

GENEVA ACADEMY
of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights



**UNIVERSITÉ
DE GENÈVE**
FACULTY OF LAW

**SOCIÉTÉ
ACADÉMIQUE** ■
■ ■ de Genève

WHITE PAPER

THE ARMS TRADE AND INTERNATIONAL LAW: ADDRESSING COMPLIANCE GAPS

EXPERT SEMINAR | 8-9 DECEMBER 2025

EXPERT SEMINAR

VILLA MOYNIER, GENEVA | HYBRID, MONDAY 8TH AND TUESDAY 9TH, DECEMBER 2025

The event was organised by the Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights (Geneva Academy) in partnership with the European Center for Constitutional and Human Rights (ECCHR) and the University of Geneva (UNIGE), with the kind financial support of the Société Académique de Genève (SACAD). For further information please contact [Chloé Bailey](#) (Senior Legal Advisor for Business & Human Rights, ECCHR) or [Florence Foster](#) (Senior Project Manager, Geneva Academy)

BACKGROUND

This document synthesizes the key insights and critical discussions from a two-day Expert Seminar co-organized by ECCHR and the Geneva Academy. It convened a select group of researchers, legal practitioners, civil society advocates, and international experts to examine the structural challenges, persistent accountability gaps, and future legal pathways in the global arms trade. The discussions, held under the Chatham House Rule, fostered a candid and collaborative dialogue among peers. To honor this principle, all interventions summarized herein have been anonymized, allowing for a frank and comprehensive overview of the discourse.

OBJECTIVES OF THE EXPERT SEMINAR

- Showcase latest research and academic writing on the arms trade and international law.
- Enable corresponding future interdisciplinary and collaborative research on these topics, including through joint funding proposals and corresponding research pathways.
- Develop a White Paper on “The Arms Trade and International Law: Addressing Compliance Gaps” to reflect on the salient issues, research and pathways forward addressed in the Expert Seminar.
- Interrogate the regulatory failures and political incentives that shield both states and corporations from accountability.
- Examine the implications of state and corporate complicity in unlawful arms transfers and its intersections with international obligations under international humanitarian law (IHL), international human rights law (IHRL), and the Arms Trade Treaty.
- Explore existing and potential legal and non-legal avenues for holding both states and companies accountable for arms transfers that violate IHL or IHRL.
- Imagine broader justice frameworks centered on survivors.

SUBSTANTIVE CONTEXT

The global arms trade operates at the intersection of national interest, corporate profit, and systemic impunity. Despite almost a decade of the Arms Trade Treaty and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs) along with increasing concern from the UN human rights system, arms continue to be transferred into contexts where there is credible evidence of risks of serious violations of IHRL and IHL. While arms-producing corporations are directly involved in supplying tools of violence, states play a central role as regulators, licensors, and often enablers of these transfers. The convergence of corporate and state interests—from national security justifications to economic incentives—creates a regulatory vacuum where accountability is neither demanded nor delivered.

KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED

- The Military-Industrial Complex and the Machinery of (Un)Accountability
- The Paradox of the Arms Trade Treaty - friend or foe of international law?
- Criminal and Strategic Legal Pathways to Accountability in the Arms Trade
- Rethinking Due Diligence: Human Rights, Corporate Responsibility, and Compliance in the Arms Sector
- Big Tech - Dangerously Bridging Civilian and Military Capabilities?

THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX AND THE MACHINERY OF (UN)ACCOUNTABILITY

To understand the systemic barriers to accountability in the global arms trade, seminar participants first deconstructed the foundational context of the "Military-Industrial Complex" (MIC). The discussion moved beyond traditional definitions to analyze the deeply integrated systems of state power, corporate interest, and geopolitical strategy that collectively shape arms export policies and perpetuate a culture of impunity.

