

US Air Force ATTACKS Iran – Ceasefire OVER | Mohammad Marandi

Mohammad Marandi joins the show to discuss the US conducting airstrikes on Iran overnight and Iran's retaliation, signaling a rapid end to the MoU ceasefire. Prof. Marandi addresses these in context of major criticisms on Iran amid fallout in Lebanon and the Strait of Hormuz. https://x.com/s_m_marandi Prof. Marandi X account 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> #iran #trump #iranwar

#Danny

Welcome to the show, everyone. Danny Haiphong here. First, some news. As you can see, I'm joined by Professor Mohammad Marandi. Overnight, the United States struck Iran in the area of Sirik near the Strait of Hormuz. Multiple areas were hit. CENTCOM published this video as, quote-unquote, evidence of their strike. And Iran has said that they have retaliated. Bahrain announced earlier this morning that a drone attack occurred in the early hours in retaliation by Iran. Of course, this all comes as tensions in the Strait of Hormuz are rising. The United States' J.D. Vance has said that there is going to be violence for violence if attacks in the Strait of Hormuz continue.

As you can see, I am joined by Professor Mohammad Marandi to discuss all of this and more. Professor Marandi, good to see you again. Hi, Danny. Thank you very much for inviting me. It's always a great pleasure being with you. Of course, hit the like button, everyone, as we get started. So, yes, Professor Marandi, your reactions to the developments? This is the first strike since the Memorandum of Understanding began or was signed by both parties. Now it seems like Iran is considering suspending it altogether after this act of aggression. Your reaction and what it means for the overall trajectory of this war?

#Mohammad Marandi

Well, the Americans are violating the MOU as expected. The Iranians never believed that the United States had any intention of voluntarily carrying out its commitments. But the Iranians, in return for all U.S. violations, are making it more difficult for the United States in the Strait of Hormuz. And the Americans have violated their commitments regarding the situation in Lebanon. The Israeli regime continues to occupy enormous parts of southern Lebanon and to carry out strikes. All of that must

come to an end in accordance with the deal. That's the first article in the MOU. The United States has been trying to undermine Iran's authority in the Strait of Hormuz by forcing Oman to declare an open corridor. That's another violation.

The U.S. constant threats against Iran. Trump, again, during the negotiations, spoke of killing, murdering the negotiators, and destroying Iran, and threatened the president. All of these are violations. So the United States violates the deal on all fronts, including releasing Iranian assets. That's also been something that's slow. Of course, what Trump said about Iran's assets that are to be released is not true — about purchasing American agricultural products and not having control over their assets. But in any case, the United States is in violation. So the Iranians warned these ships not to go through. One ship ignored Iran's military authority, and that ship was struck.

Iran did not, of course, take any responsibility, but it's obvious what happened. So the Americans struck last night. It wasn't a very important strike. They hit, I think, a tower, which is made in Iran. They just produced it; they'll replace it. The Iranians retaliated by striking Bahrain. And again today, another ship was struck, sending another message that only the Iranian-declared corridor is acceptable. Some ships do go through. The smaller ships cling to the Omani shore. They go from the Emirates alongside, very close to the Omani shore, and then go to the Fujairah port. But they're small ships, and then they transport their goods to bigger ships, like big tankers. And then a number of them have to go through to fill up a tanker.

So some do go through, and it seems that the Iranians are tolerating that. But for the most part, the number of ships that go back and forth is down. They are not nearly as many as they were before the war. And that's because of the U.S. inaction with regard to the MOU. The United States, if they carry out their commitments, the Iranians will carry out theirs. If the United States doesn't, the Iranians won't either. If the United States goes halfway, then the Iranians are going to go halfway. The difference between the situation now and before is that the Iranians, in previous agreements with the United States, this time around are not going to carry out or fulfill their obligations and commitments unless the Americans do.

#Danny

I want to pull up now the Iranian military announcement after the attacks on Sirik, because I think one thing that I find interesting is that Iran says that their naval and air forces were able to thwart and foil the attack and force the attacking forces to retreat, preserving Iranian sovereignty over its land and its waters. So I'm wondering, President Randi, does Iran even view these attacks as very significant if they are having the capability, like in terms of, you know, the damage and the proportionality of it, how they respond, given that they say that they were able to thwart it? I assume that means air defenses and other means and methods to ensure the attack was very short-lived by the United States. But your thoughts on this?

#Mohammad Marandi

I don't know the details, but what I do know is that nothing of importance was struck. And whether that's because it was thwarted or the Americans didn't intend to do much, or a combination of both, I don't know. But the Iranian response, I would imagine, was probably a bit more heavy-handed than the U.S. strike, because that's how Iran has been doing things during the last month or so. Over the last month, every time the United States violates the ceasefire, the Iranians hit harder in response. In the past, it was proportionate in previous ceasefire violations, but now it's been different. So I would imagine that the Iranians hit a bit harder, but I don't know exactly what the Iranians have done.

