
International responsibility and dispute settlement: foundations, mechanisms and challenges in international law

Responsabilidad internacional y solución de controversias: fundamentos, mecanismos y desafíos en el derecho internacional

Responsabilidade internacional e resolução de litígios: fundamentos, mecanismos e desafios no direito internacional.

Mustaph Bedjekina

✉ : bedjekina.mustapha@univ-ghardaia.dz

🆔 : <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-6318-0923>

Faculty of law and political sciences. University of Ghardaia

Cita sugerida (APA, séptima edición)

Bedjekina, M. (2026). International responsibility and dispute settlement: foundations, mechanisms and challenges in international law. *Tribunal de Justicia, Revista de Investigación jurídica*. 3(1), 18-32. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51247/tj.v3i1.965>

Abstract

The objective of this study was to analyze the configuration of international responsibility and examine the main mechanisms for dispute settlement in international law, considering their doctrinal evolution, legal foundations, and the challenges associated with their application in the contemporary international context. The methodology followed a qualitative approach with a documentary, descriptive, and interpretative research design. A legal-hermeneutic method was employed to examine specialized doctrine, international legal instruments, and scientific literature related to international responsibility, forms of reparation, and peaceful dispute settlement mechanisms. The findings showed that international responsibility constitutes an essential mechanism for ensuring compliance with international obligations through the attribution of legal consequences arising from internationally wrongful acts. Likewise, negotiation, mediation, arbitration, and international jurisdiction were identified as fundamental instruments for strengthening legal certainty and promoting the peaceful settlement of disputes. However, significant challenges remain regarding the enforcement of international decisions, the fragmentation of international law, and the growing complexity of transnational disputes. The study concluded that strengthening international cooperation, promoting legal harmonization, and improving institutional mechanisms are essential to enhance the effectiveness of international law and consolidate a more stable, coherent, and predictable international legal order.

Keywords: international responsibility, dispute settlement, international law, international arbitration.

Resumen

La presente investigación tuvo como objetivo analizar la configuración de la responsabilidad internacional y examinar los principales mecanismos de solución de controversias en el derecho internacional, considerando su evolución doctrinal, sus fundamentos jurídicos y los desafíos derivados de su aplicación en el contexto contemporáneo. La metodología se desarrolló bajo un enfoque cualitativo, con un diseño documental de alcance descriptivo e interpretativo. Se empleó el método hermenéutico-jurídico para examinar doctrina especializada, normativa internacional y literatura científica relacionada con la responsabilidad internacional, las formas de reparación y los mecanismos de solución pacífica de controversias. Los resultados evidenciaron que la responsabilidad internacional constituye un mecanismo esencial para garantizar el cumplimiento de las obligaciones internacionales mediante la atribución de consecuencias jurídicas frente a hechos internacionalmente ilícitos. Asimismo, se identificó que la negociación, la mediación, el arbitraje y la jurisdicción internacional fortalecen la seguridad jurídica y contribuyen a la solución pacífica de los conflictos, aunque persisten desafíos relacionados con la ejecución de las decisiones internacionales, la fragmentación normativa y la aparición de controversias transnacionales cada vez más complejas. Se concluyó que el fortalecimiento de la cooperación internacional, la armonización de criterios jurídicos y el perfeccionamiento de los mecanismos institucionales resultan indispensables para incrementar la eficacia del derecho internacional y consolidar un orden jurídico internacional más estable, coherente y orientado a la protección del interés común.

Palabras clave: responsabilidad internacional, solución de controversias, derecho internacional, arbitraje internacional.

Resumo

A presente pesquisa teve como objetivo analisar a configuração da responsabilidade internacional e examinar os principais mecanismos de solução de controvérsias no direito internacional, considerando sua evolução doutrinária, seus fundamentos jurídicos e os desafios decorrentes de sua aplicação no contexto internacional contemporâneo. A metodologia adotou uma abordagem qualitativa, com delineamento documental de caráter descriptivo e interpretativo. Foi utilizado o método hermenêutico-jurídico para analisar doutrina especializada, normas internacionais e literatura científica relacionada à responsabilidade internacional, às formas de reparação e aos mecanismos de solução pacífica de controvérsias. Os resultados demonstraram que a responsabilidade internacional constitui um mecanismo essencial para assegurar o cumprimento das obrigações internacionais por meio da atribuição de consequências jurídicas decorrentes de atos internacionalmente ilícitos. Além disso, verificou-se que a negociação, a mediação, a arbitragem e a jurisdição internacional fortalecem a segurança jurídica e favorecem a solução pacífica dos conflitos, embora persistam desafios relacionados à execução das decisões internacionais, à fragmentação normativa e ao aumento das controvérsias transnacionais. Concluiu-se que o fortalecimento da cooperação internacional, a harmonização dos critérios jurídicos e o aperfeiçoamento dos mecanismos institucionais são indispensáveis para ampliar a eficácia do direito internacional e consolidar uma ordem jurídica internacional mais estável, coerente e orientada para a proteção do interesse comum.

