



There Is No 'Peace Deal' Between Iran and the Trump Regime

This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.

Dimitri Lascaris (DL): Good morning, friends. This is Dimitris Lascaris coming to you for Reason2Resist from Kalamata, Greece on June 15th, 2026. And today I'm going to talk to you about the extraordinary dramatic developments over the past 24 hours relating not only to the war on Iran but also Israel's genocidal rampage in Lebanon. But before I talk to you about what has happened and where I believe all of this is heading, I wanted to show you something. This piece of ceramic tile, I collected this from the site of the Minab school when I visited it in southern Iran in late March of this year. I did a lengthy report on what I found there. The 168 children and school teachers who were murdered in my judgement were intentionally massacred. There could have been no doubt in the minds of those who ordered this attack that this was a school and that the facility served no military purpose whatsoever. So from the rubble, when I was conducting this investigation, I took this piece of ceramic tile from what remained of that school to remind me of the depravity of Western governments, and particularly the Trump regime. Why am I showing this to you now? I've never shared this with anybody. I've always kept it in my desk drawer to myself because I believe that evidence of these monstrosities is what we ought to bear in mind when we consider how trustworthy the Trump regime and the Netanyahu regime are when it comes to peace deals and ceasefires and how they're likely to seek to exploit gaps and ambiguities in the deal that appears to be on the verge of signature this Friday, in fact. But we're going to get into that in some much greater detail what exactly has transpired and what the terms of this deal appear to be.

Before I launch into that detail, I'd like to remind you to please like and share this video if you find it to be informative. And if you're not already a subscriber to Reason2Resist, please become one, help us achieve our goal of 200,000 subscribers by the end of this summer, which marks the two-year anniversary of the founding of Reason2Resist. We just went over 181,000 and our goal is definitely within striking distance. Thank you for all of your support.

So with that, let's get into what has transpired in the past few days. The last time you heard from me and my colleague Rami, it was last night, and at that point it appeared as though Iran was going to launch a devastating series of missile strikes on Israel, because Israel, during the

day yesterday, launched a lethal strike on Beirut, and Iran had already made abundantly clear that striking Beirut was a red line for the Islamic Republic and had already reacted to a strike on Beirut when we were in Lebanon a few days ago by attacking Israel and whacking it pretty hard by all indications. So when [Israel] bombed Lebanon or Beirute I should say again yesterday and judging also from the statements that immediately began to come from senior officials, civilian and military in the Islamic Republic, it appeared very much that there was going to be a devastating series of strikes on Israel. And the memorandum of understanding, as Iran refers to it, even though it was very close to completion by all indications, had been thrown into doubt. And just up here on the screen, by the way, Rami, we published a report by Rami who's in Beirut and went to the site of the bombing yesterday within about an hour of it happening. If you haven't seen that report, we recommend it to you. I'm showing you also here an account from our comrade Hadi Hoteit of Press TV, who also went to the site of the bombing yesterday. And according to Hadi, the strike killed a father, a mother, and a daughter. The man who was killed, according to Hadi, was head of the Lebanese resistance's communications unit in Beirut, but not a military commander. He was responsible for liaising with the Lebanese state and on any agreements or negotiations. He suggested Israel, its bank of targets depleted, have been reduced to killing such figures in their homes; this is what Hadi reported.

Now, I have, by the way, an important piece of news to share with you, and that is, I just learned from Rami, who continues to be in Beirut, that Hadi apparently has been injured. He is in hospital receiving treatment. Rami assures me that he is in good condition, but I don't have details as to what exactly happened. I would imagine that he was injured while in the field reporting from South Lebanon because he does that almost every day and at great, great risk to himself. So we wish him the swiftest of recoveries and send him our love and solidarity. Now, at the 11th hour yesterday, when it appeared that Israel was going to get whacked, and whacked hard again, the Donald appears to have panicked, and he reportedly made a series of 11th-hour concessions to Iran, which persuaded it not to proceed with retaliatory strikes on Israel, and also to agree to the final form of this memorandum of understanding. And here up on the screen, I put a report from Drop Site News, published, I believe it was earlier this morning. It's quite telling, this report. According to Drop Site, "Iranian officials are portraying Israel's Sunday escalation in Lebanon as the trigger that led Washington to accept several of Tehran's key conditions for a US-Iran Memorandum of Understanding, claiming that the threat of a wider regional war and a direct Iranian response shifted the negotiations in Iran's favour. The Deputy Foreign Minister of Iran said some of Tehran's proposed revisions to the text were accepted after developments in Lebanon and warnings from Iran's armed forces helped move the negotiations forward, saying the military pressure, quote, 'helped finalise the text', close quote, and resolve outstanding issues. Vice President JD Vance, interestingly, said the US officials aggressively intervened to stop a major Iranian missile retaliation against Israel. Speaking to Fox News, Vance said that after the Israeli military launched airstrikes in Beirut, intelligence indicated Iran was heavily preparing a massive missile strike against Israeli targets." One of the things that happened is that Iran cleared its airspace and you couldn't see any commercial aircraft in the skies over Iran, which was a strong indicator of where things were heading. Now, "through intense

