

Chapter 1 : Artificial Intelligence: Why AI Weapons Are Here To Stay In War

In a decision, the federal court upheld Maryland's assault weapons ban, finding that guns like the AR are weapons of war, and thus American civilians don't have an unfettered right to buy and own them under the Second Amendment.

Members of the Security Council should immediately pass a resolution referring the issue of the use of chemical weapons in Syria to the International Criminal Court. This would be an approach working within the framework of the rule of law to enforce the ban on chemical weapons that all members of the Security Council would agree on and would strengthen the international regimen that bans chemical weapons, rather than weaken it. A legal framework is in place to handle the prohibited use of chemical weapons. The Chemical Weapons Convention provides for investigation of alleged violations by specialist bodies constituted by the Convention, as well as collective measures by states parties in response to activities prohibited by the Convention, recourse to the UN General Assembly and Security Council in cases of particular gravity, and referral of disputes to the International Court of Justice. These procedures cover not only the , countries that are signatories to the Convention but also countries like Syria that are not. The procedures of the Convention allow for the Executive Council of the Chemical Weapons Convention or the Conference of States Parties to convene a special meeting to consider the situation in Syria and recommend appropriate responses by states parties and the United Nations. To operate within the law, the United States should provide the UN Security Council with the evidence it has regarding the use of chemical weapons by the Assad government. Other members of the Security Council should do the same and these materials should be provided to the International Criminal Court. This will allow the gaps in intelligence, alleged manipulation of intelligence, different information on who used the weapons and inconsistency between nations to be investigated. We urge Russia, China or other members of the Security Council to propose a resolution referring the case to the International Criminal Court if the United States fails to do so. If the United States proceeds with its plans to attack Syria over the alleged use of chemical weapons the U. The United Nations Charter allows unilateral military action only where a country is under attack or imminent threat of attack. To put it directly: The United States will be violating international law if it attacks Syria. During the congressional hearings on the Syrian attack, not one senator or Member of Congress has asked Secretary Kerry, Secretary Hagel or General Dempsey how many civilians the United States is likely to kill in this illegal military attack. The United States should become a signatory to the International Criminal Court, joining the countries that have already signed the agreement. To act within the rule of law to effectively deter the use of chemical weapons the following should occur: The Security Council should condemn any use of chemical weapons and forbid further use of chemical weapons. It should expand the scope of the UN investigation to include the issue of responsibility for attacks, refer the Syrian situation to the International Criminal Court for further investigation and adjudication, and call for convening of a peace conference. If the Security Council remains unable to act, the General Assembly should assume responsibility under the Uniting for Peace procedure. An attack by the United States on Syria would almost certainly result in many civilian casualties with great potential of a wider war and unpredictable consequences. Aerial bombardment is a diffuse tool not narrowly targeted on stopping the alleged use of chemical weapons, but a blunt act of war that will cause widespread harm. The United States government should not pursue this risky and illegal attack. Instead, it must pursue the legal, secure means of investigation and prosecution under the Chemical Weapons Convention. Syria Wars and Militarism Daily movement news and resources. Popular Resistance provides a daily stream of resistance news from across the United States and around the world. We also organize campaigns and participate in coalitions on a broad range of issues. We do not use advertising or underwriting to support our work. Instead, we rely on you. Please consider making a tax deductible donation if you find our website of value.

Chapter 2 : Is the AR a "Weapon of War"™?

Read "Controlling the Weapons of War Politics, Persuasion, and the Prohibition of Inhumanity" by Brian Rappert with Rakuten Kobo. A fresh examination of the ethical and intellectual issues and dilemmas associated with attempts to establish formal hum.

Enactment[edit] Arms control treaties and agreements are often seen as a way to avoid costly arms races which could prove counter-productive to national aims and future peace. Additionally, some arms control agreements are entered to limit the damage done by warfare, especially to civilians and the environment, which is seen as bad for all participants regardless of who wins a war. While arms control treaties are seen by many peace proponents as a key tool against war, by the participants, they are often seen as simply ways to limit the high costs of the development and building of weapons, and even reduce the costs associated with war itself. Arms control can even be a way of maintaining the viability of military action by limiting those weapons that would make war so costly and destructive as to make it no longer a viable tool for national policy. Enforcement[edit] Enforcement of arms control agreements has proven difficult over time. Most agreements rely on the continued desire of the participants to abide by the terms to remain effective. Usually, when a nation no longer desires to abide by the terms, they usually will seek to either covertly circumvent the terms or to simply end their participation in the treaty. This was seen in Washington Naval Treaty [3] and the subsequent London Naval Treaty [4] , where most participants sought to work around the limitations, some more legitimately than others. The nations which violated the terms of the treaty did not suffer great consequences for their actions. Within little more than a decade, the treaty was abandoned. The Geneva Protocol [6] has lasted longer and been more successful at being respected, but still nations have violated it at will when they have felt the need. Enforcement has been haphazard, with measures more a matter of politics than adherence to the terms. This meant sanctions and other measures tended to be advocated against violators primarily by their natural political enemies, while violations have been ignored or given only token measures by their political allies. This last has been a major obstacle to effective enforcement, as violators often attempt to covertly circumvent the terms of the agreements. Verification is the process of determining whether or not a nation is complying with the terms of an agreement, and involves a combination of release of such information by participants [8] as well as some way to allow participants to examine each other to verify that information. This is for two major reasons. To openly defy an agreement, even if one withdraws from it, often is seen in a bad light politically and can carry diplomatic repercussions. Additionally, if one remains in an agreement, competitors who are also participatory may be held to the limitations of the terms, while withdrawal releases your opponents to make the same developments you are making, limiting the advantage of that development. Theory of arms control[edit] This section does not cite any sources. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. August Learn how and when to remove this template message Scholars and practitioners such as John Steinbruner , Jonathan Dean or Stuart Croft worked extensively on the theoretical backing of arms control. Arms control is meant to break the security dilemma. It aims at mutual security between partners and overall stability be it in a crisis situation, a grand strategy , or stability to put an end to an arms race. Other than stability, arms control comes with cost reduction and damage limitation. It is different from disarmament since the maintenance of stability might allow for mutually controlled armament and does not take a peace-without-weapons-stance. Nevertheless, arms control is a defensive strategy in principle, since transparency , equality, and stability do not fit into an offensive strategy. Preth century[edit] One of the first recorded attempts in arms control was a set of rules laid down in ancient Greece by the Amphictyonic Leagues. Rulings specified how war could be waged, and breaches of this could be punished by fines or by war. There were few recorded attempts to control arms during the period between this and the rise of the Roman Catholic Church. The church used its position as a trans-national organization to limit the means of warfare. The Peace of God extended in ruling protected noncombatants, agrarian and economic facilities, and the property of the church from war. The Truce of God also tried to prevent violence between Christians. The Second Lateran Council in prohibited the use of

