



The Urgency Of The Establishment Of A World Mediation Body At The United Nations (PBB)

Sabela Gayo^{1*}

¹Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Dirgaantara Marsekal Suryadarma, Indonesia

: sabela.gayo@unsurya.ac.id

Corresponding Author*

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Security Council,
Veto,
World Mediation Body.

Date received : 13 Maret 2026

Revision date : 27 1 Mei 2026

Date published : 15 Juni 2026

ABSTRACT

The dynamics of contemporary international conflicts point to the significant limitations of the United Nations mediation mechanism sourced from a Security Council structure with a veto system. This study analyzes the urgency of the establishment of a World mediation body as an institutional solution to the structural paralysis of the United Nations in carrying out the conflict mediation function for the period 2021-2025. Using normative legal research methods with an analysis of Law No. 37 of 1999, Law No. 24 of 2000, and Law No. 1 of 1982, the study found that the politicization of the mediation process by permanent members of the Security Council has reduced the credibility and effectiveness of the United Nations in resolving the Gaza conflict, Ukraine, and other humanitarian crises. The creation of a World mediation body is supported by the theory of institutional liberalism and empirical evidence of the success of neutral and professional international mediation. Optimal institutional design includes a representative membership structure, responsive operational procedures, diversified financing, and a comprehensive legal mandate independent of the Security Council. The implications of the establishment of this body include the diversification of dispute resolution channels, the strengthening of the role of the General Assembly, and the democratization of global governance through an inclusive redistribution of power, in line with the principles of Indonesia's active free foreign policy and commitment to World Peace.

INTRODUCTION

The dynamics of contemporary international conflict undergo significant transformations that demand an in-depth evaluation of existing global dispute resolution mechanisms, particularly in the context of the institutional architecture of the United Nations (PBB). The United Nations, as an international organization founded in 1945 with the main mission of maintaining international peace and security, is now faced with structural challenges that threaten the effectiveness of its mediation function in resolving conflicts between countries (Riski, 2022). The dispute resolution mechanisms that have been set out in the UN Charter, especially through the Security Council as the main organ, show increasingly real systemic limitations in the face of the complexity of 21st century conflicts, as reflected in the repeated failure to address humanitarian crises in Gaza, Ukraine and Syria lasting until 2025 (Adwani, 2022). This limitation stems primarily from the membership structure of the Security Council granting veto power to five permanent members, creating a condition of institutional paralysis when the geopolitical interests of those countries clash with universal humanitarian imperatives, thus resulting in more than 300 uses of veto power since the founding of the PBB until 2025, with the majority used to protect national interests or political (Muhammad Wendra, 2024).

A review of the academic literature reveals that international mediation has been recognized as an essential instrument in conflict management, with implementation rates reaching a range of 60 percent in international disputes and significant success rates in a variety of cases (Lailatil Maya, 2025). Mediation is defined as a conflict management process that involves the assistance of an independent third party to facilitate negotiations between the parties to a dispute in order to reach a peaceful settlement without the use of physical violence or coercive legal authority (Jess Gifkins, 2021). Contemporary research shows that the effectiveness of mediation depends on three crucial factors, namely the motivation of the disputing parties to resolve the conflict seriously, the maturity of the conflict situation characterized by a hurting stalemate, as well as the availability of the right mediator with the characteristics of neutrality, high diplomatic skills, and a deep understanding of the context of the conflict. However, the practice of international mediation within the framework of the United Nations faces systemic structural barriers, mainly related to the politicization of the mediation process by permanent members of the Security Council who

have strategic interests in certain conflicts, thereby reducing the credibility and objectivity of the organization in facilitating fair and sustainable dispute resolution.

Previous research on the role of the United Nations in the resolution of international conflicts has identified various institutional limitations that hinder the effectiveness of the organization in carrying out its mandate. Studies conducted on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict period 2023-2025 show that although the United Nations through its agencies such as the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (OCHA), and Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) have made significant contributions to the handling of the humanitarian crisis, but the Security Council's failure to pass a cease-fire resolution over the use of the veto by the United States six times since October 2023 has exposed the organization's structural inability to stop violence and protect civilians (Nabila, 2025). An analysis of the Russia-Ukraine conflict also revealed that mediation efforts by PBB Secretary-General António Guterres face serious limitations due to deep mistrust between the parties to the conflict as well as sharp differences of views on the terms of peace, where Russia's veto in the Security Council effectively hampers any firm steps the organization can take to force a ceasefire or peace enforcement (Asep Daenuri, 2021). Furthermore, comparative studies on dispute resolution mechanisms have shown that mediation as an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has proven to be more effective than litigation in the context of business and domestic conflicts, with advantages such as cost reduction, accelerated settlement, and maintenance of relationships between parties, but this effectiveness is highly dependent on the quality of mediators, public understanding, and a supportive regulatory framework (Kadek Tegar, 2024).