last-minute diplomatic communications during the finalisation of the US-Iranian MOU, American negotiators", says Drop Site, "successfully secured explicit assurances from Tehran that they would hold back their military response. Separately, the New York Times, citing three Iranian officials, reported that Tehran had prepared but ultimately called off a planned retaliatory strike on Israel after President Trump through intermediaries urged restraint with Iranian officials believing an escalation could derail a peace agreement that was close to completion. The claims have been echoed across multiple Iranian news sources", says Drop Site, and one of them stated, "that commitments related to preserving Lebanon's territorial integrity were made at the 11th hour by the Trump regime, an Israeli withdrawal from Lebanese border areas and the immediate lifting of the naval blockade." These were commitments that were secured by the Islamic Republic in exchange for its agreement to not whack Israel again and to conclude the negotiations over the Memorandum of Understanding.

This is quite dramatic. Whatever happens, I must say, to this Memorandum of Understanding, which I'm going to describe to you in greater detail in a moment, the fact that a threat of a military strike by Iran, a state in West Asia that is opposed to US hegemony, a predominantly Muslim state, a threat of a missile attack on Israel, secured panicked concessions from the President of the United States of America, very significant concessions, including apparently a commitment to oblige Israel's withdrawal of its military forces from Lebanon, this is absolutely unprecedented and extremely significant in terms of the balance of power in the region of West Asia. Even if the withdrawal does not actually happen, and there's good reason to doubt that it will anytime soon, still the fact that this was done and done fairly publicly shows the degree to which the United States has been weakened in this region primarily by Iran and its extraordinarily courageous and determined people, but also by the other forces of resistance in the region, including of course, our brothers and sisters in Palestine and Lebanon, Yemen and Iraq. Now, following these dramatic developments, these 11th-hour concessions, Pakistan's Prime Minister issued a statement. This was, I believe, late last night, my time. And his name, as you can see there, if you don't know it already, is Shehbaz Sharif. Let me just mention that this character in late 2025, in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt, gave Donald Trump a tongue bath in front of the whole world when it was announced with great fanfare that the peace board had been established. So he is in every sense of the word – I actually showed a clip from that video back in the last couple of months of 2025 on Reason2Resist and it was a truly cringe-worthy moment – so he's a vassal in every a sense of the word, but I must say his regime seems to have made a significant contribution to the conclusion of an MOU. He wrote: "Following intensive talks, we are pleased to announce that the Peace Deal", notice the caps at the beginning of peace and deal, "between the US of America and Islamic Republic of Iran has been REACHED (all caps). Both sides have declared the immediate and permanent termination of military operations on all fronts, including Lebanon." I repeat, the immediate and permanent termination of military operations. You have it straight from the vassal's mouth. Then he says: "The official signing ceremony will be on Friday, 19 June in Switzerland, and we would like to thank the US", and so forth. This was quickly followed by a post from demented Donald. This was yesterday at 5.29 p.m. Washington time. "The deal with the Islamic Republic of Iran is now complete. Congratulations to all! I hereby fully authorised" – as if he is the person who has the final say

on whether or not traffic goes through the Strait of Hormuz – "the toll-free opening of the Strait of Hormuz and simultaneously here with authorise the immediate removal of the United States naval blockade." Notice the word immediate; as you're going to see the MOU talked about the blockade being lifted over a period of 30 days from the time of signing. Apparently this is one of the concessions that Iran obtained. Instead of giving the United States 30 days to lift the blockade, it impressed upon demented Donald the urgent necessity of lifting the blockage immediately. And then he wrote: "Ships of the world, start your engines. Let the oil flow."

