
**E-ISSN:** 2664-603X
**P-ISSN:** 2664-6021
Impact Factor (RJIF): 5.92
IJPSG 2025; 7(10): 109-114
www.journalofpoliticalscience.com
Received: 02-07-2025
Accepted: 05-08-2025

**Amit**
Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, Baba Mastnath University, Rohtak, Haryana, India

**Dr. B Parkash**
Professor, Baba Mastnath University, Rohtak, Haryana, India

**Corresponding Author:**
**Amit**
Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, Baba Mastnath University, Rohtak, Haryana, India

# Ceasefire diplomacy in Gaza: Challenges, mediators, and prospects for peace

**Amit and B Parkash**

**DOI:** https://www.doi.org/10.33545/26646021.2025.v7.i10b.711

**Abstract**
Since the outbreak of intense hostilities in Gaza, repeated cycles of fighting and fragile truces have underscored both the urgency and the difficulty of securing a durable ceasefire. Multiple regional and international actors - most prominently Egypt, Qatar, the United States, the United Nations, and Turkey - have played mediating roles at different moments, each bringing distinct leverage and constraints. This article maps the main mediators and their tools, identifies the core political, military, and humanitarian obstacles that have repeatedly derailed ceasefire efforts, and assesses short- and medium-term prospects for a lasting cessation of hostilities. It concludes with policy recommendations intended to make negotiations more durable: (1) sequencing and verifiability around hostage releases and withdrawals, (2) stronger, neutral monitoring and humanitarian guarantees, (3) parallel regional confidence-building measures, and (4) attention to post-ceasefire reconstruction and governance that can reduce incentives for renewed violence.

**Keywords:** Gaza conflict, ceasefire diplomacy, mediation, humanitarian crisis, peace negotiations

## Introduction
The Gaza conflict stands as one of the most protracted and complex crises in contemporary international politics, where cycles of violence and temporary truces have repeatedly tested the limits of diplomacy. Each outbreak of hostilities has triggered intense humanitarian suffering, regional instability, and renewed international mediation efforts aimed at halting the fighting. Yet, despite numerous ceasefire initiatives and peace proposals, lasting calm has remained elusive. The central paradox of the Gaza ceasefire process lies in its dual nature - ceasefires are both attainable and fragile. They are attainable because both Israel and Hamas, along with other armed factions, occasionally recognize the tactical and humanitarian need to pause hostilities. Domestic and international pressures, mounting civilian casualties, and the need for humanitarian relief or hostage exchanges often drive both sides toward temporary restraint. However, these very agreements are fragile because they touch upon deep-rooted political, territorial, and ideological divisions that neither side is willing to compromise on fully.

At the heart of this fragility lies a complex web of motivations and mistrust. For Israel, the ceasefire terms are often linked to security imperatives - preventing future rocket attacks, dismantling militant networks, and ensuring the return of hostages. For Hamas and other Palestinian actors, any pause in fighting must also preserve political legitimacy, resist occupation, and highlight the humanitarian plight of Gaza's population. These opposing priorities frequently produce stalemates in negotiations or trigger violations shortly after agreements are reached. Furthermore, the lack of a unified Palestinian political structure, combined with the asymmetry of power between the warring sides, has complicated mediation efforts even further.

In recent months, a renewed diplomatic push - spearheaded by Egypt, Qatar, the United States, and the United Nations, among others - has sought to link ceasefire mechanisms with broader political arrangements. These proposals typically involve a phased approach: partial Israeli withdrawals, monitored humanitarian corridors, and a sequence of hostage and prisoner exchanges tied to commitments for long-term reconstruction and governance reforms in Gaza. However, while such frameworks appear sound on paper, they often fail in practice due to weak enforcement mechanisms, divergent interpretations of compliance, and

shifting political dynamics both within Israel and among Palestinian factions.

This article explores these complexities by mapping recent developments in ceasefire diplomacy and analyzing the major factors that have repeatedly undermined sustainable peace efforts. It draws upon the lessons of past ceasefire attempts to identify patterns of success and failure, the role of mediators and guarantors, and the impact of humanitarian imperatives on diplomatic timing. The study also assesses the evolving regional environment - including the roles of Egypt, Qatar, Turkey, and the broader Arab world - in shaping the conditions for negotiation.

