

# Reconciliation-Facilitation Mechanisms in China's Dispute Management: Evolution, Challenges, and Reform Pathways

Yuanyuan Niu<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Law School, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China

\*Corresponding Author: Niu Yuanyuan

**Abstract:** In contemporary society, reconciliation-promoting mechanisms have emerged as efficient and harmonious methods for resolving disputes. These systems, driven by the development of core legal frameworks, innovative mechanisms, cross-regional cooperation, and technological advancements, are gradually becoming institutionalized. However, the growth and effectiveness of reconciliation mechanisms face significant challenges, including institutional fragmentation, cultural crises, technological disruptions, and legislative lag. These challenges complicate the resolution process and undermine the fairness and efficiency of conflict mediation. This paper explores these issues by examining the dual impacts of urbanization and social structural changes on reconciliation, the tension between technology and human-centered communication, and the limitations posed by fragmented institutions and delayed legislative updates. It further proposes solutions such as legislative integration, cultural revitalization, and the balancing of technology with human empathy to ensure the continued success and development of reconciliation mechanisms. This paper aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the barriers to reconciliation system advancement and offer recommendations for their improvement, contributing to the creation of a more harmonious society.

**Keywords:** Reconciliation Mechanisms, Institutional Fragmentation, Cultural Crisis, Technological Disruptions, Legislative Lag, Dispute Resolution, Social Harmony, Mediation, Urbanization, Legal Frameworks.

## 1. Introduction

In today's rapidly evolving world, reconciliation mechanisms have gained significant attention as efficient and harmonious dispute resolution methods. As societies modernize, these mechanisms are increasingly institutionalized, driven by legal frameworks, innovative strategies, cross-regional collaborations, and the integration of advanced technologies. However, despite their promising potential, reconciliation-promoting systems face numerous challenges that hinder their development and effectiveness. These challenges include institutional fragmentation, cultural crises, technological disruptions, and legislative lag, all of which impact the effectiveness of reconciliation efforts in addressing social conflicts. This paper explores these challenges in-depth, highlighting the tension between technological advancements and the preservation of human-centered mediation approaches, the importance of cultural preservation amidst societal shifts, and the role of legislation in standardizing and coordinating reconciliation processes. Furthermore, it proposes strategies and solutions aimed at enhancing the efficiency, fairness, and inclusivity of reconciliation mechanisms, ensuring that they remain effective tools in building a more harmonious society. Through examining these aspects, the paper seeks to contribute to the ongoing dialogue on optimizing dispute resolution systems in a complex and ever-changing global context.

## 2. Institutional Development of Reconciliation-Facilitation Mechanisms

### 2.1. Historical Foundations

Resolving disputes through reconciliation has been the main theme in China's dispute resolution history. This practice emerged from a deep cultural foundation and long-standing social practice, evolving through different dynasties and gradually forming a unique system. The tradition of reconciliation was evident as early as the feudal era, as seen in the promotion of the "village covenants" system during the Song dynasty and the "clan leader mediation" in the Ming and Qing periods, both reflecting the Confucian idea of valuing harmony. With the establishment of modern legal systems, reconciliation mechanisms gradually integrated with rule of law, forming today's diversified dispute resolution system.

One historical foundation of reconciliation-oriented mechanisms can indeed be traced back to the "he-li" system in the Tang Dynasty's "Tang Lü Shu Yi" (Tang Code and its Commentaries). "He-li" was a legal provision in ancient China allowing couples to voluntarily divorce through mutual agreement, first appearing in the Tang Code: "If a couple cannot live in harmony and agree to separate, they shall not be punished." This means that if a couple could not get along, they could divorce by mutual consent without legal consequences. As a practice, "he-li" existed from the pre-Qin to the Han period but remained outside the orthodox divorce rules based on family and clan obligations. In the medieval period, influenced by Buddhist thoughts such as "causes and conditions" and "karmic retribution," Chinese social views on marriage changed. In the ninth year of Emperor Xiaowen of the Northern Wei (A.D. 483), an imperial edict marked the

official legitimacy of "he-li," which was later codified in the Tang Code and inherited by subsequent dynasties.

