

The Role of Non-State Actors in Maritime Diplomacy: International Organizations and NGOs in Resolving Maritime Disputes

Aris Sarjito¹

¹ Universitas Pertahanan Republik Indonesia

Corresponding author: (arissarjito@gmail.com)

Received: 27 February 2024; Approved: 26 June 2024; Published: 30 June 2024

Abstrak

Meningkatnya kompleksitas sengketa maritim memerlukan kajian mendalam terhadap perkembangan peran aktor non-negara dalam diplomasi maritim. Penelitian ini menggali konseptualisasi peran aktor non-negara dalam hubungan internasional. Metode penelitian kualitatif digunakan dengan memanfaatkan data sekunder. Penelitian ini menganalisis kerangka konseptual, peran organisasi internasional dalam penyelesaian konflik, kontribusi LSM terhadap diplomasi maritim, dan faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi efektivitas aktor non-negara dalam penyelesaian sengketa. Temuan-temuan ini menjelaskan sifat aktor-aktor non-negara yang memiliki banyak aspek, dan menunjukkan kontribusi mereka yang beragam terhadap upaya diplomasi, mulai dari mediasi dan pencegahan konflik hingga rekonstruksi pasca-konflik. Penelitian ini memberikan kontribusi wawasan baru dengan mensintesis pengetahuan yang ada mengenai aktor non-negara dalam konteks diplomasi maritim dan memberikan pemahaman komprehensif mengenai dampaknya terhadap tata kelola maritim global dan regional. Temuan-temuan penelitian ini memberi masukan kepada para pembuat kebijakan, akademisi, dan praktisi yang terlibat dalam diplomasi maritim, menyoroti dinamika rumit yang membentuk efektivitas aktor non-negara dalam mengatasi tantangan maritim.

Kata Kunci: aktor non-negara, diplomasi maritim, LSM, organisasi internasional, resolusi konflik

Abstract

The increasing complexity of maritime disputes requires an in-depth study of the development of the role of non-state actors in maritime diplomacy. This study explores the conceptualization of the role of non-state actors in international relations. Qualitative research methods are used by utilizing secondary data. This study analyzes the conceptual framework, the role of international organizations in conflict resolution, the contribution of NGOs to maritime diplomacy, and the factors that affect the effectiveness of non-state actors in dispute resolution. These findings shed light on the multifaceted nature of non-state actors, and demonstrate their diverse contributions to diplomacy efforts, from conflict mediation and prevention to post-conflict reconstruction. This research contributes new insights by synthesizing existing knowledge about non-state actors in the context of maritime diplomacy and providing a comprehensive understanding of their impact on global and regional maritime governance. The findings of this study provide input to policymakers, academics, and practitioners involved in maritime diplomacy, highlighting the complex dynamics that shape the effectiveness of non-state actors in addressing maritime challenges.

Keywords: conflict resolution, international organizations, maritime diplomacy, NGOs, non-state actors

INTRODUCTION

Maritime disputes have been a persistent feature of international relations, often arising from conflicting claims over maritime boundaries, resources, and strategic interests. Understanding the background and context of these disputes is crucial for comprehending their complexity and implications for global security and stability. Maritime disputes encompass a wide range of issues, including territorial sovereignty, jurisdictional rights, navigation freedoms, resource exploitation, and environmental conservation. They occur in various maritime domains such as seas, oceans, and exclusive economic zones (EEZs), where multiple states or entities assert competing claims over overlapping areas. According to Coleman (2017), "maritime disputes can involve both state and non-state actors and can manifest in different forms, from low-intensity conflicts to full-scale military confrontations" (Coleman, 2017).

One of the primary drivers of maritime disputes is the ambiguity or absence of clearly defined maritime boundaries. States often rely on historical claims, geographical proximity, and legal interpretations to assert their maritime jurisdiction. However, differing interpretations of international law, especially the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), can lead to conflicting claims. For instance, the South China Sea dispute involves overlapping claims by multiple states based on historical rights, EEZs, and the concept of "historic waters" (Miranda & Maljak, 2022).

Resource competition is another significant factor contributing to maritime disputes. The rich natural resources found in maritime areas, such as fisheries, oil, gas, and minerals, attract competing interests. States may assert sovereignty or exclusive rights over these resources, leading to disputes over exploitation and management. In the Arctic region, for example, the melting ice caps have opened up new opportunities for resource extraction, sparking tensions among Arctic states over territorial claims and resource ownership (Zandee et al., 2020).

Furthermore, strategic considerations, including access to vital sea lanes and control over strategic chokepoints, can escalate maritime tensions. States with maritime interests often seek to safeguard their national security and economic interests by asserting control or influence over critical maritime routes. The Strait of Hormuz, a vital waterway for global oil transportation, has witnessed geopolitical rivalries and military brinkmanship due to competing interests among littoral states (Legrenzi, 2013).

Environmental degradation and the need for conservation also play a role in maritime disputes. Pollution, overfishing, habitat destruction, and climate change pose challenges to the sustainable management of marine resources. States may dispute maritime boundaries to gain control over marine conservation areas or to address environmental concerns. The dispute between Japan and South Korea over the sovereignty of the Takeshima/Dokdo islands, for instance, involves competing claims over fishing rights and marine conservation efforts (Wiegand, 2015). Maritime disputes are multifaceted challenges that stem from territorial, resource, strategic, and environmental considerations. Addressing these disputes requires a nuanced understanding of historical contexts, legal frameworks, geopolitical dynamics, and environmental concerns. Efforts to manage and resolve maritime disputes necessitate diplomatic engagement, legal arbitration, confidence-building measures, and cooperation among states and relevant stakeholders.

Maritime disputes, characterized by complex legal, political, and economic issues, often require multifaceted approaches to resolution. While states traditionally play a central role in diplomatic negotiations and legal proceedings, non-state actors have increasingly become significant contributors to maritime dispute resolution efforts. This research explores the importance of non-state actors in addressing maritime disputes, focusing on their diverse roles and contributions. Non-state actors, including international organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), regional bodies, and maritime industry stakeholders, play various roles in maritime dispute resolution. According to Johnston (2014), "non-state actors can facilitate dialogue, provide technical expertise, promote cooperation, and offer alternative dispute resolution mechanisms in maritime disputes" (Johnston, 2014).

One of the primary contributions of non-state actors is their ability to facilitate dialogue and mediation between disputing parties. International organizations such as the United Nations (UN) and regional bodies like the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) often serve as neutral mediators in maritime disputes, providing platforms for negotiation and dialogue. For instance, the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) provides a framework for resolving maritime disputes through arbitration and adjudication, with the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the International Tribunal

for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS) acting as dispute resolution mechanisms (UNCLOS, 1982).

