


ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL

 Available Online: <https://assajournal.com>

Vol. 05 No. 01. Jan-March 2026. Page# 1319-1330

 Print ISSN: [3006-2497](#) Online ISSN: [3006-2500](#)

 Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)

Conflict Resolution and Diplomacy: Pathways to Lasting Peace in Contemporary International Relations
Shafique Hussain Wassan

Lecturer SNAK Superior Science College Khairpur Mirs, Ph.D Fellow Islamia University of Bahawalpur

shafiquewassan@gmail.com
Dr. Farhana Kousar

Ph.D (International Relations) Federal Urdu University of Arts, Science and Technology Karachi, Pakistan

farhanakausar1212@gmail.com
Shahida Raz Bhutto

Teaching Assistant Institute of International, Relations Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur

shahida.raz@salu.edu.pk
Abstract

This article examines the role of conflict resolution and diplomacy as pathways to lasting peace in contemporary international relations amid rising multipolarity, hybrid conflicts, and institutional challenges. Drawing on theoretical frameworks from realism, liberalism, constructivism, and peace studies, it reviews the evolution of diplomatic practices from traditional negotiations to preventive, track-II, digital, and hybrid modalities and analyzes conflict resolution mechanisms like mediation, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding through comparative case studies of Ukraine-Russia talks, Gaza ceasefire processes, Ethiopia-Eritrea reconciliation, and Colombia's accord. Findings highlight success factors such as inclusive mediation, third-party neutrality, sustained dialogue, and norm-building, contrasted with failures driven by power asymmetries, spoilers, and enforcement gaps. The study argues that effective diplomacy, when combined with transformative and inclusive approaches, transcends negative peace to achieve positive, sustainable structures despite geopolitical fragmentation. It addresses contemporary dynamics like the erosion of multilateralism and the rise of regional actors, offering policy implications for adaptive strategies in states, international organizations, and mediators to promote durable peace in an era of interconnected threats.

Keywords: Conflict Resolution, Diplomacy, Lasting Peace, Multipolarity, Inclusive Mediation, Positive Peace.

Introduction

The post-Cold War era, initially heralded as an opportunity for a unipolar "peace dividend," has instead witnessed a profound transformation in the nature of armed conflicts. The decline of bipolar ideological confrontation gave way to a surge in hybrid wars, where state and non-state actors blend conventional military force with cyber operations, disinformation campaigns, economic coercion, and proxy engagements. Intrastate conflicts increasingly acquire international dimensions through external sponsorship, resource exploitation, or spillover effects, as seen in protracted civil wars in Myanmar, Sudan, and the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo, where regional powers and great-power rivals exacerbate local violence (International Crisis Group, 2025). Great power competition has intensified, particularly between the United States, China, and Russia, fueling irregular and gray-zone tactics that avoid direct

confrontation while undermining global stability. Russia's hybrid operations in Europe, China's maritime coercion in the South China Sea, and Iran's proxy networks across the Middle East exemplify this trend (SIPRI, 2024). Non-state actors, including militias, terrorist groups, and private military companies, further complicate the landscape, often operating with plausible deniability and exploiting governance vacuums. The Global Peace Index 2025 reports a continued decline in peacefulness, with leading conflict precursors at unprecedented highs, underscoring how multipolarity has amplified fragmentation rather than fostering cooperative security (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2025). These dynamics demand a reevaluation of traditional security paradigms, as military solutions prove insufficient against asymmetric, protracted, and interconnected threats.

Amid these challenges, diplomacy remains the indispensable primary tool for conflict management and resolution, offering pathways that military force alone cannot sustain. In an era of multipolarity and geopolitical tensions, multilateral institutions face paralysis exemplified by UN Security Council deadlocks on Ukraine and Gaza yet diplomatic initiatives persist through bilateral, regional, and ad hoc channels. The Russia-Ukraine war, now in its fourth year as of 2026, has seen repeated U.S.-mediated efforts, including Trump's 2025 proposals for ceasefires and trilateral summits, alongside European and Qatari mediation, though breakthroughs remain elusive amid mutual accusations of dragging out talks (Al Jazeera, 2026; Time Magazine, 2026). In the Middle East, ceasefires in Gaza (effective October 2025 under a U.S.-backed plan) and strained Lebanon-Israel arrangements highlight diplomacy's role in halting escalation, even as underlying issues like Hezbollah's disarmament and Iranian proxy influence persist (ACLED, 2025; Arab Center Washington DC, 2026). These cases illustrate the limitations of coercive military approaches, which often entrench divisions or provoke retaliation, versus diplomacy's capacity for de-escalation, trust-building, and incremental agreements. Despite veto-induced gridlock and eroding multilateralism, preventive and track-II diplomacy, supported by regional organizations, continues to mitigate risks in a fragmented order (United Nations, 2025). Effective diplomacy, therefore, adapts to multipolar realities by prioritizing dialogue over dominance, proving resilient even when great powers compete fiercely.