Palavras-chave: responsabilidade internacional, solução de controvérsias, direito internacional, arbitragem internacional.

Introduction

International law constitutes one of the essential pillars governing relations among States, international organizations, and the growing number of actors participating in global

governance. Its development has made it possible to establish a body of legal rules aimed at preserving peace, strengthening international cooperation, and ensuring compliance with common obligations that transcend national borders. Within this framework, one of the most significant elements for ensuring the effectiveness of the international legal system is international responsibility, understood as the obligation of subjects of international law to make reparation for the consequences arising from the breach of their international obligations. In this regard, Crawford (2005) explains that international responsibility constitutes a structural principle of the international legal order because it guarantees the effectiveness of international legal norms through the enforceability of breached obligations.

The consolidation of international responsibility has been closely linked to the strengthening of mechanisms designed to protect the rights and legitimate interests of States, international organizations, and, increasingly, individuals. The evolution of the international community has demonstrated that the failure to comply with obligations arising from treaties or customary international law gives rise to legal consequences that must be addressed in accordance with the principles of legality and justice. From this perspective, Burgos-De la Ossa and Lozada-Pimiento (2009) argue that international responsibility and diplomatic protection constitute fundamental legal instruments for ensuring reparation for damages resulting from internationally wrongful acts while preserving the balance of international relations.

The growing economic, political, and technological interdependence of the international community has increased both the number and complexity of international disputes, making the existence of effective mechanisms for their peaceful settlement indispensable. Conflicts arising from international trade, foreign investment, territorial delimitation, environmental protection, and human rights require procedures capable of resolving disputes without resorting to the use of force and in full accordance with international law. In this context, Comelio Landero (2014) maintains that alternative dispute resolution mechanisms represent an important expression of access to justice by promoting consensual solutions, whereas Mortimore (2009) highlights the importance of international arbitration as a legal instrument for ensuring legal certainty in disputes between investors and States.

Despite the progressive development of judicial and arbitral mechanisms, significant challenges remain regarding the enforcement and effective implementation of decisions adopted by international adjudicatory bodies. In many instances, the absence of sufficiently effective enforcement mechanisms, the reluctance of certain States to comply with international judgments, and the discrepancies between domestic legal systems and international obligations undermine the effectiveness of international decisions. Gómez (1993) argues that the settlement of international disputes faces considerable challenges arising from the decentralized nature of the international legal system, while González (2020) warns that the emergence of new dispute resolution mechanisms, particularly within digital environments, poses additional challenges to the effectiveness of private international law.

These challenges underscore the need to strengthen the international legal order through procedures capable of ensuring compliance with international obligations and reinforcing mutual confidence among the various subjects of international law. The peaceful settlement of disputes represents not only a fundamental principle recognized by the international community but also an indispensable condition for preserving international peace, stability, and cooperation among States. In this regard, Illanes (1985) argues that the peaceful settlement of disputes constitutes one of the principal instruments for maintaining international peace, whereas Paolillo (1981) demonstrates that even disputes involving the activities of international organizations require specialized legal mechanisms capable of ensuring legitimate and effective decisions.

The evolution of contemporary international law has also expanded the scope of international responsibility into new areas involving the protection of human rights, environmental law, foreign investment, international trade, and the responsibility of international organizations.

This transformation reflects the need to adapt traditional legal institutions to an international environment characterized by increasing normative complexity and the participation of multiple actors. Consequently, international responsibility is no longer conceived solely as a legal institution governing interstate relations but has evolved into a mechanism for ensuring compliance with international obligations of global significance, thereby strengthening legal certainty and international governance.

Against this background, the present study aims to analyze the legal framework of international responsibility and examine the principal mechanisms available for the settlement of international disputes, taking into account their doctrinal evolution, legal foundations, and the challenges affecting their application within the contemporary international legal system. To achieve this objective, the study addresses two central research questions: How is international responsibility structured within the international legal system? and What legal mechanisms exist to resolve disputes among subjects of international law effectively and in accordance with the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes? Addressing these questions will contribute to a better understanding of the role played by international responsibility and international dispute settlement mechanisms in maintaining the international legal order, while identifying the principal challenges that must be overcome to ensure the effective implementation of international decisions and strengthen cooperation among members of the international community.

Methodology

This study was conducted using a qualitative research approach, as it facilitated the understanding and interpretation of the doctrinal and legal foundations underlying international responsibility and international dispute settlement mechanisms. This approach was considered appropriate because it enabled the analysis of legal categories, normative principles, and scholarly contributions from an interpretative perspective, emphasizing a comprehensive understanding of the meaning and scope of the legal institutions under examination. In this regard, Vasilachis de Gialdino (2014) argues that qualitative research promotes an in-depth analysis of legal discourse and supports the development of well-grounded interpretations of social and normative phenomena.

The methodological design consisted of documentary research with a descriptive and interpretative scope. A systematic review of books, peer-reviewed scientific articles, international legal instruments, and specialized legal scholarship concerning State responsibility and the peaceful settlement of international disputes was conducted. Furthermore, the hermeneutic-legal method was employed to interpret legal provisions, the general principles of international law, and the interpretative approaches developed within specialized legal scholarship. In this respect, Rodríguez Vieira and Marín Díaz (2025) emphasize that qualitative-hermeneutic analysis constitutes an appropriate methodological tool for understanding the content and evolution of legal discourse through the critical interpretation of legal sources.