The research gap identified from the literature review is the lack of a comprehensive study of institutional alternatives to overcome the structural limitations of the UN Security Council in carrying out the mediation function, in particular the proposal for the establishment of an independent mediation body separate from the political power structure of the permanent members of the Security Council. Although academic discourse has identified various veto weaknesses and called for Security Council reforms, including limiting or eliminating veto power in cases of crimes against humanity, genocide, or war crimes, the literature has yet to systematically explore specific institutional designs for global mediation bodies that could operate autonomously

from the political interests of major powers. Furthermore, there are gaps in the study of operational mechanisms, membership structures, sources of financing, legal mandates, and decision-making procedures necessary to ensure the independence, effectiveness, and legitimacy of World mediation bodies in the context of a contemporary international system characterized by multipolarity and fragmentation of power. This gap is becoming increasingly crucial given the trend of diversifying international mediation actors involving emerging powers countries such as China, Turkey, Qatar, Brazil, and South Africa, which demand a reconfiguration of institutional architectures to accommodate a plurality of approaches and interests in global conflict resolution, but without a coherent coordination framework and clear accountability mechanisms (Fiemotongha Christopher, 2021).

The novelty of the research offered by this study lies in the theoretical and practical proposition of establishing a World mediation body as an independent organ within the UN framework designed to overcome the structural limitations of the Security Council in carrying out its function of mediating international conflicts. In contrast to previous studies that focused on Security Council reform through membership expansion or veto restrictions, this study proposes an alternative institutional solution in the form of the establishment of a mediation specialist body that operates on the principles of neutrality, professionalism, and independence from the political interests of the permanent member states of the Security Council. These conceptual novelties include institutional designs that integrate the technical expertise of professional mediation with multilateral legitimacy, financing mechanisms independent of the contributions of major powers to guarantee financial independence, as well as Democratic and inclusive decision-making procedures that provide proportional representation to different geographical regions and ideological spectra within the international community. In addition, the study also contributes to the development of a new normative framework in international organization law that emphasizes the separation of the technical function of mediation from political-strategic considerations, in line with the principles of functional specialization in international institutional theory that have proven effective in UN technical bodies such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Labor Organization (ILO).

Based on the identification of the structural limitations of the existing mediation mechanism and the research gaps that have been outlined, the

formulation of the problems that are the focus of this study are: first, how the structural limitations of the UN Security Council, in particular the veto mechanism, have hindered the effectiveness of the organization's mediation function in resolving contemporary international conflicts; third, what is the optimal institutional design for a World mediation body that includes the organizational structure, membership mechanisms, operational procedures, sources of financing, and legal mandates that can ensure the agency's independence, effectiveness, and legitimacy in carrying out its international conflict mediation function; fourth, What are the implications of the establishment of a World mediation body for the architecture of the existing international dispute resolution system and for UN institutional reform more broadly in the context of 21st century global governance. The present formulation of the problem is designed to explore the theoretical, practical, and normative dimensions of the proposition of establishing an independent mediation body as a solution to the crisis of the effectiveness of the United Nations in the management of international conflicts.

The purpose of this study is to comprehensively analyze the structural limitations of the UN mediation mechanism derived from the institutional design of the Security Council, in particular the veto mechanism, and its impact on the organization's ability to effectively, neutrally, and fairly perform its international conflict mediation function. Furthermore, this study aims to construct theoretical and empirical arguments supporting the urgency of establishing a World mediation body as an institutional solution to the identified limitations, by integrating the perspectives of international law, International Organization theory, and contemporary conflict mediation practices. Specifically, the study also aims to develop a comprehensive institutional design framework for a World mediation body that includes the structural, procedural, and normative dimensions necessary to guarantee the effective operationalization of such a body in a multipolar and fragmented international system. Finally, this study aims to identify the strategic implications of the establishment of a World mediation body on the institutional reform of the UN as a whole and on the evolution of international dispute resolution regimes in the context of 21st century global governance transformations marked by shifts in the distribution of powers and the emergence of non-traditional actors in peace diplomacy.

The theoretical benefit of this study is to contribute to the development of academic literature on institutional reform of international organizations, particularly in the context of adaptation of global

institutions to changing power structures and the complexity of contemporary conflicts, by offering a new conceptual framework of functional specialization in international conflict management that can serve as a reference for future research in the fields of International Organization law, peace and Conflict Studies, and multilateral diplomacy. In practical terms, this study is expected to provide substantive input for policy makers at national and international levels, especially UN member states that support institutional reform of the organization, in formulating concrete proposals for the establishment of a World mediation body that can be presented in official UN forums such as the General Assembly or the Institutional Reform Working Group. For international mediation practitioners and regional organizations involved in conflict resolution, this study offers guidance on best practices in the design of independent, professional, and effective mediation institutions that can be adapted in regional and subregional contexts. Furthermore, for global civil society and non-governmental organizations advocating for international peace and justice, the study provides a strong argumentative basis for UN reform campaigns and encourages accountability of international organizations in carrying out their mandate of protecting populations from mass atrocities, genocide, and crimes against humanity in accordance with the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) principles that have been adopted in the 2005 World Summit.

