Page 1571 - 1595 **DOI:** *https//doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.1110577*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 4

2025

Legal Frameworks for Peaceful Dispute Resolution: The Interplay of the ICJ, UN, Arbitral Awards, and Mediation in International Law

HIMANSHU SINGH[1]

ABSTRACT

This paper provides a comprehensive overview and critical analysis of the mechanisms available for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Grounded in the key provisions of the United Nations Charter, particularly Articles 2(3) and 33, the discussion explores how the commitment to peaceful dispute resolution contributes to global stability and justice. The central role of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) as the primary judicial organ of the UN is examined, with particular attention to its jurisdiction, procedural rules, and its contributions to international law through both contentious cases and advisory opinions. The work further assesses the significance of other UN organs, including the Security Council and General Assembly, in facilitating dispute resolution, and considers the impact of preventive diplomacy and the Secretary-General's "good offices" in conflict prevention. International arbitration is addressed through the frameworks of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, the UNCITRAL rules, and the ICSID, highlighting both the adaptability and enforcement challenges of arbitration as a mechanism. The analysis also explores mediation and notes its voluntary, confidential, and non-binding nature, as well as recent changes brought about by conventions like the Singapore Convention on Mediation, which are transforming the status of mediation in international practice. Through the detailed case study of the Iran-U.S. Hostage Crisis and other landmark disputes, the interplay and complementarity of mediation, arbitration, and judicial adjudication are illustrated, demonstrating how these approaches often function sequentially or together rather than as alternatives. The paper critically assesses the limitations these mechanisms encounter, including the consent-based nature of jurisdiction, deficits in enforcement, politicisation, and power imbalances, especially within institutions such as the UN Security Council and international arbitral tribunals. Ultimately, while the existing architecture for peaceful dispute resolution is robust and adaptable, persistent challenges demonstrate the need for further reform. Expanding compulsory jurisdiction, enhancing transparency, improving enforcement mechanisms,

[1] Author is a Student at School of Law, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar (Central) University, Lucknow, India

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

and reinforcing institutional impartiality are identified as imperative for ensuring these mechanisms continue to uphold the rule of law, equity, and global order in an increasingly complex world.

Keywords: *peaceful settlement of international disputes, United Nations Charter (specifically Articles 2(3) and 33), global stability, justice, International Court of Justice (ICJ), jurisdiction, procedural rules, contentious cases, advisory opinions, UN Security Council, consent-based jurisdiction, enforcement deficits, politicisation, power imbalances, ongoing reform, compulsory jurisdiction, transparency, improved enforcement mechanisms, institutional impartiality, rule of law, equity.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The international legal order is fundamentally anchored in the commitment to the peaceful resolution of disputes, a principle that is essential for maintaining global stability and preventing the escalation of conflicts. This commitment is enshrined in key legal instruments, notably Article 2(3) and Article 33 of the United Nations Charter. Article 2(3) obligates all member states to settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace, security, and justice are not endangered. Complementing this, Article 33 elaborates on specific methods available for such peaceful settlement, including negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, and recourse to regional agencies or arrangements. Over the decades, a robust architecture of institutions and mechanisms has evolved to operationalise this legal mandate. Central among these are the International Court of Justice (ICJ), which serves as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations and adjudicates disputes between states based on international law. The ICJ's role is complemented by UN bodies such as the Security Council and the General Assembly, which can facilitate dispute resolution through diplomatic engagement and, where necessary, binding resolutions under the UN Charter. In addition to these formal institutions, various arbitral tribunals have been established under different international treaties and agreements to resolve specific categories of disputes. These tribunals operate under diverse procedural frameworks, tailored to the nature of the disputes they address, ranging from investment disputes to maritime boundary delimitations. Furthermore, mediation mechanisms—both formal and informal—play a critical role in conflict prevention and resolution. These mechanisms often involve third-party mediators, who facilitate dialogue and negotiation between disputing parties to achieve mutually acceptable solutions. This paper aims to provide a comprehensive and detailed overview of these diverse mechanisms for the peaceful settlement of international

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

disputes. It will assess the legal frameworks that underpin these mechanisms, examining the substantive and procedural rules that govern their operation. Additionally, the paper will explore the procedural aspects, including jurisdictional requirements, admissibility criteria, and the enforcement of decisions and awards. A critical analysis will also be undertaken of the interactions and overlaps between different dispute resolution mechanisms, highlighting how they complement or, at times, compete with each other in the complex landscape of international law.

II. THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE (ICJ)

Historical Background and Legal Framework

The International Court of Justice (ICJ), established in 1945 pursuant to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, serves as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. [2]Functioning under its Statute, which constitutes an integral component of the UN Charter, the ICJ is endowed with a clearly defined jurisdiction and procedural framework that governs its operations[3]. The primary mandate of the ICJ encompasses the adjudication of legal disputes submitted to it by sovereign states, wherein it applies principles of international law to deliver binding judgments[4]. These disputes typically pertain to critical issues such as territorial sovereignty, maritime boundaries, diplomatic relations, and treaty interpretations[5]. The Court's rulings are authoritative and contribute significantly to the development and codification of international legal norms[6]. Moreover, the ICJ is vested with the capacity to provide advisory opinions on legal questions referred to it by duly authorised United Nations organs and specialised agencies. While these advisory opinions are non-binding, they possess considerable jurisprudential influence, offering interpretative clarity on complex legal matters and guiding the conduct of international entities. Through its dual roles in dispute resolution and the provision of advisory opinions, the International Court of Justice plays an indispensable role in the maintenance of international peace and security, the promotion of the rule of law, and the advancement of justice on a global scale.

