

“JD Vance Was Calling Netanyahu During Ceasefire Talks” – Mohammad Marandi

What really happened inside the US-Iran ceasefire negotiations? Support Independent media to remain bold: <https://patreon.com/IndiaGlobalLeft> Link for donation: <https://paypal.me/sankymudiar> In this explosive interview, Iranian political analyst and former negotiation team member Mohammad Marandi reveals what went on behind closed doors during the recent US-Iran ceasefire talks. Why did the negotiations fail? Was the US side negotiating in good faith—or was the outcome predetermined? Marandi describes a striking contrast between the Iranian delegation—composed of seasoned experts and PhD-level negotiators—and the US team, which reportedly included political figures and venture capital-linked actors. He also reacts to shocking claims that JD Vance was in contact with Benjamin Netanyahu during the talks. The conversation also explores: The real reasons behind the breakdown of US-Iran ceasefire negotiations The role of Donald Trump and US domestic politics Iran’s diplomatic posture and changing negotiation strategy The connection between Iran, Lebanon, and the broader West Asia conflict Whether a second round of talks is likely This is a rare insider account of high-stakes diplomacy at a moment of global tension. Follow us on Substack: <https://substack.com/@indiagloballeft> Twitter: <https://twitter.com/Indiagloballeft> Instagram <https://www.instagram.com/indiagloballeft/> Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=61559411353392> Spotify: <https://open.spotify.com/show/69Y9iCWUv8ha3ATsPWtWk0?si=ee1f0de3de094f17> Telegram: <https://t.me/+WNIqoiv1Rhg5NjEx> Timestamps: 00:00 – Intro – Inside the Iranian delegation – Why talks failed – US delegation controversy – Netanyahu & US coordination – Iran, Lebanon & ceasefire politics – What is Trump planning? – Will talks resume? Keywords US Iran ceasefire, Iran US negotiations, Mohammad Marandi interview, Trump Iran war, Netanyahu Iran, JD Vance controversy, Iran diplomacy, Lebanon ceasefire, Middle East geopolitics, US foreign policy, Iran Israel conflict

#Mudiar

Hello and welcome to another episode of *India and Global Left*. If you’re new to the show, please hit that subscribe button. Also, consider becoming a YouTube member, a patron, or donating a small amount using the link in the description box. Without further ado, let me welcome our guest tonight, Professor Mohammad Marandi. Professor Marandi teaches at the University of Tehran in Iran. Professor Marandi, welcome back to *India and Global Left*.

#Mohammad

Thank you very much for inviting me. It’s always a pleasure to be on your show.

#Mudiar

If I'm not mistaken, you were part of the Iranian delegation in Islamabad for the first round of talks with the U.S. representatives. Could you tell us about your experience as part of that delegation, and why the talks failed?

#Mohammad

Well, from the very beginning, when we left Iran—Tehran—at the airport, on the plane, and when we arrived at the hotel, those I spoke with in the delegation were all skeptical. They didn't believe there was much chance for any deal. The reason was past experiences with the United States. Before the 12-day war, we negotiated, but they were conspiring to launch a war. Then, before this war, we were negotiating again. The Omani foreign minister said there was significant progress—and then they launched the war. So the Iranians were skeptical. Of course, the Iranian armed forces were preparing themselves for war, just like before the 12-day war and this one. I mean, this ongoing myth that Iran was caught off guard—it's not true. Back then, Iran knew something was happening. It didn't know exactly what day or what hour, but they were expecting more.

Maybe they were caught off guard on day one, in the sense that they miscalculated what would be targeted and when, but they knew something was going to happen. In any case, this time around, the Iranian armed forces are, of course, working day and night to prepare themselves for the next phase of a potential war, which I think is highly likely. So when they went there and began negotiating, and the talks failed, no one was surprised. During the talks, it actually started somewhat positive and continued to be more or less positive throughout the day. But then, near the end of the negotiations on day one, the Americans suddenly shifted their position and took a very hard-line stance, which was surprising in the sense that the shift was so sudden—not because Iran had any expectations beforehand, as I said.