METHOD

This study uses the normative legal research method which is a doctrinal legal study approach that focuses on the analysis of written and unwritten legal norms, by reviewing legislation, international treaties, legal doctrine, and jurisprudence that are relevant to the object of research. The normative legal research method was chosen because the problems studied in this study are related to the structural limitations of the dispute resolution mechanism within the framework of the United Nations as stipulated in the UN Charter, which requires an in-depth study of international legal instruments and the proposition of establishing a world mediation body as an institutional solution that requires the construction of a new normative framework in international organizational law. Normative juridical approach is carried out by studying and analyzing theories, concepts, principles of international law, as well as reviewing various regulations and international conventions related to the international dispute resolution system and

institutional reform of international organizations. Normative legal research applied in this study is prescriptive and applied, which aims to provide solutions to legal problems identified through the construction of theoretical and practical argumentation based on the analysis of existing legal norms and the development of new normative frameworks needed to overcome the structural limitations that exist in the contemporary UN dispute resolution system (Ahmad Rosidi, 2024).

The type of research used is research on the principles of law and legal Systematics in the field of International Organization law and international dispute resolution law, by identifying the rules of law that have been formulated in international legal instruments and Indonesian national legislation governing foreign relations and international treaties. Research into legal Systematics is carried out by analyzing the institutional structure of the UN and the decision-making mechanisms within the Security Council, including provisions regarding the right of veto, to identify systemic inconsistencies and limitations that impede the effectiveness of the organization's mediation function in resolving contemporary international conflicts. The source of data used in this study is secondary data consisting of primary legal materials, secondary legal materials, and tertiary legal materials relevant to research problems. Primary legal materials include Law No. 37 of 1999 on Foreign Relations which regulates the basic principles of the implementation of Foreign Relations of the Republic of Indonesia including involvement in international organizations and peaceful settlement of international disputes, Law No. 24 of 2000 on international agreements which regulates the mechanism of making and ratifying international agreements including those relating to the United Nations and other, as well as Law No. 1 of 1982 on ratification of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and Consular Relations which is the legal basis for the implementation of international diplomacy and mediation. Secondary legal material consists of the results of previous research published in reputable scientific journals both nationally and internationally, textbooks on international law and international organization law, scientific articles, dissertations, theses, and Research reports that discuss the role of the United Nations in international conflict resolution, the limitations of the Security Council mechanism, international mediation practices, and institutional reforms of international organizations. Tertiary legal materials include dictionaries of international law, legal encyclopedias, and various publications from international organizations such as Peace Research Institute

reports, official PBB documents, as well as publications from non-governmental organizations relevant to the research topic (Sidi Ahyar Wiraguna, 2024).

Data collection techniques are carried out through library research by conducting an inventory, identification, and classification of legal materials relevant to research problems, both available in print and electronic formats through international legal databases and scientific journal repositories. Data analysis was carried out using the method of qualitative normative analysis, which analyzes the legal material that has been collected systematically and comprehensively to find answers to the formulation of research problems. Analysis techniques used include grammatical interpretation to understand the textual meaning of the provisions in national legislation and international legal instruments, systematic interpretation to understand the relationship between provisions in the international legal system and national law, historical interpretation to understand the background and purpose of the formation of legal norms under study, and teleological interpretation to understand the purpose and function of these legal norms in the context of contemporary international legal development. Data analysis was also conducted using a comparative approach to compare mediation practices and dispute resolution mechanisms in various regional and global international organizations, in order to identify best practices that can be adopted in the institutional design of the proposed World mediation body (Yulia, 2025). Conclusions are drawn deductively by applying theoretical and normative premises identified from primary and secondary legal materials to construct arguments regarding the urgency of establishing a World mediation body, and inductively by analyzing existing international mediation practices to formulate the general principles required in the institutional design of an effective, neutral, and legitimate independent mediation body in the contemporary international dispute resolution system.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Structural limitations of the UN Security Council in the International Conflict Mediation function for the period 2021-2025

The mechanism of the UN Security Council as the main organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security experienced significant structural dysfunction in the period 2021-

2025, mainly stemming from the veto provisions mandated in the UN Charter. The veto provision authorizing the five permanent members of the Security Council to reject any substantive resolution has created conditions of institutional paralysis as the geopolitical interests of those countries clash with universal humanitarian imperatives (Putri, 2023). This institutional paralysis is manifestly manifested in the handling of the 2023-2025 Israeli-Palestinian conflict, in which the United States has used its veto power six times to block a ceasefire resolution despite overwhelming majority support from Security Council members and the wider international community. This structural limitation is also seen in the case of the Russia-Ukraine conflict, where Russia's veto effectively hinders any firm steps the organization can take to force a ceasefire or peace enforcement, so mediation efforts undertaken by the PBB Secretary-General face serious obstacles (Adha and Mubin, 2022).

An analysis of the international legal framework shows that this limitation has a fundamental normative dimension in the institutional architecture of the PBB. Based on Law No. 37 of 1999 on Foreign Relations, Indonesia as a PBB member state has an obligation to carry out foreign relations devoted to national interests with the principle of peaceful dispute resolution through negotiation and consultation, but the effectiveness of this principle depends on the availability of independent and non-politicized mediation mechanisms at the level of international organizations. Law No. 24 of 2000 on international agreements also affirms that the making of international agreements, including those related to conflict resolution, must be carried out based on the principle of equality and mutual benefit, but this principle is difficult to realize when the international mediation mechanism is dominated by the political interests of major countries that have veto rights. The provisions of Law No. 1 of 1982 on the ratification of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and Consular Relations emphasize the importance of diplomacy in the resolution of international disputes, but the effectiveness of bilateral and multilateral diplomacy largely depends on the existence of a credible and impartial mediation platform that is not currently available in the structure of the PBB Security Council.