NGOs and civil society organizations also play a crucial role in maritime dispute resolution by promoting cooperation, building trust, and fostering people-to-people exchanges between disputing parties. These organizations often engage in track-two diplomacy initiatives, organizing workshops, conferences, and joint research projects to facilitate dialogue and confidence-building measures. The East-West Center's Pacific Islands Development Program, for example, facilitates dialogues and capacity-building workshops among Pacific Island countries to address maritime disputes and promote sustainable marine resource management (Picciotto, 2018).

Moreover, non-state actors contribute technical expertise and knowledge resources to support maritime dispute resolution efforts. Academic institutions, research centers, and think tanks conduct studies and provide policy recommendations on maritime legal frameworks, environmental conservation, maritime security, and resource management. Their research findings and expert analysis contribute valuable insights to inform decision-making processes and policy formulation. The International Maritime Organization (IMO), for instance, collaborates with academic and research institutions to develop guidelines and best practices for maritime safety, security, and environmental protection (IMO, 2019).

In addition to facilitating dialogue and providing expertise, non-state actors offer alternative dispute resolution mechanisms to complement formal legal processes. Arbitration, mediation, and conciliation services provided by independent organizations and private mediators offer flexible and confidential avenues for resolving disputes outside of traditional judicial systems. The Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA), for instance, offers arbitration services for maritime boundary disputes and other international conflicts, providing parties with a neutral and impartial forum for dispute resolution (PCA, 2024).

Non-state actors play a crucial and increasingly significant role in maritime dispute resolution efforts. By facilitating dialogue, providing expertise, promoting cooperation, and offering alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, non-state actors contribute to the peaceful and sustainable resolution of maritime disputes. Their diverse roles and contributions complement the efforts of states and international institutions,

highlighting the importance of multi-stakeholder cooperation in addressing complex maritime challenges.

Maritime disputes pose significant challenges to international peace and security, requiring effective mechanisms for resolution and management. While states traditionally play a central role in diplomatic negotiations, non-state actors, including international organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), have emerged as important contributors to maritime dispute resolution efforts. However, understanding the roles, functions, and effectiveness of these non-state actors in the context of maritime diplomacy remains an area of inquiry. This essay aims to delineate the problem statement and outline research objectives based on four key research questions related to the involvement of non-state actors in maritime dispute resolution.

Problem Statement

Maritime disputes, characterized by conflicting territorial claims, resource competition, and strategic interests, often defy easy resolution through traditional state-centric approaches. In recent years, there has been a growing recognition of the significance of non-state actors, such as international organizations and NGOs, in facilitating dialogue, providing expertise, and offering alternative dispute-resolution mechanisms in maritime diplomacy. However, there is a lack of comprehensive understanding regarding the conceptualization of non-state actors in international relations, the roles and functions of international organizations in conflict resolution, the contributions of NGOs to maritime diplomacy, and the factors influencing the effectiveness of non-state actors in dispute resolution. Addressing these knowledge gaps is essential for developing more holistic and effective strategies for managing maritime disputes and promoting international cooperation.

Research Objectives

This study explores the role and significance of non-state actors in maritime dispute resolution, their roles and functions, and the challenges faced by international organizations in conflict resolution. It also examines the contributions of NGOs to maritime diplomacy, focusing on their activities, initiatives, and impact on promoting dialogue, building trust, and fostering cooperation among stakeholders. The study also examines the role of NGOs in addressing specific challenges such as environmental conservation, human rights protection, and humanitarian assistance. The study also

analyzes the factors influencing the effectiveness of non-state actors in dispute resolution, including organizational capacity, legitimacy, funding sources, and political dynamics. The study concludes by examining case studies and comparative analyses to understand the success factors and challenges encountered by non-state actors in different maritime dispute contexts.

Research questions:

What is the conceptualization of non-state actors in international relations?

What are the roles and functions of international organizations in conflict resolution?

What are the contributions of NGOs to maritime diplomacy?

What factors influence non-state actors' effectiveness in dispute resolution?

By addressing these research questions, this study seeks to provide insights into the evolving dynamics of maritime diplomacy and the changing roles of non-state actors in addressing complex maritime challenges. The findings will contribute to a deeper understanding of how international organizations and NGOs can effectively contribute to resolving maritime disputes, promoting peace, and enhancing maritime governance at the global and regional levels.

METHODS

Creswell (2013) outlined qualitative research methods as useful tools for examining complex phenomena like the function of non-state actors in maritime diplomacy. In this study, we aim to investigate how international organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) contribute to resolving maritime disputes. By utilizing secondary data, we can draw on existing information to analyze and interpret the multifaceted dynamics of non-state actor involvement in maritime diplomacy.

Research Design

The research design follows a qualitative approach, emphasizing the in-depth exploration and interpretation of existing data. The use of secondary data aligns with Creswell's (2013) definition of qualitative research, which involves "an interpretive naturalistic approach to its subject matter." The study focuses on international organizations such as the United Nations (UN) and NGOs involved in maritime dispute resolution. Secondary data, including scholarly articles, reports, official documents, and media sources, will be collected and analyzed to provide a comprehensive understanding of non-state actors' roles in maritime diplomacy.

Literature Review

The literature review will serve as the foundation for understanding the conceptual framework of non-state actors in maritime diplomacy. Existing studies and scholarly articles on international organizations, NGOs, and maritime dispute resolution will be reviewed to identify key concepts, theoretical frameworks, and gaps in the current literature. This phase will guide the development of research questions and inform the analysis of secondary data.

Data Collection

The primary source of data for this research is secondary sources, ensuring a systematic and thorough exploration of the role of non-state actors in maritime diplomacy. Scholarly articles from reputable journals, reports from international organizations, official documents, and media coverage will be collected to capture diverse perspectives and insights. The data collection process will focus on identifying patterns, themes, and key findings related to the involvement of non-state actors in resolving maritime disputes.

Data Analysis

Creswell's (2013) qualitative data analysis approach, emphasizing coding, categorization, and thematic analysis, will guide the interpretation of the collected secondary data. The data will be organized based on key themes such as the diplomatic initiatives of international organizations, the impact of NGOs in conflict resolution, and factors influencing effectiveness. Patterns and connections within the data will be explored to generate rich insights into the roles and contributions of non-state actors in maritime diplomacy.

Ethical Considerations

In line with ethical standards, this research will ensure the proper citation and acknowledgment of the sources of secondary data. All data used will be publicly available, and efforts will be made to maintain the confidentiality and anonymity of individuals or organizations mentioned in the sources. Ethical considerations will also involve presenting the findings in a balanced and unbiased manner, avoiding misrepresentation or distortion of information.

Qualitative research methods using secondary data, guided by Creswell's approach, offer a robust framework for investigating the role of non-state actors in

maritime diplomacy. By drawing on a diverse range of sources, this research aims to provide a nuanced understanding of how international organizations and NGOs contribute to resolving maritime disputes. The findings are expected to contribute to the existing body of knowledge, inform policy discussions, and inspire future research in the field of maritime diplomacy.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Understanding the Conceptualization of Non-State Actors in International Relations

The study of international relations (IR) has traditionally focused on states as the primary actors. However, the increasing influence of non-state actors (NSAs) has necessitated a reevaluation of this state-centric perspective. Non-state actors, including international organizations, multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and transnational advocacy networks, play significant roles in shaping global politics. This essay analyzes the conceptualization of NSAs in IR and explores how different theoretical frameworks interpret their influence.