The establishment of the "he-li" rule broke with the traditional rites and laws, elevating marriage from family and clan obligations to a union based on mutual affection. It allowed for the dissolution of marriage through mutual agreement, representing a historical advancement and laying a foundation for later reconciliation-oriented mechanisms. [1]

The Song dynasty's "Wu Xian Fa" (Agricultural Period Laws) was another important historical foundation for reconciliation-oriented mechanisms. [2] This was a judicial system introduced in the Song dynasty that prohibited civil litigation during busy farming seasons to avoid disrupting agricultural production. The period lasted from the first day of the second lunar month to the thirtieth day of September. During this "Wu Xian" period, local officials were not to accept civil cases such as land disputes, debts, or rents. However, conflicts during this period had to be resolved through reconciliation, allowing agricultural production to resume promptly. Furthermore, Song officials often emphasized mediation when dealing with civil disputes, guiding the parties to resolve issues harmoniously, thus promoting reconciliation. Therefore, "Wu Xian Fa" provided a historical foundation for reconciliation-oriented mechanisms and demonstrated the wisdom of Song law in maintaining social stability and promoting agricultural development.

The Ming dynasty's "Sheng Ming Ting" (Enlightenment Pavilion) system is another key historical foundation for reconciliation mechanisms. [3] Established by Emperor Zhu Yuanzhang in the fifth year of the Hongwu era (1372), the system aimed to educate the public, promote good conduct, and resolve disputes in rural areas. The system designated respected elders in each village to mediate minor disputes. These elders not only mediated but also regularly read and explained laws, such as the "Great Edict" and the "Ming Code," to ensure everyone understood the law and feared breaking it. "Sheng Ming Ting" helped address common issues like excessive litigation, achieving its goal of "encouraging people to do good and stopping lawsuits," which contributed to social stability. Moreover, it had the function of legal education and moral guidance, representing an effective grassroots governance method. From a modern perspective, the mediation mechanism embodied in "Sheng Ming Ting," which emphasizes reconciliation and harmony and focuses on the parties' autonomy and voluntariness, is similar to modern reconciliation mechanisms. Thus, the Ming "Sheng Ming Ting" system provides a significant historical foundation and valuable lessons for today's reconciliation-oriented mechanisms.

In the People's Republic of China, the promotion of Ma Xiwu's method of adjudication and the establishment of the mediation system further solidified the historical foundation for reconciliation mechanisms. Ma Xiwu, a prominent figure in the Shanxi-Gansu-Ningxia border region during the Anti-Japanese War, pioneered a set of judicial practices that were people-friendly, including investigating cases among the people, simplifying procedures, and combining adjudication with mediation. This method also emphasized a conversational, non-formal approach to trials. Ma's approach became widely popular after the founding of the People's Republic of China and laid the foundation for reconciliation mechanisms. The mediation system, officially incorporated into the legal framework after the founding of New China,

became an important method for resolving civil disputes. It emphasizes bringing the parties to understand each other and reach a mutual agreement, being flexible and efficient in reducing court workload while contributing to social harmony.

In conclusion, the promotion of Ma Xiwu's adjudication methods and the implementation of the mediation system laid a solid foundation for the development of modern reconciliation-oriented mechanisms in China. Both emphasized reconciliation and mediation, reflecting the essence of traditional Chinese culture while aligning with the modern spirit of the rule of law.

## 2.2. Contemporary Institutionalization

In contemporary society, reconciliation has emerged as an efficient and harmonious method of dispute resolution, and it is gradually becoming institutionalized. This trend is supported by a variety of factors, including the enactment of core laws, innovation in mechanisms, cross-regional cooperation, and the empowerment of technology. These elements collectively contribute to the establishment of reconciliation as a more structured and recognized approach to resolving conflicts in society.

Firstly, the enactment of core laws has laid a solid foundation for the institutionalization of reconciliation. The People's Mediation Law of the People's Republic of China, promulgated in 2010, has clearly defined the legal status and procedures for mediation, providing a solid legal framework for reconciliation. This law has not only standardized the mediation process but also enhanced the credibility and enforceability of mediation agreements. Between 2010 and 2015, the execution rate of mediation agreements has seen a remarkable increase, rising from 48% to 82%, demonstrating the effectiveness of this legal framework in promoting reconciliation.