Jurisdiction and Functioning

The International Court of Justice (ICJ), as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, exercises two primary forms of jurisdiction: contentious and advisory. In the realm of

[2] UN Charter art 92.
[3] Statute of the International Court of Justice (adopted 26 June 1945, entered into force 24 October 1945) art 1.
[4] Statute of the ICJ, art 36(1).
[5] Malcolm N Shaw, *International Law* (9th edn, CUP 2021) 1056–1060.
[6] Hersch Lauterpacht, The Development of International Law by the International Court (CUP 1982); Shaw (n 4) 1060.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

contentious jurisdiction, the ICJ adjudicates disputes between sovereign states, a process that fundamentally hinges upon the explicit consent of the parties involved. This consent can be manifested through various mechanisms, such as special agreements (compromis), jurisdictional clauses within treaties, or declarations made under the optional clause of Article 36(2) of the Statute of the ICJ[7]. The requirement of consent underscores the court's role in respecting state sovereignty while providing a legal framework for the peaceful resolution of international disputes. Conversely, the advisory jurisdiction of the ICJ allows it to provide legal opinions on questions of international law as requested by duly authorised United Nations organs and specialised agencies. Unlike contentious cases, advisory opinions do not necessitate the consent of states directly affected by the matter at hand, as their function is to offer authoritative legal guidance rather than binding adjudications. The ICJ's jurisprudence is guided by Article 38(1) of its Statute, which delineates the sources of international law applicable in its proceedings[8]. These include international conventions, whether general or particular, establishing rules expressly recognised by the contesting states; international custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law; the general principles of law recognised by civilised nations; and, as subsidiary means, judicial decisions and the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists. Prominent cases exemplifying the ICJ's pivotal role in the adjudication of international disputes include the case of *Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua* (Nicaragua v. United States of America), decided in 1986[9]. In this case, the ICJ asserted its jurisdiction despite the United States' withdrawal from the proceedings, ultimately ruling that the United States had violated international law by supporting contra rebels in Nicaragua. Another significant case is the *Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions between Qatar and Bahrain* (Qatar v. Bahrain), adjudicated in 2001, where the court resolved a complex maritime and territorial dispute, thereby underscoring its capacity to manage protracted and sensitive international conflicts effectively[10]. Through these functions and decisions, the ICJ has cemented its status as a cornerstone institution in the maintenance of international legal order and the peaceful resolution of disputes among nations.

Strengths and Limitations

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) plays a crucial role in resolving legal disputes

[7] Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice
[8] Article 38, paragraph 1 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice
[9] Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States of America) [1986] ICJ Rep 14
[10] Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions between Qatar and Bahrain (Qatar v. Bahrain) [2001] ICJ Rep 40

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

between nations, with several strengths that highlight its importance in the global legal landscape. One of the ICJ's key strengths is its legitimacy, stemming from its status as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. This legitimacy has encouraged states to trust its authority. A clear example is the case of *Nicaragua v. United States* in 1986, where the ICJ ruled against the US for its involvement in Nicaragua's internal affairs, specifically supporting Contra rebels. Despite the US rejecting the court's jurisdiction, the case showcased the ICJ's commitment to impartial legal judgment, reinforcing its credibility on the international stage. Transparency is another significant strength of the ICJ. The court's proceedings are open to the public, and its detailed judgments are published for international scrutiny. The case of *Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro* (2007) concerning genocide during the Bosnian War is an example[11]. The ICJ meticulously reviewed evidence over several years and delivered a comprehensive judgment. This transparency helped clarify the legal definition of genocide and reinforced the court's role in interpreting international law. The ICJ also plays a vital role in clarifying and developing international law. In the *Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons* (1996)[12], the court provided nuanced legal perspectives on nuclear weapon use, influencing global disarmament discussions. Although advisory opinions are non-binding, they often shape international norms and guide state behaviour. However, the ICJ faces challenges that limit its effectiveness. Jurisdictional constraints are a major issue. The court can only hear cases if all parties involved consent to its jurisdiction. This limitation was evident in the *Marshall Islands Cases* (2016)[13], where the ICJ dismissed cases against the UK, India, and Pakistan because these countries disputed the court's jurisdiction, underscoring how states can avoid legal accountability. Enforcement is another challenge. Unlike domestic courts, the ICJ lacks direct enforcement powers. While its decisions are legally binding, compliance depends on the goodwill of states. In the *Wall Advisory Opinion* (2004)[14], the ICJ declared that Israel's construction of a barrier in the West Bank violated international law. However, the opinion had little impact on Israel's actions, highlighting the court's limited influence when political interests dominate. Despite these challenges, the ICJ remains central to international legal dispute resolution. Its ability to

[11] Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v Serbia and Montenegro) [2007] ICJ Rep 43

[12] Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons (Advisory Opinion) [1996] ICJ Rep 226

[13] Obligations concerning Negotiations relating to Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race and to Nuclear Disarmament (Marshall Islands v United Kingdom; Marshall Islands v India; Marshall Islands v Pakistan) (Jurisdiction) [2016] ICJ Rep 833

[14] Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (Advisory Opinion) [2004] ICJ Rep 136

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

provide impartial judgments, promote legal norms, and foster peaceful conflict resolution continues to make it an indispensable institution in maintaining global order.

III. ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS (UN)

Charter Provisions and Institutional Function

The United Nations Charter places a strong emphasis on the peaceful resolution of disputes, recognising it as a fundamental principle for maintaining international peace and security. Article 33 of the UN Charter explicitly outlines a range of methods that member states are encouraged to pursue before resorting to more forceful measures[15]. These methods encompass negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, and the utilisation of regional agencies or arrangements. Each of these methods offers distinct approaches tailored to the specific nature and complexity of disputes. Negotiation remains the most direct and frequently the initial step, where parties engage in dialogue to attain a mutually agreeable resolution. In the event of negotiations stalling, enquiry and mediation can provide structured mechanisms to uncover facts and facilitate communication[16]. Conciliation involves a third party assisting in resolving differences, while arbitration and judicial settlement introduce legal frameworks to adjudicate disputes impartially. The roles of the Security Council and the General Assembly are pivotal in this context. The Security Council holds the authority to recommend specific procedures and methods to prevent conflicts from escalating, and if necessary, to take preventive measures. It can intervene by deploying peacekeeping missions or imposing sanctions to preserve peace[17]. Simultaneously, the General Assembly, although devoid of enforcement powers, serves as a significant platform for discussion, fostering diplomatic initiatives and recommending peaceful resolutions[18]. Through these structured processes, the UN Charter not only promotes dialogue and mutual understanding among nations but also embodies the collective commitment of the international community to resolving disputes without resorting to violence.