crossbows against other Christians, although it did not prevent its use against non-Christians. The development of firearms led to an increase in the devastation of war. However, during the period until the beginning of the 19th century few formal arms control agreements were recorded, except theoretical proposals and those imposed on defeated armies. One treaty which was concluded was the Strasbourg Agreement of 1675. This is the first international agreement limiting the use of chemical weapons, in this case, poison bullets. The treaty was signed between France and The Holy Roman Empire 19th century[edit] The Rush-Bagot Treaty between the United States and the United Kingdom was the first arms control treaty of what can be considered the modern industrial era, leading to the demilitarization of the Great Lakes and Lake Champlain region of North America. The industrial revolution led to the increasing mechanisation of warfare, as well as rapid advances in the development of firearms; the increased potential of devastation which was later seen in the battlefields of World War I led to Tsar Nicholas II of Russia calling together the leaders of 26 nations for the First Hague Conference in 1864. The Conference led to the signing of the Hague Convention of 1864 that led to rules of declaring and conducting warfare as well as the use of modern weaponry, and also led to the setting up of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. Various naval conferences, such as the Washington Naval Conference, were held during the period between the First and Second World Wars to limit the number and size of major warships of the five great naval powers. The Geneva Conference led to the banning of chemical weapons as toxic gases during war as part of the Geneva Protocol. The Kellogg-Briand Pact, whilst ineffective, attempted for "providing for the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy". The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was signed to prevent further spread of nuclear weapons technology to countries outside the five that already possessed them: The Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty was signed between the United States and Soviet Union in 1987 and ratified in 1988, leading to an agreement to destroy all missiles with ranges from 500 to 5,000 kilometers. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty was signed in 1996 banning all nuclear explosions in all environments, for military or civilian purposes, but it has not entered into force due to the non-ratification of eight specific states. Its goal is to promote nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and the strengthening of the disarmament regimes in respect to other weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological weapons. It also promotes disarmament efforts in the area of conventional weapons, especially landmines and small arms, which are often the weapons of choice in contemporary conflicts. As of December 2016, the United Nations is preparing for entry into force of the Arms Trade Treaty, which has been ratified by 89 nations. Washington Naval Treaty, [25] as part of the naval conferences Geneva Protocol on chemical and biological weapons, Antarctic Treaty, signed in 1959, entered into force in 1961.

Chapter 3 : Arms control - Wikipedia

A fresh examination of the ethical and intellectual issues and dilemmas associated with attempts to establish formal humanitarian limits on weaponry. This new study considers how governments, non-governmental organizations, academics, political c.

Licensing Provisions Section 1 Definitions 1 For the purposes of this Act, weapons intended for warfare war weapons comprise the items, substances and organisms listed in the Annex to this Act War Weapons List. Section 2 Production and Marketing 1 Anyone who intends to produce war weapons shall need a licence. Section 3 Transport within Federal Territory 1 Anyone who intends to have war weapons transported outside an enclosed site within federal territory shall need a licence. Section 4 Transport outside Federal Territory 1 Anyone who intends to transport by ships flying the federal flag or by aircraft entered in the aircraft register of the Federal Republic of Germany war weapons which are loaded and unloaded outside federal territory and are not transported through federal territory shall require a licence. Section 4a Foreign Transactions 1 Anyone who intends to broker a contract on the acquisition or transfer of war weapons located outside federal territory or to show that an opportunity exists for concluding such a contract shall need a licence. Section 5 Exemptions 1 Anyone who acts under the supervision or as an employee of another person shall not require a licence under sections 2 and 4a of this Act. In such cases, the other person alone shall require a licence in accordance with section 2 to 4a of this Act. Section 6 Denial of a Licence 1 There shall be no entitlement to the granting of a licence. Section 7 Revocation of a Licence 1 A licence may be revoked at any time. In particular it may direct that, within a reasonable period, the war weapons be rendered unusable or be transferred to a person authorised to acquire them and that proof of this be furnished to the supervisory authority. If the period expires without such action, the war weapons may be seized and confiscated. Section 13 3 shall apply mutatis mutandis. Section 8 Granting and Revocation of a General Licence 1 A general licence within the meaning of sections 3 4 and section 4 2 shall be granted by statutory order. Section 9 Compensation in Case of Revocation 1 If a licence under section 2, section 3 1 or 2 , section 4 1 or section 4a of this Act is cancelled wholly or in part, the licensee shall receive adequate pecuniary compensation from the Federal Government. The amount of compensation shall be determined by the expenditure proved by the licensee to have been reasonably incurred. Account shall be taken of other possible uses of the weapons in accordance with the principles of good management. In the event of a dispute over the amount of compensation, recourse shall exist to ordinary courts of law. Section 10 Content and Form of a Licence 1 A licence may be limited in scope or duration and be the subject of conditions. Section 9 of this Act shall apply mutatis mutandis. A licence for the production of the war weapons specified in Part B of the war weapons control list may be granted without limitation to a certain quantity, an a licence for the transport of war weapons without limitation to a certain type and quantity. Section 11 Licensing Authorities 1 The Federal Government shall be responsible for granting and revoking licences. Provisions on Supervision and Exceptions Section 12 Duties concerning the Traffic in War Weapons 1 Anyone who carries out an act requiring a licence under this Act shall take the necessary measures 1. This shall not apply in the cases defined in section 5 1 and 2 of this Act and to transports in the cases defined in section 5 3 2. In the case of item 1 above, the person acquiring actual control of war weapons shall, within a period to be determined by the supervisory authority, render the war weapons unusable or transfer them to a person entitled to acquire them and furnish proof of this to the supervisory authority. The supervisory authority may upon application allow exemptions from the foregoing sentence if this is in the public interest. Such exemptions may be limited in duration and be subject to conditions. Time limits and conditions may be subsequently imposed at any time. Section 12a Special Reporting Requirements 1 The Federal Government is authorised, by statutory order requiring the consent of the Federal Council, to prescribe that the import and export of war weapons of Part B of the War Weapons List shall be reported to the Federal Office of Economics and Export Control BAFA , where the Federal Government needs these data in order to fulfil international agreements on the communication of data referring to the import and export of war weapons. The Federal Office of Economics and Export Control BAFA is permitted to compare the data collected due to a

