lebanese, it's 10 to 25,000 plus potentially since 1982. And then for Palestinians, 85 to 100,000 plus. So we're looking at nearly 200,000 people-ish, you know, depending on estimates. On the Israeli side, one to two hundred.

#Larry Johnson

One to two hundred.

#Danny

One to two hundred.

#Larry Johnson

It's a gruesome, genocidal number. Enough of this stupid crap. Oh, Iran's the number one sponsor of terrorism? If terrorism is defined as the use of violence against civilians for political purposes, the number one terrorist in the Middle East is Israel. By the numbers. It's not an anti-Semitic saying. It's not hyperbole. It's just, if your definition is this and the numbers are that, then the answer is Israel.

#Danny

Larry, I want to get to the great point I want to get to. So, you know, I completely agree across the political spectrum. There's a lot of talk of Trump, the United States defeated in this war, the MOU, this agreement being a manifestation of that agreement. Where I'm taking a lot of umbrage, actually, though, is now it's so interesting. And, you know, this is how Trump burnishes his brand, too, is he frames himself as persecuted. And one of the ways he can do that is when you have now the Iran-hawk, warmongering Zionist elite across the political spectrum.

Now, including, and of course always including, the Democratic Party speaking like this, because when now a deal, and even the prospect—look, the prospect may be slim, thin, it may be zero—for actual peace to occur. But the fact that Iran, through its efforts, has gotten to this point and has been able to force this kind of deal is saying something. But now you have the Democrats, you have neocons now talking about how humiliating this is, seemingly in the service of, well, actually, the U. S. should be more firm and more aggressive toward Iran. Here is Chris Murphy, who has been a longtime critic, Democrat, of Donald Trump. And here's how he framed the deal. Let me see if I have this on the playback speed, because he talks a little slow. Here we go.

#Speaker 2

The deal between Trump and Iran cements the fact that this war was the biggest foreign policy disaster in the last 20 years. I want this war to be over, and I knew the terms were going to be humiliating, but I didn't think they were going to be this humiliating. Here's what this deal basically is: Iran makes zero concessions, and the United States lets Iran trade oil for free and commits to give them \$300 billion in reparations. This deal is essentially Iran's terms, and it is going to make any future nuclear negotiations practically impossible.

Because by releasing the oil sanctions now, you have very little leverage to get Iran to commit to do anything later on their nuclear program. This is the price of incompetence. This is the price of people

cosplaying diplomats. You've got the president's son-in-law and a real estate developer in charge of these negotiations, and this is what you get: a deal in which Iran commits to nothing, and the United States effectively just pays Iran hundreds of billions of dollars to end the war. Thirteen Americans dead. Sixty billion dollars of your taxpayer money wasted for nothing. America gets nothing out of this agreement.

#Danny

Larry, why the hell should the U.S. get in an agreement when they're the ones who lost, and they're the ones who, you know, effectively imposed these sanctions, which you talked about for so long as being unilateral, illegal, deadly, all kinds of things? But this is the framing right now. It seems like those who are opposed to Trump on this side of the political aisle are opposed to the fact that the United States isn't extracting concessions from Iran to the point where essentially what they want, it seems like, is a status quo where the U.S. can continue starving Iran or attempting to starve Iran, attempting to isolate Iran, but just in a more effective way than what Trump did. But to me, that's just— to me, it's BS, but it's also— it doesn't reflect reality. And it's just so interesting that now we are coming into this point where it seems like Iran is cementing its real status as a sovereign global power. These types who say they oppose Trump on the basis of this war are really not opposed to war. But what are your thoughts?

#Larry Johnson

People like Chris Murphy, devoid of logic and a liar. Or I don't know if he's deliberately lying or just terribly ignorant. So let's start with the \$300 billion. That money is supposed to be pledged by other countries as an investment fund, and none of it is U.S. taxpayer dollars, so why the hell does he care? And I would simply note that we do have a parallel with Trump's "Peace to Prosperity" plan in Gaza. You know, literally billions of dollars were pledged to that. How many have actually been put into the bank? Zero. So let's start with that. Oh, we got to keep these sanctions on. Otherwise, we don't have any leverage over Iran. Okay, we've had sanctions on for 47 years. And that has caused Iran to do what? No, it hasn't changed Iran's policy.

