

# The Impact and Diversity of Mediation Leverage

## An Interim Summary

*by Jakob Landwehr*



#### **ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

Jakob Landwehr holds a Bachelor of Arts in European Studies from Chemnitz University of Technology and a Master of Arts in International Conflict Analysis from the University of Kent, Canterbury. He has started to work as a research associate at the Professorship of International Relations in Chemnitz and is pursuing his PhD in the field of Peace and Conflict Studies. His dissertation addresses the success of third-party humanitarian military interventions.

#### **COVER**

Federica Mogherini attends the High-level meeting on the Syria crisis during the 72nd United Nations General Assembly in New York, September 2017

Picture: European External Action Service <https://www.flickr.com/photos/eeas/37367665801/>

License: [CC BY-NC 2.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/2.0/)

#### **PUBLICATION DATE**

September 2019

---

#### **WISSENSCHAFT & SICHERHEIT ONLINE**

WiSi Online, short for German "Wissenschaft und Sicherheit Online - Research and Security Online" is the electronic publication series of the German Academic Association for Security Studies (BSH). All WiSi Online articles are subject to a double-blind peer review. Listed under ISSN 1667-9649, WiSi Online is being published in a new edition since 2015.

#### **IMPRINT**

© Bundesverband Sicherheitspolitik an Hochschulen (BSH)

**Editorial Board:** Jonas Jacholke, Johannes Kummerow, Stefan Maetz, René Muschter, Philipp Thimm

**Layout:** Marcus Mohr, Stefan Maetz

#### **CONTACT**

<http://www.sicherheitspolitik.de/publikationen/wisi-online/>  
[wisi-online@sicherheitspolitik.de](mailto:wisi-online@sicherheitspolitik.de)

# The Impact and Diversity of Mediation Leverage

## An Interim Summary

### ABSTRACT

The article contributes to the conceptualisation of mediation leverage. Providing a subsequent review and a theoretical framework for how to combine different forms of mediation and better understand the impact with regard to the mediation outcome, the article presents the current status quo on mediation leverage. It also addresses two different types of leverage: direct leverage and indirect leverage. The framework further emphasises the need to examine leverage in relation to different phases in the mediation process. To underline the findings, the article addresses the early United Nations (UN) mediation attempts in Syria in 2012. The results indicate that, without a proper consideration of the mediation phase, the discussion of mediation leverage is incomplete. Finally, the article provides a theoretical platform for further leverage research.

### KEYWORDS

mediation theory, effectiveness and success, mediation leverage, United Nations, Syria

For centuries, the practice of mediation has been used worldwide (Hellman 2012: 591). As there is no agreement on the exact definition of international mediation, this article refers to the commonly used, and rather broad, definition by Bercovitch, Anagnoson and Wille (1991: 8), who define mediation as a “process of conflict management where disputants seek the assistance of, or accept an offer of help from, an individual, group, state or organization to settle their conflict or resolve their differences without resorting to physical force or invoking the authority of the law”.<sup>1</sup> Despite the fact that mediation is a topic of high interest for peace and conflict studies, there are still some gaps in understanding all of its elements because mediation cannot always be effective or successful (Bercovitch/Langley 1993: 70). Indeed, there is no sufficient answer to the question about which circumstances affect the success and effectiveness of mediation (Haixia 2007: 589). However, the answer to this question is crucial to understanding the failures of mediation efforts and to increasing the probability of success.

Mediation leverage is among the many factors that have an impact on mediation outcomes and that influence its effectiveness (Bercovitch/Anagnoson/Wille 1991: 7). This article focuses on the conceptualisation of mediation leverage and its impact on the mediation outcome. To better understand mediation success and the effects of mediation with regard to leverage, it reviews previous concepts of mediation leverage and the approaches used to measure the impact of the contribution of mediation

leverage on mediation success. The article answers the following questions: how can mediation leverage be conceptualised and why is it necessary to differentiate the impact of leverage with regard to the mediation sequence and phase? The article reveals that it is insufficient to simply examine whether a mediator has leverage; rather, it is necessary to examine which kind of leverage exists and at which phase of the mediation attempt it can and should be used. Based on Greig and Diehl's (2013) approach, which identifies three conflict phases, namely the acceptance of mediation, reaching an agreement and dealing with the implementation, the article suggests it is essential to examine how the contributions of different forms of leverage affect the success of the conflict phase. The article presents two types of leverage: direct leverage and indirect leverage, and it links them to the effects they have within a bargaining framework and their impact on mediation success by producing a desired or intended result. The article is structured as follows: The first section reviews the literature on mediation theory on effectiveness and leverage, and it summarises the current state-of-the-art. The second section identifies the relationship between leverage and mediation effectiveness, deduces the types of leverage and explains how each type can contribute to the effectiveness of mediation. To underscore the findings, the article reviews the first United Nations (UN) mediation attempt of former UN Secretary-General, (UNSG), Kofi Annan, in the Syrian conflict in 2012. Finally, the article summarises and dis-

<sup>1</sup> For a more detailed discussion on the definition of mediation, please refer to Bercovitch (1992: 2–6).

cusses these findings and provides suggestions for further research.