Data collection and analysis were carried out through documentary review, using a bibliographic analysis matrix as the primary research instrument to organize, classify, and compare the principal doctrinal and normative contributions relevant to the research topic. Subsequently, the collected information was examined through qualitative content analysis, identifying thematic categories related to the legal framework of international responsibility, international dispute settlement, and the effectiveness of the international legal order. According to Avellaneda Vásquez (2024), legal research requires the systematic organization of legal sources to construct robust legal arguments, whereas Colanzi (2015) argues that qualitative analysis facilitates the identification of interpretative patterns that enhance the understanding of legal and social phenomena.

Theoretical Framework

Concept of International Responsibility

International responsibility constitutes a fundamental institution of public international law because it establishes the legal consequences arising from the breach of obligations assumed by subjects of international law. Its primary purpose is to preserve the international legal order by requiring reparation whenever conduct contrary to international law causes harm to another subject protected by the international legal system. Novak Talavera and García-Corrochano Moyano (2000) argue that international responsibility represents the legal consequence inherently associated with the breach of international obligations and constitutes one of the essential mechanisms for ensuring the effectiveness of international law.

From a doctrinal perspective, the concept of international responsibility has evolved from a model focused exclusively on interstate relations toward a broader legal framework encompassing the conduct of international organizations and, in certain circumstances, the protection of individual rights. This development reflects the increasing complexity of the international community and the expansion of international obligations arising from both treaty law and customary international law. Burgos-De la Ossa and Lozada-Pimiento (2009) explain that diplomatic protection and the mechanisms of international responsibility have acquired growing importance as legal instruments designed to ensure reparation for internationally wrongful acts affecting interests protected under international law.

The historical evolution of international responsibility demonstrates that its legal configuration has been closely linked to the development of international law itself. Early doctrinal formulations were primarily intended to resolve disputes between sovereign States. However, the strengthening of international cooperation and the institutionalization of multilateral organizations significantly broadened its scope and application. As early as 1920, Pereyra emphasized that the transformation of the international order required the establishment of legal mechanisms capable of responding to new forms of conflict arising from the evolving relationships among international actors.

Legal Nature

The legal nature of international responsibility has been the subject of extensive scholarly debate, particularly concerning its legal foundations and the effects it produces within the international legal system. One doctrinal approach maintains that international responsibility possesses a predominantly jurisdictional character, insofar as it requires the intervention of competent judicial or arbitral bodies to determine the existence of a breach and its corresponding legal consequences. An alternative approach emphasizes its obligatory character, arguing that international responsibility arises automatically once an internationally wrongful act has occurred, regardless of the authority responsible for formally declaring such responsibility. Maravi (2015) contends that these two perspectives are not mutually exclusive but rather complementary, since international responsibility combines elements derived from legal obligation with institutional mechanisms designed to ensure compliance.

The debate concerning the legal nature of international responsibility is further supported by the analysis of dispute settlement mechanisms established under various international legal instruments. The existence of compromissory clauses, arbitral procedures, and international courts demonstrates that international responsibility extends beyond the mere declaration of non-compliance and functions as an effective mechanism for judicial protection within the international legal order. In this regard, Sempértegui (2012) argues that dispute settlement clauses constitute concrete expressions of the parties' intention to submit potential breaches of international obligations to specialized procedures capable of ensuring impartial and legally binding decisions.

Responsible Subjects

Traditionally, States have been regarded as the principal subjects of international responsibility because of their status as the original holders of rights and obligations under international law. However, the evolution of the international legal system has led to the recognition that other subjects, including international organizations and, in certain circumstances, non-State actors, may also incur international responsibility when their conduct gives rise to legal consequences governed by international law. This expansion reflects the need to adapt traditional legal institutions to an international environment characterized by an increasing diversity of participants within the international community.

The identification of responsible subjects also requires consideration of the social implications of international obligations and the effective protection of the rights and interests involved. Rivera (2022) argues that contemporary legal relations require a broader understanding of the responsibilities arising from social justice and the protection of collective interests. Likewise, Álvarez-Díaz (2007) demonstrates that the ethical and legal debates surrounding responsibility have evolved toward a more comprehensive approach in which the protection of fundamental legal interests constitutes a determining factor in the attribution of legal consequences.

Elements of International Responsibility

The establishment of international responsibility requires the concurrence of specific legal elements that make it possible to determine the existence of a breach capable of giving rise to legal consequences. These elements include an internationally wrongful act, the attribution of that act to the responsible subject, and the existence of damage capable of justifying the obligation to make reparation. The combined presence of these components ensures that international responsibility is founded upon objective criteria consistent with the general principles of international law.