#Danny

According to NBC News and other sources, it's being reported that the Trump administration timed this attack to align with the closing of the markets in the United States. And we are seeing constantly, whenever this is happening—we saw this before the MOU was signed, when Iran and the United States were going back and forth—the U.S. would attack, Iran would strike back, also around the Strait of Hormuz area. We would see very little come out. And then, of course, CENTCOM publishes the video I put up, which shows very little. I mean, CENTCOM, it's unclassified information, but it simply just shows plumes of smoke coming out. You know, it doesn't show much detail. What do you make of this? It feels like this war has only become more and more censored, especially by the U.S. side.

#Mohammad Marandi

Well, I think this war has been unique in that we only discovered the immense amount of damage after the war. I mean, everything that the Iranians said turned out to be true. If you recall, after General Soleimani was murdered, the Iranians carried out a missile strike on a U.S. base in northern Iraq and did a lot of damage. But it really wasn't reported back then. And only later did we find out that there was really heavy damage done and that there were significant casualties. But this time around, the entire war has been full of casualties, with the U.S. military either lying or hiding facts. And the Iranians have been much more accurate in reporting on what was going on inside the country than the Americans reporting on what was going on inside their military bases.

#Danny

Yeah, and here's a report that the United States, the Pentagon, delayed publicly notifying or announcing the strikes on Iran until after the stock market closed, 4 p.m. Eastern time on Friday, to reduce the immediate impact on the markets. And that seems to be a big concern here, where you have the price of oil going down after the memorandum of understanding. Yet still, a lot of concern about managing the situation. The United States came out right after these strikes and said this does not torpedo the memorandum of understanding for them. This is not a return to war. But a ceasefire violation is a ceasefire violation, Professor Morandi. In all intents and purposes, when the U.S.

attacked Iran, the ceasefire is completely broken, no? And not to mention the situation in Lebanon, which is only getting worse after this so-called agreement that the so-called government that is being protested heavily in the streets of Beirut right now decided to engage with and agree upon with the U.S. and Israel. Your thoughts?

#Mohammad Marandi

Oh, yes. The United States is violating the ceasefire on multiple accounts. And the so-called agreement in Lebanon, which was signed by the government, which is a proxy government—the president and the prime minister were installed by the Americans. No one should think that they were chosen by the politicians who were elected. The Americans imposed them on the country, and they've been carrying out policies that have been dictated to them by the Americans, just like the government in Syria. And so the agreement between this government and Lebanon—first of all, the very fact that they negotiate with Israelis is a violation of Lebanese law.

But their negotiations were a huge capitulation because the Israeli regime is isolated across the world now. Countries, everyone despises the regime. Even Trump admits this. And then, at a time when it's becoming isolated, the only country that moves in the opposite direction and strengthens and builds ties with the Israeli regime—not just strengthens ties, builds ties with the regime—is the Lebanese government. And instead of first getting concessions just to sit down with them, they should make huge demands, saying, look, this is going to cost us immensely, and you need us to negotiate with you to be seen as, to be acknowledged as, you know, legitimate, supposedly.

You have to give us, the Lebanese, concessions. Nothing. They did this for free. And what did they get in return? A day or two later, a lieutenant general in a convoy of the Lebanese army and his companions were murdered. So the more you appease Zionism, the more aggressive the Zionists become. So this capitulation by the Lebanese president and prime minister, and this gifting of southern Lebanon to the Israeli regime—because Israelis have no intention of ever leaving, and these people know it—this is a huge betrayal of the country. It's treason too, if anyone looks at it objectively. Reminds me of 19th-century, 18th-century imperialism.

But it is a violation of the agreement with Iran, the MOU, because in accordance with the MOU, the Israeli regime has to leave, Lebanese sovereignty has to be accepted, and the world war has to come to an end. So this agreement was an attempt to undermine the MOU. But Iran is not going to accept that. Iran doesn't care if the Lebanese prime minister and the president sell off their parents, for the only thing that is important for Iran is that the Americans have to carry out Article 1 of the MOU. And until that happens, there won't be normalization in the Persian Gulf. And that's literally why the United States ultimately had to accept so many of Iran's conditions, because Iran controls the Strait of Hormuz.

#Danny

With this deal, though, Professor Arata, you said it very poignantly that this is a direct violation and an intentional violation of the memorandum of understanding. Do you find that one of the key parts of this is to try to plunge Lebanon into such instability that it is very difficult and complicated for Iran then to intervene, to get involved as they said they would if there were violations of this clause? Because Iran has already shown that it will strike Israel for engaging in aggression against Lebanon. But if there is a civil war scenario, if there's a scenario where you have the government against the people, the government against Hezbollah—which in many cases this agreement is really an anti-Hezbollah agreement, a recognize-Israel agreement—that makes things far more complicated, doesn't it?

#Mohammad Marandi

Hezbollah is very smart. They're very wise. And there have been many occasions in the past where enemies of Lebanon pushed the country toward civil war and Hezbollah refrained from going. And the current leader of Hezbollah, the Secretary General, has shown himself to be very, very wise and very smart. And he's managed the organization very well. And on the battlefield, they've also performed very well over the past two, three months. The plan is civil war. That's what the Israeli regime wants. They talk about it all the time. And that's obviously what the U.S. wants to see as well. At least they want to see the resistance destroyed and the Israeli hegemony over Lebanon assured. And have no doubt that if the Israeli regime gets its way, they'll take the whole of Lebanon.