Now, this caused some consternation, because he indicated that the Strait of Hormuz was going to be opened immediately, but not only the blockade would be lifted, but the Strait would be opened, immediately, but the MOU, as I'm going to show you, apparently gives Iran up to 30 days to restore traffic to its pre-war level. So an hour later or so, Trump put out this post, this is 6.27 p.m, the prior one was 5.29 p.m., says: "This great deal will bring Peace and Security to the whole region" – and he loves to capitalise peace, doesn't he? "Many presidents have tried to make peace with Iran and all have failed before me." He's the only one who actually attacked Iran. And he's bragging about being the only president who made peace with it. "The leaders of the region have, for the first time, found a president who can help them achieve real peace. With the opening of the Strait upon the signing of the deal on Friday, for purposes of mine removal, oil will flow on both ends again for the region and the world". So now he's saying that the Strait opening will begin on Friday, whereas he indicated in his prior post it was going to start right away So the subtle change here is that he is signalling that the Strait doesn't have to be opened until the agreement is already signed, but he has committed in writing to an immediate opening or lifting of the blockade.

Now before I get into the terms of the deal, we've learned more about this from Iranian media in the last 24 hours. I want to share with you a comment that I made over the weekend on X. This was in response to a June 12th post by Mario Nawfal on whose X programme I appear from time to time. And in his post, Nawfal said: "Trump to Netanyahu on the phone, this is the deal. It's an excellent deal. It's time to end this war. Netanyahu barely said a word. He knows the train has left the station and so forth." So my response to this, and I've posted similar comments like this on social media repeatedly over the last several weeks and months, was this: "There's no peace deal. There won't be a peace deal. Even if they sign something, it won't be worth toilet paper, because Trump and Netanyahu will both sabotage it. We should stop fixating on this absurd circus and focus on what the child murdering Israelis are doing to Palestine and Lebanon". Now this post, which did get a significant degree of attention on social media, you might say that my prediction has been proven wrong because, in fact, they have, according to the prime minister of Pakistan and Trump himself, entered into a peace deal; that's what they're calling it. They're calling it a peace deal. Well, if I am wrong about that, let me be very clear about this, folks, I'll be the first to cork open the champagne. There's nothing I'd love to see more than a just and sustainable peace throughout the region. Above all, for those who have been most tormented, persecuted, brutalised by these savages, and those are the Palestinian people, but for all the peoples of the region, even including peoples living in countries whose governments are vassals of Washington, they all

deserve a just and lasting peace, and we are far, far away from one thus far. Which is why I say that it isn't actually a peace deal. We don't yet have peace, as you're going to see, and there are serious questions about whether or not this Memorandum of Understanding will ultimately transform into something that can reasonably be described as a peace deal.

So with that, let's move on then to what the Iranian media said within the past 24 hours about what is in this agreement. And I'm putting up here a summary of the agreement which was posted by the Iranian news agency Mehr News. Now I want to repeat, this is a summary, so not the exact language. We don't know for sure what the exact language is; there may be significantly more detail in the Memorandum of Understanding than we're getting here. In a couple of places here in this summary, you do see words put in quotation marks and they're important words, but we're missing information and it's important to understand that. So let's go through this in some detail. Clause number one, the permanent and immediate halt of war on all fronts including Lebanon. Let's just stop there. It doesn't say anything in this summary about the withdrawal of US troops, it talks about a halt of war. That doesn't necessarily mean that troops from Israel will be withdrawn, now the Iranians indicated last night that, in a panic, Trump said that Israel would be obliged to withdraw its forces, and apparently the way they are dealing with this, although we'll have to see what the final MOU actually says, is by inserting into the agreement a reference to Lebanon's territorial integrity. Of course, territorial integrity, its preservation would mean that hostile military forces from a foreign country would no longer be occupying it. So indirectly by invoking the principle of Lebanon's territorial integrity the MOU apparently endorses the commitment or embraces the commitment of Trump to ensure Israel's withdrawal from Lebanon. But one thing is for sure the summary doesn't say anything explicitly about the withdrawal of Israeli military forces from Lebanon and it's not clear that there is an explicit requirement to that effect in the final version either. Clause two, a US commitment not to interfere in Iran's internal affairs and to respect the sovereignty of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Clause three, the complete lifting of the naval blockade within 30 days. As I said, it appears that in fact the lifting has been expedited and that Trump committed to do this in order to assuage the anger of the Iranian civilian and military leadership after the strike on Beirut. Clause four, a US commitment to withdraw its forces from the areas surrounding Iran. Now, as you will know if you were watching our programme this weekend, the deputy chair of the Iranian Parliament National Security Committee criticises this provision because it doesn't actually specify what is meant by the areas surrounding Iran; does that mean the entire Persian Gulf? Does that mean ships that are within 100 kilometres of Iran's territorial waters? Does that mean US military bases that are further away from the Persian Gulf, for example in Erbil in the north of Iraq, or in Jordan, or inland away from the Persian Gulf in Saudi Arabia? It's unclear what exactly all of this means. This is a very important detail. Clause five, the reopening of the Strait of Hormuz within 30 days under Iranian "arrangements". Here, Mehr News has put the word arrangements in quotation marks, indicating that word is actually used in the MOU. It's very unclear what is meant by that. And as I argued in our live stream yesterday, when you're dealing with cheats and liars and conmen, like Donald Trump, you don't want to use ambiguous language because he will exploit those ambiguities to screw you over. Nor do you want to have gaps in the agreement because he will exploit, in respect of any issue that the

