

Iran War - Walking the Tightrope

The Fragile U.S.-Iran Ceasefire and the Risk of Escalation

Marubeni America Corporation Washington Office
So Uehara, Senior Government and International Affairs Manager
uehara-so@marubeni.com

- The Islamabad talks were closer to a deal than the public breakdown suggested. Both sides were working within a shared framework on the nuclear question. What stopped them wasn't fundamental incompatibility. It was a decision made in Washington in the final hours.
- The blockade is real pressure, but it isn't decisive. Iran has enough room to respond incrementally through shipping disruption, insurance costs, and energy market volatility, without crossing the line into direct confrontation. Early results are mixed at best.
- The leverage balance is more even than Washington's posture implies. The U.S. gained flexibility when Iran accepted the ceasefire. But Iran controls the Strait, has asymmetric tools, and has a longer tolerance for economic pain. This comes down to time and domestic politics, and Iran is better positioned to wait.
- The nuclear file is the central obstacle, but also the most workable one. The argument had moved from whether to suspend enrichment to how long. A deal is technically within reach. What's missing is U.S. flexibility on enrichment terms.
- Israel is the biggest wildcard. It is not party to the ceasefire, continues operations in Lebanon, and introduces escalation risks that neither Washington nor Tehran fully controls. Its influence on U.S. nuclear red lines adds a layer of complexity that does not show up in the official negotiating record.

Six weeks of fighting produced no winner. The U.S. and Israel demonstrated real military superiority in the air, but Iran refused to break. It closed the Strait of Hormuz, kept launching missiles and drones at American targets and Israeli cities, and struck Gulf energy infrastructure with enough precision to rattle global markets. Neither side could land a decisive blow. That stalemate, as much as any diplomatic initiative, is what forced the opening. On April 8, Pakistan brokered a two-week ceasefire. Both sides accepted, though neither looked particularly eager.

Proposals followed quickly. The U.S. put forward 15 points; Iran countered with 10, including demands for war reparations, Hormuz, and the return of frozen assets. These were opening bids, not genuine offers, and everyone knew it. But when Trump called Iran's proposal a "workable basis" for talks, it was enough to keep things moving.

The talks themselves were historic, at least on paper. Vice President Vance led the American side into direct negotiations with Iran in Islamabad, the most senior U.S.-Iran contact since the revolution. Whatever symbolic weight that carried, it didn't translate into movement at the table. The U.S. wanted iron-clad commitments on nuclear weapons. Iran wanted trust first. Ghalibaf's formulation, whether the U.S. could "gain our trust", captured the distance between the two sides more honestly than any diplomatic communiqué. Early on April 12, Vance walked out. Pakistani officials, who had expected the talks to run several more days, were caught flat-footed. Araghchi offered a different account: the two sides had nearly reached a memorandum of understanding before Washington abruptly changed its position.

What followed was swift and deliberately provocative. Trump announced a naval blockade of the Strait of Hormuz, effective April 13. Every vessel entering or leaving an Iranian port was now subject to interception. Iran's Revolutionary Guards responded in kind, warning that any "miscalculated

move" would trap the enemy in the "deadly whirlpools" of the Strait.

The ceasefire technically holds until April 22. But a blockade is now in effect, Iran has made its intentions clear, and tens of thousands of additional U.S. troops are due to arrive in the region before the deadline expires. The gap between a fragile truce and the resumption of hostilities has rarely looked smaller.

Closer Than the Headlines Suggest

Vance's account of what happened in Islamabad was simple: Iran rejected U.S. terms, and the United States walked away. It was a clean story. It was also, by most subsequent reporting, an incomplete one.

The New York Times reported¹ that by the final hours, the core dispute had narrowed considerably. The U.S. was no longer demanding a permanent end to Iranian nuclear activity. It had moved to a 20-year suspension. Iran countered with five years. That's a real gap, but it's a gap over duration, not principle. Both sides were working within the same basic framework. That matters.