And then, suddenly, Vance, in the middle of the night—even though talks were supposed to continue in the morning—walked away. He handed out this story about a “wonderful weapon,” which is false. We know that from Joe Kent and his resignation letter, a very high-ranking—actually the highest-ranking—counterintelligence officer in the United States. He said that Iran was not pursuing a nuclear weapon. Then Vance said, “Well, Iran didn't accept our demands, so we're leaving.” Of course, the United States did not win the war, and it can't expect Iran to accept U.S. demands. What they haven't achieved in the war, they certainly won't be able to achieve at the negotiating table.

What was interesting was that during the negotiations, the Iranian side never once called Tehran. The chief negotiator, the Speaker of Parliament, Dr. Qalibaf, had a long conversation with the leader, Ayatollah Seyed Mojtaba Khamenei, beforehand, and then came prepared to negotiate with his team. But Vance was surrounded, of course, by two Israeli-firsters—one to his right and one to his

left—Witkoff and Kushner. More importantly, though, he was constantly making phone calls, and it was obvious he had no authority. The whole thing was just a sham. One of the people he called—and they were all Israeli-firsters—was Netanyahu.

And Netanyahu did say this. He said that Vance would report to him, which I found quite surprising—that the prime minister of this puny little colony would say that the vice president of the United States reports to him. But I guess telling the truth every now and then is inevitable. In any case, I think that's why the negotiations failed—because the Zionist lobby and the Israeli regime wanted them to fail. We can also draw that conclusion again from Joe Kent, who said this war came about because of the interests of the Zionist lobby and the Israeli regime. He said on many occasions that this war is not in the interest of the United States, so you can also conclude that these negotiations would fail for the same reasons.

There's nothing new here. But, you know, just like before the 12-day war and before this war—the Ramadan war, the roughly 40-day war—in this perspective of the war, the Iranians went to the negotiating table on all three occasions: the 12-day war, this war, and now, for two reasons. One is to see if there can be a reasonable solution. Obviously, that's an issue, even though on all three occasions they were highly skeptical. But you always try to see if something is possible. Maybe at some point Trump will decide that he really does need an off-ramp, so you can provide that opportunity.

But the major reason was that Iran wanted the international community—and the Iranian people—to see that we were willing to solve this crisis. If we hadn't gone, then some people, you know, from the Western media, the Western Epstein-class controlled media, would have tried to pin the blame on Iran, even though they were the ones who started the aggression, the murder, and the destruction. They would have said, "Well, if Iran had negotiated, this could have been prevented." So, in order to prevent that narrative from emerging, on all three occasions Iran participated. And I think it had an enormous effect, because I think you, too, notice—and people elsewhere notice—that across the world, public opinion supports Iran and the axis of resistance.

And public opinion has turned against the United States, its allies, its proxies, and the Zionist regime. This is extraordinary because, for 47 years, the anti-Iran narrative has always been very dominant, very effective—and now all of that is collapsing. I gave you that example before, I think, of the book **Going to Tehran**, if I'm not mistaken. I said it's a good book for people to read, by Flint and Hillary Leverett. It deals with their experience as senior White House officials—they were senior officials in the U.S. National Security Council. When they wrote **Going to Tehran**, they were hammered by everyone in the political class in the United States.

But now I think it's becoming clear that they were completely vindicated. If U.S. analysts had read their book and thought—if, instead of listening to the Zionists, they had been objective about what the book says and about the past history of the U.S.-Iranian relationship—we wouldn't be in this situation. Public opinion back then, in the United States and across the world, was very different

from what it is today. So I think the fact that Iran has gone to the negotiating table is a plus. But at the end of the day—and I'm sort of moving beyond the questions—this war is not over, and we are reaching a very critical point in the coming days and weeks.

#Mudiar

I was really struck by the contrast in the delegations and the way they conducted themselves. On the Iranian side, we had Dr. Ghalibov, Dr. Araksi, and others—Ph.D. holders, people who have known not just their own country but also cultures across the world. And then, on the other side, Kushner, Witkoff—real estate parents, mafia types, fraudsters, venture capitalists, J.D. Vance, and so on. And as you said, they didn't have the authority. I mean, J.D. Vance, in a press interview, said to one of his hand-picked journalists that "we are constantly making..." because the question was, "Did you talk to President Trump during the interview?" Of course, you know, the bootlicking kind of question.

