



Sustainability and Legitimacy in International Criminal Justice: Balancing Accountability and Human Rights

Mihai Ștefănoaia

Faculty of Law and Administrative Sciences, Ștefan cel Mare University Suceava, Romania

Abstract

International criminal justice has increasingly been evaluated not only in terms of its capacity to prosecute perpetrators of serious international crimes, but also in terms of its long-term sustainability and institutional legitimacy. This paper examines the relationship between accountability mechanisms and the protection of fundamental human rights within the evolving architecture of international criminal justice. While international tribunals and courts are designed to combat impunity for crimes such as genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes, their effectiveness depends on maintaining a careful balance between the pursuit of justice and adherence to fair trial guarantees and human rights standards. The study adopts a doctrinal and interdisciplinary approach, integrating perspectives from international criminal law, human rights law and legal psychology to analyze how accountability processes influence the perceived legitimacy and resilience of international judicial institutions. Particular attention is given to the role of procedural safeguards, victim participation and state cooperation in shaping sustainable justice mechanisms. The paper also discusses the structural and political challenges faced by international courts, including selective enforcement, resource constraints, and tensions between global justice norms and state sovereignty. The analysis suggests that the sustainability of international criminal justice depends on strengthening the normative alignment between accountability and human rights protection. By promoting transparent procedures, consistent legal standards, and victim-centered approaches, international justice institutions can enhance their legitimacy and contribute to a more resilient global legal order. Ultimately, achieving a sustainable model of international criminal justice requires balancing the imperative to punish grave crimes with the obligation to uphold the fundamental rights and dignity of all individuals involved in the judicial process.

Keywords: International criminal justice, sustainability, institutional legitimacy, accountability, human rights protection, international criminal law, fair trial guarantees, systemic resilience, global justice, rule of law.

1. Introduction

In recent decades, international criminal justice has emerged as a central mechanism for addressing mass atrocities, promoting accountability, and reinforcing the rule of law at the

global level. Institutions such as the International Criminal Court and ad hoc tribunals have been entrusted with the responsibility of prosecuting individuals for the most serious crimes of concern to the international community, including genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. However, the growing prominence of international criminal justice has also generated critical debates regarding its sustainability and legitimacy, particularly in light of political contestation, selective enforcement, and tensions with human rights standards.

Sustainability in international criminal justice refers not only to the institutional endurance of courts and tribunals, but also to their long-term capacity to deliver consistent, effective, and credible justice. This includes financial viability, state cooperation, and the ability to adapt to evolving geopolitical realities. At the same time, legitimacy, both normative and sociological, depends on the perceived fairness, impartiality, and effectiveness of these institutions. Without legitimacy, international criminal justice risks losing its authority and influence, regardless of its formal legal mandate.

A central tension arises from the need to balance accountability with the protection of human rights. While international criminal tribunals aim to combat impunity, they must also adhere to fundamental fair trial guarantees and respect the rights of the accused, victims and affected communities. This dual mandate often creates complex dilemmas. For instance, efforts to secure arrests and convictions may conflict with due process standards, while political considerations may influence prosecutorial decisions, raising concerns about selectivity and bias (Akhavan, 2001, Cryer et al., 2019).

Moreover, the legitimacy of international criminal justice has been challenged by accusations of geographical imbalance and neo-colonial bias, particularly regarding the focus of the International Criminal Court on African situations. Such critiques highlight the importance of ensuring that accountability mechanisms are perceived as equitable and universally applicable, rather than as instruments of political power. In parallel, questions have been raised about the limited impact of international prosecutions on affected communities, as well as the gap between global justice narratives and local experiences.

Another dimension of this debate concerns the relationship between international criminal justice and broader human rights frameworks. While both fields share common normative foundations, their operational logics may diverge. Criminal justice emphasizes individual responsibility and retribution, whereas human rights law prioritizes protection, prevention, and structural reform. Reconciling these approaches requires a careful calibration of legal standards and institutional practices.

Against this background, this article examines the interplay between sustainability and legitimacy in international criminal justice, with a particular focus on how accountability mechanisms can be aligned with human rights principles. It argues that the long-term effectiveness of international criminal institutions depends not only on their capacity to prosecute crimes, but also on their ability to maintain legitimacy through fairness, inclusivity and respect for fundamental rights.