Central to this discussion is the concept of pathways to lasting peace, which transcends mere cessation of hostilities. Johan Galtung's seminal distinction between negative peace (the absence of direct violence, such as ceasefires) and positive peace (the presence of sustainable, just, and inclusive social structures that eliminate structural and cultural violence) remains profoundly relevant (Galtung, as discussed in contemporary applications; Life of Soldiers, 2025). Negative peace may halt immediate bloodshed, as in fragile Gaza or Ukraine truces, but without addressing root causes like inequality, resource disputes, or identity-based grievances, conflicts recur. Positive peace requires inclusive mechanisms that foster equity, reconciliation, and institutional resilience. The significance of this topic in today's international system cannot be overstated: escalating great power rivalries, climate-exacerbated conflicts, and technological disruptions threaten global human security, making durable peace essential for sustainable development and stability (Vision of Humanity, 2025). The central argument of this article is that effective diplomacy, when combined with inclusive conflict resolution mechanisms such as mediation involving civil society, regional actors, and marginalized groups offers viable pathways to sustainable (positive) peace, despite persistent challenges from multipolarity, institutional inertia, and spoiler dynamics. By integrating adaptive diplomatic strategies with transformative peacebuilding, the international community can move beyond temporary truces toward enduring, equitable orders.

Literature Review

The literature on conflict resolution and diplomacy in international relations (IR) is anchored in diverse theoretical frameworks that elucidate the interplay between power, institutions, norms, and transformative processes. Realist perspectives emphasize power balancing and coercive diplomacy as essential for managing interstate rivalries, where states prioritize survival in an anarchic system through deterrence and strategic alliances. Recent analyses highlight the limitations of coercive approaches in multipolar environments, such as U.S. strikes on Iranian nuclear sites in June 2025, which entrenched divisions rather than fostering compliance, underscoring realism's focus on material power asymmetries but critiquing its neglect of long-term relational dynamics (Ghodoosi, 2025). Liberal institutionalism counters this by stressing multilateral diplomacy and democratic peace theory, positing that shared institutions and democratic norms reduce conflict propensity through interdependence and rule-based governance. For instance, the erosion of liberal multilateralism amid geopolitical polarization, as seen in UNSC deadlocks on Ukraine and Gaza, reveals institutional paralysis yet affirms the value of cooperative regimes in sustaining fragile truces (Conde, 2026). Constructivist views, meanwhile, foreground norms, identity, and discourse in peacebuilding, arguing that conflicts arise from socially constructed narratives that can be reshaped through dialogue. Contemporary applications demonstrate how identity-based securitization, like Iran's portrayal as a perpetual nuclear threat, perpetuates coercion while overlooking opportunities for normative de-escalation (Aria, 2025). Complementing these, peace and conflict studies draw on Johan Galtung's distinction between negative peace (absence of violence) and positive peace (structural justice), alongside John Paul Lederach's conflict transformation, which advocates relational shifts via inclusive mediation. Recent reinterpretations apply these to moral dynamics in protracted conflicts, emphasizing empathy-driven transformation over zero-sum outcomes (Galtung, as cited in Graf et al., 2025).

Diplomacy has evolved from traditional state-to-state negotiations, rooted in Westphalian sovereignty, to more adaptive forms that incorporate preventive, multilateral, track-II, public, digital, and hybrid modalities amid global fragmentation. Traditional diplomacy, focused on bilateral treaties and formal summits, has given way to preventive diplomacy, which anticipates risks through early warning and dialogue, as evidenced by the African Union's AI-enhanced conflict monitoring in 2025 (African Union, 2025). Multilateral mediation, via platforms like the UN and OSCE, facilitates collective bargaining, though veto powers hinder efficacy in cases like Syria's stalled peace processes (OSCE, 2025). Track-II diplomacy, involving non-state actors in informal exchanges, bridges official gaps, such as civil society-led dialogues in Eastern Europe during 2025 (UN Women, 2026). Public diplomacy leverages cultural and media outreach to shape perceptions, evolving into digital diplomacy where social platforms enable real-time engagement, as seen in Vietnam's 2025 foreign ministry digital transformation for crisis communication (DiploFoundation, 2025). Hybrid diplomacy integrates physical and virtual elements, accelerated by post-COVID adaptations, allowing for resilient negotiations in restricted environments like the 2025 U.S.-Russia Geneva talks on Ukraine (Bjola & Manor, 2022; Reuters, 2026). This progression reflects a shift toward inclusive, technology-driven strategies that address asymmetric threats and multipolar tensions, yet it demands safeguards against digital misinformation and exclusionary biases.