Conceptualizing Non-State Actors

Non-state actors are entities that operate across national borders and are not affiliated with any government. Their roles vary widely, from influencing policy and decision-making processes to providing humanitarian aid and advocating for human rights. Keohane & Nye Jr (1973) were among the early scholars to recognize the importance of NSAs, particularly in their concept of “complex interdependence,” which highlighted the multiple channels of interaction in global politics beyond state-to-state relations.

Theoretical Frameworks and Non-State Actors

Realism: Realism, one of the oldest IR theories, traditionally views the international system as anarchic, where states are the primary actors seeking power and security. Realists like Kenneth Waltz argue that NSAs have limited influence because states dominate the international system (Waltz, 2010). However, this perspective has been critiqued for its inability to account for the growing impact of NSAs on global governance and international norms. For example, Mearsheimer (2001) acknowledges the existence of NSAs but maintains that their influence is secondary to that of states.

Liberalism: In contrast to realism, liberalism offers a more inclusive view of NSAs. Liberal theorists assert that international institutions, economic interdependence, and NSAs contribute to global cooperation and peace (Keohane & Nye Jr, 1973). According to this perspective, organizations such as the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, and NGOs like Amnesty International play crucial roles in mitigating conflict, promoting human rights, and facilitating trade. Liberalism's emphasis on the importance of international norms and institutions aligns well with the activities of NSAs, highlighting their potential to influence state behavior and international outcomes.

Constructivism: Constructivist theory provides a different lens for understanding NSAs by focusing on the role of ideas, beliefs, and identities in shaping international relations. (Wendt, 1999) argues that the international system is socially constructed, and NSAs contribute to this process by promoting new norms and values. For instance, transnational advocacy networks, such as the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, have successfully influenced international norms and treaties. Constructivists highlight the agency of NSAs in redefining interests and identities in the global arena.

Marxism and Critical Theories

Marxist and critical theories offer a critique of the power dynamics inherent in the global capitalist system, emphasizing the role of NSAs in both perpetuating and challenging these dynamics. Scholars like (Cox, 1981) argue that multinational corporations (MNCs) are key actors in maintaining the capitalist world economy. Conversely, critical theorists also recognize the potential of grassroots movements and NGOs to challenge hegemonic structures and advocate for social justice.

Recent Developments and Case Studies

Recent scholarship has continued to explore the diverse roles of NSAs in IR. For example, the rise of global environmental governance has highlighted the importance of NGOs and scientific networks in shaping climate policy. The Paris Agreement of 2015 demonstrated the influence of non-state actors in driving international commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (Falkner, 2016). Similarly, the global response to the COVID-19 pandemic underscored the critical roles of international organizations like the World Health Organization and private sector entities in addressing global health challenges.

Non-state actors have increasingly become significant players in the realm of international relations, challenging the traditional state-centric view of diplomacy and governance. The conceptualization of non-state actors encompasses a diverse array of entities, ranging from international organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to multinational corporations, terrorist groups, and transnational criminal networks. This essay delves into the conceptualization of non-state actors in international relations, examining their roles, influence, and implications for global politics.

Non-state actors are defined as entities that operate independently of government authority and are not members of the traditional state system (Keohane & Nye, 2003). According to (Keohane & Nye, 2003), non-state actors can be categorized based on their functions, including advocacy groups, service providers, and regulatory bodies. This multifaceted conceptualization underscores the diverse roles and functions that non-state actors play in shaping international affairs. Non-state actors are entities that operate independently of government authority and are not part of the traditional state system. These actors can be categorized based on their functions, including advocacy groups, service providers, and regulatory bodies. Non-state actors play diverse roles in shaping international affairs, such as promoting human rights (e.g., Amnesty International) and providing humanitarian assistance in conflict zones (e.g., Doctors Without Borders) (Wijninga et al., 2014).

Non-state actors challenge nation-state borders and sovereignty claims, influencing global affairs. They include various entities like non-profit organizations, labor unions, non-governmental organizations, corporations, media organizations, religious groups, and violent non-state actors such as paramilitary forces (Clapham, 2016). These actors have legal recognition and are held accountable to international law. They play crucial roles in areas where state actors may be lacking, such as protection and administration in fragile states (Longley, 2022).

Additionally, service providers such as Doctors Without Borders provide critical humanitarian assistance in conflict zones, filling gaps left by state actors in delivering aid to those in need. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) constitute a prominent category of non-state actors, encompassing a wide range of civil society groups, advocacy organizations, and humanitarian agencies. NGOs operate on various issues, including human rights, environmental conservation, humanitarian assistance, and development

aid. Amnesty International and Greenpeace are examples of prominent NGOs that engage in advocacy and activism on global issues, influencing public opinion and policy decisions (Rosenau, 2021). One detailed example of this is the work of Doctors Without Borders, an NGO that provides medical aid in conflict zones and natural disasters where state actors may not be able to reach them. Another example is the Red Cross, which offers emergency relief and support to communities affected by disasters when government resources are overwhelmed.

International organizations (IOs) represent another crucial category of non-state actors, comprising intergovernmental bodies established by states to address common challenges and promote cooperation. Examples of international organizations include the United Nations (UN), the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). These organizations play pivotal roles in global governance, peacekeeping, development assistance, and economic regulation (Haas, 2017).

Multinational corporations (MNCs) are influential non-state actors that operate across national borders, exerting significant economic, political, and social influence on international affairs. MNCs engage in trade, investment, and production activities, shaping global markets, supply chains, and labor practices. Companies like Google, ExxonMobil, and Walmart wield substantial power and influence, often operating in ways that transcend or challenge state sovereignty (Strange, 1996).

In addition to NGOs, IOs, and MNCs, non-state actors also include non-state armed groups, terrorist organizations, criminal syndicates, and transnational activist networks. These entities operate outside the realm of formal state institutions, often challenging state authority and security. Terrorist groups like al-Qaeda and ISIS, for example, engage in asymmetric warfare and transnational terrorism, posing significant challenges to state security and stability (Jackson, 2009).

The conceptualization of non-state actors in international relations reflects the changing nature of global politics, characterized by increasing interdependence, connectivity, and complexity. Non-state actors wield significant influence in shaping international norms, policies, and power dynamics, often complementing or challenging state-centric approaches to governance and diplomacy. Understanding the roles, functions, and interactions of non-state actors is essential for comprehending contemporary international relations and addressing global challenges effectively.

Roles and Functions of International Organizations in Conflict Resolution

International organizations (Ios) play a pivotal role in the realm of conflict resolution, offering platforms for negotiation, mediation, peacekeeping, and post-conflict reconstruction. Their involvement can be understood through various theoretical lenses in international relations (IR), each providing insights into the mechanisms and effectiveness of Ios in mitigating conflicts. This discussion analyzes the roles and functions of Ios in conflict resolution and examines how different IR theories interpret their contributions.