statutory order under sentence 1 for purposes mentioned in sentence 1 with other data recorded by it. This shall also apply if, in individual cases, the data can be brought in connection with certain companies, if the interest in the communication or publication considerably outweighs the interest of the company concerned in the observance of secrecy.

Section 13 Seizure and Confiscation 1 The supervisory authorities and the agencies responsible for maintaining law and order may seize war weapons 1. Third-party rights to the war weapons shall expire. The owner or the possessor of a right in them shall receive reasonable pecuniary compensation from the Federal Government, taking into account the current market value of the weapons. Compensation shall not be granted if the owner or possessor of a right in them contributed with at least gross negligence to causing the threat to law and order. In such a case, compensation may be granted if its refusal would be unreasonably severe.

Section 13a Handling of War Weapons Rendered Unusable The handling of war weapons rendered unusable may be restricted by the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology by statutory order not requiring the consent of the Federal Council; in particular, the handling may be prohibited or subjected to licensing reservations. War weapons rendered unusable are war weapons which, due to technical changes, finally lost the capability of being used for their specific purpose, and cannot be put into operation again by tools of general use. Details can be stipulated in the statutory order referred to in sentence 1 above.

Section 14 Supervisory Authorities 1 The following authorities shall be responsible for supervising the acts requiring a licence under this Act as well as compliance with the duties specified in section 12 of this Act: The basic right of inviolability of the home embodied in Article 13 of the Basic Law shall be restricted to that extent. The same shall apply to persons on whom the duties specified in section 12 of this Act are incumbent.

Section 12 of this Act shall not be applicable insofar. Special Provisions on Nuclear Weapons

Section 16 Nuclear Tasks in the North Atlantic Alliance To ensure the preparation and implementation of nuclear participation under the North Atlantic Treaty of 4 April for a member state, the provisions of this part and the penal provisions of sections 19 and 21 of this Act shall apply only to nuclear weapons which are not under the control of Member States of the said treaty or which are not developed or produced on behalf of such states.

Section 17 Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons 1 Notwithstanding section 16 of this Act, it is forbidden to 1. Moreover, for the definition of nuclear weapons, sentence 2 of the introduction and section I c of Annex II of Protocol No. Penal and Administrative Fine Provisions

Section 19 Penal Provisions on Nuclear Weapons 1 A prison sentence between one and five years shall be imposed on anyone who 1. **Section 20 Penal Provisions on Biological and Chemical Weapons** 1 A prison sentence of not less than two years shall be imposed on anyone who 1. **Section 20a Penal Provisions on Anti-Personal Mines** 1 A prison sentence of one up to five years shall be imposed on anyone who 1. A particularly serious case is, as a rule, if 1. **Section 21 Acts Committed outside the Area of Application of this Act** Section 19, paragraph 2, item 2, paragraph 3, item 2, paragraphs 5 and 6, sections 20 and 20a of this Act shall also apply to acts committed outside the area of application of these provisions if the offender is a German national.

Section 22 Exceptions Sections 18, 20 and 21 of this Act shall not apply to official acts related to chemical weapons performed by 1. **Section 22a Other Penal Provisions** 1 A prison sentence of one year up to five years shall be imposed on anyone who 1. A particularly serious case is generally deemed to exist if the offender commits an act specified in paragraph 1, items 1 to 4, 6 or 7, above for gain or as a member of a gang that has been formed for continually committing such offences, with the assistance of another member of the gang. If actual control of war weapons is acquired by any other authority or agency specified in the foregoing sentence without any effort on the part of the person who imported or otherwise brought them into federal territory, his voluntary and genuine endeavour to hand over the war weapons shall be deemed sufficient.

Section 22b Infringement of Administrative Provisions 1 An administrative offence shall be deemed to have been committed by anyone who intentionally or negligently 1. Such an administrative offence shall be punishable by a fine of up to DM 1, **Section 23 Administrative Authorities** Where they are responsible for supervision under section 14 1 and 2 of this Act, the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology, the Federal Ministry of Transport, Construction and Housing and the Federal Ministry of Finance shall at the same time be administrative authorities within the meaning of section 36 1 , item 1 of the Administrative Offences Act. **Section 36 3 of the Administrative Offences Act shall apply mutatis mutandis.**

Section 24 Confiscation 1 War weapons to which an offence under sections 19, 20, 21 or

