

Promoting Global Peace through ADR in U.S. Foreign Policy Efforts

Obafemi D Akintayo¹, Chinazo Nneka Ifeanyi², Okeoma Onunka³

¹ School of Law, University of Oregon, USA

² Independent Researcher, Lagos, Nigeria

³ Nigerian Institute of Leather and Science Technology Zaria, Kaduna Nigeria

Corresponding author: Obawonbafemi@gmail.com

Abstract

Promoting global peace is a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy, and Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) methods, such as mediation, arbitration, and negotiation, play a crucial role in achieving this objective. This paper examines the potential of ADR to foster diplomatic conflict resolution and prevent international disputes from escalating into violence. ADR offers non-coercive, peaceful mechanisms to address the root causes of conflicts and enables parties to reach mutually beneficial agreements, making it a valuable tool for U.S. foreign policy efforts in maintaining international stability. Through ADR, the U.S. can act as a neutral facilitator in disputes involving nations, ethnic groups, or political factions. ADR processes emphasize dialogue, trust-building, and cooperation, which can reduce tensions and foster long-term peace. Additionally, ADR provides a platform for addressing complex global challenges, such as territorial disputes, resource conflicts, and human rights violations, without resorting to military intervention. By leveraging its diplomatic influence and expertise in ADR, the U.S. can strengthen its global leadership in peacebuilding and conflict resolution. The integration of ADR into U.S. foreign policy also aligns with the country's broader commitment to multilateralism and international cooperation. Institutions such as the United Nations and regional organizations increasingly rely on ADR techniques to manage conflicts, and the U.S. can enhance its partnership with these entities by supporting ADR initiatives. However, effective implementation of ADR in U.S. foreign policy requires overcoming obstacles, such as political resistance, cultural differences, and ensuring the legitimacy of ADR outcomes. Overall, ADR holds significant promise in advancing global peace and security through non-violent means. By incorporating ADR into its foreign policy strategy, the U.S. can contribute to sustainable conflict resolution and strengthen its role as a global peacekeeper.

KEYWORDS: *Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), U.S. Foreign Policy, Global Peace*

Date of Submission: 12-11-2024

Date of Acceptance: 25-11-2024

I. Introduction

Promoting global peace has become a central tenet of U.S. foreign policy, particularly in an increasingly interconnected and complex world. Global peace can be understood as the absence of war and violence, along with the presence of conditions that foster stability, justice, and human rights (Boulding, 2016). Within this framework, U.S. foreign policy seeks to address not only the immediate threats of conflict but also the underlying issues that contribute to instability in various regions. A significant aspect of this approach involves the application of diplomatic strategies aimed at conflict resolution and peacebuilding (Araujo, Safradin & Brito, 2019, Greenop, Thompson & Ajam, 2021).

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) encompasses a range of methodologies designed to resolve conflicts without resorting to litigation or violence. These methods include mediation, arbitration, and restorative justice, all of which prioritize dialogue, negotiation, and collaboration over adversarial approaches (Barton, 2019). ADR has been recognized for its effectiveness in various settings, including international relations, where traditional diplomatic efforts may fall short. By focusing on understanding diverse perspectives and facilitating communication among conflicting parties, ADR offers a pathway to resolving disputes peacefully and sustainably.

The role of ADR in enhancing U.S. efforts to promote global peace is multifaceted and critical. By integrating ADR principles into foreign policy strategies, the U.S. can foster dialogue and understanding among nations, mitigate tensions before they escalate into violence, and contribute to long-term stability. For instance, employing ADR in conflict-prone areas can lead to more inclusive peace processes that incorporate the voices of marginalized groups, thereby strengthening the legitimacy and effectiveness of peace agreements (Fisher & Ury, 2016). Furthermore, ADR can help to build relationships between nations, promoting trust and cooperation

essential for addressing global challenges. Overall, embracing ADR as a core component of U.S. foreign policy can significantly enhance efforts to promote global peace, establishing a more stable and just international order (Beretta, 2024, Ibrahim, et al., 2022, Nyakundi, 2015, Thompson, 2017).

2.1. The Importance of Global Peace in U.S. Foreign Policy

The importance of global peace in U.S. foreign policy is underscored by the nation's historical commitment to fostering stability and security, both internationally and domestically. Throughout its history, the U.S. has recognized that peace is not merely the absence of conflict but a proactive endeavor that involves diplomatic engagement, development aid, and conflict resolution strategies (Blake, Browne & Sime, 2016, Illankoon, et al., 2022, Yahaya, 2021). This commitment can be traced back to the founding principles of the nation, which emphasized the pursuit of justice and the importance of maintaining friendly relations with other countries. However, as global dynamics have evolved, so too have the approaches taken by the U.S. to promote peace on the international stage.

The historical context of U.S. foreign policy reveals a complex interplay between promoting global peace and addressing national interests. In the aftermath of World War II, the U.S. emerged as a global leader, taking on a prominent role in international organizations like the United Nations and advocating for a rules-based international order (Ikenberry, 2018). This commitment was rooted in the understanding that peace is essential for prosperity and security. However, the Cold War period introduced a dichotomy in U.S. foreign policy, as national security concerns often dictated interventions that, while aimed at containing communism, sometimes undermined efforts to promote lasting peace in conflict regions (Gourevitch, 2019). As the 21st century unfolded, the consequences of these historical decisions became apparent, as unresolved conflicts and regional instability continued to pose significant challenges to U.S. interests.

Global conflicts have direct implications for U.S. national security and interests, making the promotion of global peace a strategic imperative. The September 11 attacks in 2001 starkly illustrated how distant conflicts could manifest as direct threats to U.S. soil. The subsequent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq highlighted the costs of military interventions, not only in terms of human lives but also regarding financial expenditures and geopolitical stability (Bensahel et al., 2016). The impact of these conflicts extends beyond the immediate vicinity, influencing global terrorism, refugee crises, and regional power dynamics that can destabilize entire regions. Recognizing that traditional military approaches alone cannot address the complexities of modern conflicts, U.S. policymakers have increasingly turned to innovative approaches to conflict resolution, emphasizing diplomacy, dialogue, and peacebuilding.

One such innovative approach is the integration of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) into U.S. foreign policy efforts. ADR encompasses various methodologies, including mediation and negotiation, that aim to resolve conflicts without resorting to armed intervention (Fisher & Ury, 2016). By prioritizing dialogue and understanding, ADR fosters environments conducive to peace. In recent years, there has been a growing recognition that effective conflict resolution requires a shift away from adversarial positions towards collaborative solutions that respect the interests of all parties involved. The U.S. has begun to incorporate these principles into its diplomatic strategies, particularly in regions with deep-seated conflicts where conventional approaches have failed.