Ultimately, the paper argues that durable ceasefire diplomacy in Gaza requires more than tactical pauses; it demands a holistic strategy that integrates security, political legitimacy, humanitarian relief, and long-term reconstruction. By examining both the structural and situational barriers to peace, this article proposes pragmatic measures aimed at enhancing the credibility, enforceability, and sustainability of future ceasefire agreements.

## Who Mediates - and How They Influence Talks

### 1. Egypt

Egypt is the most consistent and influential mediator in Gaza ceasefire diplomacy.

- **Why it matters:** Egypt shares a border with Gaza and controls the Rafah crossing, the main gateway for people and humanitarian supplies entering or leaving the Strip.
- **How it mediates:** Cairo often hosts indirect negotiations between Israel and Hamas, helps arrange prisoner exchanges, and designs humanitarian corridor mechanisms.
- **Its leverage:** Egypt's ties with both sides - Hamas (though sometimes tense) and Israel - allow it to play a unique middleman role that few others can. Its mediation is often decisive in halting or restarting hostilities.

### 2. Qatar

Qatar has become a key diplomatic and financial intermediary between Hamas and the international community.

- **Why it matters:** Doha has strong relationships with Hamas and other Islamist groups, giving it credibility and access where Western or regional powers might not.
- **How it mediates:** It provides financial aid and reconstruction funds for Gaza, hosts Hamas' political office, and uses its influence to encourage Hamas to engage in negotiations.
- **Challenges:** Some countries - particularly Israel's allies - view Qatar's ties to Hamas with suspicion, which can complicate coordination and undermine broader trust in its mediation efforts.

### 3. The United States

The United States remains a crucial player due to its unmatched influence over Israel and its central role in regional diplomacy.

- **Why it matters:** The U.S. provides security assistance, diplomatic backing, and political cover to Israel, which gives Washington leverage in persuading Israel to accept ceasefire terms or humanitarian pauses.
- **How it mediates:** U.S. envoys often shuttle between capitals, presenting framework proposals and coordinating with Egypt, Qatar, and the UN.
- **Limitations:** U.S. influence is sometimes restricted by domestic politics, perceptions that it favors Israel, and a reluctance to apply strong pressure on its ally over contentious security issues.

### 4. The United Nations and International Organizations

The UN and other international agencies play an essential but limited role in the Gaza peace process.

- **Why it matters:** They provide legitimacy, humanitarian coordination, and monitoring - especially through agencies like UNRWA and OCHA.
- **How they mediate:** They help document violations, manage aid deliveries, and facilitate reconstruction pledges.
- **Limitations:** While they have moral and operational authority, they lack coercive power to enforce ceasefire terms or influence the combatants directly.

### 5. Other Regional Actors

Other players - such as Turkey, some Gulf states, and non-state or civil society groups - sometimes engage in parallel diplomacy.

- **How they contribute:** They may offer backchannel communications, financial support, or public advocacy for peace.
- **Impact:** Their participation can broaden diplomatic engagement, but it can also complicate consensus, especially when regional rivalries (e.g., between Turkey, Egypt, and Gulf states) influence their agendas.

In short, Gaza ceasefire diplomacy is a multi-layered and competitive process involving different actors with distinct motives and tools.

- Egypt provides geographical and logistical leverage.
- Qatar offers financial and political access to Hamas.
- The U.S. brings strategic influence over Israel.
- The UN ensures humanitarian legitimacy and coordination.
- Other regional players add flexibility but also complexity.

Together, these mediators form a web of overlapping diplomacy, where coordination and credibility are as critical as the terms of the ceasefire itself.

## Core Challenges to Securing and Sustaining a Ceasefire

Even when all sides agree in principle to halt hostilities, transforming a fragile truce into a durable ceasefire faces multiple, interlocking challenges. These difficulties are political, military, humanitarian, and regional - and each has repeatedly undermined past agreements. The following outlines the major barriers that mediators and negotiators encounter in Gaza ceasefire diplomacy.

### 1. Hostage–Prisoner Dynamics and Sequencing Problems

The issue of hostage and prisoner exchanges lies at the heart of almost every Gaza ceasefire negotiation.

- **Why it matters:** Hostages serve as a critical bargaining

chip for Hamas and other armed groups, while Israel places enormous domestic and political value on the safe return of its citizens and soldiers.

