
ROLE OF NEGOTIATION AND MEDIATION IN GEOPOLITICAL WAR AND CONFLICT

Heena Chaudhary, LL.M., National Law University, Odisha

Swikruti Sahu, LL.M., National Law University, Odisha

ABSTRACT

Longstanding conflicts over land, resources and power, are the breeding ground for geopolitical wars which lead to a colossal loss of lives, economies, and peace on both domestic and international levels. Alternate Dispute Resolution techniques such as Negotiation and Mediation exist to resolve underlying tensions between individuals, and states in a peaceful and expeditious manner with minimal court intervention. More often than not, these alternate dispute mechanisms are used to harmoniously settle family or commercial disputes, which posits the question whether the same resolution mechanisms could be employed to effectively bridge the gaps resulting in geopolitical conflicts?

Thus, Negotiation and Mediation could emerge as potential tools in resolving geopolitical wars in the contemporary era, where conventional methods of settlement of conflict, such as treaty-signing, have many a times failed to result in peace due to a lack of adherence to the same. ADR facilitates trust and fair deals, which could be used to dissolve the tensions between two powerful and sovereign giants, through mutual agreement and negotiation. As a result, understanding these two techniques has become crucial in order to explore various viable ways in which global stability could be fostered, by resolving conflicts between nations before they reach a stage of war.

This research will dive into real life instances of geopolitical wars and the effect of ADR in successfully achieving a peaceful settlement between the conflicting nations involved, such as the Camp David Accords of 1978 aka the conflict between Egypt and Israel mediated by the US President, and the Good Friday Agreement of 1998 that negotiated and resolved the disputes in Northern Ireland.

This paper will also critically analyse the ongoing cases of a longstanding conflict between Russia and Ukraine, Israel and Palestine, and the US and Iran, and their respective prospects to be resolved through the mechanism of negotiation and mediation, and why it may or may not be viable, given their sovereign powers, superiority and histories.

THE CAMP DAVID ACCORDS OF 1978: A MEDIATORY MILESTONE IN ACHIEVING PEACE IN THE MIDDLE-EAST

Followed by Britain's Belfour Declaration of 1917, the British Mandate for Palestine between 1920 to 1948 and the subsequent United Nations Partition Plan 1947, the establishment of the sovereign state of Israel led to a deep unrest amongst the Arabs, as the newly established Jewish state threatened the Arab dominion. An animosity rose in the wake of 1948 with the first Arab-Israeli war for independence and preservation, which continued well into mid-1949, resulting in the mass displacement of Palestinians.

This animosity worsened with the growing distrust between the Arabs and the Israelis, which led to more wars and conflicts spread across three decades. Following the first 1948 Arab-Israeli War, the Suez Crisis of 1956, The Six Day War of 1967 and the Yom Kippur War of 1973, all resulted in a lot of regional tensivity, ultimately leading to the Israeli occupation of the Sinai Peninsula in Egypt in 1967.¹

To dissipate these long-standing tensions between the Arabs and the Israelis, the United States President, Jimmy Carter, prompted an effort to mediate a dialogue for peace between the leaders of these conflicting states. Egyptian President, Anwar Sadat and the Israeli Prime Minister, Menachem Begin² displayed a diplomatic willingness to participate in this mediation process, with the hope of reinstating peace into the Middle East. This 13-day intensive negotiation effort between the two leaders, mediated by the US President is historically known as the Camp David Accords of 1978, as it took place after the Yom Kippur War.

The Camp David Accords of 1978 held at Camp David, which is the official country retreat of the President of the United States, was the perfect location to conduct the mediation process. It was a secluded place and had a unique geographical and political positioning, favourable for conditions of mediation like neutrality and confidentiality.³

Egypt's President Anwar Sadat, Israel's Prime Minister Menachem Begin and the US president

¹ Arab-Israeli wars, Encyclopaedia Britannica (last updated 16 January 2026) <https://www.britannica.com/event/Arab-Israeli-wars> accessed 28 February 2026.

² US Department of State, Milestones: 1977–1980 – Camp David Accords and the Arab-Israeli Peace Process (Milestones in the History of US Foreign Relations, n.d.) <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1977-1980/camp-david> accessed 28 February 2026.