DECONSTRUCTING THE MODERN MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Discussants challenged the conventional understandings of the MIC, which often focus narrowly on corporate lobbying and a "revolving door" of personnel between government and industry. A more nuanced model was presented, framing the modern MIC as an "open-plan office" where state and corporate actors are not merely influencing each other but are integral parts of the same system. In this view, government departments, armed services, and private corporations operate with overlapping interests and personnel, moving between desks rather than through doors, all within a shared enterprise of national security and capital expansion.

ANALYZING THE CORE DRIVERS OF STATE ARMS EXPORT POLICIES

Discussants compared the primary drivers of arms export policies in key producer states, highlighting how official justifications often mask deeper systemic and economic incentives. The cases of the United States and France were particularly illustrative.

UNITED STATES	FRANCE
<p>Military Procurement as a Driver: A significant, yet often overlooked, driver of U.S. arms exports is the military services' own procurement strategy. An expert with direct experience cited the example of the U.S. Army tasking its staff to find international buyers for Javelin anti-tank missiles. The core rationale was not foreign policy, but rather a "cost-saving measure" to increase the order volume and thereby lower the bulk price for the Army's own acquisition. This reveals how internal military-economic logic, rather than corporate lobbying alone, can propel arms sales.</p>	<p>Sovereignty and Strategic Autonomy: French arms export policy has historically been driven by the state's desire to maintain national "sovereignty" and "strategic autonomy," particularly in relation to the United States. Its defense industry is structurally dependent on exports to sustain its domestic production capacity. A central tenet of French policy is that arms sales provide the capacity to "influence" the behavior of client states. However, this policy has proven ineffective in practice. For example, continued arms transfers to Egypt did not improve its human rights record, and sales to Saudi Arabia and the UAE during the Yemen conflict did not grant France the leverage to moderate their conduct of the war.</p>

While distinct, both cases reveal a common thread: the use of public-facing justifications—cost-saving in the U.S., sovereignty in France—to mask the underlying systemic logic of the Military-Industrial Complex, where state and industrial interests are functionally inseparable.

THE COLONIAL FRAMEWORK OF THE GLOBAL ARMS TRADE

A critical perspective introduced during the seminar framed the global arms trade as an inherently colonial structure. This analysis posits a core-periphery dynamic, where the primary weapons producers and regulators—the imperial core, and allies—supply weapons that are overwhelmingly used in conflicts within the periphery. This structure not only sustains global inequality but also defines the legal and normative landscape of the arms trade.

The very concepts of "licit" versus "illicit" trade are defined by the core to maintain the status quo. The sustenance of the status quo demands the expansion of the military market, and the proliferation of war. In this framework, arms flowing to resistance movements or those challenging the established order are deemed illicit, while arms supplied to states committing atrocities are considered legitimate commercial transactions to advance "peace and security". This dynamic serves to suppress the right to self-determination in the periphery, ensuring that populations remain disconnected from their resources and means of production, thus perpetuating dependency.

SYSTEMIC BARRIERS TO LEGAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Participants identified several deep-rooted legal and structural barriers that consistently thwart efforts to hold states and corporations accountable.

LACK OF TRANSPARENCY

A fundamental challenge is the pervasive opacity surrounding the arms trade. It was noted that even within the U.S. government, there is a significant lack of insight into corporate marketing efforts, negotiations, and the "offsets" that accompany major arms deals. This information asymmetry makes effective oversight nearly impossible, especially in the development and sale of military high-tech.

THE "POLITICAL QUESTION DOCTRINE"

A critical roadblock in strategic litigation is the "political question doctrine," a legal principle whereby courts defer to the executive branch on matters of foreign policy and national security. Experts cited cases in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands where legal challenges to arms export licenses were dismissed. This doctrine functions not merely as a legal hurdle, but as a key mechanism used by the "core" to shield its foreign policy and arms export decisions from scrutiny. By deeming these decisions to be matters of public policy beyond judicial review, courts effectively perpetuate the colonial power dynamics that place the core's strategic interests above legal accountability.

This complex, intertwined system presents immense challenges for the international treaties, such as the Arms Trade Treaty, that were designed to regulate it.