By analyzing both doctrinal developments and critical perspectives, the study seeks to contribute to ongoing debates on the future of international criminal justice and to identify pathways for strengthening its normative and institutional foundations.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

The academic discourse on international criminal justice has increasingly focused on the twin concepts of sustainability and legitimacy, particularly in relation to institutions such as the International Criminal Court. Scholars from international law, political science and

transitional justice studies have examined how these institutions operate within a complex global environment marked by legal pluralism, political contestation and evolving human rights expectations.

Recent scholarship has increasingly examined international criminal justice from Global South perspectives, emphasizing concerns related to unequal power structures, selective enforcement, and neo-colonial dynamics within international accountability mechanisms. Scholars have also highlighted the need to evaluate legitimacy not only through institutional design, but also through the perceptions of affected communities and empirical assessments of local impact (Kendall, 2020, Nouwen & Werner, 2021).

2.1 Conceptualizing Legitimacy in International Criminal Justice

Legitimacy is a multidimensional concept, commonly divided into normative legitimacy and sociological legitimacy. Normative legitimacy refers to the extent to which institutions comply with legal principles and moral standards, including fairness, due process and respect for human rights. Sociological legitimacy, by contrast, concerns the perception of these institutions by states, affected communities and the broader international public (Clark, 2018).

In the context of international criminal justice, legitimacy is closely tied to issues such as:

- impartiality and independence of judicial bodies
- consistency in prosecutorial practices
- inclusiveness and representation of affected populations

Critiques of the International Criminal Court have often centered on allegations of selective justice and political bias, particularly regarding its focus on certain regions. Such critiques highlight the fragility of legitimacy in a system that depends heavily on state cooperation and voluntary compliance (Mégret, 2016).

The Afghanistan situation illustrates the tensions between prosecutorial discretion, political pressure, and legitimacy (International Criminal Court, 2020). The ICC Prosecutor's decision to prioritize crimes committed by the Taliban and ISIS-K while deprioritizing investigations involving United Nations (1966) personnel generated criticism regarding selective justice and unequal accountability standards.

Similarly, the Palestine situation demonstrates the highly politicized nature of international criminal justice (International Criminal Court, 2021). The ICC's exercise of jurisdiction has been both supported as a necessary accountability mechanism and criticized as politically sensitive intervention, reflecting broader debates concerning state sovereignty and judicial impartiality.

In contrast, the ICC's response to the situation in Ukraine has been characterized by unprecedented international cooperation, financial support, and rapid investigative action. While this demonstrates the capacity of international criminal justice to mobilize effectively, it has also intensified debates concerning consistency and equal treatment across situations.

2.2 Sustainability as Institutional Resilience

Sustainability in international criminal justice extends beyond financial or institutional survival. It encompasses the long-term viability and effectiveness of legal mechanisms in delivering justice and maintaining relevance. Scholars have identified several dimensions of sustainability:

- institutional sustainability, referring to stable funding, administrative capacity and operational continuity
- political sustainability, dependent on state support and cooperation
- normative sustainability, linked to the ability of institutions to maintain credibility and adapt to evolving legal standards

The International Criminal Court exemplifies these challenges, as it relies on member state cooperation for arrests, evidence gathering and enforcement of sentences. The absence of an independent enforcement mechanism raises questions about its long-term effectiveness (Bosco, 2014).

2.3 Accountability versus Human Rights: A Theoretical Tension

A central theme in the literature is the tension between accountability and human rights protection. International criminal justice seeks to hold individuals accountable for serious crimes, yet it must simultaneously uphold fundamental rights, including fair trial guarantees, the presumption of innocence and procedural safeguards.

This tension is often conceptualized through two competing paradigms:

- A retributive justice model, emphasizing punishment and deterrence
- A human rights-based approach, focusing on protection, fairness and restorative outcomes

Scholars such as Teitel (2000) argue that transitional justice frameworks must balance these paradigms to achieve both justice and reconciliation. In practice, however, this balance is difficult to maintain, particularly in politically sensitive contexts where prosecutorial decisions may be influenced by strategic considerations.

2.4 Theories of Global Governance and Legal Pluralism

The operation of international criminal justice institutions can also be understood through the lens of global governance and legal pluralism. Slaughter (2004) conceptualizes international law as a network of interacting institutions and actors, rather than a hierarchical system. Within this framework, international criminal courts interact with domestic jurisdictions, regional courts, and international organizations.

Legal pluralism further highlights the coexistence of multiple normative systems, including international law, domestic law, and informal justice mechanisms. This plurality can both enhance and complicate the functioning of international criminal justice, as it requires coordination and mutual recognition between different legal orders (Berman, 2007).

