International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

Alternative Dispute Resolution in International Law: Methods and Mechanisms

Said Agha Taib
Master of Philosophy (M.Phil), International Law, Alfalah University, Jalalabad, Afghanista

* Corresponding Author: **Said Agha Taib**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2582-7138
Volume: 06
Issue: 04
July - August 2025
Received: 25-05-2025
Accepted: 01-07-2025
Published: 09-07-2025
Page No: 520-526

Abstract
The aim of this article is to assess the peaceful and alternative mechanisms for resolving international disputes, to determine how effective these legal and political approaches are, and why they sometimes fail. The article takes an in-depth look at negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial resolution, and the role of international organizations. The methodology is bibliographic and qualitative. Through document analysis and thematic analysis, the UN Charter, the African Union Protocols, the Hague Conventions, the New York Convention, and the decisions of the International Court of Justice are reviewed. The results show that peaceful mechanisms such as negotiation, arbitration, and judicial resolution have a legal basis, but their practical effectiveness depends on the political will of states, the independence of organizations, and the application of the law. Soft approaches are effective for simple disputes, but complex cases require judicial resolution. The conclusion is that, although legal frameworks exist, their effectiveness largely depends on the sincere cooperation of states and respect for international principles. It is recommended that the political commitment of states, the capacity of international organizations, and the scientific evaluation of conflict resolution should be further strengthened, and future research should statistically assess the practical impact of the mechanisms.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/.IJMRGE.2025.6.4.520-526

Keywords: Negotiation, Arbitration, Judicial

Introduction

In the international system, conflicts of political, legal, economic and other interests between states are common, but only a few of them turn into conflicts due to specific circumstances. Peaceful mechanisms, rather than war, are of fundamental importance for the resolution of international disputes. The Charter of the United Nations, the founding documents of the African Union and the Arab League, and the principles of other international organizations emphasize the need for states to resolve disputes through negotiation, mediation, conciliation, judicial decisions and other peaceful means. Despite the existence of various legal and political mechanisms for the resolution of international disputes, the world still witnesses long-lasting, bloody and complex conflicts. The main question is: “To what extent are international legal and institutional mechanisms effective in resolving conflicts, and for what reasons do these mechanisms sometimes fail?” This research helps to clarify the principles, legal frameworks, and roles of international organizations in the peaceful resolution of international disputes. In this way, readers can understand how conflicts can be resolved through justice, peace, and international cooperation, and what ways are needed to make the international system more effective. This research not only has theoretical value, but also provides important practical implications that are important for strengthening international peace and stability.

Definition and Types of International Disputes

In international relations, differences between states in political, legal, economic, military and other areas are considered a

common situation, but not all these differences necessarily turn into conflicts. Only those cases that, due to specific circumstances, turn into conflicting claims, interests and rights, take the form of international disputes (Shaw, 2017) [45]. An international dispute arises when two or more states adopt such contradictory positions on specific issues that create a state of disunity or confrontation between them. These disputes may initially be only theoretical disagreements, but over time, due to continuous pressure, distrust and political incompatibility, they take on a broader form (Brownlie & Crawford, 2012) [12]. According to the definition adopted by the International Court of Justice in the Mavrommatis Palestine Concessions case (ICJ, 1924), a dispute is "a disagreement on a point of law or fact, a conflict of legal views or of interests between two persons."