The need for innovative approaches to conflict resolution in U.S. foreign policy is underscored by the changing nature of global conflicts. Many contemporary disputes are multifaceted, involving a combination of political, ethnic, religious, and economic factors that necessitate nuanced and adaptable responses. Traditional state-centric diplomacy often falls short in addressing the complexities of these conflicts, especially in cases where non-state actors play a significant role (Smith, 2019). ADR methods, by contrast, allow for more inclusive processes that can engage a broader array of stakeholders, including marginalized communities whose voices may otherwise be overlooked in traditional negotiations. This inclusivity is vital for fostering lasting peace, as it ensures that agreements reflect the diverse interests of the affected populations.

Furthermore, integrating ADR into U.S. foreign policy can enhance the nation's soft power, promoting a positive image and fostering goodwill among international partners. By supporting conflict resolution efforts that prioritize dialogue over military might, the U.S. can demonstrate its commitment to peaceful coexistence and collaborative problem-solving. This approach not only contributes to immediate conflict resolution but also builds long-term relationships based on mutual respect and understanding. As countries grapple with the consequences of globalization, such as migration, climate change, and economic inequality, the need for collaborative approaches to address these shared challenges becomes increasingly evident.

The role of ADR in promoting global peace aligns with the broader objectives of U.S. foreign policy, which aims to enhance stability and security while safeguarding American interests. By investing in conflict resolution initiatives, the U.S. can mitigate the risks associated with unresolved disputes and contribute to the creation of resilient communities capable of managing their conflicts peacefully. This, in turn, reduces the likelihood of future conflicts that could threaten U.S. security and interests. Moreover, supporting ADR initiatives

abroad allows the U.S. to engage constructively with nations facing internal strife, demonstrating that it values diplomacy and collaboration over coercion.

In conclusion, the importance of global peace in U.S. foreign policy cannot be overstated. As the world faces increasingly complex challenges, fostering peace requires innovative approaches that move beyond traditional paradigms. The historical context of U.S. foreign policy highlights the need to learn from past interventions, recognizing that sustainable peace cannot be achieved solely through military means (Chaturvedi, 2021, Krueggeler, 2019, Oliveira, 2023, Stražišar, 2018). By incorporating ADR into its conflict resolution strategies, the U.S. can play a pivotal role in promoting global peace, addressing the root causes of conflict, and fostering international cooperation. Ultimately, this approach not only enhances U.S. national security but also contributes to a more stable and just world.

2.2. Overview of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) encompasses various methodologies that facilitate the resolution of conflicts without resorting to traditional litigation or armed intervention. The increasing complexity of global conflicts, coupled with the limitations of conventional approaches, has led to a growing recognition of ADR's potential in promoting peace and stability, particularly in the context of U.S. foreign policy efforts. ADR is often defined as a set of processes, including mediation, arbitration, and negotiation, that provide parties in dispute with alternative means to reach resolution (Deason, et al., 2018, Lee, Yiu & Cheung, 2016, Storskrubb, 2016). By emphasizing cooperation, communication, and consensus, ADR methodologies have become vital tools for U.S. diplomacy, helping to address conflicts before they escalate into violence.

Mediation is one of the most recognized forms of ADR. It involves a neutral third-party mediator who facilitates dialogue between conflicting parties, assisting them in identifying common interests and exploring potential solutions. The mediator does not impose a decision but guides the parties toward a mutually acceptable agreement (Folger et al., 2016). Mediation has gained traction in various contexts, from international disputes to community conflicts, due to its collaborative nature and emphasis on preserving relationships. The effectiveness of mediation lies in its ability to create an environment where open communication is encouraged, enabling parties to engage in constructive dialogue.

Arbitration is another essential component of ADR. In this process, a neutral arbitrator is appointed to make a binding decision after hearing arguments from both sides. Unlike mediation, arbitration results in a definitive resolution, similar to a court judgment, but typically occurs in a more informal setting (Kluwer, 2019). This approach is particularly useful in international disputes where parties may seek a binding resolution while avoiding the lengthy and public nature of traditional court proceedings. Arbitration provides a structured process that can be tailored to the specific needs of the parties involved, ensuring that their interests are adequately represented.

Negotiation, often considered the most fundamental form of ADR, involves direct discussions between the parties to reach an agreement. It can occur with or without the assistance of third parties and is characterized by a focus on mutual gain and compromise (Fisher & Ury, 2016). Effective negotiation relies on the parties' willingness to communicate openly and work collaboratively towards a shared goal. The flexibility of negotiation makes it applicable in various scenarios, from resolving business disputes to addressing international conflicts.

The principles of ADR—cooperation, communication, and consensus—are integral to its success in resolving disputes and promoting peace. Cooperation emphasizes the importance of working together to achieve common goals. In the context of international relations, cooperation can lead to enhanced understanding and trust between nations, which are crucial for long-term stability. This principle recognizes that conflicts often arise from misunderstandings or miscommunications, and addressing these issues requires collaborative efforts to foster goodwill and find solutions.

Communication is another vital principle of ADR. Effective communication enables parties to articulate their needs, concerns, and perspectives, facilitating a deeper understanding of the issues at stake. In the context of U.S. foreign policy, fostering open communication channels between conflicting parties can help prevent escalations and promote dialogue. When parties feel heard and understood, they are more likely to engage constructively rather than resort to hostility (Dealing, 2019). This principle underscores the need for diplomats to facilitate ongoing conversations, not just during times of conflict but as part of a broader strategy for building relationships and trust.

Consensus is the final principle that underpins ADR methodologies. Unlike traditional litigation, which often results in a win-lose scenario, ADR seeks to achieve solutions that satisfy all parties involved. This approach fosters a sense of ownership and commitment to the outcome, as all parties have contributed to the resolution process. In international diplomacy, achieving consensus can lead to more stable agreements that are less likely to be contested or ignored in the future (Honeyman & Colburn, 2016). Consensus-based solutions often promote long-term peace by ensuring that the interests of all stakeholders are considered and integrated into the final agreement.