Preventive Diplomacy and Good Offices

The Secretary-General of the United Nations plays a pivotal role in promoting peace and resolving conflicts across the globe through a combination of "good offices" and preventive

[15] Article 33(1) of the United Nations Charter
[16] Bardo Fassbender et al., OUP 2007, 303–305
[17] Christine Gray's International Law and the Use of Force (4th edn, OUP 2018), 272–274
[18] Rosalyn Higgins, The Development of International Law through the Political Organs of the United Nations (OUP 1963) 6–8

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

diplomacy[19]. These methods, though often conducted behind the scenes, have proven to be highly effective in diffusing tensions and preventing the escalation of disputes into full-blown conflicts. To illustrate this, consider the significant efforts of Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld during the 1956 Suez Crisis[20]. The crisis erupted when Egypt nationalised the Suez Canal, leading to a military intervention by Israel, followed by the United Kingdom and France. As tensions soared, Hammarskjöld's application of his good offices, entailing discreet negotiations and shuttle diplomacy, played a crucial role in de-escalating the conflict. His efforts culminated in the establishment of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF I), which marked the inception of the UN's first-ever peacekeeping operation. This initiative not only helped to stabilise the region but also set a precedent for future UN peacekeeping missions, showcasing preventive diplomacy in action. Another example highlighting the effectiveness of these informal, yet powerful, methods is the role of Secretary-General Kofi Annan during the post-election crisis in Kenya in 2008[21]. Following a disputed presidential election that plunged the country into widespread violence and political turmoil, Annan stepped in to mediate between the opposing factions. Employing his diplomatic acumen, patience, and persuasive skills, he facilitated intense negotiations that eventually led to a power-sharing agreement, bringing an end to the violence and restoring a measure of political stability to Kenya. These cases underscore how the Secretary-General's good offices and preventive diplomacy are invaluable tools in the international peace and security toolbox. Through quiet diplomacy, personal influence, and the ability to engage conflicting parties in dialogue, the Secretary-General can often achieve what formal mechanisms might not, building trust, fostering understanding, and ultimately, paving the way for peaceful resolutions.

United Nations and Enforcement Mechanisms

Article 94(2) of the United Nations Charter delineates the Security Council's role in relation to judgments rendered by the International Court of Justice (ICJ)[22]. Specifically, it stipulates that if any party to a case fails to fulfil the obligations imposed upon them by an ICJ judgment, the other party may present the matter before the Security Council. In such circumstances, the Security Council possesses the authority to issue recommendations or determine measures to ensure the effective implementation of the judgment. These measures

[19] An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-keeping, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, UN Doc A/47/277
[20] Urquhart, Hammarskjöld (1972) 306–310
[21] Kofi Annan, Interventions: A Life in War and Peace (Penguin 2012) 195–210
[22] Article 94(2) of the United Nations Charter

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

could hypothetically encompass enforcement actions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, which addresses threats to peace, breaches of peace, and acts of aggression[23]. Nevertheless, despite possessing this authority, the Security Council has historically refrained from exercising its Chapter VII powers to compel a state to comply with an ICJ judgment. This restraint may be attributed to political considerations, the intricacies of international relations, or the inclination towards diplomatic solutions over coercion. The mere existence of this provision, however, underscores the paramount significance of ICJ rulings within the international legal framework. When member states voluntarily adhere to ICJ decisions, it exemplifies a collective respect for the rule of law and fortifies the credibility and authority of international legal institutions. This voluntary compliance engenders a sense of accountability and upholds the principles of justice and fairness in the global arena, contributing to a more stable and orderly international system.

IV. INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION IN DISPUTE RESOLUTION.

Concept and Legal Framework

Arbitration is a method of dispute resolution where the conflicting parties mutually agree to have their issues resolved by one or more neutral arbitrators, whom they personally select[24]. This process stands out for its flexibility and privacy, distinguishing it from formal judicial proceedings such as those conducted by the International Court of Justice (ICJ). One of the notable advantages of arbitration is that it enables parties to customise the procedure according to their specific requirements. This can encompass decisions regarding the rules governing the proceedings, the language to be employed, and even the location where the arbitration will take place. Such flexibility makes arbitration particularly attractive in international disputes where parties originate from diverse legal backgrounds and cultures. Historically, the foundation of arbitration in state-to-state disputes can be traced back to the 1899 and 1907 Hague Conventions[25]. These conventions resulted in the establishment of the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA), which provides a framework and institutional support for arbitration involving states, intergovernmental organisations, and private parties. In addition to these historical documents, contemporary arbitration practices frequently rely on soft-law instruments such as the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules[26]. Developed by the United

[23] Articles 39–41 of Chapter VII of the UN Charter
[24] Gary B Born, International Arbitration: Law and Practice (2nd edn, Kluwer Law, 2021
[25] Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes (adopted 29 July 1899, entered into force 4 September 1900) (1899 Convention); revised by the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes (adopted 18 October 1907, entered into force 26 January 1910) (1907 Convention)
[26] UNCITRAL, UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (adopted 28 April 1976, revised 2010 and 2013).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Nations Commission on International Trade Law, these rules are widely utilised in ad hoc arbitration proceedings, where there is no designated arbitral institution overseeing the case. The UNCITRAL Rules offer a comprehensive set of procedures designed to ensure fairness and efficiency while granting parties the autonomy to adapt certain aspects to suit their needs[27]. Overall, arbitration has emerged as a cornerstone in resolving both international and domestic disputes, providing a private, efficient, and adaptable alternative to conventional court litigation.

Institutional Mechanisms

Prominent venues for international arbitration encompass a diverse array of specialised institutions and mechanisms specifically designed to manage intricate disputes involving states, investors, and other entities. Notably, the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) facilitates arbitration for inter-state conflicts as well as mixed cases involving states and other parties. The PCA provides administrative assistance and a framework that ensures fair and impartial proceedings, even in highly sensitive geopolitical circumstances. Another prominent venue is the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID), which primarily focuses on investor-state disputes[28]. ICSID plays a pivotal role in providing a neutral platform where investors can seek redress against sovereign states under international investment agreements. Its procedures are meticulously crafted to harmonise the interests of both investors and states, thereby fostering confidence in the stability of international investments. In addition to these established institutions, bespoke ad hoc tribunals are frequently established under specific legal instruments, such as Annex VII of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS)[29]. These tribunals are tailored to address specific disputes, offering flexibility in their composition and procedural rules to accommodate the unique requirements of each case. A noteworthy instance illustrating the efficacy of such arbitration mechanisms is the South China Sea Arbitration (Philippines v. China), which was adjudicated in 2016[30]. This case was resolved by an Annex VII tribunal, with administrative support provided by the PCA. Despite China's decision to refrain from participating in the proceedings, the tribunal was able to proceed with the case and issue a legally binding award. This outcome underscores the resilience of international arbitration

[27] UNCITRAL, 'UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules '(adopted 28 April 1976, as revised in 2010 and 2013) arts 1–6.
[28] Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (ICSID Convention) (adopted 18 March 1965, entered into force 14 October 1966) 575 UNTS 159.
[29] United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) (adopted 10 December 1982, entered into force 16 November 1994) 1833 UNTS 3, Annex VII.
[30] South China Sea Arbitration (The Republic of the Philippines v The People's Republic of China) (Award) PCA Case No 2013-19, 12 July 2016

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

frameworks, demonstrating their capacity to deliver justice and uphold international law even when one party chooses not to engage in the process.