THE PARADOX OF THE ARMS TRADE TREATY: FRIEND OR FOE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW?

While hailed as a landmark achievement, the Arms Trade Treaty faces fierce debate over its real-world impact. Expert discussions revealed a deep paradox: the treaty is simultaneously viewed as a vital tool for legal engagement and as a convenient facade that provides a veneer of regulation while geopolitical interests continue to dominate state practice. This has led many to question whether the Arms Trade Treaty ultimately strengthens or inadvertently weakens the fabric of international law.

DUAL IDENTITY: A TOOL FOR LEVERAGE VS. A FACADE FOR GEOPOLITICS

Participants articulated the central tension at the heart of the Arms Trade Treaty's implementation.

A TOOL FOR LEVERAGE

On one hand, the Arms Trade Treaty provides a crucial, formal framework for engaging with states on their legal obligations. An expert noted that it gives organizations like the International Committee of the Red Cross a stronger, more legalistic basis for dialogue on arms transfers than relying solely on the more general obligations under Common Article 1 of the Geneva Conventions. It creates a concrete set of standards against which states can be held to account.

A FACADE FOR GEOPOLITICS

On the other hand, the treaty is seen by many as a "convenient facade" that allows states to claim compliance while pursuing self-interest. The continued transfer of arms by States Parties to conflict zones—including to Israel, Myanmar, and the warring parties in Sudan—was cited as clear evidence that geopolitical ambitions and strategic alliances frequently override treaty obligations.

CHALLENGES IN INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

The effectiveness of the Arms Trade Treaty is significantly undermined by critical challenges in its interpretation and application, particularly concerning its core risk assessment provisions.

The ambiguity surrounding the "**overriding risk**" standard in Article 7 has allowed for divergent and self-serving interpretations. The litigation in the Netherlands over F-35 parts was highlighted as a key example where the practical meaning of this standard was fiercely contested. Furthermore, participants argued that some states, notably the United Kingdom, have engaged in a deliberate strategy of interpretive regression. Concepts like "knowledge" and "overriding" are now being defined in a more permissive manner by states than were articulated by the same states during the treaty negotiations. This strategy sees states that championed standards in peacetime actively weaken them in court when their geopolitical interests are at stake.

THE ARMS TRADE TREATY IN A MULTILATERAL SYSTEM UNDER STRESS

The Arms Trade Treaty's struggles do not exist in a vacuum but are symptomatic of a broader crisis facing the multilateral arms control system. An expert pointed to the Mine Ban Convention, where states are now withdrawing or suspending their obligations, citing justifications like "interoperability" with allies and the need for transit of [prohibited] weapons. This trend reveals a disturbing pattern: commitments made in peacetime are being abandoned in the face of looming conflict. This creates a pervasive "discourse of double standards," where international law and humanitarian principles are selectively applied, eroding the credibility of the entire international legal framework.

Given these profound implementation challenges, civil society and legal practitioners are increasingly turning to domestic and international courts to forge new pathways to accountability.

COMPLEMENTARITY WITH THE HUMAN RIGHTS SYSTEM

The Human Rights system offers essential complementary pathways where the Arms Trade Treaty is limited by compliance gaps, political influence, and a lack of clear enforceability regarding its "overriding risk" standard. Treaty bodies can provide important oversight, as seen when the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination issued urgent action letters regarding arms exports or when the Committee on Economic Social and Cultural Rights examined military spending via its Maximum Available Resources provision (Article 2(1)), providing useful inroads for greater scrutiny and normative development in arms transfer governance. Special procedures enhance accountability by utilizing communications procedures to engage with companies on human rights due diligence and use systematic reporting to shed light on violations and policy gaps, acting as a potential complementary aspect to litigation. The Working Group on Business and Human Rights and the Mandate on the Occupied Palestinian Territory were cited as examples. Additionally, pathways such as Investigative Bodies or the proposed PMSC instrument (and in particular its article 11 on weapons) offer additional pathways.