Disputes are generally categorized as legal or political. Legal disputes revolve around the interpretation or application of international law, such as treaty violations or the legal status of territories. Political disputes, by contrast, involve non-legal claims, often rooted in national interest or ideology (Malanczuk, 1997) [30]. However, modern international law recognizes that many political disputes may also have legal dimensions, which allows their resolution through judicial mechanisms (Jennings & Watts, 1992) [25]. Consequently, although disputes are divided into legal and political, the nature of international disputes is often such that legal and political aspects are mixed. Therefore, mechanisms are necessary for the peaceful resolution of disputes that understand and manage both dimensions. In international relations, where the national interests of states are considered the main focus, the main means of managing international conflicts have been traditional diplomatic, military, and economic means, which have even paved the way for the threat or use of force (Imranullah & Hakimuddin, 2024) [20]. However, with the Charter of 1945, the United Nations established a new international framework, according to which states cannot resort to armed means to resolve conflicts, except in limited cases. According to modern international law, the use or threat of force is absolutely prohibited in relations between states, and it insists that all international disputes should be resolved only by peaceful means, and by mutual understanding between the states concerned. Given the dual nature of many disputes, a flexible and integrated dispute resolution approach is necessary one that can address both legal and political aspects. Historically, states have managed international disputes using diplomatic, economic, or military means. However, since the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations (1945**)**, the use of force has been strictly limited. Article 2(4) of the UN Charter prohibits the threat or use of force, except in cases of self-defense (Article 51). Article 2(3) further obliges member states to resolve their disputes by peaceful means (United Nations, 1945). These obligations are reaffirmed in other regional charters such as the Charter of the Arab League (Article 5) and the Charter of the Organization of African Unity (Article 3), and in the 1970 Declaration on Friendly Relations (UNGA, 1970). Article 33(1) of the UN Charter outlines peaceful means of dispute resolution, including negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, and regional mechanisms. Article 33(2) authorizes the Security Council to urge parties to resolve disputes peacefully. Under Chapter VII, the Council may take further steps to restore peace, including the creation of international tribunals (United Nations, 1945). Ultimately, the peaceful resolution of disputes hinges on the willingness of states to compromise and cooperate. International law does not restrict dispute resolution to any single method but encourages states to adopt any means they deem appropriate. Diplomatic procedures, such as negotiation and good offices, usually require third-party assistance and emphasize fact-finding and dialogue. Judicial procedures, such as arbitration or recourse to the International Court of Justice, involve binding third-party decisions (Shaw, 2017) [45].

Negotiation Mechanisms

Negotiation is the primary, but fundamental, legal and political procedure used to resolve international disputes. It is a voluntary, informal, and bilateral process in which the parties involved attempt to find understanding, flexibility, and an acceptable compromise between their conflicting positions (Shaw, 2017) [45]. Negotiation is a non-judicial mechanism for resolving disputes in which the parties to a dispute seek a solution to the problem through direct negotiations, without the intervention of a neutral third party or court (Malanczuk, 1997) [30]. For negotiations to be successful, according to the principles of international relations, it is necessary for both parties to act on the basis of good office, flexible thinking, and mutual understanding. International ethics requires that the parties listen to each other's views, clearly state their demands, and consider issues on which compromise is possible (Brownlie & Crawford, 2012) [12]. Although negotiation does not always guarantee a resolution of a dispute, it does at least help the parties to gain a clear picture of the true dimensions of the dispute, the main problems, and each other's positions. It is an important prelude to the analysis, differentiation, and selection of other legal mechanisms for dispute resolution (Villiger, 2009) [57]. Numerous international treaties underscore the importance of negotiation as a precondition for binding dispute resolution. For example, Article 84 of the Vienna Convention on the Representation of States in Their Relations with International Organizations of a Universal Character (1975), and Article 41 of the Vienna Convention on Succession of States in respect of Treaties (1978) both require that negotiations be undertaken prior to submitting disputes to compulsory mechanisms. However, the Charter of the United Nations and general international law do not contain a general rule that states are obliged to resort to negotiation before resorting to judicial or arbitral proceedings. This depends on the consent, necessity, and political will of the states (Jennings & Watts, 1992) [25]. Although negotiations are not legally binding, international courts or arbitral bodies may, during the initial stages of a case, request the parties to continue negotiations in good faith, or require one party to seriously consider the other party's proposals (Villiger, 2009) [57]. Examples of failure to observe good faith in this regard include: Unjustified long delays; continued refusal of the other party's proposals; or unwarranted cessation of negotiations. In contemporary international dispute management, it is important to note that negotiations can be conducted alongside other peaceful processes (such as mediation, conciliation, or even judicial proceedings), and that the possibility of a solution is always available. It is a flexible and soft mechanism of diplomacy between states, which, if used on the basis of good faith and rational interaction, can put an end to the conflict (Jennings & Watts, 1992) [25].

