News & Comment

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

The Iranian-American Impasse and the Intersection of Interests

(Translated)

News:

Tehran/Anatolia—Iranian Foreign Minister Abbas Araghchi said on Tuesday (10/11/2026) that the United States will not achieve its objectives through war or sanctions against his country, stressing that the only way to resolve the crisis is through diplomacy and accepting Iranian demands. Tehran had presented Washington on Sunday, via intermediaries, a two-phase roadmap, each phase lasting two days, aimed at resuming safe navigation in the Strait of Hormuz and initiating nuclear negotiations between the two countries. Donald Trump was more optimistic in his tone; following his meeting with the Qatari Prime Minister, he spoke of "positive momentum" toward ending the conflict and indicated a pause in launching new strikes after regional appeals. (Reuters)

Comment:

A reading of the reality and the ongoing statements and moves makes it clear that the fundamental disagreement between Tehran and Washington will persist until Allah (swt) wills. Tehran demands a reduction of pressure and the fulfillment of its seven conditions before resuming negotiations, while Washington says that the pressure itself is achieving results and sees no need to lift it in exchange for the conditions offered. Furthermore, the two sides continue to present two different narratives regarding the existence of talks and progress in them: Trump speaks positively, while Tehran denies that any negotiations are taking place. This reality confirms that neither side is serious about resolving the dispute between them.

Looking at the seven conditions Iran presented for starting negotiations—which are: stopping combat operations on all fronts, including Lebanon, Gaza, and Yemen, not just inside Iran; releasing Iran's frozen funds and assets abroad; completely lifting the naval blockade on Iran; lifting the economic and political sanctions imposed on it; withdrawing American naval and air forces from the region; paying compensation for the damages inflicted on Iran due to the war; and the cessation of threats and insults directed at Iran—the observer realizes that they are impossible demands that America cannot accept, as they amount to a declaration of surrender by America and the payment of tribute to it. In this regard, Secretary of State Marco Rubio said on Tuesday, November 10: "We're not going to pay," adding that "Iran is demanding reparations. They should be the ones paying reparations because they're the ones that have destabilized the region."

This is an explicit rejection of one of the Iranian demands to end the conflict, in addition to the insistence on sanctions and the blockade, as Rubio said: "there's really no need for major combat operations any longer, because the blockade and the economic sanctions are doing devastation to their economy." Nevertheless, Rubio confirmed Washington's openness to an agreement, but he said "The problem is the conditions they continue to place are absurd... the Iranian demands are totally unrealistic" and unrealistic, and said that the President would support a possible agreement, not a bad agreement.

It is clear that both parties fully understand the dimensions of the game between them. Iran realizes that Washington will not agree to its conditions, and Washington does not want to use military decisiveness with Iran, despite its ability to do so, especially with the armies of its agents it has mobilized in Saudi Arabia. It is also impossible for America to accept the seven conditions. This means that matters will remain at a standstill—the Strait of Hormuz

will stay closed, and the supply of the lifeblood of industry to Europe and China will remain halted with the arrival of winter. This confirms America's real intent to keep the situation suspended as it is, with ebb and flow meant to delude its allies in Europe and China into believing that America is seeking to resolve the crisis, but that the solution is faltering. This has led some observers to believe that both parties understand the dimensions of the game and that their goal is one, whether by agreement between them or without. Nor should we forget that it was Europe, in fact, that was obstructing American solutions to the Iranian nuclear file and that had been imposing commercial and economic sanctions on Iran since 2006 under the pretext of its nuclear program. Iran has old scores it wants to settle with Europe—assuming, that is, that Iran is not coordinating with America under the table to achieve this, given the convergence of interests between them.

The diplomatic language used by America, which appears contradictory and changeable from one day to the next, is not due to the Democrats winning the Congress and Senate, as they have not yet exercised their role in the two chambers. Rather, this language is deliberate to mislead Europe, China, and global public opinion regarding what Washington truly aims for: breaking the backs of its rivals in Europe and China.

Moreover, Iran's refusal to turn over its cause to its rightful owner—the Islamic Ummah—by handing authority to its people who carry the project of the Khilafah (Caliphate) on the Method of the Prophethood, specifically Hizb ut Tahrir, the bearer of the project to unify the Ummah from Indonesia to Morocco; Iran's refusal of this offer that pleases Allah (swt), His Messenger (saw), and the believers, and which would extricate it from the wars that have not ceased since the arrival of the Iranian revolution, confirms the lack of sincerity and seriousness of the Iranian leadership in acting according to the Shariah rulings established by the definitive texts of revelation. Instead, it seeks acceptance by America and the international community as a member of the international community of crusaders.

Therefore, the sincere ones in Iran must seize their leaders by the hand and demand they accept the project of Hizb ut Tahrir, which was presented to their supreme leader, Khomeini, from the time of his arrival from Paris to Tehran.

And the sincere ones within the armed forces that have been mobilized from Pakistan, Türkiye, Egypt, and Syria, in addition to the forces of the Hijaz, must revolt against their leaders and give the nussrah (military support) to Hizb ut Tahrir to establish the Khilafah (Caliphate) on the Method of the Prophethood in the cradle of the Message, Makkah and Madinah. The Messenger of Allah (saw) said, «تَكُونُ النُّبُوَّةُ فِيكُمْ مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ أَنْ تَكُونَ، ثُمَّ يَرْفَعُهَا إِذَا شَاءَ أَنْ يَرْفَعَهَا، ثُمَّ تَكُونُ خِلَافَةٌ عَلَى مِنْهَاجِ النُّبُوَّةِ، فَتَكُونُ مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ أَنْ تَكُونَ، ثُمَّ يَرْفَعُهَا إِذَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ أَنْ يَرْفَعَهَا، ثُمَّ تَكُونُ مُلْكًا عَضُوضًا، فَيَكُونُ مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ أَنْ يَكُونَ، ثُمَّ يَرْفَعُهَا إِذَا شَاءَ أَنْ يَرْفَعَهَا، ثُمَّ تَكُونُ مُلْكًا جَبْرِيَّةً، فَتَكُونُ مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ أَنْ تَكُونَ، ثُمَّ يَرْفَعُهَا إِذَا شَاءَ أَنْ يَرْفَعَهَا، ثُمَّ تَكُونُ خِلَافَةٌ عَلَى مِنْهَاجِ نُبُوَّةٍ» **"Prophethood shall remain among you for as long as Allah wills, then He will lift it when He wills. Then there will be a Khilafah (Caliphate) on the Method of Prophethood, and it will endure for as long as Allah wills, then He will lift it when He wills. Then there will be a dynastic rule, and it will last for as long as Allah wills, then He will lift it when He wills. Then there will be an oppressive ruler, and it will persist for as long as Allah wills, then He will lift it when He wills. Then there will be a Khilafah (Caliphate) on the Method of Prophethood." Then he remained silent.**

Written for the Central Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir by

Bilal al-Muhajir – Wilayah Pakistan