Internationally Wrongful Act

An internationally wrongful act constitutes the essential prerequisite for international responsibility. It arises when a subject of international law breaches an obligation established under a binding rule of international law through either an act or an omission that is legally attributable to that subject. Ruiz Colomé (1999) explains that the existence of an internationally wrongful act depends not merely upon the occurrence of damage but, more fundamentally, upon the violation of a previously assumed international obligation, making the breach itself the central element giving rise to international responsibility.

Contemporary legal scholarship agrees that the unlawfulness of conduct must be assessed in accordance with the rules of international law in force at the time the act occurred. Consequently, determining the existence of an internationally wrongful act requires verification of both the existence of the breached obligation and the incompatibility between the conduct in question and the content of that obligation. This approach reinforces legal certainty by preventing international responsibility from being based on subjective assessments or on legal rules adopted after the occurrence of the relevant facts.

Attribution to the State

Attribution constitutes the legal link through which an internationally wrongful act is assigned to the responsible subject. In the case of States, this requires demonstrating that the conduct was carried out by State organs, public officials, or individuals whose actions are legally attributable to the State under international law. Contreras and Anticona (2016) argue that attribution represents one of the most complex elements of international responsibility because it requires establishing a sufficient legal connection between the conduct in question and the international subject to which the breach is to be attributed.

The evolution of international jurisprudence has broadened the criteria governing attribution in order to respond to new forms of State action and the increasing complexity of international relations. In this regard, Prieto Vaca (2021) explains that the legal attribution of particular conduct requires consideration not only of the direct participation of State organs but also of the functions performed by other actors exercising public authority whose conduct may give rise to international responsibility when international obligations are violated.

Damage and Reparation

Damage constitutes a frequent consequence of an internationally wrongful act and provides the substantive basis for the obligation to make reparation. Although the existence of damage is not always indispensable for establishing international responsibility, it assumes particular importance when determining both the scope and the appropriate form of reparation. Arturo López (2022) argues that the obligation to make reparation seeks, as far as possible, to restore the situation that existed before the commission of the internationally wrongful act, while compensating for the adverse consequences resulting from the unlawful conduct.

Forms of Reparation

International law recognizes several forms of reparation designed to restore the legal equilibrium disrupted by the breach of an international obligation. The choice of the appropriate form of reparation depends upon the nature of the damage, the particular circumstances of the case, and the practical possibility of restoring the situation existing prior to the internationally wrongful act. The most widely recognized forms include **restitution**, **compensation**, and **satisfaction**, which may be applied individually or in combination to ensure full reparation. These remedies reflect the general principle that every violation of international law must give rise to legal consequences sufficient to restore the legal order that has been infringed.

International Dispute Settlement Mechanisms

The peaceful settlement of disputes constitutes one of the fundamental principles of contemporary international law and represents an indispensable element for preserving international peace, security, and cooperation among States. The Charter of the United Nations recognizes the obligation of subjects of international law to resolve their disputes through peaceful means, refraining from the use of force or any measure that could jeopardize international stability. Consequently, international law has developed a broad range of legal and institutional mechanisms designed to facilitate the prevention and settlement of disputes in accordance with the principles of legality, sovereign equality, and good faith.

Negotiation

Negotiation constitutes the oldest and most widely used mechanism for the settlement of international disputes because it enables the parties to reach agreements through direct dialogue without the mandatory involvement of third parties. Its principal advantage lies in the flexibility of the procedure and its capacity to preserve diplomatic relations among the States concerned. Arredondo (2019) argues that negotiation should constitute the primary means of dispute settlement available to subjects of international law, as it promotes mutually acceptable solutions while strengthening international cooperation through consensus and mutual trust.

The effectiveness of negotiation depends largely on the political will of the parties and their willingness to identify solutions consistent with international law. When negotiations are conducted in good faith, this mechanism contributes to reducing tensions and preventing the judicialization of international disputes. Furthermore, negotiation allows the incorporation of political, economic, and social considerations that may be difficult to accommodate within strictly judicial proceedings, thereby facilitating more comprehensive and sustainable agreements.

Mediation

Mediation constitutes an alternative dispute resolution mechanism in which an impartial third party facilitates communication between the disputing parties, encouraging the development of mutually acceptable agreements without imposing a binding decision. Unlike negotiation, the involvement of a mediator helps overcome obstacles arising from inadequate communication or initially irreconcilable positions. Garnica (2022) explains that mediation strengthens the culture of dialogue, promotes cooperation among the parties, and represents a particularly valuable mechanism when preserving long-term legal or diplomatic relationships is a priority.

The use of mediation has expanded significantly within the international sphere because of its ability to provide flexible solutions tailored to the specific characteristics of each dispute. This mechanism has been successfully employed in territorial, commercial, and diplomatic disputes, as well as in conflicts arising from regional integration processes. Its voluntary nature encourages compliance with the agreements reached, since such agreements derive from the consent of the parties rather than from an externally imposed decision.