CRIMINAL AND STRATEGIC LEGAL PATHWAYS TO ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE ARMS TRADE

In the face of regulatory gaps and persistent political inaction, strategic litigation has emerged as a critical, albeit challenging, tool to enforce international norms. Seminar participants agreed that legal action serves not only to seek judicial remedies but also to expose state and corporate complicity, create new forms of political and financial pressure, and shift the public and private narratives surrounding the arms trade.

THE LEGAL BASIS FOR CRIMINAL COMPLICITY

In terms of international criminal accountability, the Rome Statute provides a legal basis upon which to prosecute individuals who aid and abet international crimes by knowingly providing weapons. The key elements discussed were:

***ACTUS REUS* (THE GUILTY ACT)**

This requires demonstrating that the provision of arms made a "substantial contribution" to the commission of a crime. This contribution must be real, not merely theoretical, though it need not be the sole or essential cause.

***MENS REA* (THE GUILTY MIND)**

This requires showing that the provider had knowledge that their assistance would be used to commit crimes "in the ordinary course of events." This is a high threshold, demanding awareness that the commission of crimes is a likely, not just a possible, outcome of the arms transfer. The separation between government officials issuing licenses and companies exporting arms makes establishing mens rea particularly challenging.

KEY HURDLES IN PROSECUTING ARMS TRADE ACTORS

Despite a clear legal basis, prosecuting actors in the arms trade is fraught with obstacles. Discussions on past and ongoing cases revealed several recurring hurdles.

STATE LICENSING AS A DEFENSE

Companies frequently use the existence of a valid export license as a shield against criminal liability. This forces prosecutors to demonstrate that companies knew or should have known that they could not blindly rely on the state's authorization, especially when publicly available information indicated a high risk of misuse.

EVIDENTIARY THRESHOLDS

Prosecutors often demand an exceptionally high evidentiary standard, seeking a "direct link" between a specific weapon (e.g., remnants of a bomb at a specific strike site) and the accused supplier. This demand for a forensic connection, rather than accepting a "substantial link" based on the volume and nature of support, presents a major hurdle for accountability in complex conflict environments.

CONFLATION OF DUE DILIGENCE AND CRIMINAL INTENT

A concerning new corporate strategy involves companies using Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD) processes as a defense. The argument is made that carrying out HRDD could replace criminal standards. This conflation is reportedly confusing prosecutors and risks creating a loophole.

CASE STUDY: STRATEGIC LITIGATION AND THE F-35 SUPPLY CHAIN

The strategic litigation in The Netherlands concerning the supply of F-35 fighter jet parts to Israel served as a powerful case study. The initial legal action resulted in a court order halting direct transfers from the Dutch warehouse. However, the government narrowly interpreted this ruling, arguing it did not apply to indirect transfers via the global F-35 supply pool headquartered in the United States, which continued.

The Dutch Supreme Court's final decision was analyzed as a partial victory. The "win" was the court's landmark affirmation of the right of civil society organizations to litigate arms transfer decisions, setting a vital precedent. The "loss," however, was the Supreme Court's ruling that the lower court had overstepped its judicial role. It held that the judiciary's function was not to substitute its own decision for the executive's, but rather to compel the government to conduct a new, legally compliant risk assessment.

THE BROADER VALUE OF "LOSING" A CASE

A key theme was the significant value of strategic litigation that extends far beyond the final court verdict. Even cases that are lost on narrow legal grounds can achieve crucial strategic objectives.

EXPOSING GOVERNMENT PROCESSES

Litigation in the UK and The Netherlands has forced governments to disclose their internal decision-making methodologies for risk assessment, often revealing them to be deeply flawed and politically motivated.

CREATING INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY

Legal challenges can create a "muscle memory" within the state apparatus. An expert cited a criminal case in **Italy** against RWM, where experts advising the Italian government advised that it needed to take the litigation into account as part of its reform of the national export control law..

SHIFTING THE PUBLIC NARRATIVE

High-profile cases are instrumental in raising public awareness, however arms trade litigation remains in its infancy. They reframe arms transfers from a niche, technical issue into a matter of public concern about state complicity in atrocities, fundamentally changing the terms of the political debate.

