

Iran proposes 30-day plan to end war, rejects extended ceasefire

International Desk

Iran's latest 14-point proposal to the United States calls for issues between the two countries to be resolved within 30 days and aims to end the war rather than extend the ceasefire.

On Thursday, Iran delivered a new proposal for peace talks with the US via mediator Pakistan, with negotiations between the two sides frozen despite a weeks-long ceasefire.

United States President Donald Trump has said he is reviewing Iran's 14-point proposal, while warning that Washington could restart air strikes if Tehran "misbehaves."

Issues such as guarantees of non-aggression, withdrawal of US military forces from the areas surrounding Iran, lifting the naval blockade, release of Iran's frozen assets, payment of compensation to Tehran for war damage, removal of sanctions, and ending the war on all fronts, including Lebanon, as well as a new mechanism for the Strait

of Hormuz, are also among the topics included in the Iran's proposal.

Also on Sunday, Iranian Foreign Minister Abbas Araghchi continued its consultations with his counterparts over efforts to put an end to the US-Israeli aggression against Iran and secure peace in the region.

Araghchi held separate talks with German Foreign Minister Johann Wadepuhl and Oman's top diplomat Sayyid Badr Hamad Al Busaidi, during which they discussed developments in the region as well as Iran's latest initiative handed over the mediator Pakistan to resolve regional tensions caused by the recent US-Israeli aggression against Iran.

Speaking to reporters in Florida before boarding Air Force One on Saturday, Trump confirmed that he had been briefed on the "concept of the deal."

Despite the diplomatic opening, the US president struck a characteristically blunt tone regarding the possibility of renewed hostilities, which have been



A man rides his motorbike past a billboard installed alongside a road as Pakistan prepares to host the US and Iran for peace talks, in Islamabad, Pakistan, April 10, 2026.

● REUTERS

paused since the announcement of a ceasefire between the sides on April 7. "If they do something bad, there is a possibility it could happen," Trump said when asked if strikes would resume.

The war, launched by the US and Israel with a vast wave of surprise strikes on February 28 has been on hold since April 8, but only one failed round of direct talks has taken place between Iranian and US representatives.

In the meantime, Iran has maintained its stranglehold on the Strait of Hormuz while the United States has imposed a counterblockade on Iranian ports.

The Wall Street Journal reported on Thursday that Trump had told security



officials to prepare for the blockade to last months, causing oil prices to spike. Since the failure of the first round of the negotiations in Pakistan, regional countries have been trying to get the US and Iran to the second round of negotiations.

Iran refused to participate in the sec-

ond round due to the US violation of a Pakistan-brokered ceasefire by imposing a blockade on Iran's ports.

Iranian officials have also blamed the US side for putting forward excessive demands and shifting its position at the negotiating table for the failure of the first negotiations.

IRGC: Trump has to choose between 'impossible' war or 'bad deal'

The ball is in the United States' court, deputy FM says

International Desk

Iran's Islamic Revolution Guards Corps (IRGC) on Sunday said the United States faced a choice between an "impossible" military operation or a "bad deal" with Tehran, after President Donald Trump said the US is reviewing Iran's latest peace proposal.

"Iran sets Pentagon a blockade deadline; China, Russia, Europe shift tone against Washington; Trump's passive letter to Congress; acceptance of Iran's negotiating terms; there is only one way to read this: Trump must choose between 'an impossible military operation or a bad deal with the Islamic Republic of Iran,'" the IRGC's Intelligence Organization made the announcement in an X post.

"The room for US decision-making has narrowed," the IRGC said. Negotiations between the two countries have been deadlocked since a ceasefire came into effect on April 8, with only one round of direct peace talks held so far.

IRNA reported on Thursday that Tehran had submitted a 14-point proposal to mediator Pakistan.

Deputy Foreign Minister Kazem Gharibabadi told foreign diplomats



in Tehran on Saturday that, "The ball is in the United States' court to choose the path of diplomacy or the continuation of a confrontational approach."

Iran, he said, was "prepared for both paths." Gharibabadi said that Iran is fully and resolutely prepared to repel any renewed act of aggression against the country, although it also believes in interest-based diplomacy to resolve existing issues.

"The Islamic Republic of Iran has submitted its plan to Pakistan as the mediator with the aim of permanently ending the imposed war, and now the ball is in the US court to choose between a diplomatic solution or a continuation of the confrontational approach," he said. The diplomat said, however, that Iran has always approached talks with the US with a sense of distrust

because of Washington's track record in previous rounds of negotiations.

Iran and the US held a first round of talks in Islamabad on April 11, days after Pakistan mediated a ceasefire to allow a halt to the 40-day US-Israeli aggression against the country.

