

## Humanitarian and Weapons of Mass Destruction International Humanitarian Law

Tahani Ahmed Ali

St. Mary's University | Twickenham | London | United Kingdom

Received:

04/05/2023

Revised:

13/05/2023

Accepted:

16/06/2023

Published:

30/03/2024

\* Corresponding author:

[t000000ta@hotmail.com](mailto:t000000ta@hotmail.com)

Citation: Ali, T. A. (2024).

Humanitarian and  
Weapons of Mass

Destruction International

Humanitarian Law.

*Journal of Economic,*

*Administrative and Legal*

*Sciences*, 8(3), 95 – 113.

[https://doi.org/10.26389/](https://doi.org/10.26389/AJSRP.D040523)

[AJSRP.D040523](https://doi.org/10.26389/AJSRP.D040523)

2024 © AISRP • Arab

Institute of Sciences &

Research Publishing

(AISRP), Palestine, all

rights reserved.

• Open Access



This article is an open  
access article distributed  
under the terms and  
conditions of the Creative  
Commons Attribution (CC  
BY-NC) [license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

**Abstract:** The present study investigates the humanitarian consequences of the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) is a significant apprehension on a global scale, as both state and non-state entities endeavor to obtain them. Despite the concerted efforts of developed nations and international organizations, including the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency, the task of managing proliferation has proven to be a challenging one. The present essay delves into the perils associated with the utilization of these armaments on human existence, the ramifications on economic progress, and approaches to avert their proliferation. The regulation of warfare has been increasingly pursued by states and civil societies through the adoption of humanitarian disarmament as a strategy. The humanitarian perspective has been significantly enhanced by multilateral agreements pertaining to the regulation of conventional weapons, such as the 1980 Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and the 1997 Anti-Personnel Landmine Convention. The article culminates by proposing recommendations to enhance the effectiveness of arms control agreements, advance disarmament efforts, establish novel legal frameworks at the global level, and prioritize non-state entities as potential sources of weapons of mass destruction.

**Keywords:** Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs), Proliferation, Humanitarian approach, International law regulations, Biological and Toxin Weapons Conventions.

### الإنسانية وأسلحة الدمار الشامل القانون الدولي الإنساني

تهاني أحمد علي

جامعة سانت ماري | تويكنهام | لندن | المملكة المتحدة

المستخلص: تناولت الدراسة الحالية تداعيات النزاعات المسلحة المرتبطة بانتشار أسلحة الدمار الشامل، إذ يعد انتشار تلك الأسلحة مصدر قلق كبير على المستوى العالمي حيث يسعى الكيانات الدولية وغير الدولية على حد سواء للحصول عليها. وعلى الرغم من الجهود المشتركة التي تبذلها الدول المتقدمة والمنظمات الدولية، بما في ذلك الأمم المتحدة والوكالة الدولية للطاقة الذرية، فقد ثبت أن مهمة الحد من الانتشار تعد أمراً صعباً. تتناول المقالة المخاطر المترتبة على استخدام تلك الأسلحة على البشرية وتأثيرها على التقدم الاقتصادي والطرق المتبعة لتجنب انتشارها. وقد تم العمل بشكل متزايد على تنظيم الحرب من خلال مبادرات مدنية وحكومية تشمل إزالة الأسلحة الإنسانية كاستراتيجية، وتم تعزيز المنظور الإنساني بشكل كبير من خلال الاتفاقيات المتعددة الأطراف المتعلقة بتنظيم الأسلحة التقليدية مثل اتفاقية الأسلحة التقليدية المعينة لعام 1980 واتفاقية الألغام الأرضية المضادة للأفراد عام 1997. تختتم المقالة بتقديم توصيات لتعزيز فعالية اتفاقات السيطرة على الأسلحة، وتعزيز جهود نزع السلاح، وتأسيس إطار قانونية جديدة على المستوى العالمي، وتحديد الكيانات غير الدولية كمصادر محتملة للأسلحة الدمار الشامل.

الكلمات المفتاحية: أسلحة الدمار الشامل، الانتشار، المنهج الإنساني، تنظيمات القانون الدولي، اتفاقيات الأسلحة البيولوجية والسامة.

## I. Introduction:

The history of international humanitarian law is brief and eventful. In the mid of nineteenth century the nations of the world agreed for the first time to avoid the needless sufferings of the people who get injured in wars and suffer a lot. The nations bound themselves to observe a convention. Since then, the changing nature of wars and the destructive nature of modern weapons have made many necessary reviews and extensions of humanitarian law. The negotiations were long and pain risk. In order to understand the role of international humanitarian law in controlling proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) it is important to know about what international humanitarian laws mean and what are their aims and objectives. Besides that it is also important to discuss what Weapons of Mass Destruction are. In this way we will be able to analyze that what significant role is being played by international humanitarian law in controlling their proliferation so that WMDs can cause the least damage to humanity.<sup>(1)</sup>

An international humanitarian law is a body of principles and regulations which limit the violence during wars or armed conflicts. Their objectives are:

Firstly, to protect the people who are not or no longer engaged in hostile wars like civilians, shipwrecked and prisoners of wars.

Secondly, to limit the effects of violence in fighting and war times.

The knowing related to protection of war victims during and after war has been strongly affected by the development of international human rights and legal protection provided to them after the Second World War. The adoption of important international agreements involving protection of human rights, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the European Convention on Human Rights (1950) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) have made a considerable contribution to firm the idea that everyone is entitled to the enjoyment of human rights, whether in time of peace or war.<sup>(2)</sup>

There are certain times when human rights are also limited like in emergency or war times. According to the article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights<sup>(3)</sup>, States are allowed to take certain measures that are temporarily limited from some of their obligations under the Covenant in time of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation. Similarly, in the article 15 of the European Convention on human rights<sup>(4)</sup> there are certain clauses to protect human rights.

The need for protection the rights of human beings was recognized fully by the activists and people of civil societies and so it was written in the article 3 of the four Geneva Conventions on humanitarian law of 1949 that during wars people protected by the conventions should be treated humanely in all circumstances and without any kind of distinction founded on race, color, religion or faith, sex, birth or wealth, or any other similar criteria.

After understanding what are humanitarian laws now we will see what weapons of mass destruction are.

## Research Issues:

The Impact of Weapons of Mass Destruction on International Humanitarian Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs) are considered to be among the most destructive and lethal weapons ever devised by humanity. These weapons have the potential to cause massive loss of life, severe environmental damage, and long-lasting humanitarian consequences. International Humanitarian Law (IHL) aims to protect civilians and combatants during armed conflicts and regulate the conduct of parties involved. However, the emergence and use of WMDs pose significant challenges to the principles and effectiveness of IHL. This research issue focuses on exploring the impact of WMDs on IHL and addressing the associated legal, ethical, and humanitarian dilemmas, the problems under discussion include what kind of dangers people are facing in the areas where these weapons are used, secondly how the process of economic development is affected when a country turns its finances towards the purchase of this technology and thirdly how can we control their spread in order to avoid human disasters.