2.5 Legitimacy through Fairness and Effectiveness

A growing body of literature emphasizes that legitimacy in international criminal justice is closely linked to both procedural fairness and substantive effectiveness. Tyler (2006) argues that perceptions of fairness in legal processes are critical for institutional legitimacy, even more so than outcomes.

In this context, international tribunals must ensure:

- transparency in proceedings
- equality of arms between prosecution and defense
- meaningful participation of victims

At the same time, effectiveness—measured through successful prosecutions and tangible impact—remains essential. The challenge lies in achieving both fairness and efficiency without compromising either.

3. Methodology Research

This study employs a qualitative, doctrinal, and interdisciplinary research methodology to examine the relationship between sustainability, legitimacy and human rights in international criminal justice. Given the normative and conceptual nature of the topic, the research is primarily analytical, focusing on the interpretation of legal texts, institutional practices and scholarly debates.

3.1 Research Design

The research is structured around a normative legal analysis, complemented by theoretical and comparative perspectives. It integrates:

- Doctrinal legal research, to analyze foundational legal instruments and jurisprudence
- Theoretical analysis, to engage with legitimacy and sustainability frameworks
- Comparative assessment, to evaluate tensions and alignments between accountability mechanisms and human rights standards

This design allows for a comprehensive understanding of both the legal and conceptual dimensions of international criminal justice.

3.2 Sources of Data

The study is based exclusively on secondary sources, selected for their authority and relevance:

a) Primary legal sources

- The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court
- Jurisprudence and decisions of the International Criminal Court
- Relevant international human rights instruments (e.g., ICCPR, regional conventions)

b) Secondary sources

- Academic books and peer-reviewed journal articles
- Reports from international organizations (e.g., UN, NGOs, ICC reports)
- Critical scholarship on legitimacy, sustainability, and global justice

Sources were selected based on their doctrinal relevance, institutional authority, academic impact, and contribution to contemporary debates on legitimacy and sustainability in international criminal justice. Particular emphasis was placed on post-2019 scholarship, landmark ICC jurisprudence, and interdisciplinary studies combining legal and empirical perspectives.

3.3 Method of Analysis

The research applies several complementary analytical methods:

a) Doctrinal analysis

This involves interpreting legal provisions and case law to assess how international criminal justice institutions balance accountability with human rights obligations.

b) Thematic analysis

Key themes such as legitimacy, sustainability, selectivity and fairness are identified and analyzed across the literature and legal sources.

c) Comparative analysis

The study compares:

- different theoretical approaches (e.g., retributive vs. human rights-based models)
- institutional practices of international criminal courts

d) Critical analysis

A critical perspective is adopted to evaluate the strengths and limitations of current frameworks, particularly in relation to political influence, enforcement challenges and perceived legitimacy deficits.

The comparative and thematic analysis was operationalized by examining recurring themes across legal scholarship, institutional practices, and selected ICC situations, including issues related to prosecutorial discretion, victim participation, state cooperation, and procedural fairness. Case comparisons were used to identify patterns of legitimacy enhancement and institutional challenges.

3.4. Research Objectives

3.4.1 General Objective

The primary objective of this study is to analyze how international criminal justice can achieve a sustainable and legitimate balance between accountability for serious international crimes and the protection of human rights.

3.4.2 Specific Objectives

The research pursues the following specific objectives:

- To examine the concept of legitimacy in international criminal justice, including both normative and sociological dimensions
- To analyze the sustainability of international criminal institutions, particularly the International Criminal Court
- To explore the tension between accountability and human rights, especially in relation to fair trial guarantees and due process
- To assess the impact of selectivity and political influence on institutional legitimacy
- To evaluate how international criminal justice interacts with broader human rights frameworks
- To identify structural challenges and propose directions for improving both legitimacy and sustainability

3.5 Research Questions

The study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What factors determine the legitimacy of international criminal justice institutions?
2. How can sustainability be ensured in a system dependent on state cooperation and political support?
3. To what extent can accountability for international crimes be reconciled with the protection of human rights?
4. How do issues of selectivity and perceived bias affect the credibility of institutions such as the International Criminal Court?
5. What reforms or approaches could enhance both legitimacy and long-term effectiveness?

4. Analysis and Discussion

The relationship between sustainability and legitimacy in international criminal justice reveals a complex and often fragile equilibrium, shaped by legal principles, institutional practices, and geopolitical realities. The experience of the International Criminal Court illustrates both the potential and the limitations of international accountability mechanisms in achieving long-term effectiveness while maintaining normative credibility.

