



International Diplomacy Policy on the Iran–United States War (2025–2026) from the Perspective of Siyasaḥ Harbiyah

Rojaya Marbun ¹, Syaiful Amri ²

^{1,2}Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara

Email Correspondence: rojaya0203222079@uinsu.ac.id, syaifulamri@uinsu.ac.id

Abstract

This research is motivated by the escalation of geopolitical tensions between Iran and the United States during the 2025–2026 period. This conflict peaked with Iran's implementation of a maritime blockade of the Strait of Hormuz. The closure of this global energy route significantly impacted the international economy, including threats of inflation and a surge in energy subsidies, particularly in Indonesia. This study aims to dissect the dynamics of Iran's foreign policy changes and multilateral diplomatic responses from a Siyasaḥ (Islamic politics) perspective. Using a normative juridical method that is qualitative-descriptive with a case approach, data were collected through a literature review of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials, such as the Qur'an, Hadith, classical fiqh literature, and relevant regulatory documents. The theory of Siyasaḥ Dauliyah serves as the macro framework for international relations, while Siyasaḥ Harbiyah functions as a specific analytical tool for armed crisis conditions. The results show that Iran's initial blockade of the Strait of Hormuz was a legitimate form of asymmetric defense (*al-difa'*) when its state sovereignty was threatened. However, between April and May 2026, the Iranian government engaged in political *ijtihad* by gradually reopening access to the strait through envoy channels (*al-sifarah*) mediated by neutral countries such as Oman and Qatar. This de-escalation was triggered by multilateral diplomatic pressure from forums such as the OIC and the UN. The study concludes that the flexibility of Iran's policy, shifting from military confrontation to peaceful accommodation, is a clear manifestation of the enforcement of contemporary Siyasaḥ Dauliyah and Siyasaḥ Harbiyah strategies to achieve shared economic benefit (*maslahah ammah*) and prevent wider global harm.

Keywords: Siyasaḥ Dauliyah; Siyasaḥ Harbiyah; Diplomasi Internasional; Perang Iran–Amerika Serikat

INTRODUCTION

The geopolitical conflict between Iran and the United States is one of the dynamics of international relations with the most systemic impact on global stability. The historical roots of the dispute between the two states began with the Iranian Revolution of 1979, which reoriented Iran's foreign policy toward an “anti-Western” and anti-imperialist stance. For several decades, this friction has been continually aggravated by various crucial issues, ranging from Iran's nuclear development program and crippling unilateral economic sanctions to proxy wars in the Middle East. Entering the 2025–2026 period, these conventional tensions escalated drastically toward open military confrontation following coordinated air strikes by the United States and its regional allies against Iran's strategic infrastructure and air defenses. (Jazeera, 2026a)

On 28 February 2026, large-scale armed confrontation finally erupted through the massive air strikes launched by the United States. The most dramatic event of this conflict was the confirmed death of Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, as a result of a strike on the command center in Tehran. The death of this central figure not only shook Iran's internal politics but also triggered a radical retaliatory response. Iran promptly took the drastic step of completely closing the Strait of Hormuz, the most vital maritime route through which one-third of the world's seaborne oil supply passes. The impact was instant: energy prices surged sharply and triggered an economic crisis at the global level. By April 2026, the situation remained highly uncertain, particularly given the United

States ultimatum that expired on 6 April 2026. (Jazeera, 2026b) The impact of this confrontation was no longer confined to regional security but had extended to global macroeconomic instability. The de facto maritime blockade and the closure of the shipping lane in the Strait of Hormuz—a transit route for nearly one-fifth of the world’s oil supply—triggered a global surge in energy commodity prices. Given the significance of these juridical and geopolitical impacts, an in-depth study is required to analyze the escalation of the Iran–United States conflict. Through a juridical-normative approach and library research, this study aims to dissect the international legality of the conflict using Siyasaḥ Dauliyah as a macro framework for international relations while contextualizing it within the framework of Siyasaḥ Harbiyah, so as to provide a comprehensive understanding of the legal limits of modern warfare in the Middle East. (News, 2026)

This latest escalation has triggered profound debates in international law concerning the limits of the legality of the use of military force and the right to self-defense. The military operations launched without official authorization from the United Nations Security Council have been assessed by a number of legal scholars as a violation of the prevailing norms of international law. On the other hand, from the perspective of Islamic law, the dynamics of this conflict raise the urgency of an analysis based on the concept of Siyasaḥ Harbiyah (the fiqh of the politics of war), particularly in mapping the category of the territory of conflict (dar al-harb) and the status of tactical diplomacy amid a state of war. Iran’s response, which combined asymmetric military resilience with openness to indirect negotiations, reflects the implementation of a complex strategy for defending sovereignty within the corridors of contemporary law and politics. Problem Statement : How did the development and the principal obstacles in the diplomacy between Iran and the United States unfold, from the period of tension in 2025 to the outbreak of open war in 2026? What diplomatic policy, viewed through Siyasaḥ Harbiyah, did Iran pursue in confronting that state of war. Research Objectives : To describe and analyze the course of development and the obstacles in the diplomacy between Iran and the United States, from the phase of tension in 2025 to the outbreak of open war in 2026. To examine the diplomatic policy implemented by Iran in confronting that war based on the principles of Siyasaḥ Harbiyah. (Jazeera, 2026c)

LITERATURE REVIEW

2. The Legality of the Use of Force under International Law

2.1. The Prohibition of the Use of Force

The prohibition on the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, enshrined in Article 2(4) of the UN Charter, represents a cornerstone of the international legal order. This provision establishes that "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations". The International Court of Justice has affirmed the customary international law status of this prohibition, making it binding on all states regardless of UN membership. (Al-Mawardi, n.d.)