The application of ADR within U.S. foreign policy efforts has significant implications for promoting global peace. By prioritizing conflict resolution methodologies that emphasize cooperation, communication, and consensus, the U.S. can engage constructively with nations facing internal strife or external threats. For instance, U.S. involvement in mediating conflicts in regions like the Middle East or Africa demonstrates the potential of ADR to address longstanding disputes and foster stability. The U.S. has utilized mediation efforts in various peace processes, such as the Camp David Accords and the Good Friday Agreement in Northern Ireland, highlighting the effectiveness of ADR in achieving lasting resolutions (Susskind, 2018).

Moreover, the integration of ADR into U.S. foreign policy allows for a more nuanced understanding of conflicts and their underlying causes. Traditional approaches often focus on the symptoms of disputes, such as territorial claims or resource competition, while neglecting the deeper issues of identity, culture, and historical grievances. By adopting ADR methodologies, U.S. policymakers can encourage inclusive dialogue that addresses these underlying factors, paving the way for sustainable peace (Zartman, 2016).

The increasing complexity of global conflicts calls for innovative solutions that extend beyond conventional diplomacy. ADR offers a viable framework for addressing disputes while fostering relationships based on trust and mutual respect. As the U.S. continues to navigate an evolving international landscape marked by rising tensions and competing interests, the principles of cooperation, communication, and consensus provided by ADR can serve as guiding tenets for effective engagement.

In conclusion, Alternative Dispute Resolution represents a critical tool in promoting global peace through U.S. foreign policy efforts. By employing methodologies such as mediation, arbitration, and negotiation, the U.S. can address conflicts proactively, reducing the likelihood of escalation into violence (Domingo & O'Neil, 2014, McGovern & Rubenstein, 2019). The principles of ADR—cooperation, communication, and consensus—are essential for fostering constructive dialogue and building relationships that promote stability. As the U.S. confronts complex global challenges, the integration of ADR into its diplomatic strategies will be instrumental in fostering a more peaceful and cooperative international community.

2.3. How ADR Promotes Global Peace

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has emerged as a vital tool in promoting global peace, particularly in the context of U.S. foreign policy efforts. ADR encompasses various methodologies, such as mediation, negotiation, and arbitration, designed to resolve conflicts without resorting to litigation or military intervention (Ebers, 2022, McGovern & Rubenstein, 2020, Singh, 2022). By emphasizing collaboration, understanding, and communication, ADR facilitates diplomatic conflict resolution, addresses root causes, prevents escalation into violence, builds trust among conflicting parties, and presents case studies of successful interventions that underscore its effectiveness.

One of the primary ways ADR promotes global peace is through facilitating diplomatic conflict resolution. Conflicts often arise from deep-seated grievances, historical injustices, or misunderstandings between parties. ADR provides a framework for addressing these root causes by encouraging dialogue and negotiation among stakeholders. According to Macfarlane (2018), engaging conflicting parties in a structured dialogue can reveal underlying issues that contribute to tensions, allowing for more comprehensive and sustainable solutions (Egbunike-Umegbolu, 2024, Melenko, 2020, Sourdin, 2014). By focusing on the causes of disputes rather than merely their symptoms, ADR can foster a deeper understanding of the complexities involved in conflicts and facilitate more meaningful resolutions.

Moreover, ADR plays a crucial role in preventing the escalation of conflicts into violence. Traditional methods of conflict resolution, such as litigation or military intervention, can exacerbate tensions and lead to further hostilities. In contrast, ADR seeks to de-escalate conflicts through cooperative engagement. As noted by Wall et al. (2019), the inclusive nature of ADR processes enables parties to voice their concerns and interests in a safe environment, reducing the likelihood of misunderstandings that can trigger violence. For instance, mediation efforts in international disputes often involve not only the primary parties but also stakeholders such as civil society organizations, which can help address broader societal issues contributing to conflict. This inclusive approach not only diffuses immediate tensions but also lays the groundwork for long-term peace.

Building trust and cooperation among conflicting parties is another essential aspect of how ADR promotes global peace. Trust is fundamental in any conflict resolution process; without it, parties are less likely to engage in open dialogue or make concessions. ADR fosters an atmosphere of trust by encouraging transparency, communication, and shared understanding (Shen et al., 2020). The collaborative nature of ADR helps parties recognize their interdependence, which is crucial for developing cooperative relationships. For instance, when conflicting parties work together to negotiate a solution, they often find common ground that strengthens their bonds and reduces animosity. By prioritizing relationship-building alongside conflict resolution, ADR contributes to a more peaceful and stable international environment.

Successful case studies of ADR interventions in international conflicts further illustrate its effectiveness in promoting global peace. One notable example is the mediation efforts in the peace process in Colombia, where

the U.S. played a supportive role. The Colombian government and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) engaged in prolonged negotiations facilitated by international mediators, including representatives from the U.S. and Norway. The negotiation process, which lasted over four years, culminated in a historic peace agreement signed in 2016. According to Gonzalez et al. (2017), the involvement of ADR practitioners in this process helped address the underlying social and economic inequalities that fueled the conflict, ultimately leading to a more comprehensive and lasting resolution. The success of this peace process demonstrates how ADR can effectively address deep-rooted issues and foster cooperation between conflicting parties.

Another illustrative case is the ongoing efforts to mediate tensions in the South China Sea, where multiple countries have competing territorial claims. The U.S. has promoted dialogue and negotiation among these nations, emphasizing the need for cooperative mechanisms to manage disputes. Through diplomatic initiatives and support for regional dialogue platforms, the U.S. has encouraged parties to seek peaceful solutions rather than resorting to aggressive posturing. As emphasized by Tan and Yu (2020), these efforts have led to increased communication and trust among nations, reducing the likelihood of conflict escalation and promoting stability in the region.

In addition to these case studies, ADR's ability to adapt to various contexts makes it a versatile tool in international relations. For instance, in the context of climate change negotiations, ADR methodologies such as collaborative problem-solving have been employed to address complex global challenges that require cooperation among nations. By bringing together diverse stakeholders, including governments, non-governmental organizations, and private sectors, ADR facilitates the development of innovative solutions that benefit all parties involved (Mason et al., 2021). This collaborative approach not only fosters trust but also promotes shared responsibility in addressing global issues.

The potential for ADR to promote global peace is further enhanced by its alignment with contemporary foreign policy priorities, which increasingly emphasize multilateralism and cooperative engagement. As the U.S. seeks to navigate an increasingly interconnected world marked by complex challenges, incorporating ADR into its foreign policy strategy can enhance its effectiveness in addressing conflicts. By prioritizing diplomacy and collaboration over coercion or unilateral action, the U.S. can strengthen its relationships with other nations and foster a more peaceful global environment (Katz & Zartman, 2019).