Conceptualizing the Roles and Functions of International Organizations

International organizations are entities formed by multiple countries, structured to facilitate cooperation and address issues that transcend national boundaries. Prominent examples include the United Nations (UN), the African Union (AU), the European Union (EU), and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). These organizations engage in conflict resolution through a variety of methods, including diplomacy, peacekeeping missions, sanctions, and humanitarian aid. Their activities aim to prevent the escalation of conflicts, manage ongoing disputes, and support post-conflict recovery (Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998).

Theoretical Frameworks and International Organizations

Realism: Realism posits that the international system is anarchic, with states acting primarily in their own self-interest to ensure survival and maximize power. From this perspective, IOs are often viewed as tools of powerful states rather than independent actors with significant influence. Realists such as Mearsheimer (2001) argue that IOs have limited effectiveness in conflict resolution because they lack the enforcement power to compel states to comply with their mandates. Instead, IOs reflect the interests of dominant states, which use these institutions to further their own strategic goals.

Liberalism: Liberalism offers a more optimistic view of IOs, emphasizing their role in fostering cooperation and promoting peace. Liberal theorists argue that IOs provide valuable platforms for dialogue, reduce transaction costs, and create norms that encourage peaceful conflict resolution (Keohane & Nye Jr, 1973). The UN's peacekeeping missions, for example, have been credited with helping to stabilize post-conflict regions and facilitate political transitions. The success of the UN in negotiating

the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in Sudan in 2005 highlights the potential of IOs to mediate conflicts and support peace processes (Fortna, 2008).

Constructivism: Constructivist theory focuses on the importance of ideas, norms, and identities in shaping international relations. Constructivists argue that IOs play a crucial role in shaping the norms and values that govern state behavior. For instance, Finnemore and Sikkink (1998) highlight how IOs can promote human rights norms and influence state practices through processes of socialization and normative persuasion. The International Criminal Court (ICC), by establishing norms of accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity, exemplifies how IOs can contribute to conflict resolution by promoting justice and deterring future atrocities.

Marxism and Critical Theories

Marxist and critical theories critique the power structures inherent in the global capitalist system and highlight the ways IOs can both perpetuate and challenge these structures. From a Marxist perspective, IOs may serve the interests of capitalist states and multinational corporations, potentially exacerbating inequalities and contributing to conflicts (Cox, 1981). However, critical theorists also recognize the potential of IOs to empower marginalized groups and support transformative agendas. The role of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund in post-conflict reconstruction, for example, has been both lauded for facilitating economic recovery and criticized for imposing neoliberal policies that can undermine local sovereignty (Stiglitz & Pike, 2004).

Recent Developments and Case Studies

Recent scholarship continues to explore the complex roles of IOs in conflict resolution. The UN's involvement in the Syrian conflict, for instance, illustrates both the potential and limitations of IOs. While UN-led peace talks have struggled to achieve a lasting resolution, the organization's humanitarian agencies have provided crucial aid to millions of displaced persons (Barnett & Finnemore, 2019). The African Union's peacekeeping mission in Somalia (AMISOM) provides another pertinent example. Established to combat the insurgency by Al-Shabaab, AMISOM has contributed to stabilizing parts of Somalia and supporting the establishment of governance structures, demonstrating the AU's growing capacity for regional conflict resolution (Williams, 2013).

International organizations (IOs) play pivotal roles in conflict resolution by providing platforms for negotiation, mediation, peacekeeping, and post-conflict reconstruction. Their involvement in conflict resolution reflects the recognition of the need for multilateral cooperation and collective action to address global security challenges. This will discuss the diverse roles and functions of international organizations in conflict resolution, drawing on theoretical insights and empirical evidence.

One of the primary roles of international organizations in conflict resolution is to facilitate dialogue and negotiation among conflicting parties. IOs serve as neutral mediators, providing diplomatic channels and frameworks for peaceful resolution of disputes. For instance, the United Nations (UN) has played a central role in mediating conflicts and brokering peace agreements, such as the Oslo Accords in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Aronoff, 2009). Through its diplomatic efforts, the UN creates opportunities for dialogue, confidence-building, and reconciliation among warring factions.

Moreover, international organizations engage in conflict prevention and early warning mechanisms to identify and mitigate potential sources of conflict before they escalate into violence. The UN, for example, deploys peacekeeping missions and conflict prevention initiatives to monitor ceasefires, protect civilians, and build local capacities for conflict management (UN DPI, 1995). By addressing the root causes and triggers of conflict, IOs contribute to reducing the likelihood of violent outbreaks and promoting long-term stability.

Furthermore, international organizations play critical roles in post-conflict reconstruction and peacebuilding efforts. Following the cessation of hostilities, IOs provide humanitarian assistance, development aid, and reconstruction support to war-torn societies. The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) offer financial assistance and economic stabilization programs to facilitate recovery and rebuild infrastructure (Hintjens & Zarkov, 2014). Additionally, specialized agencies like the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) focus on rebuilding social institutions, promoting governance reforms, and addressing socio-economic inequalities in conflict-affected areas (UNDP, n.d.).

International organizations (IOs) play a crucial role in contributing to normative frameworks and legal mechanisms for peace and security. The UN Security Council, for

instance, authorizes peacekeeping operations, imposes sanctions, and mandates international tribunals to address violations of international law and ensure accountability for war crimes and human rights abuses. By upholding international norms and standards, IOs reinforce the rule of law and promote adherence to principles of human rights, humanitarian law, and conflict prevention (Finnemore, 1993; Maurer & Nelson, 2020).

IOs commit to liberal norms in global governance, such as sustainable development, gender equality, and human security. These commitments are influenced by factors like norm entrepreneurship, diffusion of global scripts, and organizational legitimacy concerns. The spread of liberal norms among IOs is essential for addressing real-world concerns in international politics (Tallberg et al., 2020). Non-state actors (NSAs) also play a significant role in shaping international affairs by challenging nation-state borders and sovereignty claims. They include various entities like non-profit organizations, labor unions, non-governmental organizations, corporations, media organizations, religious groups, and violent non-state actors such as paramilitary forces. NSAs contribute to issues like human rights advocacy, environmental protection, and conflict resolution (Clapham, 2016)

However, international organizations also face challenges and limitations in their conflict resolution efforts. Power politics, vested interests, and resource constraints often hinder the effectiveness of IO interventions. Moreover, the sovereignty concerns of member states and the lack of political will to enforce peace agreements can impede the implementation of conflict resolution initiatives. Despite these challenges, international organizations continue to play indispensable roles in addressing conflicts, promoting peace, and advancing global security objectives.