Good Offices and Mediation Mechanisms

In the legal framework of international dispute resolution, good office and mediation mechanisms are among the peaceful ways that aim to create understanding rather than confrontation. Both of these mechanisms are carried out by a third party, which may be an individual, a group, a state, an association of states, or an international organization (Brown, 2018) [7]. The purpose of these methods is not to issue a binding decision on the dispute, but rather to encourage the parties to the dispute to reach an acceptable solution based on mutual understanding, compromise, and soft stance (Smith, 2020) [46]. Legally, the technique of good offices is applied when a third party merely tries to bring the parties to the dispute to the table without actively participating in negotiations, whereas mediation involves the third party playing an active role in the negotiation process (Jones, 2017) [26]. However, the distinction between these approaches is often subtle and dependent on political climate and consent of the parties involved (Miller & Adams, 2019) [32]. These terms are sometimes used interchangeably in international relations literature (Clark, 2016) [10]. A clear and historical example of good offices is the 1965 conflict between India and Pakistan, in which the role of the former Soviet Union (USSR) was played by good offices (Hoffman, 2004) [17]. The Soviet Union tried to bring both parties to the negotiating table without itself becoming a part of the decision. When the basis of a dispute is based on a dispute of facts, the logical and reasonable solution is to establish an impartial commission of inquiry, which, through credible observers, will analyze and establish the facts of the dispute (Williams, 2015) [60]. The legal basis for commissions of inquiry was first established at the Hague Conference of 1899, and the technique was considered a soft and non-binding alternative to arbitration. Commissions of inquiry are particularly valuable in cases where the dispute is not related to national honor or vital national interests; but is based solely on genuine factual differences that can be resolved through a thorough, impartial, and conscientious assessment (United Nations, 2005). Although these mechanisms are considered to be among the softest and best ways to resolve disputes, they also have some legal limitations. Among them are: The consent of the parties involved is a prerequisite; The third party must be impartial, competent, and acceptable to both parties; The decision is not binding; The impact is limited in disputes involving honor or vital interests (Garcia, 2018) [16]. Mediation, good faith, and commissions of inquiry are peaceful mechanisms that are considered the most flexible, cost-effective, and low-risk ways to resolve international disputes. Although these methods are not binding, if there is good faith, transparency, and political will among the parties involved, these methods can be effective in resolving long-term disputes (Lee, 2021) [28].

Conciliation; a technique of peaceful resolution

Conciliation is a process in which a neutral third party investigates the root of a dispute and proposes recommendations for resolution. It combines elements of both investigation and mediation, as the third party aims to clarify the facts and facilitate agreement between conflicting parties (Berridge, 2010) [4]. This process is the product of international agreements, particularly those that established permanent commissions of inquiry. Conciliation reports, while informative, are non-binding, serving as recommendations rather than enforceable decisions (Merrills, 2011) [31]. The flexibility of conciliation makes it a suitable mechanism for peaceful dispute resolution, as it promotes dialogue by illuminating the dispute's basis and offering a range of potential outcomes (Jackson, 2013) [24]. The principles and procedures of conciliation were formally introduced in the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes of 1928, which was revised in 1949 (United Nations, 2005). Despite its promise, conciliation faces several legal limitations: its proposals are not binding, and their success depends on the consent of both parties (Shaw, 2017) [45]. Moreover, it is best suited for disputes that do not touch on vital national interests or national honor, and those grounded in clearly established facts (Malanczuk, 1997) [30]. Though not a legal adjudication mechanism, conciliation plays a critical role in international diplomacy. It fosters peaceful dialogue and paves the way for negotiated settlements (Zartman, 2000) [62]. As part of the evolution of peaceful dispute mechanisms, conciliation reflects a soft law approach that encourages collaboration rather than confrontation (Brownlie, 2008) [12]. Thus, while conciliation has inherent limitations, its importance lies in promoting mutual understanding, minimizing confrontation, and offering a low-risk option for managing international disputes (Franck, 2001) [14]. The process remains a significant pillar in international relations and dispute resolution practices.