- **The challenge:** Negotiations frequently stall over sequencing - who acts first and how each step is verified. For example, Hamas may demand a large-scale release of Palestinian prisoners before freeing hostages, whereas Israel insists on verified steps and security guarantees first.
- **The consequence:** A lack of trust and absence of independent verification mechanisms lead to repeated breakdowns. Mediators must design time-bound, phased exchanges with credible monitoring (such as neutral third-party observers) to prevent either side from feeling deceived or vulnerable.

**2. Security vs. Sovereignty: Disarmament and the "Day After"**

This challenge reflects the fundamental political contradiction between Israel's demand for security and the Palestinians' demand for sovereignty.

- Israel's stance: It seeks demilitarization of Gaza, or at least guarantees that armed groups cannot rearm or launch attacks again.
- **Palestinian concerns:** Many Palestinians view such demands as efforts to perpetuate control or occupation, undermining their right to self-rule and self-defense.
- **Negotiation dilemma:** Efforts to craft a "day after" plan - envisioning Gaza's post-ceasefire governance - often falter because they cannot reconcile security assurances for Israel with political dignity and autonomy for Palestinians.
- **Result:** Without clear, enforceable arrangements balancing both sides' existential concerns, ceasefires tend to be tactical pauses rather than steps toward sustainable peace.

**3. Fragmentation of Armed Actors and Command-and-Control Problems**

The decentralized nature of armed factions in Gaza is another major obstacle.

- **Why it matters:** Even if Hamas' central leadership accepts a ceasefire, smaller militant groups or rogue commanders may refuse to comply.
- **The challenge:** Such actors can launch unsanctioned attacks that provoke Israeli retaliation, reigniting hostilities and collapsing the truce.
- **Implication for mediators:** Successful ceasefires require not only elite-level political consent but also grassroots enforcement - ensuring that the command structure is unified and that local actors are invested in maintaining calm. This often demands internal discipline within factions and strong communication channels between mediators and local authorities.

**4. Domestic Politics and Electoral Timing**

Domestic political considerations in both Israel and Palestine heavily shape the timing, scope, and durability of ceasefires.

- **In Israel:** Governments face public pressure to demonstrate strength and deterrence. Any perceived concession can invite political backlash, especially near election cycles.
- **In Palestinian politics:** Leaders, including Hamas, must maintain internal legitimacy - both within Gaza and in the broader Palestinian movement - by showing that negotiations yield tangible gains without appearing to surrender resistance.
- **The result:** Political leaders on both sides often favor short-term, symbolic victories over long-term commitments. Ceasefire deals are thus designed to be temporary and reversible, making them vulnerable to quick collapse once domestic circumstances shift.

**5. Humanitarian Access, Reconstruction, and Verification Capacity**

A ceasefire cannot hold if humanitarian and reconstruction needs are unmet.

- **Core issue:** Gaza's population faces dire shortages of food, medicine, and infrastructure. Yet, aid delivery and rebuilding efforts are frequently tied up in political disputes over control of crossings, funding, and verification.
- **Why this matters:** When aid fails to reach civilians or reconstruction stalls, public frustration grows, undermining local support for calm and feeding militant recruitment narratives.
- **The solution:** Ceasefires must be accompanied by predictable humanitarian mechanisms - clear rules for aid delivery, transparent financial channels, and international monitoring. Without these, truces risk being seen as empty pauses that fail to address underlying suffering.

**6. Regional Spillovers and Third-Party Attacks**

The Gaza conflict does not exist in isolation; it sits within a volatile regional environment.

- **The problem:** Cross-border attacks or strikes on mediating states (such as Egypt or Qatar) can derail delicate negotiations. Similarly, Hezbollah or other regional militias might escalate tensions in solidarity, widening the conflict.
- **Impact on mediation:** Such incidents erode trust, trigger public outrage, and make compromise politically costly for all sides. Mediators must therefore anticipate and contain regional spillovers through crisis communication channels and collective security coordination.
- **Example:** Recent attacks near mediation hubs have shown how a single strike can collapse weeks of progress, underscoring the need for regional de-escalation frameworks alongside ceasefire talks.

In essence, sustaining a Gaza ceasefire requires more than halting gunfire - it demands intricate management of political incentives, humanitarian logistics, and regional security dynamics.