The US-Israeli military offensive against Iran, launched on 28 February 2026 without authorization from the UN Security Council, has been widely condemned as a violation of Article 2(4). Iran's Foreign Minister, Seyed Abbas Araghchi, formally communicated to the UN Secretary-General and the Security Council that the airstrikes "constitute a clear breach of Article 2, Paragraph 4 of the UN Charter and represent an unmistakable armed aggression against the Islamic Republic of Iran". An

independent UN fact-finding body has since stated that the attacks "run counter to the UN Charter".(Al-Mawardi, 2014)

2.2. The Right to Self-Defence

The only recognized exceptions to the prohibition on the use of force are the right to self-defence under Article 51 of the UN Charter and the use of force authorized by the UN Security Council. The United States has sought to justify its military operations as acts of collective self-defence, citing Iran's decades-long pattern of attacks against US personnel, interests, and allies. The US Legal Adviser argued that "the United States is acting well within the recognized contours of international law relating to the use of force and self-defense," grounding this assessment in "facts demonstrating Iran's malign aggression over decades".(University, 2026)

However, rigorous legal analysis suggests that these justifications struggle to meet the strict thresholds established by international law. The Caroline test, derived from the 1837 Caroline incident, establishes that anticipatory self-defence is permissible only in response to a threat that is "instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and permitting no moment for deliberation". Military action taken to neutralize speculative or longer-term threats—often described as pre-emptive force—has no widely accepted basis in international law. The International Bar Association and its Human Rights Institute have explicitly stated that the strikes "were carried out without authorisation from the UN Security Council and without a publicly substantiated armed attack by Iran that would plainly trigger the right to self-defence under Article 51".(Bozorgmehri, 2026)

Iran, for its part, has invoked its own right to self-defence under Article 51 in response to the US-Israeli aggression. Tehran has characterized its retaliatory measures, including the closure of the Strait of Hormuz, as lawful defensive actions taken in response to an armed attack. This reciprocal invocation of self-defence by both parties illustrates the contested nature of the legal framework governing the use of force in contemporary armed conflicts.

3. The Strait of Hormuz: Maritime Law and the Law of Naval Warfare

3.1. The Legal Status of the Strait

The Strait of Hormuz, a critical maritime chokepoint through which approximately 100-140 major vessels passed daily before the conflict, is governed by a complex legal framework. The 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) established that coastal states may extend their territorial sea to 12 nautical miles, placing straits less than 24 nautical miles wide under the jurisdiction of one or more coastal states while preserving the right of transit passage. Under peacetime conditions, the Strait is open to unimpeded international shipping.(Hokayem, 2026)

However, the onset of armed conflict fundamentally alters the applicable legal regime. Legal experts emphasize that the situation is no longer governed primarily by peacetime navigation rules under UNCLOS, but by the law of naval warfare. As Professor Natalie Klein of the University of New South Wales explains, "different laws apply to states that are party to the conflict and those that are neutral, making the situation even more complex for international shipping".(Agency, 2026)

3.2. Iran's Blockade of the Strait

Iran's decision to close the Strait of Hormuz to ships associated with the US, Israel, and countries that supported aggression against Iran has been characterized by some as an "illegal blockade". The unilateral suspension of transit passage through the Strait violates the prohibition on barring access to

or departure from neutral ports and coasts. However, Iran's actions must be understood within the context of the preceding US-Israeli attacks. As a belligerent state, Iran is entitled to take measures against vessels linked to its adversaries under the law of maritime warfare.

The critical legal issue concerns the failure to distinguish between vessel types. While Iran may impose restrictions on shipping, it "must distinguish between neutral merchant vessels and belligerent or enemy vessels". Reports of Iran threatening every ship coming through the Strait, regardless of flag, and firing upon commercial vessels, suggest that these legal limits may have been exceeded. Professor Klein noted that "Iran threatened every single ship going through, calling them military targets, and it's not supposed to do that". The targeting of civilian crews—over 20,000 seafarers on stranded vessels—raises serious concerns under international humanitarian law. (Indonesia, 2025)

3.3. The US Naval Blockade

The United States responded by imposing its own naval blockade, applicable to vessels transiting to or from Iranian ports. CENTCOM subsequently expanded this blockade by asserting a belligerent right to visit and search: (1) all Iranian vessels; (2) vessels suspected of carrying contraband; and (3) vessels with active Treasury Department sanctions—regardless of location. This global enforcement expansion beyond the Strait raises significant legal questions.

The legal situation has been further complicated by the fact that the United States is simultaneously observing a ceasefire with Iran while enforcing a naval blockade—a belligerent wartime operation that has no legal basis in peacetime. As one legal analyst observed, "Normally, the imposition of a naval blockade ends a ceasefire, because a blockade is itself a belligerent act". The United States is "neither fully at war nor fully at peace according to its own logic," asserting wartime legal authorities while declining to exercise the full menu of wartime military operations.

Iranian President Masoud Pezeshkian has characterized the US naval blockade as "contrary to international law, the interests of the countries of the region, global peace and stability". Iran's UN Ambassador, Amir Saeid Irvani, has similarly described the blockade as "a clear violation of the prohibition on the threat or use of force under Article 2(4) of the UN Charter" and "a serious breach of the fundamental principles of the international law of the sea". (Indonesia, 2026)

3.4. Multilateral Responses

The UN Security Council has engaged with the crisis through Resolution 2817 (2026), adopted in March, which condemned "egregious attacks" by Iran against seven neighbouring countries. Bahrain and the United States subsequently circulated a draft Security Council resolution calling for Iran to cease attacks in the Strait of Hormuz, supported by Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the UAE. However, Iran has characterized this draft resolution as "deeply flawed, and one-sided", arguing that Washington's actions "have served only to escalate tensions".

