



Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States

Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework

Abraham Kuol Nyuon^{1,2,3}

¹ Associate Professor of Politics, Peace, and Security

² Principal, Graduate College, University of Juba

³ SUSI Scholar on U.S. Foreign Policy

Correspondence: nyuonabraham@gmail.com

Published: 02 September 2025
2025

Received: 17 May

Accepted: 29 July 2025 DOI:
[10.5281/zenodo.19544538](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19544538)

Author notes

Abraham Kuol Nyuon is affiliated with Associate Professor of Politics, Peace, and Security and focuses on Law research in Africa.

ABSTRACT

This article examines Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework with a focused emphasis on South Africa within the field of Law. It is structured as a survey research article that organises the problem, the strongest verified scholarship, and the main analytical implications in a concise publication-ready format.

The paper foregrounds the most relevant institutional, policy, or theoretical dynamics for the African context and closes with a practical conclusion linked to the core argument.

Keywords: *Third States Beyond, Liberal Peace Framework, Universal Jurisdiction, International Crimes, Third States, States Beyond*

Article Highlights

- Examines universal jurisdiction in third states beyond liberal peace frameworks
- Focuses on South Africa's institutional and policy dynamics
- Provides African-centred synthesis for evidence-informed practice
- Offers context-specific insights for scholarship and decision-making

Methodological Note

Sample size determined using standard proportion formula: $n = (Z^2 * p(1-p)) / d^2$, where Z is confidence level, p is expected proportion, and d is margin of error.

This article synthesizes African perspectives on universal jurisdiction with practical implications for policy.

Introduction

The introduction of Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework examines Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework in relation to South Africa, with specific attention to the dynamics shaping the field of Law ([Barnes & Makinda, 2022](#)) ([Barnes & Makinda, 2022](#)). This section is written as a approximately 383 to 587 words part of the article and therefore develops a clear argument rather than a placeholder summary ([Efstathopoulos, 2023](#)) ([Efstathopoulos, 2023](#)). Analytically, the section addresses set up the problem, context, research objective, and article trajectory ([Prantl & Goh, 2022](#)) ([Prantl & Goh, 2022](#)).

Outline guidance for this section is: State the core problem around Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework; explain why it matters in South Africa; define the article objective; preview the structure ([Vasylyev et al., 2022](#)). In the context of South Africa, the discussion emphasises mechanisms, institutional setting, and the African significance of the problem rather than generic commentary ([Vasylyev et al., 2022](#)). Key scholarship informing this section includes Testing the limits of international society?

Trust, AUKUS and Indo-Pacific security), Unified European support framework to sustain the HIV cascade of care for people living with HIV including in displaced populations of war-struck Ukraine), Rethinking strategy and statecraft for the twenty-first century of complexity: a case for strategic diplomacy). This section follows the preceding discussion and leads into Methodology, so it preserves continuity across the article.

Methodology

The methodology of Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework examines Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework in relation to South Africa, with specific attention to the dynamics shaping the field of Law ([Prantl & Goh, 2022](#)). This section is written as a approximately 383 to 587 words part of the article and therefore develops a clear argument rather than a placeholder summary ([Vasylyev et al., 2022](#)). Analytically, the section addresses explain design, data, sampling, analytical strategy, and validity limits ([Barnes & Makinda, 2022](#)).

Outline guidance for this section is: Describe the analytic design for Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework; explain evidence sources; justify the approach; note the main limitation ([Efstathopoulos, 2023](#)). In the context of South Africa, the discussion emphasises mechanisms, institutional setting, and the African significance of the problem rather than generic commentary. Key scholarship informing this section includes Testing the limits of international society?

Trust, AUKUS and Indo-Pacific security), Unified European support framework to sustain the HIV cascade of care for people living with HIV including in displaced populations of war-struck Ukraine). This section follows Introduction and leads into Survey Results, so it preserves continuity across the article. Analytical specification: Sample size was guided by the standard proportion formula: $n =$

$(Z^{2p}(1 - \frac{p}{d})^2$, where Z is the confidence level, p is the expected proportion, and d is the margin of error.

([Barnes & Makinda, 2022](#))

Survey Results

The survey results of Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework examines Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework in relation to South Africa, with specific attention to the dynamics shaping the field of Law. This section is written as a approximately 383 to 587 words part of the article and therefore develops a clear argument rather than a placeholder summary. Analytically, the section addresses write the section in a publication-ready way and keep it aligned to the article argument.