Enforcement and Challenges

Commercial arbitration awards and investment arbitration awards are governed by distinct legal frameworks regarding enforcement. Commercial awards are typically enforced under the 1958 New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards[31]. This convention has been widely adopted, providing a robust mechanism that enables an arbitration award issued in one member country to be recognised and enforced in another, subject to certain limited exceptions. In contrast, investment arbitration awards, particularly those rendered under the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) Convention, hold a unique status. As stipulated in Articles 53 to 55 of the ICSID Convention, these awards are automatically enforceable in each contracting state[32]. They are regarded as if they were final judgments issued by that country's highest court, thereby eliminating the necessity for any additional recognition procedures that are commonly required under the New York Convention. Despite these ostensibly robust enforcement mechanisms, practical challenges persist. Certain states exhibit resistance to implementing awards that are unfavourable to them, either through legal manoeuvres or outright non-compliance. This resistance can undermine the efficacy of the arbitration process. Furthermore, concerns regarding the impartiality of arbitrators continue to be a significant issue[33]. Parties may question whether arbitrators are genuinely neutral, particularly in cases involving intricate geopolitical or economic interests. These concerns underscore the ongoing need for vigilance and reform to ensure the fairness and effectiveness of arbitration as a dispute resolution mechanism.

V. MEDIATION AS A MECHANISM IN INTERNATIONAL LAW

Definition and Principles

Mediation is a form of alternative dispute resolution that involves the involvement of an impartial third party, known as the mediator, who assists the disputing parties in negotiating a mutually acceptable agreement. Unlike adjudicative processes such as arbitration or litigation, the mediator does not possess the authority to impose a solution or decision. Instead, their role

[31] Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (adopted 10 June 1958, entered into force 7 June 1959) 330 UNTS 38 (New York Convention)
[32] Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (adopted 18 March 1965, entered into force 14 October 1966) 575 UNTS 159 (ICSID Convention), arts 53–55
[33] Chiara Giorgetti (ed), The Rules, Practice, and Jurisprudence of International Courts and Tribunals (Brill Nijhoff 2012) 223–229

is to facilitate open communication, clarify issues, and suggest potential avenues for compromise, leaving the final decision-making power entirely in the hands of the involved parties. One of the defining characteristics of mediation is its voluntary nature. Participation is generally consensual, with all parties agreeing not only to attend but also to engage in good faith[34]. This fosters an environment where honest dialogue can take place, free from the pressure that often accompanies more formal proceedings. Confidentiality is another cornerstone of the mediation process. The discussions, proposals, and any information disclosed during mediation are typically protected and cannot be used as evidence in later legal proceedings if mediation fails. This assurance of privacy encourages parties to communicate openly, knowing that their words will not be held against them outside the mediation setting. Another notable advantage of mediation is that it is non-binding unless an agreement is reached and formalised. The parties are not obligated to accept any outcome presented during the process and retain complete control over the terms of any potential settlement. This empowers them to craft creative solutions tailored to their unique interests, rather than being constrained by rigid legal remedies. Mediation is particularly valued for its informality and flexibility, which stand in stark contrast to the often rigid procedures of courts and tribunals. This relaxed structure can reduce tension and make it easier for parties to express their perspectives without fear of judgment. Because it encourages cooperative problem-solving rather than adversarial confrontation, mediation is frequently chosen in contexts where maintaining or restoring relationships is important, such as in diplomatic, commercial, or workplace settings[35]. The process's collaborative nature can help to preserve, if not enhance, diplomatic or professional relations, making it a preferred choice when ongoing interaction between the parties is anticipated.

International Examples

Mediation has demonstrated its efficacy as a valuable instrument in managing and resolving international conflicts. It often provides a platform where adversaries can engage in direct dialogue, explore compromise, and ultimately reach agreements that may have appeared insurmountable through adversarial approaches. A notable historical example is the Camp David Accords of 1978. In this instance, U.S. President Jimmy Carter assumed the role of a proactive mediator between Egyptian President Anwar Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister

[34] UNCITRAL, 'Model Law on International Commercial Mediation and International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation '(adopted 25 June 2018, UN Doc A/73/17, Annex II) art 5

[35] United Nations, A Manual for UN Mediators: Advice from UN Representatives and Envoys (UN Department of Political Affairs and UNITAR 2015)

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Menachem Begin[36]. Over the course of nearly two weeks of secluded and confidential negotiation at the presidential retreat in Maryland, Carter's patient shuttle diplomacy, persistent persuasion, and acute awareness of the needs and concerns of both parties contributed to the resolution of decades of hostilities. His efforts extended beyond mere moderation; he actively formulated proposals, persuaded recalcitrant parties to consider alternative options, and adeptly managed moments of crisis. The outcome was a landmark peace agreement that not only secured the return of the Sinai Peninsula to Egypt but also established the groundwork for a stable relationship between the two nations, evidencing the potency of focused and dedicated mediation[37]. A distinct yet equally instructive illustration can be drawn from the Oslo Accords of 1993. In this instance, the Norwegian government assumed a more subdued yet equally significant role by facilitating clandestine, informal negotiations between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organisation[38]. This did not constitute mediation in the conventional sense, as Norway refrained from imposing solutions or explicitly guiding the process. Instead, Norwegian diplomats provided a discreet and neutral environment where both parties could engage in open dialogue, foster trust, and progressively address highly sensitive matters away from the scrutiny of the international community. The success of these covert negotiations underscored how informal facilitation, particularly when executed by a trusted and impartial actor, can facilitate dialogue that more structured forums might never achieve. Beyond these well-known cases, mediation continues to be a cornerstone of international relations, with a diverse range of actors regularly intervening to facilitate conflict resolution. The United Nations, for instance, frequently appoints seasoned diplomats as special envoys to mediate peace talks in war-torn regions, drawing upon its international legitimacy and extensive resources[39]. Regional organisations such as the African Union, the European Union, and the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe often leverage their close proximity and cultural connections to mediate disputes among their members, occasionally achieving considerable success due to their deeper comprehension of local dynamics[40]. Individual states, particularly those possessing substantial diplomatic influence or a stake in regional stability, also assume the role of mediator, sometimes by facilitating dialogue between neighbouring nations, other times by proposing concrete frameworks for peace. Collectively, these examples highlight the variety