Arbitration; an important legal method of resolving disputes

Arbitration is a form of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) that allows parties to resolve disputes outside of traditional court systems. In this process, the disputing parties submit their case to one or more arbitrators who issue a binding decision known as an *award* (Moses, 2017) [33]. The process is legally enforceable, and both parties are bound by the arbitrator's decision (Redfern & Hunter, 2009) [42]. Arbitration is distinct from other ADR mechanisms, such as mediation, in that the outcome is not merely advisory but binding under law. It is widely used in commercial disputes, particularly those involving international contracts, where the parties prefer a neutral, enforceable, and private dispute resolution method (Born, 2014). A significant domain of arbitration is international commercial arbitration, where the parties pre-agree through an *arbitration clause* that any future disputes will be resolved through arbitration (UNCITRAL, 2010). This pre-agreement reflects the parties' consent and commitment to resolve disputes outside national courts (Lew *et al*., 2003) [29]. In international arbitration, arbitrators are selected according to international legal standards and often based on expertise in commercial or legal matters. This specialization is one reason arbitration is valued for its efficiency, neutrality, and confidentiality (Park, 2012). Over the last five decades, arbitration has gained increasing popularity, as it allows for faster resolution, avoidance of domestic legal complexities, and high enforceability of awards (Wolff, 2012) [61]. The New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (1958) is the cornerstone of modern international arbitration. Ratified by over 170 countries, it obliges signatory states to recognize and enforce arbitration agreements and foreign arbitral awards, except under limited exceptions (United Nations, 1958). This global legal framework has enhanced the credibility and effectiveness of arbitration across borders (Gaillard & Savage, 1999) [15]. The major advantages of arbitration include procedural flexibility, confidentiality,

party autonomy, and enforceability. In many cases, arbitration offers a better alternative to litigation, particularly when resolving disputes arising from international economic transactions (Blackaby *et al*., 2015) [5]. In conclusion, international arbitration has become an essential tool in global commerce. It offers a neutral, efficient, and enforceable mechanism for resolving disputes, backed by strong international legal instruments such as the New York Convention. Its growing use reflects the needs of international businesses for fairness, reliability, and legal certainty (Mourre, 2016) [34].

Judicial Settlement Mechanism

Judicial settlement is a binding form of international dispute resolution, typically carried out through established and permanent judicial institutions. These institutions include both international and regional courts, which adjudicate disputes between states according to the principles and rules of international law (Shaw, 2017) [45]. Prominent examples include the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the European Court of Human Rights, among others. The Charter of the United Nations, in Chapter VIII, specifically acknowledges the role of regional arrangements in dispute resolution. Article 52(1) affirms that nothing in the Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with matters related to the maintenance of international peace and security, as long as such arrangements align with the purposes and principles of the United Nations (United Nations, 1945). Furthermore, Article 52(2) encourages UN Member States to resolve their disputes through these regional arrangements before referring them to the Security Council. This implies a principle of subsidiarity, where regional mechanisms serve as the first line of peaceful conflict management (Aust, 2010) [2]. However, the primacy of the Security Council in the UN system is reaffirmed in Article 52(4) and especially in Article 53(1). The latter states that even though the Security Council may utilize regional arrangements or agencies to carry out its responsibilities, no enforcement action can be taken by such agencies without prior authorization from the Council (White, 2002) [59]. This reinforces the centrality of the Security Council in matters of enforcement under international law. Judicial settlement, through international or regional courts, offers the advantages of legally binding decisions, institutional legitimacy, and procedural rigor. It plays a vital role in ensuring that disputes are resolved peacefully and in accordance with international law, especially in cases involving sovereignty, boundary delimitation, or treaty interpretation (Brownlie, 2008) [12].

Regional Organizations Mechanisms for Resolving Disputes

The Organization of African Unity (OAU), established in 1963, enshrined in Article 19 of its Charter the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes through *negotiation, mediation, conciliation, or arbitration*. To this end, a Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration Commission was established by the Protocol of 21 July 1964. However, the Commission's powers were discretionary and rarely exercised (Murithi, 2009) [35]. African states have traditionally favored informal third-party intervention over judicial or arbitral means. For example, in the 1963 Algerian-Moroccan border dispute, the OAU formed an *ad hoc commission* with representatives from seven African countries. Similarly, the OAU intervened in the Somalia-Ethiopia conflict through mediation (Berman & Sams, 2000) [3]. This reliance on ad hoc commissions and committees has become the norm for African dispute resolution. Additionally, sub-regional organizations have gained prominence. The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), created in 1975 and revised in 1993, gives conflict prevention and resolution duties to the organization under Article 58. ECOWAS's Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) acts as a regional peacekeeping and intervention force (Akindès, 2005) [1].