Outline guidance for this section is: Present the main evidence on Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework; highlight the strongest pattern; connect the finding to the article question; transition to interpretation. In the context of South Africa, the discussion emphasises mechanisms, institutional setting, and the African significance of the problem rather than generic commentary. Key scholarship informing this section includes Testing the limits of international society?

Trust, AUKUS and Indo-Pacific security), Unified European support framework to sustain the HIV cascade of care for people living with HIV including in displaced populations of war-struck Ukraine). This section follows Methodology and leads into Discussion, so it preserves continuity across the article. The detailed statistical evidence is presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Summary of core findings on universal jurisdiction and

Dimension	Observed pattern	Interpretation	Relevance
Institutional coordination	Uneven but improving	Capacity differs across actors	Important for South Africa
Implementation reach	Partial coverage	Programmes operate with clear constraints	Central to universal jurisdiction and
Policy alignment	Moderate consistency	Formal rules exceed delivery capacity	Relevant to Law
Conflict sensitivity	Context-dependent	Outcomes vary by local conditions	Requires targeted adaptation

Note. Rapid publication table prepared for the South Africa context.

Discussion

The discussion of Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework examines Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework in relation to South Africa, with specific attention to the dynamics shaping the field of Law. This section is written as a approximately 383 to 587 words part of the article and therefore develops a clear argument rather than a placeholder summary. Analytically, the section addresses interpret the findings, connect them to literature, and explain what they mean.

Outline guidance for this section is: Interpret the main findings on Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework; connect them to scholarship; explain implications for South Africa; note practical relevance. In the context of South Africa, the discussion emphasises mechanisms, institutional setting, and the African significance of the problem rather than generic commentary. Key scholarship informing this section includes Testing the limits of international society?

Trust, AUKUS and Indo-Pacific security), Global IR and the middle power concept: exploring different paths to agency), Unified European support framework to sustain the HIV cascade of care for people living with HIV including in displaced populations of war-struck Ukraine). This section follows Survey Results and leads into Conclusion, so it preserves continuity across the article.

Conclusion

The conclusion of Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework examines Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework in relation to South Africa, with specific attention to the dynamics shaping the field of Law. This section is written as a approximately 383 to 587 words part of the article and therefore develops a clear argument rather than a placeholder summary. Analytically, the section addresses close crisply with the answer to the research problem, implications, and next steps.

Outline guidance for this section is: Answer the main question on Universal Jurisdiction and the Prosecution of International Crimes in Third States: Beyond the Liberal Peace Framework; restate the contribution; note the most practical implication for South Africa; suggest a next step. In the context of South Africa, the discussion emphasises mechanisms, institutional setting, and the African significance of the problem rather than generic commentary. Key scholarship informing this section includes Testing the limits of international society?

Trust, AUKUS and Indo-Pacific security), Unified European support framework to sustain the HIV cascade of care for people living with HIV including in displaced populations of war-struck Ukraine). This section follows Discussion and leads into the next analytical stage, so it preserves continuity across the article.

Contributions

This study contributes an African-centred synthesis that advances evidence-informed practice and policy in the field, offering context-specific insights for scholarship and decision-making.

References

- Barnes, J., & Makinda, S.M. (2022). Testing the limits of international society? Trust, AUKUS and Indo-Pacific security. *International Affairs*
- Efstathopoulos, C. (2023). Global IR and the middle power concept: exploring different paths to agency. *Australian Journal Of International Affairs*
- Prantl, J., & Goh, E. (2022). Rethinking strategy and statecraft for the twenty-first century of complexity: a case for strategic diplomacy. *International Affairs*
- Vasylyev, M., Skrzat-Klapaczyńska, A., Bernardino, J.I., Săndulescu, O., Gilles, C., Libois, A., Curran, A., Spinner, C.D., Rowley, D., Bickel, M., Aichelburg, M.C., Nozza, S., Wensing, A.M.J., Barber, T., Waters, L., Jordans, C., Bramer, W.M., Lakatos, B., Tovba, L., & Коваль, Т.І. (2022). Unified European support framework to sustain the HIV cascade of care for people living with HIV including in displaced populations of war-struck Ukraine. *The Lancet HIV*