Central to many of these legal arguments is the concept of due diligence—a field that is itself a contested and rapidly evolving area of focus for the arms sector.

RETHINKING DUE DILIGENCE: HUMAN RIGHTS, CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY, AND COMPLIANCE IN THE ARMS SECTOR

The role of HRDD in the arms sector is both critical and highly contested. While HRDD has become a baseline expectation for responsible conduct in many industries, its application to arms manufacturers is fraught with unique challenges, conceptual disconnects, and a fundamental reluctance from the industry to accept its core tenets.

ANALYZING THE SECTOR'S RESISTANCE TO HRDD

Seminar participants identified a trifecta of interlocking arguments the arms industry deploys to construct a firewall against meaningful human rights accountability.

THE UPSTREAM/DOWNSTREAM DIVIDE

The industry has shown some willingness to conduct due diligence on its *upstream* supply chain (e.g., addressing risks of forced labor in the sourcing of raw materials). However, it staunchly resists applying the same scrutiny to the *downstream* impact and end-use of its products.

THE "SOVEREIGN CLIENT" OBJECTION

Companies frequently claim that they cannot and should not be expected to conduct due diligence on their sovereign state clients. This argument positions the state as an unquestionable actor, effectively absolving the company of any independent responsibility to assess the risks associated with its customer's behavior.

THE STATE LICENSING SHIELD

The industry asserts that it is already sufficiently regulated by state export licensing regimes. It argues that this state-level oversight is the proper and sole mechanism for managing risk, thereby relieving companies of any independent corporate responsibility under frameworks like the UNGPs.

The Disconnect: "Risk to Company" vs. "Risk to People"

A fundamental conceptual gap exists between how corporations and civil society understand the concept of risk. Corporate risk management is overwhelmingly focused on identifying and mitigating legal, financial, and reputational risks to the company itself. In contrast, the HRDD framework is centered on identifying, preventing, and mitigating the risk of harm to external rights-holders—the people and communities affected by business operations. This disconnect is not merely a misunderstanding but is strategically exploited. As discussed, companies are increasingly co-opting the language of HRDD to construct a legal defense against criminal complicity. This maneuver re-centers the discourse on procedural compliance, reinforcing the primacy of "risk to company" while deflecting from accountability for harms caused to people.

EXPLORING LEVERS FOR CHANGE: BEYOND THE ARMS MANUFACTURERS

Given the direct resistance from arms manufacturers, participants evaluated the potential for influencing corporate behavior by targeting other actors across the value chain.

THE "ENABLERS"

There is significant potential to pressure the ecosystem of companies that facilitate the arms trade. This includes transport, shipping, and logistics firms (e.g., the campaign against Maersk), as well as financiers, insurers, and law firms that provide essential services.

INVESTORS

Pressure from institutional investors is a growing lever for change. However, this is often hampered by mainstream ESG research providers and rating agencies, which lack fit-for-purpose data and methodologies to meaningfully assess a company's compliance with IHL or its exposure to conflict-affected areas. Investors are also challenged by the countervailing forces of pressure being exerted by their home states and clients to invest in the defense industry—especially now in Europe—and other client and civil society demands, UNGP and OECD expectations, and internal policies to not invest in companies causing, contributing to, or linked with violations of IHL and human rights.

TRADE UNIONS

The role of organized labor, such as port workers, was mentioned as another key pressure point. By refusing to handle certain cargo, unions can directly disrupt supply chains and pressure both companies and government authorities.

As technology continues to evolve, the very definition of the "arms sector" is blurring, introducing new corporate actors and unprecedented challenges for accountability.

BIG TECH: DANGEROUSLY BRIDGING CIVILIAN AND MILITARY CAPABILITIES?