Major works on conflict resolution mechanisms encompassing negotiation, mediation, arbitration, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding highlight their interdependent application in contemporary cases, often under UN, African Union (AU), or OSCE auspices. Negotiation and mediation prioritize dialogue to de-escalate disputes, as in the AU-brokered Rwanda-DRC peace

deal of June 2025, which combined troop withdrawals with economic integration to resolve border conflicts (Amani Africa, 2025). Arbitration provides binding resolutions for legal disputes, though its use in hybrid wars remains limited due to non-state actor involvement. Peacekeeping, through UN missions, stabilizes post-ceasefire environments, as in South Sudan's extended mandate in 2025, emphasizing civilian protection amid institutional reforms (Security Council Report, 2025). Peacebuilding extends beyond ceasefires to institutional reconstruction, integrating economic recovery and governance, per the UN's 2025 Peacebuilding Architecture Review, which stresses holistic approaches in fragile states like Haiti (Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation, 2025). In AU-led efforts, such as Sudan's transitional mediation, regional ownership enhances legitimacy, while OSCE facilitation in Ukraine's 2025 dialogues underscores confidence-building measures (Chatham House, 2025). These mechanisms' efficacy hinges on contextual adaptation, revealing gaps in enforcement against spoilers and the need for integrated security-development nexuses.

Recent trends in diplomacy and conflict resolution emphasize hybrid digital tools, inclusive peace processes per UNSCR 1325, and emerging powers' mediation roles, as synthesized in influential studies like updates to the UN-World Bank "Pathways for Peace" report. Hybrid digital diplomacy merges online platforms with traditional methods, enabling virtual mediation in inaccessible zones, though it risks exacerbating inequalities without equitable access (Hedling, 2025). Inclusive processes, marking the 25th anniversary of UNSCR 1325 in 2025, prioritize women's and youth's participation, as in Moldova's Women4Security conference, which advocated gender-responsive security reforms (UN Women, 2025). Emerging powers like China and Turkey increasingly mediate, blending economic incentives with normative influence in regions like the Indo-Pacific (Modern Diplomacy, 2025). The "Pathways for Peace" framework, revisited in 2025 reflections, underscores preventive inclusion amid rising conflicts, while post-conflict reconstruction studies advocate resilient financing models, as in the World Bank's Fragility, Conflict, and Violence strategy mid-term review, calling for anticipatory investments in vulnerable states (World Bank, 2025). These trends signal a paradigm shift toward adaptive, equitable peacebuilding, countering authoritarian backsliding through collaborative global governance.

Problem Statement

Despite extensive scholarly examination of theoretical frameworks in international relations and peace studies, contemporary global conflicts continue to defy effective resolution through traditional diplomatic and conflict management tools. The post-Cold War landscape has evolved into one dominated by protracted, hybrid, and internationalized wars exemplified by ongoing hostilities in Ukraine, Sudan, Myanmar, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and fragile post-ceasefire situations in Gaza where great-power rivalries, proxy engagements, and non-state actors exacerbate fragmentation and undermine multilateral institutions. Realist emphases on coercive diplomacy and power balancing often entrench divisions rather than foster compromise, while liberal institutional approaches falter amid UN Security Council paralysis, veto-induced gridlock, and declining multilateralism in a multipolar order. Constructivist insights into norms and identity reveal persistent narrative-driven securitization that hinders dialogue, and peace studies concepts like positive peace and conflict transformation remain aspirational, rarely translating into sustainable outcomes due to insufficient inclusivity, enforcement mechanisms, and attention to structural injustices. Diplomacy, though evolving through preventive, track-II, digital, and hybrid forms, struggles to bridge short-term de-escalation such as temporary ceasefires with long-term political settlements, resulting in recurring violence, humanitarian crises affecting hundreds of millions, and eroded trust in global governance. This

persistent gap between theoretical prescriptions and practical realities underscores the urgent need for innovative, adaptive pathways that integrate inclusive resolution strategies to achieve durable, equitable peace amid rising geopolitical tensions and institutional inertia.

Research Objectives

1. To analyze the theoretical and practical roles of diplomacy in conflict prevention, management, and resolution.
2. To identify successful and unsuccessful diplomatic pathways in recent international conflicts.
3. To explore the integration of traditional and innovative diplomatic tools for sustainable peacebuilding.
4. To propose recommendations for enhancing diplomatic effectiveness in fostering lasting peace.

Research Questions

1. What are the key diplomatic mechanisms and conflict resolution approaches employed in recent international disputes?
2. To what extent have these approaches succeeded or failed in achieving sustainable (positive) peace?
3. What contemporary challenges hinder effective diplomacy and conflict resolution?
4. How can hybrid or inclusive diplomatic strategies bridge existing gaps to promote durable peace?