4. Siyasaḥ Dauliyah: Islamic Perspectives on International Relations

4.1. Conceptual Foundations

Siyasaḥ Dauliyah constitutes the Islamic study of international relations, encompassing the policies, measures, and strategies formulated and implemented by a state in managing its relations with other states at the international level. This field addresses not only domestic affairs but also foreign relations, focusing on how a state maintains its dignity and authority in international interactions. The normative sources of Siyasaḥ Dauliyah include the Qur'an, Hadith, the opinions of Muslim scholars, and theories of international relations and international law.

A fundamental principle of Siyasaḥ Dauliyah is that peace constitutes the baseline condition of international relations. The principles of equality, justice, and freedom are central to the obligations and rights of a state toward other states. Islamic international law (*siyar*) traditionally conceptualized the world as divided into *Dar al-Islam* (the territory of Islam) and *Dar al-Harb* (the territory of war), though contemporary scholarship has revisited and reinterpreted these categories in light of modern international relations. (Kilian et al., 2026)

4.2. State Sovereignty and Non-Intervention

Siyasaḥ Dauliyah affirms the sovereignty and independence of states as fundamental principles. A state may be categorized as sovereign only when it stands autonomously, free from subordination, and is not subject to the power or domination of any other state. The principle of non-intervention is deeply embedded in Islamic international relations, derived from the Qur'anic injunction that no community should transgress against another.

From this perspective, the US-Israeli military intervention in Iran constitutes a violation of Iran's sovereign equality and territorial integrity. The targeting and killing of Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, represents not merely an attack on an individual but an assault on the political authority and symbolic representation of the Iranian state. The forcible removal of a head of state or supreme leader through military means is fundamentally incompatible with the principles of Siyasaḥ Dauliyah, which emphasize mutual respect and non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states. (MetroTV, 2026)

4.3. Diplomatic Engagement and Mediation

Siyasaḥ Dauliyah places significant emphasis on diplomatic engagement (*al-sifarah*) as the preferred means of resolving inter-state disputes. The conflict between Iran and the United States has been marked by sustained diplomatic efforts, particularly through mediation by neutral states. (Lestari, 2025b) Oman and Qatar have played crucial roles as mediators, facilitating communication between the two adversaries. Qatar has welcomed the US-Iran talks held in Muscat, commending "the constructive role played by the Sultanate of Oman" and affirming "full support for the approach of diplomacy and dialogue to resolve all outstanding issues". (Kılavuz, 2026)

The diplomatic track has included multiple rounds of Omani-mediated negotiations, through which Washington sought to restrict Iran's nuclear program while Tehran hoped to lift economic sanctions. Egypt has also been involved, focusing on managing the technical and legal dimensions of the negotiations. (Miles et al., 2014) The temporary ceasefire proposed by Pakistan in April 2026 provided for the lifting of Iranian restrictions on maritime movements through the Strait "as a goodwill gesture," though this initiative ultimately failed to produce a lasting agreement. (Lestari, 2025a)

The Siyasaḥ Dauliyah framework emphasizes that diplomatic engagement must be conducted in good faith. Engaging in hostilities while negotiations are underway violates the principle of good faith and undermines international trust. The US decision to launch military strikes against Iran while diplomatic channels remained open has been criticized as inconsistent with the Islamic principle of honoring commitments and pursuing peaceful resolution of disputes.

METODE

This study is qualitative-descriptive research employing a juridical-normative approach through the method of library research. This method involves collecting, examining in depth, and analyzing

written data relating to the Iran–United States conflict of the 2025–2026 period as well as the literature on the concept of Siyasaḥ Harbiyah. This approach was chosen to obtain an in-depth picture of the phenomenon of diplomacy in a situation of open war. (Miles et al., 2014)

The data in this study are classified into two main categories according to their proximity to the research object, namely:

- a. **Primary Data.** The primary data consist of official government documents such as the official statements of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of Iran and the United States, the texts of relevant officials’ speeches, and the texts of diplomatic agreements. In addition, the principal literature of Siyasaḥ Harbiyah—such as the *Al-Aḥkam as-Sulḥaniyyah* of al-Mawardi and the works of Ibn Taymiyyah—serves as the main reference in determining the standards of Islamic law.
- b. **Secondary Data.** The secondary data comprise the latest international news, including reports on the attack of 28 February 2026 from news agencies such as Al Jazeera and Reuters. In addition, scholarly journals, geopolitical books, and analytical reports from international think tanks are used to reinforce the primary data. (Moleong, 2021)

The technique used in this study is library research. The researcher sought and collected data on the research variables from various library sources, digital archives, and credible official news records relating to the escalation of the conflict and the diplomatic policy pursued during the period of crisis.

The researcher uses the theory of Siyasaḥ Harbiyah as the principal analytical tool. The analysis focuses on four fundamental principles: (a) *al-‘ahd wa al-mithaq*, or international commitment; (b) *al-sifarah*, which encompasses the role of diplomats and mediators; (c) *darurah*, or a state of wartime emergency; and (d) *maslahah ammah*, in order to avert total destruction.

The collected data were analyzed using a descriptive-analytical method with a deductive approach. The process of analysis follows three principal stages: (1) Description: setting out chronologically the course of the Iran–United States conflict from 2025 to the ultimatum of 6 April 2026; (2) Analysis: relating the diplomatic facts identified to the principles of Siyasaḥ Harbiyah; and (3) Conclusion: drawing the final answer on the conformity of Iran’s diplomatic steps amid war with the principles of the politics of war in Islam.