Contributions of Non-Governmental Organizations to Maritime Diplomacy

Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) have become significant actors in various spheres of international relations, including maritime diplomacy. Their contributions to maritime diplomacy involve advocacy, research, policy development, and direct action in areas such as environmental protection, maritime security, and the rights of seafarers. This discussion analyzes the roles of NGOs in maritime diplomacy and explores how different international relations (IR) theories interpret their influence and effectiveness.

Understanding Maritime Diplomacy and NGOs

Maritime diplomacy encompasses the strategies and practices used by states and international actors to manage and utilize maritime spaces. This includes issues related to territorial disputes, marine conservation, maritime security, and trade routes. NGOs, as independent entities, engage in maritime diplomacy by leveraging their expertise, resources, and advocacy to influence policies and practices at national and international levels.

Theoretical Frameworks and the Role of NGOs

Liberalism: Liberalism emphasizes the importance of cooperation, international institutions, and non-state actors in global politics. It provides a framework for understanding the significant roles that NGOs play in maritime diplomacy. According to liberal theorists, NGOs enhance international cooperation by providing expertise, facilitating dialogue, and advocating for common interests. For example, organizations like Greenpeace and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) work to protect marine environments through campaigns against overfishing, pollution, and climate change (Keohane & Nye Jr, 1973). By lobbying for stricter environmental regulations and participating in international forums, these NGOs contribute to the creation and enforcement of maritime policies that reflect global environmental priorities.

Constructivism: Constructivist theory, which focuses on the role of ideas, norms, and identities in international relations, offers another perspective on the influence of NGOs in maritime diplomacy. Constructivists argue that NGOs shape the norms and values that govern state behavior in maritime issues. For instance, the International Maritime Organization (IMO), an intergovernmental organization, works closely with various NGOs to develop safety and environmental standards for international shipping. NGOs such as the International Chamber of Shipping and the Clean Shipping Coalition have been instrumental in promoting norms related to maritime safety and environmental protection (Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998). Through advocacy and norm entrepreneurship, these NGOs influence the development of international maritime law and policy.

Realism: Realism, with its emphasis on state sovereignty and power politics, offers a more skeptical view of the role of NGOs in maritime diplomacy. Realists argue that while NGOs can provide valuable information and advocacy, they ultimately lack the power and authority to effect significant change in an anarchic international system

dominated by states. From a realist perspective, the influence of NGOs in maritime diplomacy is contingent upon the interests and support of powerful states. For example, while NGOs may advocate for marine conservation, the implementation of such policies often depends on the willingness of states to enforce regulations and commit resources (Mearsheimer, 2001). Realists contend that NGOs can supplement state efforts but cannot replace the central role of states in maritime governance.

Critical Theories

Critical theories, including Marxism and post-colonialism, provide a critique of the power dynamics in maritime diplomacy and highlight the role of NGOs in challenging these structures. Marxist theorists argue that NGOs can either reinforce or challenge the capitalist interests that dominate maritime activities. For instance, NGOs advocating for the rights of seafarers, such as the International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF), work to protect workers' rights and improve labor conditions in the shipping industry (Cox, 1981). These efforts can be seen as challenging the exploitation inherent in global maritime trade. Post-colonial perspectives emphasize the role of NGOs in addressing the impacts of colonialism and advocating for the rights and interests of marginalized coastal communities. NGOs working in regions affected by maritime boundary disputes or environmental degradation often highlight the disproportionate impacts on indigenous and local populations, advocating for more equitable and inclusive policies (Escobar, 2011).

Recent Developments and Case Studies

Recent developments in maritime diplomacy illustrate the significant contributions of NGOs. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) has been a key platform where NGOs have influenced international maritime law. NGOs have played a critical role in advocating for the protection of marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ). The negotiations for a new treaty under UNCLOS to conserve and sustainably use BBNJ have seen active participation from NGOs, contributing scientific research, policy recommendations, and advocacy (Gjerde et al., 2016). The campaign against illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing provides another example of NGO involvement. Organizations like the Environmental Justice Foundation (EJF) and Oceana have conducted investigations, raised awareness, and lobbied for stronger international measures to combat IUU fishing.

Their efforts have led to significant policy changes, such as the adoption of the Port State Measures Agreement (PSMA) by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), aimed at preventing IUU-caught fish from entering the global market (Department, 2000).

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) play crucial roles in maritime diplomacy by promoting dialogue, cooperation, and sustainable management of marine resources. Their contributions span a wide range of activities, including advocacy, research, capacity-building, and community engagement. This discussion explores the significant contributions of NGOs to maritime diplomacy, highlighting their role in advancing maritime governance, environmental conservation, and conflict resolution. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) like Greenpeace and Oceana play a significant role in maritime diplomacy by advocating for ocean governance and the protection of marine ecosystems. These NGOs work towards implementing international agreements and conventions aimed at conserving marine biodiversity, combating illegal fishing, and reducing pollution. For example, Greenpeace's campaigns for marine protected areas and sustainable fishing practices have influenced policy decisions and raised awareness about the importance of ocean conservation (Levine et al., 2020).

NGOs contribute to maritime surveillance against illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing activities. Organizations like Sea Shepherd and Greenpeace operate with volunteers and donations from private donors globally. Leveraging NGOs in maritime surveillance can enhance monitoring, reporting, and enforcement efforts against malign fishing activities by various enterprises (Levine et al., 2020). In Southeast Asian maritime security, NGOs have evolved to play crucial roles in providing strategic analysis, maritime domain awareness (MDA), and advocating for the central role of maritime security and governance issues. These NGOs operate without political constraints, pushing innovation in maritime policymaking and contributing to the collective consciousness on maritime security matters (Benson, 2022).

The International Maritime Organization (IMO) recognizes the importance of NGOs in the maritime sector. NGOs contribute to various aspects of maritime diplomacy, including environmental protection, safety at sea, and sustainable shipping practices (Dominguez, 2019). NGOs also engage in research and data collection to inform evidence-based policymaking and improve understanding of maritime issues. Research institutions and think tanks collaborate with NGOs to conduct scientific studies, collect

data, and analyze trends related to marine biodiversity, climate change, and maritime security. The Pew Charitable Trusts, for example, conducts research on illegal fishing and overfishing to support policy reforms and strengthen enforcement mechanisms (Pew Charitable Trusts, n.d.).

NGOs play a crucial role in maritime diplomacy by advocating for ocean governance, marine ecosystem protection, and sustainable practices. They contribute to capacity-building and technical assistance for coastal states and local communities in maritime governance. NGOs like the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) provide support to coastal communities in areas such as sustainable fisheries management and marine conservation through training programs, workshops, and knowledge-sharing initiatives (Benson, 2022; Koch, 2018). NGOs also engage in maritime surveillance against illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing activities. Organizations like Sea Shepherd and Greenpeace operate with volunteers and donations from private donors globally. Leveraging NGOs in maritime surveillance efforts can enhance monitoring, reporting, and enforcement against illicit fishing activities by various enterprises (Levine et al., 2020).