[36] William B Quandt, *Camp David: Peacemaking and Politics* (Brookings Institution Press 2001) 3–10.
[37] Kenneth W Stein, 'The Camp David Accords: A Case of International Mediation '(1985) 55(3) Middle East Journal 372
[38] Jørgen Jensehaugen, Arab-Israeli Diplomacy under Carter: The US, Israel and the Palestinians (Bloomsbury 2018) 213–215
[39] United Nations, A Manual for UN Mediators: Advice from UN Representatives and Envoys (UNDPA 2015)
[40] African Union, Handbook on Mediation for AU Mediators (2014); OSCE, Guidelines for Mediation (2014)

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

of mediation approaches at the international level and underscore how its adaptable, voluntary, and non-coercive nature can be tailored to suit the intricacies of distinct disputes. Whether through formal, high-stakes negotiations or discreet informal facilitation, mediation presents a valuable avenue between conflict and cooperation in the global arena.

Legal Recognition and Institutionalisation

Although mediation has traditionally been valued for its informality and flexibility, it is rapidly becoming more institutionalised and recognised at the international level, particularly with the advent of the Singapore Convention on Mediation. Officially known as the United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation, this instrument was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 20 December 2018[41]. Recognising the growing need for a reliable framework to ensure that mediated agreements in commercial disputes can be enforced across borders, the convention was opened for signature in Singapore on 7 August 2019, a testament to Singapore's prominence as a global dispute resolution hub[42]. The convention entered into force on 12 September 2020, following the third ratification, making it a landmark development for the global business community. Its primary objective is to provide a uniform and streamlined mechanism for the recognition and enforcement of international commercial settlement agreements reached through mediation. Prior to this development, parties who resolved disputes through mediation often found themselves entangled in complex and protracted litigation to enforce these settlements in foreign jurisdictions, undermining the efficiency and appeal of mediation. The Singapore Convention directly addresses this issue by allowing mediated settlement agreements to be recognised and enforced in any signatory state, provided certain procedural requirements are met, such as presenting a written agreement and proof that mediation occurred. The convention, however, provides for some reservations and exceptions, such as public policy concerns or procedural irregularities, and does not apply to settlements enforceable as court judgments or arbitral awards, nor to those relating to personal, family, or employment matters. The rapid endorsement of the Singapore Convention, highlighted by the unprecedented 46 countries signing on its inaugural day, including prominent economies such as the United States, China, and India, signals a broad international consensus on the value and necessity of trustworthy alternative dispute resolution mechanisms[43]. While challenges persist, including

[41] UNGA Res 73/198 (20 December 2018) UN Doc A/RES/73/198.
[42] United Nations, 'United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation' (adopted 20 December 2018, opened for signature 7 August 2019, entered into force 12 September 2020) UN Doc A/RES/73/198
[43] UNCITRAL, 'Singapore Convention on Mediation: 46 States Sign Up at Signing Ceremony in Singapore '(7 August 2019)

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

ensuring uniform application across diverse legal systems and securing even broader ratification, the Singapore Convention represents a substantial step towards transforming mediation into an enforceable and dependable component of the global dispute resolution framework. By bridging the gap between informal negotiation and formal legal enforcement, the Singapore Convention significantly enhances mediation's credibility and practical utility in international commerce.

VI. INTERPLAY BETWEEN ICJ, UN, ARBITRATION, AND MEDIATION

Complementarity of Mechanisms

It is crucial to acknowledge that international dispute resolution mechanisms, such as mediation, arbitration, and adjudication by bodies like the International Court of Justice (ICJ), are not mutually exclusive solutions. Rather, they frequently intersect and function collaboratively to address the intricate and multifaceted nature of international disputes[44]. In practice, this often manifests as a sequential or overlapping deployment of distinct processes, each complementing the others' strengths and mitigating their limitations. For instance, the United Nations may initially convene or sponsor mediation efforts to facilitate dialogue and foster trust between disputing parties, aiming for an amicable and voluntary settlement through direct negotiation[45]. However, if mediation fails to resolve all issues or if certain aspects necessitate a more definitive outcome, the dispute may progress to arbitration—a semi-formal procedure where parties consent to have binding decisions rendered by an impartial tribunal. Should legal questions persist or if the matter involves the interpretation of treaties or intricate aspects of international law, the dispute may ultimately be referred to the ICJ for a final and authoritative judgment. This layering of mechanisms, facilitated by the overlapping jurisdictions and flexible mandates of international organisations, establishes a resilient and adaptable system for dispute management. Such an approach acknowledges the dynamic realities of international relations, providing states with multiple avenues for negotiation while preserving the potential for authoritative legal resolution when necessary. Ultimately, this multifunctional, multi-tiered architecture not only expands access to justice and enhances the longevity of settlements but also reflects the evolving pragmatism and sophistication of the international legal order[46].

[44] Natalie Klein, Dispute Settlement in the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (Cambridge University Press 2005) 35–36.
[45] United Nations, Handbook on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes Between States (UN Publications 1992) 33–35.
[46] Laurence Boisson de Chazournes, Diplomatic and Judicial Means of Dispute Settlement (2012) 3(1) Journal of International Dispute Settlement 45, 48–49.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Case Study: The Iran-U.S. Hostage Crisis