22a of this Act relates may be confiscated on behalf of the Federal Government; section 74a 2 of the Penal Code shall apply. Even if the requirements of section 74 2 of the Penal Code are not met, they shall be confiscated where the welfare of the Federal Republic of Germany so requires; this shall also apply if the offender acted without fault. Section 25 repealed Part Six: Transitional and Final Provisions Section 26 Licences Granted prior to the Entry into Force of this Act Licences granted under the provisional licensing procedure pursuant to Article 26 2 of the Basic Law shall be deemed granted under this Act. Section 26a Notification of the Exercise of Actual Control Anyone who, on the date when accession takes effect, is in actual control of previously acquired war weapons in the territory specified in Article 3 of the Unification Treaty shall notify this to the Federal Office of Economics within two months of accession taking effect, stating the type of weapons, quantity, weapons number or other identification, unless he is exempted from the requirement of a licence for the acquisition of actual control or has received an order under section 26b of this Act. After expiry of this period, actual control of war weapons that require notification but have not been notified shall no longer be exercised. Section 26b Transitional Provisions for the Territory Specified in Article 3 of the Unification Treaty 1 An act which requires a licence under this Act and has been started or envisaged in the territory specified in Article 3 of the Unification Treaty before the date when accession takes effect and cannot be deferred may be provisionally licensed. In such cases the required licence is to be applied for within a month following the issue of the provisional licence. If the licence is refused, the applicant may be granted reasonable compensation, with section 9 of this Act being applied *mutatis mutandis*, if the refusal of compensation would be unreasonably severe in view of the need to protect confidence in the former legal situation. Where, before the date when accession takes effect, state orders have been placed for for the production of war weapons or for their export to or import from Member States of the Warsaw Treaty, the acts necessary to carry out those orders and requiring a licence under sections 2 or 3 of this Act shall be deemed to have been licensed. In the case of orders under item 1 above concerning states that are not members of the Warsaw Treaty, acts which require a licence but cannot be deferred may be provisionally licensed; the second and third sentences of paragraph 1 above shall apply *mutatis mutandis*. Section 27 International treaties Obligations of the Federal Republic under international treaties shall remain unaffected. To this extent the licences required under article 26 2 of the Basic Law and under this Act shall be deemed to have been granted. Section 28 Berlin Clause.

Chapter 4 : Table of contents for Controlling the weapons of war

Get this from a library! Controlling the weapons of war: politics, persuasion and the prohibition of inhumanity. [Brian Rappert] -- A fresh examination of the ethical and intellectual issues and dilemmas associated with attempts to establish formal humanitarian limits on weaponry.

The European Union called the project a global concern and passed a resolution calling for more information on its health and environmental risks. Despite those concerns, officials at HAARP insist the project is nothing more sinister than a radio science research facility. The project was shuttered by the military in after attracting large amounts of negative publicity, though HAARP-like research undoubtedly continues in other secret projects. This essay reveals major deception promulgated by those involved to lead the public to believe HAARP was simply a research facility with little practical military value. Others go so far as to claim that HAARP technologies have been and continue to be used for weather control, to cause earthquakes, hurricanes, tsunamis, to disrupt global communications systems, and more. These researchers point to major aspects of the program which are still kept secret for alleged reasons of "national security. And there is no doubt that electromagnetic weapons capable of being used in warfare do exist. According to the original HAARP website , "HAARP is a scientific endeavor aimed at studying the properties and behavior of the ionosphere, with particular emphasis on being able to understand and use it to enhance communications and surveillance systems for both civilian and defense purposes. The HAARP project website acknowledged that experiments were conducted which used electromagnetic frequencies to fire pulsed, directed energy beams in order to "temporarily excite a limited area of the ionosphere. Nick Begich son of a US Congressman present evidence suggesting that these disturbances can even be used to trigger earthquakes, affect hurricanes, and for weather control. This essay is dedicated with compassion to those who suffered and died in the massive earthquakes in Japan and Haiti, the Indonesian tsunami, Hurricane Katrina, and more. Bernard Eastlund is the scientist whose name is most associated with the creation and development of the HAARP project. His revealing website provides reliable information on his involvement with the project. A patent issued to Dr. Eastlund makes a number of fascinating statements which clearly contradict the claim that it is only being used for research and not for military purposes or such purposes as weather control. Here are a few of key statements taken verbatim from the patent: A means and method is provided to cause interference with or even total disruption of communications over a very large portion of the earth. This invention could be employed to disrupt not only land based communications, both civilian and military, but also airborne communications and sea communications. This would have significant military implications. Exceedingly large amounts of power can be very efficiently produced and transmitted. This invention has a phenomenal variety of Large regions of the atmosphere could be lifted to an unexpectedly high altitude so that missiles encounter unexpected and unplanned drag forces with resultant destruction or deflection. Weather modification is possible by, for example, altering upper atmosphere wind patterns or altering solar absorption patterns by constructing one or more plumes of atmospheric particles which will act as a lens or focusing device. Electromagnetic pulse defenses are also possible. For those with any background in science, you might find it quite revealing to explore this patent in more detail. The very well researched CBC documentary includes this key quote: In January of , the European Union called the project a global concern and passed a resolution calling for more information on its health and environmental risks. The actual wording at bullet point 24 in this telling document states that the EU "considers HAARP by virtue of its far-reaching impact on the environment to be a global concern and calls for its legal, ecological and ethical implications to be examined by an international independent body before any further research and testing. This engaging minute CBC documentary is available for free viewing. An even more detailed and revealing minute History Channel documentary on HAARP and other secret weapons used for electromagnetic warfare is available here. Here are two quotes from the History Channel documentary: One can blast enemy missiles out of the sky, another could be used to blind soldiers on the battlefield, still another to control an unruly crowd by burning the surface of their skin. If detonated over a large city, an electromagnetic weapon could destroy all electronics in seconds. They all use