### THE RELEVANCE OF LEVERAGE IN MEDIATION RESEARCH

Although it is obvious that not every mediation effort can be effective and successful (Bercovitch/Langley 1993: 670), only a few studies have reported on the effectiveness of mediation (Bercovitch/Houston 2000; Beardsley et al. 2006; Bercovitch/Gartner 2006b, Böhmelt 2010; Eisenkopf/Bächtiger 2014). First, it is important to differentiate between success and effectiveness. Scholars have been unable to find a comprehensive definition “that would unequivocally delineate how to recognise success in international mediation” (Vuković 2014: 967). While most scholars, including Bercovitch Anagnoson and Wille (1991:8), define a successful outcome as the achievement to produce a ceasefire, a partial settlement or a full settlement, Wilkenfeld et al. (2003: 297) and Böhmelt (2010: 169) measure success based on the extent of the actors’ satisfaction with the mediation results. According to Bercovitch (1992: 22-23), the evaluation of mediation should be based on subjective criteria, for example the perception of all the actors involved in the dispute when mediation achieves its goals, and objective criteria. He argues that, in most cases, parties are satisfied when the process and outcome are perceived as effective, fair and efficient, and he links effectiveness to the implementability and permanence of a good outcome. In more recent work, Bercovitch (2005: 294) differentiates between process-related success definitions, which focus “on criteria such as fairness and efficiency”, and outcome-oriented definitions, which “may either refer to subjective criteria such as conflict parties’ perceived fairness or objective indicators such as effectiveness in terms of results achieved and/or change brought about through the mediation effort”. For the outcome-oriented approach, Greig and Diehl (2013: 106) define success based on different phases of the mediation process. They divide the mediation process into three phases: acceptance of mediation, reaching an agreement and dealing with implementation concerns. They argue that mediation is effective if a mediator succeeds in getting the parties to the table, supporting them towards reaching an agreement and, finally, implementing the agreement. Success refers to the outcome of the process and the accomplishment of the mediator’s goals. An effective mediator, instead, adequately accomplishes or produces a purpose and produces an intended result.

There is consensus on the specific factors that influence mediation effectiveness (Bercovitch/Anagnoson/Wille 1991: 7), and many studies have identified a variety of variables and a large number of these factors (Simkin 1971: 118; Vuković 2014: 968). These factors include external sources of power, influence and support, which are characteristics of the conflict parties that play an important role in the mediation process (Bercovitch/

Houston 2000: 198), as well as impartiality and repetition (Kydd 2006: 458-459) or the control or possession of the mediator’s resources (Bercovitch 1992: 19). Additionally, Böhmelt (2015: 111) argues that regional circumstances, such as culture and regional dynamics, have an impact, as does the mediator’s knowledge regarding these factors. Within this wide range of factors, Bercovitch, Anagnoson and Wille (1991: 7), and other scholars, include mediation leverage as a factor. However, only some scholars have paid theoretical and empirical attention to the dimensions of leverage (see for example Zartman/Touval 1985; Princen 1992; Beardsley 2009, 2011; Böhmelt 2010; Reid 2015; Bergmann/Niemann 2013, 2015; Landwehr 2019). In general, scholars agree that mediators that are able to use leverage tend to be more successful and effective (Reid 2015: 3; Böhmelt 2010: 176) and that the “leverage is determined by the identity and resulting characteristics of the mediator” (Kleiboer 1996: 371-372). Kleiboer (1996: 371) also highlights that few researchers bother to define leverage; they mostly assume that leverage refers to the mediator’s ability to pressure the conflict parties. Reid (2015: 4) notes that leverage remains “a universally understood yet empirically undefined concept, however, risks ignoring crucial aspects of conflict mediation.” Thus, what exactly is leverage and how is it conceptualised in the literature?

### CONCEPTUALISATION AND CATEGORISATION OF FORMS OF MEDIATION LEVERAGE

Touval and Zartman (1985: 40) are among the first scholars to define and consider the impact of leverage. Touval and Zartman (1985: 40-49) describe leverage as either “carrots” or “sticks”, which can be referred to as negative inducements, such as sanctions or the threat of military pressure, or positive incentives, such as financial aid or trade facilitation. They argue that three different sources of leverage exist, each with various manifestations. These include the parties’ need for a solution that the mediator can provide; the parties’ susceptibility to shifting the weight that the mediator can apply and the parties’ interest in side payments that the mediator can offer.