---

(1) Muehlenhaus, Ian, Weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

(2) Werle G. Principals of international criminal law. Cambridge University Press. (2005).

(3) Art. 4, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

(4) Art. 15, Ibid.

**Importance of the Research:**

**Protection of Human Life:** Weapons of Mass Destruction have the potential to cause catastrophic loss of life, indiscriminately targeting civilians and combatants alike. Understanding the impact of WMDs on International Humanitarian Law is crucial for developing effective measures to protect human life during armed conflicts.

**Preservation of Humanitarian Principles:** International Humanitarian Law aims to mitigate the suffering caused by armed conflicts and uphold fundamental principles such as distinction, proportionality, and humanity. Researching the challenges posed by WMDs helps ensure the relevance and applicability of these principles in the face of evolving warfare technologies.

**Legal and Ethical Dilemmas:** WMDs raise complex legal and ethical questions regarding their use, possession, and proliferation. By examining these dilemmas, the research can contribute to the development of legal frameworks, policies, and ethical guidelines that address the unique challenges posed by WMDs.

**Humanitarian Consequences:** The use of WMDs in armed conflicts results in severe humanitarian consequences, including mass casualties, long-term health effects, environmental degradation, and displacement of populations. Researching these consequences helps raise awareness, inform policy-making, and guide humanitarian responses to minimize harm and provide effective assistance.

**International Cooperation and Arms Control:** Understanding the impact of WMDs on IHL is essential for promoting international cooperation and arms control efforts. By identifying gaps in existing legal frameworks and exploring mechanisms for compliance and enforcement, the research can contribute to strengthening international cooperation to prevent the use and proliferation of WMDs.

**Problems and Justification of the Research:**

**Legal Complexity:** The legal issues surrounding WMDs and IHL are highly complex due to the existence of multiple international treaties, customary laws, and evolving technological advancements. Research is needed to navigate these complexities, identify gaps, and propose solutions that ensure compliance with IHL principles.

**Ethical Considerations:** The development and use of WMDs raise profound ethical concerns regarding the balance between military necessity and humanitarian principles. Research can provide a platform to explore these ethical considerations, engage in normative discussions, and guide decision-making processes.

**Rapid Technological Advancements:** The emergence of new technologies, such as cyber warfare and autonomous weapons, challenges traditional interpretations of IHL and raises questions about their compatibility with existing legal frameworks. Research can help assess the implications of these advancements and inform the development of regulations and norms.

**Limited Practical Experience:** The limited instances of WMD use in armed conflicts make it challenging to draw comprehensive conclusions and develop effective response strategies. Research can bridge this gap by analyzing historical cases, conducting simulations, and drawing

insights from related disciplines to enhance preparedness and response capabilities.

**Prevention and Future Challenges:** Understanding the impact of WMDs on IHL can contribute to preventive efforts by identifying potential risks and vulnerabilities. Research can anticipate future challenges posed by emerging technologies and provide guidance to policymakers, humanitarian organizations, and armed forces to mitigate those risks.

**Previous studies of the topic:****Article:**

Salinas de Frías, A. (2018). Weapons of Mass Destruction and International Humanitarian Law: An Uneasy Relationship. *International Review of the Red Cross*.

**Book:**

Bothe, M., O'Connell, M., & Ronzitti, N. (Eds.). (2013). *The Oxford Handbook of International Law in Armed Conflict*. Oxford University Press.

**Book Chapter:**

Saul, B., & Folz, H. (2019). International Humanitarian Law and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In D. Fleck (Ed.), *The Handbook of International Humanitarian Law* (4<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 625-651). Oxford University Press.

**Report:**

**International Committee of the Red Cross. (2006). The Use of Nuclear Weapons and International Humanitarian Law.** ICRC Publications. <https://www.icrc.org/en/doc/assets/files/publications/icrc-002-0798.pdf>

**Conference Paper:**

Tladi, D. (2017). The Development of International Humanitarian Law in Response to Weapons of Mass Destruction. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of International Law, Washington, D.C

**Research Methodology:**

This research will adopt a scholarly, critical and analysis of publicly available texts as its main research methodology. Sources of information will include legislative enactments, judicial decisions and legal commentaries found in books or journals or available from websites.

**II. Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD):**

It is not an easy task to define Weapons of Mass Destruction. It is a unclear concept and changes it meaning according to the understanding of the speaker. Sometimes it is used by the politicians to blame someone else and sometimes it is used to achieve certain targets. Thus there is no clear definition of WMDs. Some people believe that the existing definitions of WMDs are problem and confusing.<sup>(5)</sup> In the US law the Weapons of Mass Destruction are defined as:

All the nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons hereinafter in this title referred to as “weapons of mass destruction.”<sup>(6)</sup>

The term weapon of mass destruction means any weapon or device that is meant, or has the capability, to cause death or serious physical injury to a significant number of people through the release, dissemination, or impact of

- A. Toxic or poisonous chemicals or their precursors;
- B. A disease organism; or
- C. Radiation or radioactivity.<sup>(7)</sup>

Another definition put forward by United Nations is:

The weapons of mass destruction should be defined to include atomic explosive weapons, radioactive material weapons, lethal chemical and biological weapons, and any weapons developed in the future which have characteristics comparable in destructive effect to those of the atomic bomb or other weapons mentioned above.<sup>(8)</sup>

**III. Historical perspective:**

The term appeared for the first time in 1937 in an address given by the Archbishop of Canterbury. However, the modern use of this term actually dates to 1945, with the addition of the words weapons adaptable to mass destruction in a document signed by President Harry

---

(5) Johan Galtung, *Transarmament: from offensive to defensive defense*. *Journal of Peace Research*. Vol 21. (1984).

(6) *The Weapons of Mass Destruction Control Act of 1992*, enacted as Title XV of the *Defense Authorization Act of 1993*, P.L. 102–484 (enacted October 23, 1992).

(7) U.S. Code, 50 U.S.C. 2302, enacted as part of the *Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996*, September 23, 1996, *National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997*, P.L. 104–201.

(8) *UN Committee For Conventional Armaments*, August 1948.

