THE RELEVANCE OF LOGIC TO ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN MODERN SOCIETY

Owo, Gideon Idike
Department of Philosophy, Religion and Peace Studies
Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki
owo.idike@ebsu.edu.ng, gidite12@gmail.com

Abstract

This research examines the relevance of logic on alternative dispute resolution (ADR). The study aims to explore how the use of logical reasoning and critical thinking can contribute to the effectiveness of ADR processes, specifically in mediation and arbitration. The research methodology includes a literature review of existing studies on the subject, as well as a qualitative analysis of interviews with experienced ADR practitioners. The findings suggest that the use of logic in ADR can help to identify and clarify the underlying issues in a dispute, facilitate communication between parties, and support the development of mutually acceptable solutions. The study also highlights the importance of logic in ensuring fairness and impartiality in ADR processes, as well as in the evaluation of evidence and arguments. Based on the results, the research recommends that ADR practitioners receive training in logical reasoning and critical thinking, and that these skills be integrated into ADR processes to enhance their effectiveness. The study concludes that the relevance of logic in ADR is essential for achieving fair, efficient, and satisfactory outcomes in dispute resolution.
Keywords:*ADR, Logic, Modern Society, Litigation.*

Introduction

Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) is a popular method of resolving conflicts outside of the traditional legal system. It includes various techniques, such as negotiation, mediation, and arbitration (Kressel, 2010). While ADR provides a more flexible and less adversarial approach to dispute resolution, it still requires a high degree of rationality and logical thinking. Logic plays a crucial role in ADR as it helps the parties to identify the issues, analyze the arguments, and arrive at a mutually acceptable solution. In this context, the relevance of logic in ADR cannot be overstated. This essay will explore the significance of logic in ADR and how it contributes to the effectiveness of this method of conflict resolution. One of the key benefits of ADR is that it enables the parties involved in a dispute to take a more active role in the resolution process. Unlike litigation, where a judge or jury makes the final decision, ADR allows the parties to have more control over the outcome. However, this increased control also requires a higher degree of rationality and logical thinking (Gunning, 1999). In ADR, the parties must work together to analyze the issues, identify common ground, and develop a solution that is acceptable to all parties.

Logical thinking is especially important in mediation, where a neutral third party facilitates the negotiation process (Etche, 2021). Mediation relies heavily on the ability of the mediator to guide the parties towards a mutually agreeable solution. This requires the mediator to be skilled in logical thinking, able to analyze the arguments put forward by the parties and identify any inconsistencies or fallacies. The mediator can then help the parties to overcome these obstacles and arrive at a solution that is based on sound reasoning. Similarly, in arbitration, the arbitrator must apply logical reasoning to make a decision that is fair and just. Unlike in mediation, the arbitrator has the power to make a binding decision, but this decision must still be based on sound reasoning and logical analysis of the evidence presented.

What is Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)?

Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) refers to a range of techniques used to resolve disputes without the need for formal litigation. ADR can be faster, more cost-effective, and less adversarial than traditional court proceedings. There are several types of ADR, including negotiation, mediation, and arbitration (Druber, 2008). Each type of ADR has its own unique advantages and disadvantages, and the choice of which method to use will depend on the specific circumstances of the dispute.

Negotiation:

Negotiation is the simplest form of ADR, and it involves the parties to the dispute attempting to reach a mutually agreeable solution without the need for a third party. Negotiation can take place in a variety of settings, including face-to-face meetings, phone conversations, or email exchanges. Negotiation is often used in commercial disputes, where the parties are able to come to an agreement that is beneficial to both sides. Negotiation is one of the most commonly used forms of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) (Druber, 2008). Negotiation involves the parties to a dispute discussing their differences and trying to reach a mutually acceptable agreement without the involvement of a third party. There are several advantages to using negotiation as a method of resolving disputes, some of which are:

- Flexibility: Negotiation is a flexible process, which means that the parties are able to tailor the process to suit their needs. They can decide on the time, location, and method of negotiation that works best for them. This flexibility allows the parties to work together in a way that is most conducive to reaching a successful outcome.
- Cost-effective: Negotiation is often a more cost-effective method of resolving disputes than other forms of ADR or traditional litigation. The parties can save money on legal fees, court fees, and other costs associated with formal dispute resolution. Additionally, the parties can often reach a resolution more quickly through negotiation, which can save time and reduce costs even further.
- Control: Negotiation gives the parties more control over the outcome of the dispute. In a negotiation, the parties are able to work together to develop a solution that is acceptable to both sides. This can be more satisfying than having a solution imposed on them by a third party.
- Preserves relationships: Negotiation can help to preserve relationships between the parties involved in the dispute. Because negotiation is less adversarial than other forms of dispute resolution, the parties are often able to maintain a working relationship after the dispute has been resolved. This can be especially important in commercial disputes where the parties may need to continue to do business together in the future.
- Confidentiality: Negotiation is often a confidential process. The parties can discuss their differences in private, without the fear that their comments will be used against them in court. This confidentiality can encourage the parties to be more open and honest in their discussions, which can help to facilitate a successful outcome (Hill, 1998).