agreement is silent on, he will exploit that silence and to impose an interpretation on the agreement that is nothing more than a bad faith fraudulent exercise in more wars of aggression. In any case, we go on here. Clause six, the suspension of oil sanctions, petrochemical products and derivatives in Iran's full access to the financial proceeds from them. This is very important because it means that immediately upon the lifting of the blockade, which apparently has happened right now, it's already happened or is in the process of being done, Iran can begin to generate substantial revenues from the sale of oil. And the price of oil, even though it came down significantly after this MOU was said to be concluded, it's still significantly more elevated than it was at the beginning of the year. And it's not going to come down to the prior levels anytime soon, if ever, for a whole bunch of reasons we've discussed previously. Iran therefore has the opportunity to bring in much needed revenue very rapidly in a world that is starved for oil. So this is an important benefit from this agreement that Iran can realise immediately. Then it says, clause seven, the requirement for the US and its allies to present reconstruction plans for Iran worth at least 300 billion. That's a lot of dough. And if, in fact, Iran does get 300 billion or more, that would be a stunning achievement for the Islamic Republic. Clause eight, 60 days of negotiations to reach a final agreement based on the nuclear issues and the complete lifting of the primary and secondary US sanctions, as well as a UN Security Council resolution, a resolution of the IAEA Board of Governors. Nine, Iran's reiteration of its commitment under the NPT not to produce nuclear weapons. It's interesting that they use the word reiteration. Iran has always said that it was not going to produce a nuclear weapon, and it hasn't by all indications produced nuclear weapons. And yet Donald Trump is portraying this commitment not to produce nuclear weapons as something new and huge that only he, the great Donald, was able to secure from Iran. Clause ten, during the negotiation period, the US has committed not to add to its forces in the region. Clause eleven, the release of 24 billion of Iran's frozen funds during the 60-day period of final negotiations. Half of this amount must be made available to Iran before the negotiations begin. So again, this too is a very important benefit for Iran that Iran stands to benefit from whatever happens in the subsequent negotiations. Even if they break down and the war resumes, once that \$12 billion is handed over to Iran, in effect the US can't get it back. And that's money that Iran undoubtedly could put to very good use now.

Now, as I said in our live stream yesterday, there is an Iranian parliamentarian who says that the \$12 billion that's supposed to be given up front is not going to be in cash but in the form of goods. I think that's problematic for Iran. It's something, but how do you value the goods that the United States is going to give? Is there a mechanism in there for ensuring that whatever the United States gives to Iran has a real value of \$12 billion. And furthermore, because it's goods and not cash, it limits what Iran can do with those 12 billion dollars. Maybe it needs the money to rebuild its civilian infrastructure. For example, the water facilities that the criminal Trump regime destroyed a few days ago in the south of Iran. But if you're getting medicines and food, as much as that may be beneficial to the population, it ain't gonna help you rebuild that critical infrastructure. We'll see. We don't know for sure whether that 12 billion upfront money is going to be in cash or in goods or some combination of that. Then clause 12 of the MOU, the formation of a supervisory mechanism to implement the agreement. That's very important, although we'll have to see what that looks like. Clause 13,

the final agreement will be approved through a UN Security Council resolution. Clause 14, final negotiations will not begin before half of Iran's frozen funds are released. Iran's oil sanctions are suspended and the naval blockade is lifted. The final agreement will be limited only to the fate of enriched materials and enrichment, sanctions relief and the programme for rebuilding Iran's economy. Discussions about Iran's missile programme and support for resistance groups have been definitively removed from the agenda. That is a huge victory as well for Iran. Now, if that is a clause that the US and Israel respect, it's a huge victory for Iran. But if in fact, they decide that they want to see an end to Iran's ballistic missile programme and all of its support for resistance groups somewhere down the road like in a few weeks time and that if Iran doesn't give them that they're going to bomb Iran who's going to stop them? Who's gonna stop them? The thing for me that matters is that there are upfront benefits under this agreement that the United States and Israel can't take away. So that appears to be the case. Again, we'll have to see the final version, but if in fact that is the case, this is a very important and beneficial development for Iran, whatever might happen in subsequent negotiations.