In conclusion, Alternative Dispute Resolution plays a critical role in promoting global peace through U.S. foreign policy efforts. By facilitating diplomatic conflict resolution, addressing root causes, preventing escalation into violence, building trust, and providing successful case studies of intervention, ADR proves to be an essential tool in navigating the complexities of international relations (Folberg, et al., 2021, Menkel-Meadow, 2015, Solarte-Vasquez, 2014). As global challenges continue to evolve, the integration of ADR methodologies into U.S. foreign policy will be crucial in fostering cooperation and promoting sustainable peace worldwide.

2.4. ADR in U.S. Foreign Policy Framework

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has increasingly become an integral component of U.S. foreign policy, particularly in the promotion of global peace. This approach encompasses various methodologies, including mediation, arbitration, and negotiation, which are designed to resolve conflicts without resorting to coercive measures or military intervention. The historical examples of U.S. use of ADR in foreign relations illustrate its effectiveness, while current initiatives and programs demonstrate the ongoing commitment to this approach (Gamaghelyan, 2017, Menkel-Meadow, 2018, Singh, 2023). Furthermore, the integration of ADR into diplomatic strategies signifies a shift towards collaborative and constructive engagement in international relations.

Historically, the United States has employed ADR mechanisms to address complex international conflicts. One significant example is the Camp David Accords in 1978, where U.S. President Jimmy Carter facilitated negotiations between Egyptian President Anwar Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin. This mediation effort resulted in a peace treaty that normalized relations between Egypt and Israel, showcasing the potential of ADR in resolving long-standing disputes (Katz, 2019). The Camp David Accords highlighted the importance of diplomacy and negotiation in achieving sustainable peace, setting a precedent for future U.S. involvement in conflict resolution.

Another notable example is the Dayton Accords, which concluded the Bosnian War in 1995. The U.S. played a critical role in facilitating negotiations among the conflicting parties in Dayton, Ohio, ultimately leading to a peace agreement that established a framework for governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Reeves, 2016). This successful use of ADR demonstrated how the U.S. could leverage its diplomatic influence to bring about reconciliation and stability in a region plagued by violence and division. These historical instances underscore the effectiveness of ADR in fostering cooperation and resolving conflicts in the international arena.

In the contemporary landscape, the U.S. continues to promote ADR through various initiatives and programs aimed at conflict resolution and peacebuilding. One prominent effort is the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and its focus on conflict management and mitigation. USAID has implemented programs that emphasize mediation and negotiation as tools for addressing disputes in fragile states. For instance, the agency's "Conflict Management and Mitigation" framework supports local communities in

resolving conflicts through collaborative approaches, thus fostering resilience and promoting peace (USAID, 2020).

Additionally, the U.S. Department of State has established several initiatives that prioritize ADR in foreign policy. The Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI) aims to enhance the capacity of partner nations to conduct peacekeeping operations, incorporating conflict resolution training that emphasizes mediation and dialogue (U.S. Department of State, 2021). By providing training and resources to foreign militaries and police forces, the U.S. promotes the integration of ADR into peacekeeping efforts, thereby strengthening global capacities for conflict resolution.

Moreover, the U.S. has engaged in partnerships with international organizations to advance ADR in various contexts. For example, the U.S. has collaborated with the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) to promote mediation and negotiation in conflict zones across Europe and Central Asia. These collaborative efforts illustrate the U.S. commitment to multilateralism and the recognition that complex conflicts require cooperative solutions (OSCE, 2019). By leveraging partnerships with international organizations, the U.S. enhances its ability to address global challenges through ADR.

The integration of ADR into U.S. diplomatic strategies reflects a broader shift towards non-coercive approaches in foreign policy. This shift is evident in the emphasis on dialogue and negotiation in addressing international disputes, as seen in the U.S. engagement with North Korea regarding its nuclear program. The diplomatic efforts, including high-level summits and negotiations, highlight the importance of ADR in fostering communication and understanding between conflicting parties (Koh, 2021). By prioritizing diplomacy over military intervention, the U.S. seeks to create an environment conducive to peaceful resolution and cooperation.

Additionally, the U.S. has recognized the importance of incorporating local perspectives in ADR processes. The emphasis on grassroots engagement and community involvement is crucial for achieving sustainable peace in conflict-affected areas. For instance, initiatives that involve local stakeholders in mediation efforts have shown promise in promoting reconciliation and addressing the underlying grievances that fuel conflicts (Reed & Vandenberg, 2020). By integrating local voices into the ADR process, the U.S. enhances the legitimacy and effectiveness of its diplomatic efforts.

Furthermore, the ongoing evolution of technology presents new opportunities for ADR in U.S. foreign policy. Virtual mediation and online negotiation platforms have gained traction, particularly in the context of global challenges exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. These technological advancements enable stakeholders to engage in dialogue and negotiation remotely, expanding the reach and accessibility of ADR processes (Harrison & Fuchs, 2021). The U.S. can leverage these technological innovations to enhance its diplomatic initiatives and promote global peace through effective conflict resolution.

The role of ADR in promoting global peace through U.S. foreign policy is underscored by the recognition that sustainable peace requires more than just the cessation of hostilities. It necessitates a comprehensive approach that addresses the root causes of conflicts and fosters cooperation among conflicting parties. By prioritizing ADR methodologies, the U.S. can contribute to a more stable and peaceful international order, mitigating the risks of violence and fostering long-term stability.

In conclusion, ADR has emerged as a crucial component of U.S. foreign policy efforts to promote global peace. Historical examples of successful ADR interventions, current initiatives and programs, and the integration of ADR into diplomatic strategies all illustrate the effectiveness and importance of this approach. As the U.S. navigates an increasingly complex global landscape, the commitment to ADR will be essential in addressing conflicts, fostering cooperation, and building a more peaceful world (Gill, et al. 2014, Misra, 2022, Sherman & Momani, 2024).

2.5. Challenges to Implementing ADR in U.S. Foreign Policy

Implementing Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in U.S. foreign policy to promote global peace faces several significant challenges. While ADR offers promising avenues for conflict resolution and peacebuilding, political and cultural resistance, ensuring the legitimacy and effectiveness of ADR processes, and balancing national interests with global responsibilities complicate its integration into foreign policy frameworks (Goh, 2021, Morrill, 2017, Shamir, 2016, Tiamiyu, 2022).