The practice of international mediation in the period 2021-2025 shows that the politicization of the mediation process by permanent members of the Security Council has reduced the credibility and effectiveness of the UN in carrying out its mediation functions. The case of the conflict in Mali in the period 2021-2023 demonstrates that although the PBB has

played an important role as a negotiating arena, development instrument, and political mediation actor, the success of peace missions depends largely on the political support of the permanent members of the Security Council who often have geopolitical agendas that conflict with peace interests (Andika et al., 2025). This limitation is also reflected in the South Sudanese conflict, where despite the active involvement of the United Nations and regional organizations such as the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the effectiveness of mediation relies heavily on the ability to accommodate the interests of the parties to the conflict without political intervention from major powers that have strategic interests in the region (Hesti Rosdiana, 2025). This condition confirms that the membership structure of the Security Council, which gives privileges to five specific countries, creates a power asymmetry that hinders the implementation of the principles of neutral, fair and effective mediation in the settlement of contemporary international conflicts.

The implications of these structural limitations on the effectiveness of the UN mediation function are very serious and threaten the legitimacy of the organization within the international community. The UN General Assembly Resolution ES-11/1 of 2022 on Russian aggression against Ukraine shows that although the General Assembly can adopt resolutions with the support of a majority of member states, the effectiveness of such resolutions is very limited because they do not have a strong enforcement mechanism and are often ignored by the parties to the conflict, especially when one of the parties has the protection of a permanent member of the Security Council. These limitations also impact the UN's ability to deal with serious international crimes such as genocide, as seen in the case of the Rohingya in Myanmar, where although the UN has the authority under Chapters VI and VIII of the UN Charter to protect populations from genocide and crimes against humanity, the implementation of this authority is hampered by political considerations in the Security Council (Firdaus, 2023). These systemic conditions indicate that without fundamental structural reforms, particularly through the establishment of an independent mediation mechanism independent of the Security Council's political power structure, the effectiveness of the United Nations in carrying out its mandate to maintain international peace and security will continue to erode, threatening the organization's relevance in 21st century global governance (Serin Prisilia, 2021).

Theoretical and practical argumentation of the urgency of the creation of a world mediation body

Conclusion

Theoretical arguments supporting the urgency of establishing a World mediation body stem from the theory of institutional liberalism, which emphasizes the importance of international institutions in managing global interdependence and resolving conflicts between countries through multilateral cooperation mechanisms. The institutional liberalism perspective identifies that international institutions can reduce uncertainty in relations between states, provide a forum for negotiation, and create norms that limit the behavior of states in conflict, but the effectiveness of these functions depends on the independence of institutions from the political dominance of certain states (Fikry Andika, 2025). The concept of international organizations as arenas, instruments, and actors developed by Clive Archer provides an analytical framework for understanding how independent mediation bodies can function optimally by providing a neutral platform for dialogue between conflicting parties, implementing peace-building programs, and taking proactive initiatives in political mediation without bowing to the geopolitical interests of major powers. Peacebuilding theory also emphasizes the importance of a holistic approach that integrates security, political, economic, and social dimensions in conflict resolution, which requires mediation institutions that have a comprehensive mandate and sufficient technical capacity to effectively coordinate various peace programs (Muhammad Budiana, 2023).

Juridical analysis based on Indonesian national legal instruments shows that the establishment of a World mediation body is in line with the basic principles set forth in Indonesian legislation regarding foreign relations and international dispute resolution. Law No. 37 of 1999 on Foreign Relations stipulates that the implementation of Indonesia's Foreign Relations is based on the principle of active freedom devoted to the national interest, with the aim of participating in implementing a world order based on independence, lasting peace, and social justice, which implies support for the strengthening of fair and effective international dispute resolution mechanisms. Law No. 24 of 2000 on international agreements stipulates that Indonesia in making international agreements is guided by national interests and the principle of equality and mutual benefit, which shows the importance of the existence of an international

mediation platform that is not dominated by the interests of certain countries to ensure the achievement of fair and sustainable agreements. Law No. 1 of 1982 on ratification of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and Consular Relations confirms that Indonesia prioritizes dispute resolution through negotiations and consultations or deliberations between disputing countries, which indicates a preference for mediation mechanisms compared to dispute resolution through mandatory adjudication or other mechanisms that are coercive.