Secondly, the innovation of mechanisms has been a significant driving force behind the institutionalization of reconciliation. The "litigation-mediation connection" (诉调对接) mechanism is a prime example of such innovation. In terms of procedural integration, Article 122 of the Civil Procedure Law provides legal support for pre-litigation mediation, facilitating the seamless connection between mediation and litigation. This has streamlined the process of dispute resolution and has made it more efficient. In 2023, the number of mediation cases referred by national courts reached an impressive 8.7 million. [4] Furthermore, the exchange of personnel has greatly enhanced mediation efficiency. For instance, in a pilot program in Shanghai, the success rate of mediation increased by 18 percentage points by employing retired judges as mediators. [5] This innovative approach leverages the expertise of experienced legal professionals to enhance the quality and success rate of mediation.

Furthermore, cross-regional cooperation has further expanded the application of reconciliation. For example, the 2022 mutual recognition mechanism for mediator qualifications across the Yangtze River Delta region (comprising three provinces and one city) has significantly reduced the time required to mediate cross-province disputes to just 14 days. [6] This mechanism has made it easier for parties in different regions to resolve their disputes efficiently. Similarly, after the implementation of the "dual mediator" system in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area, the settlement rate of Hong Kong and Macao-related cases increased from 39% to 68%. [7] This cross-regional cooperation has not only improved the efficiency and quality

of dispute resolution but also provided more comprehensive and professional legal services for the parties involved, ensuring that disputes are resolved in a manner that is both fair and expedient.

Finally, the empowerment of technology has given wings to the institutionalization of reconciliation. With the continuous development of information technology, more and more technological tools have been applied in mediation practices. For example, some regions have built online mediation platforms that enable remote mediation and online judicial confirmation, greatly improving the convenience and efficiency of mediation. These platforms allow parties to participate in mediation sessions from anywhere, breaking down geographical barriers and making mediation more accessible. Additionally, the application of big data, artificial intelligence, and other technologies has made smart and precise reconciliation possible. These technologies can analyze vast amounts of data to identify patterns and predict outcomes, providing mediators with valuable insights and enabling more informed decision-making.

The gradual institutionalization of reconciliation is the result of the combined efforts of core laws, mechanism innovation, cross-regional cooperation, and technology empowerment. These factors have collectively contributed to the establishment of reconciliation as a more structured and recognized approach to resolving conflicts in society. In the future, as these factors continue to develop and improve, reconciliation will play an even more important role in various fields, contributing more to the creation of a harmonious society. It is expected that reconciliation will become an integral part of the legal and social fabric, fostering a culture of understanding, cooperation, and peaceful resolution of disputes.

### 2.3. Cultural Embeddedness

The development of reconciliation-promoting mechanisms in contemporary Chinese society is mainly reflected in the following two aspects:

Confucian ethics emphasizes the core values of benevolence (仁), righteousness (义), propriety (礼), wisdom (智), and trustworthiness (信). These values continue to have a profound influence in modern society. In reconciliation-promoting mechanisms, Confucian ethics of benevolence is reflected in the sympathy and understanding shown towards both parties in conflict, advocating for harmony and seeking consensus through communication and negotiation. Modern practice of Confucian ethics further includes the operationalization of the principle harmony is the most important (和为贵) and the procedural expression of the Doctrine of the Mean (中庸).

Operationalization of "Harmony is the Most Important" means that, in the actual reconciliation process, both parties should adhere to the principle of prioritizing harmony, aiming to avoid escalation of conflict, and reaching a mutually beneficial reconciliation agreement through active dialogue and compromise.

Procedural Expression of "The Doctrine of the Mean" refers to offering tiered solutions in the reconciliation process, with flexible terms such as "appropriate compensation" and "reasonable deadlines" in mediation agreements. This ensures both parties' interests are protected while leaving room for flexibility.