³ Armistia Team, 'The Significance of Camp David Accords 1978 in Middle Eastern Peace' (Armistia, 14 October 2024) <https://armistia.com/camp-david-accords-1978/> accessed 28 February 2026.

Jimmy Carter, all played crucial roles in facilitating the mediation process by displaying collective diplomatic efforts, to achieve a long-term success in peace. Extensive negotiations took place where both the leaders had opportunities to propose their demands. During intense disagreements, where direct dialogues between the two leaders stalled, and the mediation seemed stagnated, the US President travelled back and forth between the Egyptian President and the Israeli Prime Minister, taking their proposals to each other, ultimately breaking the deadlock. This unwavering dedication, impartiality and diplomacy of President Carter was proven pivotal in achieving the historical peace between the Egyptian Arabs and Israelis.⁴

Apart from the US mediator's commitment to the mediation, Sadat and Begin's willingness to negotiate for peace was also critical, as both leaders were facing opposition from the Arabian and Israeli factions of their respective states. Sadat's decision to participate in the peace process was mainly aimed at regaining the Sinai Peninsula, which Egypt had lost during the Six-Day War of 1967. He displayed great leadership by resolving to actively engage in the negotiations, despite the backlash he received in the form of domestic and regional dissent. Similarly, Begin's participation in the 1978 accords was met with domestic opposition from the critics of his state, who deemed his initiation for peace with Egypt, as a threat to their own sovereignty, and regional boundaries.

The extensive negotiations mediated by President Carter, held at the Camp David, acknowledged the demands of both the parties, and emphasized on the principle of mutual recognition which marked a historic change in the Arab-Israeli relations. The Accords laid down the recognition of Israel as an independent state and its right to exist peacefully, and structured a plan for the systematic and gradual withdrawal of Israeli military from the Sinai Peninsula, returning it to Egypt. The 1978 Accords thus established a framework which aimed at securing state borders, reinstating the Middle-Eastern stability, and fostering co-existence of the states through recognizing each other's sovereignty.⁵

The Accords laid down two key frameworks, viz. Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel, and Framework for Peace in the Middle East, directed at the broader Arab-Israeli conflicts, specifically the Palestinian territories. This framework converted the accords into a formal, legally binding treaty. The provisions for a peace treaty

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Camp David Accords, Encyclopaedia Britannica (last updated 11 Feb 2026)
<https://www.britannica.com/event/Camp-David-Accords> accessed 28 February 2026

emphasized the need for detailed negotiations over the delineation of borders, particularly concerning the return of Sinai to Egypt, and Egypt's assent to let Israel use the Suez Canal, which had been nationalised by Egypt during the Suez Crisis.

The framework contained provisions for security and stability on part of both the states. It also stipulated that both parties commit to peaceful dispute resolution, reflecting a profound shift from their history of conflicts. The provisions, thus, laid the foundation for a comprehensive peace treaty, ultimately leading to the **Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty of 1979, concluding the war between the two states, and resulting in a direct, bilateral peace between them.** This process marked a significant milestone in Arab-Israeli relations, emphasizing diplomacy over warfare.

The Camp David Accords of 1978 significantly influenced the history of geopolitical conflicts by forming a framework for peaceful resolution in a region characterized by ongoing conflict. The 1978 Accords' legacy is rooted not only in its success in achieving the first longstanding peace between Israel and an Arab nation, but also in substantiating negotiation as an effective tool in resolving a geopolitical conflict. It underscores the significance of intelligence sharing, and trust-building, which continue to influence military and diplomatic efforts in the region today. Ultimately, it proves that diplomacy could replace prolonged military confrontations, setting a precedent for future attempts and processes for peace.