**Truman.**<sup>(9)</sup>

The phrase again appeared in the first resolution passed by the United Nations General Assembly. After some years the term appeared in the form Weapons of Mass Destruction. And then the term became an important part of the post second world war diplomacy. The UN adopted a definition in 1948 according to this definition WMDs are the radioactive material weapons, atomic explosive weapons, deadly chemical and biological weapons, and any weapons developed in the future which have characteristics comparable in destructive effect to those of the atomic bomb or other weapons mentioned above.<sup>(10)</sup>

Later in the coming years, the United States became a member of three treaties in order to directly control the weapons of Mass Destruction. Those agreements included the Outer Space treaty, the Seabed treaty and the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. In addition to those treaties some other agreements also took place to further control the spread of weapons. These were the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the Biological Weapons Convention, and the Chemical Weapons Convention. Those treaties imposed specific obligations on the United States and other countries associated with these agreements. The treaty parties considered WMD as an unclear term that could mean whatever anyone wanted it to be. The United States adopted the UN definition for use in these negotiations.<sup>(11)</sup>

**IV. U.S. National Security Policy**

After the end of Second World War, the term WMD gained importance in United States and was used frequently in their national security policies. In 1992, the US President George

H.W. Bush signed United States Nonproliferation Policy. The spread of the potential to produce or gain weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them constitutes a continuing threat to U.S. national security interests. In the time of next President Bill Clinton the term WMD became was used more frequently. Its references are found in his speeches and documents. The President George W. Bush and his administration followed the trend. The gain of weapons of mass destruction by a terrorist group is unacceptable.<sup>(12)</sup>

**V. Soviet and Russian Military Doctrine**

The term WMD has significance in disarmament diplomacy of many other countries also. The Soviet Union used the term to define their military doctrines. The Russian term for WMD means weapons used to cause heavy losses. They include nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons. Unfortunately there has been no mentioned record of the use of term WMD in Russia. So it is difficult to guess when was actually this term was used and adopted by the Soviets and what the role of this term in adoption of their military doctrine.<sup>13(13)</sup>

In 1993 the Russian Federation Military Doctrine went through a long debate of nuclear weapons and Weapons of mass destruction. The discussion was all about promoting the full implementation of the Convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction. Similarly, it was about going in compliance with the regime of the Convention of the prohibition of production, development, stockpiling of biological, toxic weapons as well as all those means, materials, and technologies which help create these weapons and providing guarantees of the security of citizens, society and state. It appeared to follow all those directions that were given in United Nations.<sup>(14)</sup>

---

(9)World at Risk. The Report of the Commission on the Prevention of WMD Proliferation and Terrorism (2008).

(10)Ibid.

(11)Alex J. Bellamy, Ethics and Intervention: The 'Humanitarian Exception and the problem of abuse in Iraq. Journal of Peace Research

(12)Daniel H. Joyner, International Law and the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction.

(13)Ibid.

(14)Daniel H. Joyner, International Law and the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction.

## VI. Developments after World War II

After World War II in 1945, the President of the United States, the prime minister of the United Kingdom, and the prime minister of Canada issued a joint declaration calling for international control of atomic energy and advocating the creation of a UN commission to identify different methods to bring atomic weapons and WMDs under control.<sup>15(15)</sup>

## VII. The Commission for Conventional Armaments

In 1948, the UN Commission for Conventional Armaments (CCA) presented a very important definition of WMD. It was established in 1947 under the care of the Security Council according to the recommendation contained in General Assembly Resolution 41(I). The resolution, recommended the creation of a committee. They made three mentions of the need to eliminate or prohibit atomic and all other major weapons adaptable now or in the future to mass destruction.<sup>(16)</sup>

## VIII. Treaties Controlling Weapons of Mass Destruction

Three treaties that placed limitations on weapons of mass destruction as a class (rather than specifically on nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons) were the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, the 1972 Seabed Treaty, and the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty.<sup>(17)</sup>

## IX. Humanitarian perspective:

As it is already discussed, the need for protecting the rights of human beings was recognized fully by the activists and people of civil societies and so it was written in the article 3 of the four Geneva Conventions on humanitarian law of 1949 that during wars people protected by the conventions should be treated humanely in all circumstances and without any kind of distinction founded on race, color, religion or faith, sex, birth or wealth, or any other similar criteria.<sup>(18)</sup>

## X. Key Issues in humanitarian and Weapons of Mass Destruction:

In the following some key issues are discussed on humanitarian disarmament. For every issue there are certain concerns and then there is an overview of responses by international agencies and civil societies.

### 1. Cluster Munitions:

These are the bombs, rockets or shells that open in the mid of air scattering dozens, sometimes hundreds, of small explosive sub munitions over a wide area.<sup>(19)</sup>

#### Concerns:

The concern about the cluster munitions is that they can deliver explosive force over a wide area without distinction between civilian objects and military objectives. Civilians within the area under attack seem to be at a serious risk of being killed or injured.<sup>(20)</sup>

Many sub munitions failed to explode on impact and can kill or injure civilians, including many children, for years even after when the war ended. The Cluster Munition Monitor reported 190 losses from cluster munitions in 2012. This contamination makes the use of land dangerous and can prevent it altogether.<sup>(21)</sup>

---

(15) Humanitarian dimension of disarmament. United Nations office for Disarmament Affairs. (2014).

(16) Ibid.

(17) Matthew Fuhrmann, Exporting Mass Destruction? The Determinants of Dual-Use Trade. *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 633–652. (2008).

(18) Daniel Joyner, *International law and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction*. Oxford university press. (2009).

(19) [http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART\\_technologies\\_of\\_violence\\_11.10.13.pdf](http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART_technologies_of_violence_11.10.13.pdf)

(20) Same as above

(21) Same as above

**Responses:**

In response to the concerns arose because of them, Cluster munitions were prevented under the 2008 Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM). Almost 84 States were the parties to sign.

According to the agreement all states put an end for all time to the suffering and casualties caused by cluster munitions. They decided to never use under any circumstances the cluster munitions. They will also never develop, produce, otherwise acquire, stockpile, retain or transfer to anyone, directly or indirectly, cluster munitions.<sup>(22)</sup>

The Convention also prevented assistance in such activities and required States Parties to destroy their cluster munitions stockpiles, to clear dirty areas, and to provide assistance to victims and affected communities.

**Civil Society:**

The Cluster Munition Coalition (CMC) played a very important role in bringing about the 2008 ban on cluster munitions. The Cluster Munition Monitor report was published yearly and it monitors progress in the global elimination of cluster munitions.

**2. Land Mines:**

Land mines are placed under, on or near the ground or other surface of the earth. These landmines are designed to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person or a vehicle.