Axios² added another layer. The two delegations were also deep into negotiations over Iran's existing stockpile of highly enriched uranium, specifically, what to do with it. The U.S. wanted it removed from Iranian soil. Iran proposed monitored down-blending under IAEA supervision, or transfer to a third country like Russia or China. Again, these are arguments over implementation, not whether to act at all. That's not what a collapsing negotiation looks like.

The timeline tells the same story. The talks ran past 3 a.m. and covered multiple issues simultaneously. Negotiations don't reach that stage, that hour, if one side has already decided to walk. Something was happening in that room.

Iran's account reinforces this reading. Araghchi said the two sides were "inches away"³ from a memorandum of understanding when Washington shifted its position. Multiple reports suggest the Iranian delegation didn't see the ending coming. That's consistent with a process that was still moving, not one that had already broken down.

To be clear, both sides have every reason to spin what happened. Neither account should be taken at face value. But strip away the posturing, and a coherent picture emerges: the talks had moved past the question of whether a deal was possible. What remained were a handful of specific disputes, real but not insurmountable, concentrated in a narrow range of issues. That's not a failure of diplomacy. That's diplomacy interrupted.

What Actually Blocked a Deal

Three issues killed the deal. The nuclear file was the decisive one. The Strait of Hormuz and the question of sequencing made an already difficult negotiation harder.

(1) Nuclear Issue

By the final hours in Islamabad, the U.S. package had grown considerably. Washington was pressing for a roughly twenty-year suspension of uranium enrichment, the dismantlement or shutdown of

¹ 4/13, New York Times. ([link](#))

² 4/13, Axios. ([link](#))

³ 4/9, Araghchi X post. ([link](#))

major enrichment facilities, and the removal of Iran's existing stockpile of highly enriched uranium. From Tehran's perspective, that wasn't a negotiating position, it was a demand for surrender. As Hamidreza Azizi⁴ notes, accepting these terms would mean relinquishing Iran's remaining deterrent after two military confrontations with the U.S. and Israel. That's not a concession any Iranian leadership could sell at home.

The frustrating part is that a middle ground was still visible. Both sides were working within a time-bound framework. The argument was about how long, not whether. That's the kind of gap that gets bridged. But Iranian officials contend that Washington's position hardened in the final stretch, with what they describe as shifting goalposts and a creeping maximalism that closed off the space that had been opening up.

Why? Two explanations have circulated. Trita Parsi⁵ points to Israeli pressure, noting that it has tightened U.S. red lines in past negotiations and may have done so again here. He's careful not to treat it as confirmed, and offers an alternative reading: that the last-minute hardening, including the blockade threat, was a pressure tactic designed to extract more concessions rather than a genuine walk-away. Vali Nasr⁶ focuses on the internal dynamics of the U.S. team. In his telling, the delegation was in continuous contact with Trump throughout the talks, and the President raised the bar in the final phase, moving from partial compliance to full capitulation as his threshold for agreement, and signaling a blockade if talks failed. The practical effect was that the negotiators in the room didn't have the authority to close a deal within the range they were actually negotiating.

Different explanations, same result: the window closed before anyone could climb through it.

One thing worth noting: neither side has formally declared the talks dead, and the ceasefire is still technically holding. Parsi's read is that what looks like breakdown may be, at least in part, tactical positioning. Both sides recalibrating pressure before the next move. That interpretation is hard to dismiss entirely.

(2) Strait of Hormuz

Iran isn't treating the Strait as a bargaining chip. It's treating it as insurance. Given how little confidence Tehran has in U.S. commitments (and the JCPOA experience gives them good reason) control over maritime access is the one form of leverage that can't be taken away by executive order or congressional vote. Iran wasn't going to hand that over on a promise.

The U.S. wanted the Strait reopened immediately. Iran said it would only happen once hostilities had genuinely ended and there was confidence any agreement would hold. So the two sides weren't just negotiating what a deal would look like. They were negotiating the order in which things.