Most approaches deduce leverage from resources or material power (see for example Bercovitch/Anagnoson/Wille 1991; Bercovitch/Gartner 2006b; Siniver 2006; Bergmann/Niemann 2015). Scholars have contributed to this definition of leverage over the years. Based on previous attempts to address the basis of social power, Rubin (1992: 255-260) describes six different power sources: reward, expert, legitimate, referent, informational and coercive power. Shapira (2009) uses the same power sources, but includes third-party power instead of referent power. The idea of information as leverage is also supported by Princen (1992: 42). Beardsley (2008: 727) introduces two types of leverage: tangible and intangible. While tangible leverage refers to the commonly used

material power and resources, intangible leverage is based on the mediator's use of prestige and the ability to make promises. In another approach, Beardsley (2009: 273) solely focuses on resources as leverage. Most scholars focus on reward and coercive power, mostly in line with Touval and Zartman (1985) (see for example Tocci 2008: 882–883; Herrberg 2018: 307). Thus, the mediator's resources can be financial, human or intellectual (Herrberg 2018: 307) or simply military, economic or diplomatic tools and instruments or resources of persuasion (Bergmann 2018: 242). Reid (2015: 5–8) extends the concept of leverage to include information and the historical and cultural ties of the involved parties. Reid (2015: 6) argues that “leverage finds its sources in characteristics of all actors as well as the conflict environment and need not be confined to material manipulation”. Reid (2015: 24) introduces capability and credibility into the discussion about leverage. Capability addresses the material measures of influence; credibility refers to the “tangible forms of influence, such as historical and cultural ties” (Reid 2015: 24). The UN emphasises the importance of considering the relationship between the conflict and the mediator as leverage (UNSG 2009: 10). Bercovitch and Kadayifci-Orellana (2009: 181) also refer to intangible resources. They highlight that credibility, legitimacy, trust, moral standing and persuasive powers are the leverage sources a mediator can use, and they attribute these resources, in particular, to non-state actors and less powerful mediators. Faith-based mediators possess intangible resources, using religion as source of leverage for good, and they provide moral and spiritual leverage (Bercovitch/Kadayifci-Orellana 2009: 199). This indicates that the type of leverage depends on the mediator and the conflict parties. The question is how to include all these different types of leverage in one approach. The present article suggests differentiating between direct leverage and indirect leverage. Direct leverage comprises all the types of leverage a mediator uses or threatens to use. For example, this includes coercive measures and incentives or information. Indirect leverage is based on the perception of one or more of the conflict parties, such as legitimacy and historical and cultural ties.

#### **THE IMPACT OF MEDIATION LEVERAGE ON SUCCESS AND EFFECTIVENESS**

To emphasise the importance of differentiating between types of leverage, it is important to consider how they contribute to mediation success and effectiveness. Reid (2015: 6) notes that many studies fail to address the context-dependent dimensions, and they do not link different types of leverage to mediation processes. She provides evidence to show that capability leverage contributes to signing an agreement, while credibility leverage tends to achieve a more durable peace (Reid 2015: 24). However, many leverage considerations tend to focus on

one dependent variable: signing an agreement (Zartman/Touval 1985; Bergmann 2018). Böhmelt (2010: 172) distinguishes between ceasefire, partial settlement and full settlement, and Bercovitch, Anagnoson and Wille (1991: 9, 15) distinguish between great differences or settling the dispute, initiating negotiations and achieving a ceasefire (see also Touval 1982; Kriesberg 1991; Bercovitch/Houston 1996). Bergmann and Niemann (2015: 4; 8) suggest an internal and external conflict perspective. In comparison to successful operationalisation, effectiveness can integrate subjective dimensions, such as the ability to achieve the mediator's goals (Bergmann/Niemann 2015: 4). Bergmann and Niemann (2013: 5) measure whether a mediation effort had “some positive impact on the conflict and its management in terms of conflict settlement”, and they differentiate between six values of conflict settlement as dependent variables and three values for goal attainment.