In fact, because the United States refused to live up to the terms of the JCPOA, refused to ease the sanctions, Iran had an incentive to go out and enrich uranium up to 60% and threatened to go to 90%. So now they're actually, with the end of this deal, blockaded and with the end of sanctions on Iranian oil. But, you know, we're not doing that. We're not doing that. Oh, we want to have a deal. And this is pure self-interest. We want that Iranian oil out there ASAP because we're running out, as I talked about earlier. This is a five-alarm fire. It's an emergency. We can't wait. And so, yeah, we'll let Iran sell oil. We're going to let Russia sell oil. We're not going to try to interfere with any of that. Get more out there on the market as possible.

And even by doing that now, it's probably too late. It is, you know, it's like you've jumped out of an airplane and your parachute fails to open. And then you've got a reserve chute, and say 20 feet

above the ground, you finally pull the chute. You might survive, but you're going to be pretty messed up. And that's where we are economically right now. We might survive, but there's still going to be significant economic damage done, not just to the United States, but around the world because of these shortages. So what I do find odd is that, you know, instead of the traditional, where the Democrats, you know, were for at least one period defined as the anti-war party—God, man, they're as venomous as many of the Republicans. It's tough to tell them apart.

#Danny

Yeah, that's been a prevailing trend for a long time, which I find is funny. Some people say, "Dan, you have Trump derangement syndrome on this show." He just happens to be the president. I mean, if you watch this show during the Biden administration, not much difference when it comes to criticizing the president. The absolute horrors and, you know, absurdity of U.S. wars. But, um, let's do one more example. Here is Ro Khanna, who has been a more—his voice has been more, I would say, prominent and more vocal, more critical, more consistent on these issues to some degree. But even he goes on Fox News, and just watch the narrative. It's very similar: "You and your colleagues just want to upend this president's agenda. Is that what's happening right now with this MOU with Iran?"

#Speaker 1

No, I actually support the agreement and bringing the war to an end. I have always supported bringing the war to an end. I will say, though, that this agreement is not as good as what the JCPOA was. And let me just give you three factual reasons. First, under the JCPOA, 97 percent of the enriched uranium was removed from Iran. Under this agreement, it simply dilutes it. Second, the JCPOA had the Security Council resolution as a force of law with intrusive IAEA inspections. That still has not been achieved. And most problematically, we're going to be on the hook to raise \$300 billion for Iran's economic development and reconstruction. Not U.S. taxpayer money, but raising that money. Why aren't we focused on the economic development and reconstruction of Middletown, Ohio, Johnstown, Pennsylvania? We're putting \$300 billion to be raised for child care, for health care, for Americans.

#Danny

Which, even though I agree with him on that last point, is still a straw man argument, because who's to say both can't be done? The U.S. should probably, honestly, pay up—literally—because they destroyed Iranian infrastructure, etc. But nonetheless, it's the same argument, Larry. It's this idea that, yeah, we should get—it's like, the U.S. should get way more from Iran, despite the reality being far different than when the JCPOA was signed. But what are your thoughts?

#Larry Johnson

Well, yeah, no, this is—let's call this JCPOA light. Look, Trump will be able to declare at the end of the process, OK, we've got a permanent assurance that Iran is not going to build a nuke. I mean, that supposedly was the issue all along. I maintain it was not. The nukes were just an excuse to try to destroy the Islamic Republic. We couldn't stand having this religiously based state. Well, again, you've got to ask yourselves, why does the Islamic Republic of Iran bother us so much, but the Islamic Republic of Saudi Arabia, which isn't even a republic—the Islamic monarchy of Saudi Arabia, the Islamic monarchy of Qatar, the Islamic monarchy of Kuwait—we have no problem with that. And the reality is, the Shia interpretation of Islam produces much more moderate believers that are not usually engaged with suicide.

The suicide bombers typically, traditionally, historically, have come out of these Sunni extremist groups known as the Salafists, the Deobandis, the Wahhabis—not out of Iran, not out of Shia Islam. The multiple marriages, multiple wives—again, that's sort of a Gulf Arab, a Saudi thing. It's not a Shia thing in Iran. So there's just so much misinformation out there that has been piled up in trying to get Americans past this propagandized narrative that's been created, that is just absolutely false. But most Americans believe it, and they're unwilling to accept that, you know what, the Iranians are not horrific, horrible people, and, you know, they're not killing thousands. In fact, again, let's deal with history: which country has invaded more countries in the 21st century than any other country in the world?