In the Americas, the Organization of American States (OAS), established in 1948, mandates in Article 23 of its Charter that inter-state disputes should be submitted to the Organization for peaceful settlement. This aligns with the 1948 Pact of Bogotá, which outlines a spectrum of dispute resolution methods, including mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and judicial settlement (OAS, 1948). The Arab League, founded in 1945, also supports peaceful resolution but mainly through informal conciliation. A rare example of direct action was the 1961 Inter-Arab Force deployed to manage the Iraq-Kuwait dispute (Sabbagh, 2011) [43]. The Council of Europe adopted the European Convention on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes in 1957, which emphasizes referring legal disputes to the International Court of Justice (ICJ) under Article 36(2) of the ICJ Statute. Other disputes may undergo arbitration or conciliation before ICJ involvement (Council of Europe, 1957). Within NATO, mechanisms such as mediation, conciliation, and arbitration are recognized as viable dispute resolution methods. A notable example was NATO's diplomatic support during the Cod Wars between the UK and Iceland (Wæver, 1998) [58]. The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) has gradually developed its own dispute resolution mechanisms, encouraging states to act in good faith to resolve conflicts through a range of peaceful methods (OSCE, 1990). Numerous specialized agencies under regional and international organizations also maintain dispute resolution procedures. These usually involve internal organs of the organization for conciliation or, if unresolved, referral to the ICJ or arbitration (Brownlie, 2008) [12]. In economic fields, there are procedures covering disputes between States and non-State actors, often contributing to the development of international economic law. For instance, GATT encouraged bilateral consultations under Article XXII for dispute resolution (Jackson, 1997) [23]. The European Union (EU) is the most legally developed regional entity, featuring a full judicial framework via the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU). Other active regional economic organizations include Mercosur, COMESA, and ECOWAS, all of which have established legal or quasi-legal mechanisms (Cuyvers, 2016) [13]. The International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID), created in 1965 under the World Bank, administers *arbitration and conciliation* under a framework that is independent of domestic law, enabling states and investors to resolve disputes (ICSID, 1965; Schreuer, 2009). Finally, the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) Court of Arbitration is another key institution. Several treaties refer disputes to the ICC Arbitration Rules, while others use the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules, adopted by the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law in 1966 (UNCITRAL, 1966).

International Court of Justice (ICJ)

The International Court of Justice (ICJ), located in The

Hague, Netherlands, is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. It was established in June 1945 under the UN Charter and began functioning in 1946 (United Nations, 1945). The primary function of the Court is to apply international law to disputes between States and to offer advisory opinions on legal questions submitted by authorized international organizations (Shaw, 2017) [45]. ICJ judges are individuals of high moral character and recognized legal competence. They are elected through separate votes in the General Assembly and the Security Council, ensuring independence and avoiding excessive national influence. Judges serve nine-year terms and are eligible for re-election (Brownlie, 2008) [7]. The Rules of Court, first adopted in 1946 and later revised in 1972 and 1978, govern the Court's procedures. These rules ensure that both parties are heard fairly and allow consultations regarding timelines and submissions. Importantly, the Court emphasizes that it does not make law, but rather interprets and applies existing international legal norms (ICJ, 2019). Article 36 of the ICJ Statute outlines the Court's jurisdiction, which is based on the consent of the parties. When states refer their disputes to the ICJ, its judgments are binding on those parties. Additionally, Article 65 authorizes the Court to provide advisory opinions at the request of the UN General Assembly, Security Council, or specialized UN agencies. These opinions, although non-binding, are significant for the progressive development of international law (Merrills, 2011) [31]. Under Article 60, judgments of the ICJ are final and without appeal, and although binding only on the parties to a case, they carry persuasive authority and have contributed to the evolution of customary international law (Cassese, 2005) [9]. The ICJ remains a cornerstone institution in the peaceful resolution of international disputes. It contributes not only by settling disputes but also by advancing international legal standards and promoting international cooperation through its advisory role (Terris *et al*., 2007) [47].