The "*Fengqiao Experience*" has become a model for dispute resolution in contemporary China and is further

spreading across the country due to its practical success. In Zhuji City, Zhejiang Province, the establishment of a "petition runner" system transformed petition cases into mediation matters, reducing the rate of repeated petitions by 74%. [8] Each community grid is equipped with one full-time mediator and five volunteers, achieving a "grid-based mediation" system where disputes are responded to within 15 minutes. [9] This is both an extension of the "*Fengqiao Experience*" and a concrete practice of embedding culture into reconciliation-promoting mechanisms.

Furthermore, judicial democratization is also an important manifestation of the integration of socialist rule of law. Judicial democratization means that the adjudicating body is not limited to professional judges, but also includes ordinary citizens, allowing the recognition of individual rights to align with the will of the majority. However, this does not imply that justice is detached from the framework of law, but rather that, within the legal framework, through the principles of judicial independence and technical operations by professional judges, individual demands are connected with the will of the people via institutional means and mediation. True judicial democratization lies in the discovery and accumulation of new consensus through the adjudication of specific cases, translating the reasonable demands of individual parties, minorities, and vulnerable groups into the legal system through case law, gradually promoting institutional reforms.

The modern practice of Confucian ethics (including the operationalization of harmony is the most important and the procedural expression of the Doctrine of the Mean) and the integration of socialist rule of law are the two key manifestations of the development of China's reconciliation-promoting mechanisms today. They jointly contribute to resolving social conflicts and building a harmonious society, making a positive contribution to China's social stability and development.

## 3. Structural Challenges and Operational Deficiencies

### 3.1. Institutional Fragmentation

There is indeed an issue of institutional fragmentation in China's reconciliation-promoting mechanisms. This fragmentation is evident in several aspects, including the institutional system, government coordination, governance structure, and information resources. The institutional system, for instance, lacks unity and coordination, with reconciliation mechanisms varying significantly across different regions and departments. There are no unified standards or procedures in place, which creates numerous difficulties for parties seeking reconciliation. Such fragmentation in the system not only affects the efficiency of reconciliation but also undermines its fairness, leading to potential disparities in how disputes are resolved across different areas.

From the perspective of the institutional system, the reconciliation-promoting mechanisms lack unity and coordination. There are differences in reconciliation mechanisms across different regions and departments, with no unified standards or procedures. This creates numerous difficulties for parties seeking reconciliation. Such fragmentation in the system not only affects the efficiency of reconciliation but also undermines its fairness, as it leads to potential disparities in how disputes are resolved across different areas. This lack of uniformity can result in confusion

and frustration for those attempting to navigate the reconciliation process, as they may encounter different requirements and outcomes depending on where they are located.

Fragmentation also exists in government coordination. Government departments do not collaborate closely enough in reconciliation-promoting work, resulting in inefficient resource integration and poor information sharing. This weakens the government's role in promoting reconciliation and makes parties seeking government assistance feel confused and helpless. The lack of a cohesive approach to reconciliation efforts means that resources are not being utilized to their full potential, and the information that is shared is often outdated or incomplete, further complicating the reconciliation process for those involved.

Additionally, fragmentation in governance structures is an issue that cannot be ignored. The current reconciliation-promoting mechanism involves multiple governing entities, such as courts, administrative agencies, and social organizations. However, the division of responsibilities between these entities is unclear, and there is overlapping or redundant work. This not only leads to the waste of resources but also leaves parties uncertain when choosing reconciliation pathways. The confusion surrounding which entity is responsible for what aspect of the reconciliation process can result in delays and additional stress for those seeking resolution to their disputes.

Lastly, fragmentation of information resources also restricts the development of reconciliation-promoting mechanisms. Due to an imperfect information-sharing system, information cannot be transmitted and shared in a timely manner between different departments and agencies. As a result, parties seeking reconciliation are unable to obtain comprehensive and accurate information. This, to some extent, affects the smooth progress of reconciliation. The inability to access up-to-date and relevant information can lead to misinformed decisions and further complications in the reconciliation process, ultimately hindering the ability to reach a fair and satisfactory resolution.

### **3.2. Cultural Adaptation Crisis**

Reconciliation-promoting mechanisms in contemporary society indeed face many challenges, among which the cultural crisis is particularly prominent. This crisis manifests primarily in two aspects: the urban-rural adaptability gap and the generational gap, both of which pose significant obstacles to effective reconciliation.