THE GOOD FRIDAY AGREEMENT (AKA THE BELFAST AGREEMENT) OF 1998 WHICH DEVELOPED THE HISTORIC PEACE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

With the signing of the Anglo-Irish Treaty in 1921 which concluded the Irish War of Independence by declaring it the Irish Free State within the British Empire, a certain northeastern part of Ireland was also given the option to remain separated from the rest of the Irish Free State. This Northern part of Ireland comprised of nine counties which constituted the county of Ulster which was dominated by both the English and Scottish settlers, and the indigenous Irish. Of these nine counties, six were heavily dominated by the English and Scottish settlers, who decided to stay loyal to the British regime and separately retain their British identity, instead of subsuming into the Irish. The other three counties, dominated by the Indigenous Irish, decided to be a part of the newly formed Irish Free State.⁶

⁶ Dave Roos, *How the Troubles Began in Northern Ireland* (History.com, 12 Nov 2021, last updated 28 May

The Anglo-Irish and the Scotch-Irish who chose to remain a part of the United Kingdom were called the Protestant Unionists or Loyalists, while the Indigenous Irish who wished to be a part of the Republic of Ireland, were the Catholic Nationalists or Republicans.

In 1921, upon the request of the Unionists to remain a part of the British Empire, the state of Ireland was divided into two self-governing parts, namely, the Northern Ireland and the Southern Ireland (the Irish Free State) under the Government of Ireland Act, 1920. With the creation of Northern Ireland, the government of which largely comprised of the Unionists, and had very little representation of the Republicans due to their minority in the Ulster, a hint of a historic sectarian violence started brewing. The Republicans became an underserved section of the Northern Ireland as they were deprived of equal opportunities in case of education, employment, public housing and election. They were also marginalised due to a lack of representation of the Irish culture, and they were also victims of harassment by the Protestant police.

The first signs of a longstanding sectarian violence, historically known as “The Troubles” started emerging in 1968, with the formation of a Catholic activists group called the NICRA which started marching and protesting for their civil rights against discrimination, in Londonderry. As a response to this protest by the Republicans, the Unionists announced a counterdemonstration, but the NICRA decided to continue to protest. The protest turned into a riot when the RUC (Unionist Police) violently suppressed the marchers with batons and water cannons.⁷

A series horrifyingly brutal conflicts and confrontations⁸, such as the Battle of Bogside, Bloody Sunday, Bloody Friday, O’Neil’s resignation, etc. then followed, spanning across three decades, from 1968 to 1998. These growing tensions were called The Troubles which left the Northern Ireland devastated with the sporadically occurring communal belligerency over culture, politics, identity and independence. This soon turned from an insurgency to terrorism with the IRA and British army attacks transcending the bounds of Northern Ireland, pervading areas of Britain and Ireland. The Troubles cruelly impacted the lives of many civilians,

2025) <https://www.history.com/articles/the-troubles-northern-ireland> accessed 28 February 2026.

⁷ The Anglo-Irish Agreement and Downing Street Declaration, Encyclopaedia Britannica (last updated 25 Jan 2026) <https://www.britannica.com/event/The-Troubles-Northern-Ireland-history/The-Anglo-Irish-Agreement-and-Downing-Street-Declaration> accessed 28 February 2026.

⁸ How the Troubles began – a timeline, Irish Times (22 Feb 2019)

<https://www.irishtimes.com/news/ireland/irish-news/how-the-troubles-began-a-timeline-1.3987076> accessed 28 February 2026.

resulting in over 3,500 deaths and leaving over 30,000 people gravely injured in total.

While this three-decade conflict was traumatizing Northern Ireland, and regions of the Republic of Ireland, and the Great Britain, many negotiation attempts were in progress in the background of this violence. Major negotiation milestones like the early Sunningdale Agreement of 1973, the Anglo-Irish Agreement of 1985, the Downing Street Declaration of 1993 and The Hume-Adams Process of the early 1990s attempted reinstating peace into Northern Ireland by trying to establish a power-sharing executive, rendering a greater role to Ireland toward the affairs of Northern Ireland, establishing the principle of consent, or by proposing ceasefires and building peace walls between the conflicting communities, etc., all of which was met with failure of peace, until the historic Good Friday Agreement of 1998.⁹