That would be the United States, not Iran. Iran hasn't invaded a single country. It was asked, invited by the government of Syria to come in and help fight off U.S.-backed Islamic terrorists, which we funded. I mean, we can't even keep our own bullshit straight. I mean, one minute we're fighting the war on terrorism, and the next minute, man, we're enabling them, we're equipping them, we're funding them, and then we help make them president of Syria and invite them to the White House.

#Danny

Hey, Larry, didn't you hear? Maybe, maybe Trump is going to call up Jolani to take over the Lebanon operation because, you know, Israel can't get it done. I mean, this is, you know, this is the kind of logic that stands. This is what Trump has said in part. But, you know, I actually had this tab pulled up to these things in some ways and respects. We see the Zionists panicking as well because a lot of this stuff has failed. You know, a lot of this. While Iran has been demonized—and Trump still does, right?—47 years of terrorism and killing people in the United States and terrorizing the region, biggest sponsor of terror. This is literally coming from an Israeli source, Isaac Khotiner of Channel 14, who is a big Netanyahu ally.

#Larry Johnson

And he talked about how... No, it was Shimon Riklin. Oh, Shimon Riklin.

#Danny

Oh, yes. Yeah. Oh, yes. Yes. Sorry, sorry. That's the interviewer I just showed her interviewing Shimon Riklin. And what he says is literally that he's now blaming Trump for why the Kurds in Iraq did not fight or did not take up arms and try to destabilize Iran during this period, stating that actually it was Trump who stopped it rather than what Trump said, which is this coming from Drop Site News. Trump had originally said, or at least his sources had said, the Kurds don't want to fight. And you've talked about this too, Larry. But now this prominent Zionist of Channel 14 News, Shimon Riklin, is now, because of this deal, saying, nope, Trump actually was the one to have stopped this idea. He didn't want it. So again, what are Kurdish militants? They're terrorists. And the reasoning for why Trump didn't do it, said this Shimon Riklin character, is because Turkey didn't want it, which we know Turkey's history with the Kurds and why they might not want such a thing. So your thoughts on this?

#Larry Johnson

Well, again, the Kurds have been the redheaded stepchild of the entire Middle East. The Turks hate them. The Iranians hate them. The Iraqis hate them. The Syrians hate them. They don't have anybody that really likes them except maybe Israel. And Israel is only using them for their own, you know, it's total manipulation. Israel is only concerned as long as they serve Israeli interests. They're great to help. They're good friends. Over the last couple of weeks, say the 9th, the 10th, Iran was regularly carrying out strikes up in Erbil at these camps, whether it was CIA camps. And there were some Iraqi Kurds and other Kurds being trained to go back into Iran and to try to engage security forces and try to create enough of a popular uprising that they might have some chance of overthrowing the government.

But, you know, Iran was attuned to that and was blowing them up, weakening them. This is where, you know, like Jelani said, once he heard Trump say, hey, you know, Jelani can go do it, Jelani said, I don't think so. They're not going to do it because they'd get their ass kicked. That was one of the things, you know, we were furious at General Soleimani of Iran for, because when he went in, he really led the counter-terrorist insurgency in Syria against ISIS and all of its, you know, let's call them descendants, like al-Nusra and then Hayat Tahrir al-Sham. He was very effective in defeating those Islamic extremists.

And let's not forget ISIS, you know, they took great glee in attacking and killing Iranian Shia because they viewed them as apostates. So this, you know, this religious motivation was genuine. It wasn't just contrived. So this is, you know, at least right now, I think al-Jolani had enough sense to recognize this. He understood Kissinger's warning that to be an enemy of the United States is dangerous, but to be a friend of the United States is lethal. And that they could very well be sending him and his remaining terrorists to their death. And so he smartly opted out and said, no, I'm not going to do that.

#Danny

Yeah. Well, let's get to it in the last six minutes or so we have. Good heavens, time flies when you're having fun. Time flies when you're having so much fun. Exactly, exactly. Well, here's the – now, right before we came on, CENTCOM published this, putting more meat behind what you described, Larry, in terms of the United States actually making moves to show, I guess we can call it, good faith around this MOU. CENTCOM said that U.S. forces lifted the blockade on all maritime traffic entering and exiting Iranian ports and coastal areas in accordance with the president's direction. American forces are not impeding the transit of vessels to or from Iranian ports. All U.S. military blockade enforcement efforts have ceased.

