

US-Iran Nuclear Talk: Heading for Another Fiasco?



06 May 2025

By ***Mahbubur Rashid Bhuiyan***

Research Fellow, BISS

In 2025, renewed efforts to revive negotiations between the United States and Iran over Tehran's nuclear programme have generated cautious optimism, but a closer look suggests the risk of another diplomatic failure is high. The recent rounds of indirect talks, mediated by third parties such as Oman, culminated in an agreement to reconvene and focus on limiting uranium enrichment, inspections, and sanctions relief. Yet, in the

wake of revived sanctions by the European E3 (Britain, France, Germany) via the “**snapback**” mechanism, Iran has responded by effectively suspending further negotiation and declaring that cooperation with the IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency) is “**no longer relevant.**”

The Return of Maximalist Posturing

From the outset, both sides have re-entered the diplomatic arena with deeply entrenched red lines. The US, following past experience, demands verifiable rollback of enrichment and full restoration of IAEA access; Iran insists on the lifting of all sanctions and recognition of its right to peaceful enrichment. Tehran has openly rejected immediate resumption of talks under the current punitive regime, signalling that it will monitor Western actions before fully reengaging. Meanwhile, Iran’s Supreme Leader has publicly expressed low expectations about the talks’ outcomes.



Structural Challenges to a Durable Deal

Observers argue that diplomacy alone, without credible pressure or leverage, is unlikely to compel Iran to accept the level of constraints demanded by its adversaries. The 2015 JCPOA experience has left scars: loopholes and ambiguities in inspection rights, delayed snapbacks of sanctions, and divergence over enforcement eroded trust. In 2025, the military dimension has reemerged: US and Israeli strikes on Iran's nuclear sites have heightened insecurity and hardened Iranian resolve.

Verification and enforcement mechanisms remain deeply disputed. Who monitors compliance? How to respond to violations? What guarantees can prevent a party from exploiting a ceasefire or suspension window? These questions remain unresolved.



Strategic Calculations and Diplomatic Dilemmas

From the floor's perspective, discussion turned to the underlying incentives and risk calculations driving both sides. Some noted that Iran's domestic economic woe under sanctions and internal mismanagement gives it reason to seek relief. Others countered that Iran's strategic posture and regional ambitions may outweigh near-term economic pressure. The US, meanwhile, must balance between pressing for a stronger agreement and avoiding the risk of further escalation or military backlash. The question arises: are negotiators seeking a robust, enforceable deal or a temporary façade that could unravel?

Participants reflected on the possibility of limited, interim deals: temporary pauses, sectoral limitations, or freeze agreements tied to sanctions relief etc. as stepping stones toward broader accord. Yet the fear was that such arrangements could become loopholes exploited by either party, undermining the legitimacy of the entire process. The need for

independent inspections, phased rollback, and irreversible mechanisms was viewed as essential to prevent another collapse.

Concluding Reflections: Fiasco or Forging a Path?

The current US-Iran nuclear diplomacy appears caught between hope and history. While there is genuine impetus for negotiation, structural distrust, maximalist posturing, and renewed militarised pressure threaten to derail progress. The recent snapback of sanctions and Iran's suspension of IAEA cooperation suggest that Tehran may be recalibrating its engagement posture and waiting for better terms or international shift before committing further.

If negotiations proceed without robust verification architecture, credible enforcement, and clearly defined red lines, the risk is high that this round will collapse like many before. The lesson from past years: a deal without substance is worse than none as it breeds cynicism and accelerates escalation. Yet, failure is not preordained. With careful diplomacy, calibrated incentives, and international buy-in, it remains possible to salvage a roadmap that reduces risk while preserving diplomatic credibility.

In sum, the current climate suggests that the US-Iran nuclear talk is teetering on the edge of another fiasco unless parties can overcome their legacies of mistrust and negotiate with realism, restraint, and durable safeguards.

Russo-Ukrainian Ceasefire Talk



26 May 2025

By *Mahbubur Rashid Bhuiyan*

Research Fellow, BISS

The Monthly Researcher’s Meet (MRM) held at the BISS Auditorium in September 2025 engaged in a timely and in-depth discussion on the “**Russo-Ukrainian Ceasefire Talk.**” The session analysed the renewed international attention to ceasefire negotiations between Russia and Ukraine, exploring the evolving dynamics of the conflict, diplomatic efforts toward de-escalation, and the broader implications for global peace and security. The discussion examined the complex balance between humanitarian imperatives and

strategic considerations that continue to shape both parties' willingness to pursue a meaningful cessation of hostilities.

Current Diplomatic Context

Participants began by assessing the current diplomatic landscape, noting that the year 2025 has seen renewed yet cautious dialogue between Moscow and Kyiv. Talks mediated in Istanbul in May led to a large-scale prisoner exchange but failed to produce a sustainable ceasefire. Russia expressed conditional interest in a temporary truce, reportedly a 30-day pause proposed by the United States, but attached stringent conditions restricting Ukraine's capacity to remobilise during the lull. Ukraine, by contrast, maintained that any credible ceasefire must respect its sovereignty and territorial integrity, and rejected proposals that could legitimise territorial occupation.

The floor discussed how both sides appear locked in a strategic deadlock: Russia seeks to consolidate battlefield gains while avoiding international isolation, whereas Ukraine must balance the moral and humanitarian urgency of halting conflict with the risk of losing tactical ground. This equilibrium of attrition has made negotiations fragile and outcome-dependent on battlefield shifts or external diplomatic incentives.



Key Issues and Strategic Barriers

The discussion identified three structural impediments to a durable ceasefire. First, Russia's internal resilience, strengthened by economic adaptation, mobilised industries, and shifting global alliances reduces the urgency for compromise. Second, Ukraine's dependence on sustained Western support and its determination to reclaim occupied territories create little room for concessions. Third, the divergent interests of external stakeholders, including the United States, European Union, and regional actors, complicate any coherent mediation strategy. Participants also noted that without credible verification mechanisms, ceasefire violations would remain inevitable.

The floor debated whether existing institutions such as the UN or OSCE possess sufficient authority to enforce a ceasefire, or whether an alternative multilateral

architecture, perhaps a coalition-based monitoring system should be designed for modern conflicts of this nature.



Analytical Perspectives and Discussion

A lively exchange followed on the political calculus of both sides. Some argued that Moscow's recent flexibility signals tactical repositioning rather than genuine interest in peace, while others viewed it as a potential opening for incremental diplomacy. The conversation also drew attention to humanitarian concerns, emphasising that prolonged conflict has deepened civilian suffering and exacerbated global economic disruptions.

In this context, participants agreed that a ceasefire must not be used as a **“reset mechanism”** for either side to regroup militarily. Instead, it should serve as a foundation for phased demilitarisation, confidence-building measures, and gradual political

settlement. The notion of a “**localised ceasefire**” in specific high-impact zones, under independent international monitoring, was seen as a pragmatic short-term objective.

Concluding Reflections

The session concluded with reflections on the global implications of the Russo-Ukrainian ceasefire discourse. Participants underscored that beyond its regional dimension, the conflict serves as a test case for the credibility of international mediation, enforcement of humanitarian norms, and the resilience of global diplomacy. The floor concurred that achieving a lasting ceasefire will depend on structural incentives, impartial verification, and sustained political will rather than symbolic declarations.

From Bangladesh’s analytical standpoint, participants noted that the evolving situation offers valuable lessons on conflict management, negotiation architecture, and the interplay between military realities and diplomatic timing. The MRM ended with the shared understanding that while peace remains distant, constructive diplomacy, anchored in accountability and international cooperation, is essential for transforming fragile talks into meaningful progress toward resolution.