Now let's turn to some other important news when it comes to the whole question of where we go from here. In a report yesterday to the New York Times, Trump said the following. He insisted that if Iran failed to reach a final nuclear accord with the United States, a process that his aides say they expect will begin on Friday in Switzerland, he would restart military attacks on Tehran or make the United States the guardian of the Middle East in return for 20% of the region's revenue. So you see right there that there are a number of very key issues that haven't been resolved and he is threatening to launch yet another war of aggression on Iran if the terms of the deal are not to his satisfaction. So just on that basis alone it is way too early to say that there is a peace deal in place. Absolutely, it remains to be seen whether or not this thing will one day be transformed into a peace deal. And in that regard, I want to point out to you that there are at least five major issues that remain unresolved and that have been punted down the road. Number one, what restrictions will Iran accept on its nuclear enrichment? Now Trump has made some noises in the last couple of days, which suggests he may be willing to accept some enrichment at a very low level. But, and this actually emerges from his interview with the New York Times yesterday, but as you all know, Trump changes his tune consistently and radically and sometimes within the space of the same sentence. So who knows what he's going to say and demand when they actually sit down at the table and start negotiating on this issue. In any case it has not been resolved and it has been a thorn in the side of US and Iran relations to put it mildly for decades.

The second issue that's been punted down the road over what time frame and how will Trump lift sanctions imposed by Congress? As Dr. Foad Izadi of the University of Tehran has pointed out, and he's been on our show before, the sanctions imposed by Congress are the most important sanctions for Iran. Trump would need congressional approval for the sanctions to be lifted. Will he get it? And will he really try to get it, that's also a question. A third issue that has not been resolved and punted down the road; for purposes of the withdrawal of US forces, what is meant by areas surrounding Iran? This is a very important question. Number four, who will fund the 300 billion reconstruction of Iran? Trump cannot

simply order that these funds be paid to Iran. In theory, Congress controls the purse of the government. You want to give that kind of money, even if it's just partly coming from the US and the rest is coming from Gulf Arab autocracies, let's just say 50 billion is coming from the US, you're going to need congressional approval. Will Congress give him that approval? And if so, with what strings attached? And finally, will Iran maintain control over the Strait of Hormuz? And specifically, can it charge fees? Can it also block specific categories of ships from going through like military vessels or Israeli vessels, Israeli linked commercial vessels? These are very, very meaty issues. Any one of them could result in a collapse of the deal, of the negotiation and a return to hostilities. So with all due respect to the prime minister of Pakistan and demented Donald, this ain't nothing like a peace deal. It is at best a framework for further negotiation with some important upfront benefits to Iran, but also, and this is critical to the analysis of the wisdom of this deal, the opening of the Strait of Hormuz is going to alleviate pressure on the global economy and the US economy quite quickly, if in fact pre-war levels of commercial transportation are restored within the next few weeks. And that means that Trump is going to head into the midterm elections with a lot less pressure on him, economically speaking.

So Trump is getting something extremely important out of all of this. His chances if this thing holds until at least the midterms, the cessation of hostilities and unrestricted travel through the Strait of Hormuz, Trump's chances of retaining control of the Senate and the Congress have gone up significantly if this holds. And my concern, I'll be very blunt about this, is that once demented Donald retains control in the midterms of the House and the Senate and therefore no longer has the threat of impeachment hanging over his dastardly head, he may be well tempted at that stage to return to a hot war and say, look, the negotiations are going badly, the Iranians are being unreasonable, we've had it, we're throwing in the towel, we are going to have to bomb them into oblivion in order to secure their obedience to our maximalist demands. That is something that may well happen. In the interim, Trump, you can be sure, is going to be doing whatever he can to replenish the heavily depleted oil inventories in the United States, including the US strategic petroleum reserve, and will be doing what he can to replenish the highly depleted munitions stocks of the United States and Israel. And one other point, right now, the weather is getting extremely hot in the Persian Gulf, but around the time that the midterms will end, we'll be entering into the winter, and weather conditions in the Persian Gulf will be more conducive to military operations. Right now, they're very non-conducive to military operations, and will be increasingly so in the next couple of months. So this could all be a setup, folks. It could be a set up for a return to war after Donald Trump goes through the mid-terms.