However, this article argues that to fully understand the impact of leverage, it is important to bear in mind that mediation can be understood as a process that is characterised by a sequence of events that include “getting the parties to the table, reaching an agreement, and making the agreement endure over time” (Vuković 2014: 976). Additionally, the diversity of “leverage, must be recognized for it has potential to shape mediation outcomes in crucial ways” (Reid 2015: 5). Thus, it is necessary to bear in mind why and when mediation occurs. A mediator is an accepted third (outside) party that helps the conflict parties find possible solutions from among a wide range of alternatives, in case the conflict parties are neither willing nor able to solve the dispute on their own (Greig/Regan 2008: 761; Vuković 2014: 966). This includes a wide variety of activities ranging from the suggestions of ideas for compromise to enabling better communication between the conflict parties (Zartman/Touval 1985: 32). As necessary preconditions for mediation, Hellman (2012: 592) highlights the willingness of the conflict parties to accept a mediator, or even request mediation, and the mediator's willingness to commit to the mediation effort. Mediators have different motives for initiating mediation, such as their own interests in an agreement or their belief in the positive effects of the mediation attempt (Clayton/Gleditsch 2014: 268). Conflict parties are often interested in mediation in order to achieve peace, but also to secure additional profits, such as financial resources, to reach a better agreement about or guarantees for security during the implementation of the agreement (Zartman/Touval 1985: 33). Conflict parties can also use the mediator as a ‘scapegoat’ if the negotiation does not come to an agreement or to publicly demonstrate their commitment to solve the conflict by accepting a third party as a mediator (Bercovitch 1992: 9). The motives for accepting a mediator might not be to come to an agreement; they can be to gain additional

time, avoid negative publicity or gain international sympathy (Greig/Diehl 2013: 117). Finally, conflict parties might try to avoid weakness by offering peace, and they do not want to directly address their opponent (Greig/Diehl 2013: 107). There are also several reasons, why the conflict parties do not accept a mediator, or even accept negotiations at all, such as believing in their own victory. Additionally, the conflict parties do not accept an agreement or abort negotiations if the agreement is beyond the “best/worst alternative to a negotiated agreement (BATNA/WATNA)” (Zartman 2009: 324). This least favourable option is based on calculations of the costs and benefits of the ongoing negotiations. The distance between these options is the bargaining range between the involved parties. An agreement is possible if the bargaining range between the parties’ overlaps (zone of possible agreement); it is impossible if there is no overlap. Nevertheless, the reservation point can vary because the costs of conflict can increase and become prohibitive (ripeness moment) (Zartman 2009: 331).

These calculations are based on a rational cost-benefit perspective (Greig/Regan 2008: 766). Susskind and Babbitt (1992: 32) emphasise that the concept of rational economic decision makers can be extended to political, economic and psychological considerations of the conflict costs. If all sides perceive the situation as being unwinnable, the mutually hurting stalemate is very harmful, and the conflict parties tend to make concessions. Under the condition of a one-sided hurting stalemate, the other side will reject any offers and spoil the settlement process (Greig/Diehl 2013: 108–109). Mediators can facilitate a balance by either strengthening the weaker conflict party or weakening the stronger conflict party to create the conditions of a mutually hurting stalemate. The sources to influence the conflict parties can be different because they can be the disadvantages a mediator induces (Greig/Diehl 2013: 109).

To summarise, a mediator can use power to impact the bargaining space and manipulate the costs of the conflict (Beardsley 2008: 728; Diehl/Greig 2012: 8–9). Another problem related to reaching an agreement is information failure (Reid 2015: 6). Bush (1996: 8) describes the strategic barriers that arise because all the conflict parties have a “strategic incentive to hide information or even mislead the other side about it, in order to win a larger share of the stakes”. While an overlapping bargaining space theoretically exists, parties do not provide the necessary information, such as possible concessions, because they fear being perceived of as weak (Fearon 1995: 381). Finally, a lack of information can lead to a suboptimal outcome and, subsequently, to new intensions and short-lasting agreements (Greig/Regan 2008: 766). The different impact that leverage can have demonstrates that different phases of the conflict resolution process should be examined, individually, to determine the effect and success that leverage has on the mediation effort. While

one type of leverage can be crucial for one phase, it might not have an impact on reaching an agreement or implementing that agreement.

### UN MEDIATION EFFORTS IN SYRIA

This section reviews the first mediation attempt of the UN, and it examines the failed outcome. It argues that while the mediator had indirect leverage to get the conflict parties to the negotiation table, there was no direct leverage to get the parties to find and implement an agreement. While indirect leverage has an effect on the first mediation sequence and the conflict phase, other types of leverage are necessary in the later stages of the mediation process.

