ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences
Volume 4, Issue 4, 2025 ISSN-L (Online): 3006-6638

International Commercial Law And Arbitration: Adr In International Law, The UN Framework, And Practical Gaps

Muhammad Sulaim Ajmal Khan
mhero4923@gmail.com
Department of Law, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan

Ameer Hamza Khan
ameer.hamza270200@gmail.com
Department of Law, University of Swabi

Riaz Ahmad Khan
riazahmad@awkum.edu.pk
Department of Law, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan

Usman Shahab
usmanshahab6245@gmail.com
Department of Law, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan
Corresponding Author: * Riaz Ahmad Khan riazahmad@awkum.edu.pk

Received: 06-11-2025 **Revised:** 21-11-2025 **Accepted:** 12-12-2025 **Published:** 24-12-2025

ABSTRACT

International business creates legal problems that do not fit neatly inside one country's court system. Companies trade goods, share technology, build projects, and move money across borders, often with partners they may never meet in person. When a dispute happens, the main question is not only "Who is right?" but also "Where will the dispute be decided, and will the final decision be respected in other countries?" This research explains how Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) - in particular international commercial arbitration - answers those questions. It opens with ADR as a general concept in the sphere of international law and relates it to how the United Nations (UN) approaches peaceful dispute settlement. It then explains, in detail, arbitration: how it operates, why businesses use it, and what makes it different from court litigation. After that, the research examines the most important UN-based legal framework that applies to arbitrations, especially the New York Convention of 1958 on the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards, and the UNCITRAL Model Law that many countries employ to structure their legislation on arbitration. It also places arbitration inside the wider world of international commercial law, including how international contract rules such as the CISG reduce legal uncertainty in cross-border trade. Finally, it identifies major gaps: uneven court attitudes, misuse of the "public policy" exception, problems with non-signatories, delay and cost, unequal bargaining power, and the challenge of handling modern disputes involving multiple parties and urgent interim relief. The research ends with practical recommendations aimed at law reform, better drafting of arbitration clauses, improved court–arbitration cooperation, and stronger ethical and procedural safeguards.

Keywords: *Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR); international commercial arbitration; UNCITRAL; New York Convention 1958; enforcement of arbitral awards; public policy exception; party autonomy; CISG; international commercial law; judicial intervention..*

INTRODUCTION

International commercial life is built on trust, but trust is tested when money, time, and reputation are on the line. A supplier in one country may sell machinery to a buyer in another. A construction company may build a power plant abroad. A bank may finance a project in a third country. These deals are written in contracts,

and contracts are supposed to prevent conflict. Yet disputes still happen: delays, defective goods, non-payment, currency problems, government restrictions, or sudden political and economic changes.

When a dispute happens inside one country, the normal path is simple: go to a national court. But cross-border disputes create special problems. First, the parties may not trust each other's courts. A company from Country A may worry that the courts of Country B will Favor local parties. Second, even if a court gives a judgment, enforcing that judgment in another country can be slow and uncertain. Third, international business often requires technical expertise; a normal judge may not have time or background to understand complex industries. Because of these reasons, modern international trade increasingly relies on ADR, especially international commercial arbitration, to settle disputes.

ADR as a Concept in International Law

ADR as a Concept of International Law ADR stands for settlement without a full trial in court. In simple words, it is a collection of peaceful methods which helps parties to find solutions to the problems without making every disagreement a long public fight. ADR is not only for private businesses. Even public international law, which concerns itself with disputes between states, seeks settlement by peaceful means rather than by force. One of the more significant examples is the UN Charter. In Chapter VI, Article 33 enumerates the methods such as negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and judicial settlement, and tells the parties to seek a solution through peaceful means in the first instance (United Nations). This is important because it demonstrates a global legal culture: disputes should be managed in structured and peaceful processes. Even though the differences between state-to-state disputes and business disputes are obvious, the underlying logic is similar. Whether the parties are two countries or two companies, they often want three things: speed, fairness and a result that can be used in real life. ADR supports these goals. Negotiation is the most elementary method: the parties are talking directly. Mediation brings in a neutral assistant. Conciliation is like mediation but in some cases has a more active role of the neutral person. Arbitration is different: it concludes with a binding decision, called an award, which is similar in effect to a judgment. That binding nature is one reason that arbitration is central to international commerce. In international business, ADR is also a means to maintain relationships. If two companies plan to work together for many years, a public court battle may destroy trust. ADR processes are often more private and more flexible. They can reduce the "winner takes all" feeling and allow solutions that fit business needs. However, ADR is not automatically perfect. It can be misused. A stronger party may pressure a weaker party into unfair terms. A private process may hide serious wrongdoing. This research does not treat ADR as magic; it treats it as a tool that works well only when supported by good law, good institutions, and good judicial behaviour.