⁴ Hamidreza Azizi is a visiting fellow at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) in Berlin, specializing in Iranian foreign policy, Persian Gulf security, and Russia-Iran relations. He is widely cited in Western policy circles as one of the more analytically rigorous voices on Iranian strategic thinking.

⁵ Trita Parsi is the co-founder and executive vice president of the Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft in Washington, D.C. Born in Iran and raised in Sweden before moving to the United States, he is one of the most prominent English-language analysts of U.S.-Iran relations and has written extensively on the failures of American Iran policy. He is a persistent advocate for diplomacy over military confrontation.

⁶ Vali Nasr is a professor of international politics at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) and one of the most widely cited scholars on Iranian politics and Middle East affairs in the United States. He served as a senior adviser at the State Department during the Obama administration. Born in Iran, he brings both academic rigor and firsthand policy experience to his analysis of Iranian decision-making.

(3) Sequencing

The broader sequencing problem runs through the entire U.S.-Iran relationship. Washington wants Iran to move first. Make concessions upfront, then receive phased and conditional relief. Tehran has heard that before. Under the JCPOA, Iran made irreversible commitments and received benefits that proved very reversible indeed. The logic of "act now, trust us later" doesn't carry much weight in Tehran anymore.

This played out directly in the uranium stockpile discussions. The options on the table, removal, monitored down-blending, transfer to Russia or China, were all serious proposals. But the underlying argument was about sequence: would Iran take sensitive nuclear steps first, or would sanctions relief and asset unfreezing move in parallel? That question didn't get answered. Until it does, it's hard to see how any agreement holds together.

The Blockade: Pressure Tactic or Strategic Miscalculation?

The naval blockade of the Strait of Hormuz is either a pressure tactic or the opening move of something much harder to stop. Probably both.

Parsi's read is that it's leverage, a way to squeeze Iran while the ceasefire technically holds and communication channels stay open. In that interpretation, the blockade is the negotiating table by other means. Neither side has gone back to shooting, which is at least consistent with the idea that both are still calibrating rather than committing.

The operational reality complicates that picture. Enforcing a blockade in the Strait means U.S. naval forces operating in close proximity to Iranian territory, well within range of the missiles, drones, and maritime threats that constrained American operations throughout the conflict. Add mine-clearing operations to the mix and the vulnerability increases further. The blockade may be designed as a pressure tool, but the conditions under which it has to be enforced create risks that don't stay neatly contained.

Then there's China. Roughly 40 percent of the oil moving through the Strait is headed there. U.S. Central Command has signaled that vessels entering or leaving Iranian ports are subject to interception. Beijing has already made clear it expects its shipping to move without interference. The moment U.S. forces attempt to stop a Chinese-linked vessel, the crisis acquires a second dimension that has nothing to do with Iran's nuclear program.

Nasr doesn't expect Iran to absorb the blockade quietly, but he also doesn't expect a dramatic response. His read is incremental escalation: selective disruption of shipping lanes, pressure on maritime insurance markets, moves designed to amplify energy price volatility. Iran doesn't need to fire a missile to make the blockade expensive. It can make the Strait unpredictable, deciding which ships get through and which don't, while extending pressure through the Houthis to the Bab el-Mandeb. The goal isn't a knockout blow. It's to raise costs steadily and let the economic pain do the work, particularly on energy-importing economies in Asia. Nasr calls this "gamesmanship", escalation and negotiation running in parallel, neither fully overtaking the other.

Danny Citrinowicz⁷ sees the same basic dynamic but is less sanguine about where it leads. In his assessment, Iran will likely test U.S. resolve directly, targeting naval assets or moving against

⁷ Danny Citrinowicz is a nonresident senior fellow at the Atlantic Council. He spent over two decades in Israeli military intelligence, including as head of the Iran branch, before moving into policy analysis. His assessments are shaped by an Israeli security perspective and tend to focus on Iran's military capabilities, nuclear program, and regional proxy network.

commercial shipping, which would send energy prices sharply higher and generate spillover effects across Asian markets. He also flags the infrastructure angle: facilities built to route oil around Hormuz become targets, and the Bab el-Mandeb becomes active again.

