International human rights law offers an overarching international legal framework to help determine the legality of the use of any weapon, as well as its lawful supply. It governs acts of states and non-state actors alike. In doing so, human rights law embraces international humanitarian law regulation of the use of weapons in armed conflict and disarmament law, as well as international criminal justice standards. In situations of law enforcement (e.g. counterpiracy, prisons, ordinary policing, riot control, and many peace operations), human rights law is the primary legal frame of reference above domestic criminal law. This important and timely book draws on all aspects of international weapons law and proposes a new view on international law governing weapons. Also included is specific discussion on armed drones and cyberattacks, two highly topical issues in international law and international relations.
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EDITOR'S PREFACE

International human rights law (IHRL) offers an overarching international legal framework to help determine the legality of any weapon. Such a bold assertion may come as a surprise to some, and perhaps be adjudged a heresy by others. Instinctively, an international lawyer might be tempted to argue that a weapon's legality should be determined by reference to international humanitarian law (IHL); indeed, there are strong reasons for such an argument. It does, though, ignore two critical facts. First, weapons are used far more often away from the battlefield than they are as a method of warfare. In a situation of ‘law enforcement’, IHL does not apply and IHRL is a primary frame of reference under international law. Second, even in a situation of armed conflict fundamental human rights continue to apply, and in certain circumstances may even supersede IHL norms.

It could also be argued that disarmament law is a critical legal framework. To date, however, only four weapons have been rendered illegal by a disarmament treaty: anti-personnel mines, biological weapons, chemical weapons, and cluster munitions.\(^1\) This means the vast majority of extant weapons are not addressed. Moreover, of the four weapons covered by disarmament law treaties, chemical weapons are not unequivocally prohibited since certain chemical agents may lawfully be used for domestic law enforcement (and therefore their regulation automatically falls under IHRL).

In contrast to most branches of international law, IHRL is eclectic, drawing actively on norms from other legal regimes – including, though not limited to, IHL and disarmament law – or on standards set in a range of domains of professional endeavour. Its implementation is supported by a variety of formal and informal mechanisms operating nationally, regionally, and internationally. What is more, IHRL is dynamic: its implementing mechanisms, which

---

\(^1\) One could argue that the prohibition of ‘blinding laser weapons’ in Protocol IV to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons falls within the realm of disarmament law due to the prohibition on transfer. According to Article 1 of the Protocol: ‘It is prohibited to employ laser weapons specifically designed, as their sole combat function or as one of their combat functions, to cause permanent blindness to unenhanced vision, that is to the naked eye or to the eye with corrective eyesight devices. The High Contracting Parties shall not transfer such weapons to any state or non-state entity.’
range from courts, tribunals, and commissions to treaty-based oversight bodies and thematic or country-based special rapporteurs, all contribute to this dynamism.

Accordingly, although this book focuses on the law as it stands today, it also describes the law as it is evolving. The distinction between lex lata and lex ferraenda is made explicitly in each chapter. In addition, on occasion the authors offer their own views as to the direction the law should take; where such 'advocacy' occurs, it is similarly overt.

The book comprises six parts. Part I looks at the use of weapons for law enforcement purposes. Chapter 1 considers the use of firearms in law enforcement; such weapons should only be used by law enforcement officials where a threat to life or of serious injury exists. Today, most police forces are routinely armed, and increasingly the weapons with which some are equipped are of a military nature, capable of firing at a rate of many hundreds of rounds per minute. Intentional lethal use of force should, though, be limited to situations where it is strictly unavoidable to protect life. In Chapter 2, Abi Dymond-Bass and Neil Corney discuss the use of so-called 'less-lethal' weapons. The term 'non-lethal' is avoided wherever possible, as it is a misnomer: many of the weapons that attract this epithet are potentially lethal, as experience has taught us. Chapter 3 reviews the use of weapons – lethal or 'less-lethal' – for crowd management, crowd control, and riot control. In Chapter 4, Silvia Suteu applies international and regional standards to the use of weapons in custodial centres, for it is well established in law (if not necessarily in practice) that human rights do not stop at the prison gate. In Chapter 5, Alice Priddy applies the 'international law of law enforcement' to the maritime environment, looking at the use of weapons in counterpiracy operations, including by private security service providers.

Indeed, it is now possible to speak of an 'international law of law enforcement'. This body of law is, I would argue, composed of three main elements:

- international human rights law, especially rights to life, liberty, security, to peaceful protest (an umbrella right comprising a number of independent rights), and to freedom from torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment;
- customary international law, derived from, inter alia, criminal justice standards, especially the 1979 Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials;
and the 1990 Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials; and

- general principles of law, which reflect core principles of national criminal law across democratic nations.