There are significant cultural differences between urban and rural areas in terms of cultural inheritance, values, and lifestyles. Urban residents, having lived for a long time in an environment with a stronger legal atmosphere, tend to prefer litigation as a means of resolving disputes. They are more likely to focus on the fairness of legal procedures and the certainty of outcomes, making them more inclined to rely on legal measures to protect their rights. In contrast, rural residents may be more inclined to use traditional methods such as mediation and negotiation to resolve conflicts. They often place more importance on social relationships and local customs, and may feel unfamiliar or even resistant to the litigation process. This urban-rural divide further complicates efforts to promote reconciliation in diverse social contexts.

Additionally, the generational gap is another cultural crisis faced by reconciliation-promoting mechanisms. With the rapid development of society and continuous technological

advancements, there are noticeable differences between the younger and older generations in terms of values, ways of thinking, and behaviors. Young people tend to place more emphasis on individual rights and freedom, making them more likely to choose legal means, such as litigation, to protect their rights. On the other hand, the older generation may place greater importance on family harmony and neighborly relations, aligning more with traditional ideas, and may be more inclined to use methods like mediation and reconciliation to resolve disputes. This generational gap leads younger individuals to prefer litigation when facing conflicts, while older generations may lean toward traditional reconciliation methods. The resulting divide between generations can hinder effective communication and understanding, making it difficult to find common ground for reconciliation.

### **3.3. Technological Disruption**

Technological disruption has emerged as a formidable barrier to reconciliation-promoting mechanisms, posing two primary challenges that require careful consideration and strategic solutions:

On one hand, the older adult demographic and individuals from low-income backgrounds are encountering a notably higher failure rate when attempting to utilize online systems for the purpose of mediation. These particular groups may find themselves at a disadvantage due to insufficient technical skills, a struggle to adapt to emerging platforms, or restricted access to the necessary technology. This situation not only impedes their capacity to safeguard their own rights but also contributes to the exacerbation of social conflicts, as these individuals are less equipped to navigate and resolve disputes effectively.

On the other hand, virtual mediation suffers from the loss of approximately 80% of non-verbal cues that are essential for the establishment of trust. Non-verbal cues, which encompass a wide array of human communication elements such as facial expressions, body language, tone of voice, and gestures, are pivotal in conveying a wealth of emotional content. [10] They facilitate a deeper understanding of each party's intentions and feelings, which is crucial in any mediation process. However, within virtual environments, these non-verbal cues are significantly diminished, presenting a considerable challenge for mediators who operate in such settings. This attenuation of non-verbal communication not only compromises the efficacy of the mediation process but can also result in a higher incidence of misunderstandings and conflicts, further complicating the resolution of disputes.

## **4. Underlying Causes of Systemic Issues**

### **4.1. Legislative Lag**

The development of reconciliation-promoting mechanisms is indeed constrained by legislative delays and the lack of unified mediation rules to coordinate specific industry regulations. This situation has resulted in a significant impediment to the advancement of these mechanisms, which are designed to foster harmony and resolution in various sectors. The absence of a cohesive legislative framework and standardized mediation protocols has created a fragmented approach to reconciliation, complicating the efforts to establish a more coherent and effective system.

Legislative delays are primarily reflected in the insufficient

recognition and slow response to reconciliation-promoting mechanisms. In legislative work, past practices often focused more on the role of law in confirming the outcomes of reforms, rather than on its role in guiding and promoting reform, especially in terms of facilitating reconciliation. This has led to a lack of timely legal recognition and support for many new practices emerging from reforms, particularly those related to reconciliation-promoting mechanisms. Moreover, lawmakers often rely on policy documents with soft constraints to address new issues. However, these policy documents, lacking state enforcement power, are often difficult to implement effectively, thus limiting the development of reconciliation-promoting mechanisms. The legislative process, therefore, appears to be lagging behind the rapid pace of change and innovation in reconciliation practices, creating a gap that needs to be bridged to ensure that the law keeps up with the evolving needs of society.