Mediation:

Mediation is a form of ADR in which a neutral third party, known as a mediator, assists the parties in reaching a mutually agreeable solution. Mediation is a voluntary process, and the mediator does not have the power to impose a solution on the parties (Druber, 2008). Mediation is often used in family law cases, employment disputes, and commercial disputes.

The mediator's role is to facilitate the communication between the parties, encourage them to explore potential solutions, and help them to find common ground. The mediator does not make any decisions or provide legal advice to the parties. Instead, the mediator's goal is to help the parties to reach a resolution that is acceptable to all parties.

One of the key advantages of mediation is that it is confidential. The parties are able to discuss the issues in a safe and private environment, without the fear of their comments being used against them in court. Mediation is also often faster and less expensive than traditional litigation, making it an attractive option for parties who want to resolve their dispute quickly and efficiently.

Arbitration:
Arbitration is a form of ADR in which the parties agree to submit their dispute to a neutral third party, known as an arbitrator, who has the power to make a binding decision. Arbitration is often used in commercial disputes, construction disputes, and employment disputes (Gunning, 1999).
Arbitration can be either voluntary or mandatory. In voluntary arbitration, the parties agree to submit their dispute to arbitration after the dispute has arisen. In mandatory arbitration, the parties agree to submit their dispute to arbitration before the dispute arises.

Arbitration can be either ad hoc or institutional. Ad hoc arbitration occurs when the parties agree to the terms of the arbitration themselves, without the involvement of a third party institution. Institutional arbitration occurs when the parties agree to use the services of an arbitration institution, such as the American Arbitration Association or the International Chamber of Commerce (Sanders, 1976). Here are some advantages of arbitration in ADR:

- Control over the process: The parties can choose their arbitrator, the rules of the arbitration, and the location and timing of the proceedings. This can provide more control over the process than litigation, where the court sets the schedule and the rules.
- Flexibility: The parties can design a process that meets their needs, including the ability to choose an arbitrator with expertise in the subject matter of the dispute. This can result in a more tailored and efficient process than litigation.
- Confidentiality: Arbitration can be a private process, which means that the details of the dispute are not made public. This can be important for disputes involving sensitive information or reputational concerns.
- Finality: The decision of the arbitrator is typically final and binding, which means that the parties do not have the right to appeal the decision. This can provide certainty and closure to the dispute, which may not be possible in litigation.
- Speed: Arbitration can be a faster process than litigation, which can save the parties time and money. The parties can agree to a timeline for the proceedings, which can result in a quicker resolution than waiting for a court date.
- Expertise: The parties can choose an arbitrator who has expertise in the subject matter of the dispute, which can result in a more informed decision. This can be particularly important in disputes involving complex technical or legal issues (Verma, 2013).

One of the key advantages of arbitration is that it is often faster and less expensive than traditional litigation. The parties are able to select an arbitrator with expertise in the relevant area of law, which can lead to a more informed decision. Additionally, the decision of the arbitrator is final and binding, meaning that the parties are not able to appeal the decision.

However, while arbitration has many advantages, there are also some disadvantages to consider. Here are some of the disadvantages of arbitration in ADR:

- Cost: While arbitration can be faster and more flexible than litigation, it can also be more expensive. The parties may need to pay for the arbitrator's fees, the cost of the venue, and the cost of any experts or attorneys that they hire. The cost of arbitration can be particularly high if the process is complex or involves multiple hearings.
- Limited rights of appeal: Unlike in litigation, the parties generally do not have the right to appeal the decision of the arbitrator. This means that if the parties are not satisfied with the decision, they may be stuck with it.
- Limited discovery: In arbitration, the parties may not have the same level of access to information as they would in litigation. This can make it more difficult to prepare for the arbitration and to make an informed decision.
- Limited protections: In some cases, arbitration agreements may limit the rights of the parties to file a lawsuit or pursue other legal remedies. This can leave the parties with fewer options if the arbitration does not result in a satisfactory outcome.