On March 2011, the Syrian people protested against the government, which had been in power since 1970. The protests escalated after security forces heavily repressed the protest. Two months later, the conflict fully escalated, leading to a civil war (Clayton/Gleditsch 2014: 272). While the Arab League (LAS) initiated a first attempt to de-escalate the conflict, the Syrian government opposed the attempt. It argued that the mediator, Secretary-General Nabil al-Arabi, was not trustworthy because the LAS was mainly driven by Qatar and Saudi Arabia, which wanted a government change in Syria. Nevertheless, due to pressure from the international community, the Syrian government accepted military monitors from Arab countries in December 2011. Due to increased violence, the monitors were unable to contribute to a ceasefire and they had to withdraw (Lundgren 2015: 3–4). Instead, the UN took over and former UNSG, Kofi Annan, was put in charge of the mediation efforts on 23 February 2012 (Tamminen 2012: 7; Asseburg 2018: 28). Because Russia opposed the West’s position to remove Assad and the Syrian government, the appointment of Annan was a compromise between both sides (Hinnebusch/Zartman 2016: 6). Based on the LAS plan to solve the conflict, on 16 March 2012 the UN mediator suggested a similar six-point plan that should lead to an inclusive “political process” to stop the violence (Gowan 2013: 1–2; Hinnebusch/Zartman 2016: 7–8). The plan was supported by the UN General Assembly (UNGA), and it allowed the UNSG to appoint a special envoy (UNGA 2011: §4). The Russian support for the plan also forced the Syrian regime to accept it (Hinnebusch/Zartman 2016: 8). The mediation resulted in a ceasefire and the implementation of the first steps of the agreement (Clayton/Gleditsch 2014: 272). On 21 April 2012, the UNSC adopted Resolution 2043 to establish the UN Supervision Mission in Syria (UNSMIS) with up to 300 unarmed soldiers to monitor the cessation of armed violence (UNSC 2012: §5). On 25 May 2012, the mission claimed that pro-government troops were responsible for a massacre in the city of Houla, and it highlighted that Assad did not fully withdraw all of Syria’s forces as required. However, the UNSC was unable to agree on how to condemn these problems, particularly because Russia did not want to solely blame

the Assad government (Gowan 2013: 4; Hinnebusch/Zartman 2016: 8–9). Moreover, the number of attacks on observers increased by mid-June, and the mission ended (UNSMIS n.d.).

When the ceasefire was no longer respected, the mediation team decided to change the strategy and focus on the great powers involved, mainly Russia and the United States (US). The idea was to get them engaged to put pressure on the conflict parties (Lundgren 2015: 4). Annan convened the Action Group for Syria (focusing on the UNSC P5 and excluding Syria and Saudi-Arabia, but not Turkey and Qatar). This meeting was later referred to as the Geneva I Conference, and it issued the so-called Geneva Communiqué (Hinnebusch/Zartman 2016: 9). The communiqué did not explicitly specify the future of Assad (Lundgren 2015: 4). However, it included a set of demands that went beyond previous negotiations to mandate regime change (Hinnebusch/Zartman 2016: 9). Because Russia and the US could not agree on the approach towards Assad, the communiqué was neither implemented nor adopted by the UNSC for more than a year. While the UNSC finally agreed on a resolution under Chapter VI of the UN Charter, which ensured that the Syrian government would implement the peace plan, another resolution under Chapter VII, which was proposed by Western countries, addressed the use of non-military sanctions in the case of Assad's forces, but it did not end the use of heavy weapons or withdraw troops from towns and cities. That resolution was vetoed by China and Russia (Hinnebusch/Zartman 2016: 9). In August 2012, the lack of progress led to the resignation of Annan (Lundgren 2015: 4).

There are various reasons why the mediation attempt in Syria failed.<sup>2</sup> Annan visited Syria 17 times and met three times with Assad, using a twofold approach (Hinnebusch/Zartman 2016: 10). He wanted to bring the parties to the table and mediate a ceasefire to increase the trust between the involved actors, and he also wanted to send an observer mission (Asseburg 2018: 35). Mancini and Vericat (2016: 10) emphasise that Annan and members of his team were respected, and they enjoyed high prestige among the conflict parties. The conflict parties recognised the team's diplomatic experience and the team members' regional and international relations (Mancini/Vericat 2016: 1; Asseburg 2018: 36). Because the international community did not want to militarily intervene at the beginning of the conflict, negotiations were the only possible way to solve the conflict (Goldewijk 2017: 14). The use of indirect leverage enabled negotiations between the parties.<sup>3</sup> However, as highlighted by Asseburg (2018: 39), there are serious doubts as to whether the

conflict parties accepted the mediation offer and came together because they were really interested in finding an agreement (Asseburg 2018, 39). Although the legitimacy of the UN led the conflict parties to accept Annan as the mediator, the mediation was not effective at the second phase of reaching an agreement (see Greig/Diehl 2013). Hinnebusch and Zartman (2016: 1) highlight that, in Syria, the mediators on the mediation team faced the problem of the lack of a mutually hurting stalemate.