The common thread across these assessments is that the blockade doesn't produce a stable outcome. As a negotiating tool, it might generate leverage. As a military commitment, it opens pathways that extend well beyond the U.S.-Iran bilateral and that, once opened, are not easily closed.

Shifting Balance of Leverage

Whatever leverage the U.S. has gained from Islamabad and the blockade, most analysts are not ready to call it decisive. The emerging consensus among Iran watchers is that Iran still holds meaningful cards, and that Washington has not established the kind of advantage that forces a capitulation.

The structural reason is straightforward. Iran controls access to the Strait of Hormuz and possesses the asymmetric capabilities to make that control painful for anyone who depends on maritime oil flows. You don't need military superiority to impose costs on global energy markets. You just need to make the Strait unpredictable, and Iran has demonstrated it can do that.

Views diverge on how far U.S. pressure will go. Some analysts argue the blockade and financial squeeze will constrain Iranian exports enough to shift the balance in Washington's favor in the near term. Others see it as a high-risk bet: an open-ended military commitment that gives Iran room to respond indirectly, through shipping disruption, proxy activity, and sustained pressure on energy markets, without ever crossing the threshold that would trigger a full U.S. military response.

The deeper problem is time. Iran has spent decades absorbing economic pressure and has learned to function under sanctions that would destabilize most economies. It also faces fewer immediate domestic political constraints. The United States is in a different position. Energy prices are a kitchen table issue, market instability has direct political consequences, and the midterms are not far off. The U.S. may be able to apply more pressure in the short run, but a prolonged standoff favors the side that can wait longer.

Recent signals suggest both sides know this. Trump has floated the possibility of additional talks in the coming days, which means the diplomatic channel is not dead. But the core disputes have not moved. The duration of any enrichment suspension and the reopening of the Strait remain unresolved. And early reports on the blockade's effectiveness are mixed: port activity in Iran appears to have slowed, but Iran-linked vessels are still transiting the Strait. The pressure is real. So is Iran's capacity to absorb it⁸.

The Israel Variable

Israel is not a party to the ceasefire, and it has been acting accordingly. Military operations in Lebanon have continued, and Iran has tried to use that as leverage, pushing to link the Lebanon file to the broader U.S.-Iran negotiations. Both Washington and Jerusalem have resisted that linkage, but the

⁸ As of April 15, assessments of the U.S. naval blockade's effectiveness remain divided. Commercial vessel traffic through the Strait appears to have fallen to a small fraction of prewar levels, driven by elevated combat risk, reduced insurance coverage, and a more assertive U.S. enforcement posture. At the same time, systematic interdiction or seizure of Iran-linked vessels does not yet appear to be occurring at scale. It would be premature to render a definitive judgment on the blockade's effectiveness at this stage. The situation is best characterized as an enforcement gray zone still in progress. How effective the blockade ultimately proves to be will depend heavily on whether diplomatic talks resume and whether the United States moves to actually seize or forcibly intercept vessels

problem doesn't go away just because both parties reject it. Israeli actions remain a live variable in a negotiation they are not formally part of.

There is a parallel diplomatic effort underway, though it is fragile. Lebanese officials are trying to separate their file from the Iranian track entirely, seeking a ceasefire on terms that reflect Lebanese state authority rather than Hezbollah's position or Iranian backing. Jacob Magid's⁹ reporting, based on conversations with U.S., Israeli, and Lebanese officials following a recent high-level meeting in Washington, suggests Beirut is pushing to reclaim some agency here, even while acknowledging it has limited leverage to do so.

Israel is not buying it. The core skepticism in Jerusalem is whether the Lebanese government has either the will or the capacity to meaningfully constrain Hezbollah. That doubt, layered on top of ongoing security concerns along the northern border, keeps the pressure toward continued military operations. The prospect of reestablishing a buffer zone in southern Lebanon has not left the table.