International Arbitration

International arbitration constitutes one of the most well-established mechanisms for the settlement of disputes involving States, international organizations, and foreign investors. Its defining characteristic is that the parties voluntarily submit their dispute to one or more independent arbitrators whose decision is legally binding. Córdova Mendoza, Ochoa Espinoza, and Durán Ocampo (2019) argue that arbitration combines the procedural flexibility characteristic of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms with the binding force of adjudicative decisions, making it an efficient instrument for resolving international disputes.

The expansion of international arbitration has significantly contributed to strengthening legal certainty in international relations, particularly in the fields of international investment and trade. The specialization of arbitrators, the confidentiality of proceedings, and party autonomy are among the principal advantages consistently recognized in legal scholarship. Nevertheless, ongoing debates continue regarding the transparency of certain arbitral proceedings and the need to achieve an appropriate balance between protecting State interests and safeguarding the rights of private investors.

International Jurisdiction

International jurisdiction represents the institutional mechanism through which specialized judicial bodies hear and resolve disputes in accordance with international law. Unlike arbitration, the jurisdiction of international courts is governed by constitutive legal instruments and predetermined procedural rules, thereby ensuring greater stability and consistency in the interpretation and application of international legal norms. Álvarez Soza (2020) argues that international jurisdiction plays a fundamental role in consolidating the international rule of law by delivering decisions grounded in objective legal principles and the uniform application of international law.

The work of international courts also contributes to the progressive development of international law through the establishment of jurisprudential standards that guide the interpretation of treaties and other sources of international law. This process strengthens legal certainty and promotes the harmonization of international legal standards, thereby enhancing predictability in relations among the various subjects of international law.

International Courts

International courts constitute fundamental institutions for ensuring the effective application of international law and resolving disputes on the basis of impartial legal criteria. Their existence reflects the progressive institutionalization of the international legal system and the

strengthening of mechanisms designed to ensure compliance with international obligations. Through their decisions, these judicial bodies contribute to the development of international jurisprudence and to the refinement of the legal rules governing the international community.

International Court of Justice

The International Court of Justice is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations and serves as the court of general jurisdiction for the resolution of legal disputes between States. Its judgments are of fundamental importance for the interpretation of international law and for strengthening the principle of the peaceful settlement of international disputes. López Martín (2013) argues that the Court has played a decisive role in resolving territorial and maritime disputes, establishing jurisprudential standards that contribute to the stability and predictability of the international legal order.

In addition to adjudicating contentious cases, the International Court of Justice issues advisory opinions at the request of authorized organs and specialized agencies of the United Nations. Although these opinions are not legally binding, they exert considerable influence on the development of international law. The Court's jurisprudence provides authoritative guidance for other international tribunals as well as for States in interpreting and implementing their international legal obligations.

Arbitral Tribunals

International arbitral tribunals complement the work of permanent international courts by providing specialized procedures tailored to the specific characteristics of particular categories of disputes. Their procedural flexibility and the possibility of appointing arbitrators with specialized technical expertise explain their widespread use in commercial, financial, and investment disputes. Requejo Isidro (2017) emphasizes that the experience of international arbitral tribunals has made a substantial contribution to the development of effective mechanisms for resolving transnational disputes involving private parties and other subjects of international law.

The consolidation of international arbitration has strengthened the confidence of economic actors in international systems of dispute resolution. Nevertheless, legal scholarship continues to examine issues relating to transparency, impartiality, and the enforcement of arbitral awards in order to ensure an appropriate balance between party autonomy and the protection of the public interest.

Specialized Bodies

In addition to the International Court of Justice and international arbitral tribunals, a variety of specialized bodies have been established to resolve disputes arising in specific areas of international law. These institutions reflect the increasing specialization of international relations and provide mechanisms for addressing disputes that require particular technical expertise. Ovalle Favela (2011) argues that the establishment of specialized adjudicatory bodies has contributed to a more efficient administration of justice by enabling the resolution of complex disputes through procedures specifically tailored to the characteristics of each legal field.

The existence of these specialized bodies also enhances the effectiveness of the international legal system by allocating jurisdiction according to the nature of the disputes concerned. Such specialization facilitates a more precise interpretation of international legal norms and contributes to greater legal certainty for the various subjects participating in international legal relations.

Contemporary Challenges

International law currently faces significant challenges arising from the transformation of international relations and the emergence of new actors, risks, and forms of international

conflict. Growing economic interdependence, technological advancement, and globalization have increased the complexity of international disputes, creating a pressing need for more effective mechanisms capable of ensuring the consistent application of international law and the protection of the common interests of the international community.

One of the principal challenges concerns the effective implementation of decisions rendered by international courts and other international adjudicatory bodies. Although such decisions are grounded in international law, their enforcement often depends on the willingness of States to comply and on the existence of appropriate domestic implementation mechanisms. Johnson (2016) argues that consensus-building, constructive dialogue, and reasoned legal argumentation constitute essential elements for strengthening compliance with international decisions and enhancing the legitimacy of international dispute settlement mechanisms.

Another significant challenge relates to the fragmentation of the international legal system, resulting from the coexistence of multiple treaties, international courts, and specialized legal regimes that may, in certain circumstances, produce divergent interpretations of international legal norms. Peixoto Batista (2016) explains that this fragmentation requires greater efforts toward normative harmonization in order to preserve the coherence of the international legal system and avoid inconsistencies that could undermine legal certainty and the uniform application of international law.