A central issue emerging from the analysis is the interdependence between legitimacy and sustainability. Legitimacy understood as both legal validity and perceived fairness constitutes a prerequisite for institutional sustainability. Without the confidence of states and affected communities, international criminal institutions risk losing cooperation, funding, and political support. At the same time, sustainability reinforces legitimacy by enabling institutions to function consistently, deliver results, and build a stable body of jurisprudence. This reciprocal relationship suggests that neither concept can be pursued in isolation, rather, they must be developed in tandem.

However, this balance is significantly challenged by the tension between accountability and human rights. International criminal justice seeks to prosecute individuals responsible for serious crimes, yet it must do so within a framework that fully respects due process and fair trial guarantees. The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court establishes a comprehensive set of procedural safeguards, but their practical application often raises difficult questions (International Criminal Court, 1998). For instance, lengthy proceedings, pre-trial detention, and evidentiary challenges may affect the rights of the accused, while at the same time undermining perceptions of efficiency and effectiveness. This creates a structural dilemma: prioritizing efficiency may compromise fairness, whereas strict adherence to procedural guarantees may reduce the perceived effectiveness of the system.

Another critical dimension concerns selectivity and political influence, which directly impact institutional legitimacy. The focus of international prosecutions on certain regions or situations has generated accusations of bias and unequal justice. Although legal criteria such as jurisdiction and admissibility formally guide prosecutorial decisions, the reality of international politics inevitably shapes which cases are pursued. This perception of selectivity weakens the authority of institutions like the International Criminal Court, as legitimacy depends not only on legal correctness but also on the appearance of impartiality and universality.

Furthermore, the effectiveness of international criminal justice is constrained by its dependence on state cooperation. Unlike domestic legal systems, international courts lack independent enforcement mechanisms and rely on states for arrests, evidence collection, and enforcement of sentences. This structural limitation affects both sustainability and legitimacy.

When states fail to cooperate or selectively comply with obligations, it undermines the credibility of the system and raises questions about its practical capacity to deliver justice.

The analysis also highlights the importance of victim-centered approaches in enhancing legitimacy. Increasing recognition of victims' rights such as participation in proceedings and access to reparations represents a significant development in international criminal justice. However, gaps remain between formal recognition and actual implementation. Limited outreach, procedural complexity, and resource constraints may reduce the meaningful participation of victims, thereby affecting the perceived fairness and inclusiveness of the system. ICC jurisprudence concerning victim participation has progressively expanded the procedural role of victims in international criminal proceedings. Decisions in cases such as Lubanga and Katanga recognized the importance of victim participation and reparations in strengthening the legitimacy of international justice. At the same time, these developments have required careful balancing with the fair trial rights of the accused, particularly regarding disclosure obligations and procedural efficiency.

In addition, the broader framework of global governance and legal pluralism plays a crucial role in shaping international criminal justice. Institutions such as the International Criminal Court operate within a multi-level legal environment, interacting with domestic courts, regional systems, and international organizations. While this plurality allows for complementary mechanisms of accountability, it also creates coordination challenges and potential inconsistencies. The principle of complementarity, for example, seeks to balance international and domestic jurisdiction, but its application depends heavily on national capacity and willingness to prosecute.

From a critical perspective, the sustainability of international criminal justice requires not only institutional resilience but also normative adaptability. As new forms of conflict and transnational crime emerge, international courts must evolve to remain relevant. At the same time, they must preserve core human rights standards to maintain legitimacy. This dual requirement underscores the need for continuous reform and innovation within the system.

In conclusion, the analysis demonstrates that international criminal justice operates within a delicate balance between competing demands: accountability versus rights protection, legal principles versus political realities, and global aspirations versus local impacts. The long-term sustainability and legitimacy of institutions such as the International Criminal Court depend on their ability to navigate these tensions effectively, ensuring that justice is not only done but also perceived as fair, impartial, and meaningful.

The principle of complementarity further illustrates both the strengths and limitations of the international criminal justice system. In some contexts, ICC involvement has encouraged domestic reforms and national prosecutions, while in others limited state capacity or political unwillingness have obstructed effective cooperation. Failures to execute arrest warrants in cases involving high-profile suspects have particularly affected perceptions of institutional authority and effectiveness.

Several measures could contribute to strengthening both the sustainability and legitimacy of international criminal justice.

First, greater transparency in prosecutorial prioritization would help reduce perceptions of selectivity and political bias. Clearer public criteria concerning case selection and resource allocation could enhance institutional credibility.