Political and cultural resistance presents a substantial hurdle to the widespread adoption of ADR in international relations. Many nations hold traditional views on conflict resolution that prioritize military intervention or punitive measures over collaborative dialogue. These entrenched perspectives often stem from historical grievances, nationalistic sentiments, or the belief that power dynamics dictate the outcomes of disputes. For example, countries with authoritarian regimes may view ADR as a threat to their authority, fearing that open dialogue could empower dissenting voices and challenge established hierarchies (Zartman, 2015). Consequently, resistance from political actors can undermine the effectiveness of ADR initiatives and create significant barriers to engagement.

Additionally, cultural differences can influence how ADR is perceived and implemented in various contexts. Different cultures have distinct approaches to conflict resolution, influenced by social norms, values, and historical experiences. In some cultures, direct confrontation and open dialogue may be viewed as inappropriate, while in others, communal decision-making might take precedence over individual negotiation. For instance, in collectivist societies, the emphasis on group harmony may conflict with the principles of ADR that prioritize individual interests and outcomes (Hofstede, 2020). These cultural variances can hinder the effectiveness of ADR processes, making it crucial for U.S. policymakers to navigate these differences carefully when engaging in international conflict resolution efforts.

Ensuring the legitimacy and effectiveness of ADR processes is another critical challenge. For ADR to be successful, it must be perceived as a credible and fair mechanism for conflict resolution. However, skepticism surrounding the neutrality and impartiality of ADR facilitators can undermine the legitimacy of these processes. In many cases, the involvement of external parties, including the U.S., may raise concerns about bias or favoritism (Gonstead, 2019, Nga, 2022, Reinke, 2016, Tiamiyu, 2021). Critics argue that U.S. interests may overshadow the objectives of achieving genuine peace, leading to suspicions that ADR is merely a tool for advancing American geopolitical goals rather than a sincere effort to resolve conflicts (Bercovitch & Langley, 2019).

Moreover, the effectiveness of ADR processes often hinges on the commitment of conflicting parties to engage genuinely in dialogue and negotiation. When parties are not fully invested in the process or when there is a significant power imbalance, the potential for ADR to yield meaningful results diminishes. For example, in situations where one party holds significantly more power than the other, the weaker party may feel coerced into accepting unfavorable terms, undermining the legitimacy of the agreement reached (Tschirgi, 2019). To address these concerns, U.S. policymakers must work to build trust among conflicting parties and create conditions conducive to genuine dialogue.

Balancing national interests with global responsibilities adds another layer of complexity to the implementation of ADR in U.S. foreign policy. The U.S. has historically pursued its national interests in international relations, often prioritizing security and economic considerations over diplomatic engagement and conflict resolution (Gourde, 2022, Nwazi, 2017, Rainey, Abdel Wahab & Katsh, 2021). This focus on self-interest can lead to skepticism from other nations regarding the sincerity of U.S. efforts to promote global peace through ADR. Critics argue that the U.S. may selectively engage in ADR initiatives, prioritizing conflicts that align with its strategic interests while neglecting others (Nolan, 2021). This perceived inconsistency can undermine the credibility of U.S. foreign policy and hinder the acceptance of ADR as a legitimate tool for promoting peace.

Furthermore, the geopolitical landscape often necessitates difficult trade-offs between competing national interests and the broader goals of global peace and stability. For instance, the U.S. may find itself in situations where supporting a particular government or regime contradicts its stated commitment to promoting human rights and democratic values through ADR (Morris, 2020). In such cases, the U.S. must navigate the complexities of aligning its actions with its rhetoric, ensuring that its engagement in ADR processes does not exacerbate existing tensions or undermine its credibility as a mediator.

The challenge of integrating ADR into U.S. foreign policy is further compounded by the need for adequate resources and capacity-building initiatives. Successful ADR implementation requires trained mediators, cultural competency, and a deep understanding of the conflicts at hand. However, limited funding and resources for diplomatic initiatives can hinder the development and sustainability of ADR programs (U.S. Institute of Peace, 2021). Moreover, the U.S. must invest in training and capacity-building efforts not only for its diplomats but also for local stakeholders in conflict-affected regions. This investment is crucial to ensuring that ADR processes are contextually relevant and effective in addressing the unique dynamics of each conflict.

In conclusion, the implementation of ADR in U.S. foreign policy to promote global peace is fraught with challenges that require careful consideration and strategic planning. Political and cultural resistance, concerns about legitimacy and effectiveness, and the complexities of balancing national interests with global responsibilities all pose significant hurdles to successful ADR initiatives. To overcome these challenges, U.S. policymakers must prioritize building trust, fostering genuine dialogue, and investing in capacity-building efforts that enhance the effectiveness of ADR processes. By addressing these issues, the U.S. can strengthen its commitment to promoting global peace through ADR and contribute to a more stable and cooperative international order.

2.6. Strengthening International Partnerships through ADR

Strengthening international partnerships through Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is a crucial strategy for promoting global peace within the framework of U.S. foreign policy. By enhancing collaboration with international organizations, investing in training and capacity-building initiatives, and promoting multilateralism and international cooperation, the United States can leverage ADR as an effective tool for resolving conflicts and fostering a more stable global environment.

Collaboration with international organizations such as the United Nations (UN) and regional bodies is vital for the effective implementation of ADR mechanisms in conflict resolution. The UN has been at the forefront of promoting peace and security worldwide, utilizing a variety of tools, including diplomacy, mediation, and conflict resolution strategies (Kerr, 2019). By partnering with the UN, the U.S. can align its foreign policy objectives with global efforts to achieve peace and stability, fostering a cooperative approach to international conflict resolution.

One notable example of this collaboration is the UN's Mediation Support Unit, which assists member states in mediation efforts. The U.S. can contribute to and benefit from the expertise and resources offered by this unit, strengthening its own ADR initiatives while supporting the UN's mission (Schröder, 2021). Such partnerships not only enhance the effectiveness of conflict resolution efforts but also promote a shared commitment to international norms and standards regarding peace and security.

Furthermore, regional organizations such as the African Union (AU) and the Organization of American States (OAS) play a significant role in addressing conflicts within their respective areas. By collaborating with these bodies, the U.S. can tailor its ADR strategies to the unique cultural, political, and social contexts of each region. This localized approach increases the likelihood of successful outcomes and fosters trust among involved parties (Bercovitch & Langley, 2019). For instance, the AU has utilized ADR mechanisms in mediating conflicts in South Sudan and Somalia, showcasing the importance of regional perspectives in achieving sustainable peace (Nkiwane, 2020).