directed energy to create a powerful electromagnetic pulse. Imagine using a flood to destroy a city or tornadoes to decimate an approaching army in the desert. If an electromagnetic pulse went off over a city, basically all the electronic things in your home would wink and go out, and they would be permanently destroyed. The military has spent a huge amount of time on weather modification as a concept for battle environments. "Electromagnetic Warfare," is available here. United States defence chiefs said that if the project had been completed before the end of the war, it could have played a role as effective as that of the atom bomb. Details of the tsunami bomb, known as Project Seal, are contained in year-old documents released by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. Clearly the military has the capability to cause a tsunami and likely to cause earthquakes and hurricanes, as well. Bernard Eastlund, watch "Holes in Heaven. Yet these weapons are kept secret as long as possible, allegedly for reasons of national security. The many layers of intense secrecy both in the military and government result in very few people being aware of the gruesome capabilities for death and destruction. The massive Manhattan Project development of the first atomic bomb is one such example. It is through the use of the highly organized military and intelligence services that the power elite of our world, in cooperation with key allies in government and corporate ownership of the media, are able to carry out major cover-ups and secret operations like those involved with HAARP. Some researchers have raised questions about the possible involvement of HAARP in major disasters like the earthquakes in Haiti and Japan, the Indonesian tsunami, and hurricane Katrina. Might they even have been caused by rogue elements which gained control of this devastating technology? Disasters like this happen naturally on a regular basis, yet if you begin to research, there is some high strangeness around some of these disasters. The evidence is inconclusive, yet with the known and unknown major destructive capabilities of this weapon, serious questions remain. HAARP and Manipulation of Emotions The capability of influencing and even controlling human emotions has been studied by the military and intelligence services of the world for many decades. A concise, information-packed description of such programs with links to declassified CIA documents for verification is available here. One thoroughly researched book titled Mind Controllers describes an effective method of remotely influencing human emotions. Each one of these negative emotions is properly and separately tagged. They are then placed on the Silent Sound carrier frequencies and could silently trigger the occurrence of the same basic emotion in another human being. For the section focused on nonlethal weapons, which includes the above quote, see this page. This may all sound quite unbelievable to those who are not versed in the secret ways of the military-intelligence complex. Yet there is strong evidence to support this possibility. Here is the abstract of U. The modulated carriers may be transmitted directly in real time or may be conveniently recorded and stored on mechanical, magnetic or optical media for delayed or repeated transmission to the listener. Patent and Trade Office website at this link. Below are the listed objects of the invention in that patent: In other words, the subliminal messages could be inserted into TV and radio waves without the awareness of the listener or viewer. Such messages could easily be beamed from satellites, as well, triangulated on a desired location. Using the incredible broadcasting capabilities of HAARP, these subliminal messages could conceivably even be broadcast over a larger area to create the desired effect on an entire population. So why is this not being discussed more widely? At least a dozen other patents have been approved related to the usage of technology designed to cause subliminal changes in desired targets. A list and brief descriptions of many of these patents with links for verification is available on this webpage. For the latter, the image pulsing may be imbedded in the program material, or it may be overlaid by modulating a video stream. The capability of remotely influencing emotions through the use of certain wave lengths has been successfully demonstrated. The implications are huge. Yet there is exceedingly little regulation of how this technology will be used. By educating yourself on this important matter and spreading the word to your friends and colleagues, you can make a difference in building the necessary momentum to bring these matters to light and to ensure they are not used in disempowering ways. You can watch this revealing program online at this link. For many other ideas and suggestions on how you can further educate yourself and what you can do to help inform others about this secret program and make a difference in our world, see the box below. And to bring this matter home, let us also look at where each of us are keeping secrets in ways that can end up harming those around us. HAARP was officially shuttered by the military in Operation of the facility was

transferred to the University of Alaska in What you can do: Read other powerful, reliable major media articles on nonlethal beam weapons. Inform your media and political representatives of this critical information on HAARP and weather control. To contact those close to you, visit this page. Urge them bring this information to light and allow public dialog on HAARP, weather control and electromagnetic weapons. To read excellent, well researched articles by top researchers in the field of HAARP, electromagnetic warfare and secret weapons, click [here](#) , [here](#) , and [here](#). Learn about the intriguing history and development of controversial behavior modification programs in this excellent two-page summary. Footnotes and links to reliable sources are provided for verification purposes. Explore inspiring ideas on how we can build a brighter future in this short essay. Share this article on key news websites using the "Share" icon on this page, so that we can fill the role at which the major media is sadly failing. Together, we can make a difference.

Chapter 5 : Weather Control as a Cold War Weapon | History | Smithsonian

A fresh examination of the ethical and intellectual issues and dilemmas associated with attempts to establish formal humanitarian limits on weaponry. This new study considers how governments, non-governmental organizations, academics, political commentators and others have responded to the.

When most new weapons are developed, calls for their banned use often follow. Similar attempts to ban weapons and set rules for the appropriate conduct of war provide examples, from which we can conclude what to expect from AI weapons. In 1864, delegates from around the world convened in Geneva to discuss rules and laws in war. Of particular concern was the use of chemical weapons, a new weapon being developed at the time. The convention would eventually call for a ban on asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases. Only two countries were against banning their use, the United States and in support of America the United Kingdom. The argument the United States used against prohibiting chemical weapons was that states should use all means at their disposal to end a war as quickly as possible. They assumed that banning chemical weapons would only serve to extend the length of the conflict, thus ultimately causing more people to die. However, as examples such as the longbow, crossbow, firearms, explosive shells, and submarines demonstrate, the dominant pattern has been for such moral qualms to disappear over time as these innovations became incorporated into the standard techniques of war. But what is driving its limited use? The argument that the taboo is the only thing stopping the widespread use of the weapon is made much less convincing by the fact that chemical weapons are not a particularly effective or useful tool on the battlefield. The creation of gas clouds of sufficient concentration to be effective is difficult. These limitations make the weapon only attractive to leaders and regimes that are already in a very desperate position. Now contrast that with the development of submarines. Submarines were first being developed for wide-spread use around the same time as chemical weapons, and submarines were also viewed similarly. They were seen as a dishonorable weapon, lurking unseen below the surface and killing their targets anonymously. This was especially the case with the rise of unrestricted submarine warfare. All three new technologies of war considered here created and create significant ethical dilemmas and are still viewed by many as unethical. However, of the two historical examples, the ineffective tool developed a taboo while the effective tool did not. So, will AI be an effective tool of war? It seems highly likely that it will be a useful tool of war. While AI weapons are likely to advance military effectiveness, the subsequent development of countermeasures will likely prevent them from upending the modern system of war. AI can be used to increase effectiveness and efficiency for more than just combat operations. AI can improve supply lines, enhance the training of new soldiers, and increase the effectiveness and efficiency of intelligence gathering and processing. But their effectiveness in combat operations seems especially promising. AI is not a wholly revolutionary idea to be applied to the military domain, and it is merely the next logical step in the digitization and mechanization of the modern battlefield. We already see some of these tactics being employed on the battlefield, the sheer number of states investing in such technology, and current weapon systems that offer insight their potential, all seem to indicate that AI weapons will be highly effective tools of war. Army veteran and a Ph. He researches military operations and strategy, terrorism, and civil-military relations.