The collaborators right now in Lebanon, the wealthy collaborators, if Lebanon were to fall ultimately one day, they'll go to their mansions and palaces in southern France or in Florida or wherever they've hidden their wealth. But ordinary people will be refugees. It'll be like the West Bank or Gaza or all those other places where the Israeli regime takes land and kills the natives living there. So while the Americans are trying to use their proxies in Syria against Hezbollah to some effect—because right now they are shutting the border to prevent Iran from smuggling aid to the resistance from that part of the country—Syria, the Syrian regime, is in no position to attack Lebanon.

It's a broken regime. It's comprised of all these different terrorist groups, and the government is busy killing factions within these organizations, or people within these factions that don't agree with them. And they're also killing minorities, especially on the coast nowadays again. But they don't have the power to go into Lebanon. And if they do, the Iranians will—if the Iranians can defeat the Americans with missiles and drones, it's not going to be a problem defeating the Syrian regime. And of course, the Iraqi resistance would intervene too. So Syria isn't that much of a problem. In Lebanon, the army of Lebanon, half of them at least, are sympathetic to Hezbollah. At least. Because the majority of Lebanese don't support this policy.

And they know that the president and the prime minister do not have a popular mandate. And everyone knows the intentions of the Israeli regime. So the majority are not with— I mean, there are those who are anti-Hezbollah, like the sort of ISIS, Al-Qaeda type that are funded by Qatar and Erdogan and these others in the Persian Gulf. And of course, the fascists like the Lebanese Forces

and others who are funded by the West and NGOs and Western embassies and Western intelligence agencies. These are, of course, they support all of this because of their hatred towards the resistance. But most Lebanese don't accept that. So I don't think they can successfully carry out a civil war. And Hezbollah is very careful.

#Danny

Yeah, well, let me pull up this. This is J.D. Vance, what he is saying, and I want your thoughts on this. This is the narrative the United States is pushing out there after these strikes and after the Lebanon deal. Iran signed a ceasefire agreement. We have honored it. If they have disagreements about how the MOU is being applied, they can pick up the phone, but violence will be met with violence, says Vance. The United States has honored the ceasefire agreement, they said, but yet at the same time lost the definition, it seems, of what ceasefire is.

#Mohammad Marandi

Oh, yes. I mean, first of all, they've been violating the ceasefire during this whole, the last two months. They've, on many occasions, as you and I have discussed in the past, bombed Iranian islands, the Iranian mainland, and on every occasion, the Iranians retaliated. And of course, in Lebanon, you saw genocide unfold and ethnic cleansing and mass slaughter and systematic destruction. That wasn't a problem for him. And as we speak, it is going on in Gaza too. The Holocaust there continues, and that is also part of the agreement. Gaza isn't named, but it says a regional end to this violence.

So the Americans are violating, as I said earlier, the MOU at multiple levels. And they have—I mean, they started this war. They waged war against the Iranian people, unprovoked, illegal. So for them to talk about Iran violating the ceasefire, that's a bit too much. Iran warned a ship not to travel without coordinating with Iran through the Strait of Hormuz. That is not a violation of the ceasefire. And that ship refused to abide by orders from the Navy, and it was hit. And so Iran did not strike the United States for the United States to strike Iran.

#Danny

Now the United States military is saying that they are ready to provide \$30 million, which to a trillion-dollar albatross is a drop in the bucket. But nonetheless, they are saying that they want to provide this to the Lebanese Armed Forces and for some reason Rwanda. I don't really know what this means because the United States ultimately, if they're going to change the calculation here, they're going to have to provide some massive support. I don't know what \$30 million will buy for the Lebanese Armed Forces, but ultimately all of this is geared toward what they say is to disarm Hezbollah, which again is only inciting more conflict and therefore in violation of the MOU. It's this circle that goes around and around and around.

#Mohammad Marandi

Yes, of course, this support for the army. They always say that we support the Lebanese army, not so that it can defend the country, but so that it can attack Hezbollah. They say it all the time. So this is about supporting the president and the prime minister in pushing the country toward civil war. But again, I find it difficult to imagine that it actually happens, and if it does, that it succeeds. Because Hezbollah has massive support in the armed forces, and the armed forces would collapse. And Hezbollah is a very powerful and competent military force, and they have huge popular support.

And most people, as I said, don't support this policy of capitulation to the Israeli regime and the gifting of Lebanese territory to Israel, because it's obvious that this regime is not going to back down. So Iran is going to ignore all this. Iran says that we have an MOU. You want us to normalize trade through the Strait of Hormuz? You have to carry out Article 1. It's as simple as that. And until that happens, there's not going to be an agreement and there's not going to be normalization in the Strait of Hormuz. So the United States has to make a decision. They can do all they want, make all the agreements they want with the Israeli regime, but the pressure is going to continue to build — the economic pressure.