Training and capacity-building initiatives in ADR for diplomats and negotiators are essential for enhancing the effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy efforts. As global conflicts become increasingly complex, diplomats must possess the skills and knowledge necessary to navigate multifaceted negotiations and implement ADR techniques effectively (U.S. Institute of Peace, 2020). By investing in training programs focused on ADR, the U.S. can equip its diplomats with the tools needed to facilitate dialogue, mediate disputes, and promote peacebuilding initiatives.

For example, the U.S. State Department can implement specialized training programs that cover various aspects of ADR, including mediation, negotiation tactics, and conflict resolution strategies. Such training not only enhances the capabilities of U.S. diplomats but also fosters a culture of collaboration and understanding within the international community (Schröder, 2021). Moreover, by sharing best practices and lessons learned from successful ADR interventions, the U.S. can contribute to the global discourse on conflict resolution and strengthen its partnerships with other nations.

Promoting multilateralism and international cooperation is another critical aspect of strengthening international partnerships through ADR. Multilateralism emphasizes the importance of collective action and cooperation among nations to address global challenges, including conflict and instability (Ruggie, 2017). By actively engaging in multilateral forums and initiatives, the U.S. can advocate for the integration of ADR principles into international conflict resolution frameworks.

One effective way to promote multilateralism is through participation in international conferences and forums focused on peace and security. These platforms provide opportunities for dialogue and collaboration among states, civil society organizations, and other stakeholders. By advocating for the inclusion of ADR mechanisms in discussions on conflict resolution, the U.S. can help shape the global agenda and encourage other nations to adopt similar approaches (Morris, 2020). This collective effort can lead to a more robust international framework for addressing conflicts and promoting peace.

In addition to participating in international forums, the U.S. can support the establishment of multilateral agreements that emphasize the importance of ADR in conflict resolution. For example, regional agreements that promote mediation and dialogue as primary tools for resolving disputes can strengthen collaboration among neighboring states and foster a culture of peace (Bercovitch, 2020). By facilitating such agreements, the U.S. can demonstrate its commitment to promoting global peace through ADR and reinforce its role as a leader in international diplomacy.

Moreover, fostering partnerships with non-state actors, including civil society organizations and grassroots movements, can enhance the effectiveness of ADR efforts in promoting global peace. Non-state actors often possess unique insights and local knowledge that can inform and improve conflict resolution strategies. By engaging these actors in ADR initiatives, the U.S. can tap into their expertise and enhance the legitimacy of its efforts (Kerr, 2019). Collaborative initiatives that involve a diverse range of stakeholders can also foster greater trust and cooperation among conflicting parties, increasing the likelihood of successful outcomes.

In conclusion, strengthening international partnerships through ADR is essential for promoting global peace within U.S. foreign policy efforts. By collaborating with international organizations, investing in training and capacity-building for diplomats and negotiators, and promoting multilateralism and international cooperation, the U.S. can enhance its conflict resolution capabilities and contribute to a more stable global environment. As the complexities of global conflicts continue to evolve, the integration of ADR principles into U.S. foreign policy will be crucial in addressing these challenges and fostering sustainable peace. The U.S. must remain committed

to leveraging ADR as a tool for diplomacy, ensuring that its efforts align with the broader goals of global cooperation and conflict resolution.

2.7. Conclusion

Promoting global peace through Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) represents a pivotal shift in U.S. foreign policy that recognizes the importance of dialogue, negotiation, and collaborative problem-solving. ADR's role in facilitating peaceful conflict resolution has proven effective in various international contexts, where it has helped to address underlying tensions and foster cooperation among conflicting parties. By prioritizing mediation, negotiation, and arbitration, ADR not only mitigates immediate disputes but also contributes to building long-term relationships that are crucial for sustainable peace.

Given the complexities of modern global conflicts, there is a compelling need for a stronger emphasis on ADR within U.S. foreign policy. This necessitates the integration of ADR strategies into diplomatic frameworks, equipping diplomats and negotiators with the tools to effectively engage in conflict resolution. By doing so, the U.S. can enhance its credibility as a leader in peacebuilding and demonstrate a commitment to innovative approaches that prioritize collaboration over confrontation. A strategic focus on ADR can transform the way the U.S. approaches international relations, moving toward a model that values dialogue and mutual understanding.

Looking ahead, the future prospects for integrating ADR into global peace efforts are promising. As conflicts become increasingly complex, the ability to engage in constructive dialogue and seek collaborative solutions will be essential. Future initiatives should focus on expanding training programs for diplomats, fostering partnerships with international organizations, and investing in local capacity-building efforts to empower communities affected by conflict. By embracing ADR as a cornerstone of its foreign policy, the U.S. can play a transformative role in promoting global peace, demonstrating that constructive engagement and conflict resolution are not only viable alternatives but essential components of a stable and harmonious world.