The International Maritime Organization (IMO) recognizes the importance of NGOs in the maritime sector. NGOs contribute to various aspects of maritime diplomacy, including environmental protection, safety at sea, and sustainable shipping practices (Dominguez, 2019). NGOs play a crucial role in conflict prevention and resolution in maritime disputes by fostering dialogue, building trust, and facilitating cooperation among stakeholders. Track-two diplomacy initiatives organized by NGOs bring together government officials, academics, civil society representatives, and industry stakeholders to discuss maritime issues, identify common interests, and explore collaborative solutions. Organizations like the International Crisis Group (ICG) conduct research and advocacy on maritime security issues in conflict-prone regions, offering policy recommendations to mitigate tensions and promote peace (Benson, 2022).

NGOs have evolved to play essential roles in providing strategic analysis, maritime domain awareness (MDA), and advocating for the central role of maritime security and governance issues. They operate without political constraints, pushing innovation in maritime policymaking and contributing to the collective consciousness on maritime security matters (Dominguez, 2019). NGOs contribute significantly to maritime

surveillance against illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing activities. Leveraging NGOs in surveillance efforts can enhance monitoring, reporting, and enforcement against illicit fishing activities by various enterprises. Organizations like Sea Shepherd and Greenpeace operate with volunteers and donations from private donors globally (Levine et al., 2020).

Furthermore, NGOs play a crucial role in promoting social justice and human rights in maritime contexts. Organizations like Human Rights at Sea advocate for the rights of seafarers, migrant workers, and marginalized communities affected by maritime activities. By raising awareness about labor rights abuses, human trafficking, and environmental injustices, NGOs contribute to creating a more equitable and sustainable maritime industry (Cacciaguidi-Fahy, 2007).

Factors Influencing Non-State Actors' Effectiveness in Dispute Resolution

Non-state actors (NSAs) such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs), multinational corporations (MNCs), and international organizations play crucial roles in dispute resolution across various global contexts. These actors often operate independently of governmental control, leveraging their expertise, resources, and networks to mediate conflicts, advocate for peace, and promote justice. This essay analyzes the factors influencing the effectiveness of NSAs in dispute resolution and explores how different international relations (IR) theories interpret their roles and impact.

Understanding Non-State Actors in Dispute Resolution

NSAs engage in dispute resolution by facilitating dialogue, providing technical expertise, advocating for marginalized groups, and supporting post-conflict reconstruction. Their effectiveness in these roles is influenced by several factors, including their legitimacy, access to resources, ability to mobilize support, and the political context in which they operate.

Theoretical Frameworks and Non-State Actors' Effectiveness

Liberalism: Liberalism emphasizes the importance of cooperation, international institutions, and the role of non-state actors in fostering peace and resolving conflicts. According to liberal theorists, NSAs contribute to dispute resolution by providing platforms for dialogue, reducing transaction costs, and promoting norms of cooperation and peace (Keohane & Nye Jr, 1973). The effectiveness of NSAs, from a liberal

perspective, is often linked to their ability to operate within supportive institutional frameworks and to mobilize international support. For example, the role of NGOs in the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, which led to the Ottawa Treaty, demonstrates how NSAs can effectively advocate for international norms and policies (Rutherford, 2010).

Constructivism: Constructivist theory focuses on the role of ideas, norms, and identities in shaping international relations. Constructivists argue that the effectiveness of NSAs in dispute resolution is closely tied to their ability to influence the normative and ideational environment in which they operate. For instance, transnational advocacy networks can shape state behavior by promoting new norms and values, as seen in the case of the anti-apartheid movement led by NGOs and advocacy groups (Price, 2003). Constructivists highlight the importance of legitimacy and normative appeal in enhancing the influence of NSAs.

Realism: Realism, with its focus on state sovereignty and power politics, offers a more skeptical view of the effectiveness of NSAs in dispute resolution. Realists argue that the anarchic nature of the international system and the centrality of state interests limit the influence of NSAs. From this perspective, the effectiveness of NSAs is contingent upon their alignment with the interests of powerful states and their ability to navigate the strategic priorities of state actors (Mearsheimer, 2001). Realists contend that while NSAs can play supportive roles, their impact is often secondary to that of states.

Critical Theories

Critical theories, including Marxism and post-colonialism, provide a critique of the power dynamics and structural inequalities in the international system. These theories argue that the effectiveness of NSAs in dispute resolution is influenced by their ability to challenge and transform these power structures. For example, NGOs advocating for workers' rights and social justice, such as the International Trade Union Confederation, often confront powerful economic interests and state actors to promote equitable outcomes (Cox, 1981). Critical theorists emphasize the role of NSAs in empowering marginalized groups and addressing systemic injustices.

Factors Influencing Effectiveness

Legitimacy and Credibility: The legitimacy and credibility of NSAs are crucial factors influencing their effectiveness in dispute resolution. NSAs that are perceived as

impartial, knowledgeable, and aligned with the values and interests of the stakeholders involved are more likely to gain trust and support. For instance, the credibility of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in providing humanitarian aid and mediating conflicts is bolstered by its adherence to principles of neutrality and impartiality (Forsythe, 2005).

Access to Resources: Access to financial, technical, and human resources significantly affects the capacity of NSAs to engage in dispute resolution. Well-resourced NSAs can conduct extensive research, provide expert analysis, and sustain long-term engagement in conflict zones. Organizations like Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International leverage their resources to document human rights abuses and advocate for justice, thereby influencing dispute resolution processes (Bob, 2005).

Network and Coalition Building: The ability of NSAs to build networks and coalitions enhances their effectiveness in dispute resolution. By collaborating with other NGOs, international organizations, and state actors, NSAs can amplify their impact and mobilize broader support. The Coalition for the International Criminal Court, which includes over 2,500 civil society organizations, exemplifies how network building can influence international legal norms and accountability mechanisms (Glasius, 2006).

Political Context: The political context in which NSAs operate also shapes their effectiveness. Political will, state openness to non-state intervention, and the overall stability of the region affect the ability of NSAs to contribute to dispute resolution. In authoritarian or conflict-prone environments, NSAs may face significant challenges, including restrictions on their activities and threats to their personnel (Carothers, 2016).

Recent Developments and Case Studies

Recent developments highlight the evolving role of NSAs in dispute resolution. The involvement of NGOs in the peace processes in Colombia, such as the efforts by Conciliation Resources and the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, demonstrates the critical role of NSAs in facilitating dialogue and supporting the implementation of peace agreements (De la Calle, 2017). Similarly, the role of MNCs in promoting conflict-sensitive business practices and contributing to economic stability in post-conflict regions underscores the multifaceted contributions of NSAs to dispute resolution (Killick et al., 2005).

Non-state actors, including international organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and civil society groups, play increasingly significant roles in dispute resolution efforts. However, their effectiveness in mediating conflicts and promoting peace varies depending on a range of factors. This discussion explores the key factors that influence the effectiveness of non-state actors in dispute resolution, drawing on theoretical insights and empirical evidence from the field of international relations.

