

CALL FOR PAPERS

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL MILITARY JUSTICE FORUM

Le congrès international sur la justice militaire

LONDON
6-7 MAY 2027
Royal College of Defence Studies





4th INTERNATIONAL MILITARY JUSTICE FORUM

LONDON
6-7 May 2027

“Military justice from a multidisciplinary perspective”

Venue / Lieu : Royal College of Defence Studies.

More information / Plus d'informations: militaryjusticeforum.com

The International Military Justice Forum (IMJF) is a **two-day academic event** dedicated to **fostering scholarship and teaching** in the fields of military justice and military criminal law. It aims at bringing together academics, professionals, military officers, students, and all those who share an interest in these exciting disciplines. Its first objective is to **highlight the diversity of military justice systems**, to expose their salient features, to **explore their history** and to underline their **actual evolution**. In a comparative way, the IMJF also aims to emphasise links and similarities that may have existed – or still exist – between national military laws, which may be consequences of circulations of legal models, codes, doctrines and people or the existence of geopolitical influences. This scientific event must finally allow us to imagine together what the **future of military justice** could be, as our armed forces are transformed by **new technologies** and ever-changing threat perceptions.

Its originality is to **mix disciplines**: Law, legal history, military history, ethics, philosophy, and new technologies will be at the heart of debates and discussions.

The fourth edition of the IMJF is organised by:

- The Centre de Recherche de l'**Académie Militaire Saint-Cyr Coëtquidan** (CreC Saint-Cyr),
- The Faculty of Military Science of **Stellenbosch University**,
- The **Office of the Judge Advocate General of His Majesty's Armed Forces**,
- The Institut d'Histoire du Droit of **Université Paris Cité**.

Objectives

1) To highlight contemporary military justice systems and reforms to come

This first part should be used to **deepen existing knowledge** on military justice systems that exist in the world and to **identify points of comparison**. Many issues are to be considered: What are the legal foundations of military justice? Which courts hear military cases? Has military justice been civilianised? What is the jurisdiction of military courts? How are courts organised? Do military courts exist both in wartime and peacetime? How are they hierarchised? How do they work? Are they special and different from civilian courts? Are there specialised civilian courts? Or are they organised in a mixed way? Are military personnel subject to trial in civilian courts? Are civil parties permitted in military courts? Who is the judge? Is there a legally-trained judge in military court? What is the procedure? What are the offences? What are the penalties? Who decides whether an offence should be tried in military court? Are the standards for prosecuting military offences different from the standards for prosecuting civilian offences? What is the officer's role in military justice? What is the procedure for punishing military personnel for minor offences? What about military justice and fundamental rights? How to improve the protection of victims and to improve the fight against any type of discrimination?

All these questions could also be used to **provide a critical look** at a national military justice system, in terms of structure, functioning or respect of fundamental rights: **why and how to improve military justice?**



2) To recount the history of military justice

This second part aims to highlight the main historical developments of military justice, from Antiquity to the contemporary period:

- **The evolution of the sources of military justice:** Military justice systems are known to have been largely built by major legislations, as, among others, the first Articles of War in England (1385), the Mandement de Montdidier (1347) and legislations of 1796 in France or the Swedish code of 1621. At the origins of these founding texts, famous legislators have left their mark on the history of military justice. However, the latter has also developed in practice, thanks to courts decisions and to political debates. In other words, what have been sources of military justice? Who are those who contributed to its history?
- **The institutional aspect:** Gradually, military justice has been structured and institutionalised, before being integrated into State administration. How has military justice been transformed in the context of the construction of states and the establishment of permanent and professional armed forces? This question implies others: how did new bodies of specialised lawyers appear? What has been the relationship between military and civilian justice? Broadly speaking, what have been the major structural and institutional transformations of military justice?
- **Military justice in its military context:** Establishing a modern system of military justice is one thing. Ensuring it functions properly is another. Has the military justice system always been effective – particularly in times of war, debacle or defeat – in enforcing discipline and punishing acts of violence committed by combatants against civilians? Has the military justice system been used during wartime to try civilians, collaborators, or traitors?
- **Military justice in practice:** The history of military justice is also that of trials and cases. Some are famous, others have been forgotten. Some have made military justice grow, others have turned public opinion against it. What are great military affairs in history? Which less well-known ones deserve to be known better?





3) The circulation of military justice models in the world

Comparative studies can answer two sets of questions:

- **Why compare national systems of military justice?** It seems that many authors, lawyers or not, military or not, have in the past compared, and still compare, national military laws or military justice systems today. There are a variety of reasons for that: criticising a system, promoting or rejecting reform, categorising or classifying laws or procedures, or simply exposing diversity. It also seems that several national military laws have been models used to build other national legal systems. The aim is to look at the circulation of military law models around the world, and to expose methods and motives of legal comparison.
- **Are there “families” of military justice?** French comparatist René David identified several “families” of legal systems in the world (Common Law, Civil Law, Religious Law, etc.). But could it be possible to identify families of military laws? In other words, have colonisation, international treaties of all kinds (e.g. NATO), intergovernmental organisations (e.g. Commonwealth), political unions (e.g. USSR), political and economic associations (e.g. EU) or simply interstate cultural or diplomatic bonds, contributed to the emergence of “families” of military justice systems, whose members share common features and similarities?

4) Imagine tomorrow's military law and military justice

Mercenaries and contractors, drones, battlefield robotisation, augmented soldiers, artificial intelligence, present and future technological developments, and their use by armed forces, must necessarily be controlled and regulated by law. Stakes are numerous: responsibility, punishments, consent, courts' jurisdiction, protection of persons, restrictions of means and methods of warfare, etc. What does the future hold for military law and military justice? What reforms are needed to enable our current systems to cope with tomorrow's war?



We invite proposals that fall within the following categories:

- **Individual papers.** Paper proposals must not exceed 400 words.
- **Panel proposals.** Panel proposals, including short bios of the panelists, must not exceed 800 words.

Papers will be given in English

Proposals should be sent to the forum's organisers, specifying in which section papers would be included: **militaryjusticeforum@gmail.com**

The deadline to submit a proposal is **01 October 2026**

Organisation committee:

Gwenaël Guyon (CReC Saint-Cyr)

Evert Kleynhans (Stellenbosch University)

Judge Alan Large (Office of the JAG of the the UK)