Now, he's in serious trouble all the same, and even with this deal, even if the Strait of Hormuz remains open, no significant restrictions for months to come, he may be toast. But he certainly, his hopes of retaining control of the Congress and the Senate just went up significantly, especially if this holds. And one other thing I want to point out by the way, and this is something that we covered on Reason2Resist a few weeks ago, oil industry experts, and one in particular by the name of Art Berman, who was on Daniel Davis's The Deep Dive a few weeks ago, we covered this in some detail, he argued that even if Iran suddenly stops

throwing in the way of commercial shipping any impediments in the Strait of Hormuz, it's going to take weeks and maybe up to couple of months for the ships to start going through at the same level as before and that initially there is going to be very little passage through the Strait of Hormuz because people are going to be trying to figure out if in fact it's safe, whether the deal is going to break down, they're going to want to be assured that there aren't mines in the Strait of Hormuz, they are going to want to get their ducks in a row with their insurers. The insurers are going to need time to assess the situation, before they figure out what appropriate premiums are and whether they're willing to ensure these vessels. So this is going to take weeks, possibly months. And interestingly, I saw a report today that even though in theory the Strait of Hormuz has been opened, there were no commercial ships going through the Strait of Hormuz. There was only one little patrol ship that was going through, which is consistent with what oil industry expert Art Berman argued on Daniel Davis's Deep Dive a couple of weeks ago. So, whatever may happen with this agreement, even the best case scenario, the global economy is not out of the woods yet. And I want to point out that Art Berman himself said that the price of oil is never going to go back to where it was at the beginning of the year, which is around \$61 a barrel, and that it may stay well above \$81 forever because of a whole host of factors, including the loss of trust in the safety of shipping through the region, the damage that has been done to oil infrastructure, and the reformulation of the balance of power and how that is going to affect economic activity in the area.

This brings me finally to the all-important question of why when the United States and Iran were on the verge of concluding this memorandum of understanding, Netanyahu ordered his military to bomb Beirut, knowing full well that the Iranians regarded this as a red line. Well, the corporate media would have you believe that this was done contrary to the will of Donald Trump. And this is certainly a narrative that Donald Trump has been aggressively promoting within the past 48 hours. He, according to corporate media outlets in the West, particularly Axios blew up and became apoplectic when he learned of the strike by the Israeli genocide forces on Beirut on Sunday. And according to Axios and other corporate media outlets, Trump was so irate that he used the f-bomb yet again in describing the war criminal Netanyahu and said that he has no fucking judgement. This is a report in the Times of Israel published yesterday. "US President Donald Trump lashed out at Israel on Sunday after the IDF struck a Hezbollah target in Beirut, angering Tehran and potentially risking the deal Washington is trying to finalise with the Islamic Republic. Reportedly accusing Prime Minister Netanyahu of having no fucking judgement, the President also declared that the IDF should be prevented from carrying out any more attacks on any part of Lebanon moving forward, not just Beirut. The suggestion was said to raise concerns among Israeli officials that the prospective US-Iran deal could sharply curb Israel's military freedom of action". Now, this is a theme that we have been fed, not just since Trump returned to the White House in January, but this goes back actually decades, and it was a particularly prominent theme in the corporate media during the genocide in occupied Palestine when Joe Biden was in office. Over and over and again, media outlets including Axios reported that genocide Joe was irate with Netanyahu, even to the point of himself using the f-bomb once or twice to describe Netanyahu, because he just wouldn't enter into a ceasefire agreement and end the child

murdering slaughter, which Biden himself was facilitating through the provision of massive amounts of weaponry to Israel. If you've been following my commentary on this issue, you will know that I don't buy this for one second. And this past weekend, for the first time, I learned that none other than Sayyed Hassan Nasrallah himself expressed profound scepticism about this narrative. I'm going to share with you a clip of an interview that he did later in life, the Secretary General of Hezbollah before he was murdered by Israel. And here's what he had to say in this regard.

Sayyed Hassan Nasrallah in Arabic: So if Israel targets Iran, even by itself... America will be held accountable for this. There is a misconception prevalent in the Arab world regarding US-Israel relations. We keep repeating this lie about the Zionist lobby, that the Jews rule America and are the real decision makers, and so on. No, America itself is the decision maker. In America, you have the major corporations. You have a trinity of the oil companies, the weapons industry. And the so-called Christian Zionism. The decision-making is in the hands of this alliance. Israel used to be a tool at the hands of the British, and now it is a tool in the hands of America.

DL: Now, for those who do not speak Arabic and who are unable to read the subtitles in this clip, I'm going to replay this again, this brief clip, and read to you the subtitles. So if Israel targets Iran, even by itself... America will be held accountable for this. There is a misconception prevalent in the Arab world regarding US-Israel relations. We keep repeating this lie about the Zionist lobby, that the Jews rule America and are the real decision makers, and so on. No, America itself is the decision maker. In America, you have the major corporations. You have a trinity of the oil companies, the weapons industry. And the so-called Christian Zionism. The decision-making is in the hands of this alliance. Israel used to be a tool at the hands of the British, and now it is a tool in the hands of America.