But J.D. Vance said that they are constantly in touch with President Trump, as did Secretary Pompeo and Pete Hegseth, and so on. He also mentioned Scott Bessent. Of course, he didn't mention Netanyahu, or maybe even Lindsey Graham and other Zionists. But the point I'm trying to make here is how helpless, or how non-representative, the representatives of the United States were—and how illiterate they were. I'm bringing this up because the propaganda for years and decades has been that Americans are well-educated and know about the world, which is not the case. And then they claim to be a democracy, a representative one. But if you are truly representative, then you should hold power—which is clearly not the case.

#Mohammad

Yes, the three men on the Iranian side were all Ph.D. holders. Dr. Ghalibov, who was also a general—he was a commander in the war—has a Ph.D. and is an associate professor at the University of Tehran. Dr. Araksi, the foreign minister, also has a Ph.D. And Dr. Hadi Bagheri, who led the nuclear negotiations four years ago, is the deputy head of the Supreme National Security Council and the deputy for international relations. He too holds a Ph.D. and teaches at a university in Tehran. That's the Iranian side—and the other side is, of course, as you pointed out.

And then the Iranian delegation, when they spoke among themselves, had their experts in the room next door to consult with. But the Americans, even though they had— from what I understand— a much larger delegation than the Iranians, the head of the delegation, the U.S. vice president, had no authority whatsoever. And again, when Netanyahu says, "He reports to me," you'd think there would be outrage across Western media that he would even use that language. But it's not even mentioned in Western media, because the entire mainstream Western media is controlled by the Epstein class— controlled by the Zionist oligarchy.

So obviously, ordinary Americans aren't going to be fed any of that—and people across the world who waste their time watching CNN won't either. Because even the opponents of Trump in the ruling class—whether it's the owners of The Guardian, The New York Times, or other outlets—when it comes to the empire, they're all in the same boat. They'll all antagonize Iran. They'll all try to blame Iran, blame Iran. They may attack Trump. They may say he's messed up the war, or he's done a terrible job, or he's miscalculated. But they'll still do their job in demonizing Iran. You know, the whole story about tens of thousands of peaceful protesters being slaughtered on the streets—that was utterly fake news. It was all being promoted by the collective Western media to prepare for war, to prepare the ground for these genocidal strikes.

Do you see all that? You know, as Beirut and Lebanon are being carpet-bombed every day, they're carrying out genocide and ethnic cleansing there. Does anyone see Western media up in arms? Of course not. Every day they're slaughtering Palestinians in Gaza. Do we see any outrage in the West? No, they look away. So when Netanyahu says the most outrageous things about how the U.S. vice president— I think he said he repeatedly, he constantly reports to me— you shouldn't expect Western media to point this out, because he's the boss. Again, going back to what Joe Kent said— I refer to Joe Kent a lot, not because he's revealed anything that you and I and your viewers didn't already know. We've all known this for years. But the fact that it came from inside the system, from such a high-ranking official, I think basically makes our case for us.

#Mudiar

The Western media has also tried its best to hide the crimes of their class in Minab. I wanted to ask you, since you were part of delegations before as well—before or during the JCPOA—about the mood this time. I read a report saying that on the flight the delegation took, there were the names of the girls who were martyred or killed in Minab. Of course, the Western media has tried to hide those crimes and the sentiment around them. My question, Professor, is: what was the sentiment that the delegation carried with them? Because for some time there's been this idea that Iranian delegations are too gentle—that they're sometimes too good-natured, that they don't treat the other side as an enemy. What was the mood this time, and did something change?

#Mohammad

In general, well, you're right. Contrary to Western propaganda—where they're civilized and we're uncivilized—our diplomats and our delegations are, like our own people, much more civilized than them, and much more polite. Many see that as a fault. Now, that's debatable, but it's a fact. You're absolutely correct. The delegation and the flight itself were unofficially, or maybe officially, named Minab 168, because of the children slaughtered—the 168 little elementary school kids who were intentionally murdered by the Americans.