More ships are moving through the Strait than they were three or four weeks ago. But the shortages across the world continue to grow — at a slower pace, but they continue to grow. And therefore, the United States is by no means out of the woods. Iran knows that. And until Article 1 is implemented, that's how it's going to be. So what Iran — and I should just add this — what Iran is pushing, and what it has been pushing for the last almost four months now, is that it's trying to drive a wedge between the United States and the Israeli regime, trying to push the United States toward economic crisis so that it ultimately has to prioritize its own interests over that of the Israeli regime.

Because it's always Israel first. And now the Israelis want one thing, but the Americans see that if they follow the Israeli regime's lead, it will be devastating for their own economy. That's why they signed the MOU in the first place. That's why they gave all those concessions to Iran. They didn't do it willingly. And the Iranians know quite well that even after they signed the MOU, there was no intention by the Americans to carry it out, as we discussed earlier. They've been constantly trying to undermine the MOU. But the Iranians are going to remain steadfast, and they will make sure that until all of their demands are met — some have been met — the U.S. has lifted the siege.

A disproportionate amount of the oil that's been exported from the Persian Gulf since the signing of the agreement, the MOU, has been Iranian oil. Huge amounts of Iranian oil. So Iran has been able to make up for a lot of lost exports. So they've lifted the siege. They've lifted the sanctions on the Iranian energy sector, officially at least. I don't know if it's actually being implemented. They've spoken about releasing Iranian assets. I don't know how far that's gone. But they clearly have not implemented the deal. And, of course, the issue of Lebanon is the first article. And until that happens, until it happens, there won't be an agreement. And so the trade through the Strait of Hormuz is going to continue to be much less than it should be.

#Danny

Well, Professor Rondi, I think it's a good time now to ask you about some narratives I've noticed as these strikes have reemerged. And as the MOU builds on days and now weeks since its signing, there are many more people — the commentariat all over social media, those reporting news, maybe exploiting some news — all talking about Iran losing its leverage, even by mildly opening the Strait of Hormuz and engaging in these talks. And now, with all the evidence, of course, that the United States is not going to be a good-faith party to it, as well as, of course, Israel's transgressions, that staying in this and allowing it to go on in the same way it is going is tantamount to losing this leverage. What do you make of that? It's an argument I'm hearing and I'm seeing come up as the days and weeks go by of the United States and Iran, I guess, sort of negotiating, but not really. But at the same time, this is a big statement, and I'm curious about your thoughts on it.

#Mohammad Marandi

Well, in Iran also, there's this ongoing debate between those who support the MOU as it is and those who say that Iran has been too lenient. And the leader, he made a comment on the MOU, which has broadened that debate, even though his comment is not exactly— I mean, he does point out that he's critical of it. But he says he gave the Supreme National Security Council and the government a mandate to carry it out. But he obviously was critical of it. But he doesn't explain how he's critical. And that, of course, has been discussed behind closed doors. And I'm not privy to that sort of knowledge of exactly what he wanted that was not in the agreement. But he was critical. And some people in the country have taken this as like the state has capitulated and this is completely against what he wants.

That is not necessarily the case. Although I agree that there are criticisms of the deal, I think those who support the deal have good arguments to make, and those who are critical of the deal have good arguments to make. But I don't agree with either side completely. And that's usually how it is for me because I'm not on any political side, and I've been accused by different factions of always being affiliated with the other side. With the JCPOA, some people have called me a staunch supporter of the nuclear deal. I never supported the nuclear deal. And they would say I'm allied with those groups. And then supporters of the nuclear deal, those hardcore supporters, would say I'm one of the hardcore opponents of the nuclear deal. I was never a hardcore opponent of the nuclear deal.

I just would say there are problems with it. There are shortcomings, but I'm not in any of these political camps. What I think is fair to say is that there are those who would like to see Iran launch, fire missiles, and keep the Strait of Hormuz shut. And the world is not as simple as that. I mean, first of all, Iran never closed the Strait of Hormuz. It was never fully closed. And there are countries that are friendly to Iran and the axis of resistance that use the Strait of Hormuz. And if we shut them out and shut them down, then maybe their politics would change. So that's one issue. The second is that

Iran itself was being targeted through the siege, and its own exports and imports were being blocked. And the Iranian people, right now, inflation is very high. It's roughly, I think, something like 68% or 70%.

That's very high. Of course, inflation in Iran has always been high because of the maximum pressure sanctions. And the government constantly adjusts people's wages, government employee wages, the minimum wage and all that. But it's not easy. And now it's more difficult. So for people to expect, for anyone to expect the state not to take into consideration the reality of the economic life of ordinary people, I think that's being too naive or they're being too simplistic. The government has to function. People have to have jobs. They have to have food. Supplies have to exist. And so Iran uses the Strait of Hormuz too. Iran was tough. They outlasted the Americans in siege warfare. They compensated to a large degree by using their neighboring countries to import goods, to export what they could, but it made life much more difficult.