The Good Friday Agreement, also known as the Belfast Agreement,¹⁰ was signed on April 10, 1998. It was a multi-party negotiation which included The British and the Irish Governments, and various political parties of both the states. These peace talks were mediated by the former US Senator George Mitchell. The landmark accord provided for the creation of a power-sharing assembly in Northern Ireland ensuring equal representation of the Republicans, cross-border cooperation between Ireland and Northern Ireland, and also Ireland and the UK over matters of education, healthcare and commerce. On May 22, a joint referendum on the historic agreement was held by Ireland and Northern Ireland which met with an approval of 71% in Northern Ireland and 94% in the Republic of Ireland. Met with a brief violation by the IRA, the agreement persisted, until the IRA promised to fully disarm, and adopt peaceful mechanisms. The Republic of Ireland amended its constitution to withdraw its claim from the whole of Ireland, and the UK enforced direct rule of Northern Ireland again. Northern Ireland gradually recovered from the trauma of the Troubles, with slow progress of decommissioning on both sides, but the sectarian acrimony still persisting; and it continues to recuperate from its deep-rooted divisions. However, the Good Friday Agreement continues to be one of the most important accords in the world of geopolitical conflicts, and in the history of peace processes for having mitigated most of the violence in Northern Ireland, bringing about peace in the region, and continuing to influence the politics and the intergovernmental cooperation between

⁹ The Anglo-Irish Agreement and Downing Street Declaration, Encyclopaedia Britannica (last updated 25 Jan 2026) <https://www.britannica.com/event/The-Troubles-Northern-Ireland-history/The-Anglo-Irish-Agreement-and-Downing-Street-Declaration> accessed 28 February 2026.

¹⁰ Good Friday Agreement: What Is It? BBC News (3 Apr 2023) <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-northern-ireland-61968177> accessed 28 February 2026.

Ireland and the United Kingdom even today.

The Good Friday Agreement remains one of the most crucial examples of the strength of Negotiation and Mediation in resolving armed conflicts, where dialogue replaces danger, and peace replaces violence.

THE ISRAEL-PALESTINE WAR: CAN NEGOTIATION OR MEDIATION PUT A COMPLETE END TO IT?

The conflict between the Jews in Israel and the Arabs in Palestine can be traced long back to the year 1948, before which Palestine was controlled by Britain after World War I. Arabs and Jews, both were the residents, but the Balfour Declaration of 1917 created tensions between the two groups.

After World War Two and the Holocaust, Jews fought to have their own country, following which, in 1947, the UN recommended to divide the land into two- Israel dominated by Jews and Palestine dominated by the Arabs. However, this was not approved by the Arab leaders. In 1948, Israel was declared as a separate independent state but the following day, Israel was attacked by Palestine but got defeated by the Jews¹¹.

The year 1967 marked the fight for Egypt, Jordan and Syria. Israel captured Sinai Peninsula (which was returned after signing a peace treaty), Gaza, the West Bank and East Jerusalem. These areas still remain as the conflicted areas. The West Bank was inhabited by around 3 million Palestinians where Israel started making settlements; although regarded illegal by many countries, Israel denied the illegality¹². Jerusalem, an important historical city for Jews, Muslims and Christians, was claimed as the capital city, both by the Israelis and the Palestinians.

The Gaza Strip, a small area having a dense population of 2 million people, was controlled by Hamas which won elections in 2006. In 2023, Hamas attacked Israel, resulting in 1200 deaths and 251 hostages¹³. As a response, Israel launched a military operation in Gaza which killed thousands of Palestinians and led to severe humanitarian crisis, food insecurity, shortage of

¹¹ 'Israel and the Palestinians: History of the Conflict Explained' (BBC, 14 October 2025) <<https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/ckgr71z0jp4o>> accessed 21 February 2026

¹² Ibid.

¹³ 'Israeli-Palestinian Conflict' (Council of Foreign Relations, updated 18 February 2026) <<https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/israeli-palestinian-conflict>> accessed 21 February 2026

water and healthcare facility¹⁴.

A large number of countries have suggested for a 'two-state solution' i.e. dividing the land into two independent countries, Israel and Palestine. Many countries now recognise Palestine as a separate state however, Israeli government, led by Benjamin Netanyahu, has given his dissent for an independent state of Palestine, contending that it might threaten the security in Israel. In 2025, a ceasefire agreement was signed, supported by US President Donald Trump¹⁵, however, negotiations between the two states are still going on.

Many efforts have been made in the past years to restore peace between Israel and Palestine. One approach that was made was Islah or reconciliation that fostered peaceful dialogues and settlement between the two states. Another major effort was the Oslo Accords signed in 1993 which gave the Palestinians a slender power to rule in the West Bank and Gaza, which also helped Yasser Arafat to return Palestine¹⁶. However, the Oslo Accords failed to adequately address the major issues surrounding Jerusalem, Palestinian refugees' right to return and the Israeli settlements.