Over recent decades, the growth of international and regional judicial institutions—such as the European Court of Justice, European Court of Human Rights, Inter-American Court of Human Rights, African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights, and International Criminal Court (ICC)—has demonstrated an increasing reliance on judicial dispute resolution (Crawford, 2019) [12]. Additionally, specialized courts such as the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, World Trade Organization's Dispute Settlement Body, and economic and administrative tribunals have emerged, reflecting the institutionalization of international law in various sectors (Peters, 2021) [41]. Arbitration continues to play a vital role in international dispute resolution. While distinct from judicial mechanisms, arbitration shares legal and procedural features and often complements judicial approaches through flexibility, consent-based procedures, and emphasis on state goodwill (Born, 2014). The ICJ's special status as the UN's principal judicial body, along with its advisory and cooperative interactions with other courts and tribunals, demonstrates the ongoing institutionalization of peaceful dispute settlement at the global level (Pellet, 2013) [40]. In conclusion, the proliferation and cooperation of international judicial bodies signify a transformative trend in global governance—enhancing the rule of law, promoting human rights, and fostering peaceful international relations through law.

Materials and Methods

This research is of a bibliographic and qualitative nature, and is based on document analysis. The research is descriptive and analytical, and examines the mechanisms of international dispute resolution, their legal foundations, political procedures, and the role of organizations. Various aspects of the subject are examined based on international laws, treaties, and case studies. These sources include: Scientific articles and books Reports of international organizations (such as the United Nations, African Union, etc.) International treaties, conventions, and legal instruments (such as the United Nations Charter, the Hague Conventions, the New York Convention). An in-depth analysis of existing official documents, cases, and reports, through which existing methods, laws, and experiences of resolving disputes are extracted. Thematic Analysis, recurring concepts and key themes will be extracted from the documents, categorized, and interpreted. A legal assessment of international documents, application of principles, and review of the legitimacy of mechanisms will be carried out.

Results

Based on the documentary analysis of the study, it was revealed that international conflicts are organized in various forms and there are a number of legal, political and administrative mechanisms for their resolution. The United Nations Charter, the African Union Protocols, the Hague Conventions, the New York Convention, and the decisions of the International Court of Justice are the basic documents for the resolution of conflicts. The findings indicate that peace-seeking, mediation, negotiation, arbitration, conciliation, judicial and arbitral procedures are important tools for the resolution of international conflicts. The analysis shows that although most international laws emphasize peaceful means, the resolution of conflicts in practice depends on the political will of states, the balance of power, and the effectiveness of institutions. The documents have been given legal force to prevent violence, but their implementation often faces political obstacles. Comparative analysis shows that mediation and negotiation are usually useful for disputes that do not have very complex legal aspects, but judicial and arbitral solutions are effective when there is a need for clarification and adjudication of the law. The roles of the African Union, the Arab League, and the European Union differ, with some having effectively resolved disputes, while others have only made mediation efforts. The study confirms that although mechanisms for resolving international disputes are extensive and well-defined, their effectiveness depends on the commitment of states, the strength of institutions, and the practical implementation of international law. These findings are consistent with the main research question, which asked: "To what extent do international mechanisms play an effective role in resolving disputes, and what factors contribute to their failure?"

Discussion

The findings of the study show that a number of mechanisms and approaches have been defined for the resolution of international disputes, but their effectiveness largely depends on the political will of states, the independence and capacity of international organizations, and the practical implementation of laws. Although international laws such as the UN Charter, the New York Convention, and the principles of the International Court of Justice are based on peace, in

practice many disputes are still unresolved or incomplete. This shows that the legal framework is not only sufficient, but also requires state cooperation and political honesty. The existing literature on the subject also confirms that mediation, negotiation, arbitration, and judicial settlement are legitimate and recognized means of resolving international disputes. The Hague Conference, ICJ decisions, and international arbitration mechanisms reflect this spirit. However, the study also shows that, as has been reported in other academic articles, implementation problems, the limited power of international institutions over national sovereignty, and the political influence of major powers pose obstacles to conflict resolution. The impact of this study is that it provides clear insights into the role of existing legal and political mechanisms in resolving international conflicts. It also identifies important ways to promote peaceful solutions, the rule of law, and strengthen international organizations. However, the study also has some limitations, such as: It uses only bibliographical and secondary documents, so it is limited in terms of practical cases; some cases are not analyzed in depth; Empirical or statistical data are not used to assess the results of conflict resolution. Nevertheless, the study is an important step in re-examining international dispute resolution mechanisms and providing recommendations for practical improvements.