Practical arguments in favor of the establishment of a World mediation body are based on empirical evidence regarding the success of mediation as a dispute resolution mechanism in various contexts of international and domestic conflicts. Research on the role of mediation in international conflict resolution shows that mediation has an implementation rate reaching the sixty percent range in international disputes with a significant success rate, especially when the mediator has the characteristics of neutrality, high diplomatic skills, and a deep understanding of the conflict context (Maria Zhomartkyzy, 2023). The case of successful mediation in the conflict in Aceh, Indonesia, demonstrates that international mediation supported by internal commitment and an approach that respects local history and culture can result in sustainable peace, in contrast to the failed peacebuilding in Iraq after the U.S. invasion caused by neglect of the local context and the absence of legitimate multilateral support. China's mediation experience in the Saudi-Iranian dispute also shows that mediation conducted by actors considered neutral and having no direct interest in the conflict can achieve positive results, although perceptions of mediator bias and neutrality remain a challenge in the context of certain conflicts such as the Russian-Ukrainian war (Nur Rachmat Yulianto, 2025).

The urgency of the establishment of a World mediation body is also supported by contemporary developments in international mediation practice that demonstrate the fragmentation and diversification of mediation actors that require coherent coordination mechanisms. The Institute for Security Studies report identifies that international mediation is at a critical juncture due to fragmentation occurring on three levels: an increasingly complex conflict landscape, a polarized geopolitical environment, and the proliferation of mediators from different countries and regional organizations that have differing approaches and interests (Emmaculate Liaga, 2024). The trend of diversifying mediation actors involving emerging powers such as China, Turkey, Qatar, Brazil, and South Africa demands a reconfiguration of

the institutional architecture to accommodate a plurality of approaches in global conflict resolution, but without a clear coordination framework and transparent accountability mechanisms, the proliferation of mediators can create counterproductive competition and reduce the effectiveness of peace efforts. The establishment of a World mediation body as an independent organ within the framework of the United Nations can be a solution to this fragmentation by providing a global coordination platform that ensures complementarity between various mediation initiatives, facilitates the exchange of learning and best practices between mediators, and ensures that mediation efforts remain focused on universal peace and humanitarian interests as opposed to, international treaties, and diplomacy.

Optimal institutional design of the world mediation agency

The design of the organizational structure of the world mediation body should be based on the principles of proportional geographical representation and ideological inclusiveness in order to ensure the legitimacy and credibility of the institution in a multipolar international community. The membership structure of this body can adopt a rotational model with a regional quota system that guarantees representation from different geographical regions including Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe and Oceania, with a democratic and transparent electoral mechanism through the UN General Assembly to avoid political domination by certain countries. The membership of the mediation body should be composed of professional mediation experts who are selected based on technical competence, experience in conflict resolution, and a track record of neutrality in international relations, not based on the representation of national governments that can carry a specific political agenda. The agency's internal organizational structure needs to include specialized divisions based on conflict types such as inter-state conflict, internal conflict, resource-based conflict, and identity conflict, with each division supported by a team of experts who have substantive expertise in the context of that specific conflict. Based on Law No. 37 of 1999 on Foreign Relations, coordination between international mediation bodies and Indonesian diplomatic representatives must be carried out through the Minister of Foreign Affairs to ensure conformity with Indonesia's foreign policy, but the mediation bodies themselves must have operational independence that is not subject to political

instructions from any member state (Ni Kadek Marhaeni, 2023).

The operational procedures of the world mediation body must be designed to ensure responsiveness, flexibility and effectiveness in dealing with different types of international conflicts of varying complexity. The mechanism for the activation of mediation bodies can include three paths: a request from the parties to the conflict, a referral from the UN General Assembly with a majority of votes without the need for Security Council approval, or a proactive initiative of the mediation bodies themselves based on monitoring global conflict situations that indicate a potential escalation of violence or humanitarian crisis. Mediation procedures must follow international standards established in the United Nations Guidance for Effective mediation which emphasizes the principles of consent of the parties to the conflict, impartiality of mediators, inclusivity in the mediation process, and national ownership of the results of mediation to ensure the sustainability of peace. Mediation bodies need to have the authority to use a variety of dispute resolution methods including dialogue facilitation, direct mediation, conciliation, and the establishment of fact-finding commissions, with the flexibility to tailor approaches based on the specific characteristics of the conflict being addressed. Law No. 24 of 2000 on international agreements provides that mediation agreements that result in international agreements must go through a ratification process that corresponds to the material category of the agreement, which implies that the mediation body needs to facilitate not only the achievement of the agreement but also the implementation and formal ratification of the agreement by the parties involved (Ni Kadek Marhaeni, 2023).

The source of financing of the world mediation agency is a crucial aspect that determines the independence and sustainability of the operation of this institution from the political influence of donor countries. The optimal financing Model is a combination of mandatory contributions from all UN member states based on formulas proportional to the economic capacity of each country, voluntary funding from member states and international organizations, and innovative financing mechanisms such as international taxes on global financial transactions or arms trade allocated to peace efforts. Transparency in the financial management of mediation bodies must be ensured through independent auditing mechanisms and comprehensive public reporting to ensure accountability for the use of funds and prevent abuse or politicization through financial

instruments. Diversification of sources of financing is essential to reduce dependence on contributions from major countries that can use financial leverage to influence the decisions and operations of mediation bodies, in line with the principle of independence that is the foundation of the legitimacy of these institutions. Law No. 1 of 1982 on the ratification of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations emphasizes the importance of facilitating and supporting diplomatic activities including mediation, which in the context of the world mediation Agency means that UN member states have an obligation to provide adequate financial and logistical support to ensure the effectiveness of the international mediation function (Made Krishna, 2023).