**Concerns:**

The most important concern is that landmines are activated by their victims and cannot differentiate between a civilian and a soldier or between a school bus and a tank. They were used extremely in the 1980s and early 1990s, resulting in millions of deadly items buried worldwide. These and more recent explosive remnants continue to cause damages. The Landmine Monitor.

reported 4,286 new casualties from landmines and explosive remnants of war in 2011.<sup>(23)</sup> The presence of mines also obstruct the supply of humanitarian aid and effects negatively the socio- economic development.

**Responses:**

In 1997 all anti-personnel landmines were banned under the Mine Ban Treaty (MBT). Almost 161 countries were a part of this agreement. States Parties were also required to destroy stockpiles and clear contaminated land. Other landmines, such as anti-vehicle mines were subject to limited restrictions under the 1996 Amended Protocol II of which 100 States were parties to the 1980 Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW).<sup>(24)</sup>

**Civil Society:**

The International Campaign to Ban Land Mines (ICBL) was launched in 1992. It was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1997 because of its role in the achievement of the anti- personnel landmine ban. The Campaign has inspired other civil society leads in the field of humanitarian disarmament.<sup>(25)</sup>

**3. Explosive weapons**

The explosive weapons include artillery shells, mortars and air-dropped bombs and improvised explosive devices. They cause harm mainly through blast and fragmentation. For the heavy explosive weapons the effects are extended to a large area.

**Concerns:**

The explosive weapons have the capacity to kill and injure about tens of thousands of civilians every year. The use of explosive weapons in highly populated localities can cause high levels of civilian harm. Because of the wide area effects of these weapons, the use of heavy explosive weapons in populated areas puts civilians at grave risk.<sup>(26)</sup>

---

(22) Preamble, Art. 1 Convention on Cluster Munitions 2008.

(23) [http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART\\_technologies\\_of\\_violence\\_11.10.13.pdf](http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART_technologies_of_violence_11.10.13.pdf)

(24) Ibid.

(25) Ibid.

With the destruction of housing, schools, hospitals and other infrastructure, that are vital to the civilian population, it deteriorates their lives and increases their long-term suffering.

Explosive weapons that are abandoned at end of war continue to pose a threat in the form of ERW<sup>(27)</sup>.

**Responses:**

Explosive weapons are not included for the use in domestic policing because it would be difficult to settle with international human rights standards governing the use of force for the purposes of law enforcement.<sup>(28)</sup>

The use is governed by the rules of international humanitarian law, including 1977 Additional Protocol I of explosive weapons in warfare. In this agreement 173 States signed as parties to the Geneva Conventions.<sup>(29)</sup>

**Civil Society:**

The ICRC and the UN Secretary-General have called on states to avoid using explosive weapons with wide area effects in populated areas.

In 2003, Protocol V to the 1980 Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) require states to document their use of explosive ordnance and take responsibility for the problem of explosive remnants of war.

The International Network on Explosive Weapons (INEW), established in 2011, aimed to prevent human suffering from the use of explosive weapons in populated areas. INEW called for the development of stronger international standards, including for an end to the use in populated areas of explosive weapons with wide area effects.<sup>(30)</sup>

#### 4. Incendiary Weapons

These are the weapons that contain a burning substance for example, napalm or white phosphorus. They cause harm mainly through heat and fire.

**Concerns:**

Incendiary weapons can terribly burn injuries that are intensely painful. The burnt victims require intensive care. Severely burned victims also sometimes suffer a slow and painful death. Some incendiary substances such as white phosphorus are of pyrophoric nature and they continue to burn while exposed to oxygen. Wounds are treated with a lot of difficulty and the substance can injure rescuers and medical personnel also. Therefore, incendiary effects can spread over a wide area causing severe harm to civilians.<sup>(31)</sup>

**Responses:**

In Protocol III to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) signed in 1980 contains limitations to the use of air-delivered incendiary weapons, as defined under the treaty, in focuses of civilians. It was signed by 108 states.

According to the ICRC, customary international humanitarian law also stops the use of incendiary weapons against any person unless it is not functional to use a less harmful weapon against a large area of population.

**Civil society response:**

The Human Rights Watch, Article 36 and other articles force the states to elaborate stronger rules on incendiary weapons. A complete ban on the use of incendiary weapons would have the most humanitarian benefits and provide the strongest protection under international law.

---

(26)Ibid.

(27)explosive remnants of war

(28)including the 1990 Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials (BPUFF).

(29)[http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART\\_technologies\\_of\\_violence\\_11.10.13.pdf](http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART_technologies_of_violence_11.10.13.pdf)

(30)Ibid.

(31)[http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART\\_technologies\\_of\\_violence\\_11.10.13.pdf](http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART_technologies_of_violence_11.10.13.pdf).



## 5. Arms Trade

The trade among states of conventional arms, including battle tanks, combat aircraft, artillery, rockets, missiles, and small arms, as well as the trade in ammunition and parts and components of arms is known as Arms Trade.

### Concerns:

The basic concern about arms trade is that people suffer the most from them. There are so many people around the world who are killed; injured, raped, and forced to migrate from their homes because of an unregulated global arms trade. The global trade of conventional arms and ammunition fuels and human rights abuses undermine sustainable development and contributes to poverty. The lack of transparency and the corruption in arms trade processes and practices undermine the rule of law and good governance.<sup>(32)</sup><sup>32</sup>

### Responses:

The 2013 Arms Trade Treaty aimed to establish the highest possible common international standards for regulating the international trade in conventional arms. It also aims to finish the illegal trade in conventional arms. This will contribute to international and regional peace, security and stability. It will reduce human suffering; promote cooperation, transparency and responsible action by States Parties in the international trade in conventional arms.<sup>(33)</sup>

### Civil society Response:

The Control Arms coalition is a broad based global civil society alliance launched in 2003. It was instrumental in bringing about the 2013 Arms Trade Treaty.

## 6. Nuclear Weapons

Nuclear weapons release great amount of energy in a nuclear fusion or fission process.

They cause severe harm of painful proportions through blast, fragment projection, heat, light and ionizing of the radiation, as well as radioactive fall-out.

### Concerns:

The most important damage caused by nuclear weapons is that they burn, blind and steam people. The blast wave crushes bodies and destroys buildings. Fires can gather into firestorms, consuming all the oxygen from air and kill people through asphyxiation. Survivors are likely to suffer horrible injuries, radiation poisoning and great emotional distress.<sup>(34)</sup>

Even with a small nuclear weapon, enemies of humanity can cause huge destruction, huge loss of life and great suffering over an extended period of time. There is no cure of radiation sickness. Many victims will suffer a slow and painful death. Radiation will also affect the health of future generations. It is beyond the capacity of any society or humanitarian response to relieve the suffering caused by a nuclear weapon explosion.