So Iran has been using this deal to export, but also the Iranians continue to enforce, to put pressure on the United States through limiting the number of ships that can pass through the Strait of Hormuz. And that's how the Iranians—if the Iranians didn't have that sort of leverage, the Americans wouldn't have lifted the siege. If Iran didn't have that leverage, the Americans wouldn't have conceded to accepting the sovereignty of Lebanon and so on, and to ending the war across the region. And so, on the one hand, you have to keep this in mind, that Iran has friends—countries like China and other countries that import from and export to the region—but import from the region. They can't just ignore them.

They're friends of Iran. And as I said, the Iranians themselves have to continue to keep the economy afloat in order to be able to resist, in order to help the resistance in Lebanon, in order to help—it's not, you know, this—they get support from Iran, we all know that, in order to help Yemen protect itself, in order to help Gaza. It's not as if the resistance in Gaza receives support from thin air. It comes from somewhere. So developing those tunnels and putting defense capabilities against further Israeli aggression, all of this costs money. At the negotiating table, the United States conceded a lot. Is this an ideal situation? Definitely not. Am I a fan of this agreement?

No. But in general, what I try to do is not take sides, because when I'm speaking to you and others, I'm trying to defend what I think are the people on the right side of history, those who are doing the right thing. I believe that Iran and the axis of resistance have been doing that. And so if I don't agree with a particular thing that the president said, or a position taken by the chief negotiator, or a critic of the president, or a critic of the chief negotiator, if I don't take a position on that, I think it's because it's not my responsibility.

I don't think people outside of Iran really care too much about the details to that degree. What is important are the fundamental differences that exist between Iran, the United States, and the Israeli regime. And then once that is established, we can go into the details about what's going on in Iran—why one set of people is opposed to the deal, and why some are supporting the deal. But let me

give you a personal example on campus. This was not so long ago. I was speaking with two of my students—or two students; they're not my students, but two students who came to my office. And then a colleague came and said, you know, you need to do a deal, as if I'm a negotiator.

You need to do a deal. The economic situation is difficult, and you have to, you know, don't be so harsh and try to, you know, find some solution with the Americans. I said, look, I'm not a negotiator. I'm not a decision-maker. And he left. And then literally 40 minutes later—I don't know, an hour later, or 30 minutes later—another colleague came in, and those two students were still in the room talking about something completely different, just university stuff. And then this professor was saying, why are you conceding so much? The Americans—if you keep going down this path, the Americans are going to give nothing, and then they're going to come back for more war.

And I said, look, I'm not a negotiator. I'm not a decision-maker. So both different sides make these decisions and assume that I'm involved. But I think that, on the whole, while there are problems with this agreement, no doubt there are calculations behind it. And Iran's most important leverage against the Israeli regime and its occupation in Lebanon—because that's what a lot of people are worried about, obviously—is its ability to put pressure on the U.S. economy. I mean, Iran can lob a few missiles here and there and do damage, but the real pressure is when Iran keeps the Strait of Hormuz half closed. That is what worries Trump, and that's what he said explicitly.

#Danny

Yeah. And I think, you know, ideological differences in debates, I think those are very much to be expected. But I do find it interesting that whenever there is a pause in the fighting, I think the initial reaction for a lot of people who, as you said, want to see missiles flying, they don't take into consideration all these other factors as to why the missiles may have stopped flying. And they go immediately toward, well, this person's a traitor, this leader—this—it feels almost like, I don't love to say these things, but it does feel almost like a psychological operation, like it's trying to sow division.

#Mohammad Marandi

I mean, you know, this is a good point. I've lived in Lebanon, and right here there's a picture of one of the martyrs of Lebanon who was a friend of my children. And there's more than one in my house, and an Iranian martyr as well. But I've lived there. I mean, every day I'm in contact with people in Lebanon—every single day. And a Lebanese media outlet, Al Mayadeen, invites me regularly to discuss the situation on their shows, on their TV channel. But I hear these people tell me, you see online, and some people send messages to me that Iran has betrayed Hezbollah. But Hezbollah does not believe that Iran has betrayed it.

So these people who are constantly putting out tweets saying—and they attack me online too—they say, oh, you've betrayed them, look, are you happy? Every time they kill innocent civilians in Lebanon during the past few days, ever since the ceasefire, ever since the MOU was signed, they

say, are you happy now that they're slaughtering the Lebanese? I mean, it's just for some, I don't know, some money from the United States, as if I'm a negotiator, you know, just so that the United States would hand over money—you've sold Lebanon. But that's not how Hezbollah sees it. That's not how the Secretary General of Hezbollah sees it. He said he's very happy with Iran's position. That's not what the council of Hezbollah that rules Hezbollah sees either.

That's not how their media says it. That's not how the people I know in Hezbollah, or those who are close to Hezbollah or the resistance, see it. But these people who've never been to Lebanon, they see it as a betrayal. The point is that it was largely because Iran threatened to fire missiles at the Israeli regime that the United States accepted Article 1, meaning the sovereignty of Lebanon. So if Iran had fired those missiles, then the United States, after Iran had fired, maybe the United States would then say, okay, now that you fired those missiles, I'm not going to accept that article. I'm not going to. So sometimes, by refraining from doing something, you get concessions.