- Trust deficits, competing national narratives, and fragmented authority structures make each agreement precarious.
- Without sequenced commitments, credible monitoring, and broad political buy-in, ceasefires remain temporary.

A durable truce, therefore, depends not only on negotiation skill but on designing mechanisms that bridge security concerns, political dignity, and humanitarian imperatives -

the three pillars on which any lasting peace must rest.

**Prospects: What a Realistic Path Toward Stability Looks Like**

Achieving a durable ceasefire in Gaza requires more than a temporary suspension of hostilities. It demands a structured, phased, and verifiable roadmap that connects short-term humanitarian imperatives with medium- and long-term political, security, and reconstruction goals. A realistic path toward stability, therefore, lies in designing an agreement that is gradual, conditional, and reinforced by independent oversight. The following elements outline what such a framework should include.

**1. Phased, Verifiable Sequencing**

One of the most critical lessons from past ceasefire failures is that all-or-nothing deals rarely hold. Instead, stability is more likely when steps are phased, reciprocal, and verifiable.

- **How it works:** Negotiators should start with small, rapid confidence-building measures-for example, daily humanitarian aid deliveries through clearly designated corridors, limited pauses in hostilities, and the staggered release of hostages.
- These initial gestures can build trust, create momentum, and generate public support for continuing negotiations.
- Subsequent phases would then involve mapped Israeli redeployments, monitored reductions in military presence, and gradual easing of restrictions.
- **Verification:** Independent verification is crucial. Organizations such as the United Nations, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), or other neutral technical monitors can ensure that each side complies with its commitments. Transparency and neutral oversight prevent disputes over compliance, reducing opportunities for collapse or manipulation.

**2. Neutral Monitoring and Enforcement**

Ceasefires often break down due to disagreements about who violated what. To address this, a neutral, well-resourced monitoring mechanism is essential.

- **Role of monitors:** A robust humanitarian-monitoring mission-ideally under UN or multilateral auspices-should be tasked with verifying access routes, inspecting convoys, and reporting on violations.
- **Mandate clarity:** The mission's scope and authority must be clearly defined, including rules for inspections, access to sensitive sites, and reporting procedures.
- **Why it matters:** Clear monitoring reduces mistrust, enhances accountability, and ensures humanitarian aid reaches civilians quickly and safely. Effective monitoring transforms a paper ceasefire into a credible, enforceable reality.

**3. Parallel Regional Confidence Measures**

Because Gaza's conflict is entangled with broader regional dynamics, regional confidence-building measures must operate alongside local ceasefire efforts.

- **Regional guarantees:** Neighboring and influential states-especially Egypt, Qatar, Gulf states, and Turkey-can offer security guarantees, border management commitments, and diplomatic engagement that reinforce stability.

**Examples**

- Gulf states could pledge funding and technical support for border security or reconstruction.
- Egypt could manage transit points and ensure humanitarian logistics through Rafah.
- Turkey could play a diplomatic role in liaison and communication between factions.
- **Impact:** These measures reduce cross-border tensions, contain potential spoilers, and demonstrate regional ownership of peacebuilding - essential for preventing spillovers or proxy escalations.

**4. Post-Ceasefire Governance and Reconstruction Plan**

No ceasefire can endure without a clear vision for the "day after" - what governance, reconstruction, and civilian life in Gaza will look like once the guns fall silent.

- **The plan:** A multiyear strategy should be launched that links stability to reconstruction - including infrastructure rebuilding, de-mining, restoration of essential services, and economic revitalization.
- **Governance:** Local administrative structures, potentially under international or Arab oversight, should manage reconstruction transparently and inclusively to prevent political capture by any one faction.
- **Financing and transparency:** Donor coordination mechanisms are vital to ensure accountability and equitable resource allocation. When reconstruction is credible and visible, it strengthens public commitment to peace and reduces incentives for renewed violence.

**5. Addressing Political Finalities Incrementally**

Given the depth of mistrust and the unresolved nature of core political issues - such as statehood, recognition, and long-term security guarantees - a comprehensive settlement is not immediately achievable.