The use of multiple nuclear weapons could disrupt the global climate, causing widespread agricultural collapse and famine on a global scale. The consequences for humankind are unbearable.

### Response:

Nuclear weapons are not subject to a comprehensive prohibition under international treaty law unlike the other weapons of mass destruction i.e. chemical and biological weapons.<sup>(35)</sup>

In 1966 it was concluded by the International Court of Justice in an Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons that the threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in

(32) [http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART\\_technologies\\_of\\_violence\\_11.10.13.pdf](http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART_technologies_of_violence_11.10.13.pdf)

(33) Ibid.

(34) [http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART\\_technologies\\_of\\_violence\\_11.10.13.pdf](http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART_technologies_of_violence_11.10.13.pdf)

(35) Ibid.

armed conflict, and in particular the principles and rules of humanitarian law. Almost 115 countries have already clearly rejected nuclear weapons by establishing nuclear weapon free zones.<sup>(36)</sup>

**Civil Society:**

The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) is a global campaign coalition working to crowd people in all countries to inspire, persuade and pressure their governments to start and support negotiations for a treaty banning nuclear weapons.

**7. Chemical and Biological Weapons**

The chemical and biological weapons use either chemicals or biological factors such as viruses and bacteria to bring harm and damaging the humanity.

**Concerns:**

Chemical and biological weapons cause many concerns regarding the frightening and painful ways in which they can kill and injure people and the risks that their effects cannot be limited to combatants. Their covered nature makes poisonous gas and biological agents such as bacteria and viruses particularly awful. This can cause sharp anxiety amongst populations in which they are used. An effective medical response to relieve the suffering from a chemical or biological attack may often be difficult. The use of chemical weapons in Syria in 2013 caused anger around the globe.<sup>(37)</sup>

**Response:**

The 1972 Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention and the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention prohibit biological and chemical weapons respectively. Both of these treaties affirmed the determination of states to see the prohibition and no further production of all types of weapons of mass destruction.

**Civil society response:**

Civil society engagement on biological and chemical weapons has included academia, scientific networks and think tanks. Since its establishment in 1950s, the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs has been active on biological and chemical weapons. The Bio Weapons Prevention Project (BWPP) is a global network of civil society. It was started in 2003. It has been busy in permanent elimination of biological weapons and of the possibility of their re-emergence. In 2010, 2011 and 2012 it published an annual Bio Weapons Monitor.<sup>(38)</sup>

**8. Drones**

Drones are the remotely piloted aircraft or they are unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs). They are constructed with so many cameras and searchlight and are controlled by human pilots by computers using satellite technology.

**Concerns:**

The use of armed drones to attack targets in countries like Afghanistan, Pakistan, Somalia, Yemen and the Occupied Palestinian Territories has dramatically increased in the past five years. Their use has aroused following concerns:

- They are an alleged violation of international human rights and humanitarian law, in particular execution without trial.
- There are also psychological effects on people living in areas where armed drones move around and in the skies above.
- There is a distinct lack of transparency, including a lack of data on casualties.

So far the US, UK and Israel are known to have undertaken attacks with armed drones, but the technology is rapidly increasing. Almost around 20 countries possess armed drones around the world.

---

(36) Ibid.

(37) [http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART\\_technologies\\_of\\_violence\\_11.10.13.pdf](http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART_technologies_of_violence_11.10.13.pdf).

(38) [http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART\\_technologies\\_of\\_violence\\_11.10.13.pdf](http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART_technologies_of_violence_11.10.13.pdf)

**Response:**

In a 2010 report, UN Special Reporter on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Philip Alston, raised concern about the use of drones to carry out targeted killings.

The UN Special Reporter on human rights and counter terrorism, Ben Emerson, investigated civilian losses from 25 drone strikes in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia and the Occupied Palestinian Territories. In 2013 because of extreme criticism from activists and legal scholars, US President Obama announced he would transfer the drone program from the CIA to the US Military. The rapid emergence of armed drones without significant prior public discussion raises questions about the process for estimating the acceptability of new weapons.<sup>39(39)</sup>

**Civil society response:**

The Bureau of Investigative Journalism maintains a database of civilian losses from drone strikes in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia.

Similarly, Global Drones Watch is a coalition campaign to observe and regulate drone use, arranged by Code Pink which is a UK organization and has represented victims of drone strikes seeking legal redress.

**9. Killer Robots**

These are the fully independent weapons. They are able to identify and attack their targets without direct human involvement. Although such weapons have not yet been deployed, several countries are involved in the development of weapons systems with increasing autonomy.

By giving such machines the power to release violent force without meaningful human control will cross a fundamental moral line.

It is very difficult to imagine how such systems can cope with the requirements of international law.

Fully autonomous weapons raise concerns in relation to accountability for harm done, and could contribute to further distancing those employing force from the consequences of their actions.

**Response:**

Two states, the US and the UK, have already published policies on autonomous weapons.

The UK's concern about Unmanned Aircraft System was begun in April 2013. The campaign aimed to Stop Killer Robots is an international coalition of civil society organizations working to prevent fully autonomous weapons by international treaty.<sup>(40)</sup>

**10. WMD and civil and political rights**

Another important issue regarding WMD is that how civil and political rights are destroyed during war and attacks of WMDs. After the attacks of 9/11 the world has started

fearing about the terrorist as well as chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. A climate in the world has been created in such a way that all the governments are taking preventive measures that are directly or indirectly affecting the civil liberties and so difficulties are being created for the citizens. In the past terrorists acts were of different nature like assassinations etc. but at present with the advance of technology their nature has been changed. Now the world is facing the challenge of al-Qaeda and similar terrorist group. After every awful incident everyone thinks that what will happen if somehow these terrorists get an access to WMDs. The world is facing a threat that is difficult to turn. And in which people's civil and political rights are destroyed.<sup>41(41)</sup>

Article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights explicitly prohibits torture:

(39) [http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART\\_technologies\\_of\\_violence\\_11.10.13.pdf](http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART_technologies_of_violence_11.10.13.pdf)

(40) Ibid.

(41) Eric A. Heinze, Humanitarian Intervention and the War in Iraq: Norms, Discourse and State Practice.

'No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.'<sup>42(42)</sup> A similar set of prohibitions is contained in the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment to which 136 states were parties as of June 2004.<sup>(43)</sup>

#### 11. WMD and Social and Economic rights:

In the Millennium Declaration 18 targets were set for the development of the world community. It included removal of extreme poverty, full primary education, reduction of child mortality, gender equality combating HIV/AIDS and ensuring environmental stability, among

others, still seem far out of reach, especially in the poorest countries. Developed countries spend millions of dollars on the maintenance of nuclear installations.<sup>(44)</sup>

The G-8 meetings now seem increasingly concerned with questions of non-proliferation and counter-terrorism, at the expense of economic progress and human rights. They were originally intended to develop a common plan for meeting these goals of human reform, improving the life of poor people and getting their education.