Among prior studies, several works are taken as reference material, namely: Ahmad Fauzi (2021), “An Analysis of Siyasaḥ Harbiyah on Iran’s National Defense Strategy in Facing the Military Pressure of the United States (A Case Study of the Killing of Qasem Soleimani)””; and Sarah Wijaya (2023), “The Effectiveness of Third-Party Diplomacy in Easing Iran’s Nuclear Tensions: The Role of Oman and Qatar as Mediators.”

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The 2025 Period: Pre-War Escalation and the Failure of the Muscat Channel

Geopolitical tensions between Iran and the United States entered a critical phase throughout 2025. This period was marked by the renewed implementation of the “maximum pressure” policy by the administration of President Donald Trump, which aimed to compel Iran to sign a far stricter new nuclear pact, to cripple its ballistic-missile capabilities, and to cut off financial support for regional proxy elements. The impact of the global economic embargo imposed unilaterally by the United States

extremely reduced Iran's fiscal capacity, triggering a wave of depreciation of the rial and the paralysis of civilian infrastructure in various Iranian provinces.

As a mechanism to counter these crippling sanctions, Iran accelerated its uranium-enrichment program beyond the threshold of civilian needs, particularly at the underground facilities in Isfahan and Natanz. From the perspective of conventional international law, the escalatory actions of both parties reflected a total failure of the framework of preventive diplomacy mandated in the Charter of the United Nations. Amid the increasingly tangible threat of military confrontation, the Sultanate of Oman initiated the facilitation of indirect negotiations known as the Muscat Channel on 12 April 2025. The United States delegation was led by Special Envoy Steve Witkoff, while the Iranian delegation was commanded by Foreign Minister Abbas Araghchi, with communication between the rooms mediated privately by Oman's Foreign Minister, Badr al-Busaidi. In this initial round, Iran offered compromise concessions in the form of a three-step plan: (1) reducing uranium enrichment back to the level of 3.67 percent; and (2) reopening comprehensive inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) under the Additional Protocol. In return, Iran demanded the unblocking of financial assets frozen in Western financial institutions, the restoration of crude-oil export permits, and a written commitment from the United States to obstruct the snapback mechanism of UN sanctions by European allies.

The United States envoy initially welcomed this positively; however, the domestic political constellation in the United States and geopolitical pressure from Israel drastically altered the policy direction. The buildup of United States naval forces in the Central Command (CENTCOM) area, the deployment of an aircraft-carrier battle group, and the conduct of large-scale joint military exercises simulating the destruction of Iran's nuclear facilities were instead intensified throughout the middle and end of 2025. The failure of the Muscat Channel became inevitable when conservative factions within the structure of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) and Iran's National Security Council responded to that external threat by issuing a stern warning to expel all IAEA inspectors from their sovereign territory. Deep mutual distrust, the absence of binding formal legal guarantees, and the asymmetry of sovereign demands brought down all the diplomatic gains made at Muscat, placing the two states on the brink of open war at the close of 2025. (MetroTV, 2026)

An Analysis of Siyasaḥ Dauliyah on the Failure of the Muscat Channel

Within the architecture of siyasaḥ, interactions among states, peace treaties, and the resolution of conflict fall under the auspices of Siyasaḥ Dauliyah (Islamic foreign/international politics). Siyasaḥ Dauliyah establishes that the original rule of international relations in Islam is peace (*al-asl fi al-'alaqat al-dauliyah hiya al-silm*), whereas war is an emergency option that may be pursued only where there is manifest aggression (*'udwan*) or betrayal of an agreement. The implementation of diplomacy through the Muscat Channel was conceptually consistent with the principles of *al-mushalahah* (reconciliation) and *al-sifarah* (legitimate diplomatic delegation) for the prevention of bloodshed (*hifz al-nafs*). According to Siyasaḥ Dauliyah, the failure of the Muscat Channel resulted from the non-fulfillment of the fundamental principles of Islamic international treaties (*al-mu'ahadat*), namely the principles of legal certainty, mutualistic justice, and the fulfillment of promises (*wafa' al-'ahd*). Where a political entity uses the instrument of negotiation merely as a tactical shield to carry out military mobilization and the buildup of weapons along an adversary's border, such conduct is categorized as an indication

of khiyanat al-‘ahd (potential betrayal of an agreement). In his *Al-Ahkam as-Sultaniyah*, al-Mawardi affirms the obligation of the political authority to preserve the integrity of an agreement so long as the opposing party demonstrates good faith:

وَإِذَا صَلَّحَ أَهْلُ الْحَرْبِ عَلَى هُدْنَةٍ مُدَّةً، لَمْ يَجُزْ أَنْ يَغْدِرَ بِهِمْ وَلَا أَنْ يَبْدَأَهُمْ بِحَرْبٍ قَبْلَ انْقِضَائِهَا، إِلَّا أَنْ يَظْهَرَ مِنْهُمْ خِيَانَةٌ تَنْقُضُ الْعَهْدَ

“And when the Muslim leader concludes peace with the enemy upon a truce for a fixed period, it is not permissible for him to betray them, nor to begin war against them before its term expires, unless a betrayal that nullifies the agreement becomes manifest from them.”

When the Iranian delegation was willing to submit a draft for nuclear de-escalation and the operational restriction of proxy groups, in Islamic juridical terms they had laid the foundation for peace, which must be responded to proportionally. However, the continued unilateral economic pressure from the West, viewed through the perspective of *Siyasaḥ Dauliyah*, constitutes non-military economic aggression (*al-‘udwan al-iqtisadi*) that corrupts the very essence of peace itself. Therefore, Iran’s withdrawal from the Muscat commitment and the threat to expel the international inspectors constitute a defensive measure to safeguard the public interest (*maslahah ammah*) and sovereignty (*siyadah*) of the state from foreign intervention intent on toppling the regime.