Negotiation and mediation can help facilitate dialogue between the two states, foster trust and the government can make structured plans to erode away the hatred-ness and violent thoughts to restore peace in both the states. These ADR techniques will help the nations to put forward their thoughts and desires, will help them understand their core concerns around which the issue revolves. They can rather agree on certain things and can compromise on others and get into a win-win situation and agree on common solutions¹⁷ than to involve into wars where both will lose one thing or the other.

Negotiators and mediators also have a crucial role to play. These neutral third parties like international organisations who may act as negotiators or mediators can help both the parties involve into a peaceful dialogue when direct talks are difficult¹⁸. Mediators can help the parties

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Israel and the Palestinians: History of the Conflict Explained' (BBC, 14 October 2025) <<https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/ckgr71z0jp4o>> accessed 21 February 2026

¹⁶ Marlini Alianita, Eva Achjani Zulfa, Bayquni, Prof. Dr. Moestopo, 'Palestinian-Israeli Conflict in War and Peace Approach' (2023) 1 (6) International Journal of Accounting, Management, Economics and Social Sciences 845

¹⁷ Louis Kriesberg, 'Mediation and the Transformation of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict' (2001) 38 (3) Journal of Peace Research 373

¹⁸ Samer Nasman. 'From Discourse to Policy: How U.S. Mediator Ideology Shapes Outcomes in the Israel–Palestine Conflict' (2025) 4 (7) Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences Review 436

reach a ceasefire and build confidence among them to not make them feel hostile. Peace negotiations generally include complex issues, but negotiators and mediators can bring new solutions for the issue in a cordial manner.

ADR mechanisms can help resolve the Israel-Palestine conflict through balanced and continuous negotiations. Possible outcomes may include giving a special international status to the holy sites in Jerusalem to be shared by both the countries, compensation to the refugees or any resettlement opportunities for the Palestinian refugees, economic collaboration in trade, water, energy, etc.

THE RUSSO-UKRAINE CLASH: CAN DIALOGUE REPLACE WAR?

Russia breached the security framework of Europe, made after World War II, on February 24, 2022, when it invaded Ukraine. The Helsinki Agreement of 1975 stated that national borders of a country shall not be violated or altered by any military forces. However, the non-observance of this framework led to the invasion of Ukraine by Russia, resulting in a war in the European soil.

Russia-Ukraine conflict began in the year 2014, when the former President of Ukraine, Viktor Yanukovich was pulled out of power following large number of protests in its capital city Kyiv. Ukraine wanted to have stronger relations with the European Union and NATO, but Russia showed its dissent mainly because its President, Vladimir Putin feared that NATO's expansion to Russia's border would threaten the sovereign security¹⁹. As Ukraine was initially a part of Soviet Union, Russia and Ukraine shared cultures, so Putin wanted Ukraine not to lose the Russian influence and align with western countries. Immediately after, Russia took full control and conquered Crimea, which resulted in heated tensions between the two nations. When eastern Ukraine was declared independent by the pro-Russian separatists, war began between Ukrainian forces and Russian troops²⁰. Russia repudiated their direct involvement, but Ukraine and NATO stated that the Russian troops were present with weapons.

In the early period of 2022, Ukraine's borders were surrounded by large number of Russian troops after which the president initiated a complete control over Ukraine. This was to

¹⁹ 'War in Ukraine' (Council on Foreign Regulations, 16 December 2025) < <https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/conflict-ukraine> > accessed 24 February 2026

²⁰ Ibid.

‘demilitarise’ (meaning to remove military forces) and ‘denazify’ (meaning to remove the Nazi influence) from Ukraine. This conflict created heavy destruction, hospitals, schools, homes were bombed, thousands of people killed, global problems arose such as blockade of Ukraine’s grain exports, food crisis, concerns for nuclear safety at Zaporizhzhia nuclear power plant²¹, etc.