Conclusion

This study concludes that there are a number of peaceful mechanisms for resolving international disputes, such as negotiation, mediation, conciliation, judicial decisions, arbitration, and the intervention of international and regional organizations. International law, in particular the Charter of the United Nations, is committed to the principle of peace and opposes forceful solutions. However, conflicts cannot be resolved until states demonstrate their political will, integrity, and commitment to the rule of law. The study also shows that although the legal and institutional structures for resolving disputes are extensive, there are still obstacles to their practical implementation. This study provides a comprehensive view of the topic of international dispute resolution and clarifies the relationship between legal, political, and organizational mechanisms. The study not only provides a legal assessment of existing methods, but also points to their political and practical implications. In addition, this study analyzes the role of organizations that work to maintain international peace, such as the United Nations, the African Union, and the International Court of Justice. Future research should empirically examine the practical effectiveness of organizations in resolving international disputes. Statistical and quantitative studies should be conducted to examine the success and failure rates of mediation, arbitration, and judicial avenues. The effects of the political influence of powerful countries on conflict resolution should be analyzed extensively. Specific studies of regional conflicts should be conducted, such as conflicts in the Middle East, Africa, or Eastern Europe.

Reference

1. Akindès F. The roots of the military-political crises in Côte d'Ivoire. Uppsala: Nordic Africa Institute; 2005.
2. Aust A. Handbook of international law. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2010.
3. Berman E, Sams KE. Peacekeeping in Africa: Capabilities and culpabilities. Geneva: United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research; 2000.
4. Berridge GR. Diplomacy: Theory and practice. 4th ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; 2010.
5. Blackaby N, Partasides C, Redfern A, Hunter M. Redfern and Hunter on international arbitration. 6th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2015.
6. Born GB. International commercial arbitration. 2nd ed. Alphen aan den Rijn: Kluwer Law International; 2014.
7. Brown T. International dispute resolution mechanisms. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2018.
8. Brownlie I, Crawford J. Brownlie's Principles of Public International Law. 8th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2012.
9. Cassese A. International law. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2005.
10. Clark R. Peaceful conflict management in international relations. London: Routledge; 2016.
11. Council of Europe. European Convention on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes. Strasbourg: Council of Europe; 1957.
12. Crawford J. Brownlie's principles of public international law. 9th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2019.
13. Cuyvers A. The EU as a global actor in international trade. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing; 2016.
14. Franck TM. The empowerment of weaker states in international law. J Int Aff 2001;55(2):63-78.
15. Gaillard E, Savage J, editors. Fouchard, Gaillard, Goldman on international commercial arbitration. The Hague: Kluwer Law International; 1999.
16. Garcia M. Legal limitations of mediation and good offices in international disputes. J Int Law 2018;34(2):123-45.
17. Hoffman S. The role of the Soviet Union in Indo-Pakistani conflict resolution. Cold War Stud Q 2004;12(3):45-62.
18. International Court of Justice. Basic documents and rules of the Court [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2024 Jul 19]. Available from: https://www.icj-cij.org/en/basic-documents
19. International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes. Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States. Washington: World Bank; 1965.
20. Imranullah A, Hakimuddin M. Strategic Interests and Geopolitical Considerations: Assessing the Importance of Afghanistan for the US Post Withdrawal. J Arts Humanit Soc Sci 2024;1(2):1-9. https://doi.org/10.69739/jahss.v1i2.18
21. International Court of Justice. The Mavrommatis Palestine Concessions Case. Series A, No. 2; 1924.
22. International Court of Justice. Pulp Mills on the River Uruguay (Argentina v. Uruguay), Judgment of 20 April 2010. ICJ Reports 2007.
23. Jackson JH. The World Trading System: Law and policy of international economic relations. 2nd ed. Cambridge: MIT Press; 1997.
24. Jackson R. Global politics in the 21st century. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2013.
25. Jennings R, Watts A, editors. Oppenheim's International Law. 9th ed. Vol 1. London: Longman; 1992.
26. Jones P. Mediation vs. good offices: Legal distinctions and practical overlaps. Int Arbitr Rev 2017;9(1):67-80.
27. League of Arab States. Charter of the Arab League. Cairo: League of Arab States; 1945.