As such, it is understood that the action of law enforcement may demand the use of force, including the use of weapons. To be lawful, however, such force – and any concomitant use of a weapon – must be both necessary and proportionate. Naturally, any weapon used must not be illegal under applicable national or international law. Furthermore, any use of weapons where death or serious injury results must be followed by an independent investigation to assess the legality of the use of force and to determine who should be held accountable for any unlawful action.

Part II addresses IHRL and armed conflict. In Chapter 6, Andrew Clapham discusses the complex interaction between weapons and armed non-state actors. He looks first at the legality of state transfers of arms to rebels and then at their legal obligations as individuals, armed groups, and as putative states. In Chapter 7, Nigel White assesses how weapons may lawfully be used in peace operations. As he observes, modern peace operations represent a challenge for the development of international human rights-based standards for the use of weapons since such operations are multinational and contain a range of armed components. He finds that while training, preparation, and risk assessment prior to the deployment of peace operations are improving, clear, human-rights-compliant standards still need to be elaborated, particularly by the United Nations. In Chapter 8, Sharon Weill and I describe the relationship between IHL and IHRL as it pertains to the use of weapons in armed conflict. General IHL criteria outlaw the use under any circumstances of weapons possessing certain characteristics (either because they are inherently indiscriminate, or because they are of a nature to cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering), while the rules of distinction, proportionality, and precautions in attacks govern combat action ‘on the battlefield’ (a key question, of course, being what are the outer limits of that notion?). We argue that in other circumstances IHRL standards governing the use of lethal force apply. Finally

3 Adopted by the Eighth UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, Havana, Cuba, 27 August to 7 September 1990. A UN General Assembly resolution adopted the same year welcomed the Basic Principles and invited governments ‘to respect them and to take them into account within the framework of their national legislation and practice’. Operative Paragraph 4, UN General Assembly Resolution 45/166, adopted without a vote on 18 December 1990. In the view of the UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, these standards are ‘authoritative statements of international law that set out the principles on the use of force by the police.’ Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, annexed to UN doc. A/66/330, 30 August 2011, §36.
for Part II, in Chapter 9 I look at IHRL’s application to the use of weapons and *jus ad bellum* – the resort to armed force between states or between a state and a non-state actor where it constitutes, respectively, an international armed conflict or an armed conflict of a non-international character.

Part III looks at selected weapons and technologies from an IHRL and IHL perspective. In Chapter 10, David Fidler discusses their relevance for cyberattacks. He concludes that existing experiences with cyberweapons suggest that such weapons pose less threat to human rights interests than do traditional military weaponry and tactics. Government use of cyberweapons against political dissidents worries human rights activists, but the response to this problem does not focus on weaponised computer code as such but on protecting and expanding internet freedom. In Chapters 11 and 12, Michael Crowley looks, in turn, at the use of riot control agents and chemical incapacitants. Both have been used for law enforcement, sometimes with lethal consequences. He argues that further clarification of the application of international law is urgently required. In Chapter 13, I look at the proliferation of drones and their use within and outside armed conflicts. They probably represent the future of warfare as well as perhaps policing, albeit over the longer term.

Part IV considers the implications of IHRL for weapons design, acquisition, and transfer. In Chapter 14, Abi Dymond-Bass, Neil Corney, and I propose a normative framework for a review of the legality of a weapon for use in law enforcement as well as reiterating the rules applicable to means of warfare destined for use in armed conflict. Using selected human rights norms and principles is, we assert, long overdue. In Chapter 15, Annyssa Bellal assesses to what extent a proposed international arms transfer may be prohibited by human rights law or under broader international law governing state responsibility for complicity. In Chapter 16, Gilles Giacca and Tahmina Karimova discuss the implications of economic and social rights for arms acquisitions. They conclude that no *expressis verbis* rule of international law requires states to prioritise spending on socio-economic rights over military expenditure.

Part V is devoted to issues of responsibility and accountability for unlawful use of weapons under human rights law. In Chapter 17, Ralph Steinhardt describes the extent of corporate responsibility for the design, manufacture, sale, and use of weapons. He argues that company-wide compliance programmes – adopted to minimise the risk of alien tort litigation – become a free-standing means for assuring that corporations do not replace governments as the dominant perpetrator of human rights abuse. In Chapter 18, Megan Burke and Loren Persi-Vicentic assess the right to a remedy and reparation where the use of a weapon is unlawful. They conclude that, given the relative lack of individual compensation schemes for violations of IHL, human rights law and, in certain cases, potentially international criminal law can offer broader and more significant avenues for redress.
In the final section of the book (Part VI) on future regulation of weapons under international law, I set out how I believe international weapons law, including IHRL, should regulate weapons and weapons systems. This includes certain weapons still under development or on the horizon.

