

sounds and smells capable of inducing immediate flight or temporary digestive distress.⁸⁹

Fortunately, from a SALW perspective, few of the non-lethal systems under R&D would have any real utility for non-state actors. It is difficult to visualize many scenarios where a perpetrator(s) would prefer a non-lethal weapon as opposed to a lethal weapon in most of the situations where SALW are problems⁹⁰. Secondly, some of these systems are untried and for many, suspect in their stated benefits. According to a Marine Corps source, “a few years ago the Marine Corps used sticky foam in their training videos for Somalia. Now sticky foam keeps rearing its ugly head. We used it to reinforce barriers, but that was where the benefits stopped. It has no other application. It has too many problems.”⁹¹ Notwithstanding this difficulty, the same article suggested that the Pentagon will place about 30 per cent of its non-lethal R&D budget on kinetic technologies (those weapons that pack a punch) and 25 per cent of the budget on acoustic weapons (those that produce painful or unpleasant audio frequencies). These are apparently classified as “crowd control tools.” One such kinetic item is the non-lethal claymore mine. The mine – preferred because of its universal recognition value – is stripped and rebuilt with rubber balls. Its recognisability generates deterrence. Should that deterrence fail, the impact of the balls is designed to disperse a crowd quickly and without bloodshed. Stingballs, malodorants, entanglements, electric taser-shockers, and dye-markers are also being explored. All allegedly offer non-lethal solutions to potentially deadly situations. The same source indicated that these solutions were preferable in the world where CNN shares the battlefield with the combatants.⁹²

A report on non-lethal technologies sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations⁹³ cautiously supported the prospect of using such weapons but raised several concerns, one of which was the risk of proliferation. The Council noted that

“U.S. development of non-lethal weapons has already aroused and will continue to excite the interest of others, particularly since much military research and development is based

⁸⁹ Report of an Independent Task Force sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations. See: <http://www.foreignrelations.org/studies/transcripts/taskfrc.htm>; and <http://hackvan.com/pub/stig/news/BAD:non-lethal-weapons-tech.htm>

⁹⁰ One example might be a group bent on kidnaping or raping – eg. an operation where the victims are desired alive. Another example could involve an activity aimed at seizing material while minimizing casualties for political reasons or to escape less severe penalties if caught. In all cases these activities could also be conducted using conventional SALW and would most probably be conducted with a mixture of non-lethal and lethal weapons, assuming both were available.

⁹¹ Jeffrey J Hinkle, “Weapons for Today’s World May Not Require Perfection,” *National Defense* (April 1998), p. 46-48. Available at <http://www.ndia.org/magazine/98Apr/nonleth.htm>.

⁹² *Ibid*, p. 47. For further details on conference and copies of all presentations see <http://www.ditc.mil/ndia/nld3>

⁹³ For details see <http://hackvan.com/pub/stig/news/BAD:non-lethal-weapons-tech.htm>