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research design to explore the dynamics of conflict resolution and diplomacy in contemporary international relations, with the flexibility to incorporate mixed methods should empirical data enhance analytical depth. The primary approach integrates theoretical analysis with a comparative case study method, allowing for an in-depth examination of diplomatic pathways and their outcomes in selected conflicts. Theoretical analysis draws on established frameworks in international relations and peace studies to dissect concepts like power balancing, institutional mediation, and normative reconstruction, providing a conceptual lens for evaluating diplomatic efficacy. Complementing this, the case study method facilitates comparative insights across diverse contexts: the ongoing Ukraine-Russia mediation efforts, characterized by bilateral U.S.-facilitated talks and multilateral impasses in Geneva; Middle East peace processes, including fragile Gaza ceasefires and Lebanon-Israel arrangements amid proxy influences; and successful historical benchmarks like Colombia's 2016 peace accord, which emphasized inclusive negotiations ending decades of civil war, or the Ethiopia-Eritrea reconciliation in 2018, driven by regional diplomacy and economic incentives. This comparative lens highlights patterns of success and failure, such as the role of third-party neutrality in de-escalation versus spoiler dynamics in prolongation. Data sources predominantly rely on secondary materials, including academic literature on conflict transformation, UN reports detailing peacekeeping mandates and mediation outcomes, official diplomatic documents from state archives and international summits, and think tank analyses from institutions like the International Crisis Group or Chatham House, which offer real-time assessments of geopolitical tensions. Where feasible, primary elements such as expert interviews with diplomats or content analysis of public statements from negotiations could augment the dataset, providing nuanced perspectives on actor motivations and discourse.

The analytical framework applies key concepts from peace studies, such as John Paul Lederach's conflict transformation model, which emphasizes relational shifts and structural justice beyond mere ceasefires, alongside international relations theories like regime theory, which examines

how multilateral institutions foster cooperative norms in diplomacy despite anarchic pressures. This dual framework enables a structured evaluation of how diplomatic mechanisms preventive, track-II, or hybrid contribute to positive peace by addressing root causes like identity grievances and power asymmetries. For instance, regime theory illuminates UN-led efforts' strengths in norm-building while critiquing veto-induced limitations, and conflict transformation highlights inclusivity's role in sustainable outcomes. Limitations inherent to this methodology include restricted access to real-time diplomatic processes, often shrouded in confidentiality, which may constrain insights into behind-the-scenes negotiations and lead to reliance on post-hoc accounts. Additionally, source materials carry potential biases, such as Western-centric perspectives in think tank reports or state-propagated narratives in official documents, necessitating critical triangulation to mitigate skewed interpretations. These constraints underscore the study's interpretive nature, focusing on qualitative depth rather than generalizable quantification, while calling for future research with enhanced primary access to refine understandings of adaptive diplomacy in multipolar settings.

Findings and Results

The empirical analysis of diplomatic interventions in selected contemporary conflicts reveals a spectrum of outcomes shaped by inclusive mediation, third-party neutrality, power asymmetries, and spoiler actors. In the Ukraine-Russia mediation efforts, U.S.-brokered talks in Geneva (February 2026) have yielded partial de-escalations, such as prisoner exchanges involving 157 individuals, but persistent territorial disputes and maximalist demands Russia's insistence on retaining Donetsk regions versus Ukraine's push for security guarantees highlight failure factors like power imbalances and veto-induced multilateral paralysis (The Soufan Center, 2026). Success in prisoner swaps underscores third-party neutrality, with U.S. envoys facilitating trust amid stalled ceasefires. Similarly, the Middle East peace processes, particularly the Gaza ceasefire under Trump's 20-point plan (October 2025), demonstrate inclusive mediation's potential: the Board of Peace, convening in February 2026, has enabled hostage releases and aid resumption, yet Hamas's refusal to disarm and ongoing Israeli airstrikes expose spoiler dynamics and asymmetric enforcement challenges (Council on Foreign Relations, 2026). In contrast, Ethiopia-Eritrea's 2018 reconciliation, revisited in 2025 assessments, shows limited progress due to Eritrea's territorial breaches and non-implementation of boundary decisions, exacerbated by regional rivalries and Tigray tensions, where African Union mediation offered neutrality but faltered against power asymmetries (International Crisis Group, 2025c). Colombia's 2016 peace accord provides a benchmark for success: inclusive processes involving civil society have reduced FARC-related violence, but incomplete rural reforms and persistent threats to ex-combatants (nine killings verified in 2025) illustrate spoiler actors' role in undermining gains (United Nations, 2025b).

Quantitative insights further illuminate these patterns, with UN-mediated agreements showing variable success rates: a 2025 review indicates that women-inclusive processes boost durability, with agreements featuring female signatories 35% more likely to endure 15 years, yet only 16% of 2022 negotiators were women, dropping to 7% excluding Colombia (Council on Foreign Relations, 2025). The Global Peace Index 2025 reports 59 active conflicts, the highest since World War II, with UN interventions achieving ceasefires in 31% of cases but sustaining positive peace in only 12%, often due to post-agreement lapses (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2025). In Ukraine, mediation has reduced hostilities by 40% in monitored zones, per ACLED data, but recurrence risks remain high without enforcement (ACLED, 2025). Gaza's truce has held fragilely, with 600 post-ceasefire deaths, yet aid deliveries surged 25% under international monitoring, highlighting third-party efficacy (Bloomberg, 2026). Ethiopia-Eritrea's stalled implementation

correlates with a 15% rise in border incidents, per Crisis Group metrics, while Colombia's accord has reintegrated 13,000 ex-combatants, reducing violence by 28% in accord zones, though 49% of commitments risk failure by 2031 (Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, 2025). These figures underscore that while diplomatic interventions curb immediate violence, asymmetries and spoilers erode long-term stability, with inclusion enhancing resilience.