There's no doubt in my mind, and no doubt in the minds of Iranians, that this was the first wave of attack. They had months, if not years, to vet the target, and all those targets in the first wave were carefully chosen. In subsequent weeks during a war, if someone says, "We need a new target," and an officer rushes to find something and makes a mistake, that's plausible. But in this case, no—it's not. This was a known school. It's on all the maps and on all the apps as well. And, of course, many of the children were the kids of military officers. It's believed these kids were targeted specifically to teach the Iranian military a lesson. And, of course, it wasn't just the 168 kids who were killed at that school—it was also their teachers, school staff, and many other children and people across the country. They were also murdered during those forty days. But it was symbolic, and I think it was also a reminder to the delegation itself that they had a responsibility to stand up for these kids, to defend the country, and not allow the United States or the Zionist regime to benefit from their crimes.

One important point, I think, was that the only reason the United States accepted a ceasefire was because it agreed to Iran's 10-point plan as a framework—even though later, according to the White House spokeswoman, they said they threw it in the bin. That shows the United States is completely unreliable. But when they accepted it initially, I think that was a sign they acknowledged they had lost the war. They were the ones seeking a ceasefire, just like during the 12-day war. It wasn't Iran that was seeking it. So the delegation knew they had the upper hand, militarily and, of course, morally. And that's basically why the United States walked away. As empires do, they made demands, and those demands were not going to be met.

And one of the things about the United States—and this is something I believe some Iranian negotiators in the past miscalculated, especially during the Rouhani years—is that when you speak with Americans and offer concessions out of goodwill to solve a problem, they don't see it that way. They see it as a sign of weakness. So in the past, whenever the Iranians put forward concessions as a gesture of goodwill, the Americans would double down. I think gradually the Iranians are better understanding the reality of the United States, and that negotiating with the empire has to be done differently. In any case, at the moment, we are where we are. But the war is ongoing—they are slaughtering people in Lebanon. Lebanon was part of the ceasefire.

And then the Pakistani prime minister explicitly said so. But two things happened. One was that Netanyahu was against it, just like he wrecked the negotiations—he wrecked the ceasefire. And again, this shows who's in charge. It's definitely not Trump. As Tucker Carlson said, he's a slave—but a slave who's still responsible for his criminal actions. Netanyahu wrecked it, but also the Lebanese prime minister wrecked it. And this is one of the interesting things: the Lebanese prime minister could have had a ceasefire without paying any political price, and he could have saved the lives of many Lebanese citizens. But he chose not to, because he was collaborating with Netanyahu and Trump. So he helped undermine the ceasefire in Lebanon by saying, no, we're going to have our own direct negotiations with the Israeli regime—which would be a first—and that we want normalization.

And, of course, this is causing a huge uproar in Lebanon, and it's also led to the deaths of many Lebanese. But what Iran did in response—many people, I think, were saying, "Well, why did Iran accept the ceasefire?" Iran didn't actually accept the ceasefire in the way it was supposed to be carried out. Iran, as a result of what was happening in Lebanon, prevented the partial normalization of trade. So, until the U.S. siege was put in place yesterday, the status of the Strait of Hormuz continued to be as it was during the war. And this, I think, is key. Because I'm sure you've had economists who know much more than I do on your show discussing the implications of the energy crisis, the fertilizer crisis, the fuel crisis, the petrochemical crisis, and so on. This is going to have much greater consequences in the near future. So Iran is continuing to put enormous pressure on Trump. And that is basically why Trump accepted the push for a ceasefire in the first place—because of the Strait of Hormuz. By continuing the genocide in Gaza—in Lebanon, sorry, because there is now a genocide in Lebanon taking place—people have to wake up. The momentum we saw last year, when people were on the streets across the world, has to be quickly revived. They're slaughtering in Gaza, and they're slaughtering even more in Lebanon, ethnically cleansing the country. The reason why shipping through the Strait of Hormuz was effectively shut down again was because of Netanyahu. So Netanyahu—the Zionist Netanyahu-Trump alliance—is responsible for what's coming. And if this continues, especially with the U.S. siege on the Strait of Hormuz, it's going to lead to the collapse of the world economy. I think we're heading for a very, very painful recession that will swiftly lead to a depression.

#Mudiar

Does Iran have any diplomatic or other ties with Nawaf Salam and Josephine's government in Beirut? I'm asking because the mainstream media doesn't talk about the layers in Lebanon. They're saying there's a direct talk between Lebanon and Israel on a ceasefire, as if they represent everyone in Lebanon. This is, of course, brokered by Washington and the United States to de-link Iran from the Palestine issue at its very heart. So, could you tell us a little about Iran's relationship with the government in Beirut, and break down this reactionary group of people that Washington has cobbled together in the name of talks?