Scholars have highlighted that the perceptual condition of a mutually hurting stalemate, in which neither side can win and the ongoing conflict is very costly for all sides involved, can lead to an agreement (Rubin/Pruitt/Kim 1994: 156; Greig/Diehl 2013: 108–109). Not only Assad, but also his opponents, who were being backed by Western powers, often had unattainable demands in the negotiations and a reservation point that did not change. For the Syrian regime, China and Russia vetoed the resolution at the Security Council whether or not they contained military forms of pressure, and the mediator was not backed by the UNSC (Evans/Thakur/Pape 2013: 207; Mancini/Vericat 2016: 10). Several factors caused the division within the UNSC, including previous resentments over Libya, because, in particular, the Russian Federation condemned the interpretation of the resolution adopted by the UNSC to stop the violence (Gowan 2013: 2). This demonstrates that the UN mediators did not have any external leverage to change the reservation points of both parties by increasing their costs of the conflict. It also highlights the problem of multilateral organisation mediators that depend on various member states, which have their own interests (Mancini/Vericat 2016: 1). In addition to the lack of pressure, the conflict parties were not convinced that the reached agreements would be implemented (Hinnebusch/Zartman 2016: 6). The combination of the lack of trust and the lack of coercive power led to the perception of the conflict parties seeking a military victory instead of agreeing to political negotiations (Mancini/Vericat 2016: 10). Annan also named the unwillingness to compromise as one of the decisive factors for his resignation due to a lack of substantial progress (Tamminen 2012: 7). Although Annan was able to bring the parties to the table, he failed to reach an agreement. While he and his team did possess indirect leverage, which was successful at getting the parties to the negotiation table, he lacked direct leverage. Thus, it was not possible to implement any agreement. The mediation attempt did not force the parties to change their reservations points; neither did it significantly impact the BATNAs. Without a mutually hurting stalemate, or at least a one-sided hurting stalemate, no conflict party was willing to make any concessions.

<sup>2</sup> For a proper discussion on why the mediation attempt failed, please refer to Mancini and Vericat (2016), Goldewijk (2017) and Asseburg (2018).

<sup>3</sup> However, they did not bring all the relevant local conflict parties and regional involved actors to the table (Asseburg, 2018: 36).

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

This article contributed to a better understanding of mediation leverage. The existing theories of mediation are often insufficient for differentiating between types of leverage and their application in different conflict phases. Reviewing the status quo of attempts to categorise and conceptualise mediation leverage, the article suggested the need to differentiate between direct and indirect leverage. Additionally, the effects and success of leverage should be examined with regard to the conflict settlement phase of the mediation attempt. Based on the work of Greig and Diehl (2013), who propose three different phases of the mediation process, the article argued that different types of mediation leverage could have a different impact on each stage. This indicates that the discussion of the success of single mediators is incomplete without a proper consideration of the mediation phase. Thus, the effectiveness of a mediator's leverage should also be examined. A study of the Syrian civil war