Now, someone may argue, well, the Americans are not going to carry it out. Of course, they're not going to do so willingly. They support genocide. Look at Gaza. Look at Lebanon for the last two and a half years, more than two and a half years. But Iran has leverage. What is that leverage? It's the Strait of Hormuz. It may not be so exciting. You know, you don't see these missiles flying through the air. And it may be slower in its impact. But the impact is very real. I mean, for Trump to say, to be worried about becoming another Hoover, President Hoover, and for Trump to say openly that we only have four more weeks of energy supplies, that's saying a lot. And that shows that the Strait of Hormuz is important.

#Danny

Yeah, and back to your point, a lot of the now recovering shortfall of that oil that was being blocked is Iranian oil. And that's interesting. I think some people have to acknowledge that while you may not love everything about this, and it doesn't fit into some maybe streamlined, perfect ideal, that is always going to be a fantasy because there are so many factors that go into even victory. The fact of the matter is that Iranian oil right now is playing a big role in alleviating this shortfall because there are still so many ships stuck in the Strait of Hormuz that aren't following the designated route and won't be able to follow it because it's such a big backlog.

This reminds me of weapons to Taiwan. The U.S. keeps sending weapons to Taiwan. Taiwan can't use them. They can't train with them. They don't have the military capacity to have them, so they just keep piling up. It's like a big IOU. They keep piling. They don't use them. But this is what happens when you wage war the way the United States does. It has consequences. And I want your comments on this, Professor Rondi. You know, you mentioned those assets before. It feels like every time the United States—and this is, I think, going to be a big problem for this ceasefire or maybe lack thereof agreement.

Every time the United States says they're going to concede the frozen assets, then they say they're going to control the whole process, that they're going to dictate where this money goes. This is Iranian money frozen in accounts that illegally did so in places like Qatar, and yet the United States is now saying they're going to control where these funds end up going. It reminds me of Venezuela after that horrific kidnapping attempt against Maduro. Immediately they said, now we're going to control exactly where Venezuelan oil flows. Your thoughts on this?

#Mohammad Marandi

Yes, and again, as I said, I think there are flaws in this agreement. And personally, if I was involved, I would have probably insisted on a couple of things being different from what they are, especially with regards to the—well, anyway, since I'm not a negotiator, I don't want to go there. But another thing is that some of these people who are now constantly speaking of betrayal, now they begin to believe everything that Trump says. And the entire world says Trump is a serial liar, but these people, apparently, when it comes to Iran, they believe all that he says. So when Trump says all this money is going to go to American farmers, these people basically say, oh, look, they've betrayed the cause and they're going to buy American goods.

And then if Trump, or for example, when the Americans carry out that, when they have that trilateral agreement between the Israelis and their proxies in Beirut, they said, look, the MOU was just a piece of paper and they sold out. No, that's not true. First of all, Iran did not accept the United States controlling its assets. Or, for example, Trump says, we're going to see all the nuclear installations, and then they say, see, they've sold out there too. No, the Iranians have not agreed for the IAEA inspectors to go to those sites that were bombed. IAEA inspectors do go to sites, and we've discussed this many times before, that were not bombed, like the nuclear reactor in Bushehr.

There are Russian staff working there, or at the Tehran experimental reactor. That's for Iran. That's never been a problem, you know, so their inspectors go there. But to those sites, the Iranians have not agreed to them visiting the ones that were bombed. Iran did not speak to the chief negotiator. If the MOU progresses and we reach a stage where everything is sorted out, then, you know, yes, ultimately when things normalize, they normalize. Do I think that the negotiators, everything that they do, is ideal? No. Do I think that the text is ideal? No. But it's not what we're being told by Trump. But suddenly some people seem to take everything that Trump says as fact, and a person who's known across the world to be utterly dishonest.

So I think some friends have to be patient, but also Iran, when Iran sells its oil or when Iran wants its assets back, those assets are used to strengthen Iran and thus the axis of resistance. Those are concessions that Iran demands, and Iran demands that the sovereignty of Lebanon be restored. Is this going to be resolved overnight? No. Is it going to be resolved a month from now? No. This agreement may ultimately collapse or may be extended in its current form or in some other form for many months. I don't know what will happen, but Iran is not naive about the United States. But

what is important right now is that the United States is facing difficulty, not only the energy crisis, but also the situation in Ukraine.

Europe is escalating against Russia, and the Russians are ultimately moving towards some sort of decision. Trump is going to have great difficulty focusing on Iran and Russia, and of course China, for a long period of time under these very difficult circumstances. He did not defeat Iran on the battlefield. If he comes back for more, and we know that their assets are in the region, they have enough assets to carry out a ground assault against Iran, which we've discussed before. But Iran is prepared for that. The United States won't win that war, and it would lead to a global economic catastrophe that would be far worse than the 1930s. But that is a possibility. It becomes increasingly more difficult for the United States to wage this war with Iran, or this confrontation with Iran, as the situation in Ukraine heats up.