From ADR to Arbitration: What Arbitration Is and Why It Matters

Arbitration is a process where the parties agree to let a private decision-maker (an arbitrator, or a panel called a tribunal) resolve their dispute. The agreement to arbitrate is usually written into the contract as an arbitration clause. Sometimes it is made later, after a dispute appears.

Arbitration matters in international commerce for two main reasons. First, the parties can choose a neutral forum. Instead of going to the courts of either party's country, they can choose a neutral seat (legal place) of arbitration, such as Singapore, London, Paris, or Geneva. Second, arbitration awards are often easier to enforce internationally than court judgments, mainly because of the New York Convention. The Convention creates shared rules for recognizing arbitration agreements and enforcing foreign awards. In practice, this means a party that wins an arbitration can take the award to a court in another country and request enforcement, and courts are expected to enforce it unless a limited list of exceptions applies.

Arbitration is also valued for flexibility. Parties can choose the language, the number of arbitrators, the timing, and sometimes the rules of evidence They can choose arbitrators with expertise in engineering, shipping, banking or energy. For complex business disputes, that expertise can result in better quality decision-making. At the same time, arbitration is by no means blameless. It can be costly, particularly if there are three arbitrators, numerous lawyers and long hearings. In some cases, it is also slow. Confidentiality, often viewed as an advantage, may also be a weakness in the sense of concealing unfairness or a lack of learning from past mistakes. Another criticism is that arbitration doesn't establish a system of precedent that is public like that of courts. That can cause the law to be uneven in result, which makes the law less predictable. So, arbitration is in between two worlds. It is private but it is based on public law. It is flexible but needs to be fair. It is global, but it still depends on national courts for enforcement and support.

METHODOLOGY

This research is based on a doctrinal methodology of law, i.e., the study and interpretation of primary sources of the law and authoritative sources. The central instruments are UN and UNCITRAL instruments: the New York Convention (UNCITRAL), the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration (UNCITRAL), UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (UNCITRAL), the CISG (UNCITRAL), and Singapore Convention on Mediation. It also makes use of official explanatory resources, that of the UNCITRAL Secretariat Guide on the New York Convention. In addition, the research has a comparative case law approach by examining leading decisions from different jurisdictions demonstrating how important Convention issues are put to practice. Some examples include U.S. case law interpreting public policy in narrow terms, Indian Supreme Court reasoning on the issue of foreign award enforcement (Indian Kanoon), and UK Supreme Court material on consent and jurisdiction issues (supremecourt.uk). The goal is not to survey every country, but to illustrate common patterns and problems that exist in systems across the board. Limitations are recognised in the sense that arbitration practice is extensive and is in a state of constant flux. This research is a study about the most central framework of UN and the main legal issues that arise repeatedly in the matters of enforcement and court interaction

THE UN AND UNCITRAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR ARBITRATION

The New York Convention (1958): The Backbone of Enforcement

The most important global treaty for international commercial arbitration is the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, commonly called the New York Convention. It was adopted in 1958 and entered into force in 1959. Its main goal is simple: to make arbitration agreements and arbitral awards effective across borders. Without enforcement, arbitration would be only a private opinion. With enforcement, it becomes a real legal tool.

The Convention requires courts of contracting states to recognize written arbitration agreements and, when an award is made, to enforce it, subject to limited defences (UNCITRAL). These defences include issues such as invalid arbitration agreement, lack of proper notice, inability to present a case, awards beyond the scope of the arbitration agreement, problems with tribunal composition, or the award not being binding. Courts can also refuse enforcement if the dispute is not arbitrable in that country or if enforcement would violate the country's "public policy" (newyorkconvention1958.org).

The phrase "public policy" is one of the most debated concepts in arbitration law. If courts interpret it too broadly, they can refuse enforcement for almost any reason, and arbitration loses its value. If interpreted too narrowly, courts could enforce awards that are inconsistent with basic justice. Many legal systems have attempted to limit this exception to safeguard the aim of the Convention. A famous US case, Parsons & Whittemore v. RAKTA, is often cited at treating the public policy defence as very narrow and limited to basic

notions of morality and justice. In India, Renusagar v. General Electric is also known for keeping a low profile when it comes to public policy in enforce foreign award (Indian Kanoon). These cases demonstrate an important thought: courts should not repeat the entire argument at the stage of enforcement. They should show respect for arbitration unless there is a serious legal reason not to. The success of the Convention is also backed by official UN guidance. The UNCITRAL Secretariat has produced a detailed guide discussing how to interpret the Convention in a uniform way in different countries This is part of a broader international effort: harmonize enforcement standards so international trade can function with greater legal certainty.

The UNCITRAL Model Law (1985, amended 2006): A Template for National Legislation

The New York Convention is a treaty, meaning states must ratify it. But countries also need modern domestic arbitration laws. To support this, the UN Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) created the Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration in 1985, with major amendments adopted in 2006 (UNCITRAL). A "model law" is not binding by itself. Instead, it is a well-designed template that countries can simply copy into their own legislation which will enhance compatibility between legal systems. The Model Law deals with all aspects of the life of an arbitration: arbitration agreement, tribunal appointment, jurisdiction, procedure, court support, interim measures, and setting aside of an award (UNCITRAL). One of its most famous ideas is the limitation of superfluous court intervention. While the precise wording differs from one enactment to another, the structure of the Model Law is based on the principle that the courts should support arbitration, not control it. This is a balance that must be struck: while arbitration requires the courts for coercive power (such as enforcing interim measures or awards), arbitration also requires independence so that it does not become disguised litigation. The 2006 amendments are widely related with the improvement on interim measures and a modern approach to the arbitration agreement, among other things (UNCITRAL). In real life, interim measures can be very important. For example, if a party is worried the other side will move assets, they may need some urgent orders to freeze assets or preserve evidence. If the national courts refuse to help, it may be meaningless to have an award later.

UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules: A Neutral Set of Procedure Rules

Besides treaties and model laws, parties need procedural rules for conducting arbitration. UNCITRAL has produced Arbitration Rules that are used worldwide, especially when parties want a neutral procedural framework. These rules have been revised over time, reflecting modern needs. They show UNCITRAL's broader role: creating legal tools that make cross-border commerce smoother and more predictable.

Mediation and the UN Framework: The Singapore Convention and Model Law

Although this research focuses on arbitration, a complete ADR picture should include mediation. The UN has supported mediation through the United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation (known as the Singapore Convention on Mediation) (UNCITRAL). The goal is to give mediated settlement agreements a more reliable path to enforcement, similar in spirit (though not identical in function) to what the New York Convention does for arbitral awards

UNCITRAL has also produced a Model Law on International Commercial Mediation (2018), updating earlier work on conciliation. This matters because international commerce does not rely only on "win/lose" decisions. Many disputes are solved through settlement, and legal systems increasingly recognize the value of making settlements enforceable.

International Commercial Law: The Bigger Legal Environment Around Arbitration

International commercial law is the body of rules that governs cross-border business. It includes national contract laws, private international law (conflict of laws), international treaties, trade customs, and model rules. Arbitration operates inside this environment because most arbitration disputes come from contracts. To understand arbitration, you must understand what kinds of rules parties are fighting about.

Uniform Contract Law and the CISG

A major legal tool in international sales is the **United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG)**. UNCITRAL describes its purpose as providing a modern, uniform, and fair regime for international sales contracts, aiming to increase certainty and reduce transaction costs. The CISG was adopted in 1980 and entered into force in 1988 (UNCITRAL).

The CISG is relevant in arbitration because, where it is applicable, it provides the arbitrator with a clear set of rules regarding formation of a contract, obligation and remedies. Instead of arguing between themselves which law of Country A or Country B should be applied, the parties may operate within the common legal text (if both are CISG states or the choice of law rules bring that result). That reduces uncertainty. It also makes the decision easier to justify and compare to between the cases.

Soft Law and Commercial Practice

International commercial law also contains non-binding but influential sources such as standard contract terms and principles. For example, the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts are frequently relied upon in international contracting as a neutral point of reference and its most recent version adopted in 2016 (UNIDROIT). These principles are "soft law," which means that they are not a treaty, but they can be taken into account by parties when entering contracts or by tribunals in the interpretation of international practice. Soft law influences arbitration because arbitration is strongly shaped by party choice. If the parties choose UNIDROIT Principles or refer to trade usages, arbitrators may apply them.

Why Arbitration Fits International Commercial Law

Arbitration is often described as the “natural partner” of international commercial law because both aim to manage cross-border complexity. International commercial law tries to harmonize rules, so trade is predictable. Arbitration tries to provide a neutral and enforceable dispute system. In a sense, they solve different parts of the same problem: the problem of doing business across borders where no single country’s courts and laws feel fully neutral to everyone.

Arbitration in Practice: How It Works in International Commerce

To keep this understandable, it helps to walk through arbitration in a story-like sequence.

First, there is a contract. The contract includes an arbitration clause. A good clause usually states: (1) disputes will go to arbitration, (2) the seat of arbitration (legal place), (3) number of arbitrators, (4) language, (5) institution or rules (like ICC or UNCITRAL), and sometimes (6) the governing law of the contract.

Second, a dispute arises One party sends out a notice of arbitration. The tribunal is formed. If the arbitration is institutional then the institution assists with appointment and administration. If it is ad hoc, the parties are relying on rules such as UNCITRAL as well as the co-operation of courts, if necessary.

Third, the tribunal is the body that makes procedural decisions. Parties exchange documents, witness statements, expert reports and legal arguments. There may be hearings. The tribunal needs to respect basic fairness: each side needs to be heard; each side needs to have a chance to respond.

Fourth, the tribunal makes an award. The award determines liability and remedies - payment, damages, interest, costs, or sometimes declarations.

Fifth, if the losing party does not do so voluntarily, the winning party seeks enforcement. This is where the national courts and the New York Convention play a major role. The court re-trying the case does not. It reviews whether the limited Convention defenses apply (newyorkconvention1958.org).

This process demonstrates the primary advantage of arbitration: it is private and flexible with the backing of public enforcement.

Advantages of International Commercial Arbitration

The greatest benefit is enforceability. Many businesspeople want arbitration, not because it is morally superior, but because it is practical. A court judgment made in one country can have complicated recognition issues in other countries. Arbitration awards, however, have a very popular enforcement route by way of the New York Convention (UNCITRAL).

The second way is in the form of neutrality. Parties can avoid "home-court advantage" by arguing neutral seat and neutral arbitrators. This builds confidence. It is of special value where political tensions or economic nationalism might have an impact on court trust.

A third advantage is expertise. Arbitrators can be chosen for technical experience. This is important when there are disputes over engineering defects, shipping delays, financial derivatives or energy pricing. In such cases, the use of expertise can help to minimise misunderstanding and minimise the time for dispute.

A fourth benefit is flexibility in procedures. Parties are free to tailor the process to the needs of the dispute. Some disputes require expedited decisions. Others require in-depth document review. Arbitration is more easily adjustable than rigid court procedure.

A fifth advantage, and often mentioned, is confidentiality. Many arbitrations are private, which can help to protect trade secrets and reputation. Still, confidentiality is not automatic in all systems, and it might clash with the public interest in some areas. But, in normal commercial disputes, privacy can be a real boon.

The Main Gaps and Problems in Arbitration Nowadays

Arbitration is good, but not perfect. Its weaknesses often derive from the same source as its strength: It is global but relies on local courts and local legal culture.

Uneven Court Support and the "Public Policy" Risk

The New York Convention creates a common framework that is nevertheless interpreted differently by courts. One important defence is that of "public policy." If the courts use public policy as a catchall excuse for refusing awards, then enforcement is an unpredictable process. That unpredictability is detrimental to trade because businesses can't confidently assess risk.

Courts that respect the Convention tend to constrict the public policy. The U.S. case Parsons & Whittemore is a good example of a case where the public policy exception is not in the form of a general appeal on the merits (Justia). India's Renusagar is also widely associated with the restrained approach in the foreign award context (Indian Kanoon). These examples support the Convention's objective - that enforcement should be refused for serious reasons only, not because a judge does not agree with the tribunal's reasoning.

The gap, however, remains. Some courts may be tempted to "review" the dispute indirectly by calling it public policy. This is not a legal issue; it is a training and judicial culture issue. If judges have not been exposed to arbitration, they will treat it as a lesser decision rather than a final dispute mechanism.

Non-Signatory Problem and Jurisdiction Issues

Arbitration is consensual in nature. Usually, it is the parties who signed the arbitration agreement to which they are bound. But business these days tends to take on some complicated structures: parent company, subsidiary, agents, government-linked entities, joint ventures. A dispute can be between a party who did not formally sign the contract but who had a real role in the transaction.

This raises a difficult question: can a tribunal make an award against a non-signatory? Courts sometimes allow it in the principles of certain doctrines (like agency, assignment, alter ego, or group-of companies approaches), but the law varies from country to country. A well-known case that is related to this issue is Dallah v. Pakistan, in which Enforcement was resisted on the ground that government was not a proper party to the arbitration agreement (supremecourt.uk). This demonstrates a major gap, that even if a tribunal believes that it has jurisdiction, enforcement can fail if the enforcing court disagrees as to consent.

Delay and Cost

A misconception often runs that arbitration is faster than court. That is not always true. Big commercial arbitrations can last for years. They can take large production of documents, presence of many experts and lengthy hearings. Arbitrators, unfortunately, are often busy people, not full-time judges. Institutions even have schedules and processes. The result can be high cost and delay, that is, a lot like litigation.

This gap has prompted reforms and mechanisms such as expedited procedures, enhanced case management and cost sanctions. Still, cost and time delays are key criticisms.

Unequal Bargaining Power

All arbitration agreements are not freely negotiated. In certain contracts, one party is much stronger. It may compel the weaker party to accept a seat of a distance, a foreign language, or costly institutional rules. In the case of consumer or employment, this can cause some serious fairness issues. Even in a business, small suppliers may be faced with unfair clauses.

International commercial arbitration typically presupposes that the parties concerned are relatively sophisticated, but the world is not always what it seems. This causes a disconnect with the theory and practice because arbitration is glorified as consensual, but consent sometimes is more formal than real.

Multi party and Multi Contract Dispute

Many disputes nowadays involve several contracts and a number of parties. A construction project can involve having a main contract, subcontracts, finance agreements, and insurance. If conflicts are divided between different arbitrations, then results may be inconsistent. Consolidation is not always an option. Joinder

of parties can be legally hard without consent. This is a gap of structure: the contractual nature of arbitration makes it less smooth for complex networks of relationships.

Measures Interim and Asset Protection

Interim measures are often urgent matters. If a party is in the process of transferring assets out of a country, a final award may be too late. The UNCITRAL Model Law framework underpins interim measures as an important part of modern arbitration law (UNCITRAL). But actual effectiveness is dependent on national courts. If courts are slow or unwilling to assist arbitration, interim relief may not work, and the final award may be a paper victory.

RECOMMENDATIONS: HOW ARBITRATION AND COMMERCIAL LAW CAN WORK BETTER TOGETHER

The first is stronger and clearer national implementation of the New York Convention and the UNCITRAL Model Law. The Convention is most effective when courts accept the defences of Convention as limited and do not resort to a disguised appeal on the merits (newyorkconvention1958.org). This requires training. Judges who are knowledgeable about arbitration are less likely to abuse public policy and procedural objections.

The second recommendation is improved drafting of arbitration clauses. Many enforcement disputes start with badly drafted clauses: unclear seat, unclear institution, contradictory clauses, missing governing law. Businesses should take dispute clauses seriously, and not as little boiler plate text that can be added at the end of the contract. The third recommendation is procedural efficiency reform. Parties and tribunals should have rigid timetables, concentrate on document production and the early identification of key issues. Arbitration institutions should continue to develop expedited options. Efficiency is a term that is not only associated with speed but also making costs proportionate to the value and complexity of the dispute. The fourth recommendation is fairness protections to weaker parties in commercial chains. While international commercial arbitration typically assumes equality of the parties, the systems of law may be on the lookout for abusive clauses. Courts may require limited protective doctrines in extreme cases, but they must balance protection and respect for arbitration. The answer is not to destroy arbitration, but to avoid its abuse. The fifth recommendation is better management of multi-party disputes, for example more clarity on the drafting of contracts throughout project documents to allow for consolidation or co-ordinated proceedings where appropriate. This can be either done through having consistent dispute clauses for related contracts or engineering the dispute system for the whole project rather than separate for each link in the chain. The sixth recommendation is to recognise that arbitration is part of a wider ADR system. Mediation and making a settlement should be encouraged and that must be done where there are business relationships. The Singapore Convention facilitates this by attempting to make settlement of international disputes mediated more enforceable (UNCITRAL) and UNCITRAL's model law on mediation helps to facilitate more predictable mediation practice (UNCITRAL). When arbitration and mediation are utilized wisely, many disputes can be solved at an early date saving cost and time.

CONCLUSION

International commercial arbitration has become one of the most important legal tools of cross border business. It derives its strength from the careful design that has been given to it: private decision-making combined with public enforcement. The UN system works in support of peaceful settlement as a general value and UNCITRAL has developed a practical legal architecture for trade disputes. The New York Convention establishes an international enforcement regime and the UNCITRAL Model Law assists countries to modernize their national arbitration laws. Together, they minimise uncertainty and aid international commerce. Yet the system is still plagued by serious gaps. Enforcement is only as good as the

courts to which it is applied. Public policy is sometimes a necessary safety valve, but sometimes it becomes a loophole for resisting valid awards. Consent-based limits cause problems for modern multi-party business structures. Cost and delay can undermine arbitration's potential. These weaknesses do not mean that arbitration should be rejected, but rather that arbitration needs to be well managed, supported by a consistent judicial practice, and wisely linked to other ADR mechanisms, such as mediation. In the end, arbitration is not the contrary of law. It is a method which is dependent on law. International commercial law gives the rules that govern trade and arbitration is a reliable method of resolving disputes as to rules.

REFERENCES

United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (New York, 1958). (UNCITRAL)

UNCITRAL, UNCITRAL Secretariat Guide on the New York Convention (2016 edition). (UNCITRAL)

UNCITRAL, UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration (1985), with amendments as adopted in 2006. (UNCITRAL)

UNCITRAL, UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (including revisions noted by UNCITRAL). (UNCITRAL)

UNCITRAL, United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG) (adopted 1980; in force 1988). (UNCITRAL)

United Nations, Charter of the United Nations, Chapter VI (Pacific Settlement of Disputes), Article 33. (United Nations)

United Nations/UNCITRAL, United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation (Singapore Convention on Mediation). (UNCITRAL)

UNCITRAL, Model Law on International Commercial Mediation and International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation (2018). (UNCITRAL)

Parsons & Whittemore Overseas Co., Inc. v. Société Générale de l'Industrie du Papier (RAKTA), 508 F.2d 969 (2d Cir. 1974). (Justia)

Renusagar Power Co Ltd v. General Electric Company, Supreme Court of India (decision dated 7 October 1993). (Indian Kanoon)

Dallah Real Estate and Tourism Holding Company v. The Ministry of Religious Affairs, Government of Pakistan, UK Supreme Court [2010] UKSC 46 (Judgment 3 Nov 2010). (supremecourt.uk)

UNIDROIT, UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts (2016) – Overview. (UNIDROIT)