Our great naval ships will remain in the general area to make sure that all aspects of the agreement are adhered to, obeyed, and in full force or effect. And your last comments, Larry, you know, I thought this headline was kind of a perfect synopsis of how maybe, if we can say, the layperson should view what has happened here. It says Iran has learned a valuable lesson as it returns to the negotiating table: it can survive the worst the U.S. can throw at it. Iran, indeed, Larry, they took what the United States could throw at it, and now through this MOU and the developments, it seems like they've come out stronger for it. How do you view this? What are your concluding, maybe, points on what we're witnessing here?

#Larry Johnson

The CIA needs to change its attitude or its philosophical framework for doing regime change. You want to get regime change in Iran? The last thing you want to do is attack not only the regime but the people, because we've seen over and over again, whether it's in Iran or whether it's in, say, Cuba or Syria or wherever, that that kind of outside intervention actually brings the people together and strengthens the existing regime. It doesn't weaken it. So we end up having the exact opposite effect. It's like I've maintained for a while. I said, if you really want to weaken the regime in Iran, if I was back at CIA running operations, I'd make sure I would be delivering Starlink platforms that had free access to, like, Pornhub.com or something.

And so all the young guys would be out there, man, they'd be obsessed with Western pornography instead of, you know, being out in the streets supporting a religious government. And I'm saying that somewhat tongue-in-cheek, but it's to give you the idea of just the opposite. Similarly, like with Cuba, you know, lift all the sanctions, man. Make that government provide for the people, because as long as you've got sanctions outside, government incompetence can be explained away as those damn gringos, man. The reason things don't work here is because of the outside pressure. If that was only released, you know, we'd be okay.

So what the United States has done once again, what they've done in this, they took what was an aging strategy. The Ayatollah Khamenei, he was coming to the end of his days, and you could say it was sort of, you know, the older generation was still in control. Boy, you know, the decapitation strategy worked effectively. It created a whole bunch of openings for young people to move up and, you know, in some cases, perhaps more aggressive or more enthusiastic. But what this has done

now has united Iran in a way that it has not been united in 47 years. And just look in the mirror — maybe Donald Trump in part and Bibi Netanyahu for the other part can take credit for that.

#Danny

Well said, and it seems in the last minute I have you, Larry, the estimation tends to be—or I don't even think these warmongers really think this far ahead—but you give Cuba, you give Iran the opportunity to develop on their own, there's always the chance that they actually do just fine. And I think the mindset is, no, you have to make these people suffer, you have to make them feel the maximum amount of pain and pressure, because the alternative, you know, this probably goes back to old Cold War thinking, is, well, they're just lost forever. Right. They said the same thing about Vietnam and everything else. Right. Lost forever.

#Larry Johnson

Yeah.

#Danny

It seems like that kind of logic of you need full-spectrum dominance. You can't live with Cuba being whatever Cubans want. You can't live with Iranians being whatever Iran wants. That's ultimately the folly of that mindset. But Larry, thanks so much for coming on. I'll close up here because I know you have another appointment. So I'll be in touch with you, and thanks so much again.

#Larry Johnson

All right, my friend. Hey, thanks, and you have a great day. Thank you. It was a pleasure being with you, as always. Bye-bye.

#Danny

Yeah, of course. See you again soon. Bye-bye. All right, everybody, so I'm just going to close up here with a few announcements, so that's five minutes or so. Tomorrow I'll be back on at 1 p.m. Eastern Time with Professor Mohamed Marandi, good friend of the show, just a good friend in general. He is actually a stand-up guy, just like Larry here is as well. So, what you want to do now is you want to hit the like button before you go, you want to hit the subscribe button if you haven't. You can check out Larry's work at sonar21.com in the video description below and all the places to support this channel. In the last five minutes, I just want to make a clarifying point here on the position of your host of this program, which is—this, you know, I am in no way, shape, or form ever going to say that, you know, the United States is going to take its foot fully off the gas when it comes to trying to destroy, overthrow governments like Iran's, and in this case, let's just say Iran, because the very system, the very makeup of the U.S. political and economic power structure...