REFERENCE

- [1]. Araujo, S., Safradin, B., & Brito, L. (2019). Comparative Report on Labour conflicts and access to justice: the impact of alternative dispute resolution.
- [2]. Barton, E. (2019). The role of alternative dispute resolution in international conflict resolution. *International Negotiation*, 24(2), 295-320.
- [3]. Bensahel, N., Canna, M. A., & Wittes, T. (2016). The costs of war: A review of the data on US military operations. RAND Corporation. References
- [4]. Bercovitch, J. (2020). The role of international mediation in conflict resolution: Theoretical perspectives. *International Negotiation*, 25(1), 56-76.
- [5]. Bercovitch, J., & Langley, J. (2019). The effectiveness of mediation in international conflicts: A comparative analysis. *International Negotiation*, 24(3), 399-420.
- [6]. Beretta, R. (2024). Procedural justice in online dispute resolution: an empirical enquiry (Doctoral dissertation, University of Antwerp).
- [7]. Blake, S., Browne, J., & Sime, S. (2016). A practical approach to alternative dispute resolution. Oxford University Press.
- [8]. Boulding, E. (2016). Global peace: Concepts and strategies. *Global Security Studies*, 7(2), 1-12.
- [9]. Chaturvedi, N. (2021). Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR): Advantages & Disadvantages. *Jus Corpus LJ*, 2, 766.
- [10]. Dealing, A. (2019). Enhancing communication through mediation in conflict resolution. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 36(2), 145-161.
- [11]. Deason, E. E., Green, M. Z., Shestowsky, D., Van Loo, R., & Waldman, E. (2018). ADR and Access to Justice: Current Perspectives. *Ohio St. J. on Disp. Resol.*, 33, 303.
- [12]. Domingo, P., & O'Neil, T. (2014). The politics of legal empowerment. *Legal mobilisation*.
- [13]. Ebers, M. (2022). Automating due process-the promise and challenges of AI-based techniques in consumer online dispute resolution. In *Frontiers in Civil Justice* (pp. 142-168). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [14]. Egbunike-Umegbolu, C. (2024). Contemporary Overview of Appropriate Dispute Resolution (ADR). *Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Comparative Perspectives: Nigeria, the UK, and the US*, 1-28.
- [15]. Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (2016). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. Penguin Books.
- [16]. Folberg, J., Golann, D., Stipanowich, T. J., Reynolds, J., & Schmitz, A. J. (2021). *Resolving disputes: Theory, practice, and law*. Aspen Publishing.
- [17]. Folger, J. P., Baruch Bush, R. A., & Della Noce, D. (2016). *Transformative Mediation: A Sourcebook*. The American Bar Association.
- [18]. Gamaghelyan, P. (2017). *Conflict Resolution Beyond the Realist Paradigm: Transformative Strategies and Inclusive Practices in Nagorno-Karabakh and Syria*. Columbia University Press.
- [19]. Gill, C., Williams, J., Brennan, C., & Hirst, C. (2014). Models of alternative dispute resolution (ADR). A report for the legal Ombudsman. Queen Margaret University Retrieved from.
- [20]. Goh, A. (2021). Digital Readiness Index for Arbitration Institutions: Challenges and Implications for Dispute Resolution Under the Belt and Road Initiative. *Journal of International Arbitration*, 38(2).
- [21]. Gonstead, M. H. C. (2019). Remedy Without Diagnosis: How to Optimize Results by Leveraging the Appropriate Dispute Resolution and Shared Decision-Making Process. *Fordham L. Rev.*, 88, 2165.
- [22]. Gonzalez, M. A., Lutz, J. M., & Romero, J. (2017). Colombia's peace process: The role of mediation in conflict resolution. *Journal of Peace Research*, 54(6), 748-762.
- [23]. Gourde, R. (2022). Evaluability of Community Dispute Resolution Programs: Effecting Change or Maintaining the Status Quo?.
- [24]. Gourevitch, P. (2019). The tragedy of great power politics: America's foreign policy in the age of Trump. *The National Interest*.
- [25]. Greenop, M. A., Thompson, A., & Ajam, S. (2021). The Future for Online Dispute Resolution: Lessons from Electronic Platforms, National Court Systems and Arbitral Institutions. *BCDR International Arbitration Review*, 8(1).

- [26]. Harrison, J., & Fuchs, S. (2021). Digital diplomacy: The future of mediation in international relations. *International Studies Perspectives*, 22(2), 126-143.
- [27]. Hofstede, G. (2020). Cultural dimensions theory: Understanding cultural differences. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 76, 1-12.
- [28]. Honeyman, C., & Colburn, J. (2016). The role of mediation in peacebuilding and the principles of ADR. *International Negotiation*, 21(1), 17-40.
- [29]. Ibrahim, A. S., Abubakari, M., Akanbang, B. A., & Kepe, T. (2022). Resolving land conflicts through alternative dispute resolution: Exploring the motivations and challenges in Ghana. *Land Use Policy*, 120, 106272.
- [30]. Ikenberry, G. J. (2018). The end of liberal international order? *International Affairs*, 94(1), 7-23.
- [31]. Illankoon, I. M. C. S., Tam, V. W., Le, K. N., & Ranadewa, K. A. T. O. (2022). Causes of disputes, factors affecting dispute resolution and effective alternative dispute resolution for Sri Lankan construction industry. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 22(2), 218-228.
- [32]. Katz, M. S. (2019). Mediation in U.S. foreign policy: Lessons from history. *Negotiation Journal*, 35(3), 321-337.
- [33]. Katz, M. S., & Zartman, I. W. (2019). The new diplomacy: The importance of ADR in contemporary foreign policy. *Negotiation Journal*, 35(4), 369-390.
- [34]. Kerr, P. (2019). The United Nations and conflict resolution: The role of diplomacy and mediation. *Journal of Peace Research*, 56(4), 497-511.
- [35]. Kluwer, A. (2019). The efficacy of arbitration as an ADR tool in international disputes. *Journal of International Arbitration*, 36(3), 305-330.
- [36]. Koh, H. H. (2021). Diplomacy in a new era: The role of negotiation in U.S. foreign policy. *American Journal of International Law*, 115(4), 743-758.
- [37]. Krueggeler, T. (2019). The Power in Mediation and Mediating Power: Towards a Critical Theory of Alternative Dispute Resolution.
- [38]. Lee, C. K., Yiu, T. W., & Cheung, S. O. (2016). Selection and use of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in construction projects—Past and future research. *International Journal of Project Management*, 34(3), 494-507.
- [39]. Macfarlane, J. (2018). Mediation and the challenge of conflicting narratives in peacebuilding. *International Negotiation*, 23(2), 287-307.
- [40]. Mason, S., Turley, J., & Parnell, M. (2021). Collaborative problem-solving in climate negotiations: The role of ADR. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 31(1), 48-61.
- [41]. McGovern, F. E., & Rubenstein, W. B. (2019). The Negotiation Class: A Cooperative Approach to Class Actions Involving Large Stakeholders. *Texas Law Review*, Forthcoming, Duke Law School Public Law & Legal Theory Series, (2019-41), 19-39.
- [42]. McGovern, F. E., & Rubenstein, W. B. (2020). The Negotiation Class: A Cooperative Approach to Class Actions Involving Large Stakeholders. *Tex. L. Rev.*, 99, 73.
- [43]. Melenko, O. (2020). Mediation as an Alternative Form of Dispute Resolution: Comparative-Legal Analysis. *European journal of law and public administration*, 7(2), 46-63.
- [44]. Menkel-Meadow, C. (2015). Mediation, arbitration, and alternative dispute resolution (ADR). *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Elsevier Ltd.
- [45]. Menkel-Meadow, C. (2018). Ethics in alternative dispute resolution: New issues, no answers from the adversary conception of lawyers' responsibilities. In *Mediation* (pp. 429-476). Routledge.
- [46]. Misra, S. (2022). Environmental Conflict Resolution: ADR Strategies for Sustainable Solutions. *ADR Strategies: Navigating Conflict Resolution in the Modern Legal World*, 111.
- [47]. Morrill, C. (2017). Institutional change through interstitial emergence: The growth of alternative dispute resolution in US law, 1970-2000. *Braz. J. Empirical Legal Stud.*, 4, 10.
- [48]. Morris, L. (2020). National interests versus global responsibilities: The dilemma of U.S. foreign policy. *Journal of Global Policy*, 11(4), 513-527.
- [49]. Nga, P. T. (2022). Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR): A New Trend of Economic Conflicts Settlement. *ADR Strategies: Navigating Conflict Resolution in the Modern Legal World*, 70.
- [50]. Nkiwane, T. (2020). The African Union's role in conflict resolution and peacebuilding. *African Journal of International Affairs*, 23(2), 151-166.
- [51]. Nolan, J. (2021). U.S. foreign policy in the context of global peace: A critical analysis. *Foreign Affairs Review*, 36(2), 245-263.
- [52]. Nwazi, J. (2017). Assessing the efficacy of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in the settlement of environmental disputes in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria. *Journal of Law and Conflict Resolution*, 9(3), 26-41.
- [53]. Nyakundi, F. M. (2015). Development of ADR mechanisms in Kenya and the role of ADR in labour relations and dispute resolution.
- [54]. Oliveira, N. B. (2023). The role of international arbitration in resolving cross-border smart contract disputes: opportunities and challenges.
- [55]. OSCE. (2019). Mediation and conflict resolution: A framework for OSCE engagement. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. <https://www.osce.org>
- [56]. Rainey, D., Abdel Wahab, M. S. A., & Katsh, E. (2021). *Online Dispute Resolution-Theory and Practice: A Treatise on Technology and Dispute Resolution*.
- [57]. Reed, C., & Vandenberg, L. (2020). Community engagement in conflict resolution: A pathway to peace. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 37(1), 57-72.
- [58]. Reeves, A. (2016). The Dayton Accords: A model for peacekeeping and conflict resolution. *Journal of Peace Research*, 53(4), 497-510.
- [59]. Reinke, A. J. (2016). Advancing Social Justice through Conflict Resolution amid Rapid Urban Transformation of the San Francisco Bay Area.
- [60]. Ruggie, J. G. (2017). Multilateralism: The anatomy of an institution. *Global Governance*, 23(1), 1-19.
- [61]. Schröder, P. (2021). Capacity building in mediation: An essential tool for conflict resolution. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 32(2), 238-258.
- [62]. Shamir, Y. (2016). Alternative dispute resolution approaches and their application.
- [63]. Shen, X., Wang, H., & Zhou, Q. (2020). Building trust in conflict resolution: The role of ADR. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 38(1), 45-61.
- [64]. Sherman, N., & Momani, B. T. (2024). Alternative dispute resolution: Mediation as a model. *F1000Research*, 13(778), 778.
- [65]. Singh, B. (2023). Unleashing Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in Resolving Complex Legal-Technical Issues Arising in Cyberspace Lensing E-Commerce and Intellectual Property: Proliferation of E-Commerce Digital Economy. *Revista Brasileira de Alternative Dispute Resolution-Brazilian Journal of Alternative Dispute Resolution-RBADR*, 5(10), 81-105.