#Mohammad

Well, the Lebanese prime minister and the president were not elected based on public support. They were imposed on Lebanon under duress by the Americans and their regional proxies—the Saudis, the Qataris, the Emiratis—who are all basically agents of the United States, with differing worldviews but still agents of the United States. And they, of course, are pushing Lebanon in the direction that the United States wants. Public opinion in Lebanon, as polls have always shown, is completely against normalization with the Israeli regime. So why does the U.S.-installed Lebanese prime minister push for direct talks—and his people, and of course the president by extension? It's because they're agents of the United States.

It's as simple as that. Why did he undermine the ceasefire? Because he wanted the resistance and its supporters across Lebanon to be hammered. He wants to see their towns bombed and their people slaughtered, because he thinks it will change the balance of power in his favor. And so he, again, as I said, undermined the ceasefire that the Iranians and the Americans agreed upon, along with Netanyahu—and we are where we are. The Americans want to separate Iran from the Palestinian issue because no one but Iran and its allies cares for the Palestinians. No one else does.

I mean, if anyone thinks that Erdogan or, you know, those who own Al Jazeera are sincere supporters of Palestine, they're only fooling themselves. No one supports the Palestinian people except for ordinary people across the region and across the world. Overwhelmingly, whether it's in Turkey or in Egypt or in Jordan, people's hearts are with Palestine across the world. But no government is going to do anything about it, as we know. They're all doing business as usual—Turkey transporting cheap fuel from Baku, Egypt importing gas, and Jordan facilitating trade for the Israeli regime. We can go on. The Americans are doing their best to destroy the link between Iran and Lebanon, and between Iran and Palestine. I have no doubt they will ultimately fail. And Lebanon—while it's very painful now and it's going to get more painful in the days ahead because the Israelis are slaughtering people—they're doing to Lebanon what they did to Gaza. And again, the Western media is intentionally looking away. They have no excuse, because they pretended they couldn't verify anything in Gaza by saying, "We don't have a presence." But they do have a presence in Lebanon. Their journalists have fixers and drivers and producers and all that. Yet their reports basically justify genocide.

They're trying their best to justify genocide by saying these are Hezbollah targets or Hezbollah strongholds, which are lies—and they know they're lies. I've spoken to a couple of them, and they say, "Well, no, we didn't put those terms in our reports; our editors did that." It doesn't change anything. Their name is on it, and they're complicit in genocide. They're like the criminals of the Nazi regime. They have no excuse, nor do their editors. But people across the world are seeing what's being done to Lebanon, and hopefully people will show their outrage, because last year the only reason Trump was forced to move toward that fake ceasefire in Gaza was the huge momentum building on the streets across Europe and around the world.

So we'll have to see. But again, I think the main issue—the main battleground that will determine the fate of all—is the silent war. And that is the Strait of Hormuz. Every hour that this strait is closed down, it's like a ticking time bomb moving closer to explosion. I think that if Trump does not back down and does not accept Iran's requirements regarding Lebanon and Iranian sovereignty, then the world is going to face catastrophe—and so will Trump.

#Mudiar

My last question, Professor Marandi. By the way, the IMF released a report today documenting the damage caused to the global economy. They said this has already happened, and global economic growth for at least a year will be significantly lower than what they had estimated before. I should

also add that the impact on the Global South will be particularly damaging, but we've been discussing that in other conversations with economists. I wanted to ask, finally, a question that you probably can't answer—which is: what's going on in Trump's mind? Or, to put it more precisely, could there be a second round of talks, given that we're seeing this idea being floated in the media?

Trump has said that the war with Iran is close to being over, in one of his interviews on Fox News, hinting at a second round of talks. The U.S. military also claims they've completely halted economic trade going in and out of Iran by sea, which is a complete lie. I've been tracking data—particularly Iran-China trade data—and that's clearly false based on those statistics. But are you preparing for a second round of talks and your second visit?