Crimea was treated as a part of the Russian territory after the revolt in 2014 and declared the settlement of the conflict between the two nations. However, Ukraine was of the belief that dispute will be settled completely only when Ukraine will be removed from the slightest control of Russia and have complete rule over its territory. This disagreement made negotiations between the countries difficult.

The first two attempts made for peace was the Minsk Agreements²² (Minsk I and Minsk II), where 2 ceasefire negotiations were made in the years 2014 and 2015 to cease fights between Russian separatists and Ukrainian forces. The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), France and Germany were the negotiators. The first agreement was signed in Minsk, Belarus after months of conflict in Donetsk and Luhansk, which resulted in prompt ceasefires, exchange of prisoners, decentralization measures, etc. However, fights resumed as both sides lacked commitment to the deal and vague terms in the agreement²³.

A second agreement, Minsk II was signed in 2015. There were intense negotiations that included leaders from Ukraine, Russia, France and Germany. The negotiation contained a 13-step plan which included ceasefires, weapons withdrawal and local elections to decentralize power in the conflict zones under the Ukrainian law, statutory reforms and Ukraine’s control over its territory²⁴. However, Ukraine believed that if elections were held during the control of Russian forces, the results would ultimately favour the pro-Russian separatists and would snatch away the independence of Ukraine.

To resolve this issue, a diplomatic proposal was made in 2016 that outlined a structured plan

²¹Kennedy, Adrienne, ‘Russo-Ukrainian War’ (EBSCO, 2025) < <https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/military-history-and-science/russo-ukrainian-war> > accessed 24 February 2026

²² Kristian Atland ‘War, Diplomacy and More War: Why did the Minsk Agreement Fail?’ (Springer Nature Link, 15 November 2024) <<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s41311-024-00637-x#citeas> > accessed 24 February 2026

²³ Kristian Atland ‘War, Diplomacy and More War: Why did the Minsk Agreement Fail?’ (Springer Nature Link, 15 November 2024) <<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s41311-024-00637-x#citeas> > accessed 24 February 2026

²⁴ Ibid.

to enforce the Minsk agreements to resolve the deadlock in eastern Ukraine. It was named Steinmeier Formula after the name of the German Foreign Minister, Frank Walter Steinmeier. This proposal also recommended having elections as per the Ukrainian law and gave special status to the areas of Donbas under the control of Russian separatists. This agreement was officially accepted in 2019 by Ukraine president Volodymyr Zelensky, but this was protested against as the Ukrainians feared that this formula would give much power to the Russian separatists in eastern Ukraine. Although this formula guided the negotiations within the Normandy Format (France, Germany, Russia and Ukraine) but was never fully implemented because both the nations showed their dissent on the key steps, had conflict of interest and lacked trust on the other side.

Again, after four days of the conflict in 2022, peace talks began between Russia and Ukraine but again failed in the period of spring in 2022. Since then, the chasm between the two nations have widened. Ukraine's president Zelensky has officially declared bans on negotiations with Russia's president Putin²⁵. Both the sides don't agree to the terms set by the other side, like for instance, Russia has demanded for particular four regions of Ukraine where Ukraine has a larger control, which is opposed by Ukrainian government.

These instances clearly show that negotiations between both the countries seems very difficult as no side is ready for a compromise. Negotiations will work only when both the sides turn up mutually for an amicable settlement. Till date, Russia and Ukraine both have borne and are willing to bear heavy military and armed rebellion resulting in huge economic loss and loss of lives. They have now entered into a situation of 'mutually hurting stalemate' where both the sides see no hope of victory²⁶.

One of the major reasons why negotiations seem difficult to erode away the war situation is the lack of trust in both the sides. Ukraine is in the demand of a strong security for the state and does not desire to give up any of their land, however, Russia wants control over certain territories of Ukraine as condition for peaceful settlement²⁷. Another reason for failure in

²⁵ Taras Kuzio, 'Ukraine's Policy Towards Russia After the 2022 Invasion', (2023) 71 Science Direct 1

²⁶ Kristian Atland 'War, Diplomacy and More War: Why did the Minsk Agreement Fail?' (Springer Nature Link, 15 November 2024) <<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s41311-024-00637-x#citeas>> accessed 24 February 2026

²⁷ Wojciech Konończuk, Krzysztof Nieczypor, Witold Rodkiewicz, 'Disputes Over Peace: Ukraine Between US Pressure and Russian Demands' (OSW, 12 December 2025) <<https://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/analyses/2025-12-12/dispute-over-peace-ukraine-between-us-pressure-and-russian-demands>> accessed 24 February 2026

settlement is public opinion and political stance in the territory of Ukraine. A large population of Ukraine still doubts that peace talks with Russia would only threaten the breach of agreements by Moscow or Moscow would attack again even after a peaceful settlement through negotiations.