The legal mandate of the world mediation body should be established through amendments to the UN Charter or through resolutions of the General Assembly that provide a solid legal basis for the operationalization of this body in the international legal system. The mandate shall include the authority to accept conflict referrals from the General Assembly, the UN Secretary-General, regional organizations, or the parties to the conflict; the authority to conduct independent investigations and collection of facts related to the conflict; the authority to facilitate dialogue and negotiation between the parties to the conflict; the authority to propose peace solutions and oversee the implementation of peace agreements; as well as the authority to coordinate with regional organizations and other mediation actors to ensure the complementarity of peace efforts. This mandate should explicitly stipulate that the world mediation body operates independently of the Security Council and is not subject to the veto mechanism, although it remains obliged to report its activities and results to the General Assembly and the Security Council at regular intervals. Decision-making procedures within the world mediation body should be democratic with a voting system that gives every member an equal vote, with clear majority thresholds for various types of decisions from operational decisions to strategic decisions that affect the direction of the body's policy. Based on the three Indonesian laws governing foreign relations, international treaties, and diplomacy, the establishment and operationalization of the world mediation body is in line with Indonesia's commitment to peaceful dispute resolution, strengthening multilateralism, and contributing to world peace and order, so that Indonesia has a strategic interest to support the initiative to establish this body and actively participate in its operationalization.

Implications of the establishment of a World mediation body on UN institutional reform

The establishment of a World mediation body will have transformative implications for the architecture of the international dispute resolution system by creating institutional alternatives that complement existing mechanisms without replacing the role of the Security Council or the International Court of Justice. The first implication is a diversification of dispute resolution pathways that gives UN member states the option to use independent mediation mechanisms when the Security Council's pathway is hampered by political considerations or when parties to a conflict need a mediator deemed more neutral and credible. The existence of an independent mediation body will create competitive pressure on the Security Council to increase its effectiveness and responsiveness in dealing with conflicts, or risk becoming increasingly irrelevant as countries prefer to use alternative, more effective mediation channels. The second implication is the strengthening of the role of the General Assembly in the UN's peace and security architecture, as a mediation body activated and overseen by the General Assembly would provide stronger democratic legitimacy compared to Security Council decisions that often reflect the interests of five specific countries. The third implication is to increase the capacity of the UN system to deal with conflicts simultaneously and comprehensively, as specialized mediation bodies with sufficient resources and expertise can deal with multiple conflicts in parallel without being burdened by the limited capacity of the Security Council, which often concentrates on just a few priority conflicts.

Juridical analysis shows that the establishment of a World mediation body is in line with the spirit of UN institutional reform that has been the discourse in the international community over the past few decades. Law No. 37 of 1999 on Foreign Relations stipulates that Indonesia as a UN member state is obliged to contribute to improving the effectiveness of international organizations in maintaining world peace and order, which implies support for institutional reforms that strengthen the capacity of the UN in carrying out its mandate. Law No. 24 of 2000 on international treaties provides a legal framework for Indonesia to participate in the establishment of a new international organization or organ within the framework of the United Nations through the mechanism of ratification of international agreements in accordance with the categories of material provided for in such agreements. Law No.

1 of 1982 on the ratification of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations affirms that strengthening the dispute resolution mechanism through negotiation and mediation is a priority in Indonesia's foreign policy, which is consistent with the support for the establishment of a professional and independent international mediation body. Institutional reform of the United Nations through the establishment of a World mediation body will also contribute to the implementation of the Responsibility to Protect principle by providing preventive mechanisms that can identify and address conflicts before they develop into mass atrocities or genocide.

The implications of the establishment of a World mediation body for 21st century global governance include a redistribution of power in the international system from a unipolar or bipolar model towards a more inclusive and representative multipolarity. The creation of a mediation body that provides proportional representation to countries from different geographical regions and ideological Spectra will democratize the decision-making process in the management of international conflicts and reduce the dominance of large countries that have been controlling the peace and security agenda through the Security Council mechanism. These implications are in line with contemporary trends in international relations marked by the emergence of emerging powers and the demand from developing countries for greater participation in global governance. The establishment of a mediation body will also strengthen the norms of multilateralism and collective solutions to global problems, which are becoming increasingly important in the context of transnational challenges such as climate change, pandemics and forced migration that require effective international cooperation. The success of mediation bodies in resolving conflicts fairly and sustainably could set a precedent for further institutional reforms in the UN system, including reform of the Security Council itself, reform of the UN financing system, and the establishment of stronger accountability mechanisms to ensure that international organizations operate in accordance with the principles enshrined in the UN Charter.