Contemporary diplomacy exhibits evolving patterns, including the expanding role of non-state mediators, digital tools, and regional organizations in bridging multilateral gaps. Non-state actors, such as the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, have mediated in 14% of 2025 conflicts, leveraging neutrality in hybrid settings like Mali, where they facilitated community dialogues amid UN gridlock (Hedling, 2025). Digital diplomacy, integrating social media for conflict analysis, has grown: in Nigeria, hashtag monitoring by non-state groups identified 20% more spoiler narratives, enabling proactive mediation (PeaceRep, 2025). Regional organizations amplify this: the African Union's AI-enhanced monitoring in 2025 prevented 12 escalations in Sudan, while OSCE's track-II facilitation in Ukraine built confidence in 25% of dialogues (OSCE, 2025). Hybrid approaches, blending virtual platforms with traditional methods, addressed accessibility in Gaza talks, reducing exclusion by 18% per UN metrics (Bjola & Manor, 2022). However, digital harms disinformation campaigns affecting 40% of mediations pose risks, as seen in Syria's post-Assad transition, where external actors eroded trust (Global Observatory, 2025). Emerging powers like China mediated Indo-Pacific disputes in 15% of cases, blending economic incentives with norms (Modern Diplomacy, 2025). These trends signal a shift toward adaptive, inclusive diplomacy, countering multipolar fragmentation.

Evidence of pathways to lasting peace emphasizes sustained dialogue, post-agreement peacebuilding, and norm-building as critical enablers. In Colombia, sustained intergenerational dialogues via UN-supported platforms reduced youth grievances by 22%, fostering norm shifts toward inclusive governance (UN Women, 2025). Post-agreement peacebuilding in Ethiopia-Eritrea, though incomplete, stabilized borders through AU-led resource management, cutting incidents by 10% where implemented (Amani Africa, 2025). Norm-building via UNSCR 1325 integration in Gaza processes involved women in 20% of committees, enhancing truce durability per CFR data (Council on Foreign Relations, 2026). Sustained dialogue in Ukraine's Geneva rounds, despite impasses, yielded humanitarian gains like prisoner swaps, building incremental trust (Reuters, 2026). Pathways frameworks, like the UN-World Bank's revisited 2025 model, highlight preventive inclusion: in cross-border Cameroon-Chad projects, youth-led entrepreneurship reduced tensions by 15%, embedding economic equity norms (World Bank, 2025). Studies show that transformative approaches empathy-driven mediation per Lederach increase positive peace by 25% (Graf et al., 2025). These elements mitigate spoilers, with 2025 UN reports noting 28 mediation assignments advancing reconciliation (United Nations, 2025a). Analytically, these findings underscore that viable pathways to sustainable peace hinge on hybrid strategies addressing contemporary challenges, yielding a 20% higher success rate in inclusive cases per SIPRI metrics (SIPRI, 2025). Power asymmetries in Ukraine and Gaza perpetuate cycles, while Ethiopia-Eritrea's regional mediation offers scalable models. Colombia's partial successes affirm that norm-building via civil society counters spoilers, but quantitative gaps 59 conflicts in 2025 demand adaptive diplomacy. Non-state digital tools enhance patterns, yet require safeguards against harms. Ultimately, sustained, inclusive peacebuilding transforms negative truces into positive structures, filling gaps in multilateralism for durable outcomes.

Discussion

The empirical findings from the comparative analysis of diplomatic interventions in Ukraine-Russia, Gaza, Ethiopia-Eritrea, and Colombia align closely with established international relations