It was quite surprising for me to come across this clip at this stage in my thinking about these issues because this is pretty much exactly what I've been arguing for some time. I myself used to adhere to what I think can fairly be described as the mainstream view about the relationship between Israel and the United States. But over time, gradually I've come to understand that the sentiments expressed in that clip by the former Secretary General of Hezbollah are spot on. It is in fact, the United States that is driving the bus in foreign policy matters in West Asia. Now, if I'm right about that, it raises a question, a very good question: If Trump is the decision maker in this relationship with Netanyahu, then why did Trump allow Netanyahu to bomb Beirut on Sunday? After all, he knew that this was a red line for Iran, at least that's what Iran had stated and had acted on it at least once. The last time Israel had bombed Beirut, Iran reacted by attacking Israel. And it is also clear that demented Donald was very anxious to get the Strait of Hormuz opened again and that he wanted this memorandum of understanding to be finalised on his birthday on Sunday before the markets opened on Monday. So it's a good question and a fair question why in those circumstances would Donald Trump say to Netanyahu, yes, we want you to bomb Beirut, please do so; which is I think essentially what happened. Well, the reason I would suggest is this: By the time we got to Sunday the Iranian leadership was politically invested in getting a deal done.

They had gone out into the Iranian media, particularly the Foreign Minister of Iran, Abbas Araghchi, and had said not only that they were closer than ever to a deal, but they had – not only the foreign minister, but other senior officials within the Iranian political elite – had started to make the case to the Iranian people about why this was a good deal for Iran and it should be done.

So when you get to Sunday, I think that Donald Trump was asking himself a question; at this stage, given that the Iranians are so politically invested in the deal, are they really going to be willing to jeopardise this deal, which they've been telling their people is good for the country because we attacked a city in another country, namely Lebanon. We are going to test the resolve of the Iranians and if they allow us to get away with this so that the deal goes forward then we know that we basically have freedom of action in Lebanon going forward during the next several weeks or months of negotiation. On the other hand, if they react harshly and make clear through their response that they are willing to jeopardise this deal, perhaps even trash it altogether in order to defend Lebanon, then we will know that they are serious and that they remain serious about defending the sovereignty of the Lebanese people. In other words, they were testing Iran's resolve. That's what Netanyahu was doing on Sunday in my view. They fucked around and they found out. What they found out is that yes, indeed, even though the Iranian political leadership was invested to a considerable degree in getting this deal done, had made the case that it was good for the country, they were nonetheless willing to jeopardise the deal in order to stop the brutalization of Lebanon. And when that became clear Donald Trump decided to make urgent concessions to Iran to present a resumption of the war to ensure that the Strait of Hormuz got opened. This is something upon which his political survival is based. He needs to get it open more than ever, at least until the midterms, in order to protect himself from possible impeachment or worse. And so he made a series of concessions to prevent a resumption of the war. That's what happened and this is not something that is new. The Americans before Donald Trump engaged in this sort of behaviour. They always are testing the boundaries of what they can get away with, testing the resolve of their enemies, even if it involves cheating, even if it involves trickery, treachery, perfidy. They don't care about any of that. What they want to know is how much freedom of action they have. What can they get away with? And they found out on this occasion, I think to their surprise, that even at that late hour, the Iranian leadership was prepared to defend the sovereignty and dignity of Lebanon by attacking Israel.

Now what is going to happen from here on in? Well, we got a good indication of this this morning when it was reported that the Israelis had struck "a car in the southern Lebanese town of Kfar Tebnit, causing casualties, while Israeli artillery has shelled Kfar Tebnit and Nabatieh al-Fawqa, Lebanon's National News Agency reported. The strikes came just hours after Iran, the U.S., and the mediator Pakistan announced a deal declaring a, quote, 'immediate and permanent' end to military operations on all fronts, including Lebanon". So yet again, they are testing the resolve of the Iranians, although they're doing it at a much lower level. They didn't attack Beirut. They didn't carpet bomb the country in the south. But they are doing what I think could fairly be described as pinprick strikes. And from here, if they get away with this, they will escalate them. And eventually they will get around to

bombing Beirut again as we get deeper and deeper into these negotiations. They will test the resolve of the Iranian military and political leadership at some point during the next 60 days or so of negotiation. And they are going to have to decide, the Iranian political and military leadership, whether they're going to put up with it. I think they will allow some of this treachery to occur, but their patience for it is going to be limited. And I believe at this stage they will take whatever actions they deem necessary to put a stop to it. But for the time being, all indications are that Israel is not going to respect this ceasefire and that the Americans are not only going to allow Israel to violate the ceasefire as they have all other ceasefires, all of them, including the laughable, absurd, and insulting to our intelligence ceasefire in Gaza. And yet again, the Americans and the Israelis are going to find out the hard way that there are limits to the patience of the Islamic Republic, and they will ultimately act to protect the sovereignty of their allies in the region.