The lack of unified mediation rules is also a key factor hindering the development of reconciliation-promoting mechanisms. Mediation rules in different industries and fields often vary or even contradict each other, making it difficult to standardize and normalize the mediation process. In the absence of unified mediation rules, mediators may face confusion when applying the rules to specific industry disputes, leading to low mediation efficiency and making it harder for the mediation results to be recognized by the parties involved. Furthermore, the lack of unified mediation rules restricts the promotion and application of reconciliation-promoting mechanisms across different industries and fields. This inconsistency not only complicates the resolution of disputes but also hampers the broader adoption of reconciliation practices, which could otherwise contribute significantly to conflict resolution and social cohesion.

## 4.2. Urbanization Acceleration

The rapid urbanization and social structural changes are complex social phenomena that have a dual impact on reconciliation-promoting dispute resolution mechanisms. Although there are some positive factors embedded within this process, we primarily emphasize the negative effects in this analysis. Below is an in-depth analysis of this viewpoint:

Urbanization, characterized by the swift transformation of rural areas into urban landscapes, has been accompanied by a surge in social structural changes. These changes, while presenting certain positive aspects, also carry with them a set of challenges that can negatively influence mechanisms designed to resolve disputes through reconciliation. The rapid urbanization process has indeed exacerbated social conflicts. As large populations move into cities, disparities in resource allocation, employment opportunities, and living conditions within the urban environment may become more pronounced. This inequality can lead to increased social conflicts and tensions, making reconciliation-promoting dispute resolution mechanisms face greater challenges in addressing these issues. At the same time, social structural changes such as career diversification, family nuclearization, and the weakening of community bonds may erode the reconciliation power found in traditional community relations, making reconciliation more difficult. [11]

Moreover, the fast-paced urbanization has brought about a concentration of diverse populations in limited spaces, often resulting in a mosaic of cultures and lifestyles. This diversity, while enriching the urban fabric, can also lead to misunderstandings and conflicts due to cultural differences.

The pressure cooker environment of cities can amplify these conflicts, making it harder for reconciliation-promoting mechanisms to operate effectively. Additionally, the social structural changes mentioned earlier, such as the rise of individualism and the weakening of community relations, may hinder the spread and popularization of reconciliation culture. The strengthening of individualism can lead people to focus more on personal interests, neglecting the collective good of the community and society, which undermines the formation and development of a reconciliation culture. At the same time, the detachment of community relationships may lead individuals to lean more toward formal dispute resolution methods like litigation, rather than alternative dispute resolution methods like reconciliation.

Furthermore, the rapid urbanization has also led to the creation of sprawling urban slums and informal settlements, where the lack of basic amenities and services can fuel social unrest and conflict. The strain on urban infrastructure and services can also lead to a breakdown in the social fabric, making it challenging for reconciliation-promoting mechanisms to function effectively. In conclusion, the negative effects of accelerated urbanization and social structural changes on reconciliation-promoting dispute resolution mechanisms cannot be ignored. These changes may lead to intensified social conflicts, weakened reconciliation efforts, and hindered cultural dissemination of reconciliation. Therefore, in the face of these challenges, it is essential to explore and innovate reconciliation-promoting dispute resolution mechanisms to meet the needs of societal development. Additionally, governments, social organizations, and individuals must work together to promote social harmony and stability.

## 4.3. Profit-Driven Digitization

The digitalization process, which is propelled by the pursuit of profit, has undoubtedly enhanced efficiency in various sectors. However, this technological advancement has concurrently exacerbated the challenges encountered by mechanisms designed to promote reconciliation. The ubiquitous adoption of digital tools has rendered dispute resolution increasingly dependent on technological solutions, frequently overlooking the significance of interpersonal communication and the role of emotional mediation. [12] Scholarly research suggests that an overreliance on technology during mediation can result in a diminishment of human empathy, which is crucial for fostering understanding and harmony. This shift towards digital means may inadvertently contribute to a reduction in the chances of achieving reconciliation. Although digital tools provide a level of convenience that was previously unimaginable, they often fall short in replicating the warmth and nuanced understanding that comes from face-to-face interactions. Consequently, resolving deeply entrenched conflicts becomes a more formidable task, as the human element essential for effective mediation is compromised.