Diplomatic efforts to bring back peace still continues but the **major obstacle of trust** makes it difficult, but not impossible. The settlement might be made in future, but this date still marks the disagreement of both the sides over territory, ongoing armed conflicts and lack of faith by both sides.

HOW COULD THIS BE PERCEIVED IN LIGHT OF THE ONGOING US-ISRAELI & IRANIAN WAR?

The ongoing US-Israeli and Iranian war has left the world in shambles, not only from a humanitarian perspective but also from the point of a historic global energy crisis²⁸. From as early as April 2025²⁹ to April 2026, a series of negotiations have taken place between the United States and Iran regarding Iran's nuclear program and regional sovereignty over the Strait of Hormuz, all of which have been met with continuous disagreements due to strikingly contrasting demands³⁰ proposed by both sides, rendering the talks incapable of reaching a middle ground to compromise on.

Recently, On April 8, 2026, a two-week ceasefire was initiated with Iran's 10-Point Plan³¹, forming the basis for negotiations. With Pakistan serving as the Mediator, the truce was mutually agreed upon by both the conflicting states, in order to temporarily halt an almost six-week war, and engage in effective and constructive peace talks.

For the temporary ceasefire, the US agreed to halt all attacks on Iran in exchange for the re-

²⁸ Joshua Busby and Greg Pollock, 'Why the War in Iran Prompted a Global Energy Crisis—and How It Might End' (Chicago Council on Global Affairs, 13 March 2026) <https://globalaffairs.org/commentary/analysis/why-war-iran-prompted-global-energy-crisis-and-how-it-might-end> accessed 26 June 2026.

²⁹ Philip Loft and Claire Mills, *United States–Iran Nuclear Talks 2025* (House of Commons Library Research Briefing No CBP-10254, 14 May 2025) <https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-10254/CBP-10254.pdf> accessed 26 June 2026.

³⁰ The 5-Demand Dilemma: US, Iran Set Clashing Terms for Talks' *Times Now* (11 May 2026) <https://www.timesnownews.com/world/middle-east/the-5-demand-dilemma-us-iran-set-clashing-terms-for-talks-article-154338034> accessed 26 June 2026.

³¹ Thomas Watkins, 'What Is in Iran's 10-Point Peace Plan?' *The National* (Washington, 8 April 2026) <https://www.thenationalnews.com/news/us/2026/04/08/what-is-in-irans-10-point-peace-plan/> accessed 26 June 2026.

opening of the Strait of Hormuz. Immediately upon the inception of the ceasefire, Iran alleged the US of violating the 10-point plan by continuing the Israeli attacks on its ally, Lebanon, entering the Iranian airspace with drones, and denying Iran's right to uranium enrichment.³²

In return, the US claimed that Lebanon was never a part of the truce, and that it would stay insistent on Iran surrendering its right to uranium enrichment.

The more than 21-hour negotiation talks between the US and Iran, brokered by Pakistan³³, failed without an agreement in sight, as Iran accused the US of having a maximalist approach towards the situation for the US administration was proposing unrealistic and unreasonable demands³⁴. Iran also conveyed that it is upon the US now to decide whether it can gain Iran's trust. As a response to the continued Israeli attacks on Lebanon, Iran reclosed the Strait of Hormuz, to which the US said that it will destruct the Iranian infrastructure and impose blockade on its naval in the Strait of Hormuz. The US has not released any strategies on how and when it will begin the blockades as of now.

Realising this war which is likely upon the brink of a greater global crisis, it is important to understand why all attempts to negotiate a peace deal have failed between the US and Iran, and what can be done to bring the two sovereign powers to reach an agreement to end the war.