A fresh examination of the ethical and intellectual issues and dilemmas associated with attempts to establish formal humanitarian limits on weaponry.

Please assist us in getting this information out into all the media outlets that will run this. It is showing the advantage of directed energy weapons, active denial and, biochemical weapons, hostage-taking, couched in language that means the opposite. This document is about a guide to oppose international law and is an admission of skirting international law. Those people involved in writing this document are the perpetrators promoting the use of these weapons. We must expose these weapons and the crimes these perpetrators are causing to all living creatures on a cellular level - to all populations not chosen by the elite to survive - this is population control and genocide based upon the active denial program. Active Denial System ADS is a weapon of mass torture, mass destruction and an inhumane psychologically traumatizing weapon. This weapons are also used to blow up your vehicle tires, your engine, your water heaters, well pumps, they are used to cause pin hole plumbing leaks and these weapons can fry your brain. They are using doublespeak when stating non-lethal when these weapons are lethal. The Use of Language to Deceive You. A unique analysis of American English, examples of double-speak are "human kinetics" in place of "physical education," and "pavement deficiencies" instead of "potholes. Lutz points out that his mission is not to eradicate double-speak, but to eliminate double-speak from the discourse of important issues where it is most dangerous. He states that double-speak is most prevalent in government, followed closely by the advertising industry. The reason why we are referencing this book is to introduce you to the idea that since the end Carter administration and the rise of the Reagan Bush administration in double speak, a deceptive language of falsified meanings, was developed which is degrees opposite of how the dictionary defines meanings of words; i. Freedom is Slavery; War is Peace and so on. The document you are about to read discussing "non-lethal" weapons is an extremely dangerous document and an admission of lethal weapons designed to injure, maim and kill. Globally, documents like this have play deceptive word games and have successfully manipulated us with ambiguities and double speak. For a number of years a great deal of research and development has been taking place in developing new types of weapons, ostensibly in order to reduce mortality figures. A kinetic-energy weapon is one that threatens or inflicts harm to a person through the application to the human body of the energy that a bullet, fragment, or other projectile possesses due to its mass and motion. Page 5 The exercise of physical force so as to inflict injury on, or cause damage to, persons or property; action or conduct characterized by this; treatment or usage tending to cause bodily injury or forcibly interfering with personal freedom. These weapons are also damaging personal property. Page 6 A substance whose chemical action on specific biochemical processes and physiological systems, especially those affecting the higher regulatory activity of the central nervous system, produces a disabling condition e. The term excludes riot control agents when used for law enforcement purposes, herbicides, smoke, and flames. Page 22 The use of poison or poisoned weapons is prohibited. He argues, therefore, that synthetic chemical analogues i. In several cases, pepper spray was reportedly used. In the case of Venezuela, Human Rights Watch has reported that in early February and late March , National Guard and police officers beat and tortured people detained during and after protests in Caracas and other Venezuelan cities. Some reported that their captors hurled tear gas bombs into the closed vehicles in which they were seated, causing extreme distress, near suffocation, and panic, while others described how the powder from tear gas canisters was sprinkled on their faces and eyes, causing burns and skin irritation. Page 49 As part of a seemingly pre-planned massacre at a stadium in Conakry, Guinea, on 28 September , it has been reported that tear gas was first fired into the political gathering from outside. They first began to fire tear gas from outside the stadium " many canisters of tear gas were fired into the stadium. Just then, the red berets entered from the big gate to the stadium. As soon as they entered, they began to fire directly at the crowd. As I looked back, I could see many bodies on the grass. I decided to try and run out of the stadium. An electrified conductive fluid is ejected from a gun at high velocity, making contact with stationary or moving targets. The single stream of

fluid delivers a high-voltage pulse capable of delivering a shock even through thick protective clothing. The liquid stun gun has significant advantages over the handheld electric stun devices or the electric stun devices with attachment wires capable of being projected toward targets up to 15 feet away. The liquid stun gun can engage one or more persons, and does not require attachment wires with barbed tips, which often must be surgically removed. The water stream may be moved among targets until the selected target is positively engaged before the high voltage is applied. This feature can be used to avoid stunning innocent bystanders or hostages. This wireless stun gun technology can also be used in conjunction with a vehicle-mounted water cannon for use in crowd or riot control. Water can be sprayed on the crowd, delivering debilitating but not lethal shocks. In certain military applications the electrical current could be controlled to deliver potent electrical shocks to equipment as well as individuals. There have been accidents and injuries from their use in Iraq. Thermal laser weapons use infrared lasers to heat the skin to cause pain but not permanent injury. The radiation acts in a dose-dependent manner and so exposure duration is critical in terms of safety. For an analysis of disabilities resulting from burns, see in general the report on the second working group of experts convened by the ICRC on 5â€”7 November , in L. But who will use them and why? This is Truly Diabolical. And whether you like it or not is not the question. Humans are being transformed! The movies show us snippets of their evil plans, one needs to watch these little details and read the source documents as recommended above. Then there are, in some 15 or so years out, the real expectation of robotic crew members with Machine Intelligence approaching human via biomimmetics. Altogether, "Designer Humans" designed as "Exploriticus Sapiens". Preface - What the hell is happening. Your unfortunate lack of critical thinking skills leaves you without the ability to see the unseeable. You watch, but you fail to see. This is what they are doing to you and your family, and this is how they do it. Complete, high dexterity remote control of every single synapse and neuron for every person on the face of the earth.

Chapter 7 : Customs online - Weapons of war

Buy Controlling the Weapons of War at calendrierdelascience.com This button opens a dialog that displays additional images for this product with the option to zoom in or out.