Moreover, the emergence of transnational disputes involving electronic commerce, international migration, environmental protection, transnational organized crime, and private international legal relationships requires more effective mechanisms of international cooperation. Hernández Ramos (2015) emphasizes that transnational mediation represents a valuable instrument for addressing such disputes by facilitating consensual solutions in contexts characterized by the coexistence of multiple legal systems and the cultural diversity of the parties involved.

Finally, the effectiveness of international law remains one of the central issues in contemporary legal scholarship. The capacity of the international legal system to ensure compliance with international obligations, protect fundamental rights, and respond effectively to global challenges will depend upon the continued strengthening of international institutions and the effective cooperation of States. In this regard, Ojeda Huerta (2023) argues that the effectiveness of public international law should be assessed not only in terms of the existence of legal norms but also according to their capacity to produce tangible effects on the conduct of subjects of international law and to contribute to the maintenance of a stable, predictable, and law-based international legal order.

Discussion

The findings of the present study confirm that international responsibility constitutes one of the fundamental mechanisms for ensuring the effectiveness of international law, insofar as it enables the enforcement of obligations assumed by subjects of international law and establishes legal consequences for their breach. This conclusion is consistent with Crawford (2005), who argues that international responsibility is a structural component of the international legal order because it ensures the effective operation of international legal norms through the obligation to make reparation for damage resulting from internationally wrongful acts. Similarly, Novak Talavera and García-Corrochano Moyano (2000) emphasize that international responsibility represents an indispensable safeguard for preserving the stability and credibility of the international legal system.

Another significant finding concerns the close relationship between international responsibility and the mechanisms for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. The results demonstrate that the existence of procedures such as negotiation, mediation, arbitration, and international adjudication strengthens legal certainty by providing institutional avenues

through which disputes may be resolved in accordance with international law. In this regard, Arredondo (2019) argues that negotiation remains the preferred mechanism for resolving international disputes because of its flexibility and its capacity to preserve diplomatic relations, whereas Córdova Mendoza, Ochoa Espinoza, and Durán Ocampo (2019) emphasize that international arbitration provides legally binding decisions that enhance the confidence of both States and economic actors in the legal resolution of international disputes.

The study also reveals that the effectiveness of international responsibility depends not only on the existence of legal rules but also on the practical capacity to enforce decisions rendered by competent international bodies. In many instances, compliance with international judgments continues to depend upon the political will of States and the ability of domestic legal systems to incorporate and implement international obligations effectively. This finding is consistent with Gómez (1993), who observes that the settlement of international disputes faces significant limitations arising from the decentralized structure of the international legal system. Likewise, Johnson (2016) argues that consensus-building and the perceived legitimacy of international decisions constitute essential factors in promoting their effective implementation.

The findings further indicate that the evolution of international law has considerably expanded the scope of international responsibility into new areas involving human rights protection, environmental governance, international investment, and the conduct of international organizations. This development demonstrates that traditional legal institutions have been required to adapt to an international community characterized by increasing interdependence and the participation of a growing diversity of actors. Burgos-De la Ossa and Lozada-Pimiento (2009) explain that diplomatic protection and international responsibility have acquired new dimensions in response to the processes of economic globalization, while Ojeda Huerta (2023) maintains that the effectiveness of international law depends upon its capacity to respond adequately to contemporary challenges through increasingly specialized legal institutions.

Finally, the study confirms that the principal challenges confronting contemporary international law are associated with normative fragmentation, the coexistence of multiple international adjudicatory bodies, and the emergence of increasingly complex transnational disputes. These circumstances require stronger cooperation among States, greater efforts toward the harmonization of legal standards, and the consolidation of effective mechanisms capable of ensuring the consistent implementation of international obligations. In this context, Peixoto Batista (2016) argues that the fragmentation of the international legal system requires enhanced normative coordination in order to preserve the coherence of the international legal order, whereas Hernández Ramos (2015) highlights the importance of developing flexible dispute settlement mechanisms capable of responding to the transnational nature of contemporary conflicts. Consequently, international responsibility and international dispute settlement mechanisms continue to play a decisive role in consolidating a more effective, stable, and coherent international legal system committed to protecting the common interests of the international community.

Conclusions

International responsibility constitutes one of the fundamental pillars of international law, as it ensures that breaches of international obligations give rise to legal consequences aimed at restoring the disrupted legal order and strengthening legal certainty among the subjects of the international community. The analysis conducted in this study demonstrates that this legal institution has evolved from a conception centered exclusively on States to a broader framework capable of responding to the transformations of global governance and the increasing complexity of international relations. In this regard, Crawford (2005) argues that international responsibility ensures the effectiveness of the international legal system,

whereas Novak Talavera and García-Corrochano Moyano (2000) emphasize its importance as a safeguard for ensuring compliance with international law.