The Crisis of February 2026

Entering early 2026, the diplomatic crisis mutated into a full-scale kinetic confrontation. On 6 February 2026, an emergency indirect nuclear-negotiation effort was again attempted in Muscat, Oman, with a plan to continue a second round in Geneva, Switzerland. However, that diplomatic space was immediately sealed shut when the United States provocatively deployed its second aircraft-carrier battle group, the USS Gerald R. Ford, to the waters of the Middle East to compel Iran to submit to three absolute Western demands: the permanent termination of all uranium enrichment, the total restriction of the ballistic-missile program, and the complete severance of relations with the axis-of-resistance network such as Hamas, Hezbollah, and the Houthis. In response to that military penetration, Iran mobilized the masses on a massive scale at the commemoration of the 47th anniversary of the Islamic Revolution on 11 February 2026. Iran also employed another strategy to anticipate a total blockade: throughout mid-February 2026, it tripled the volume of its crude-oil exports above the normal level in order to secure war-time foreign-exchange reserves. (“Perang Iran 2026: Krisis Timur Tengah dan Dinamika Pangkalan Militer CENTCOM,” 2026)

On 28 February 2026, following the total collapse of diplomatic consensus and intelligence claims regarding Iran’s readiness to produce weapons-grade fissile material, the United States, under the direct order of President Donald Trump, launched a massive military aggression into the heart of Iran’s sovereign territory. This operation was termed Operation Epic Fury by the United States Department of Defense. The first wave of air strikes was carried out using a combination of stealth fighters, strategic bombers, and hypersonic cruise missiles that struck command centers in Tehran, Isfahan, Qom, Karaj, and Kermanshah.

This attack was specifically designed as an operation to decapitate the leadership and to totally destroy strategic infrastructure. Based on satellite-imagery monitoring, the residential complex of Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei in Tehran was completely destroyed, resulting in the death of the Supreme Leader along with a number of key negotiating figures, including Ali Larijani. Allied

military command stated that the strike succeeded in crippling up to 80 percent of Iran’s nuclear-industrial base, including the underground enrichment installation in Isfahan.

As an instant retaliation, Iran activated an aggressive defensive posture by firing hundreds of ballistic missiles and swarms of drones across the region. Iran’s principal targets included United States military bases scattered across Jordan, Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates. In addition, the Iranian military officially announced the total closure of the Strait of Hormuz, which immediately paralyzed the global oil-supply route and triggered severe shocks in the stock markets and the international economy. (Reuters, 2026b)

An Analysis of Siyasaḥ Harbiyah on the February 2026 Attack

When diplomatic boundaries were transgressed and a large-scale physical confrontation broke out, the analysis of Islamic law shifts from the domain of Siyasaḥ Dauliyah to Siyasaḥ Harbiyah (the regulation of war and Islamic humanitarian law). Siyasaḥ Harbiyah sets out clearly the legitimacy of the declaration of war (*jus ad bellum*), the manner of conducting battle (*jus in bello*), and the protection of non-combatant entities.

a. Defensive Legitimacy against Military Aggression Based on Siyasaḥ Harbiyah

The unilateral military aggression launched by the United States axis on 28 February 2026 without any legal mandate from the UN Security Council is a manifest form of *al-baḡhy* (transgressing the limits) and armed aggression (*al-‘udwan al-musallah*). Within the framework of Islamic law, when a territory of *dar al-Islam* is suddenly attacked by a foreign power, the obligation of self-defense (*difa‘*) changes in legal status to *fardhu ‘ain* (an individual obligation) upon the military command authority and all capable elements of the nation. This is grounded in the word of Allah the Exalted in the Qur’an:

وَقَاتِلُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ الَّذِينَ يُقَاتِلُونَكُمْ وَلَا تَعْتَدُوا ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْمُعْتَدِينَ

“And fight in the way of Allah those who fight you, but do not transgress. Indeed, Allah does not like transgressors.” (QS. Al-Baqarah: 190)

The ballistic missiles launched by Iran toward United States military bases in the Gulf region constitute a proportionally lawful retaliatory act (*al-muqabalah bi al-mithl*) in order to halt the ongoing aggression. This defensive act is confirmed by al-Mawardi as an absolute obligation upon a ruler to preserve the existence of religion and the sovereignty of the state from destructive external intervention. In *Al-Aḥkam as-Sultaniyah*, the duty of guarding the frontiers and leading the defense of the state is formulated as a principal pillar of authority:

ثُمَّ عَلَيْهِ حِمَايَةُ النُّبُوءَةِ وَالذَّبُّ عَنِ الْحَرِيمِ لِيَسْتَوِطِنَ النَّاسُ فِي مَسَاكِينِهِمْ وَيَمْضُوا فِي أَسْفَارِهِمْ آمِنِينَ مِنْ غَائِلَةِ عَدُوِّ

“Then it is incumbent upon the ruler to protect the sovereign domain and to defend the sanctity of the homeland, so that people may dwell in their homes and travel on their journeys secure from the menace of an enemy.” (Al-Mawardi, p. 23)

تَرْتِيبُ الْقَوَاتِ فِي أَطْرَافِ الْبِلَادِ لِحِمَايَةِ التُّغُورِ وَحِفْظِ الْمَنَافِذِ لِئَلَّا يَبْصِلَ الْعَدُوُّ إِلَى حَرِيمِ الْمُسْلِمِينَ

“And the arrangement of command formations at the edges of the country is intended to protect the frontier regions and to guard the points of access (the strategic waterways/routes), so that the enemy cannot reach the protected domain of the Muslims.” (Al-Mawardi, p. 34)

In *fiqh* terms, the closure of the strait is a form of *hifz al-manafidh* (guarding the strategic points of access) so that the enemy’s warships or logistics vessels affiliated with the backers of aggression cannot penetrate more deeply into the Persian Gulf. In *Siyasaḥ Harbiyah*, crippling the economic

power and energy supply of an enemy that is used to finance war against the Muslims is a legitimate tactical strategy. Through this perspective, the closure of the Strait of Hormuz in order to halt the supply of commodities to states directly involved in the aggression may be categorized as a strategic measure to minimize the adversary's military room for maneuver and to suppress the rate of further damage. This is grounded in the universal fiqh maxim:

“Repelling harm/corruption takes precedence over securing benefit.”