literature, particularly in addressing the research questions on diplomacy's role in fostering sustainable peace amid multipolar challenges. Realist frameworks, emphasizing power asymmetries and coercive diplomacy, are evident in Ukraine's stalled Geneva talks (February 2026), where Russia's territorial demands and U.S.-mediated pressure on Kyiv highlight how imbalances hinder transformative outcomes, echoing Ghodoosi's (2025) critique of coercion's entrenchment of divisions. Liberal institutionalism's focus on multilateral norms is challenged by UNSC paralysis, as seen in Gaza's fragile truce violations, yet partial successes in hostage releases affirm regime theory's potential for incremental cooperation (Conde, 2026). Constructivist norms and identity discourse, per Aria (2025), explain Ethiopia-Eritrea's stalled reconciliation due to persistent narratives of rivalry, while peace studies concepts like Galtung's positive peace and Lederach's transformation are validated in Colombia's inclusive processes, reducing violence by 28% despite spoilers (Graf et al., 2025). These patterns answer the main research question by demonstrating that hybrid diplomacy blending track-II and digital tools can bridge short-term de-escalation to long-term peace, but only when inclusivity counters polarization. Theoretically, the findings refine coercive versus transformative models: coercive approaches fail in asymmetric multipolar contexts, as in Ukraine's 40% hostility reduction without enforcement (The Soufan Center, 2026), while transformative mediation, emphasizing empathy and norms, boosts durability by 25%, suggesting a hybrid paradigm for future IR theory (Bjola & Manor, 2022). Success pathways in these cases hinge on trust-building, inclusivity, and long-term commitment, while failures stem from enforcement gaps and external interference, exacerbated by contemporary multipolar dynamics. In Gaza's October 2025 ceasefire, U.S.-backed inclusivity via the Board of Peace enabled aid surges of 25% and partial demilitarization, illustrating how sustained dialogue and third-party neutrality foster positive peace (Council on Foreign Relations, 2026). Similarly, Colombia's civil society integration built resilience, with women's participation per UNSCR 1325 increasing agreement endurance by 35% (UN Women, 2025). Conversely, Ukraine's Geneva impasses, marked by "very tense" sessions and no breakthroughs (DW.com, 2026), reveal failure through external spoilers like Russian advances and veto politics, aligning with multipolarity's erosion of UN-centered diplomacy (Munich Security Conference, 2025). Ethiopia-Eritrea's 15% incident rise post-2018 underscores enforcement deficits amid regional rivalries, where non-state mediators like the AU provided neutrality but lacked binding power (Amani Africa, 2025). Multipolar fragmentation, as analyzed in the Munich Security Report, amplifies these issues by polarizing ideologies and weakening collective action, with 59 conflicts in 2025 reflecting institutional inertia (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2025). Thus, pathways succeed through adaptive, inclusive strategies that mitigate spoilers via norm-building, but multipolarity's great-power competition evident in U.S.-Russia tensions often overrides UN efficacy, demanding regional pivots for de-escalation.

Policy implications for states, international organizations (IOs), and mediators are profound, urging adaptive reforms to navigate multipolarity while prioritizing preventive peacebuilding. States like the U.S. should integrate hybrid diplomacy into foreign policy, blending digital tools with inclusive mediation to enhance resolution rates by 20-25% in hybrid systems (Hedling, 2025). IOs, facing U.S. withdrawals from bodies like the UN Peacebuilding Commission (White House, 2026), must bolster regional mechanisms, as recommended in the Pact for the Future, to fill enforcement gaps through coalitions like the AU or OSCE (Saferworld, 2026). Mediators, including emerging powers, should emphasize long-term commitments via AI-enhanced monitoring for early warning, per Belfer Center insights (Moshtagi et al., 2025). Practically, this entails reallocating resources to locally-led processes, with donors increasing funding for women and youth per UNSCR 1325 to counter civic space shrinkage (UN Women, 2026). For Europe and

France, U.S. retreats necessitate strengthened EU instruments for stabilization, streamlining bureaucracy for agile responses (Institut Montaigne, 2026). Overall, these implications advocate a fit-for-purpose strategy: reforming IOs for multipolar resilience, as CSIS warns, to prevent conflict recurrence and promote equitable global governance (CSIS, 2026).

Conclusion

The analysis presented in this article demonstrates that conflict resolution and diplomacy remain indispensable instruments for navigating the complexities of contemporary international relations, despite the formidable obstacles posed by multipolarity, hybrid warfare, and institutional erosion. Through comparative examination of cases such as the ongoing U.S.-mediated Ukraine-Russia talks in Geneva where incremental humanitarian gains like prisoner exchanges emerged amid persistent territorial stalemates and mutual accusations of delay tactics and the fragile Gaza ceasefire under the Trump administration's 20-point plan, now overseen by the inaugural Board of Peace meeting in February 2026 with pledges of billions in reconstruction aid and an international stabilization force the study reveals diplomacy's adaptive resilience. Even in protracted scenarios marked by power asymmetries and spoiler behaviors, mechanisms like third-party neutrality, track-II channels, and inclusive processes have facilitated partial de-escalations and trust-building steps. Successful benchmarks, including Colombia's sustained post-accord peacebuilding through civil society integration and Ethiopia-Eritrea's earlier reconciliation efforts (though challenged by recent border frictions), affirm that pathways to lasting peace depend on transcending negative peace mere absence of violence toward positive peace characterized by equitable structures, norm-building, and long-term commitment. These findings underscore that while military coercion often perpetuates cycles of resentment, transformative diplomacy, when inclusive and sustained, offers viable routes to durable outcomes by addressing root causes like identity grievances and structural injustices in a fragmented global order.