The next big question is: Will other judges see it the same way? Most of the time, the distinction is of little practical importance: But on Tuesday, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in Richmond, Virginia, came down squarely one side of this debate, with big implications for how states regulate assault weapons. Email address The Canon Sent every Saturday. The Daily Bulletin Sent weekday mornings. The gun was first designed by famed engineer Eugene Stoner in the late s as a replacement for rifles developed during and soon after World War II. These rifles are virtually identical in functionality to the M, with one difference: Meaning, its owner must squeeze the trigger each time he or she fires a shot. After a series of mass shootings committed with commercially-sold assault weapons and fears grew that gangs were using such firearms to out-gun police, President Clinton restricted their manufacture and sale. The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of , a sweeping omnibus crime bill, included a ban on assault weapons. When that ban expired in , the market for such guns opened up. Demand skyrocketed during the Obama administration, especially after Democrats introduced new gun control legislation following the massacre at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Connecticut, which was carried out with an AR-style rifle made by Bushmaster. In , Maryland and several other states passed their own laws banning the sale, transfer, or transportation of guns like the AR A group of Maryland residents, who wished to buy such weapons but were prevented from doing so under the new law, sued the state and were joined by gun dealers and trade groups like the National Shooting Sports Foundation. Pro-gun groups like the NRA and more gun-friendly state governments, including Alabama and Kansas, filed briefs backing the suit. The state of Maryland defended the law, and was supported by gun-violence-prevention groups like the Brady Campaign and states like Illinois and New York. The two sides argued over the development history, technical features, and place in American life of these assault weapons. Civilian ownership of fully automatic weapons has been strictly regulated since the passage of the National Firearms Act in , and no new automatic weapons have been produced for the civilian market since For those outside the gun world, however, that may be a distinction without much of a real-world difference. The ruling by the Fourth Circuit attempted no such balancing act. But, right now, that distinction may not matter much outside the courtroom.

Chapter 8 : Weather warfare - Wikipedia

The main weapons and equipment items used by the United States DoD members are listed below. Listing every weapon in the arsenal would not be practical for an article, so this series will cover the highlights, starting with some of the main weapons and equipment used by the Infantry and Special Operations Units.

Talbot, along with scientist Dr. Schaefer, released three pounds of dry ice frozen carbon dioxide into the clouds. As they turned south, Dr. I shouted to Curt to swing around, and as we did so we passed through a mass of glistening snow crystals! Needless to say, we were quite excited. After the experiments of G. And, as Cold War tensions heightened, weather control was seen by the United States as a potential weapon that could be even more devastating than nuclear warfare. Its stated purpose was to determine the effectiveness of weather modification procedures and the extent to which the government should engage in such activities. Methods that were envisioned by both American and Soviet scientists and openly discussed in the media during the mid- included using colored pigments on the polar ice caps to melt them and unleash devastating floods, releasing large quantities of dust into the stratosphere creating precipitation on demand, and even building a dam fitted with thousands of nuclear powered pumps across the Bering Straits. This dam, envisioned by a Russian engineer named Arkady Borisovich Markin would redirect the waters of the Pacific Ocean, which would theoretically raise temperatures in cities like New York and London. Irving Langmuir, who had worked with Dr. Schaefer during those early experiments conducted for the G. In Captain Howard T. Captain Orville was quoted widely in American newspapers and popular magazines about how the United States might use this control of the skies to its advantage. As the article noted, in an age of atomic weapons and supersonic flight, anything seemed possible for the latter half of the 20th century. A weather station in southeast Texas spots a threatening cloud formation moving toward Waco on its radar screen; the shape of the cloud indicates a tornado may be building up. An urgent warning is sent to Weather Control Headquarters. Back comes an order for aircraft to dissipate the cloud. And less than an hour after the incipient tornado was first sighted, the aircraft radios back: The storm was broken up; there was no loss of life, no property damage. This hypothetical destruction of a tornado in its infancy may sound fantastic today, but it could well become a reality within 40 years. In this age of the H-bomb and supersonic flight, it is quite possible that science will find ways not only to dissipate incipient tornadoes and hurricanes, but to influence all our weather to a degree that staggers the imagination. Indeed, if investigation of weather control receives the public support and funds for research which its importance merits, we may be able eventually to make weather almost to order. It may someday be possible to cause torrents of rain over Russia by seeding clouds moving toward the Soviet Union. And fortunately for the United States, Russia could do little to retaliate because most weather moves from west to east. I would not be surprised if accomplished it in five years or failed to do it in the next. They are quiet men, so little known to the public that the magnitude of their job, when you first hear of it, staggers the imagination. Their object is to control the weather and change the face of the world. Some of these men are Americans. The first skirmishes of an undeclared cold war between them already have been fought. Efforts to control the weather, however, would find skeptics in the U. National Research Council, which published a report: We conclude that the initiation of large-scale operational weather modification programs would be premature. Many fundamental problems must be answered first. We believe that the patient investigation of atmospheric processes coupled with an exploration of the technical applications may eventually lead to useful weather modification, but we emphasize that the time-scale required for success may be measured in decades.

Chapter 9 : BBC NEWS | In Depth | How did rape become a weapon of war?

Controlling the weapons of war: politics, persuasion and the prohibition of inhumanity / Brian Rappert. JZ R37
Reconceptualising arms control: controlling the means of violence / edited by Neil Cooper, David Mutimer.

Not surprisingly, in view of the threat of nuclear devastation, the second challenge to the traditional paradigm of strategy came from the effort to control nuclear weapons. Arms control has had a long history, perhaps as old as organized warfare itself, but it is a broad sense, arms control grows out of historical state practice in disarmament, which has had, since the 20th century, a long record of successes and failures. A narrower definition of each term, however, reveals key differences between disarmament and arms control. Partial disarmament may consist of the elimination of certain types or classes of weapons or a general reduction but not elimination of all classes of weapons. Whereas disarmament agreements usually directly prohibit the possession or production of weapons, arms-control agreements often proceed by setting limitations on the testing, deployment, or use of certain types of weapons. Arms-control advocates generally take a more or less realistic approach to international relations, eschewing pacifism in a world they view as anarchic and as lacking any central authority for settling conflicts. Furthermore, whereas the objective of disarmament agreements is the reduction or elimination of weapons, arms-control agreements aim to encourage countries to manage their weapons in limited cooperation with each other. Disarmament conferences with a large number of participants have often degenerated into public spectacles with shouting matches between the delegations of countries that have resulted in increased tensions. Nevertheless, arms-control efforts, particularly those between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War, proved useful in limiting the nuclear arms race, and, by the end of the 20th century, the term arms control was often used to denote any disarmament or arms-limitation agreement.