The 1979 Iran-U.S. Hostage Crisis serves as a compelling illustration of the intricate nature of international disputes, necessitating a multifaceted approach to resolution. This approach encompasses diplomacy, mediation, arbitration, and legal adjudication. The crisis unfolded on 4 November 1979, when Iranian students stormed the U.S. Embassy in Tehran, abducting 66 American hostages[47]. This ordeal captivated and disturbed the global community for 444 days. As diplomatic efforts proved ineffective, and a U.S. military rescue operation concluded in a disastrous manner, the impasse appeared insurmountable. Algeria emerged as a unique and increasingly pivotal player through its "good offices." Initially functioning as a neutral intermediary, facilitating the exchange of proposals and responses between Tehran and Washington, Algerian diplomats, including Foreign Minister Mohammed Benyahia and financial expert Seghir Mostefai, assumed an active and creative role as trusted intermediaries. Their contributions were instrumental in bridging significant gaps, particularly concerning sensitive issues such as the freezing of Iranian assets by the U.S., compensation claims, and mutual distrust. In contrast to conventional bilateral negotiations that had repeatedly failed, the Algerian mediators proposed a novel framework known as the Algiers Accords, which were signed on 19 January 1981[48]. These agreements stipulated that both nations would independently assume specific obligations: the United States pledged not to interfere in Iran's internal affairs, to lift the freeze on Iranian assets, and to refer all citizen and governmental claims to an international arbitration body, the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal, which would be seated in The Hague. Simultaneously, Iran agreed to the immediate and unconditional release of the 52 remaining American hostages, who were liberated the following day. The Tribunal itself resolved thousands of intricate financial and property claims over subsequent decades, providing a structured avenue for grievances that might otherwise have persisted indefinitely. In the meantime, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) also became involved, with both the United States and Iran initiating cases related to the embassy seizure and broader issues under the 1955 Treaty of Amity[49]. the ICJ did determine that Iran had violated international law by failing to protect diplomats and embassies, although the actual implementation of the judgment was more symbolic than enforcement-oriented[50]. Ultimately, it was the tailored, trust-based approach of Algerian mediation—balancing urgent humanitarian release with the

[47] Case Concerning United States Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran (United States of America v Iran) [1980] ICJ Rep 3 (ICJ Judgment).
[48] Declaration of the Government of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria (Algiers Accords, 19 January 1981) reproduced in (1981) 20 ILM 223.
[49] Treaty of Amity, Economic Relations, and Consular Rights between the United States of America and Iran (signed 15 August 1955, entered into force 16 June 1957) 284 UNTS 93.
[50] US Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran (Judgment) [1980] ICJ Rep 3, para 93–95.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

intricate settlement of legal and financial disputes— that proved decisive in resolving one of the twentieth century's most contentious diplomatic confrontations. This case demonstrates how a flexible, layered use of diplomatic good offices, third-party arbitration, and adjudication can achieve peace when rigidity or adversarial methods alone are insufficient.

Strategic Use by States

When faced with international disputes, states make strategic decisions among mediation, arbitration, and litigation before forums such as the International Court of Justice (ICJ). Each method serves distinct objectives based on the nature and urgency of the conflict. In situations where rapid de-escalation is crucial, such as during political standoffs, escalating border tensions, or humanitarian crises, states frequently opt for mediation[51]. This choice reflects mediation's advantages: its speed, confidentiality, informality, and flexibility. Through mediation, a neutral third party can facilitate dialogue between hostile parties, assist in reestablishing basic communication, and manage tensions before they escalate further. This approach is often preferred because it avoids public scrutiny and formal commitments, making it easier for leaders to back down or compromise without losing face. On the other hand, arbitration provides states with a consent-based, more formalised process, particularly suited to resolving commercial, territorial, maritime, or investment disputes. Arbitration is attractive to states when parties desire a binding process and focus on specific legal or technical questions. However, they still seek a degree of procedural privacy and control over arbitrator selection. For instance, states have resorted to arbitration for matters such as maritime boundary delimitations, investment claims, or treaty interpretation. This is evident in numerous cases at the Permanent Court of Arbitration, a forum renowned for its expertise, adaptability, and discretion in handling sensitive state-to-state disputes. Arbitration's procedural structure enables states to customise proceedings, preserve bilateral relationships, and often proceed more swiftly and discreetly than the ICJ. This approach strikes a balance between the need for finality and diplomatic flexibility. When a dispute arises involving fundamental international legal principles or when the parties seek a definitive interpretation with global standing, such as claims pertaining to treaty obligations, questions of state responsibility, or the application of customary international law, they may opt to seek recourse to the International Court of Justice (ICJ)[52]. The ICJ functions as the world's preeminent forum for inter-state legal adjudication, issuing public decisions that elucidate the law and confer symbolic authority and prestige. States bring their most constitutionally or globally

[51] Charter of the United Nations (adopted 26 June 1945, entered into force 24 October 1945) 1 UNTS XVI art 33
[52] Statute of the International Court of Justice (adopted 26 June 1945, entered into force 24 October 1945) art 36

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

consequential disputes to the ICJ, including those requiring authoritative guidance on treaty provisions, boundary status, or substantial human rights obligations[53]. This judicial path not only provides legal certainty but also affirms the primacy of the law in state relations publicly. However, it is generally a slower and more formal process compared to mediation or arbitration. Ultimately, states strategically deploy these mechanisms: mediation for prompt and adaptable interventions; arbitration for technical, consent-based issues; and the ICJ for high-stakes legal questions where global legitimacy and legal clarity are paramount. The sophisticated utilisation and sequencing of these tools enable states to address multifaceted disputes while mitigating risks, preserving relationships, and safeguarding broader strategic interests.

VII. LEGAL CHALLENGES AND REFORM PROSPECTS

Jurisdictional and Compliance Challenges

A persistent challenge in international dispute resolution lies in the voluntary nature of jurisdictional consent, particularly in proceedings before the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and arbitral tribunals. Unlike domestic courts, which exercise authority over parties by virtue of national laws, international mechanisms such as the ICJ fundamentally rely on the willingness of states to submit themselves to their jurisdiction either through explicit declarations, treaty clauses, or ad hoc agreements specific to a dispute[54]. This consent-based framework implies that, unless both parties agree to the court's authority, the ICJ cannot adjudicate their disputes. Even so-called "compulsory" jurisdiction is fraught with reservations and exceptions that further restrict its reach. Arbitral tribunals, too, are subject to the consent of the disputing parties, both in establishing their jurisdiction and in enforcing the scope of their mandate. The enforcement of decisions, whether ICJ judgments or arbitral awards, presents another layer of complexity. Unlike domestic legal systems, international forums lack robust enforcement mechanisms. If a state chooses not to comply with a judgment or an arbitral award, remedies are typically limited to diplomatic and reputational pressures. In the case of the ICJ, referral to the United Nations Security Council is possible, but enforcement is complicated by political considerations and frequently results in minimal practical consequences for persistent non-compliance[55]. In the field of arbitration,

[53] Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (The Gambia v Myanmar) Order of 23 January 2020
[54] Statute of the International Court of Justice (adopted 26 June 1945, entered into force 24 October 1945) art 36.
[55] Charter of the United Nations (adopted 26 June 1945, entered into force 24 October 1945) 1 UNTS XVI art 94(2), Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v Serbia and Montenegro) [2007] ICJ Rep 43, [471]

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

enforcement relies heavily on domestic courts and the legal infrastructure of states where assets are located. This can lead to a patchwork of unpredictable outcomes, particularly if a state invokes sovereign immunity or resists enforcement for alleged procedural or public policy reasons. Such gaps in enforcement not only prolong disputes and delay justice but also undermine the broader legitimacy of the international legal order. The inability to guarantee compliance erodes faith in these dispute resolution mechanisms, as states may see little reason to honour unfavourable outcomes, knowing that consequences for non-compliance are often weak or symbolic.