The entry of Big Tech into the military domain represents a paradigm shift in modern warfare. The integration of artificial intelligence (AI), mass data collection, and dual-use technologies is fundamentally altering conflict dynamics and creating novel challenges for existing legal, ethical, and accountability frameworks. This convergence is erasing traditional lines between the civilian and military spheres, with profound implications for IHRL and IHL.

THE "PIPELINE OF HARM": FROM CIVILIAN DATA TO LETHAL TARGETING

The concept of a "pipeline of harm" was used to describe how civilian technology and data are being weaponized. The Israel-Palestine context was presented as a stark case study of this process in action:

MASS SURVEILLANCE

Civilian surveillance systems, such as the "Wolf Pack" program, are used to collect vast amounts of biometric and movement data on the Palestinian population through facial recognition and other means.

DATA FUNNELING

This civilian-gathered data is then funneled directly into military databases and AI-driven target generation systems. Systems known as "Lavender" and "The Gospel" were cited as examples of AI tools used by the IDF to process this data and recommend thousands of individuals as potential targets versus historic, human-generated and much smaller, target lists.

WEAPONIZATION

This process transforms everyday social and biometric personal data into direct input for lethal decision-making. It dangerously blurs the lines between civilian administration and combat operations, turning entire populations into potential intelligence sources and targets.

This pipeline represents a paradigm shift, transforming the traditional model of weapons sales—the transfer of a discrete object—into a continuous, data-driven *service* of lethal targeting. This fundamentally complicates legal notions of supply and complicity.

AI AND THE EROSION OF HUMAN JUDGMENT

While AI-enabled decision support systems are often marketed as tools that make targeting more precise and efficient, experts warned of their corrosive effect on human judgment. The speed and scale at which these systems generate recommendations create a significant risk of "automation bias," where human operators become overly reliant on the machine's output. This can reduce the human role to that of a mere "rubber stamp," precluding the possibility of meaningful human control and context-appropriate judgment as required by IHL.

INVESTOR DILEMMAS IN THE AGE OF DEFENSE TECH

The convergence of defense and technology poses profound challenges for responsible investors seeking to align their portfolios with ethical and legal norms.

A DEFINITIONAL CRISIS

Investors are now forced to confront fundamental questions: "What is a weapon?" and "What is a weapons company?" when a software firm like Palantir plays a massive and integral role in military operations. Traditional categories are no longer sufficient.

PERSISTENT DATA GAPS

The failure of traditional Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) data providers is particularly acute in this area. These agencies are not equipped to track a tech company's involvement in IHL violations or its exposure to conflict zones in a meaningful way, leaving investors without the necessary information to conduct proper due diligence.

THE VENTURE CAPITAL FACTOR

A significant and often opaque role is played by venture capital, which is aggressively funding new and unregulated military technology startups, far from the scrutiny applied to publicly traded companies.

This rapid and largely unregulated convergence of civilian and military technology represents a profound challenge that will demand new, interdisciplinary approaches to law, regulation, and corporate accountability.

LOOKING AHEAD

While many ideas circulated over the extensive conversations, the following non-exhaustive list of forward looking suggestions are being put forward by the group for the broader community of practice around the arms trade and international law to consider.

ENHANCE ARMS TRADE TREATY OVERSIGHT

Develop a formal mechanism for oversight, accountability, and public commentary (such as an expert panel or peer review process similar to the Universal Periodic Review or Human Rights Treaty Bodies) to assess states' implementation and compliance with Arms Trade Treaty obligations.

ADDRESS ARMS TRADE TREATY INTERPRETATION

Seek formal interpretive statements or declarations from relevant states (especially those involved in the original negotiations) to solidify that terms like the “overriding risk standard” mean “clear risk” and the knowledge standard for prohibitions implies “constructive knowledge”.

PRIORITIZE DOMESTIC IMPLEMENTATION

Focus on the robust domestication of the Arms Trade Treaty by ensuring states adopt comprehensive national implementing legislation and maintain national control lists, thereby enhancing accountability at the capital level.