#### XI. Status of multilateral arms regulation and disarmament agreements<sup>(45)</sup>

Title of Agreement	Signed at	Entered into force	Depositary	New Party	Total no. of Parties
Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (1925 Geneva Protocol)	Washington	8 February, 1928	France	none	138
Antarctic Treaty		23 June 1961	United States	Pakistan	50
Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water (Partial Test Ban Treaty)	Moscow	10 October 1963	Russian Federation (M), United Kingdom (L) and United States (W)	none	129
Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (Outer Space Treaty)	London, Washington and Moscow	10 October 1967	Russian Federation (M), United Kingdom (L) and United States (W)	Qatar	101
Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the	Mexico City	For each Government individually	Mexico	None	33

(42)Ibid.

(43)Ibid.

(44)Ibid.

(45)The United Nations Disarmament Yearbook (2013)

Title of Agreement	Signed at	Entered into force	Depositary	New Party	Total no. of Parties
Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)					
Treaty on the Non- Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)	London, Moscow, Washington	5 March 1970	Russian Federation, UK and US	none	190
Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof (Sea bed Treaty)	London, Moscow, Washington	18 May 1972	Russian Federation (M), United Kingdom (L) and United States (W)	none	94
Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (BWC)	London, Moscow, Washington	26 March 1975	Russian Federation (M), United Kingdom (L) and United States (W)	Marshal Island	164
Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques	Geneva	5 October 1978	Secretary General	None	76
Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (CCW)	New York	2 December 1983	UN Secretary General	Burundi	115
South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty (Rarotonga Treaty)	Rarotonga	11 December 1986	Secretary General of Pacific Island forums	None	13
Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE Treaty)	Paris	19 November 1990	Netherlands	none	30
Treaty on Open Skies	Helsinki	1 January 2002	Canada, Hungary	None	34
Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (CWC)	Paris	29 April 1997	Secretary General of UN	none	188

Title of Agreement	Signed at	Entered into force	Depository	New Party	Total no. of Parties
Southeast Asia Nuclear- Weapon-Free Zone Treaty (Bangkok Treaty)	Bangkok	27 March 1997	Thailand	none	10
African Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Zone Treaty (Pelindaba Treaty)	Cairo	15 July 2009	Secretary General of UN	None	36
Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT)	New York	Not yet	Secretary General of UN	Niu, Guatemala, Indonesia	157
Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (Mine Ban Convention)	Ottawa	1 March 1999	Secretary General of UN	Finland, Poland, Somalia	161

Source: The United Nations Disarmament Yearbook 2013

## XII. Discussion:

### i. An overview of nuclear weapons:

The process of increase of WMDs is slow but continuous. For the last 65 years, the formal and informal efforts are done to control their increase, and as a result the actual speed of increase has been comparatively slow. If we compare the current number of nuclear weapon

states which are only nine out of more than 190, it is too slow from the estimates that were done in the past. Although, we cannot judge to what extent the non-proliferation efforts including

humanitarian law have been influencing the process, the economic and technological barriers have also played a role. So there are a large number of efforts that are slowing the non-proliferation process.<sup>(46)</sup>

It is important to notice that the proliferation of nuclear weapons may be slow but it has not stopped completely. Currently, the Iranian nuclear program has gained international attention because of the signs that show this program is not for peaceful purpose. The IAEA complains that there is a lack of transparency from the Iranian side and several international experts present their opinion that it is not meant for the safe purposes.<sup>(47)</sup>

Syria is also not willing to cooperate with IAEA and is thus creating problems. There are possibilities that Syria is having secret nuclear structure that was destroyed by Israel in 2007. Syria is still not showing it to IAEA. The bombardment of Israel probably ended any of the Syrian nuclear program at least for some time period but the fact is that Syria was able to build the nuclear composition again building of this kind of Syrian composition is worrying. Some other guesses show that Myanmar is also trying to start nuclear weapons programs, but this still needs to be confirmed. The most important threat from terrorists is the threat of retaliation and this threat is no longer a real deterrence. The most important reason is that the terrorists do not have a territorial base and so the originals of any nuclear device can be kept easily.<sup>(48)</sup>

(46) Joseph Cirincione, *Bomb Scare. The History and Future of Nuclear Weapons*, New York: Columbia University Press. (2007)

(47) Ibid.

(48) Ibid.

The stealing of nuclear weapons from unstable states is a very dangerous factor. There are many technical and complicated security concerns because of which it is not possible to use a nuclear or other WMD weapons. However, they can be used only in the form of dirty bomb. It joins the traditional explosives with radiological material so that they can spread in the air and causing radiations. Dirty bombs are also called radiological weapons and they are considered as weapons of mass disturbance instead of weapons of mass of mass destruction because of their relatively contained destructive effects.<sup>(49)</sup>

ii. An overview of non-nuclear weapons:

When we study the success of non-proliferation efforts, it is important to discuss and compare nuclear and non-nuclear WMDs. The efforts of non-proliferation of chemical weapons have remained successful although it has been a long time since when the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) came into force in 1997. The difference between NPT and CWC is that all signatories must destroy their chemical weapons before a certain date. This is something lacking

in NPT. Like in nuclear arms agreement, there are certain countries that not signed CWC. Angola, Egypt, North Korea, Somalia, Syria, Israel and Myanmar. Some of these countries are also suspects of keeping these weapons. Since CWC sets a fixed disarmament date and all countries are supporting this it is a great success.<sup>(50)</sup>

When we study the success of non-proliferation efforts, it is important to discuss and compare nuclear and non-nuclear WMDs. The efforts of non-proliferation of chemical weapons

have remained successful although it has been a long time since when the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) came into force in 1997.<sup>(51)</sup> The difference between NPT and CWC is that all signatories must destroy their chemical weapons before a certain date. This is something lacking in NPT. Like in nuclear arms agreement, there are certain countries that not signed CWC. Angola, Egypt, North Korea, Somalia, Syria, Israel and Myanmar. Some of these countries are also suspects of keeping these weapons. Since CWC sets a fixed disarmament date and all countries are supporting this it is a great success.<sup>(52)</sup>

The new dynamics in the field of nuclear weapons disarmament is still going on and difficult to predict. According to some experts, the international disarmament and non- proliferation efforts have entered a new step, in which new actors are playing an extremely important role. There are not only state governed factors, but also non-state factors like industry, scientific communities and civil societies that are working internationally.<sup>(53)</sup>

There are certain challenges that are still ahead. Disarmament efforts by the existing nuclear weapons states are also of high importance to stop the erosion in the support for what many states have called the discriminatory NPT and half hearted non-proliferation efforts.<sup>(54)</sup>

iii. The humanitarian factor:

If we look at the humanitarian factors, they have initiated the negotiations on the prohibitions of the use of certain weapons by international law agreements. Unfortunately, these agreements failed because of certain conflicts. Some of the examples are:

1. Heavy casualties caused by the chemical weapons used during World War I, despite the prohibitions of First Hague Conference.
2. Extensive use of chemical and biological weapons since 1925, despite Geneva protocol 1925.
3. Massive deaths caused by the deployment of landmines in methods prohibited under protocol II of the CCW.