#Mohammad

Iran is preparing for all scenarios. Trump wants talks—that's why he keeps talking about them. Remember, he was saying that Iran was begging for a ceasefire for forty days. He began with unconditional surrender, then gradually shifted toward a fifteen-point plan, and ultimately accepted the Iranian framework—the ten-point plan for negotiations—which showed who was really winning and who was losing the war. And he says the war is almost over. He's been saying that since the beginning of the war, that it's almost over. So nothing Trump says really has any significance. I've stopped listening to him.

I don't listen to his interviews because nothing changes for me—anything he says could change within two minutes, two hours, or two days. What matters for Iran are the facts on the ground. Let me go back to the ceasefire: the United States violated it by not including Lebanon, because of Netanyahu. Tehran said, "OK, you're violating your side of the bargain. We're not going to let those ships that were supposed to be added to the list—those that could leave or go through the Strait of Hormuz—operate."

This is the difference between negotiations between Iran and the United States. Iran gave significant concessions. The Iranians immediately carried out their side of the bargain, and the Americans didn't. Under Obama, the Iranians were constantly trying to pressure the United States to abide by its side of the deal, but it wouldn't. And then, of course, Trump later tore up the agreement. This time around, as soon as the United States violates it, the Iranians say, "Oh, okay, you're not going to do that? No ships." And they immediately respond.

And the devastation and the slaughter that we see in Lebanon—which is painful to watch—and the indifference of Western journalists and politicians is absolutely disgusting, of course. But what Iran is doing to the United States, to Trump and his allies through the Strait of Hormuz, is far more devastating. It's just not something we're going to see in the IMF report, which I haven't seen yet. I would imagine it tries to downplay what's happening because, of course, the IMF is controlled by the United States. It's not going to come out and say this is catastrophic. But if this continues, it's going to be horrific. And the economic situation, as you and I know, was already very bad before the war.

And things are—you know—the global economy, the U.S. economy, Western economies, are in deep, deep trouble. This economic catastrophe will have an impact on multiple levels, not just because the shortage of fertilizer is going to increase dramatically. This is just the tip of the iceberg right now. We don't see what's really happening; it's all under the surface, for the most part. So fertilizers, petrochemicals, oil, refined fuel, LNG—all these on one side—but there are other implications too. These Arab family dictatorships, all the extra wealth they used to get from oil and gas, they would put into U.S. stocks and U.S. bonds. That's ended.

And because of the enormous damage done to their economies—because they were complicit in the war and Iran had to retaliate—they're going to have to use that money that's already in U.S. stocks and bonds, or elsewhere, the assets they purchased, in order to repair. And it's never going to go back to normal, because the region is not going to go back to normal. Iran will continue to hold the Strait of Hormuz in the future. So, the cows that the West milks—the cows in Qatar, the cow in the Emirates, the cow in Kuwait, the cow in Saudi Arabia, the cow in Bahrain—their milk is running dry. The damage being done to Western economies, the U.S. economy, the world economy, is multilayered, and the world knows who to blame.

Just again, going back to Joe Kent—it's the Zionist lobby and the Israeli regime. So it's Netanyahu and Trump, as their representatives, that people will blame across the world. The pressure across the world will grow against the United States because countries will suffer, and the pressure inside the United States will grow too. People will increasingly turn against this genocidal regime that, as we speak, is carrying out genocide. And again, I go back to that book **Going to Tehran**: if the United States had chosen a different path and disobeyed their Zionist overlords, we wouldn't be where we are today.

#Mudiar

The hedge funds, the insurance companies, the investment banks were blamed during the 2008 crisis. The equivalent of those criminals would be the Zionist lobby. We'll leave it there. Professor Mohammad Marandi, thank you so much for your time, and have a wonderful rest of the day ahead.

#Mohammad

You too. I hope you have a very good day, and I hope your viewers also have a good day. And I advise everyone to actually go and read **Going to Tehran**. It's an eye-opener about the reality of U. S.–Iranian relations.

#Ayushman

Hi, my name is Ayushman. I, along with Mudiar Jyotishman, have started this platform. Over the last two years, we've tried to build content for the left and progressive forces. We've interviewed economists, historians, political commentators, and activists so far. If you've liked our content and

want us to build an archive for the left, I have two requests for you. Please consider donating to the cause—the link is in the description below. And if you're not able to, don't feel bad. You can always like and share our videos with your comrades. Finally, don't forget to hit the subscribe button.