



Negotiation does not imply acceptance of the other party; instead, its aim is to explore various facets of a complex issue, identify suitable solutions, and clarify existing challenges. From this viewpoint, negotiation acts as a tool for enhanced interaction and comprehension.



The United States, Iran and five other world powers announced an understanding outlining limits on Iran's nuclear program on April 2, 2015.  
● BRENDAN SMIALOWSKI/AP

the key question remains why Iran's situation is still not better than in the past or compared to neighboring countries. To address the country's problems, corruption must be eliminated, and long-serving officials should step aside to allow young individuals with fresh ideas to enter the arena. Furthermore, the challenges of resolving the nation's issues, even with financial resources like oil revenue and government rents, are not easily overcome. Even in conditions of distrust, negotiating with the opposing side can be an effective tool, provided it is accompanied by self-confidence and appropriate executive mechanisms. The issues at hand cannot be resolved solely through negotiation. Discussions serve as a means for clarifying and fostering mutual understanding of

the matters involved. Negotiation does not imply acceptance of the other party; instead, its aim is to explore various facets of a complex issue, identify suitable solutions, and clarify existing challenges. From this viewpoint, negotiation acts as a tool for enhanced interaction and comprehension. Every negotiator across diverse fields—such as business, economics, politics, culture, and values—should strive to address intricate issues by prioritizing transparency and mutual understanding. This approach should be undertaken to gain greater leverage and resolve problems through the power of the negotiation table.

**Talks, not the sole resolution**  
The concept of negotiation must be properly understood, as a correct understanding can help resolve the country's is-

sues. However, if its essence is not grasped, desired outcomes cannot be achieved.

**'Trust' in foreign policy**  
In critiquing the views of those who oppose negotiation with the US, citing concerns about its untrustworthiness and past breaches of agreements, it is important to emphasize that successful negotiation—particularly in the realm of foreign policy—requires negotiators to possess self-confidence and a strong belief in their objectives. The negotiator should view themselves as powerful and, by clarifying the issues, act rationally and wisely to accurately predict the future of negotiations, using this insight to enhance the current situation and guide future paths. Opponents of negotiation with the US often highlight its untrustworthiness due to its history of breaching agreements.

This concern stems from past instances of the US violating agreements, particularly in international contexts. However, in the realm of politics and diplomacy, negotiation remains feasible even amidst distrust between parties. In such scenarios, rather than avoiding negotiation, legal and diplomatic tools should be employed to safeguard interests and avert potential issues. Negotiation in a distrustful environment typically occurs through mechanisms such as agreements, memorandums of understanding, executive guarantees, and official registration in international organizations. Within these frameworks, even when parties lack trust, agreements can be forged that are acceptable to both sides. In diplomacy and foreign policy, "trust" should not be expected to be absolute; instead, it should be cultivated through negotiations, guarantees, and executive mechanisms. Negotiators must navigate this space with rationality and transparency to mitigate problems and misunderstandings. This entails creating conditions where both sides can reasonably arrive at an agreement and utilize executive mechanisms to uphold the credibility of agreements. If negotiators are not well-versed in such concepts and principles, negotiations may falter, and desired outcomes may remain unattained.

**Challenges of military confrontation**  
Opponents of negotiation with

the US often believe that the US, driven by its fear of military confrontation with Iran, emphasizes negotiation as a means to reduce tensions and secure greater advantages. They argue that the US, through its political and propaganda efforts in Iran, aims to draw Iran into negotiations to avert military conflict. If Iran genuinely seeks to confront the US, there are opportunities available. Iran can leverage its current positions to bolster resistance groups such as Hezbollah in Lebanon, Hamas, and other forces in Syria. If the US is indeed fearful of military confrontation with Iran, why doesn't Iran capitalize on this fear by taking military actions, such as closing the Strait of Hormuz or attacking US aircraft carriers in the Persian Gulf? If those who hold such views believe in their validity, why don't they pursue these issues practically if they are capable of such actions? If the US turns to negotiation to avoid war, Iran should strategically take advantage of this situation because negotiation is less costly for the US than war. The fate of negotiation and foreign policy decisions must be clarified. Iran should identify its priorities and make definitive choices regarding how to confront external threats, utilizing various tools such as diplomacy or military capabilities. There is little time left for reflection in this matter, and a practical, effective path to resolve the country's political and security issues should be determined promptly.

**But are Russia, China, UK, and Saudi Arabia trustworthy?**  
If the US is not a trustworthy negotiating party, can other countries like Russia, China,

Britain, or Saudi Arabia be considered trustworthy? Generally, no country can be entirely trustworthy, and negotiators must recognize that trust is a relative concept. Negotiation is founded on the premise that even in a climate of distrust, discussions can occur; however, in such circumstances, agreements and executive guarantees are typically necessary, and these agreements are documented in international organizations to ensure compliance with commitments. Conversely, when negotiations occur in an atmosphere of complete trust, the processes are carried out more transparently and swiftly, without the need for additional complexities. This underscores the significance of 'trust' in negotiations, highlighting that trust must be present on both sides for negotiations to succeed. This criticism applies to certain individuals involved in decision-making and policy-making who lack a proper and comprehensive understanding of fundamental political concepts. If these individuals lack familiarity with fundamental political concepts, such as negotiation and trust, the results of decisions and negotiations will not achieve the desired outcome. Under these circumstances, politicians and decision-makers may encounter political and social challenges, potentially resulting in serious issues for the country. Negotiation, as a crucial instrument in foreign policy, necessitates a deeper understanding and accurate recognition of basic political concepts; otherwise, negotiations and decisions will not yield the desired results.

The article was provided by Persian service of the Islamic News Agency (IRNA).



A woman holds up a poster of Gen. Qassem Soleimani, who was assassinated in a US drone attack in 2020 in Iraq, during a commemoration for him in Tehran, Iran on Jan. 3, 2024.  
● AP