Before ending this introduction, a brief discussion is merited of the definitions of weapons and of arms and of the distinction between them. Both terms are used in international law, including in international treaties, but nowhere is either term formally defined. In general, however, an arm is a narrower concept, as it refers to devices specifically manufactured to kill or injure, especially where they are military in nature. A weapon, on the other hand, can be any item or action that is so used, as well as to coerce a person’s behaviour. This encompasses so-called truth serums, among others. Further, it is common to refer to rape as a ‘weapon’ of war in terms that could not apply to arms. For ...

---

4 A US Department of Defense Working Group has reportedly suggested a definition of ‘all arms, munitions, materiel, instruments, mechanisms or devices that have an intended effect of injuring, damaging, destroying or disabling personnel or property.’ Cited in ICRC, A Guide to the Legal Review of New Weapons, Means and Methods of Warfare: Measures to Implement Article 36 of Additional Protocol I of 1977, ICRC, Geneva, 2007, p. 8, fn. 17. Within the context of IHL, a weapon has been defined by one British military lawyer as connoting ‘an offensive capability that can be applied to a military object or enemy combatant’. J. McClelland, ‘The Review of Weapons in Accordance with Article 36 of Additional Protocol I’, International Review of the Red Cross, vol. 85, no. 850 (June 2003), 397–415, p. 404. The US Department of Defense’s Dictionary of Military Terms does not contain a definition of ‘weapon’ or of ‘arms’.

5 In November 2012 it was reported that the date when stone-age humans first invented the lethal technology of spears and arrows had been put back many thousands of years with the discovery of small stone blades dating to 71,000 years ago. Archaeologists believe the ‘bladelets’ were used as the sharp tips for arrows or spears and were made by a relatively sophisticated technique involving the heat treatment of stone before shaping the final cutting edges. Steve Connor, ‘Stone-age humans began using lethal technology 71,000 years ago to fight Neanderthals’, Independent, 7 November 2012.

6 It appears to be insufficient for rape to be widespread in order to be termed a weapon of war under international criminal law. In a case before the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, the Trial Chamber read out the verdicts against three men, which included the following: ‘The trial against the three accused has sometimes been called the “rape camp case”, an example of the systematic rape of women of another ethnicity being used as a “weapon of war” … It is to some extent misleading to say that systematic rape was employed as a “weapon of war”. This could be understood to mean a kind of concerted approach or an order given to the Bosnian Serb armed forces to rape Muslim women as part of their combat activities in the wider meaning. There is no sufficient evidence for such a finding before the Trial Chamber … What the evidence shows, is that the rapes were used by members of the Bosnian Serb armed forces as an instrument of terror. An instrument they were given free rein to apply whenever and against whomsoever they wished.’ ICTY, Prosecutor v. Kunarac et al., Judgment (Trial Chamber) (Case No. IT-96-23-T), 22 February 2001, Summary.
the purpose of this book, we take a broad definition of the term ‘weapon’, as follows:

Any device constructed, adapted, or used to kill, harm, disorient, incapacitate, or affect a person’s behaviour against their will, or to damage or destroy buildings or materiel. A weapon acts through the application of kinetic force or of other means, such as the transmission of electricity, the diffusion of chemical substances or biological agents or sound, or the direction of electromagnetic energy. The term ‘weapon’ includes cyber weapons that damage computer systems and networks or result in physical harm to people or objects.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA</td>
<td>Central Intelligence Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoW</td>
<td>Coalition of the Willing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>2-chloro-1-phenyl-ethanone (phenyacyl chloride)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>Contingent-Owned Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Dibenz-(b,f):1:4-oxazepine (dibenzoazepine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Committee on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPD</td>
<td>2006 Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>[(2-chlorophenyl)-methylene] propanedinitrile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Conference of States Parties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWC</td>
<td>1992 Chemical Weapons Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFS</td>
<td>Department of Field Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Diphenylaminochloroarsine (adamite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPKO</td>
<td>UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>Depleted uranium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUF</td>
<td>Directives on the Use of Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHR</td>
<td>1950 European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>Economic Community of West African States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECtHR</td>
<td>European Court of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Effective dose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDW</td>
<td>Electrical Discharge Weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEZ</td>
<td>Exclusive economic zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPR</td>
<td>European Prison Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU NAVFOR</td>
<td>European Union Naval Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>US Federal Aviation Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPU</td>
<td>Formed Police Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA</td>
<td>Free Syrian Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCS</td>
<td>Ground control station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Academy</td>
<td>Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIC</td>
<td>Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAC</td>
<td>International armed conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACmHR</td>
<td>Inter-American Commission on Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACP</td>
<td>International Association of the Chiefs of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACHR</td>
<td>Inter-American Court of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCPR</td>
<td>1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Criminal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR</td>
<td>1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICI</td>
<td>International Court of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>International Committee of the Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICoC</td>
<td>International Code of Conduct for Private Security Service Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTR</td>
<td>International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTY</td>
<td>International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IED</td>
<td>Improvised explosive device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFOR</td>
<td>Implementation Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHL</td>
<td>International humanitarian law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHRL</td>
<td>International human rights law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILC</td>
<td>International Law Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
xxvi