Second, stronger cooperation mechanisms between international courts and states are necessary. This may include incentives for compliance, diplomatic pressure, and coordinated sanctions in cases of persistent non-cooperation.

Third, reducing excessive pre-trial detention and procedural delays should become a priority. Establishing more efficient procedural timelines would improve both fairness and perceptions of effectiveness.

Finally, victim-centered outreach strategies should be expanded through local engagement programs, accessible communication mechanisms, and increased participation opportunities for affected communities. Such measures would strengthen sociological legitimacy and improve public confidence in international criminal justice institutions.

5. Conclusion

This study has examined the complex relationship between sustainability and legitimacy in international criminal justice, with particular reference to institutions such as the International Criminal Court. The analysis has demonstrated that the effectiveness of international criminal justice depends not only on its capacity to prosecute serious international crimes, but also on its ability to maintain credibility, fairness and long-term institutional viability.

A central conclusion of this research is that legitimacy and sustainability are deeply interconnected and mutually reinforcing. Legitimacy grounded in adherence to legal standards, impartiality and respect for human rights is essential for securing the cooperation of states and the trust of affected communities. In turn, sustainability ensures the continuity and stability necessary for international institutions to function effectively and to build consistent jurisprudence over time.

At the same time, the study highlights the persistent tension between accountability and human rights protection. While international criminal justice aims to combat impunity, it must do so within a framework that fully respects due process, fair trial guarantees, and the rights of both defendants and victims. Achieving this balance remains one of the most significant challenges facing the system, particularly in light of procedural complexities and resource constraints.

The research also underscores the impact of selectivity, political influence and reliance on state cooperation on institutional legitimacy. Perceptions of unequal justice or political bias can undermine the authority of international criminal courts, while the absence of independent enforcement mechanisms limits their practical effectiveness. These structural constraints highlight the importance of strengthening cooperation mechanisms and enhancing transparency in prosecutorial decision-making.

Furthermore, the increasing recognition of victims' rights and participation represents an important step toward enhancing the legitimacy of international criminal justice. However, ensuring meaningful and effective implementation of these rights remains a critical task for future development.

In conclusion, international criminal justice stands at a crossroads, where its future depends on its ability to reconcile competing demands and adapt to evolving global challenges. Strengthening both sustainability and legitimacy requires a holistic approach, combining institutional reform, greater inclusivity, improved cooperation and a continued commitment to human rights principles. Only by maintaining this balance can international criminal justice fulfill its fundamental purpose: delivering accountability in a manner that is fair, credible, and enduring.

References

- Akhavan, P. (2001). Beyond impunity: Can international criminal justice prevent future atrocities? *American Journal of International Law*, *95*(1), 7–31. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2642034>
- Berman, P. S. (2007). Global legal pluralism. *Southern California Law Review*, *80*(6), 1155–1238.
- Bosco, D. (2014). *Rough justice: The International Criminal Court in a world of power politics*. Oxford University Press.
- Clark, P. (2018). *Distant justice: The impact of the International Criminal Court on African politics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108576260>
- Cryer, R., Friman, H., Robinson, D., & Wilmschurst, E. (2019). *An introduction to international criminal law and procedure* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- International Criminal Court. (1998). *Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court*.
- International Criminal Court. (2020). *Situation in Afghanistan*.
- International Criminal Court. (2021). *Situation in the State of Palestine*.
- International Criminal Court. (2022). *Situation in Ukraine*.
- Kendall, S. (2020). *The limits of international criminal justice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mégret, F. (2016). The politics of international criminal justice. *European Journal of International Law*, *27*(3), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0922156515000710>
- Nouwen, S., & Werner, W. (2021). Doing justice to the political: The International Criminal Court in context. *Leiden Journal of International Law*, *34*(2), 327–347.
- Prosecutor v. Lubanga*, Case No. ICC-01/04-01/06, Judgment pursuant to Article 74 of the Rome Statute (International Criminal Court, March 14, 2012). <https://www.icc-cpi.int/court-record/icc-01-04-01-06>
- Prosecutor v. Katanga*, Case No. ICC-01/04-01/07, Judgment pursuant to Article 74 of the Rome Statute (International Criminal Court, March 7, 2014). <https://www.icc-cpi.int/court-record/icc-01-04-01-07>
- Slaughter, A.-M. (2004). *A new world order*. Princeton University Press.
- Teitel, R. G. (2000). *Transitional justice*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195100648.001.0001>
- Tyler, T. R. (2006). *Why people obey the law*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400828609>
- United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*.