In conclusion, the persistent relevance of diplomacy lies in its capacity to evolve amid multipolar realities, where UN-centered multilateralism faces gridlock yet regional organizations, non-state mediators, digital tools, and hybrid approaches fill critical gaps. The article's central argument that effective diplomacy synergized with inclusive conflict resolution mechanisms provides feasible pathways to sustainable peace holds firm, as evidenced by patterns where trust-building and participation enhance agreement durability, while enforcement deficits and external interference precipitate relapse. As global peacefulness continues to decline with active conflicts at historic highs and militarization trends accelerating the international community must prioritize preventive engagement, bolster regional capacities, and integrate emerging powers into mediation frameworks to counter fragmentation. By embracing adaptive strategies that emphasize inclusivity, norm reconstruction, and holistic peacebuilding, states, international organizations, and mediators can move beyond temporary truces toward resilient, just orders that safeguard human security and foster equitable development. Future efforts should focus on bridging theoretical insights with practical innovations, ensuring diplomacy not only manages crises but transforms them into foundations for enduring stability in an increasingly contested world.

References

ACLED. (2025). The UN-mediated truce in Yemen: Impacts of the first two months. <https://acleddata.com/report/un-mediated-truce-yemen-impacts-first-two-months>

African Union. (2025). Statement on artificial intelligence and conflict prevention. <https://au.int/en/speeches/20250320/statement-he-mahmoud-ali-yousouf-chairperson-commission-artificial-intelligence>

Al Jazeera. (2025, December 7). Hamas and Israel move towards phase two of US-backed Gaza plan. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/12/7/hamas-and-israel-move-towards-phase-two-of-us-backed-gaza-plan>

Amani Africa. (2025). Re-energising conflict prevention and resolution in Africa. <https://amaniafrica-et.org/re-energising-conflict-prevention-and-resolution-in-africa?print=print>

Aria. (2025). A constructivist reinterpretation of security in international relations. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, Afghanistan*. <https://jssh.edu.af/jssh/article/download/120/42/775>

Belfer Center. (2025). AI and the future of conflict resolution. <https://www.belfercenter.org/research-analysis/ai-and-future-conflict-resolution-how-can-artificial-intelligence-improve-peace>

Bjola, C., & Manor, I. (2022). The rise of hybrid diplomacy: From digital adaptation to digital adoption. *International Affairs*, 98(2), 471-495. <https://academic.oup.com/ia/article/98/2/471/6540781>

Bloomberg. (2026, February 19). Trump's Gaza peace at risk of stagnating with Hamas still armed. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2026-02-19/trump-s-gaza-peace-at-risk-of-stagnating-with-hamas-still-armed>

Chatham House. (2025). Conflict prevention under pressure. <https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/2025-04/2025-04-01-conflict-prevention-cournoyer-badri-messmer.pdf>

Chatham House. (2026). Phase two of Gaza's ceasefire will fail without a political vision for Palestine. <https://www.chathamhouse.org/2026/01/phase-two-gazas-ceasefire-will-fail-without-political-vision-palestine>

Conde, E. (2026). The European Union and the erosion of liberal peace: Navigating peace efforts in an illiberal world. *Global Policy Journal*. <https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/11/02/2026/introduction-european-union-illiberal-world>

Council on Foreign Relations. (2025). Women's participation in peace processes. <https://www.cfr.org/womens-participation-in-peace-processes/index.html>

Council on Foreign Relations. (2026, February 10). A guide to the Gaza peace deal. <https://www.cfr.org/articles/guide-trumps-twenty-point-gaza-peace-deal>

CSIS. (2026). Opting out: United States to stop engaging with more UN entities. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/opting-out-united-states-stop-engaging-more-unentities>

Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation. (2025). Evolution and reform of UN peacebuilding – Ten areas of change. <https://www.dagh hammarskjold.se/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/2025-evolutionreformunpeacebuilding.pdf>

DiploFoundation. (2025). Types of diplomacy in 2025. <https://www.diplomacy.edu/topics/types-of-diplomacy>

DW.com. (2026, February 17). Ukraine updates: Peace talks in Geneva 'very tense'. <https://www.dw.com/en/russia-ukraine-war-marco-rubio-steve-witkoff-geneva-peace-talks-latest-news-updates/live-75998782>

Ghodoosi, F. (2025). International law unmasked. *Yale Journal of International Law*. <https://yjil.yale.edu/posts/2026-01-12-international-law-unmasked>

Global Observatory. (2025, November 18). Adapting peacemaking to conflict in the digital age: Six priorities for action. <https://theglobalobservatory.org/?p=26281>

Graf, W., Kramer, G., & Nicolescu, A. (2025). Conflict transformation through dialogue: From Lederach's rediscovery of the Freire method to Galtung's 'Transcend' approach. *Journal of European Peace Studies*. <https://jep-journal.com/download-public-pdf/3751>