One of the primary factors influencing the effectiveness of non-state actors in dispute resolution is their legitimacy and credibility as impartial mediators. According to Bercovitch and Jackson (2009), "the perceived impartiality and credibility of non-state actors can enhance their ability to facilitate dialogue and negotiation among conflicting parties" (Bercovitch & Jackson, 2009). Non-state actors who are perceived as neutral, trustworthy, and capable of representing diverse interests are more likely to gain the trust and cooperation of conflicting parties.

Moreover, the capacity and resources of non-state actors play a crucial role in determining their effectiveness in dispute resolution. Organizations with the financial, technical, and human resources to facilitate mediation processes, provide technical expertise, and implement peacebuilding initiatives are better equipped to address complex conflicts. The International Crisis Group (ICG), for example, conducts field research, analysis, and advocacy on conflict issues worldwide, leveraging its expertise to promote peace and stability (ICG, n.d.).

Additionally, the level of access and engagement with key stakeholders is essential for the effectiveness of non-state actors in dispute resolution. Organizations that have strong networks, relationships, and communication channels with conflicting parties, government officials, and local communities can facilitate dialogue, build trust, and foster cooperation. Track-two diplomacy initiatives organized by NGOs bring together diverse stakeholders to discuss contentious issues and explore mutually acceptable solutions (Horowitz, 2000).

Furthermore, the political context and power dynamics surrounding a conflict significantly influence the effectiveness of non-state actors in dispute resolution. In highly polarized or asymmetric conflicts, where power imbalances and mistrust are prevalent, non-state actors may face challenges in gaining legitimacy and influencing outcomes. Moreover, geopolitical rivalries, competing interests, and external interventions can

complicate mediation efforts and undermine the effectiveness of non-state actors (Baybars-Hawks, 2018).

Lastly, the willingness of conflicting parties to engage in dialogue, compromise, and seek peaceful solutions is a critical factor in determining the effectiveness of non-state actors in dispute resolution. Organizations that have the support and commitment of conflicting parties to resolve their differences through negotiation rather than resorting to violence are more likely to succeed in facilitating peace processes (Sarjito, 2022). The role of track-one diplomacy, where official government representatives engage in direct negotiations facilitated by non-state actors, is crucial in this regard (Mitchell & Banks, 1998).

CONCLUSION

Non-state actors, including multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations, terrorist groups, and social movements, operate across borders and sectors, often blurring the lines between traditional state and non-state roles. Their diverse agendas can align with or diverge from those of states, creating opportunities for both cooperation and conflict, and thereby shaping the dynamics of global politics and influencing international negotiations. The conceptualization of non-state actors in international relations has evolved to reflect their growing influence, with realism remaining skeptical of their impact, while liberalism, constructivism, and critical theories acknowledge their diverse roles. These frameworks recognize the contributions of NSAs, providing a comprehensive understanding of the complex dynamics of the contemporary international system. Recent case studies further illustrate the critical functions of NSAs in addressing global issues, emphasizing the need for IR scholarship to continue integrating their roles into analyses of international relations.

International organizations are indispensable actors in conflict resolution, leveraging their diplomatic, humanitarian, and normative capacities to prevent, manage, and resolve conflicts by facilitating dialogue, preventing violence, supporting reconstruction, and upholding international norms, thereby fostering peace, stability, and development in conflict-affected regions. The roles and functions of international organizations in conflict resolution are multifaceted and can be interpreted through various IR theoretical frameworks: realism remains skeptical of their efficacy, while

liberalism and constructivism highlight their potential to foster cooperation, shape norms, and promote peace. Marxist and critical theories provide a nuanced critique of the power dynamics involved, recognizing both the limitations and transformative potential of IOs. Recent case studies underscore the critical functions of IOs in addressing complex conflicts, reinforcing the importance of continued scholarly engagement with their roles in global governance.

Non-governmental organizations make significant contributions to maritime diplomacy by advocating for ocean governance, conducting research, providing technical assistance, facilitating dialogue, and promoting human rights, complementing the work of governments, international organizations, and other stakeholders in addressing maritime challenges and advancing sustainable development goals. By harnessing the expertise and resources of civil society, NGOs play a vital role in shaping a more inclusive, transparent, and accountable maritime governance framework. The contributions of NGOs to maritime diplomacy are multifaceted and significant, encompassing advocacy, research, policy development, and direct action. Liberal and constructivist theories highlight the positive roles of NGOs in fostering cooperation and shaping norms, while realism remains skeptical of their influence compared to state actors. Critical theories offer insights into the ways NGOs challenge existing power structures and advocate for marginalized groups. Recent case studies underscore the critical roles of NGOs in addressing complex maritime issues, reinforcing the need for continued scholarly and practical engagement with their contributions to maritime diplomacy.

The effectiveness of non-state actors in dispute resolution is influenced by a variety of factors, including their legitimacy, capacity, access, political context, and the willingness of disputing parties to engage in dialogue. By understanding and addressing these factors, non-state actors can enhance their ability to mediate conflicts, promote peace, and contribute to global security and stability. Liberal and constructivist theories highlight the positive roles of NSAs in fostering cooperation and shaping norms, while realism remains skeptical of their influence compared to state actors. Critical theories provide insights into how NSAs challenge existing power structures and advocate for marginalized groups. Recent case studies illustrate the diverse and significant

contributions of NSAs in resolving complex disputes, reinforcing the need for continued scholarly and practical engagement with their roles in international relations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I extend my deepest gratitude to Fiera for her invaluable assistance throughout my research. Her unwavering support, insightful feedback, and dedication have significantly contributed to the success of this project.

REFERENCES

- Aronoff, M. J. (2009). Camp David Rashomon: contested interpretations of the Israel/Palestine peace process. *Political Science Quarterly*, 124(1), 143–167.
- Barnett, M., & Finnemore, M. (2019). *Rules for the world: International organizations in global politics*. Cornell University Press.
- Baybars-Hawks, B. (2018). *Non-state actors in conflicts: conspiracies, myths, and practices*.
- Benson, J. (2022). *The Roles of Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in Southeast Asian Maritime Security*. www.rsis.edu.sg
- Bercovitch, J., & Jackson, R. D. W. (2009). *Conflict resolution in the twenty-first century: principles, methods, and approaches*. University of Michigan Press.
- Bob, C. (2005). *The marketing of rebellion: Insurgents, media, and international activism*.
- Cacciaguidi-Fahy, S. (2007). The law of the sea and human rights. *Sri Lanka J. Int'l L.*, 19, 85.
- Carothers, T. (2016). Closing space for international democracy and human rights support. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 8(3), 358–377.
- Clapham, A. (2016). Non-state actors. *Daniel Moeckli, Sangeeta Shah & Sandesh Sivakumara, International Human Rights Law*.
- Coleman, N. (2017, July 27). *Conflict and compromise – maritime dispute resolution*. Gard. <https://www.gard.no/web/updates/content/23769855/conflict-and-compromise-maritime-dispute-resolution>
- Cox, R. W. (1981). Social forces, states and world orders: beyond international relations theory. *Millennium*, 10(2), 126–155.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (3rd ed.)*. Sage.