## 5. Pathways for Institutional Optimization

### 5.1. Legislative Integration

In order to effectively tackle and resolve the challenges that arise from the fragmentation of institutions, it is imperative to adopt a comprehensive strategy of legislative integration aimed at optimizing and consolidating these institutions. To

achieve this, a series of specific measures can be implemented:

Initially, the establishment of a hierarchical jurisdiction system among community, commercial, and cross-border mediation institutions can be pursued. This system would be designed to ensure that different types of cases are appropriately allocated to the relevant institutions, following predefined rules and standards. The implementation of such a system design is expected to enhance mediation efficiency, minimize unnecessary repetitive efforts, and guarantee that each case is managed by the institution that is most fitting for its resolution.

Secondly, to ensure the fairness and effectiveness of the mediation process, it is crucial to develop a stringent set of ethical guidelines. These guidelines would clearly delineate the boundaries and constraints of employing artificial intelligence (AI) within the mediation process, especially in cases involving sensitive or complex disputes. The use of AI should be explicitly prohibited in such instances to maintain the integrity and professionalism of the mediation process.

By implementing these measures, we can achieve a more integrated and optimized framework for existing mediation institutions. This will, in turn, provide society with a dispute resolution mechanism that is both more efficient and equitable.

## 5.2. Cultural Revitalization

In order to tackle the cultural crisis that is currently challenging the reconciliation-promotion mechanism, we can implement a comprehensive set of strategies that focus on the revitalization of cultural practices. On one hand, it is imperative that we delve deeply into the rich tapestry of reconciliation culture, uncovering its core values and essence. This culture, a testament to the collective wisdom amassed over the ages, embodies the principles of tolerance, empathy, respect, and the willingness to find common ground. Through educational initiatives, public outreach programs, and other vehicles of cultural dissemination, we can foster a broader comprehension and appreciation of reconciliation culture among the populace. This, in turn, can significantly bolster social cohesion and unity, knitting the fabric of society more tightly together. On the other hand, we must also champion cultural innovation and forward-thinking development. While honoring the legacy of reconciliation culture, it is essential to adapt and evolve in response to the demands of our contemporary era and practical societal needs. This involves the exploration of novel reconciliation concepts, methodologies, and frameworks that resonate with today's world. Furthermore, it is crucial to weave reconciliation culture into the very fabric of modern society, integrating it seamlessly into sectors such as education, legal systems, and economic practices. By doing so, the reconciliation culture can play its significant role in nurturing social harmony and stability, ensuring that its principles are not merely preserved but actively contribute to the betterment of our communities.

## 5.3. Human-Centric Technology

In the current society, the reconciliation-promotion mechanism is encountering significant challenges due to technological disruption. This situation necessitates that we place a greater emphasis on incorporating humanistic care into the ongoing process of technological advancement and development. It is imperative that we ensure the utilization of technological tools serves to assist rather than replace the direct communication and interaction that occurs between

individuals. By fostering mediators who possess emotional intelligence, we can harness the power of technology in conjunction with the warmth of human touch to forge a dispute resolution system that is not only underpinned by technological support but is also imbued with the essence of human care.

This envisioned system will play a pivotal role in truly achieving the harmonious coexistence of technology and humanity. It will enable technological development to serve the comprehensive progress of human society more effectively. We must acknowledge that technological progress should not be confined to the mere innovation of tools and the enhancement of efficiency; it should also concentrate on its influence on human social relationships and emotional communication. Only by adopting this broader perspective can we ensure that technological development does not result in emotional detachment among people, but rather fosters deeper and more meaningful interpersonal interactions.

As we navigate this journey, it is essential that we continuously explore and engage in practical exercises to discover the optimal synergy between technology and humanity. Through this ongoing process of exploration and practice, we can construct a society that is not only more harmonious but also more progressive.

## 6. Conclusion

China's reconciliation-facilitation mechanisms stand at a critical juncture, facing a pivotal decision: to preserve the rich traditions of relational justice while simultaneously embracing the digital efficiency of modern times. The path to success in this endeavor necessitates a delicate balance between legislative centralization, which ensures uniformity and consistency, and cultural adaptability, which respects the diversity and nuances of local practices. This balance is crucial to maintaining mediation as a "living institution," a dynamic and responsive process, rather than allowing it to degenerate into a mere bureaucratic tool.