- **Pragmatic approach:** Negotiators should therefore de-prioritize maximalist goals in the short term and instead focus on durable de-escalation measures that create political space for future diplomacy.
- **Incrementalism:** This means deferring contentious "final status" issues while concentrating on maintaining calm, improving humanitarian conditions, and building trust through sustained cooperation.
- **Benefit:** Such an approach buys time for political environments to stabilize and for external actors to prepare frameworks that could later support a more comprehensive peace process.

**Policy Recommendations**

While diplomacy in Gaza is often shaped by crisis management, long-term stability requires clear, institutionalized mechanisms that go beyond temporary arrangements. The following policy recommendations outline practical, implementable steps to strengthen future ceasefire agreements, improve humanitarian outcomes, and reduce the likelihood of renewed conflict.

**1. Insist on Independent Verification Language in Any Agreement**

One of the most consistent weaknesses in past ceasefires has been the lack of clear verification mechanisms. Agreements often use vague terms like "mutual compliance" or "as

agreed upon," leaving room for interpretation and dispute.

- **What should change:** Future ceasefire texts must explicitly identify the monitoring body, define timelines, and specify what happens when violations occur.
- **How to implement:** Include clauses that establish independent verification teams (such as UN or ICRC-led missions) with access rights to inspect border areas, aid corridors, and demilitarization zones.
- **Why it matters:** When both parties know that violations will be investigated quickly and impartially - through rapid-response investigation units and proportionate dispute-resolution mechanisms - the ceasefire gains credibility. Clear, enforceable verification language prevents escalation based on accusation or rumor.

**2. Institutionalize Humanitarian Access Before and During Ceasefires**

Humanitarian aid should never depend on the political mood of negotiations.

- **The problem:** In many past conflicts, aid access has been treated as a bargaining chip, leading to civilian suffering and renewed hostilities.
- **The solution:** Humanitarian corridors, funding channels, and supply routes should be institutionalized and automatic - meaning they remain open regardless of military dynamics.
- **Implementation:** Link aid delivery to measurable compliance indicators (for instance, sustained ceasefire days or verified security cooperation) so that relief becomes a predictable component of the ceasefire framework.
- **Why it matters:** Making aid predictable enhances civilian trust in diplomacy and ensures that humanitarian needs are not weaponized by either side.

**3. Expand Mediator Coalitions but Clarify Roles**

Ceasefire diplomacy benefits from multilateral participation - regional and international actors bring different forms of leverage. However, without coordination, overlapping efforts can cause confusion or mistrust.

- **What to do:** Form broad-based mediator coalitions that combine regional influence (Egypt, Qatar, Turkey) with international legitimacy (UN, U.S., EU).
- **Clarify responsibilities:** Assign specific technical roles - for example:
  - Egypt leads on border crossings and logistics,
  - Qatar on hostage negotiations and financial arrangements,
  - The UN on monitoring and reporting,
  - The U.S. and EU on security guarantees and donor coordination.
- **Why it matters:** Role clarity reduces duplication, prevents diplomatic competition, and creates a coherent negotiation architecture where each actor complements the others.

**4. Mitigate Spoiler Risks with Localized Engagement**

Even the most carefully negotiated agreements can unravel when local actors - militant commanders, clan leaders, or community networks - reject or ignore ceasefire terms.

- **What's needed:** Combine high-level diplomacy with localized outreach strategies aimed at those on the ground who control operational decisions.
- **How to do it:**
  - Conduct direct communication campaigns with local commanders to clarify terms and timelines.
  - Engage community and religious leaders to build local ownership of peace.
  - Use media and social platforms to reinforce ceasefire messaging and counter misinformation.
- **Why it matters:** By addressing potential spoilers early and integrating them into communication channels, mediators reduce the risk of rogue attacks that can derail national or regional progress.

**5. Create a Finance + Governance Compact for Gaza**

Reconstruction and governance in Gaza must be transparent, accountable, and politically neutral to prevent relapse into conflict.

- **The problem:** In the past, reconstruction funds have been delayed, misused, or politicized, fueling frustration and mistrust.
- **The recommendation:** Establish a finance + governance compact - a joint framework among donors, local authorities, and neutral oversight bodies - that links funding to strict transparency standards and non-militarization guarantees.
- **Implementation:**
  - Require that donor funds be channeled through audited mechanisms supervised by international financial institutions or UN-led bodies.
  - Support locally legitimate administrative structures (possibly under an interim or technocratic authority) to manage civilian services and reconstruction projects.
  - Condition future aid on verified civilian use and accountable governance.
- **Why it matters:** Transparent reconstruction ensures that aid benefits civilians rather than fueling rearmament or factional control. It also strengthens governance legitimacy, reducing incentives for renewed violence.