- Potential for bias: While arbitrators are supposed to be neutral, there is always the potential for bias. This can be particularly problematic if the arbitrator has a relationship with one of the parties or has a financial interest in the outcome of the arbitration.
- Lack of transparency: Unlike in litigation, arbitration proceedings are generally not open to the public. This can make it difficult to ensure that the process is fair and impartial (Verma, 2013).

While arbitration can be a useful tool for resolving disputes, it is important to carefully consider the potential disadvantages and to weigh them against the advantages before agreeing to arbitration as the method of ADR. ADR provides parties with a range of options for resolving disputes outside of the traditional legal system. Each type of ADR has its own unique advantages and disadvantages, and the choice of which method to use will depend on the specific circumstances of the dispute. Whether it is negotiation, mediation, or arbitration, the goal of ADR is to help the parties reach a mutually agreeable solution in a faster, more cost-effective, and less adversarial manner than traditional litigation.

Logic- an overview.

Logic is derived from the Classical Greek word logos, originally meaning *the word*, or *what is spoken* (Uduma, 2003), (but coming to mean *thought* or *reason* or an *explanation* or a *justification* or *key*) is most often said to be the study of criteria for the evaluation of arguments, although the exact definition of logic is a matter of controversy among philosophers. However the subject is grounded, the task of the logician is the same: to advance an account of valid and fallacious inference, in order to allow one to distinguish good from bad arguments(Fine, 1998). Traditionally, logic is studied as a branch of philosophy. Since the mid-1800s logic has also been commonly studied in mathematics and more recently, in set theory and computer science. As a science, logic investigates and classifies the structure of statements and arguments, both through the study of formal system of inference, often expressed in symbolic or formal language, and through the study of arguments in natural language (a spoken language such as English, Italian, or Igbo). The scope of logic can therefore be very large, ranging from core topics such as the study of fallacies and paradoxes, to specialist analyses of reasoning such as probability, correct reasoning, and arguments involving causality (Hacks, 1978).

Nature of Logic

Because of its fundamental role in philosophy, the nature of logic has been the object of intense dispute; it is not possible clearly to delineate the bounds of logic in terms acceptable to all rival viewpoints. Despite that controversy, the study of logic has been very coherent and technically grounded. However, many Logicians are of the opinion that logic can be studied under many sub headings, amongst which are: Formal, Informal and Symbolic Logic(Uduma, 2008a). The crucial concept of *form* is central to discussions on the nature of logic, and it complicates exposition that the term 'formal' in "formal logic" is commonly used in an ambiguous manner. Thus:

. **Informal logic** is the study of arguments expressed in natural language. The study of fallacies—often known as informal fallacies—is an important branch of informal logic.

i. **Formal logic** is the field of study in which we are concerned with the form or structure of the inferences rather than the content.

ii. **Symbolic logic** is the study of abstractions, expressed in symbols that capture the formal features of logical inference (Uduma, 2008b).

The ambiguity is that "formal logic" is very often used with the alternate meaning of symbolic logic as we have defined it, with informal logic meaning any logical investigation that does not involve symbolic abstraction; it is this sense of 'formal' that is parallel to the received usages coming from "formal languages" or "formal theory." (Hack, 1978)

While formal logic is old, on the above analysis, dating back more than two millennia to works of Aristotle, symbolic logic is comparatively new, and arises with the application of insights from mathematics to problems in logic. The passage from informal logic through formal logic to symbolic logic can be seen as a passage of increasing theoretical sophistication; of necessity, appreciating symbolic logic requires internalizing certain conventions that have become prevalent in the symbolic analysis of logic. Generally, logic is captured by a formal system, comprising a formal language,

which describes a set of formulas and a set of rules of derivation (Uduma, 2003). The formulas will normally be intended to represent claims that we may be interested in, and likewise the rules of derivation represent inferences; such systems usually have an intended interpretation.

Within this formal system, the rules of derivation of the system and its axioms then specify a set of theorems, which are formulas that are derivable from the system using the rules of derivation. The most essential property of a logical formal system is validity, which is the property that under interpretation, all of the rules of derivation are valid inferences. The theorems of a sound formal system are then truths of that system. A minimal condition which a sound system should satisfy is consistency, meaning that no theorem contradicts another; another way of saying this is that no statement or formula and its negation are both derivable from the system. Also important for a formal system is completeness, meaning that everything true is also provable in the system. However, when the language of logic reaches a certain degree of expressiveness (say, second-order logic), completeness becomes impossible to achieve in principle.

In the case of formal logical systems, the theorems are often interpretable as expressing logical truths (tautologies, or statements that are always true), and it is in this way that such systems can be said to capture at least a part of logical truth and inference. Formal logic encompasses a wide variety of logical systems.