The challenges of implementing institutional reforms through the creation of a World mediation body include political resistance from Security Council permanent member states that have an interest in maintaining the status quo, limited financial and human resources for the operationalization of the new body, as well as the need to establish the credibility and legitimacy of the new institution in an international community skeptical of the

effectiveness of international organizations. Nevertheless, momentum for institutional reform of the United Nations has strengthened due to the organization's repeated failures in dealing with contemporary humanitarian crises and the growing dissatisfaction of member states with the Security Council's performance. An advocacy strategy for the establishment of a World mediation body can begin with the formation of a group of like-minded states to submit formal proposals to the UN General Assembly, followed by a diplomatic campaign to build a broad coalition of support from different geographic regions and ideological Spectra. The involvement of global civil society organizations, research institutions, and mediation practitioners in the advocacy process can strengthen the legitimacy of proposals and provide the technical expertise necessary to design an optimal institutional framework. Based on the three Indonesian laws governing foreign relations, international treaties, and diplomacy, Indonesia is strategically positioned to lead or support the initiative to establish a World mediation body as part of its commitment to world peace and strengthening multilateralism, in line with the principles of active free foreign policy and contribution to a world order based on independence, lasting peace, and social justice.

CONCLUSION

The study concluded that the structural limitations of the UN Security Council, especially the veto mechanism, have created institutional paralysis that hampers the effectiveness of the organization's mediation function in resolving international conflicts for the period 2021-2025, as manifested in the failure to handle crises in Gaza, Ukraine, and other conflicts. The establishment of a World mediation body as an independent organ within the framework of the United Nations is an urgency supported by theoretical arguments from the perspective of institutional liberalism and empirical evidence of the success of international mediation, and in line with the principles set forth in Law No. 37 of 1999, Law No. 24 of 2000, and Law No. 1 of 1982. The optimal institutional design of the world mediation Agency includes a geographically representative membership structure, flexible and responsive operational procedures, diversified sources of financing to ensure financial independence, as well as a comprehensive legal mandate with democratic decision-making mechanisms. The creation of this body will have transformative implications for the architecture of international dispute resolution by creating institutional alternatives that complement existing

mechanisms, drive Security Council reform, strengthen the role of the General Assembly, and contribute to the democratization of 21st century global governance through a more inclusive and representative redistribution of power.

Based on the findings of the study, it was suggested to the Indonesian government to take a diplomatic initiative by forming a coalition of countries that have the same vision to submit a proposal for the establishment of a World mediation body in the UN General Assembly forum as part of the organization's institutional reform agenda. Academics and research institutions are recommended to carry out further studies on the technical aspects of the operationalization of mediation bodies, including coordination mechanisms with regional organizations, best practices in the selection of professional mediators, and innovative financing models that ensure the sustainability of the institution. Global civil society organizations need to intensify advocacy campaigns to build public support for UN reform and the establishment of independent mediation mechanisms through public education, mobilization of international opinion, and involvement in multilateral consultation processes. Further research should explore comparative studies on the effectiveness of various models of international mediation, political-economic analyses of resistance to UN institutional reforms, as well as phased implementation strategies for the operationalization of World mediation bodies in the complex and fragmented context of contemporary geopolitics.

REFERENCES

- Adha, R. M., & Mubin, S. (2022). Upaya Perserikatan Bangsa-Bangsa (Pbb) Sebagai Organisasi Internasional Dalam Menengahi Konflik Rusia Dan Ukraina Pada Tahun 2022. *Jurnal Pena Wimaya*, 2(2).
- Adwani. (2022). Eksistensi Indonesia Sebagai Anggota Tidak Tetap Dewan Keamanan PBB Dalam Mewujudkan Perdamaian Dan Keamanan Internasional. *JHSK*, 17(1), 1–13.
- Andika, F., Rachmat, A. N., & Akbar, T. H. (2025). Peran Persatuan Bangsa-Bangsa (Pbb) Dalam Memelihara Perdamaian Di Mali Tahun 2021-2023. *Global Insights Journal: Jurnal Mahasiswa Hubungan Internasional*, 02(02). <https://doi.org/10.36859/gij.v2i2.3262>