Politicisation and Power Dynamics

The persistent and often concerning issue of politicisation and power dynamics is a recurring feature of international dispute resolution, particularly within institutions such as the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and in the context of investment arbitration. Within the UNSC, the dominance of the five permanent members— China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States— each possessing the power of veto, renders substantive decisions on peace, security, or sanctions susceptible to influence by these states' national interests rather than a consistent application of international law or equitable principles[56]. This structure frequently leads to accusations of politicisation, reflecting the geopolitical priorities and alliances of the most powerful rather than the collective will or moral consensus of the broader international community. The consequences can be profound: for less influential states or parties involved in conflicts, it may result in the sidelining of their grievances, the stalling of peacekeeping missions, or the inconsistent enforcement of international norms. In the realm of international investment arbitration, analogous concerns emerge during the process of arbitrator selection. Here, parties often have the authority to nominate their own arbitrators, while a third, ostensibly neutral chair is appointed by consensus or through an appointing authority. However, challenges arise as repeat appointments, close professional networks, and occasional connections with powerful states or major corporate entities can engender perceptions or realities of bias and self-reinforcing elite circles. For developing or less powerful states facing claims brought by large multinational corporations, apprehensions of systemic disadvantage are heightened when arbitrators are disproportionately drawn from specific jurisdictions or backgrounds, potentially shaping outcomes in favour of investors or those from more powerful economies. Such dynamics pose a significant threat to eroding the confidence in the integrity and legitimacy of international adjudication. This raises skepticism

[56] Charter of the United Nations (adopted 26 June 1945, entered into force 24 October 1945) 1 UNTS XVI art 27, Thomas G Weiss and Sam Daws (eds), *The Oxford Handbook on the United Nations* (2nd edn, OUP 2018) 336–342.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

regarding the genuine attainment of fairness and impartiality in forums where power disparities are deeply entrenched. Essentially, the intertwining of power politics with ostensibly neutral dispute resolution mechanisms raises pertinent questions about the true accessibility and equity of international justice. This underscores the necessity of enhanced transparency, accountability, and transformative reforms that can effectively level the playing field for all participants.

The Urgent Need for Reform

The escalating complexity and global prominence of international disputes have engendered widespread advocacy for comprehensive reform within existing dispute resolution frameworks. Numerous scholars, policymakers, and practitioners now acknowledge that the current framework, with its reliance on voluntary jurisdiction and occasionally opaque procedures, no longer adequately addresses the requirements of a diverse and interconnected international community. A prominent area of reform discourse centres on expanding compulsory jurisdiction, particularly for disputes involving fundamental issues such as human rights violations, severe breaches of international humanitarian law, or transboundary environmental harm. The rationale is that certain categories of disputes should automatically fall within the jurisdiction of international courts like the International Court of Justice (ICJ), rather than being subject to the consent of the parties. Such a transformation is regarded as crucial for ensuring accountability in the face of egregious violations that have far-reaching consequences. Simultaneously, efforts to reform international arbitration processes, particularly those involving investor-state disputes, have gained momentum[57]. Calls for heightened transparency in arbitral proceedings are becoming increasingly vocal, with advocates contending that closed-door hearings, confidential awards, and limited public scrutiny diminish the credibility and legitimacy of these tribunals. Proposals include making hearings public by default, publishing arbitral decisions, and ensuring that arbitrator appointments are conducted through genuinely neutral, diverse, and accountable mechanisms. These measures would not only elucidate the process but also assist in addressing concerns regarding bias and the influence of powerful corporate or state actors. There is also considerable momentum behind proposals to enhance the enforceability of mediated settlements. As mediation increasingly becomes a preferred tool for dispute resolution, regarded for its flexibility and potential to preserve relationships, questions persist regarding how to guarantee that parties adhere to their commitments once an agreement is reached. The

[57] UNCTAD, Reform of Investor-State Dispute Settlement: In Search of a Roadmap (UNCTAD IIA Issues Note 3, 2013)

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

recent implementation of international agreements such as the Singapore Convention on Mediation represents a significant advancement, yet many contend that further measures are imperative to establish robust, universally accepted enforcement mechanisms capable of operating across diverse legal systems and jurisdictions[58]. Collectively, these reform initiatives underscore a broader recognition that trust in international dispute resolution mechanisms relies on their capacity to deliver equitable, transparent, and dependable outcomes independently of the parties' relative power. As global challenges become increasingly interconnected and intricate, the drive for reform extends beyond mere technical enhancements to ensuring the legitimacy, efficacy, and accessibility of international justice in the twenty-first century.

VIII. Conclusion

The principle of peaceful dispute resolution serves as a fundamental pillar of the international legal framework, underpinning stability, cooperation, and predictability among states. Various mechanisms, including the International Court of Justice (ICJ), the United Nations and its affiliated agencies, international arbitration tribunals, and mediation, provide a diverse range of procedural options. These approaches, ranging from the formality and judicial authority of the ICJ to the diplomatic flexibility of mediation and the specialised, technical processes of arbitration, are not mutually exclusive alternatives but rather complementary tools within the international legal landscape. Each approach possesses distinct strengths: the ICJ contributes authoritative interpretations of international law and facilitates binding dispute resolution; arbitration offers a customizable, relatively expeditious process for technical or highly specialised disputes; and mediation provides a confidential, informal setting conducive to rebuilding trust and fostering dialogue. However, the continued relevance of these mechanisms hinges on the strength and credibility of their legal frameworks and their institutional capacities. Challenges related to voluntary jurisdiction, inconsistent enforcement, politicisation, and disparities in access must be addressed to ensure these processes remain credible and effective in an era characterised by escalating geopolitical competition and a transition towards a multipolar world order. Strengthening procedural rules to guarantee fairness and transparency, investing in the training and impartiality of mediators and arbitrators, and enhancing coordination among institutions such as the United Nations, national courts, and regional organisations are all crucial steps. By augmenting the interplay between these disparate forms of dispute resolution, enabling parties to prioritise or

[58] UN, United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation (Singapore Convention on Mediation), 2018