UN mediation attempt confirmed these assumptions. In 2012, the mediation efforts of former UNSG Annan using indirect leverage enabled the UN mediation team to bring the conflict parties to the negotiation table. However, because the mediators lacked direct leverage, they were unable to make further progress. While many additional factors (which were not the focus of this article) contributed to the mediation failure, the findings demonstrate that it is important to analyse the specific leverage strengths and weaknesses of a mediator in order to determine if the mediation is effective and to consider the impact of leverage on its effectiveness. While a mediator can possess leverage, depending on the conflict phase, that leverage may or may not contribute to effectiveness and success. The article spotlighted the need for further quantitative and qualitative research specifically focusing on the link between the leverage type and the conflict phase. There are also various possibilities to expand this concept. Certain types of leverage might be more useful in certain types of conflict.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ASSEBURG, Muriel (2018): Syria: UN Mediation at the Mercy of Regional and Major-Power Interests, in: Muriel Asseburg, Wolfram Lacher and Mareike Transfeld, *Mission Impossible? UN Mediation in Libya, Syria and Yemen*, SWP Research Paper Stiftung. p. 28-43, [https://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/research\\_papers/2018RP08\\_Ass\\_EtAl.pdf](https://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/research_papers/2018RP08_Ass_EtAl.pdf) [10.5.2019].
- BEARDSLEY, Kyle (2008): Agreement without Peace? International Mediation and Time Inconsistency Problems, in: *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (4), p. 723-740.
- BEARDSLEY, Kyle (2009): Intervention Without Leverage: Explaining the Prevalence of Weak Mediators, in: *International Interactions* 35 (3), p. 272-297.
- BEARDSLEY, Kyle (2011): *The Mediation Dilemma* (New York: Cornell University Press).
- BEARDSLEY, Kyle/QUINN, David/BISWAS, Bidisha/WILKENFELD, Jonathan (2006): Mediation style and crisis outcomes, in: *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50 (1), p. 58-86.
- BERCOVITCH, Jacob J. (1992): The Structure and Diversity of Mediation in International Relations, in: Jacob J. Bercovitch and Jeffrey Z. Rubin (Eds.), *Mediation in International Relations* (New York: St. Martin's Press), p. 1-29.
- BERCOVITCH, Jacob J. (2005): Mediation Success or Failure: A Search for the Elusive Criteria, in: *Cardozo Journal of Conflict Resolution* 7, p. 289-302.
- BERCOVITCH, Jacob J./ANAGNOSON, Theodore/WILLE, Donnette L. (1991): Some Conceptual Issues and Empirical Trends in the Study of Successful Mediation in International Relations, in: *Journal of Peace Research* 28 (1), p. 7-17.
- BERCOVITCH, Jacob J./LANGLEY, Jeffrey (1993): The Nature of the Dispute and the Effectiveness of International Mediation, in: *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37 (4), p. 670-691.
- BERCOVITCH, Jacob J./GARTNER, Scott S. (2006a): Is There Method in the Madness of Mediation? Some Lessons for Mediators from Quantitative Studies of Mediation, in: *International Interactions* 32 (4), p. 329-354.
- BERCOVITCH, Jacob J./GARTNER, Scott S. (2006b): Empirical studies in international mediation: Introduction to a special issue of *International Interactions*, in: *International Interactions* 32 (4), p. 319-328.
- BERCOVITCH, Jacob J./HOUSTON, Allison (2000): Why Do They Do It Like This?: An Analysis of the Factors Influencing Mediation Behavior in International Conflicts, in: *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44 (2), p. 170-202.
- BERGMANN, Julian/NIEMANN, Arne (2013): The European Union as an Effective Mediator in Peace Negotiations? Conceptual Framework and Plausibility Probe, *Mainz Papers on International and European Politics (MPIEP) No. 5.*, <https://international.politics.uni-mainz.de/files/2013/12/mpiep05.pdf> [10.1.2019].
- BERGMANN, Julian/NIEMANN, Arne (2015): Mediating International Conflicts: The European Union as an Effective Peacemaker?, in: *Journal of Common Market Studies* 53 (5), p. 957-975.
- BÖHMELT, Tobias (2010): The effectiveness of tracks of diplomacy strategies in third-party interventions, in: *Journal of Peace Research* 47 (2), p. 167-178.
- BUSH, Robert A. B. (1996): "What Do We Need a Mediator For?": Mediation's "Value-Added" for Negotiators, *12 Ohio St. J. on Disp. Resol.* 1.
- CLAYTON, Govinda/GLEDITSCH, Kristian S. (2014): Will we see helping hands? Predicting civil war mediation and likely success, in: *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 31 (3), p. 265-284.
- DIEHL, Paul F./GREIG, Michael J. (2012): *International Mediation* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- EISENKOPF, Gerald/BÄCHTIGER, André (2014): Mediation and Conflict Prevention, in: *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 57 (4), p. 570-597.
- EVANS, Gareth/THAKUR, Ramesh/PAPE, Robert P. (2013): Correspondence: Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect, in: *International Security* 37 (4), p. 199-214.
- FEARON, James D. (1995): Rationalist Explanations for War, in: *International Organization* 49 (3), p. 379-414.
- GOLDEWIJK, Berma K. (2017): International Mediation in Syria's Complex War: Strategic Implications, in: Paul Ducheine, and Frans Osinga (Eds.), *Netherlands Annual Review of Military Studies* (The Hague: T.M.C. Asser Press), p. 107-23.
- GOWAN, Richard (2013): Kofi Annan, Syria and the Uses of Uncertainty in Mediation, in: *International Journal of Security and Development* 2 (1), p. 1-6.

GREIG, Michael J./DIEHL, Paul, F. (2013): *International Mediation* (Malden: Polity Press).

GREIG, Michael J./REGAN, Patrick M. (2008): When Do They Say Yes? An Analysis of the Willingness to Offer and Accept Mediation in Civil Wars, in: *International Studies Quarterly* 52 (4), p. 759-781.

HAIXIA, Qi (2007): A Comparison of the Effectiveness of International Conflict Mediation Strategies, in: *Chinese Journal of International Politics* 1 (4), p. 589-622.

HELLMAN, Johan (2012): The Occurrence of Mediation: A Critical Evaluation of the Current Debate, in: *International Studies Review* 14 (4), p. 591-603.

HINNEBUSCH, Raymond/ZARTMAN, William (2016): *UN Mediation in the Syrian Crisis: From Kofi Annan to Lakhdar Brahimi* (New York: International Peace Institute).

JACOBS, Scott (2002): Maintaining neutrality in dispute mediation: managing disagreement while managing not to disagree, in: *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (10), p. 1403-1426

KLEIBOER, Marieke (1996): Understanding success and failure of international mediation, in: *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 40 (2), p. 360-389.

KYDD, Andrew H. (2006): When Can Mediators Build Trust?, in: *The American Political Science Review* 100 (3), p. 449-462.

LANDWEHR, Jakob (2019): No way out? Opportunities for mediation efforts in the Donbas region, *East European Politics* 35 (3), p. 291-310.