The study further demonstrates that the mechanisms for the peaceful settlement of international disputes—including negotiation, mediation, arbitration, and international adjudication—constitute essential instruments for preventing conflicts and resolving disputes in accordance with the principles of international law. The effective coordination between these mechanisms and the institutions responsible for administering international justice promotes the stability of international relations and strengthens mutual confidence among the various actors of the international legal system. In this respect, Arredondo (2019) highlights the value of negotiation as a preventive mechanism for conflict resolution, while Álvarez Soza (2020) emphasizes the role of international adjudication in consolidating the international rule of law.

Finally, the study concludes that the principal contemporary challenges lie in ensuring the effective implementation of international decisions, reducing normative fragmentation, and adapting international law to the new transnational disputes arising from globalization. Addressing these challenges requires strengthening cooperation among States, promoting greater legal harmonization, and consolidating international institutions capable of responding effectively to contemporary global demands. In this regard, Peixoto Batista (2016) warns that normative fragmentation may undermine the coherence of the international legal system, whereas Ojeda Huerta (2023) argues that the effectiveness of international law ultimately depends upon its capacity to produce tangible effects on the conduct of subjects of international law and to contribute to the maintenance of a stable, predictable, and law-based international legal order.

Study Limitations

The principal limitation of this research lies in its strictly documentary nature. Consequently, the analysis relied exclusively on previously published doctrinal, normative, and jurisprudential sources without incorporating empirical evidence derived from case studies or interviews with specialists in international law.

Future Research

Future research should incorporate comparative studies across different legal systems, together with analyses of cases decided by international courts and tribunals, in order to evaluate the practical application of international responsibility and the effectiveness of international dispute settlement mechanisms in diverse legal and institutional contexts.

Acknowledgments

The author expresses sincere gratitude to the scholars and specialists in public international law, international dispute settlement, and international arbitration whose research, doctrinal contributions, and jurisprudential developments provided an invaluable foundation for this study. The author also acknowledges the valuable contributions of fellow researchers and academic reviewers, whose comments and recommendations enriched the analysis, strengthened the scientific rigor of the research, and contributed to a deeper understanding of the contemporary challenges facing international responsibility and the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

Declaration of Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there are no personal, professional, academic, institutional, or financial conflicts of interest that could have influenced the design, conduct, analysis, interpretation of the findings, or publication of this research.

Referencias

- Álvarez Soza, D. R. (2020). La Jurisdicción Internacional frente al Nuevo Derecho Internacional como medio de solución de las Controversias y su implicancia Constitucional comparada. *Revista Universitaria Ruta*, 22(2), 22-40.
- Álvarez-Díaz, J. A. (2007). La controversia sobre la vivisección. *Acta bioethica*, 13(1), 53-60.
- Arredondo, R. (2019). La negociación como método de solución de controversias internacionales. *Revista Jurídica de la Universidad de Palermo*, 17(1), 79-109.
- Arturo López, C. (2022). Controversia. Sobre la obligación de reparar las injusticias y los daños causados contra cualquier clase de bienes humanos. *ideas y valores*, 71(178).
- Avellaneda Vásquez, J. (2024). Metodología de investigación en Derecho y Literatura para la educación jurídica y derechos humanos. *Justicia*, 29(45).
- Burgos-De la Ossa, M. A., & Lozada-Pimiento, N. (2009). La protección diplomática en el marco de las controversias internacionales de inversión. *International Law*, (15), 243-278.
- Burgos-De la Ossa, M. A., & Lozada-Pimiento, N. (2009). La protección diplomática en el marco de las controversias internacionales de inversión. *International Law*, (15), 243-278.
- Colanzi, I. (2015). Testimonios: nuevos desafíos de la metodología cualitativa en investigación. In *V Congreso Internacional de Investigación 11-13 de noviembre de 2015 La Plata, Argentina*. Universidad Nacional de La Plata. Facultad de Psicología.
- Comelio Landero, E. (2014). Los mecanismos alternativos de solución de controversias como derecho humano. *BARATARIA. Revista Castellano-Manchega de Ciencias sociales*, (17), 81-95.
- Contreras, C. P., & Anticono, D. Q. (2016). Imputación de actos de corrupción en la contratación pública y su implicancia en el arbitraje de contrataciones con el estado. *Arbitraje PUCP*, 6, 151-168.
- Córdova Mendoza, K. T., Ochoa Espinoza, A. M., & Durán Ocampo, A. R. (2019). Algunas consideraciones sobre la mediación y arbitraje. *Revista Universidad y Sociedad*, 11(4), 287-295.
- Crawford, J. (2005). Los artículos de la Comisión de Derecho Internacional sobre la Responsabilidad Internacional del Estado: Introducción, texto y comentarios. <https://www.torrossa.com/en/resources/an/2477269>
- Flores, Á. B. (2020). La indemnización expropiatoria. *Anales de la Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas y Sociales*, 17.
- Garnica, M. R. C. (2022). La mediación, mecanismo alternativo de solución de controversias. *Revista electrónica de divulgación jurídica y criminológica*. Revista electrónica EXLEGE Universidad De La Salle Facultad de Derecho Año 2, núm. 3 Pp. 75-90
- Gómez, J. M. P. (1993). La solución de controversias internacionales. *Revista Alegatos*, (24), 57-76.
- González, W. N. (2020). Los mecanismos extrajudiciales de resolución de conflictos en línea: su problemática en el derecho internacional privado. *Anuario colombiano de Derecho internacional*, 13, 187-208.
- Hernández Ramos, C. (2015). Mediación transnacional: una aproximación práctica en el ámbito de las relaciones privadas internacionales. *Barataria. Revista Castellano-Manchega de Ciencias Sociales*. 19: 151-160. <https://doi.org/10.20932/barataria.v0i19.32>

