

24 more vessels traverse Hormuz under IRGC supervision



3 >



irandaily.ir

newspaper.irandaily.ir

IranDailyWeb

Hezbollah says will not accept 'partial ceasefire' with Israel

Iran threatens to freeze US talks if Israeli strikes in Lebanon persist

2 >



OPINION

Imam Khomeini; unrivaled architect of change

4 >



Iran banking on experience in bid for historic World Cup breakthrough

6 >



New discoveries shed light on ancient sanctuary at Vigol site

7 >

Middle East's largest cancer hospital opened in Tehran

8 >



The photo shows the newly-built building of Iran's Cancer Institute which was inaugurated in Tehran on June 2, 2026. defapress.ir

Trump's intervention signals Lebanon's importance to fate of Iran-US negotiations

By Delaram Ahmadi
Staff writer

INTERVIEW EXCLUSIVE

In response to Israel's advance in Lebanon and threats to strike Beirut, Iran warned it would not only halt negotiations with the United States but would also stand firmly against those actions. Shortly afterward, US President Donald Trump claimed he had spoken with Israeli and Hezbollah leaders and urged them to stop attacking one another. In an interview with Iran Daily, Mohsen Farkhani, an international affairs analyst, argued that Trump's intervention in the manner of Israel's confrontation with Hezbollah underscores the importance of this region in determining the future of US-Iran negotiations.



Mohsen Farkhani

IRAN DAILY: What combination of factors pushed the United States and President Trump toward more direct involvement in the Lebanon crisis?

FARKHANI: Because of its geographic vulnerabilities and its deep geopolit-

ical, technological and economic dependence on US support, Israel does not undertake major military or security actions without direct coordination with Washington. As was seen during previous US administrations, when American presidents declined to align themselves with Netanyahu's regional policies, Israel largely limited itself to assassinating Iranian scientists.

Trump's intervention in the way Israel confronts Hezbollah, as well as the regime's intention to launch attacks on Beirut's southern suburbs, reflects both the importance of this region in shaping the outcome of US-Iran negotiations and Israel's lack of independence in making major security and military decisions that affect regional dynamics.

Despite entering the war with declared objectives that included military action against Iran and the need for Iran's unconditional surrender, Trump has failed to achieve those goals and has instead suffered a severe setback as a result of Iran's asymmetric response across the geopolitical, economic, energy and hegemonic discourse spheres.

Heavy political and public pressure inside the United States, the approaching midterm elections, the World Cup,

and the damage inflicted on America's global credibility are among the factors that have pushed Trump into a position of weakness and a pressing need to find a way out of the confrontation with Iran.

Exiting this conflict through the signing of an agreement that commits Iran to a number of low-cost conditions represents the least expensive option available to the US administration for slowing Iran's transformation into the world's fourth major power. Consequently, during the ceasefire period, after testing various alternatives, Trump has devoted all his efforts to securing an honorable exit from the conflict and avoiding a withdrawal without an agreement with Iran.

Some reports point to a tense conversation between Trump and Netanyahu. How should this tension be interpreted? Is it a temporary tactical disagreement over Lebanon and Iran, or signs of a deeper divergence in the strategic priorities and calculations of Washington and Tel Aviv?

Netanyahu's effort to place Trump before a fait accompli and prevent the emergence of any agreement with Iran is an action that, if successful, would severely damage Trump's political future and presidency.

For this reason, exchanges of views and discussions between Trump and Netanyahu—whether tense or cordial—should be assessed within the framework of the special strategic partnership between the United States and Israel. Since tactical disagreements are a natural feature of military and security policymaking, tension in a telephone conversation between the two leaders should not be interpreted as evidence of a strategic rift. Nor does the tone of such contacts fundamentally affect US-Israel relations.

On the contrary, such tensions reflect the seriousness with which the United States and Israel are pursuing the containment, control and even elimination of Iran's sphere of influence in the region, as well as Iran's ability thus far to disrupt their calculations. Accordingly, the leaking of reports about a tense phone call between Trump and Netanyahu can, at best, be viewed as an attempt to portray Trump as blameless in the recent war and to project a false image of him as a peacemaker.

If Israel expands the scope of its operations in Lebanon, what scenarios lie ahead for the region? How would the United States respond?

Given Iran's intelligence and military

understanding of US and Israeli behavior, as well as its upper hand in humiliating the United States and imposing new regional realities—including Washington's inability to restore the previous order in the Strait of Hormuz—Iran has succeeded in imposing its will on the US, Israel and their regional allies.

From this perspective, several scenarios can be envisioned.

The first and most likely scenario is the emergence of a temporary but fragile ceasefire under US supervision, accompanied by controlled tensions. Such an arrangement would leave room for Netanyahu to assess the extent to which military and security objectives have advanced. This would be Netanyahu's preferred option, since it would allow a return to the battlefield at any moment while also shielding him from legal threats inside Israel.

The second scenario involves the continuation of targeted Israeli attacks in southern Lebanon without extending operations into Beirut, coupled with Hezbollah responses. This would preserve a war of attrition against Hezbollah, both psychologically and logistically, while denying the group the opportunity to fully recover and rebuild a high level of operational readiness.

Page 2 >