Although the closure of the strait sacrifices the economic benefit of global shipping (*masalah khashah*), the act becomes lawful in order to repel a far greater corruption (*masalah ammah*)—namely the total destruction of state sovereignty as a result of the allied aerial bombardment. The closure of the maritime route was intended to compel the international community to pressure the aggressor to halt its kinetic strikes immediately. (Reuters, 2026a)

b. Violations of the Ethics of Islamic War (Jus in Bello) in the Allied Military Operation

Although the United States claimed that its strikes were highly precise and targeted military-nuclear infrastructure, the facts on the ground showed very massive civilian collateral damage. One of the bleakest humanitarian tragedies of this crisis was the total destruction of a Girls' Elementary School in Minab as a result of an allied aerial bomb. In *Siyasaḥ Harbiyah*, the targeting of children, women, and non-military civilian facilities is a grave violation (*jarimah harb*) against the law of Allah and His Messenger. The Prophet (peace be upon him) explicitly prohibited the killing of these categories of non-combatants in various military expeditions, as stated in a hadith:

عَنْ ابْنِ عُمَرَ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا قَالَ: وَجَدْتِ امْرَأَةً مَقْتُولَةً فِي بَعْضِ مَعَازِي رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ، فَأَنْكَرَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَتْلَ النِّسَاءِ وَالصِّبْيَانِ

“Narrated from Ibn ‘Umar (may Allah be pleased with them both), who said: A woman was found killed in one of the military expeditions of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him), so the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) condemned the killing of women and children.” (Narrated by al-Bukhari no. 3014; Muslim no. 1744) (Sahih al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim, n.d.)

Operation Epic Fury, which disregarded the principle of distinction (*al-sifat al-mumayyizah*) between combatants and non-combatants as well as the principle of proportionality, is, in Islamic juridical-normative terms, condemned as an act of wrongdoing that is void. The mass killing of schoolchildren in Minab nullifies every claim of unilateral moral justification proclaimed by the United States.

c. International Diplomacy Policy

In the aftermath of the destructive strike of 28 February 2026, the landscape of international diplomacy underwent extreme polarization. The global community split into factions of deep strategic interest. On one side, the United Kingdom, France, and Germany issued a joint statement—with Prime Minister Sir Keir Starmer—strongly condemning Iran's retaliatory missile strikes against the Arab Gulf region. Even so, internal fractures within their camp began to appear when the British Prime Minister openly affirmed that the United Kingdom “does not believe in regime change from the skies,” indicating partial disagreement with the radical leadership-decapitation doctrine applied by Trump. On the opposing side, Russia and China firmly condemned the United States aggression, calling it a flagrant violation of the sovereignty of a sovereign state and of international law. Russia and China

promptly mobilized political pressure at the UN Security Council and provided logistical-intelligence support to Iran's emergency authorities in order to stabilize internal conditions following the death of the Wilayat al-Faqih, Ayatollah Khamenei. (Shaheen, 2026)

At the multilateral level, intergovernmental international organizations were compelled to move swiftly to halt the war so that it would not mutate into a Third World War. Through intensive mediation pioneered by Pakistan as a regional nuclear power, a temporary ceasefire agreement lasting two weeks was achieved and declared on 8 April 2026. This declaration compelled a temporary halt to all kinetic bombing by the United States as well as the launching of ballistic missiles by Iran. As a continuation of that ceasefire, a new round of direct peace negotiations was opened in Islamabad on 10 April 2026. Although the first round of the Islamabad talks had not yet produced a comprehensive resolution owing to the depth of the gap between the two parties' diplomatic positions, the existence of this channel became the sole humanitarian safety valve in the Middle East. (Surbakti, 2010)

The Strategic Role of Indonesia in the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)

As the country with the largest Muslim population in the world and the holder of a constitutional mandate to participate in carrying out world order based on independence, lasting peace, and social justice, Indonesia assumed a highly proactive leadership role on the international stage. Responding to the outbreak of the 2026 Iran War, the Government of Indonesia, through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, consistently issued stern condemnations of all forms of unilateral military aggression and demanded the immediate cessation of hostilities in order to prevent a more massive humanitarian catastrophe. Indonesia welcomed the ceasefire declaration of 8 April 2026 and actively encouraged the strengthening of the parties' commitments at the Islamabad negotiating table.

Within the forum of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), Indonesia positioned itself as the primary mover for the political consolidation of the Islamic world. Indonesia urged the OIC to mobilize all diplomatic, economic, and legal power in order to halt the spiral of violence in the Middle East. The strategic steps orchestrated by Indonesian diplomacy within the OIC framework included the following: (Parliament, 2026)

- c. **Convening a Special Session of OIC Foreign Ministers.** Indonesia urged the OIC Secretariat-General to hold an Extraordinary Summit to produce a joint resolution binding upon all member states to refuse the use of their airspace, waters, or land as a launching base for Western military strikes against Iran. This step was highly crucial given that United States military bases are located within the territory of Arab states that are OIC members.
- d. **Secondary Humanitarian Diplomacy.** Taking advantage of the historic momentum of seventy-five years of bilateral diplomatic relations between Indonesia and Iran, which had just been celebrated at the end of 2025, Indonesia used this political modality of trust to approach the emergency government faction in Iran so that it would keep the door open for substantive negotiations in Islamabad and prevent an uncontrolled nuclear escalation.
- e. **Mobilizing International Legal Assistance.** Together with the cluster of developing countries in the OIC, Indonesia encouraged the use of international legal instruments, including urging the UN General Assembly and the International Court of Justice to issue an Advisory Opinion on the legal status of a unilateral leadership-decapitation strike against the head of state/spiritual leader of a nation.