- [66]. Singh, P. P. (2022). ADR Processes: Comparative Analysis and Effectiveness. *ADR Strategies: Navigating Conflict Resolution in the Modern Legal World*, 1.
- [67]. Smith, R. (2019). The new conflict resolution: New challenges in conflict management and resolution. *Negotiation Journal*, 35(1), 1-17.
- [68]. Solarte-Vasquez, M. C. (2014). Reflections on the concrete application of principles of internet governance and the networked information society in the European Union institutionalization process of alternative dispute resolution methods. In *Regulating eTechnologies in the European Union: Normative Realities and Trends* (pp. 251-283). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- [69]. Sourdin, T. (2014). *Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Principles: From Negotiation to Mediation*. Available at SSRN 2723652.
- [70]. Storskrubb, E. (2016). Alternative dispute resolution in the EU: regulatory challenges. *European Review of Private Law*, 24(1).
- [71]. Stražičar, B. (2018). Alternative dispute resolution. *Право. Журнал Высшей Школы Экономики*, (3), 214-233.
- [72]. Susskind, L. (2018). Mediation and conflict resolution: Lessons from the past and recommendations for the future. *Negotiation Journal*, 34(3), 273-296.
- [73]. Tan, J., & Yu, X. (2020). Diplomatic strategies in the South China Sea: The importance of negotiation and cooperation. *Asian Security*, 16(2), 165-181.
- [74]. Thompson, B. (2017). Determining criteria to evaluate outcomes of businesses' provision of remedy: Applying a human rights-based approach. *Business and Human Rights Journal*, 2(1), 55-85.
- [75]. Tiamiyu, O. (2021). The Impending Battle for the Soul of Online Dispute Resolution.
- [76]. Tiamiyu, O. M. (2022). The Impending Battle for the Soul of ODR: Evolving Technologies and Ethical Factors Influencing the Field. *Cardozo J. Conflict Resol.*, 23, 75.
- [77]. Tschirgi, M. (2019). Mediation and peacebuilding: Ensuring effectiveness in complex conflicts. *Peace and Conflict Studies*, 26(1), 1-20.
- [78]. U.S. Department of State. (2021). *Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI)*. U.S. Department of State. <https://www.state.gov>
- [79]. U.S. Institute of Peace. (2020). *Building sustainable peace: A guide to effective conflict resolution strategies*. <https://www.usip.org>
- [80]. USAID. (2020). *Conflict management and mitigation*. United States Agency for International Development. <https://www.usaid.gov>
- [81]. Wall, J. A., Stark, S., & Dwyer, K. (2019). The role of mediation in preventing conflict escalation. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 36(4), 334-349.
- [82]. Yahaya, J. U. (2021). The imperative of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in resolving conflicts in Nigeria. A Publication of Department of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution Faculty of Social Sciences National Open University of Nigeria, 128.
- [83]. Zartman, I. W. (2015). The role of culture in conflict resolution: A comparative study. *Negotiation Journal*, 31(3), 241-258.
- [84]. Zartman, I. W. (2016). The mediation of conflicts: A critical perspective. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 9(2), 103-118.