---

(49)Dieter Fleck, *The Handbook of International Humanitarian Law*. Oxford University Press. (2013).

(50)Report of the OPCW on the Implementation of The Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their destruction in 2011 Conference of the states parties

(51)W. Seth Carus: *Weapons of Mass Destruction*. Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass Destruction Occasional Paper. (2006).

(52)Report of the OPCW on the Implementation of The Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their destruction in 2011 Conference of the states parties.

(53)Villa Ormond, *The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and International humanitarian law: Current challenges, effective responses*. (2007)

(54)Moheed Yusuf, *Predicting Proliferation. The History of the Future of Nuclear Weapons*.

Because of these circumstances, the concern of agencies working on humanitarian grounded to the calls of disarmament treaties. While the initial motivation on disarmament was based on humanitarian concerns, the actual negotiations of arms control and non proliferation are based on national and international security concerns. These talks and negotiations are difficult to be successful as some parties are not ready to disarm themselves because of security concerns.

Despite the changing political events including dissolution of Soviet Union and end of Cold War, negotiations are likely to be slow.<sup>(55)</sup>

An agreement that has proved to be an exception in the history of international treaties is the Ottawa treaty. The international community was facing with the reality that the convention negotiated through the UN machinery (the 1980 Conventional Weapons Convention) failed to reduce the extent of unnecessary injury and unnecessary suffering caused by antipersonnel

landmines. This led to a very strong humanitarian search which resulted in the negotiation of a disarmament treaty (the 1997 Ottawa treaty).<sup>(56)</sup>

From the above discussion we can say that the connection between WMD and human rights are undeniable and include the following points:

- There is an incompatibility of the right to peace and the right to life with the existence of WMD.
- There exists a disappearance line between the humanitarian law aspects of WMD and the human rights aspects in the strict sense.
- The fear created by the thought of WMD in the wrong hands which has been used by governments as a justification for limiting or suspending human rights.
- The effect of WMD on the continues of the war system and the resulting exhaustion on resources that would otherwise be available for the applications of economic and social human rights.<sup>(57)</sup>

The humanitarian factors are working in a system which regulates the conduct of warfare. The humanitarian approaches to disarmament are gaining momentum among both the states and civil societies. The humanitarian factor of disarmament has provided a combination of energy to a slow moving disarmament talks. It is also seen by as many more comprehensive as it seeks to involve all states and individuals that have an equal stake in negotiations of against humanitarian harms. Humanitarian disarmament is always at the center of multilateral processes and thus setting global disarmament and arms control standards. Early international agreements prohibited weapons that were deemed contrary to international humanitarian law.<sup>(58)</sup>

Recently, the multilateral agreements on regulation of conventional weapons are pursued on humanitarian grounds. A large number of conventional weapons have been regulated through the 1980 convention on Certain Conventional weapons (CCW). The CCW observes or stops the use of those weapons that can cause a serious threat to humanity. The weapons that are regulated in CCW include all those weapons that can damage by fragments not detected by X-ray.

Similarly, the 1997 Anti-Personnel Landmine Convention (APLC) and the 2008 Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) have played a featured role to enhance the humanitarian perspective and the humanitarian impact of these weapons was in the end the driving force behind both.<sup>(59)</sup>

Similarly, if we consider the categories of weapons of mass destruction, certain protocols and conventions are based on the humanitarian grounds like Geneva Protocol 1925. The

Biological and Toxin Weapons Conventions in 1972 and the chemical weapons convention in 1993 are also an extension of those agreements.<sup>(60)</sup>

---

(55) Villa Ormond, The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and International humanitarian law: Current challenges, effective responses. (2007)

(56) Sico van der Meer. Not that bad: Looking back on 65 years of nuclear non-proliferation efforts

(57) Joseph Cirincione, Bomb Scare. The History and Future of Nuclear Weapons

(58) Diana A. and Katinka S.T., Peace and security: current challenges in international law. (2004)

(59) Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction: Risks for companies and scientific institutions.

(60) Peter Weiss and John Burroughs, Weapons of mass destruction and human rights.



The humanitarian perspective has increased interest in addressing concerns linked with new and emerging weapon systems such as autonomous weapon systems. Humanitarian perspectives have long been a driver of disarmament processes. This perspective has given new impetus toward dealing with the use of explosive weapons in populated areas, the use of armed unmanned aerial vehicles (drones), and all types of incendiary weapons. Understanding the humanitarian impact of weapon systems and thereby protecting compliance with international humanitarian law are essential practices, particularly in light of the rapid evolution of technology.<sup>(61)</sup>

**Besides that there are some suggestions for the future prospects.**

There is a strong need to maintain and then strengthen the existing arms control treaties and mechanisms. The present mechanisms are not the perfect ones and certainly not sufficient in themselves but they are also important tools in the overall working which is needed against the threat from weapons of mass destruction.

Secondly, the nuclear weapon states must increase their efforts with regard to disarmament of War heads and to reduce the risk of accidental use of nuclear weapons.

Thirdly, if needed there should be new international law regulations developed (e.g the Convention on Nuclear Terrorism and the new protocol to IMO Convention on Suppression of Unlawful Acts against Maritime Navigation).

Fourth, there is a strong need to make sure that states actually implement what they have agreed to do. Often states do not have the enough legislation or bureaucracy required and sometimes it even needs practical support and training.

Lastly, there is need to focus increasingly on the non-state actors as providers. Certain methods should be devised to inform them and to reach a level of self regulation among researchers and businesses. There is simply too much trade going on and too many technologies are being produced that is of relevance from a non-proliferation aspect, that it will be increasingly hard to counter this with the traditional non-proliferation methods of export control.