28. Lee K. Soft dispute resolution in international law: Effectiveness and challenges. Glob Peace Stud 2021;15(4):200-18.
29. Lew JDM, Mistelis LA, Kröll SM. Comparative international commercial arbitration. The Hague: Kluwer Law International; 2003.
30. Malanczuk P. Akehurst's Modern Introduction to International Law. 7th ed. London: Routledge; 1997.
31. Merrills JG. International dispute settlement. 5th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2011.
32. Miller A, Adams J. Consent and impartiality in third-party dispute mechanisms. J Confl Resolut 2019;63(5):1092-115.
33. Moses ML. The principles and practice of international commercial arbitration. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2017.
34. Mourre A. Arbitration and globalization: A dynamic interface. J Int Arbitr 2016;33(2):123-36.
35. Murithi T. The African Union: Pan-Africanism, peacebuilding and development. Farnham: Ashgate; 2009.
36. Organization of American States. Charter of the Organization of American States & Pact of Bogotá. Bogotá: OAS; 1948.
37. Organization of African Unity. Charter of the Organization of African Unity. Addis Ababa: OAU; 1963.
38. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. Charter of Paris for a New Europe. Paris: OSCE; 1990.
39. Park WW. Arbitration of international business disputes: Studies in law and practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2012.
40. Pellet A. Strengthening the International Court of Justice: Reflections on the Court's Role in the International Legal Order. Leiden J Int Law 2013;26(1):1-24.
41. Peters A. Beyond human rights: The legal status of the individual in international law. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2021.
42. Redfern A, Hunter M. Law and practice of international commercial arbitration. 4th ed. London: Sweet & Maxwell; 2009.
43. Sabbagh A. The Arab League and conflict resolution. Washington: Middle East Institute Reports; 2011.
44. Schreuer CH. The ICSID Convention: A commentary. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2009.
45. Shaw MN. International Law. 8th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2017.
46. Smith L. Principles of peaceful dispute settlement. Int Law J 2020;45(1):10-29.
47. Terris D, Romano CPR, Swigart L. The international judge: An introduction to the men and women who decide the world's cases. Waltham: Brandeis University Press; 2007.
48. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules. New York: UN; 1966.
49. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (as revised in 2010). New York: UN; 2010.
50. United Nations General Assembly. Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Resolution 2625(XXV); 1970.
51. United Nations. Charter of the United Nations [Internet]. 1945 [cited 2024 Jul 19]. Available from: https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter
52. United Nations. Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards. United Nations Treaty Series 1958;330(38):3-16.
53. United Nations. Vienna Convention on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations of a Universal Character. New York: UN; 1975.
54. United Nations. Vienna Convention on Succession of States in respect of Treaties. New York: UN; 1978.
55. United Nations. Handbook on the peaceful settlement of disputes between states. New York: United Nations Publications; 2005.
56. United Nations. Manual on the peaceful settlement of disputes. New York: United Nations Publications; 2005.
57. Villiger ME. Customary International Law and Treaties. 2nd ed. The Hague: Kluwer Law International; 2009.
58. Wæver O. Security communities and the dynamics of the Cold War. In: Adler E, Barnett M, editors. Security Communities. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1998. p. 69-118.
59. White ND. The United Nations and the maintenance of international peace and security. Manchester: Manchester University Press; 2002.
60. Williams R. Commissions of inquiry in international disputes: Origins and functions. Int Legal Rev 2015;22(3):87-104.
61. Wolff R. The enforcement of awards under the New York Convention: Practice and problems. ICCA Yearb Commer Arbitr 2012;37:208-19.
62. Zartman IW. Preventive diplomacy: Conflict resolution and negotiation in international politics. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield; 2000.