A Review of *Siyasah Dauliyah* and *Siyasah Harbiyah* on the Diplomacy Policy and Indonesia's Role

The collective international response through the mechanism of the Islamabad ceasefire and the active mediating role played by Indonesia within the OIC possesses a very firm juridical-normative legitimacy within the system of Islamic constitutional law.

a. The Justification of the Islamabad Ceasefire in *Siyasah Harbiyah*

The ceasefire agreement declared on 8 April 2026, after five weeks of destructive war, is a tangible manifestation of the concept of *al-hudnah* or *al-muwada'ah* (an agreement for the temporary cessation of hostilities) in *Siyasah Harbiyah*. Islamic law unconditionally permits the adoption of the ceasefire option where the military commander perceives a clear benefit—whether to consolidate forces, to halt the slaughter of civilians, or to provide room for a just peace process. Al-Mawardi states that *al-hudnah* may be activated by the authority of the imam in order to avert a greater harm (*dar' mafasid*) arising from the continuation of war: (The Holy Qur'an, n.d.)

أَنْ يُعَقِدَ الْإِمَامُ أَوْ مَنْ قَوَّضَ إِلَيْهِ مَعَ أَهْلِ الْحَرْبِ عَقْدًا عَلَى تَرْكِ الْقِتَالِ مُدَّةً مُقَدَّرَةً بِمَا يَرَى فِيهِ الْمَصْلَحَةُ

“The essence of a ceasefire is a contract concluded by the imam (the supreme leader) or the party to whom authority is delegated, together with the people of war (the enemy), to cease fighting for a fixed period determined according to what is deemed to contain benefit therein.”

The agreement brokered by Pakistan and the international community to freeze the fighting in the field gave rise to a legal foundation that all parties are obliged to respect. In *Siyasah Harbiyah*, a violation of a formally agreed ceasefire is regarded as a grave sin and a transcendental betrayal.

b. Indonesia's Role as Executor of the Command of *Islah* (*al-sifarah*)

Indonesia's diplomatic action in demanding the de-escalation of the conflict and mobilizing the OIC to mediate the dispute between Iran and the United States is a direct application of the command of the Sharia regarding *al-islah* (peaceful reconciliation) between disputing groups. Allah the Exalted commands imperatively in the Qur'an:

وَإِنْ طَائِفَتَانِ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ اقْتَتَلُوا فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا فَإِنْ بَغَتْ إِحْدَاهُمَا عَلَى الْأُخْرَى فَقَاتِلُوا الَّتِي تَبْغِي حَتَّى تَفِيءَ إِلَى أَمْرِ اللَّهِ فَإِنَّ فَاءَتْ فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا بِالْعَدْلِ وَأَقْسِطُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ

“And if two factions among the believers should fight, then make peace between them. But if one of them transgresses against the other, then fight against the one that transgresses until it returns to the command of Allah. And if it returns, then make peace between them in justice and act justly. Indeed, Allah loves the just.” (QS. Al-Hujurat: 9)

Through *Siyasah Dauliyah*, Indonesia's role in the OIC is categorized as an instrument of *al-wasathiyah* (a moderating nation) acting as a just arbiter (*al-hakam al-'adl*). By demanding the total cessation of the United States' unilateral strikes—classified as *al-baghyu* (the aggression of wrongdoing)—without justifying non-conventional provocative acts, Indonesia's foreign diplomacy sought to uphold an international law grounded in justice. Indonesia's strategy of encouraging the OIC to prohibit the use of military bases in Muslim countries for allied aggression is a highly tactical preventive step to break the chain of mutual assistance in sin and enmity (*al-ta'awun 'ala al-ithmi wa al-'udwan*). In juridical-normative terms, the international diplomacy policy after the February 2026 crisis proves that the principles of *Siyasah Harbiyah* and *Siyasah Dauliyah*—such as the protection of civilians, the fulfillment of the promise of a ceasefire, and the obligation of multilateral *islah*—are

highly relevant and urgent legal instruments to be implemented in order to save the global humanitarian system from total destruction.

Present the findings of your research along with the interpretation of those results. Discuss the results obtained, compare them with previous studies, and explain the implications. Use tables and graphs to clarify the data if necessary.

Present the research results in a systematic way. Use tables, graphs, or diagrams to present data visually and make it easier to understand. After presenting the results, interpret them by explaining what the results mean in the context of the research. Compare with previous studies: do your results support or contradict other research? Discuss the implications of these findings—both for theory, practice, and policy—and the limitations that may exist in your research. (Fauzi, 2021)