- Illanes, S. F. (1985). Solucion Pacifica de Controversias y el Mantenimiento de la Paz, La. *Revista Chilena de Derecho*, 12, 279.
- Johnson, D. W. (2016). *La controversia constructiva: argumentación, escucha y toma de decisiones razonada* (Vol. 14). Ediciones SM España.
- López Martín, A. G. (2013). El arreglo de las controversias territoriales por la Corte Internacional de Justicia. Una aproximación a sus líneas directrices. *Revista Electrónica De Derecho de la Universidad de La Rioja (REDUR)*, (11), 55-72.
- Maravi, R. J. Z. (2015). *La eficacia del arbitraje como mecanismo de resolución de controversias empresariales a la luz de la teoría contractual y la teoría jurisdiccional sobre su naturaleza jurídica*. Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (Peru).
- Mortimore, M. (2009). *Arbitraje internacional basado en cláusulas de solución de controversias entre los inversionistas y el Estado en acuerdos internacionales de inversión: desafíos para América Latina y el Caribe*. CEPAL.
- Novak Talavera, F., & García-Corrochano Moyano, L. (2000). Derecho internacional público. Tomo I. *Introducción y Fuentes*.
- Núñez Herrera, I. (2020). *Análisis crítico de las resoluciones del tribunal fiscal en las controversias por solicitudes de restitución arancelaria-drawback con indicios de sobrevaloración de mercancía*. [Tesis de Master, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Peru].
<https://www.proquest.com/openview/5e81f59ecee13eee6a0d84926188878d/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Ojeda Huerta, E. (2023). Reflexiones sobre la eficacia del Derecho Internacional Público. *Forseti. Revista De Derecho*, 12(18), 97-112.
<https://doi.org/10.21678/forseti.v12i17.2170>
- Olvera Echeveste, J. C. (2020). Mecanismos Alternativos de Solución de Controversias. *Ecos sociales*, 8(24).
- Ovalle Favela, J. (2011). Las controversias constitucionales y los órganos autónomos. *Cuestiones constitucionales*, (25), 101-127.
- Paolillo, F. (1981). Solucion de Controversias Relacionadas con Actos de Organizaciones Internacionales: el caso de la Autoridad Internacional de los Fondos Marinos. *REDI*, 33, 491.
- Peixoto Batista, J. (2016). Armonización y fragmentación de las reglas en el sistema internacional: un acercamiento al caso de la OMC. *Relaciones internacionales*, 25(50), 45-71.
- Pereyra, C. (1920). *La Tercera Internacional: doctrinas y controversias*. Biblioteca Nueva.
- Prieto Vaca, J. P. S. (2021). Responsabilidad del Estado por la Actuación de los Árbitros ¿Se puede utilizar el título de imputación jurídica error judicial, para obtener la reparación de los daños causados por estos en su actuación?. *Justicia, Sociedad Y derecho*, 1(2), 47-63. <https://doi.org/10.24267/25009389.683>
- Requejo Isidro, M. (2017). Gestión de controversias trasfronterizas inter privados: la experiencia de los tribunales arbitrales mixtos. *Anuario español de derecho internacional privado*, 17.
- Rivera, É. C. (2022). La justicia social se adentra en la cocina. Controversias acerca del salario para el trabajo de cuidados. *Eikasía Revista de Filosofía*, (106), 127-140.

- Rodríguez Vieira, M. G., & Marín Díaz, J. C. (2025). El discurso jurídico en la ficción: Un análisis cualitativo-hermeneútico en la narrativa venezolana. *Dictum - Revista De Ciencias Jurídicas Y Políticas | Universidad Yacambú*, 4(2), 37-55. Recuperado a partir de <https://revista.uny.edu.ve/ojs/index.php/dictum/article/view/718>
- Ruiz Colomé, M. A. (1999). Las consecuencias del hecho ilícito internacional. *Revista Española de Derecho Internacional*, vol. 51, no. 1, 1999, pp. 340-43. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44297903>. Accessed 15 May 2026.
- Sempértegui, L. (2012). Naturaleza Jurídica de la Cláusula de Solución de Controversias de los Contratos de Prestación de Servicios Petroleros en el Ecuador. *Revista Ecuatoriana de Arbitraje*, (3), 127-158.
- Vasilachis de Gialdino, I. (2014). *Discurso científico, político, jurídico y de resistencia: análisis lingüístico e investigación cualitativa*. Gedisa editorial.