- De la Calle, L. (2017). The Role of Civil Society in Peace Processes: A Comparative Analysis of Colombia and the Basque Country. *International Journal on World Peace*, 34(1), 31–60.
- Department, A. O. of the U. Nations. F. (2000). *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture, 2000* (Vol. 3). Food & Agriculture Org.
- Dominguez, A. (2019). NGOs. IMO. <https://www.imo.org/en/OurWork/ERO/Pages/NGOs.aspx>
- Escobar, A. (2011). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World* (Vol. 1). Princeton University Press.
- Falkner, R. (2016). The Paris Agreement and the new logic of international climate politics. *International Affairs*, 92(5), 1107–1125.
- Finnemore, M. (1993). International Organizations as Teachers of Norms: The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and Science Policy. *International Organization*, 47(4), 565–597. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2706939>
- Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. *International Organization*, 52(4), 887–917.
- Forsythe, D. P. (2005). *The humanitarians: The international committee of the Red Cross*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fortna, V. P. (2008). *Does peacekeeping work? Shaping belligerents' choices after civil war*. Princeton University Press.
- Gjerde, K., Reeve, L., Harden-Davies, H., Ardron, J., Dolan, R., Durussel, C., Earle, S., Jimenez, J. A., Kalas, P., & Laffoley, D. (2016). *Protecting Earth's last conservation frontier: scientific, management and legal priorities for MPAs beyond national boundaries*.
- Glasius, M. (2006). *The International Criminal Court: A Global Civil Society Achievement*. Routledge.
- Haas, P. M. (2017). *Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination*. In *International Organization* (pp. 285-319). Routledge.
- Hintjens, H., & Zarkov, D. (Eds.). (2014). *Conflict, peace, security and development: Theories and methodologies*. Routledge.
- Horowitz, D. L. (2000). *Ethnic groups in conflict, updated edition with a new preface*. Univ of California Press.
- ICG. (n.d.). *About Us*. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from <https://www.crisisgroup.org/about>
- IMO. (2019). *Introduction to IMO*. <https://www.imo.org/en/About/Pages/Default.aspx>

- Jackson, B. A. (2009). Technology strategies for homeland security: Adaptation and coevolution of offense and defense. *Homeland Security Affairs*, 5(1).
- Johnston, D. (2014). Non-State Actors in Maritime Security: Current Challenges and Future Directions. *Maritime Studies*, 13(1), 1–17.
- Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (2003). Governance in a globalizing world. In *Power and governance in a partially globalized world* (pp. 193–218). Routledge.
- Keohane, R. O., & Nye Jr, J. S. (1973). Power and interdependence. *Survival*, 15(4), 158–165.
- Killick, N., Srikantha, V., & Gündüz, C. (2005). *The Role of Local Business in Peacebuilding*. Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.
- Koch, V. (2018). *Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture SOLUTIONS IN FOCUS*. www.bluesolutions.info
- Legrenzi, M. (2013). *Security in the Gulf: historical legacies and future prospects*. Routledge.
- Levine, T. P., Levine, D. P., & Mills, W. (2020, October 20). *Leveraging NGOs and Volunteerism for Maritime Surveillance Against IUU Fishing*. <https://cimsec.org/leveraging-ngos-and-volunteerism-for-maritime-surveillance-against-iuu-fishing/>
- Longley, R. (2022, July 28). *What Are Non-State Actors?*. ThoughtCo. <https://www.thoughtco.com/non-state-actors-5443123>
- Maurer, T., & Nelson, A. (2020). *International Strategy to Better Protect the Financial System Against Cyber Threats* TIMMAURE R AND ARTHUR NELSON.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. WW Norton & Company.
- Miranda, G., & Maljak, V. (2022). The Role of United Nations Convention on the Laws of the Sea in the South China Sea Disputes. *E-International Relations*. <https://www.e-ir.info/2022/06/23/the-role-of-united-nations-convention-on-the-laws-of-the-sea-in-the-south-china-sea-disputes>.
- Mitchell, C. R., & Banks, M. M. (1998). *Handbook of Conflict Resolution: The Analytical Problem-Solving Approach*. Praeger Publishers.
- PCA. (2024). *Introduction to the PCA*. <https://pca-cpa.org/en/about/>
- Pew Charitable Trusts. (n.d.). *Illegal Fishing Project*. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/projects/illegal-fishing-project>
- Picciotto, R. (2018). The Pacific Islands: New Priorities for a New Development Era. *Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, 4(4).

- Price, R. (2003). Transnational civil society and advocacy in world politics. *World Politics*, 55(4), 579–606.
- Rosenau, J. N. (2021). Governance in the Twenty-first Century. In *Understanding Global Cooperation* (pp. 16–47). Brill.
- Rutherford, K. R. (2010). *Disarming states: The international movement to ban landmines*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Sarjito, A. (2022). Perang Hibrida: Perang Generasi Keempat. *Manajemen Pertahanan: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Penelitian Manajemen Pertahanan*, 8(1).
- Stiglitz, J., & Pike, R. M. (2004). *Globalization and its Discontents*.
- Strange, S. (1996). *The retreat of the state: The diffusion of power in the world economy*. Cambridge university press.
- Tallberg, J., Lundgren, M., Sommerer, T., & Squatrito, T. (2020). Why international organizations commit to liberal norms. *International Studies Quarterly*, 64(3), 626–640.
- UN DPI. (1995). *United Nations Peace-keeping Operations*. United Nations. Department of Public Informaiton.
- UNCLOS. (1982). *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea*.
- UNDP. (n.d.). *United Nations Development Programme*. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from <https://www.undp.org/>
- Waltz, K. N. (2010). *Theory of international politics*. Waveland Press.
- Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics* (Vol. 67). Cambridge university press.
- Wiegand, K. E. (2015). The South Korean–Japanese security relationship and the Dokdo/Takeshima islets dispute. *The Pacific Review*, 28(3), 347–366.
- Wijninga, P., Oosterveld, W. T., Galdiga, J. H., Marten, P., Chivot, E., Gehem, M., Knowles, E., Maas, M., Schellekens, M., Silveira, J., Yang, M. Y., Zelinska, O., de Jong, S., Kogut, P., van Luit, E., van Esch, J., Bekkers, F., De Spiegeleire, S., & Sweijs, T. (2014). BEYOND THE DICHOTOMY. In *STRATEGIC MONITOR 2014 (FOUR STRATEGIC CHALLENGES)*. Hague Centre for Strategic Studies. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep12608.8>
- Williams, P. D. (2013). Fighting for peace in Somalia: AMISOM’s seven strategic challenges. *Journal of International Peacekeeping*, 17(3–4), 222–247.
- Zandee, D., Kruijver, K., & Stoetman, A. (2020). The future of Arctic security. *Clingendael Report*, 2020–2024.