LUNDGREN, Magnus (2015): *Peacemaking in Syria: Barriers and Opportunities*, Swedish Institute of International Affairs 1, <http://www.ui.se/eng/upl/files/111609.pdf> [Accessed 10 January 2019].

MANCINI, Francesco/VERICAT, Jose (2016): *Lost in Translation: UN Mediation in Libya, Syria and Yemen* (New York: International Peace Institute).

NATHAN, Laurie (2013): The Intelligence Requirement of International Mediation, in: *Intelligence and National Security* 29 (2), p. 208-226.

PRINCEN, Thomas (1992): *Intermediaries in International Conflict* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

RAUCHHAUS, Robert W. (2006): Asymmetric Information, Mediation, and Conflict Management, in: *World*

*Politics* 58 (2), p. 207-241.

REID, Lindsay (2015): Finding a Peace that Lasts: Mediator Leverage and the Durable Resolution of Civil Wars, in: *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 1 (1), p. 1-31.

RUBIN, Jeffrey Z. (1992): Conclusion: International Mediation in Context, in: Jacob J. Bercovitch, and Jeffrey Z. Rubin, J. (Eds.), *Mediation in International Relations* (New York: St. Martin's Press), p. 249-272.

RUBIN, Jeffrey Z./PRUITT, Dean G./KIM, Sung H. (1994): *Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate, and Settlement* (2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill).

SHAPIRA, Omer (2009): Exploring the Concept of Power in Mediation: Mediators' Sources of Power and Influence Tactics, in: *Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution* 24 (3), p. 535-570.

SIMKIN, William E. (1971): *Mediation and the Dynamics of Collective Bargaining* (Washington DC: Bureau of National Affairs).

SMITH, Alastair/STAM, Allan (2003): Mediation and Peacekeeping in a Random Walk Model of Civil and Interstate War, in: *International Studies Review* 5 (4), p. 115-135.

SUSSKIND, Lawrence/BABBITT, Eileen (1992): Overcoming the Obstacles to Effective Mediation of International Disputes, in: Jacob J. Bercovitch, and Jeffrey Z. Rubin (Eds.), *Mediation in International Relations* (New York: St. Martin's Press), p. 30-51.

SVENSSON, Isak (2008): Guaranteeing peace: the credibility of third-party mediators in civil wars, in: Jacob J. Bercovitch and Scott S. Gartner (Eds.), *International conflict mediation: New approaches and findings* (New York: Routledge), p. 115-134.

TAMMINEN, Tanja (2012): Towards a common European language on peace and mediation, in: Tanja Tamminen (Ed.), *Strengthening the EU's peace mediation capacities* (Helsinki: Finnish Institute of International Affairs), p. 33-44.

TOCCI, Natalie (2008): The EU and Conflict Resolution in Turkey and Georgia: Hindering EU Potential Through the Political Management of Contractual Relations, in: *Journal of Common Market Studies* 46 (4), p. 875-897.

TOUVAL, Saadia/ZARTMAN, William (1989): Mediation in international conflicts, in: Kenneth Kressel and Dean C. Pruitt (Eds.), *Mediation Research: The Process and Effectiveness of Third-Party Intervention* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass), p. 115-137.

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY (UNGA) (2011): Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic (A/RES/66/176) (19 December 2011). <https://undocs.org/A/RES/66/176> [30.3.2019].

UNITED NATIONS SECRETARY-GENERAL (UNSG) (2009): Report of the Secretary General on Enhancing Mediation and its Support Activities (S/2009/189), [https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/SGReport\\_EnhancingMediation\\_S2009189%28english%29.pdf](https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/SGReport_EnhancingMediation_S2009189%28english%29.pdf) [10.1.2019].

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL (UNSC) (2012): Middle East (S/RES/2043 (2012)), [https://undocs.org/S/RES/2043\(2012\)](https://undocs.org/S/RES/2043(2012)) [30.3.2019].

UNITED NATIONS SUPERVISION MISSION IN SYRIA (UNSMIS) (n.d.): United Nations Supervision Mission in Syria, <https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/mission/past/unsmis/> [30.3.2019].

VUKOVIC, Siniša (2014): Three Degrees of Success in International Mediation, in: *Journal of International Studies* 42 (3), p. 966-976.

WILKENFELD, Jonathan/YOUNG, Victor/ASAL, Victor/QUINN, David (2003): Mediating international crises: Cross national and experimental perspectives, in: *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 47 (3), p. 279-301.

ZARTMAN, William (2009): Conflict Resolution and Negotiation, in: Jacob J. Bercovitch, Victor Kremenyuk and William Zartman, *The SAGA Handbook of Conflict Resolution* (London: SAGA Publications), p. 322-339.

ZARTMAN, William/TOUVAL, Saadia (1985): International Mediation: Conflict Resolution and Power Politics, in: *Journal of Social Issues* 41 (2), p. 27-45.