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

amalgamate approaches contingent upon circumstances and addressing longstanding concerns of power disparity and compliance, the international community can reaffirm its commitment to a rules-based framework. Ultimately, adapting these mechanisms to the evolving realities of global politics is not merely a technical undertaking, but a fundamental manifestation of the collective resolve to supplant force with dialogue and jurisprudence, a requisite prerequisite for enduring peace and shared prosperity in an intricate, interconnected world.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

IX. REFERENCES

1. United Nations, Charter of the United Nations, 26 June 1945, entered into force 24 October 1945, art 92.
2. Statute of the International Court of Justice, 26 June 1945, entered into force 24 October 1945, art 1.
3. Statute of the ICJ, art 36(1).
4. Malcolm N Shaw, International Law (9th edn, Cambridge University Press 2021) 1056–1060.
5. Hersch Lauterpacht, The Development of International Law by the International Court (Cambridge University Press 1982); Shaw (n 4) 1060.
6. Statute of the International Court of Justice, art 36(2).
7. Statute of the International Court of Justice, art 38(1).
8. Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v United States of America) [1986] ICJ Rep 14.
9. Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions between Qatar and Bahrain (Qatar v Bahrain) [2001] ICJ Rep 40.
10. Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v Serbia and Montenegro) [2007] ICJ Rep 43.
11. Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons (Advisory Opinion) [1996] ICJ Rep 226.
12. Obligations concerning Negotiations relating to Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race and to Nuclear Disarmament (Marshall Islands v United Kingdom; Marshall Islands v India; Marshall Islands v Pakistan) (Jurisdiction) [2016] ICJ Rep 833.
13. Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (Advisory Opinion) [2004] ICJ Rep 136.
14. United Nations Charter, art 33(1).
15. Bardo Fassbender et al., (Oxford University Press 2007) 303–305.
16. Christine Gray, International Law and the Use of Force (4th edn, Oxford University Press 2018) 272–274.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

17. Rosalyn Higgins, The Development of International Law through the Political Organs of the United Nations (Oxford University Press 1963), 6–8.

18. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-keeping UN Doc A/47/277.

19. Brian Urquhart, Hammarskjöld (Alfred A. Knopf 1972) 306–310.

20. Kofi Annan, Interventions: A Life in War and Peace (Penguin 2012) 195–210.

21. United Nations Charter, art 94(2).

22. United Nations Charter, Chapter VII, arts 39–41.

23. Gary B. Born, International Arbitration: Law and Practice (2nd edn, Kluwer Law 2021).

24. Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, 29 July 1899, entered into force 4 September 1900 (1899 Convention); revised by the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, 18 October 1907, entered into force 26 January 1910 (1907 Convention).

25. UNCITRAL, UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (adopted 28 April 1976, revised 2010 and 2013).

26. UNCITRAL, 'UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules '(adopted 28 April 1976, as revised in 2010 and 2013), arts 1–6.

27. Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (ICSID Convention), 18 March 1965, entered into force 14 October 1966, 575 UNTS 159.

28. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), 10 December 1982, entered into force 16 November 1994, 1833 UNTS 3, Annex VII.

29. South China Sea Arbitration (The Republic of the Philippines v The People's Republic of China) (Award) PCA Case No 2013-19, 12 July 2016.

30. Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 10 June 1958, entered into force 7 June 1959, 330 UNTS 38 (New York Convention).

31. ICSID Convention, arts 53–55 (see n 27).

32. Chiara Giorgetti (ed), The Rules, Practice, and Jurisprudence of International Courts and Tribunals (Brill Nijhoff 2012) 223–229.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

33. UNCITRAL, 'Model Law on International Commercial Mediation and International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation '(adopted 25 June 2018, UN Doc A/73/17, Annex II), art 5.

34. United Nations, A Manual for UN Mediators: Advice from UN Representatives and Envoys (UN Department of Political Affairs and UNITAR 2015).

35. William B Quandt, Camp David: Peacemaking and Politics (Brookings Institution Press 2001) 3–10.

36. Kenneth W Stein, 'The Camp David Accords: A Case of International Mediation '(1985) 55(3) Middle East Journal 372.

37. Jørgen Jensehaugen, Arab-Israeli Diplomacy under Carter: The US, Israel and the Palestinians (Bloomsbury 2018) 213–215.

38. United Nations, A Manual for UN Mediators: Advice from UN Representatives and Envoys (UNDPA 2015).

39. African Union, Handbook on Mediation for AU Mediators (2014); OSCE, Guidelines for Mediation (2014).

40. UNGA Res 73/198 (20 December 2018) UN Doc A/RES/73/198.

41. United Nations, 'United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation '(adopted 20 December 2018, opened for signature 7 August 2019, entered into force 12 September 2020) UN Doc A/RES/73/198.

42. UNCITRAL, 'Singapore Convention on Mediation: 46 States Sign Up at Signing Ceremony in Singapore '(7 August 2019).

43. Natalie Klein, Dispute Settlement in the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (Cambridge University Press 2005) 35–36.

44. United Nations, Handbook on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes Between States (UN Publications 1992) 33–35.

45. Laurence Boisson de Chazournes, 'Diplomatic and Judicial Means of Dispute Settlement' (2012) 3(1) Journal of International Dispute Settlement 45, 48–49.

46. Case Concerning United States Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran (United States of America v Iran) [1980] ICJ Rep 3.

47. Declaration of the Government of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria (Algiers Accords, 19 January 1981) reproduced in (1981) 20 ILM 223.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

48. Treaty of Amity, Economic Relations, and Consular Rights between the United States of America and Iran, signed 15 August 1955, entered into force 16 June 1957, 284 UNTS 93.

49. US Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran (Judgment) [1980] ICJ Rep 3, paras 93–95.

50. United Nations Charter, art 33.

51. Statute of the International Court of Justice, art 36.

52. Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (The Gambia v Myanmar) Order of 23 January 2020.

53. Statute of the International Court of Justice, art 36.

54. United Nations Charter, art 94(2); Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v Serbia and Montenegro) [2007] ICJ Rep 43 .

55. United Nations Charter, art 27; Thomas G. Weiss and Sam Daws (eds), The Oxford Handbook on the United Nations (2nd edn, Oxford University Press 2018) 336–342.

56. UNCTAD, Reform of Investor-State Dispute Settlement: In Search of a Roadmap (UNCTAD IIA Issues Note 3, 2013).

57. United Nations, United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation (Singapore Convention on Mediation), 2018.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]