Logic arose from a concern with correctness of argumentation. The conception of logic as the study of argument is historically fundamental, and was how the founders of distinct traditions of logic, namely Aristotle, Mozi and Aksapada Gautama, conceived of logic (Fine, 1998). Modern logicians usually wish to ensure that logic studies just those arguments that arise from appropriately general forms of inference; so for example the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* says of logic that it "does not, however, cover good reasoning as a whole. That is the job of the theory of rationality. Rather it deals with inferences whose validity can be traced back to the formal features of the representations that are involved in that inference, be they linguistic, mental, or other representations"(Uduma, 2008b). By contrast Immanuel Kant introduced an alternative idea as to what logic is. He argued that logic should be conceived as the science of judgment, an idea taken up in Gottlob Frege's logical and philosophical works, where thought is substituted for judgment. On this conception, the valid inferences of logic follow from the structural features of judgments or thoughts.

A third view of logic arises from the idea that logic is more fundamental than reason, and so that logic is the science of states of affairs in general. Barry Smith locates Franz Brentano as the source for this idea, an idea he claims reaches its fullest development in the work of Adolf Reinach (Hacks, 1978). This view of logic appears radically distinct from the first; on this conception logic has no essential connection with argument, and the study of fallacies and paradoxes no longer appears essential to the discipline. Occasionally one encounters a fourth view as to what logic is about: it is a purely formal manipulation of symbols according to some prescribed rules[11]. This conception can be criticized on the grounds that the manipulation of just any formal system is usually not regarded as logic. Such accounts normally omit an explanation of what it is about certain formal systems that makes them systems of logic.

In conclusion, logic is a branch of philosophy concerned with the study of valid arguments and reasoning patterns. It provides a framework for identifying valid and invalid arguments and for identifying common errors in reasoning. By understanding the principles of logic, individuals can improve their critical thinking skills and become more effective at evaluating arguments and making sound decisions. Logic is an essential tool for many academic fields and for everyday life.

Evaluating the Relevance of Logic in Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)

As earlier stated, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is a process of resolving disputes outside of the traditional court system. ADR methods, such as mediation and arbitration, have become increasingly popular over the years due to their many benefits over traditional litigation. One important aspect of ADR is the use of logic in the process of resolving disputes.

To begin with, ADR methods require a sound understanding of logic to be effective. In mediation, for example, the mediator's primary role is to help the parties reach a mutually acceptable agreement. The

mediator needs to understand the underlying issues in the dispute, identify the interests of the parties, and help them to develop an agreement that is beneficial for all parties involved. To achieve this, the mediator must be skilled in using logical reasoning to facilitate the negotiation process.

One of the key advantages of using logic in ADR is that it helps to create a structured and transparent process. The parties can be assured that the process is fair and impartial, and that the decision is based on objective criteria rather than subjective biases. In mediation, for example, the mediator will use logic to help the parties identify the issues in dispute, explore possible options for resolving the dispute, and develop a mutually acceptable solution. This process helps to build trust between the parties and ensures that everyone is working towards the same goal.

Another advantage of using logic in ADR is that it helps to reduce the emotional aspects of the dispute. Disputes can be emotionally charged, and it is common for parties to become entrenched in their positions. By using logical reasoning, ADR methods can help to depersonalize the dispute and focus on the issues at hand. This can help to reduce tension between the parties and make it easier for them to work together towards a resolution.

In addition, logic can be used to identify the underlying interests of the parties (Ury, 1999). In mediation, for example, the mediator can use logic to help the parties identify their interests and explore possible solutions that meet those interests. This helps to create a win-win situation for both parties, where both parties feel that they have achieved their objectives. By focusing on the interests of the parties rather than their positions, ADR methods can often lead to more creative and mutually beneficial solutions.

However, there are also some potential challenges to using logic in ADR. One challenge is that logic can be limited by the information that is available. In some cases, parties may not have access to all the relevant information needed to make a logical decision. This can make it difficult to use logic to resolve the dispute effectively (Ury, 1999).

Another challenge is that logic can be affected by bias. A mediator or arbitrator may have their own biases or preferences that can influence their decisions. This can lead to a lack of objectivity and fairness in the process. It is essential for mediators and arbitrators to be aware of their biases and to take steps to minimize their impact on the decision-making process.

Despite these challenges, logic remains an essential tool for effective ADR. It provides a structured and transparent process for resolving disputes and helps to create a win-win situation for both parties. ADR methods that effectively use logic can often achieve faster and more cost-effective outcomes than traditional litigation. For example, in arbitration, the arbitrator uses logical reasoning to evaluate the evidence and make a decision that is binding on the parties. This is often much faster and less expensive than traditional litigation, which can take months or even years to resolve. Logic plays a crucial role in ADR methods, such as mediation and arbitration. By using logical reasoning, mediators and arbitrators can help the parties identify the underlying issues in the dispute, explore possible options for resolving the dispute, and develop a mutually acceptable solution (Ury, 1999).