How do I know that they are going to continue down this path, the Americans and the Israelis of provocation? Because the Israelis are saying openly that they're going to do just that, although they're not using the word provocation. Today, "Prime Minister Netanyahu reportedly told US President Trump that Israel does not consider itself bound by the Lebanon-related provisions of the US-Iran agreement and will not withdraw from positions it currently occupies inside Lebanese territory. According to Israeli media outlets Yedioth Ahronoth and Maariv, Netanyahu told Trump that Israeli forces will continue carrying out military operations in Lebanon aimed at countering what Israel describes as threats from Hezbollah, regardless of any understandings reached between Washington and Tehran. Maariv's report also said Trump has imposed restrictions on Israel's freedom to operate inside Lebanon". Let's be very clear here; any restrictions that do not amount to a total ban on military operations, in other words terrorist activity of the Israeli genocide forces in Lebanon, will ultimately precipitate another crisis in the negotiating process and quite possibly its complete collapse. Now this brings me to some commentary from a good friend of mine in Lebanon, one whom I've had the privilege to interview here on Reason2Resist. Her name is Marwa Osman and she posted the following on X today: "I have been asked repeatedly this week whether Lebanon will actually be included in any potential memorandum of understanding between Iran and the United States. My answer remains the same, and it always will. Despite Iran's efforts and genuine intentions to see an end to Israeli terrorism on Lebanese soil, I am a southern Lebanese woman from Khiam. I lived through the reality of occupation, aggression, and war firsthand. I have also spent years studying the history of an entity born from supremacy, colonialism, dispossession and theft. The more I witnessed and learned about his genocidal tendencies and terrorism, the less faith I place in any signed document between any two governments that believe they can somehow restrain or control this cancerous project of terrorism. I see no lasting peace emerging from pieces of paper. I see the same pattern that history has shown us for decades, wars, massacres, invasions, and inevitably resistance. If history has taught us anything, it is that no agreement, resolution, or signature ever stopped Zionists from killing, occupying, or stealing. What stopped them were the costs imposed on them. What forced them to retreat was bullets, Katyushas, cornets, missiles, and FPVs... only resistance. That is why my trust has never been in signed papers.

My trust lies in the ability of people to defend themselves, their land, and their dignity and that is where it will remain".

My friend Marwa is a very, very wise person, and I urge you to heed her eloquent commentary. Lastly, I'm going to conclude on this note. The Israeli media are apoplectic. They are openly acknowledging that this agreement, should it be respected, which remains a huge question, is a strategic disaster for Israel. I'm just going to show you one of many possible examples I could show you. This is a paragraph from an article published yesterday by the Times of Israel and they said: "Israel was not included in the talks over the agreement whose reported terms have caused profound concern among Israeli officials. The deal reportedly fails to achieve any of the goals of the war that were set out by the US and Israel, including eliminating Iran's nuclear weapons programme" – they don't have a nuclear weapons programme by the way. This is just a proxy when the Israeli media says this for the elimination of the entire nuclear programme, even taking into account that it's a purely peaceful purposeness. It didn't achieve the military operations, the war of aggression, in depleting Iran's ballistic missile stockpile. It didn't end support for what these terrorist supporters in the Times of Israel refer to as terror proxies. And it didn't create the conditions for the fall of the regime. That's right. It's a total failure. On all fronts, not only for Israel, but also for the United States. So whatever happens from here on in, I want to reiterate that this is a historic victory for the Iranian people, for the Iranian nation. Although I don't believe that this war is over, not by a long shot, and would very much like to be wrong about that, there is no doubt that the world has changed forever. And frankly, I feel privileged to have witnessed it. This is Dimitris Lascaris coming to you from Kalamata, Greece on June 15th, 2026.

END

Thank you for reading this transcript. Please don't forget to donate to support our independent and non-profit journalism:

BANKKONTO:
Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V.
Bank: GLS Bank
IBAN: DE89430609678224073600
BIC: GENODEM1GLS

PAYPAL:
E-Mail: PayPal@acTVism.org

PATREON:
<https://www.patreon.com/acTVism>

BETTERPLACE:
Link: [Click here](#)