So it's not as if the Americans can do this forever. The pressure from Iran will continue. And as I said, the Strait of Hormuz is far more powerful than missiles. Missiles do damage, but ultimately it was through those missiles and drones that Iran kept the Strait of Hormuz under its control. But the Strait of Hormuz is the prize. So Iran will be able to put a lot of pressure on the United States. It doesn't look so exciting, but it has its impact, as we all know. And as I said, the situation in Ukraine is going to make it more difficult for the United States because the West right now is literally waging war. They want to strengthen the drone and missile capabilities of the Ukrainians to strike Russia further, and Russia is going to have to make some important decisions in the months ahead.

I think Europe is not going to succeed, but in any case, the Iranians recognize that the West is facing great difficulty on multiple fronts, and that strengthens Iran's hand. And the Russians too, many of my Russian friends who I'm also in regular contact with say that it would be good if the Russians dealt with NATO like the Iranians dealt with these regimes in the region that collaborated with the Americans and Israelis. When they allowed their air bases and military bases and their territories to be used against Iran, Iran punished them. And now the Russians are saying, well, if you help the Ukrainians and you send them missiles and drones, then you are complicit, and now they're thinking about targeting them. The logic is not the same exactly. I mean, these countries in the Persian Gulf were directly involved in the war.

They were part of the war. Their territory was used against Iran. But the Russian logic is not without merit. The Europeans are hell-bent on killing Russians and helping the Ukrainians, and so the Russians are saying, well, if you do that, then we'll take a page from the Iranian playbook and perhaps strike NATO countries that have missile factories and drone factories to help. So the point I'm making is that the weeks and months ahead are going to be very difficult for the West, largely because of their own policies. And the Iranians are going to remain steadfast. And during this time of grave difficulty for the West—economic, military, political, and so on—Iran is going to continue to insist that every page, every sentence, every word in the MOU is complied with, is carried out, is fulfilled.

#Danny

And to your point, Professor Morandi, I think it's important that part of the psychological operation I mentioned earlier is to divert attention away from what is happening. Especially for shows like this, where audiences tend to be in the United States and the West, it can be very romantic, alluring, attractive to speculate and claim to know what's going on inside Iranian politics and leadership and all of this. It distracts from the actual crisis that the war and the warmongering parties are experiencing, especially the United States. So you mentioned the economic side of this.

You mentioned the geopolitical side of this, where we have, you know, multiple fronts that are not going well for the U.S. But then there's also the domestic side of this that is heating up as well. This is Time magazine that summarized, just a couple of days ago, what the Americans are thinking of the U.S.-Iran deal. And some of these numbers are quite staggering. A Reuters/Ipsos poll says just 24% of people in the United States think the war with Iran was worth the cost. Only 23% of respondents, including 50% of all Republican respondents, believe the U.S. is now in a stronger position than before the war started. Thirty-five percent now think the U.S. is in a weaker position.

And to the issue of the deal, it doesn't get much better. Sixty-three percent of people in the United States in a Reuters/Ipsos poll think it is unlikely the MOU will lead to lasting peace between the U.S. and Iran. So all of these numbers are very damning in the sense that not only is this war very unpopular, but people in the United States are not convinced that this deal will resolve the problems that they're experiencing because of it, which means that, you know, we're just a few months from midterm elections, which are going to be a critical part of how the U.S. regime dictates and governs itself over the next several years. And, yeah, they don't have six months, a year plus, to correct that situation. So that's a major crisis.

#Mohammad Marandi

I have no doubt that these are things that the Iranians are calculating. The Iranians are looking at U.S. elections. The Iranians are looking at Ukraine. There are multiple things that they're looking at and calculating. And another accusation made is that the Iranians have sold out Gaza. Of course not. I mean, yeah, Ayatollah Khamenei was martyred because of Gaza, Sayyed Hassan Nasrallah was martyred because of Gaza, the war waged against Iran was because of Gaza, the slaughter in Lebanon was because of Gaza. Everyone else is complicit — the governments in Egypt and Turkey and Jordan and the Persian Gulf and across the world. No one is waging war, no one has even sanctioned, no one has even cut off ties with the regime. Not a single country has cut off diplomatic ties with the Israeli regime. Not a single country has cut off economic ties — some import gas, some transfer.

#Danny

Oh no, the first time. The first error. Are you still there, Professor Nandi?

#Mohammad Marandi

To make those accusations... This is my cell phone, someone called.

#Danny

All right. Maybe start from where that person called you. Sorry, what was I saying? Oh, I said maybe start again from where you were before the person called.

#Mohammad Marandi

No, but what was I saying?

#Danny

Oh, well, that completely lost me too because of the distraction. It's okay. Continue wherever you want.

#Mohammad Marandi

Yeah, I was just saying that the war was waged on Iran because of Gaza. The war against Hezbollah was because of Gaza. And all these countries in the region, none of them broke off ties with the Israeli regime. None of them broke off political ties. None of them have broken off economic ties. Some import gas, some transport oil, some export oil. They're all doing business. And then Iran is making the sacrifices. And Hezbollah is making enormous sacrifices. And Yemen has made so many sacrifices. And then to say that they've sold out — the Iranians have told Hamas, the political wing, in their discussions, that they will pursue the issue of Gaza in the negotiations.