The proposed reforms, which encompass legislative integration, culturally intelligent training, and ethical AI governance, provide a comprehensive roadmap for achieving sustainable dispute management. These reforms aim to harness the best of both traditional and modern approaches, blending the wisdom of the past with the technological advancements of the present.

As globalization continues to intensify, China's ongoing experiment in hybridizing ancient wisdom with modern governance holds the potential to redefine the paradigms of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in the 21st century. By embracing innovation while honoring tradition, China is poised to become a global leader in the field of dispute resolution, offering a model that other nations may draw inspiration from.

## 7. Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## References

- [1] Li Hangqi: A fault prognosis strategy for an external gear pump using Machine Learning algorithms and synthetic data generation methods. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 2023, 123: 348-372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apm.2023.07.001>.
- [2] Zhang Jian: The legal basis for the formation of an "unlitigation" society in ancient China. *Lantai World*, 2015,

- (03): 132-133. <https://doi.org/10.16565/j.cnki.1006-7744.2015.03.090>.
- [3] Yang Yang: A Study on the Li Lao Dispute Resolution System in the Ming Dynasty. Doctoral dissertation, Yantai University, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.27437/d.cnki.gytd.2023.000604>.
- [4] Baidu Baijiahao. Exploration and practice of building an online dispute mediation platform. Baidu Baijiahao, 2024. <https://baijiahao.baidu.com/s?id=1788072800911768179&wfr=spider&for=pc>.
- [5] Shanghai Municipal Justice Bureau. The development of mediation and reconciliation work by the judicial administration in Shanghai. Shanghai Municipal Justice Bureau, 2024. <https://mzj.sh.gov.cn/lnb-xw/20240815/4b6f73533ce34850a84b087198421e7a.html>.
- [6] The Paper. Efficiency and challenges in online dispute resolution. The Paper, 2024. [https://m.thepaper.cn/baijiahao\\_27012762](https://m.thepaper.cn/baijiahao_27012762).
- [7] WeChat Official Account. Thoughts on online mediation and legal collaboration mechanisms. WeChat Official Account, 2024. [https://mp.weixin.qq.com/s?\\_\\_biz=MzA3ODA5NjY3NQ==&mid=2652387376&idx=3&sn=8c5d2e89d199b3145e356e82f164fa46&chksm=85663e2b29299bf7f4af358e3bab91da46549fcdc3273941b98212c08ac86222f575ffa30ed2&scene=27](https://mp.weixin.qq.com/s?__biz=MzA3ODA5NjY3NQ==&mid=2652387376&idx=3&sn=8c5d2e89d199b3145e356e82f164fa46&chksm=85663e2b29299bf7f4af358e3bab91da46549fcdc3273941b98212c08ac86222f575ffa30ed2&scene=27).
- [8] Shanxi Provincial Government. Innovation in Shanxi's social dispute mediation mechanism. Shanxi Provincial Government, 2019. [https://www.sx.gov.cn/art/2019/3/9/art\\_1462938\\_30942467.html](https://www.sx.gov.cn/art/2019/3/9/art_1462938_30942467.html).
- [9] Guangzhou Social Legal Service Platform. Exploring the community mediation service system in Guangzhou. Guangzhou Social Legal Service Platform, 2024. [https://www.gzsfw.gov.cn/shzl/content/post\\_64488.html](https://www.gzsfw.gov.cn/shzl/content/post_64488.html).
- [10] Xu Qinyong: Expression of justice in online dispute resolution. Journal of East China University of Political Science and Law, 2024, 27(02): 83-93.
- [11] Ye Bin& Xiong Bingyuan: A law and economics analysis of online shopping dispute resolution methods. Research on Economic Issues, 2022, (05): 17-26. <https://doi.org/10.19654/j.cnki.cjwtyj.2022.05.002>.
- [12] LongFei: The current status and future prospects of China's online dispute resolution mechanism. Application of Law, 2016, (10): 2-7.