The unprovoked US-Israeli aggression on Iran began on February 28 with airstrikes that assassinated senior Iranian officials and commanders.

The Iranian armed forces unleashed 100 waves of successful retaliatory strikes against sensitive and strategic American and Israeli targets throughout the region.

They also blocked the Strait of Hormuz to oil and gas tankers affiliated with the enemies and those cooperating with them in an attempt to maintain security at the critical waterway.

On April 8, forty days into the war, an Islamabad-brokered temporary ceasefire went into effect but the first round of Tehran-Washington negotiations failed to reach an agreement.

Trump unilaterally extended the truce, but imposed an inhumane "naval blockade" against Iran.

Leader's aide warns US carriers, says graveyard ready for 'pirates'

A senior advisor to Leader of the Islamic Revolution Ayatollah Seyyed Mojtaba Khamenei said the United States is the "only pirate in the world that possesses aircraft carriers," warning that such carriers will face destruction if tensions escalate. Mohsen Rezaei, a former chief commander of the Islamic Revolution Guards Corps (IRGC), said in an X post on Sunday that Iran's ability to confront "pirates" is no less than its ability to "sink warships."

"Prepare to face a graveyard of your carriers and forces, just as the wreckage of your aircraft was left behind in Isfahan," he wrote.

It came after US President Donald Trump unabashedly admitted that the US Navy is acting "like pirates" in carrying out Washington's naval blockade of Iranian ports.

"We took over the ship, we took over the cargo, we took over the oil. It is a very profitable business ... We are like pirates. We are sort of like pirates but we are not playing games," Trump said on Friday, while describing the seizure of an Iranian ship by US naval forces a few days earlier.

Iranian Foreign Ministry spokesman Esmaeil Baqaei said Trump's boast was "no verbal slip" but "a direct and damning admission of the criminal nature of their actions against international maritime navigation."

The US-Israeli aggression against Iran began on February 28 with airstrikes that assassinated senior Iranian officials and commanders, including Leader of the Islamic



Republic Ayatollah Seyyed Ali Khamenei. The Iranian armed forces responded by launching daily missile and drone operations targeting locations in the Israeli-occupied territories as well as US military bases and assets across the region.

Furthermore, Iran retaliated against the strikes by closing the Strait of Hormuz, which resulted in a significant increase in oil prices and its by-products.

On April 8, forty days into the war, a Pakistan-brokered temporary ceasefire between Iran and the US took effect.

Negotiations ensued in Islamabad but stopped short of an agreement amid Washington's maximalist demands and insistence on unreasonable positions.

Since then, Trump has offered shifting timelines and goals for the war, which remains extremely unpopular in the US.

He has faced widespread condemnation over his comments on the aggression, including when he threatened to destroy Iran's "entire civilization."

US war on Iran ...

Therefore, these divisions can be seen as serious evidence that, prior to the outbreak of war, there was neither a complete intelligence consensus nor a clear strategy regarding objectives, costs, and the endgame of the conflict.

Democratic rivals of the Trump administration made several attempts in Congress to limit the president's war powers, yet each effort failed due to opposition from Trump's fellow Republicans. What explains this?

The failure of Democratic efforts to limit presidential war powers should be seen as a combination of political calculation and institutional considerations. On one hand, Republicans aligned with Trump were unwilling to display signs of division or weaken their political leadership in the midst of a crisis; therefore, opposition to limiting measures was less about the "nature of the war" and more a po-

litical response aimed at preserving party cohesion and supporting the president. On a deeper level, segments of the US power structure are reluctant to see the president's authority as commander-in-chief curtailed, as these powers are considered part of the traditional flexibility embedded in US foreign and military policy. As such, Republican opposition was not only politically motivated, but also partly rooted in defending the institutional balance of power within the American political system.

What impact does this situation have on the political legitimacy of the White House's decision? Can it be said that this war has faced a domestic legitimacy crisis from the outset? Overall, these developments—from widespread public opposition to divisions within security institutions and clashes in Congress—have inevitably had a significant impact on the polit-

ical legitimacy of the White House's decisions. In the US political system, the legitimacy of military action is not confined to the executive branch alone; it largely depends on the level of consensus across public opinion, higher institutions, and the broader political structure. When such consensus fails to materialize, a decision to go to war—even if legally within presidential authority—will face serious domestic doubts. From this perspective, such a war can be seen as having encountered a form of internal challenge or erosion from the very beginning. In other words, this does not necessarily imply a complete absence of legitimacy, but rather indicates that its political and social backing has been fragile and contested. Under these conditions, the longer or more costly the war becomes, the more these legitimacy gaps are likely to play out and turn into a source of political pressure on the government.



Mohammad Ali Rajabi
Cartoonist

CARTOON