CONCLUSION

The Iran–United States military confrontation (2025–2026) reflects the collapse of diplomacy as a result of the violation of the principle of treaties (*khiyanat al-‘ahd*) through unilateral Western pressure, culminating in the destructive aggression of February 2026. From the perspective of *Siyasaḥ Harbiyah*, that unilateral attack is classified as transgressing the limits (*al-baghyu*) and as violating the ethics of Islamic war (*jus in bello*) because it sacrificed civilians. This condition granted legal legitimacy to Iran to undertake an obligatory self-defense (*difa’*) in order to preserve the sovereignty of its territory (*himayat al-baidah*), as regulated by al-Mawardi in *Al-Ahkam as-Sultaniyah*. Conversely, the international diplomatic response that produced the ceasefire in April 2026 is juridically an implementation of the concept of *al-hudnah* in order to prevent a greater humanitarian damage (*dar’ al-mafasid*). In the context of *Siyasaḥ Dauliyah*, Indonesia’s strategic role in the forum of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)—through its insistence on a special session and its rejection of the use of Muslim territory as a base for foreign military operations—is a tangible form of the Sharia command to undertake peaceful reconciliation (*al-islāh*). Indonesia acted as a just arbiter (*al-hakam al-‘adl*) in order to break the chain of wrongdoing (*al-ta’awun ‘ala al-ithmi wa al-‘udwan*). The study also affirms that the flexibility of Iran’s policy, shifting from military confrontation to peace accommodation, is a tangible manifestation of the enforcement of contemporary *Siyasaḥ Dauliyah* and the strategy of *Siyasaḥ Harbiyah* in order to achieve shared economic benefit (*maslahah ammah*) and to prevent wider global damage.

REFERENCES

- Agency, I. E. (2026). *Global Energy Crisis Report 2026: Macroeconomic Fallout of the Strait of Hormuz Closure*. IEA Publications.
- Al-Mawardi, A. al-H. (n.d.). *Al-Ahkam as-Sultaniyah wa al-Wilayat al-Diniyah*. Dar al-Fikr.
- Al-Mawardi, A. al-H. (2014). *Al-Ahkam al-Sulthaniyyah*. Qisthi Press.
- Bozorgmehri, N. (2026). *Conventional Military Escalation in the Middle East*. Middle East Strategic Review.
- Fauzi, A. (2021). *Analisis Siyasaḥ Harbiyah Terhadap Strategi Pertahanan Nasional Iran dalam Menghadapi Tekanan Militer Amerika Serikat (Studi Kasus Pembunuhan Qasem Soleimani)*.
- Hokayem, E. (2026). *The Decades of Friction: Nuclear Ambitions, Unilateral Sanctions, and Proxy Networks in the Persian Gulf*. International Institute for Strategic Studies.
- Indonesia, K. L. N. R. (2025). *Momentum Historis 75 Tahun Hubungan Diplomatik Bilateral*

- Indonesia-Iran. Kementerian Luar Negeri Republik Indonesia.
- Indonesia, K. L. N. R. (2026). *Pernyataan Pers Bersama: Sikap Diplomasi Bebas-Aktif Indonesia terhadap Eskalasi Jalur Maritim Timur Tengah*. Direktorat Timur Tengah, Kementerian Luar Negeri Republik Indonesia.
- Jazeera, A. (2026a). *Emergency Nuclear Negotiations and Diplomatic Deadlock in Muscat*. <https://www.aljazeera.com/amp/opinions/2026/2/8/iran-us-talks-in-muscat-bought-time-not-a-deadlock>
- Jazeera, A. (2026b). *Islamabad Peace Forum Opens Following a Two-Week Temporary Ceasefire*. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2026/4/8/iran-says-talks-with-us-will-begin-in-pakistans-islamabad-on-friday>
- Jazeera, A. (2026c). *Report on Civilian Casualties in Minab Following Allied Airstrike*.
- Kilian, L., Murphy, D. P., & Zhou, X. (2026). *Macroeconomic Impacts of Maritime Blockades: Energy Commodity Price Shocks in the 2026 Iran Crisis*. *Journal of International Economics*.
- Kilavuz, M. S. (2026). *The Boundaries of International Legal Frameworks on Unilateral Military Force*. *Leiden Journal of International Law*.
- Lestari, A. (2025a). *Analisis Jalur Maritim Global dan Signifikansi Geopolitik Selat Hormuz*. *Jurnal Energi dan Geopolitik Kontemporer*.
- Lestari, A. (2025b). *Dinamika Keamanan Maritim di Selat Hormuz*. *Jurnal Geopolitik Nasional*, 8(3), 102–115.
- MetroTV. (2026). *Indonesia Dukung Deeskalasi Konflik Iran-AS melalui Jalur Perundingan Islamabad*. YouTube.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Moleong, L. J. (2021). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- News, A. J. (2026). *US Launches Massive Airstrikes against Iran Following Diplomatic Collapse*. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2026/2/28/explosions-in-downtown-tehran-smoke-seen-rising>
- Parliament, U. K. (2026). *The US-Iran Military Confrontation 2026: Operation Epic Fury, Diplomatic Failures, and UK Policy Response*. House of Commons Library.
- Perang Iran 2026: Krisis Timur Tengah dan Dinamika Pangkalan Militer CENTCOM. (2026). In *Media Strategis*.
- Reuters. (2026a). *Iran Confirms the Death of Supreme Leader Khamenei after Tehran Strike*. <https://www.reuters.com/world/iran-khamenei-2026>
- Reuters. (2026b). *Leadership Decapitation in Tehran: Strategic Implications of the Passing of Ayatollah Ali Khamenei*. In *Reuters World News*.
- Sahih al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim. (n.d.).
- Shaheen, F. (2026). *Anti-Imperialism and Asymmetric Defense: The Evolutionary Trajectory of Iran’s Foreign Policy since 1979*. *Foreign Policy Analysis*.
- Surbakti, R. (2010). *Memahami Ilmu Politik*. Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- The Holy Qur’an. (n.d.).
- University, B. (2026). *Posisi dan Peran Kepemimpinan Diplomasi Indonesia di Forum OKI Merespons Perang Iran 2026*. Character Building Department, BINUS University.