LEVERAGE HUMAN RIGHTS MECHANISMS

Utilize international human rights bodies, such as Treaty Bodies (e.g., CERD, CESCR) and Special Procedures, more deliberately to scrutinize arms transfers, share systematic reporting on violations, and sensitize diplomats and officials to the human rights and humanitarian dimensions of arms transfer governance.

PURSUE STRATEGIC LITIGATION

Continue using strategic litigation and judicial review to uncover government decision-making processes, challenge the political question doctrine, and expose evidence for potential criminal accountability against companies.

TARGET FINANCIAL/ENABLING ACTORS

Increase scrutiny and pressure on non-traditional actors who enable the arms trade, including transport companies, accountants, and lawyers, by advocating for mandatory tools like compulsory beneficial ownership registries down the supply chain.

DEMAND AI COMPLIANCE UPSTREAM

Promote the principle of “lawful by design” or “responsible by design” by demanding that compliance mechanisms are integrated into AI and defense technologies throughout their entire life cycle (from research and design through deployment and decommissioning), requiring states to enforce this prior to procurement.

ENGAGE PARLIAMENTARIANS AND REGIONAL BODIES

Engage more granularly with parliamentarians within exporting states to secure greater oversight of arms licensing decisions and encourage regional bodies (like ECOWAS or OSC) to align their common positions on transfers with ATT standards.

ENABLE CIVIL SOCIETY EXPERTS TO BRIDGE INVESTOR DATA GAPS

Create opportunities and resources that connect civil society organizations with expertise in the ATT and relevant national, multilateral, and international regulations, defense industry involvement in IHL and IHRL violations, and specific conflicts with institutional investors so they can include experts' data and analysis in their investment, company engagement, and exclusion/divestment decisions.

The seminar's discussions painted a stark picture of a global arms trade at a critical inflection point. The traditional architecture of arms control, already strained by geopolitical interests and the systemic logic of the Military-Industrial Complex, is being rapidly outpaced and redefined by the convergence of technology, finance, and privatized state power. The blurring lines between civilian and military tech, the weaponization of data, and the strategic co-opting of human rights language by corporate actors create a new and complex landscape of harm. Addressing these challenges requires moving beyond siloed legal and policy approaches. Forging a new, interdisciplinary front for accountability—one that integrates strategic litigation, robust investor due diligence, and innovative regulatory thinking—is no longer an option, but an urgent necessity.

AI tools were used as a general writing aid during the drafting of this outcome document. All outputs were reviewed, edited, and fact-checked by the authors and participants to the expert seminar, to ensure accuracy and originality.

THE GENEVA ACADEMY

The Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights provides post-graduate education, conducts academic legal research and policy studies, and organizes training courses and expert meetings. We concentrate on branches of international law that relate to situations of armed conflict, protracted violence, and the protection of human rights.

The Geneva Academy is an independent academic centre. Our publications seek to provide insights, analysis and recommendations, based on open and primary sources, to policymakers, researchers, media, the private sector and the interested public.

DISCLAIMER

The designations and presentation of materials used, including their respective citations, do not imply the expression of any opinion on the part of the Geneva Academy concerning the legal status of any State, territory, or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its boundaries. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Geneva Academy, our donors, our parent institutions, or the Academy board. The Geneva Academy welcomes the consideration of a wide range of perspectives in pursuing informed debate on critical policies, issues, and developments in international law.

GENEVA ACADEMY
of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights

a joint centre of



INSTITUT DE HAUTES
ÉTUDES INTERNATIONALES
ET DU DÉVELOPPEMENT
GRADUATE INSTITUTE
OF INTERNATIONAL AND
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES



**UNIVERSITÉ
DE GENÈVE**
FACULTY OF LAW

Villa Moynier
Rue de Lausanne 120B
CP 1063 - 1211 Geneva 1 - Switzerland

Phone: +41 (22) 908 44 83
Email: info@geneva-academy.ch
www.geneva-academy.ch

© The Geneva Academy
of International Humanitarian Law
and Human Rights

This work is licensed for use under a Creative Commons
Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International
License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).