#Danny

It really does depend on ensuring that a country like Iran cannot thrive. And you might ask, well, why is that? Well, because if they do, then maybe the rest of the world will see that the U.S. is not the only game in town, that the United States actually may be the bad game. It may not be the game anyone really wants to play, and that those who continue to play along tend to be vassals, tend to be neocolonies, tend to be completely dependent, tend to have massive immiseration, suffering, lack of sovereignty, and complete leadership that's brutal and repressive and things like this. So if Iran is able to thrive and develop and live in peace, then Iran may serve, as Russia, as China, as other countries have and continue to do around the world, as possible examples that the United States' power elite, the ruling class, the warmongers, just cannot stomach.

So I don't believe that the war is necessarily over. But if you just look at sometimes material reality—actually, a lot of times, if not all the time—material reality eventually does manifest. It catches up to the idealists, to those who dream of full-spectrum dominance, to those who want to see a world where the United States is indeed the only option, that there is no alternative, as the old post-Cold War phraseology “TINA”—there is no alternative—indicates and spreads the message of. So, indeed, the reality on the ground is that the United States cannot get what it wants out of Iran. It's never going to squeeze out of Iran these massive kinds of concessions that the United States was maximizing and trying to place maximum pressure on Iran to get out of them.

It's just not going to happen. So if that's not going to happen, well, the consequences of continued war, as now Trump himself is saying, are too catastrophic. And lastly, on the points of Gaza and Palestine, look, a lot of people wanted Palestine, Gaza, West Bank to be directly in this document. And truth be told, I do believe that this document truly only covers the events from February 28th onward, which Lebanon, of course, has—beginning of March of this year—ended up being. Israel tried to take advantage of this deal to escalate its siege and its genocidal campaign against Lebanon. And I believe that's why we have Lebanon directly in this deal. And not to mention the solidarity, all those more important points, right?

Solidarity between Iran and Hezbollah, et cetera, as being main points, primary points. But I do think in the basic framework of an agreement like this, this is why you don't see Gaza and Palestine particularly named. But a cessation of fighting on all fronts. Negotiations are about to occur. So we are going to see how this stopping war on all fronts, what it really means to Iran. And we have to remember that Iran is the primary supporter, and really the only supporter in the region, especially as a state, of Palestine, Palestinian resistance, and all that it has done. And by strengthening Hezbollah and protecting Lebanon and beating back Israel there, that does help the Palestinian resistance.

We have to remember this, and we have to remember that Iran continues to support Palestine in the biggest way that no other country in the region is willing or capable of doing, given, as I said, their political, social, and economic makeup as a society across the Gulf states. They are indeed indebted

to Israel and the United States in large part and have no capacity, let alone the will. So just remember this as we go, because there are a lot of, of course, understandable feelings about Palestine and wanting Palestine to be put up front. And I wouldn't disagree with that. I would say that, yes, indeed, any complete end to the war on Iran should include Palestine explicitly.

But I don't believe that we should count out and denigrate Iran with this MOU, sticking with a more narrow framework in order to extract real concessions, which are very real. And all of this helps Palestine. I've made this argument for a long time now, which is if the axis of resistance strengthens, then the Palestinian resistance strengthens because it's all one resistance. So we should not look at it as, well, Iran is abandoning Palestine. That would be a huge mistake. And really, I believe it's a criticism made on the sidelines when, of course, the intricacies, the complexities, the material conditions on the ground are, you know, what ultimately dictate how, in a specific moment, these kinds of outcomes are ultimately delineated.

So just don't try to withhold, or even if you have the criticisms, don't let it derail you from the ultimate, I think, the ultimate objective of what a peace-loving humanity should be, which is doing everything we can to ensure that the United States and Israel cannot do what they are doing around the world. And Iran is doing, I think, its part in that goal for its own purposes and for the purposes of the rest of the world as well. So hit the like button, everyone. I'm going to be out of here now. Hit the like button. Be sure to hit the video description up afterwards as well. That will give you all the places you can support this show—Patreon, Substack, and much more. And without further ado, 1 p. m. Eastern Time tomorrow, June 19th, with Professor Mohammad Marandi. I'll see you then. Again, hit the like button. I'll see you on the next show. Bye-bye.