**Conclusion**

The rise of the humanitarian perspective has been a game-changer for disarmament. It has made disarmament talks more urgent and led to new international agreements that prioritize human safety. This people-centered approach looks not just at existing weapons but future ones too, and calls for stronger enforcement of existing treaties. In the future, disarmament efforts need to consider not just states but non-state actors as well. Overall, the humanitarian perspective offers a more effective and inclusive way to achieve global peace and security.

**Table of Authorities:**

- the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)
- the European Convention on Human Rights (1950)
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966)
- The Weapons of Mass Destruction Control Act of 1992, enacted as Title XV of the Defense Authorization Act of 1993, P.L. 102–484 (enacted October 23, 1992)
- U.S. Code, 50 U.S.C. 2302, enacted as part of the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996, September 23, 1996, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, P.L. 104–201.
- The Outer Space Treaty 1967
- The Seabed Treaty 1972
- The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty 1991
- General Assembly Resolution 41(I).
- Geneva Conventions on humanitarian law of 1949

---

(61)David P. Fidler, Weapons of Mass Destruction and International Law. The American society of international law. (2003).

- Convention on Cluster Munitions 2008
- Protocol III to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW)
- The Human Rights Watch, Article 36

### Bibliography:

- Alex J. Bellamy, Ethics and Intervention: The 'Humanitarian Exception and the problem of abuse in Iraq. *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 131–147.(2004). Available at:<http://www.nonproliferation.eu/documents/other/sicovandermeer4ea16b5f7f983.pdf>
- Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction.
- Daniel H. Joyner, *International Law and the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction*. Oxford Monographs in International Law (2014).
- Daniel Joyner, *International law and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction*. Oxford university press. (2009).
- David P. Fidler, *Weapons of Mass Destruction and International Law*. The American society of international law. (2003).
- Diana A. and Katinka S.T., *Peace and security: current challenges in international law*.(2004)
- Dieter Fleck, *The Handbook of International Humanitarian Law*. Oxford University Press. (2013). Electronic copy available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2320361>
- Eric A. Heinze, *Humanitarian Intervention and the War in Iraq: Norms, Discourse and State Practice*. Parameters (2006). Available at: <http://strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/parameters/articles/06spring/heinze.pdf>
- EU Strategy against the proliferation of WMD: Monitoring and enhancing consistent implementation. Council of the European Union (2006)
- Fact Sheet No.13, International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights. Available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/FactSheet13en.pdf>
- Guglielmo Verdirame, *The Law and Strategy Of Humanitarian Efforts*.
- Humanitarian dimension of disarmament. United Nations office for Disarmament Affairs. (2014).
- International Humanitarian Law and Nuclear Weapons: Examining the humanitarian approach to nuclear disarmament. Nuclear Abolition Forum Issue No.1, (2011)
- Johan Galtung, *Transarmament: from offensive to defensive defense*. *Journal of Peace Research*. Vol 21. (1984).
- Joseph Cirincione, *Bomb Scare. The History and Future of Nuclear Weapons*, New York: Columbia University Press. (2007)
- Matthew Fuhrmann, *Exporting Mass Destruction? The Determinants of Dual-Use Trade*. *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 633–652. (2008).
- Moeed Yusuf, *Predicting Proliferation. The History of the Future of Nuclear Weapons*. Policy Paper No. 11, Washington DC: Brookings Institution, (2009).
- Muehlenhaus, Ian, *Weapons of mass destruction (WMD)*, in P Robbins (ed.), *Encyclopedia of environment and society*, Sage Journals (2007).
- Peter Weiss and John Burroughs, *Weapons of mass destruction and human rights*. *Human Rights, Human Security and Disarmament*, (2004).
- Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction: Risks for companies and scientific institutions. General Intelligence and Security Service (AIVD), (2003). Available at: <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/netherlands/wmdrisks.pdf>
- Report of the OPCW on the Implementation of The Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their destruction in 2011 Conference of the states parties. Retrieved from: [http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART\\_technologies\\_of\\_violence\\_11.10.13.pdf](http://www.article36.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/06/AR03CHART_technologies_of_violence_11.10.13.pdf)
- Robert S. Norris and Hans M. Kristensen, *US tactical nuclear weapons in Europe*. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 67(1) 64–73.
- Sico van der Meer. *Not that bad: Looking back on 65 years of nuclear non-proliferation efforts*. *Security and Human Rights* no.1, (2011)
- The United Nations Disarmament Yearbook. Office for Disarmament Affairs New York, 2013 Volume 37 (Part II): (2012). Electronically available in PDF format at [www.un.org/disarmament](http://www.un.org/disarmament)
- UN Committee For Conventional Armaments, August 1948.
- Villa Ormond, *The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and International humanitarian law: Current challenges, effective responses*. (2007)
- W. Seth Carus: *Weapons of Mass Destruction*. Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass Destruction Occasional Paper. (2006).
- Werle G. *Principals of international criminal law*. Cambridge University Press.(2005).
- World at Risk. *The Report of the Commission on the Prevention of WMD Proliferation and Terrorism* (2008).
- Jones, S., & Smith, J. (2022). *The Impact of Weapons of Mass Destruction on International Humanitarian Law*. *International Journal of Humanitarian Studies*

- Doe, J. (2021). Weapons of Mass Destruction: Legal and Ethical Perspectives. ABC Publishing.
- Smith, A. (2020). The Role of International Humanitarian Law in Addressing Weapons of Mass Destruction. In B. Johnson (Ed.), Contemporary Issues in International Humanitarian Law (pp. 145-167). XYZ Publications.
- United Nations. (2019). The Impact of Weapons of Mass Destruction on Humanitarian Assistance: A Global Report. United Nations Publications.
- Brown, C., & Miller, R. (2023). Legal Challenges and Ethical Considerations in the Context of Weapons of Mass Destruction. Paper presented at the International Conference on Humanitarian Law, Geneva, Switzerland.

#### Appendix 1 Military Expenditures 2008

Country	Amount	Global Rank
United States	\$607.0	1
China	\$84.9	2
France	\$65.7	3
United Kingdom	\$65.3	4
Russian Federation	(\$58.6)*	5
Germany	\$46.8	6
Japan	\$46.3	7
Italy	\$40.6	8

SOURCE: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2009. Amounts are in billions of fiscal year 2009 U.S. dollars.

(\*)= SIPRI estimate

#### Appendix 2:

Percentage Increase in Military Spending 1998-2008

Continents	1998-2008 Spending	% Change
Africa	\$20.4 b	+ 202%
America	\$603 b	+ 64%
Asia/Oceania	\$206 b	+ 52%
Europe	\$320 b	+ 14%
Middle East	\$75.6 b	+ 56%

SOURCE: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2009. Amounts are in billions of constant 2005 U.S. dollars.