And Hamas and Palestine are part of the MOU, though not named, because the war is taking place in Lebanon. But we have to keep in mind that the ceasefire in Gaza was, you know, because whenever the Iranians say Gaza, the Americans say, well, we have a ceasefire and everyone's endorsed it. Erdogan and Sisi and the King of Jordan, Abdullah, and all these leaders from the region and beyond, they all went to Sharm el-Sheikh in Egypt and endorsed Trump's ceasefire and praised him and whitewashed his crimes. And none of them have complained since, even though well over a thousand people have been murdered since then. Every day they're bombing the place and killing more people — children, infants, schoolchildren — every day.

I don't see any of these governments say anything. It's only Iran paying a price, yet I think some people are attacking Iran in order to cover up their own inaction. Al Jazeera Arabic did a show on Iran — why is Iran, like, why is it not including Gaza? I mean, what has Qatar done except fund Kushner and Witkoff and Trump's sons, and gift him an airplane, and, you know, be a part of it? Its air base to the United States, its land for the United States to bomb Yemen and Iran and Syria and

so on. I mean, who are they to talk about Iran? But Al Jazeera does this in order to undermine the resistance, in order to justify their own role as a proxy of the United States.

#Danny

In all wars, too. It's not even just regionally, which is abhorrent. It's every war. It's Ukraine. It's, you know, following the U.S. line almost to a T on so many critical questions and ignoring voices that are challenging it, which do exist and are becoming more and more prominent. And I just want to say one last thing because we only have about a minute left, but I wanted to say that we just had, in terms of that, Russia possibly getting inspiration from Iran and how Iran conducted its response to the U.S.-Israeli aggression. We're now still getting information about how bad this damage was that Iran inflicted on the U.S. And now the United States, as I covered yesterday, is considering moving their installations either further west, further away from the Iranian theater, as we might be able to call it, and maybe even underground, which is crazy.

Which I think is astounding. And so we already are having, obviously, the United States thinking about reducing, legitimately reducing its presence, not because they want to, not because of morals or principles or anything, but just because they have to because of what Iran did. And I think that in and of itself has to be considered and just understood better in order to not fall into this, what I think is total folly, which is always wanting to impose maximal demands on Iran when, in fact, everybody — the resistance, everybody who's paying attention, especially the resistance — knows that this is a long, long, long war where there's a lot of factors to take into account. But Professor Morandi, your final thoughts as we head out.

#Mohammad Marandi

There's a long way to go, and this is not over. It's not going to be finished through a few missiles and drones. And we shouldn't be easily influenced by empire propaganda. We shouldn't try to unwittingly strengthen those narratives. We should be more active, do our own bit, each of us, to expose the Israeli regime further. The United States has finally come out and said it's genocide. We knew this for over two and a half years now, almost three years now. But in any case, we have to just keep pushing and pushing, and we're getting there. The Israeli regime has no legitimacy in the eyes of so many people across the world.

And now, you know, we saw what happened in New York and how Jews voted against Zionists in New York, so many. And now the Jews of New York are anti-Semites, apparently, from what I'm reading. It just shows how, you know, this is this awakening against Zionism, just like Muslims do not accept Al-Qaeda and ISIS and these Takfiri groups. We see, increasingly, Jews being very open in their opposition to Zionism, and Christians opposed to Zionism. And, you know, we have to keep pushing. Everyone has to push. And it's going to take a long time, and it's going to be difficult, and there are going to be many ups and downs, but we're going to get there.

#Danny

Yeah, I want to thank everyone who viewed today, put up the super chats. Thanks so much for those, everyone who moderated, and, of course, anyone who came here. Preston Rodie's X account is in the video description below where you can find his work and all the interviews and everything else he's doing. Hit that like button before you go. That helps boost the show in YouTube's algorithm. Tomorrow, we have June 28th at 1 p.m. Eastern time. We'll have KJ Noh on the show. First of all, Andy, any words of goodbye to our audience as we head out of here?

#Mohammad Marandi

No, just we should all pray for the people of Venezuela. Yeah. And one of my friends, they've been forced to leave their home because it's not clear if their home is stable or if people can help them. I mean, we're sanctioned. We can't. We have, you know... And we have a war going on, but we should pray for them. And if we can help in any way or form, I think it would be a good time to do so.

#Danny

Yeah, we are seeing, despite what I believe is still a very strong collective preparedness and readiness by the Venezuelan people, the sanctions have taken their toll, and it is a brutal cost that they've paid in this earthquake or these earthquakes and their aftershocks. So definitely heed those words, everyone. Try to find an organization, try to find people who are legitimately helping, because the United States right now is looking to consolidate, not through them—power, yeah, be careful—they're trying to consolidate their influence and power over Venezuela through this disaster capitalism. Disaster imperialism is very much a thing. But nonetheless, heed those words and definitely give them your thoughts and any support you can. All right, everybody, we're gonna head out of...