**Conclusion**

Ceasefires in Gaza are not only ceasefires of guns; they are exercises in sequencing, verification, humanitarian logistics, and regional diplomacy. Mediators bring different strengths-Egypt's gatekeeping, Qatar's Hamas contacts, the U.S.'s leverage with Israel, and the UN's normative and operational capacity-but each is limited without robust mechanisms to verify compliance, manage spoilers, and translate short-term pauses into durable political and socioeconomic change. While the immediate prospects for a complete political settlement remain dim, pragmatic, well-sequenced agreements that tie humanitarian relief, hostage returns, and monitored redeployments to a transparent reconstruction compact represent the most realistic pathway to lasting reduction in violence. The international community's ability to sustain political focus, fund reconstruction, and shield mediators from regional escalation will largely determine whether the next ceasefire becomes the beginning of a durable peace or another temporary interlude.

**References**

1. Al Jazeera. Qatar says Turkiye to join Gaza mediation

talks in Doha. 2025 Sep 30. Available from: https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/9/30/turkiye-to-join-gaza-mediation-talks-in-doha-qatars-foreign-ministry-says
2. Caldero R. Hamas says it will free all hostages under Trump plan. Here's what that really means. The Rio Times. 2025 Oct 4. Available from: https://www.riotimesonline.com/hamas-says-it-will-free-all-hostages-under-trump-plan-heres-what-that-really-means/
3. Chatham House. Can the Trump peace plan for Gaza succeed? 2025 Oct 2. Available from: https://www.chathamhouse.org/2025/10/can-trump-peace-plan-gaza-succeed
4. Crisis Group. Israel-Hamas cease-fire in Gaza. 2024 Jun 7. Available from: https://www.crisisgroup.org/middle-east-north-africa/east-mediterranean-mena/israelpalestine-united-states/gaza-ceasefire
5. Freedman L. Will there finally be peace in Gaza? SAMF. 2025 Oct 4. Available from: https://samf.substack.com/p/will-there-finally-be-peace-in-gaza
6. Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect. The reality of Gaza's fragile ceasefire: current and future risks for atrocities in occupied Palestinian territory and Israel. 2025 Feb 19. Available from: https://www.globalr2p.org/publications/the-reality-of-gazas-fragile-ceasefire-current-and-future-risks-for-atrocities-in-occupied-palestinian-territory-and-israel/
7. Middle East Eye. Gaza ceasefire deal announced after 466 days of genocide and 46,000 dead. 2025 Jan 15. Available from: https://truthout.org/articles/gaza-ceasefire-deal-announced-after-466-days-of-genocide-and-46000-dead/
8. Newsweek. Hamas responds to Donald Trump's Gaza peace plan. 2025 Oct 3. Available from: https://www.newsweek.com/hamas-responds-ceasefire-peace-deal-israel-hostages-trump-10827257
9. Reuters. Pope hopes Gaza plan achieves 'desired results' soon. 2025 Oct 5. Available from: https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/pope-hopes-gaza-plan-achieves-desired-results-soon-2025-10-05/
10. Security Council Report. The Middle East, including the Palestinian question. 2025 Oct. Available from: https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/monthly-forecast/2025-10/the-middle-east-including-the-palestinian-question-22.php
11. The Guardian. US envoys head to Egypt for Gaza ceasefire talks as Trump says 'we are very close' to deal. 2025 Oct 4. Available from: https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/oct/04/trump-gaza-peace-deal
12. Times of Israel. Qatar, Egypt and Turkey said to urge Hamas to accept Trump's Gaza ceasefire proposal. 2025 Oct 1. Available from: https://www.timesofisrael.com/qatar-egypt-and-turkey-said-to-urge-hamas-to-accept-trumps-gaza-ceasefire-proposal/
13. United Nations. The Middle East, including the Palestinian question. 2025 Oct. Available from: https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/monthly-forecast/2025-10/the-middle-east-including-the-palestinian-question-22.php