Washington is pushing back. The scale of Israeli strikes in Lebanon since the Iran ceasefire has raised enough concern in Washington that Rubio has been directly involved in trying to limit the damage. The message from the U.S. side is clear enough: Israeli actions that complicate the broader strategic picture are not helpful right now.

But Netanyahu is not operating with much room to maneuver. His coalition partners and a security-focused electorate do not reward restraint in Lebanon, and the political cost of appearing to pull back under U.S. pressure is real. So diplomatic channels stay open while military operations continue, and the two tracks run uncomfortably in parallel.

The risk this creates for the broader situation is straightforward. Israeli actions can accelerate escalation timelines in ways that Washington cannot fully control, constrain U.S. strategic flexibility at precisely the moments it matters most, and generate facts on the ground that outpace the political process. That is not a hypothetical. It is the pattern that has defined this conflict from the beginning.

Where Things Stand

Nobody has won this negotiation yet, and nobody has walked away from it either. That ambiguity is where things stand.

The Islamabad talks did not collapse because a deal was impossible. They collapsed because someone in Washington decided, in the final hours, that the terms on the table were not good enough. The gaps that remained were real, but they were the kind of gaps that get closed in a second round of talks, not the kind that signal fundamental incompatibility. The breakdown was a decision, not an inevitability.

The blockade that followed is pressure, but it is not a knockout blow. Port activity in Iran has slowed, but ships are still moving through the Strait. Iran has not been brought to its knees, and it retains plenty of ways to make the blockade expensive for everyone involved without firing a single missile. The pressure is real. So is Iran's capacity to absorb and redirect it.

The leverage question does not have a clean answer. Iran holds structural advantages that do not disappear under economic pressure: geography, asymmetric capabilities, and a demonstrated

⁹ Jacob Magid is the Washington correspondent for the Times of Israel, covering U.S.-Israel relations, American Jewish affairs, and U.S. Middle East policy. He is regularly cited for his sourcing among U.S., Israeli, and Lebanese officials, and has broken several stories on behind-the-scenes diplomatic exchanges between Washington and Jerusalem during the current conflict.

tolerance for sustained pain. The United States has more flexibility to decide when this confrontation ends, and more ability to apply near-term pressure. But the clock runs differently for each side. Iran can wait. The U.S., with midterms approaching and energy prices climbing, has less room to be patient.

Meanwhile, Israel keeps adding complexity. Operations in Lebanon continue, the northern border remains tense, and Netanyahu has limited political space to pull back. Washington is pressing for restraint, but Israeli actions have a way of generating facts on the ground faster than diplomacy can absorb them.

The ceasefire holds, technically. Both sides have left the door open to further talks. Trump has suggested more conversations may be coming. But the core issues, enrichment duration, the Strait, sequencing, remain exactly where they were when Vance walked out of Islamabad. What comes next depends on whether the current combination of pressure and limited engagement nudges both sides back to the table, or whether the incremental escalation that has already begun takes on a momentum of its own. The margin for miscalculation is narrow, and it is getting narrower.

Marubeni America Corporation Washington Office

1717 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 375, Washington, DC 20006

<https://www.marubeni.com/jp/research/>

(Disclaimer)

- This document is created based on publicly available information; however, we do not guarantee its validity, adequacy, or completeness.
- Any advantages or disadvantages resulting from decisions made based on this document are the responsibility of the individual who made the decisions, and we bear no responsibility for them.
- The contents of this document are subject to change without notice.
- The individual texts, photographs, illustrations, etc., included in this document (hereafter referred to as "Information") are copyrighted works of our company, protected under the Copyright Law of Japan and international treaties such as the Berne Convention. Except in cases permitted by copyright law, such as personal private use and quotation, reproducing, distributing, modifying, translating, adapting, broadcasting, or making available to the public the Information contained in this document without the permission of the copyright holder is a violation of copyright law.