- Aryawan, M. K. D., Hartana, Mangku, D. G. S., Yulianti, N. P. R., & Sari, E. R. (2023). Peran Perserikatan Bangsa-Bangsa Sebagai Organisasi Internasional Dalam Kasus Perang Rusia-Ukraine. *Jurnal Locus Delicti*, 4(April), 14–26. <https://ejournal2.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JLD>
- Budiana, M. (2024). Conflict Resolution and Peace Building in the International Arena. *Journal of Student Collaboration Research*, 1(2), 16–35. <https://myjournal.or.id/index.php/JSCR>
- Christopher, F., Godknows, N., Uki, I. E., Seaman, O. L., & Harcourt, E. H. (2021). The UN Security Council Permanent Membership: The Troubling Trend of Expansion and Hegemony. *Open Journal of Political Science*, 316–327. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojps.2021.112021>
- Daenuri, A. (2021). *Peran Perserikatan Bangsa – Bangsa Dalam Menengahi Konflik Rusia Dan Ukraina*.
- Gifkins, J. (2021). Beyond the Veto Roles in UNSecurity CouncilDecision-Making. *Global Governance*, 27, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1163/19426720-02701003>
- Hartana, & Lestari, K. A. Y. (2021). Peran Organisasi Internasional Perserikatan Bangsa- Bangsa Sebagai Subjek Hukum Organisasi Internasional Dalam Mewujudkan Perdamaian Dunia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan Undiksha*, 9(3), 1185–1197.
- Iqbal, F. M., & Oktaviani, J. (2023). Resolusi Majelis Umum PBB ES-11/1 tahun 2022 dalam Mendorong Perdamaian Dunia terkait Agresi Rusia terhadap Ukraina. *Jurnal Ilmu Hubungan Internasional LINO*, 03, 60–76. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31605/lin.o.v3i1.2317>
- Liaga, E., Yohannes, D., Manager, P., Belay, T., Dessu, M. K., Researcher, S., & Coordinator, T. (2024). *Adapting UN Mediation for Emerging Challenges and Security Threats*. April, 1–10.
- Marhaeni, N. K., Hartana, Mangku, D. G. S., Yulianti, N. P. R., & Sari, E. R. (2023). Eksistensi Perserikatan Bangsa-Bangsa (Pbb) Sebagai Organisasi Internasional Dintinjau Dari Hukum Internasional. *Jurnal Locus Delicti*, 4(April), 1–13. <https://ejournal2.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JLD>
- Maya, L., Risnain, M., & Nugraha, L. G. (2025). Pembatasan Penggunaan Hak Veto Dewan Keamanan Melalui Mekanisme Uniting For Peace Majelis Umum Perserikatan Bangsa-Bangsa. *Mataram Journal of International Law*, 3(1), 1–22.
- Nations, U. (2021). *United Nations Guidance for Effective Mediation*.
- Putra, K. T. W., & Sugama, I. D. G. D. (2024). Mekanisme dan efektivitas mediasi sebagai alternatif penyelesaian dalam sengketa bisnis. *Jurnal Kertha Negara*, 12(7), 813–822. <https://jurnal.globalscients.com/index.php/jkhp/article/view/665>
- Putri, N. M. M. S. (2025). Peran Pbb Dalam Menangani Konflik Israel-Palestina Tahun 2023. *DIPLOMACY AND GLOBAL SECURITY JOURNAL*, 2(2), 693–705. <https://doi.org/10.36859/dgsj.v2i2.4596>
- Rosdiana, H., Nathania, V. Z., & Irwansyah. (2025). Dinamika Perundingan Damai: Efektivitas Mediasi Internasional Dalam Konflik Sudan Selatan. *Stigma : Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Politik Dan Humaniora*, 4(1), 8–14. <https://jurnal.risetilmiah.ac.id/index.php/stigma>
- Rosidi, A., Zainuddin, M., & Arifiana, I. (2024). Metode Dalam Penelitian Hukum Normatif Dan Sosiologis (Field Research). *Journal Law and Government*, 2, 46. <https://doi.org/10.31764/jlag.v2i1.21606>
- Sukmawan, Y. A., & Damayanti, D. (2025). Metode Penelitian Hukum Normatif dan Empiris sebagai Strategi Penguatan Perspektif Kajian Ilmu Hukum. *NoLaJ*, 4(1), 114–128. <https://notarylaw.journal.ulm.ac.id/index.php/nolaj>

- Tutkey, S. P. (2021). Peran Perserikatan Bangsa-Bangsa Dalam Penanganan Kasus Kejahatan Genosida Menurut Hukum Internasional. *Lex Administratum*, IX(6), 25–34.
<https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/administratum/article/view/34395>
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia. (1982). *Nomor 1 Tahun 1982 Tentang Pengesahan Konvensi Wina Mengenai Hubungan Diplomatik Beserta Protokol Opsionalnya Mengenai Hal Memperoleh Kewarganegaraan (Vienna Convention On Diplomatic Relations And Optional Protocol To The Vienna Convention On Diplomatic R. April 1963*, 1–7.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia. (1999). *Nomor 37 Tahun 1999 Tentang Hubungan Luar Negeri*. 1.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia. (2000). *Nomor 24 Tahun 2000 Tentang Perjanjian Internasional*.
- Wendra, M., & Sutrisno, A. (2024). Tantangan Penyelesaian Konflik Internasional yang Dilematik mengenai Hak Veto dalam Dewan Keamanan PBB (Studi kasus Palestina dengan. *Journal of Contemporary Law Studies Volume*., 2(2), 171–180.
<https://doi.org/10.47134/lawstudies.v2i2.2373%0ATantangan>
- Wiko, G. (2025). Urgensi Pembaharuan Hukum Penyelesaian Sengketa Melalui Mediasi. *BANI Arbitration and Law Journal*, 1(2), 122–135.
<https://doi.org/10.63400/balj.v1i2.16>
- Yuliantoro, N. R. (2025). *China ' s Role in International Conflict Mediation and Its Implications for International Relations*. 8, 1–19.
- Zhomartkyzy, M. (2023). The role of mediation in international conflict resolution. *Law & Safety*, 1584(90).
<https://doi.org/10.32631/pb.2023.3.14>

Copyright holder :

Sabela Gayo

First publication right :

International Asia Of Law and Money Laundering

This article is licensed under:

