

Board of Peace: Selective Engagement with Global Peace Mechanisms: Why India Resists International Peace Oversight in the Context of Kashmir: A Comparative Study with Gaza Strip

Syed Rizwan Haider Bukhari ^{1*}

¹ PhD Scholar, Department of Political Science, Islamia College University Peshawar, Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.
Email: bukharipalmist@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: This paper discusses the selective involvement of India in international peace processes in the Kashmir conflict as compared and contrasted to international accountability in Gaza Strip. The paper is titled Board of Peace: Selective Engagement with Global Peace Mechanisms and evaluates how India and other countries have resisted third-party mediation, monitoring, or institutional supervision in Kashmir even though the country is actively involved in global peacekeeping. The study places the Indian position in the context of sovereignty-focused diplomacy, postcolonial integration, and nationalism based on security. The three major arguments underpinning the reasons why India has consistently opposed external intervention, especially by the United Nations, are constitutional incorporation of Jammu and Kashmir, the issue of territory integrity, and strategic reasons pertaining to Pakistan. In contrast, the government of Gaza is marked by a wide multilateral involvement and humanitarian surveillance. The comparative analysis highlights the structural asymmetries in international peace processes, which indicates the non-alignment doctrine of India and the asymmetrical relation in Gaza. This paper adds to arguments about sovereignty, humanitarian responsibility and international governance.

KEYWORDS: India, Kashmir, Gaza, Global Peace Mechanisms, Sovereignty, Humanitarian Accountability, International Oversight, Multilateral Diplomacy, Postcolonial Nationalism

Introduction

The idea of global board of peace is increasingly becoming institutionalized in a world where international standards of humanitarian protection, monitoring conflicts, and multilateral mediation are increasingly being developed through mechanisms of fact-finding missions, peacekeeping operations, human rights monitoring agencies, and special envoys. The reaction of states to such mechanisms is asymmetric, however. Some are extensively internationalized and put under long term institutional and diplomatic control, yet some are fiercely closed with domestic sovereignty. This paper discusses this asymmetry using the example of Kashmir, and how that has always been the case with India refusing to allow international control over the peace situation in the region and the means in which this approach can be contrasted with the Gaza Strip which has been highly internationalized (Mustafa & Elahi, 2025).

Pages: 135 – 143

Volume: 5

Issue: 1 (2026)

Corresponding Author

Syed Rizwan Haider Bukhari

✉ bukharipalmist@gmail.com

Cite this Article: Bukhari, S. R. H. (2026). Board of Peace: Selective Engagement with Global Peace Mechanisms: Why India Resists International Peace Oversight in the Context of Kashmir: A Comparative Study with Gaza Strip. *The Regional Tribune*, 5(1), 135-143.

<https://doi.org/10.55737/trt/v-i.211>

Since the partitioning of British India in 1947, Kashmir has been among the most arduous matters of conflict between India and Pakistan, which has produced wars, militarization, insurgency and a long tradition of diplomatic aggravation. Although the case went to the United Nations in 1948, over the years India shifted to outright denial of any third-party intervention and demanded bilateral resolution within the framework of the Simla Agreement and characterizing the definition of the problem as a national constitutional one. Following the 2019 abrogation of Article 370, New Delhi places the events in Jammu and Kashmir in the framework of administrative choices, which are to be freely made, with no foreign observation mission, mediation offer, or human rights investigation. This is contrary to the fact that India is, otherwise, a prolific country in the body of peace keeping and international governance in the United Nations which raises serious questions on the selectivity of engagement (Adejumo & Chiwar, 2025).

Gaza Strip is a high-involvement conflict space, as compared to other regions. UN resolutions, humanitarian surveillance by international bodies, and intervention by regional and world powers have been repeated in the Israeli-Palestinian unrest and particularly in the happenings in Gaza. The politics, the lack of harmony in governance and the controversy surrounding the sovereignty of Gaza have offered conditions whereby the international surveillance machine is far more evident and prevalent than in Kashmir. This contrast makes the additional research on why sovereignty, recognition, power imbalance, and geopolitical alignment, are drivers or barricadors of the world peace systems consumption (Kohl, 2025).

The paper puts the Indian resistance into the background of some of the greatest arguments in the field of international relations on sovereignty, an identity of postcolonial statehood, security nationalism, and norm diffusion. It asserts that, Indian policy is not accidental, otherwise it would be a planned policy whose basis relied on three interwoven logics to retain the territorial integrity, bar internationalization making the bargaining power alter toward Pakistan, and preserve the precedent against external scrutiny of domestic war zones. At the same time, the comparison of Gaza demonstrates the lack of equality of using international peace mechanisms, which were mediated by the question of statehood, alliances politics, and the context of the distribution of powers in the world (Almassri, 2025).

The given study tries to go beyond the normative evaluation of intervention or non-intervention through the parallel political structure and focus on the structural and strategic justification of selective engagement. The paper by comparing Kashmir and Gaza belongs to broader scholarly arguments on the sovereign power and international obligations in unresolved conflicts, limits of multilateral peace build, and the ability of multilateralism to execute its mission (Mamoon & Pilot, 2025).

Literature Review

International peace mechanisms and international governing literature, sovereignty and resistance to foreign governance theories, Kashmir and Gaza Strip conflicts literature are interrelated disciplines of scholarship that are of importance in this study. Both of these bodies of work lead to a unified idea of what conceptual and empirical foundation of the analysis of selective participation by states in international peace architectures or their resistance (Zhang & Jiang, 2025).

The analyses of international peace processes document the progressive rise of the number of world governance systems since the mid-way of the twentieth century the United Nations system in particular. According to peacekeeping and conflict resolution experts, there is a new lifestyle of multilateral monitoring missions, special envoys, human rights rapporteurs, and mediation systems in dealing with a long sieved conflict situation. Studies by Roland Paris, Michael Doyle among others outline the liberal paradigm of the peace, that interconnects the

international oversight to the democratization, the institution building and the human rights protection. Although this is happening, scholarship critique projects the ineffectiveness of these mechanisms beyond host-state permission, operating geopolitics in the Security Council and application of norms unequally across different regions. This literature validates that the international participation in peace is not a neutral or automatic process, but rather power politics and an institutional inhibition provoke it (Chidozie et al., 2025).

To this end, the theoretical debates on sovereignty and non-intervention also provide significant insight on the motivation behind state antagonism to external intervention. A powerful conception of sovereignty, which has been formulated by Stephen Krasner, draughts the international legal sovereignty and domestic sovereignty, whereby the states may technically belong to international institutions and, in a technical sense, exercise jurisdiction over the internal politics. Constructivist and postcolonial critics also accuse that the backlash against the oversight is predominantly a consequence of the share of experience of the imperial oppression, the sense of deliberation to the external offenses of the territorial integrity. The sovereignty is not merely a principle to most postcolonial states, but also a symbol of a hard-won independence. In this respect, the international surveillance can be delivered as an infringing of the local power, particularly when these alterations are linked with the human rights charges or the offers of mediation. The literature suggests that resistance can be ideational and strategic to a large extent and is conditioned by the narratives of identity and the process of state-building (Dewan & Badol, 2025).

The origins of the Kashmir conflict and its evolution are researched a lot in the context of South Asia. The historical record goes back to the accession of the princely state in 1947 and additional involvements of the United Nations towards ceasefire would then follow and resolutions would then call out plebiscite. Politic Science studies focus on how India is gradually transforming to be bilateral especially since the 1972 Simla Accord as well as its uprising that Kashmir is not being left out in India. Physiocratic savants have traced the interplay of insurgency, militarization and constitutional politics in region, albeit since 2019, with the repeal of Article 370. Human rights approach research helps to illuminate in making claims of mistreatments, hindering communication, reducing civil rights and primarily holding the practice into question by the international community. However, in as much as this literature documents the diplomatic position and national governance styles employed by India, it never puts the adversity of India in a broader comparative framework of a selective player to the world peace mechanisms.

On the contrary Gaza Strip literature takes an initiative to emphasise the entanglement of the international action in the case of Israeli-Palestinian dilemma. Gaza is usually viewed as a hyper-internationalized war front where the acts of humanitarian crisis, inquiry missions, and diplomatic encroachments all transpire. Such studies as Sara Roy and Nathan Brown speak about the example of governance fragmentation, politics of blockade and the efforts of the international agencies to sustain humanitarian infrastructure. Legal studies are associated with the problem of occupation, self-determination and application of the international humanitarian law. It is also contrasting to that of the Kashmir since status of the controversial statehood in Gaza, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in general, has become one of the subjects of multilateral interested attention and more and more debates at the UN and even under the international control system. This diversity points to the distinction of the effectiveness of global peace mechanisms across conflict situations (Jain, 2025).

There is very little comparative scholarship over Kashmir and Gaza. Although the two areas are often utilized in rhetoric in political discourse, none of the academic endeavors have done much of a comparative study on the degree and nature of international control in a systematic fashion. The trends of insurgency, securitization or identity politics are how the existing comparative conflict studies are directed, as opposed to involvement in world peace architecture. Accordingly, there exist no awareness on how such structural factors perceived statehood, geopolitical alliance, and

power asymmetries in the region can determine a degree of acceptance or imposition or opposition to international mechanisms (Domi & Lata, 2025).

Overall, the literature demonstrates that global peace systems are designed to work within a multi-dimensional cage consisting of sovereignty and power politics and normative competition. But it has failed to sufficiently seek the mechanism of selective engagement: why a nation that is a devoted actor in the UN peacekeeping as well as multilateral diplomacies is so obstinate of international inquiry in Kashmir, when other war zones in the world living in an air of global control systems comprise Gaza. The suggested means of bridging this gap is to unite theories of sovereignty and postcolonial statehood with a systematic comparison of Kashmir and Gaza which will also be a contribution to broader discourses of the politics of international peace governance (Ozdemir, 2025).

Research Methodology

The study uses qualitative comparative case study design to explain selective participation in global peace mechanisms based in Kashmir and the Gaza Strip. Without assuming much difference between the regions, a most-similar systems approach is applied where the two regions are considered as protracted territorial conflicts that could be compared in terms of why one is resistant to international supervision and why the other is highly internationalized. Primary sources of information include official policy publications, UN resolutions and the academic literature. The paper also analyses how sovereignty and territorial integrity are being discussed as applied to Kashmir; especially in UN forums and compares it to the humanitarian approach to Gaza. Selective engagement is measured in terms of international missions of monitoring, multilateral debates, human rights observer access and third party mediating activities. The approach includes a synthesis of realist (strategic security interests) and constructivist (sovereignty and postcolonial identity), thus offering a systematic approach as to why India opposes international control of peace in Kashmir as opposed to Gaza.

Discussion

When compared to the Gaza Strip, the selective interaction with the global peace mechanisms in Kashmir is not only reactive but an outcome of intricate relationships between the norms of sovereignty, the concept of strategy, the sphere of historical memory, and the geopolitics. With a combination of realist, constructivist, postcolonial and institutional approaches, it becomes possible to observe a subtle picture of how India rejects the responsibility of global peace (Mirkooshesh & Safa, 2013).

Realistically, India has its position based on security issues. Kashmir is perceived to be a central national security concern of India, as it is connected to its own national rivalry with Pakistan, and interregional deterrence relations. The yielding to international mediation might diffuse the leverage of India, globalize the bilateral conflicts, and establish precedence of external observation in other vulnerable areas. Conversely, the lack of consolidated state control has resulted in continued multilateral intervention because the political division and asymmetry between Israel and Palestine in Gaza gave way to easier coordination (Majumdar & Bose, 2020).

Constructivist approach underlines that the sovereignty is a socially constructed and historically placed phenomenon. In the case of India, Kashmir is defined as a part of the Union and since the abrogation of Article 370 in 2019, India strengthened its statement that the events in Kashmir are local. India is based on non-intervention and bilateralism, which opposes international supervision as unendowed in UN forums. The debate on Gaza on the other hand is often dominated by the issues of occupation, humanitarian crisis, and self-determination which justify global intervention. In this way, material realities are identified as the determinants of the internationalization of conflicts, alongside the existing normative frameworks (Yousefi et al., 2026).

About the postcolonial standpoint, India is resistant to interference in Kashmir because the Indian people are sensitive to outside interference based on the history of India. India is a postcolonial country, and it quite appreciates strategic autonomy, which can be traced to the tradition of the Non-Aligned Movement. Opposition to oversight is considered one of the defenses of postcolonial sovereignty against perceived neo-imperialism in the international rule. On the other hand, Gaza lacks a fully recognized status and lacks a state, which creates the opportunity to involve more outside forces, particularly on a humanitarian agenda (Graduate et al., 2025).

At an institutional level, the international peace machinery is affected by the State consent, Security Council politics and geopolitical orientations. Like a great power in the region, India has power to stand against foreign imposition in Kashmir. On the contrary, Gaza has been the scene of repeat resolutions and negotiations, because of her symbolic significance of international politics and disrupted governmental composition. It highlights the idea that global peace machinery is still not working equally, guided by influences of power relationships and political practicability (Choraria, 2025).

The issue is even more complicated with references to human rights. Both advocacy groups demand monitoring in both Gaza and Kashmir, and its efficacy is based on the possibility of access and political circumstances. There is limited international intervention in Kashmir due to limited accessibility and the framing of the conflict by international intervention as internal security. Humanitarian agencies have a more established presence in Gaza despite the obstacles, and it emphasizes the way the normative pressures merge with the political opportunity structures (Othman, 2025).

The comparative analysis also brings out the fact that selective engagement is not identical to isolationism. India engages in global peace keeping but is opposed to international control in Kashmir meaning that involvement in international peace mechanisms is not structured generally but rather issue specific. States can have multilateralism in their interest and oppose it when it poses a threat to their territorial claim or their own internal control. Thus, the Board of Peace is also used to form a debatable space in which sovereignty, legitimacy and power are negotiated (Luckham, 2025).

Summing up, the unwillingness of India to allow international peace to oversee Kashmir is rooted in the hardcore and strategic security factors, the individual postcolonial sovereignty discourses, institutional power relations, and geopolitical alliances. The comparison with Gaza underlines how the distinctions in the statehood and international politics conditions determine the extent and structure of International relations. Through a multidimensional theoretical framework, this research is able to show that the tendency to selectively engage with the global peace mechanisms is a structural tendency of the international system rather than an idiosyncratic phenomenon that is limited to certain conflicts (Kozman & Cozma, 2025).

Findings and Analysis

The comparative assessment of Kashmir and the Gaza Strip generate several key findings regarding selective engagement with global peace mechanisms.

- ▶ The opposition of India towards the international oversight on peace in Kashmir is essentially a sovereignty issue. Even when half of the 2019 revocation of Article 370 was made to take effect, India only describes Kashmir as an internal constitutional issue. Through redefining the administrative and legal status of the region in the Union related to external mediation or monitoring India has limited the normative space of conducting the same. Interaction with institutions associated with the United Nations is precisely calculated: On the one hand, India extensively takes part in peacekeeping processes of the United Nations in many countries, and on

the other, India refuses to take part in third-party mediation in Kashmir. This implies that sovereignty is only selectively applied in cases where territorial integrity and internal political control are seen as threatened.

- ▶ The second important discovery is strategic bilateralism used as a mechanism of containment. India underlines that the bilateral dialogue on the conflicts connected with Kashmir is to be used, citing documents as the Simla Agreement. This approach restricts internationalization and avoids the situation when external players influence the conditions of the negotiations. Bilateralism therefore serves as a building block to prevent the creation of precedent regulation that would interfere with internal battalion or undermine deterrence in South Asia.
- ▶ The comparison to Gaza shows that the level of international supervision is positively associated with the statehood and power imbalance. The fractured administrative division and disputed statehood in Gaza have allowed intensive international involvement, such as humanitarian surveillance, frequent UN discussions and investigative trips. In contrast with India, the governments in Gaza lack centralized international jurisprudence or similar geopolitical power. The most strident mechanisms of global peace in Gaza can be exemplified by limited state capacity or non-recognition, and the most prudent where powerful states find ways of evading the international process.
- ▶ According to discourse analysis, the discourse surrounding every conflict determines the way to engage internationally. In Kashmir, India presents the problem as part of counterterrorism and internal security and diminishes the perceived legitimacy of international surveillance. The prevailing discourses in Gaza focus on occupation, humanitarian crises and self-determination, which reinforce the concept of moral and legal legitimacy in monitoring. The results indicate that the international systems of peace are attentive to both material reality as well as to the terms of the normative construction of conflicts in international discourse.
- ▶ The attitude of India is not a negligent attitude towards multilateralism; it is an attitude of selective multilateralism. India is also among the largest donor countries to peacekeeping operations of UN and a participant in international governance platforms. In Kashmir therefore, the resistance is issue-based, not systemic. This highlights the point that states make distinctions between the arenas where multilateral engagement can be used to boost international standing and those arenas where it jeopardizes core sovereignty claims.
- ▶ The rest of the analysis leads to the larger general conclusion that the so-called Board of Peace is a structurally skewed entity. There is no standardized international peace oversight, but instead it is subjected to power hierarchies, geopolitical alliances, or even the approval of well-known states. Kashmir and Gaza depict opposite points of this scale. In Kashmir the sovereign and regionally dominant state serve well to restrict the international surveillance and in Gaza, disputed sovereignty and geopolitical rivalry generate enduring international intervention.

Conclusion

This paper finds that selective participation in international peace mechanisms is a structural characteristic of the modern international politics influenced more by the status of sovereignty, geopolitical advantage, normative clarification, and institutional power relationship than the level of confrontation. The lack of international control in Kashmir by India can be traced back to a sovereign-based decision making process whereby strategic security imperatives, bilateral commitments and postcolonial imperatives are the forces at work. India has maintained a rigid stance in internationalizing Kashmir in the UN forums as an internal constitutional issue to preserve the territorial control and sovereignty. Conversely, the broken rule and controversial statehood in Gaza allow long term international intervention, as humanitarian and occupation discourses allow the external surveillance and intervention of the interveners. The absence of this gap highlights the varied usage of global peace instruments as

policing becomes dependent on the appeal and capacity of politics, not normative parity. Finally, sovereignty becomes a determining factor by which international supervision is embraced and opposed, which underlines a clash of interests between territorial integrity and international responsibility in the case of prolonged conflicts. This study gets into a wider discussion of global governance through a case of Kashmir and Gaza, demonstrating how structural inequalities and preferences of states influence both the boundaries and possibilities of intervention by a state to obtain peace.

Recommendations

Considering the comparison of the Kashmir situation and the situation in Gaza Strip, the following proposals may be employed to reconcile the problems of sovereignty with the need to deliver effective peace and accountability tools in the framework of the broader Board of Peace.

- ▶ **Additional Promote Sovereignty-Sensitive Oversight Paradigms:** The actors are foreign nation actors and are to devise less authoritarian more alliance-based overseeing structures, particularly under the system and structure of the United Nations. When it comes to resistance to other states like India, the fear of precedence and independence is normally the cause. Tacit diplomacy, technical support missions and usually planned review mechanisms would be more friendly than external monitoring/fact finding missions forced.
- ▶ **Encourage Bilateral-Plus Systems:** As India has been categorically engaged in bilateralism in the Kashmir case, it may be advisable to explore a bilateral-plus strategy. It would keep it as the main negotiating contact between those with interests in this but allow some other mutually consensual technical facilitation (e.g. humanitarian coordination, confidence-building verification). These blend structures reduce the fears on internationalization but maximize transparency and trust.
- ▶ **Empower Domicile Accountability Humans:** One solution to this call of having international oversight in place is strengthening credible domestic institutions. Independent human rights commissions, judicial reviews and open Kashmir based grievance redressing would improve internal legitimacy besides reducing the external pressure. Domestic accountability is sufficient and need not be subject to international intervention.
- ▶ **Decouple Humanitarian Engagement:** Gaza demonstrates that international intervention can be inspired by the heights and lows of humanity. Both cases require humanitarian access and development to be decoupled to more geopolitical conflicts. Observed apparent difference between political mediation and humanitarian observation may reduce incidences of resistance among sovereign states while weakening the safety of civilians.
- ▶ **Normalize International Supervision Standards:** Among the structural issues which have surfaced in the analogy is absence of consistency in application of global peace mechanisms. UN and its auxiliary organizations must also establish certain more concrete universal guidelines as to when monitoring missions or fact-finding investigations should begin. Clear standards would reduce perceptions of discrimination and bias and increase legitimacy.
- ▶ **Support Regional Dialogue Platforms:** Regional organizations can complement global institutions and informal forums of diplomatic action. Track II discussions between civil society and international security practitioners on the basis of confidence-building steps and dialogues in South Asia would contribute to relieving tensions, without internationalization. Similarly, increased regional participation in the Middle Eastern Diplomacy would instigate more balanced control systems in Gaza.
- ▶ **A Restructure of Collaborate with Cooperative Governance:** Players in world politics should never talk of intervention, they should talk of cooperative governance. Capacity-building partnerships as a watchdog tool rather than a state may be acceptable to states that value their sovereignty. The positive engagement that values territorial integrity and respects the humanitarian concerns is more likely to be successful.

References

- Adejumo, T., & Yakubu Chiwar, G. (2025). Comparative study of different intervention models in peace building. *Global Journal of Social Sciences*, 24(1), 111-117. <https://doi.org/10.4314/gjss.v24i1.11>
- Chidozie, F., Osimen, G., Osimen, U., Newo, M., & Bhadmus, J. (2025). Global Peace in a Multiregional International System. *African Renaissance*, 22, 97–113. <https://doi.org/10.31920/2516-5305/2025/22n3a5>
- Choraria, D. (2025). The Role of Women in Peace-Making: Global Perspective and the Indian Context. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, 12(10), 2770–2772. <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.1210000237>
- Dewan, R., & Badol, M. H. A. R. (2025). Governance of global peace and security through the international courts: Serving a holistic purpose or maintaining hegemony? *International Journal of Law*, 11(3), 132–138. <https://www.lawjournals.org/assets/archives/2025/vol11issue3/11063.pdf>
- Domi, I., & Lata, K. (2025). Israel-Palestine conflict: A retrospective analysis from origins to the present day and prospects for the future. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development*, 12(1 S1), 71. <https://doi.org/10.56345/ijrdv12n1s109>
- Majumdar, A. J., & Bose, S. (2020). Geopolitics, conflicts and peace. In *Peace and Conflict Studies* (pp. 83-96). Routledge India.
- Graduate, P., Dargahi, M., Nasrallah, Khosrowabadi, J., & Quarterly, G. (2025). The Role of Peace Courts as a Novel Institution in Reducing the Burden on the Judicial System: A Comparative Study of Successful International Models. 121. <https://doi.org/10.22034/judg.2025.2048415.1360>
- Jain, A. (2025). Is peace in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip possible? A historical and comparative analysis. *Galore International Journal of Applied Sciences and Humanities*, 9(3), 138-142. <https://doi.org/10.52403/gijash.20250314>
- Kohl, I. (2025). Cybersecurity and the Future of Global Peace: International Norms for Digital Conflict Prevention. *International Journal of Technology, Management and Humanities*, 11(04), 49-57. <https://ijtmh.com/index.php/ijtmh/article/view/216>
- Kozman, C., & Cozma, R. (2025). War and peace journalism in the 2023 Israel–Gaza war: A comparative analysis of the headlines of five international news agencies. *International Communication Gazette*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17480485251397756>
- Luckham, R. (2025). War and peace in Ukraine and in Gaza: A comparative analysis. Springer Nature Switzerland. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-92151-3>
- Mamoon, D., & Pilot, M. (2025). *Echoes of Unity: Patriotism, Peace, and the Promise of Pakistan*.
- Mirkoushesh, A. H., & Nouri Safa, S. (2013). Ontology of international peace in the context of Iranian culture of tolerance and peace. *Quarterly Journal of Strategic Studies*, 22(68), 7-38.
- Mustafa, S., & Elahi, F. (2025). Assessing the role of international organizations in restraining states from war and promoting global peace and security. *Bangladesh Journal of Administration and Management*, 37(2). <https://doi.org/10.56379/bjam.v37i2.93>
- Almassri, A. (2025). Decolonizing links between international scholarships and peace: Insights from a critical realist study in Palestine. *Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education*, 17(3), 39-44. <https://doi.org/10.32674/2wek3197>

- Othman, A. (2025). *Trump and Gaza: Why the board of peace is designed to fail civilians*. Unpublished. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.15045.31205>
- Özdemir, F. (2025). Jerusalem as a global issue and analysis of Hazrat Umar's Jerusalem covenant/al-amān in the context of its contribution to global peace. *Journal of The Near East University Islamic Research Center*, 11(1), 144-160. <https://doi.org/10.32955/neu.istem.2025.11.1.07>
- Yousefi, R., Jafari Pabandi, S. F., & Zolqadr, M. (2026). The role of international relations and international law scholars in advancing global peace and security. *Journal of Historical Research, Law and Policy*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.61838/jhrlp.162>
- Zhang, Y., & Jiang, X. (2025). From an international perspective, China's ideological and political education plays a major role in promoting global peace and development. *Journal of Innovation and Development*, 10(2), 12-16. <https://doi.org/10.54097/qpwr4m27>