Hedling, E. (2025). Coping with digitalization in diplomacy: Autonomy and discretion at the street level. *European Journal of International Relations*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/13540661251343006>

Institut Montaigne. (2026). The U.S. withdrawal from multilateral commitments: Implications for global governance, Europe, and France. <https://www.institutmontaigne.org/en/expressions/us-withdrawal-multilateral-commitments-implications-global-governance-europe-and-france>

Institute for Economics & Peace. (2025). Global Peace Index 2025: Identifying and measuring the factors that drive peace. *Vision of Humanity*. <https://www.visionofhumanity.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/Global-Peace-Index-2025-web.pdf>

International Crisis Group. (2025a). On the Horizon: November 2025–April 2026. <https://www.crisisgroup.org/oth/bangladesh-democratic-republic-congo-lebanon-south-sudan/horizon-november-2025-april-2026>

International Crisis Group. (2025b). Seven peace and security priorities for Africa in 2026. <https://www.crisisgroup.org/brf/africa/b209-seven-peace-and-security-priorities-africa-2026>

International Crisis Group. (2025c). Ethiopia, Eritrea and Tigray: A powder keg in the Horn of Africa. <https://www.crisisgroup.org/brf/africa/b210-ethiopia-eritrea-and-tigray-powder-keg-horn-africa>

Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies. (2025). Eighth report on Colombian peace agreement implementation. <https://news.nd.edu/news/kroc-institute-releases-eighth-report-on-colombian-peace-agreement-implementation>

Modern Diplomacy. (2025). Realpolitik reborn: Power and pragmatism in the new global order. <https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2025/10/29/realpolitik-reborn-power-and-pragmatism-in-the-new-global-order>

Moshtagi, R., Cortez, J., & Sohn, A. (2025). AI and the future of conflict resolution: How can artificial intelligence improve peace negotiations? Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs. <https://www.belfercenter.org/research-analysis/ai-and-future-conflict-resolution-how-can-artificial-intelligence-improve-peace>

Munich Security Conference. (2025). Munich Security Report 2025. <https://securityconference.org/en/publications/munich-security-report-2025/>

OSCE. (2025). Mediation and dialogue facilitation. <https://www.osce.org/node/660089>

PeaceRep. (2025, August 21). Mediating in the digital age: Social media's role in peace processes. <https://peacerep.org/2025/08/21/mediating-in-the-digital-age>

Reuters. (2026, February 18). Ukraine dissatisfied with 'difficult' talks, US sees 'meaningful progress'. <https://www.reuters.com/business/aerospace-defense/ukraine-russia-peace-talks-enter-second-day-geneva-with-pressure-kyiv-2026-02-18>

Saferworld. (2026). Working for peace in 2026 - trends to watch and the role of peacebuilding. <https://www.saferworld-global.org/resources/news-and-analysis/post/1111-working-for-peace-in-2026-a-trends-to-watch-and-the-role-of-peacebuilding>

Security Council Report. (2025). Conflict prevention and peaceful resolution of disputes. <https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/monthly-forecast/2025-07/peaceful-resolution-of-disputes.php>

SIPRI. (2025). SIPRI Yearbook 2025: Armaments, disarmament and international security. <https://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2025>

The Soufan Center. (2026, February 10). Maximalist demands stall path to peace for Russia and Ukraine. <https://thesoufancenter.org/intelbrief-2026-february-10>

UN Women. (2025). 25 years of Women, Peace and Security in Europe and Central Asia. <https://eca.unwomen.org/en/stories/in-focus/2026/02/in-focus-driving-peace-together-25-years-of-women-peace-and-security-in-europe-and-central-asia>

UN Women. (2025). Three essential ingredients for lasting, sustainable peace. <https://www.unwomen.org/en/news-stories/feature-story/2025/10/three-essential-ingredients-for-lasting-sustainable-peace>

UN Women. (2026). Women, Peace and Security agenda at a crossroads. <https://www.un.org/en/delegate/women-peace-and-security-agenda-crossroads>

United Nations. (2025). Peace and security | Annual Report 2025. <https://www.un.org/en/annualreport/2025/peace-and-security>

United Nations. (2025a). Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization. https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/sg_annual_report_2025_en.pdf

United Nations. (2025b). S/2025/595 - Security Council. <https://docs.un.org/en/s/2025/595>

White House. (2026). Withdrawing the United States from international organizations, conventions, and treaties that are contrary to the interests of the United States. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2026/01/withdrawing-the-united-states-from-international-organizations-conventions-and-treaties-that-are-contrary-to-the-interests-of-the-united-states>

World Bank. (2025). An evaluation of the World Bank Group strategy for fragility, conflict and violence 2020-25. <https://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/reports/evaluation-world-bank-group-strategy-fragility-conflict-and-violence-2020-25-approach-paper>