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ILO
IMB
IMF
IMO
INCB
IPCC
IRA
ITAR
JAG
JNLPW
KFOR
LAPD
LD
LGB
LOS
LRAD
MDG
MNC
MONUC
MONUSCO
MOSOP
MoU
MPK/MPA
MPS
NATO
NEER
NGO
NIAC
OC
OECD
OEFF
OHCHR
OIOS
OLA
ONUC
OUNCA
ONUMOZ
ONUSAL
OPCW
ORF
PAVA

International Labour Organization
International Maritime Bureau
International Monetary Fund
International Maritime Organization
International Narcotics Control Board
Independent Police Complaints Commission
Irish Republican Army
International Traffic in Arms Regulations
Judge Advocate General
Joint Non-lethal Weapons Program
Kosovo Force
Los Angeles Police Department
Lethal dose
Laser guided bomb
Long Range Acoustic Device
Millennium Development Goal
Multinational corporation
UN Mission in Democratic Republic of Congo
UN Organization Stabilization Mission in Democratic Republic of Congo
Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni People
Memorandum of Understanding
N-nanonylmorpholine
Metropolitan Police Service
North Atlantic Treaty Organization
Non-lethal Environmental Evaluation and Remediation Center, Kansas State University
Non-governmental organisation
Non-international armed conflict
Oleoresin capsicum
Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
One Earth Future Foundation
Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
Office of Internal Oversight Services
UN Office of Legal Affairs
UN Operation in the Congo
UN Observer Group in Central America
UN Operation in Mozambique
UN Observer Mission in El Salvador
Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons
Omega Research Foundation
Pelargonic Acid Vanillylamide
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

PCA       Permanent Court of Arbitration
PCIJ      Permanent Court of International Justice
PDT       Pre-Deployment Training
PERF      US Police Executive Research Forum
PIRA      Provisional Irish Republican Army
PKK       Kurdistan Workers Party
PLAN      Proportionate, lawful, accountable, and necessary
PMSC      Private military and security contractor
Principles for the UN Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Protection of Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment Detainees
PS        Trichloronitromethane chloropicrin
PSSP      Private security service provider
RAF       British Royal Air Force
RCA       Riot control agent
RoE       Rules of Engagement
RPG       Rocket-propelled grenade
RULAC Project Rule of Law in Armed Conflicts Project
SAPS      South African Police Service
SAS       Special Air Service
SCSL      Special Court for Sierra Leone
SCO       Shanghai Cooperation Organization
SIPRI     Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
SOFA      Status of Forces Agreement
SPT       Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
TCN       Troop-contributing nations
TSN       Troop-sending nations
UAV       Unmanned aerial vehicle
UCAV      Unmanned combat aerial vehicle
UDHR      1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UN        United Nations
UNAVEM    UN Angola Verification Mission
UNCC      UN Compensation Commission
UNDOF     UN Disengagement Observer Force
UNDP      United Nations Development Programme
UNDSS     UN Department of Safety and Security
UNEF      UN Emergency Force
UNFICYP   UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus
UNGA      UN General Assembly
UNIFIL    UN Interim Force in Lebanon
**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNISOM</td>
<td>UN Operations in Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMBIH</td>
<td>UN Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMIK</td>
<td>UN Mission in Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMIS</td>
<td>UN Mission in Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>UN Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPROFOR</td>
<td>UN Protection Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSAS</td>
<td>UN Stand-By Arrangement System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSC</td>
<td>UN Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSG</td>
<td>UN Secretary-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNTAC</td>
<td>UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNTAG</td>
<td>UN Transition Assistance Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF</td>
<td>US Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XREP</td>
<td>eXtended Range Electronic Projectile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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