History Early efforts The first international assembly that addressed the issue of arms control among other issues was the first Hague Convention. Although this and later Hague conferences failed to limit armaments, they did adopt a number of agreements on territorial and functional matters. Other Hague conferences addressed issues of arbitration and principles and treaties of warfare. The Hague Convention approved prohibitions on the use of asphyxiating gases and expanding bullets, dum-dums and discharges of projectiles or explosives from balloons, though none of these agreements was observed during World War I. The United States, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and Japan agreed to limit the number and tonnage of their capital ships and to scrap certain other ships. At the London Naval Conference, however, Italy and France refused to agree to an extension of the agreement, and Japan withdrew. In the Geneva Protocol, which now has some parties, prohibited the use of asphyxiating and poisonous gases and bacteriological weapons in international conflicts, though it did not apply to internal or civil wars. Because many countries retained the right to use such weapons in a retaliatory strike, the Geneva Protocol came to be seen as a broader and more effective agreement that included prohibitions of using such weapons in a first strike. The conclusion of the Pacific phase of the war ushered in the atomic age as the United States dropped atomic bombs on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. Two of the victor states, the United States and the Soviet Union, soon began to develop large arsenals of nuclear weapons. The possibility of the mutual destruction of each country by the other in an intercontinental exchange of nuclear-armed missiles prompted them to undertake increasingly serious negotiations to limit first the testing, then the deployment, and finally the possession of these weapons. As precursors, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) was established in 1957 as an autonomous intergovernmental body, under the auspices of the United Nations, to promote peaceful uses of nuclear technology and to prevent the use of such technology for military purposes; and in the Antarctic Treaty, signed by 12 countries, including the United States and the Soviet Union, internationalized and demilitarized Antarctica and paved the way for future arms-control agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States. Many of the arms-control agreements of the Cold War period focused on mutual deterrence, a strategy in which the threat of reprisal would effectively preclude an initial attack. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy considered treaties that sought to control the production of weapons in an attempt to avoid a nuclear conflict. During the Cuban missile crisis, a new series of

arms-control issues appeared, including the need for diplomatic communication to avert potential nuclear catastrophe. Beginning in the s, the United States and the Soviet Union sponsored several international arms-control agreements designed to be of limited risk to each side. The first of these, the partial Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty , prohibited tests of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater, which thus effectively confined nuclear explosions to underground sites. The Outer Space Treaty further limited the deployment of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction by banning countries from placing them in orbit. In the two superpowers took the lead in establishing the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Non-proliferation Treaty; NPT , whereby they agreed not to promote the spread, or proliferation, of nuclear weapons to countries that did not already possess them. Two classes of states are parties to the NPT: The treaty, originally signed by 62 countries, had grown to some parties by the early 21st century, although declared or suspected nuclear states such as India, Pakistan, and Israel were not parties. The NPT became effective in for a year period; it was extended indefinitely in This agreement placed limits on the number of MIRVs, strategic bombers, and other strategic launchers each side possessed. Although the SALT agreements stabilized the nuclear arms race between the two superpowers, it did so at very high force levels, with each country continuing to possess many times the offensive capacity needed to utterly destroy the other in a nuclear exchange. For a technical discussion of weapons systems, see the article rocket and missile system. In the accession in the Soviet Union of a liberalizing regime under Mikhail Gorbachev generated intensified arms-control negotiations between the two superpowers. The result of these efforts, the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty , committed the United States and the Soviet Union to the complete elimination of their stocks of intermediate- and medium-range land-based missiles. In the meantime, a new set of bilateral negotiations between the superpowers had begun in with the aim of reducing rather than merely limiting their arsenals of nuclear warheads and launch platforms missiles and bombers. These negotiations, called the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks START , produced a treaty in that committed the superpowers to reducing their strategic nuclear forces by 25 to 30 percent over a period of years. The United States and the Soviet Union also began eliminating various types of tactical battlefield nuclear-armed weapons, including artillery shells, depth charges, land mines, bombs, and the warheads carried on various tactical missiles. The START agreement built on the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty , which committed the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to strict limits on the number of tanks, combat aircraft, armoured vehicles, and attack helicopters that each side could possess. Recent efforts Following the breakup of the Soviet Union in late , newly sovereign Russia undertook efforts to drastically reduce its nuclear and conventional armed forces through unilateral actions and agreements with the United States. In the s the United States and Russia played major roles in the conclusion of the Chemical Weapons Convention , which prohibited the development, production, stockpiling, and use of chemical weapons and called for the destruction of existing stocks within 10 years. The convention, drafted by the 39 countries of the Conference on Disarmament and entering into force in , reaffirmed the Geneva Protocol of , restated the prohibitions of the Treaty of Versailles and the Washington treaties against the use of poisonous gases, and added a ban on bacteriological warfare; some states were party to the agreement by the early 21st century. The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty , which would prohibit all forms of nuclear explosive testing, had been signed by more than states and ratified by more than by the early 21st century but had failed to enter into force because some of the 44 states whose signatures were required for its enactment including the United States, China, India, Israel, North Korea , and Pakistan chose not to sign. In , as a result of efforts led by the International Campaign to Ban Landmines ICBL , a treaty prohibiting the use of antipersonnel mines was negotiated; it went into effect in , and, by the early 21st century, nearly countries had signed it, though China, Russia, and the United States had not. In June , despite intense international opposition, the United States, citing fundamental changes in its security needs since the s, withdrew from the ABM Treaty to pursue a national missile defense system designed to protect the country against nuclear attack. The United States subsequently offered to share defense technology with Russia and cover some of its allies, but the Russian response was lukewarm. Although Russia opposed the U. The Cluster Munition Coalition , a network of nongovernmental organizations including the ICBL and Amnesty International , had spearheaded efforts to

prohibit the devices on the grounds that unexploded bomblets present a lethal risk to civilians long after a conflict has ended. The Convention on Cluster Munitions was adopted despite opposition from the largest manufacturers and stockpilers of the weapons including China, Russia, and the United States. It was signed in December and entered into force on Aug.