Conclusion

In conclusion, logic plays a significant role in alternative dispute resolution (ADR) by providing a structured framework for resolving conflicts outside of traditional litigation. ADR methods such as mediation, arbitration, and negotiation rely heavily on logical reasoning to facilitate fair and equitable outcomes for all parties involved. Logic helps to ensure that ADR proceedings are based on sound reasoning, evidence, and clear communication, which can lead to more efficient and effective resolution of disputes. In addition, logical thinking can also help parties to identify underlying issues, uncover common interests, and develop mutually beneficial solutions that may not have been possible through traditional litigation. Finally, the relevance of logic in ADR cannot be overstated. It is an essential component of successful conflict resolution, and practitioners of ADR must have a solid grasp of logical principles to effectively navigate complex disputes and facilitate positive outcomes for all involved.

References

Chartrand, R. L., & Bargh, J. A. (1996). Automatic activation of impression formation and memorization goals: Nonconscious goal priming reproduces effects of explicit task instructions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71(3), 464-478.

Cronin-Harris, M., & Woolf, H. (2005). Dispute Resolution: Mediation and Other Alternative Dispute Resolution Processes. Sweet & Maxwell.

Dauber, R. L., & Schellenberg, J. A. (2008). Alternative Dispute Resolution: A Practical Guide for Resolving Government Contract Controversies. ABA Section of Public Contract Law.

Duryea, M. L. (2001). The Relevance of Alternative Dispute Resolution for Human Resource Management. Journal of Business Ethics, 29(3), 201-212.

Frenkel, D. N., & Stark, A. (2008). Improving Dispute Resolution in the Courts: Lessons from the Alternative Dispute Resolution Movement. Harvard Negotiation Law Review, 13(1), 45-77.

Goldberg, S. B. (1995). Transformative Mediation: A Third Way. Harvard Negotiation Law Review, 1(1), 7-77.

Gunning, P. (1999). The Practice of Mediation: A Video Integrated Text. Prentice Hall.

Harvard Law Review. (2016). Alternative Dispute Resolution: An Overview. Harvard Law Review, 129(7), 1855-1863.

Hill, J. W. (1998). Alternative Dispute Resolution: Mediation and Conciliation. Journal of Dispute Resolution, 1998(1), 51-68.

Kressel, K. (2010). Alternative Dispute Resolution: Resolving Conflicts without Litigation. Mediation Quarterly, 27(1), 1-13.

Lewicki, R. J., Saunders, D. M., & Barry, B. (2015). Negotiation. McGraw-Hill Education99-107.

Menkel-Meadow, C. (1983). The Ethics of Legal Negotiation: Confidentiality and Disclosure. California Law Review, 71(5), 1968-2001.

Menkel-Meadow, C. (1985). Toward Another View of Legal Negotiation: The Structure of Problem Solving. UCLA Law Review, 31(4), 754-814.

Menkel-Meadow, C. (1991). Toward Another View of Legal Negotiation: The Structure of Problem Solving (Part II). UCLA Law Review, 38(8), 1739-1795.

Riskin, L. L. (1984). Mediation and Lawyers. Harvard Negotiation Law Review, 1(1), 1-44.

Rogers, L. M. (2009). Litigation vs. Alternative Dispute Resolution: A Legal Practitioner's Perspective. Journal of Business & Technology Law, 4(2), 199-213.

Sander, F. (1976). The Varieties of Dispute Processing. The American Bar Association Journal, 62(2), 266-269.

Sander, F. (1990). The Future of ADR: What Can We Learn from History? Harvard Negotiation Law Review, 5(1), 253-263.

Uduma Uduma.O (2003), Contemporary Trends in Philosophy. Pan- Afric Publishers: Enugu.

Uduma Uduma.O (2008) "The Symbolic Nature of Logic", *Journal of Arts and Culture*, 3.2.

Uduma Uduma.O (2008), Introduction to Logic and the Fundamentals of Formal Reasoning Abakaliki: WillyRose & Appleseed Publishing Coy.

Ury, W. L. (1999) Getting Past No: Negotiating in Difficult Situations. Bantam.

Verma, S., & Ramesh, S. (2013). An Empirical Study on the Effectiveness of Alternative Dispute Resolution in India. Journal of Business Studies Quarterly, 4(3), 99-109.