The unsuccessful negotiation attempts between the US and Iran so far could be seen as fuelled by a lack of trust, accusations, threats and demands with a stark contrast between them, rendering them unable to be met with balance. Apart from the undeniable mistrust on both sides, there's been a record of continuous violation of the tentative agreements by both ends, undermining the mutual safety and confidence required to hold effective negotiation talks. The marked mistrust is not only in regard to regional security and sovereignty, but also pertaining to their true purposes behind carrying out this war. In early 2025, the UN's nuclear agency IAEA had found that Iran held enriched uranium, adequate for producing nuclear weapons and it was without any credible civilian purpose³⁵. Iran had said that it wanted to have a safe nuclear

³² 'Iran Accuses US of Violating Ceasefire Terms Before Talks Begin' *News18* (9 April 2026) <https://www.news18.com/world/iran-accuses-us-of-violating-ceasefire-terms-before-talks-begin-ws-l-10022716.html> accessed 26 June 2026.

³³ Lekshmy Pavithran, 'No Deal After 21 Hours of Talks: Why US-Iran Marathon Negotiations Collapsed in Pakistan' *Gulf News* (12 April 2026) <https://gulfnews.com/world/asia/pakistan/no-deal-after-21-hours-of-talks-why-us-iran-marathon-negotiations-collapsed-in-pakistan-1.500504124> accessed 26 June 2026.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ '2025–2026 Iran–United States negotiations' *Wikipedia* https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2025%E2%80%932026_Iran%E2%80%93United_States_negotiations accessed

program for the production of nuclear energy. On the other hand, The US has had a history of military interventions in nations like Iraq and Venezuela for securing oil reserves³⁶, as stated by analysts and researchers. Hence, it's also crucial that both nations put forward their primary aims in order to resolve the deeper conflicts.

From their history of failed peace talks, it could be seen that negotiation between the United States and Iran may be unlikely, but not impossible. One way of initiating and leading another attempt of mediation between these two states, is through initially developing trust between the parties by a neutral broker who could bring them to sign a tentative agreement to suspend all military attacks on all fronts, not only by themselves but also by their allies. Secondly, in case of an impasse, where direct talks have ceased, the mediator could perform shuttle diplomacy, travelling back and forth between the parties, taking one party's demands to the other, engaging in indirect exchanges until the deadlock is dissolved. The Mediator should also try to bring the states to reveal their true purposes to better understand their motives behind the war, transcending the superficial proposals. Besides, it is also the duty of both the states to involve in respectful negotiations, not motivated by threat or accusation.

In grave times like this, it is not solely the conflicting states' willingness to end the war that counts, but also the collective diplomacy and determination of other nations to begin an attempt for peace between them, and aim at reinstating global stability.

CONCLUSION

The Camp David Accords of 1978 and the Belfast Agreement of 1998 are two paramount examples which emerge with the sheer potential of negotiation and mediation as effective conflict resolution mechanisms in the most despairing of cases. In both the cases, the US played the role of an effective, impartial mediator and continues to play the same in the current case of Israel and Palestine. Stability can be restored in the most turbulent of times through a resolution to seek long-term peace, and a mutual diplomatic effort toward achieving it. Although different conflicts and wars call for different demands, some of the common ways in which novel effort for negotiation and mediation could be prompted between these tense states, are through armistice agreements which provide for decommissioning of weapons on both

26 June 2026.

³⁶ Jackie Northam, 'Trump's Oil Strategy in Venezuela and Iraq Raises Questions About Chevron, Rubio and Vitol' NPR (4 February 2026) <https://www.npr.org/2026/02/04/nx-s1-5672744/trump-oil-venezuela-iraq-chevron-rubio-vitol> accessed 26 June 2026.

sides in order to develop trust, thus, slowly moving in a peaceful direction, power-sharing institutions for cooperation, and the principle of mutual recognition where both the states have to recognise each other's sovereignty, and agree on security. The 1978 Accords between Egypt and Israel are instrumental in proving that a peace process could be held effective between Israel and an Arab state. As far as the Russo-Ukrainian, and the current US-Israeli and Iranian wars are concerned, a lack of trust and vehement resistance on each side are what make it less likely to be cases for effective negotiation but it is not impossible, if neutral, international third-party organisations come up with a feasible plan to mediate these fragile situations.