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ARMS TRADE

United Nations News Centre, UN Officials Hail Entry into Force of Landmark Global Arms Trade Treaty (Dec. 23, 2014). On December 24, 2014, the Arms Trade Treaty entered into force. As of that date, sixty states have ratified the treaty and 130, including the United States, have signed it (the United States has not ratified the treaty). The treaty regulates international trade in conventional arms. In particular, it prohibits states from exporting conventional weapons to other states when they know those weapons will be used for genocide, crimes against humanity, or war crimes. The text of the treaty is available here.

AUTONOMOUS WEAPONS

ASIL Insights, Exporting Armed Drones – The United States Sets Policy (July 24, 2015). This Insight explores the new State Department policy on the export of unmanned aerial vehicles, finding that it satisfies the United States Conventional Arms Transfer (CAT) Policy, and the guidelines of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). However, the policy raises a wider set of concerns about the legality of targeted killings and using remotely operated weapons, and it fails to address these issues.

The Guardian, UK Opposes International Ban on Developing “Killer Robots” (Apr. 13, 2015). The UK is opposing an international ban on so-called “killer robots” at a United Nations conference that is this week examining future developments of what are officially termed lethal autonomous weapons systems (Laws). The UK Foreign Office stated, “At present, we do not see the need for a prohibition on the use of Laws, as international humanitarian law already provides sufficient regulation for this area . . . The United Kingdom is not developing lethal autonomous weapons systems, and the operation of weapons systems by the UK armed forces will always be under human oversight and control. As an indication of our commitment to this, we are focusing development efforts on remotely piloted systems rather than highly automated systems.”

Dep’t of State, U.S. Export Policy for Military Unmanned Aerial Systems (Feb. 17, 2015). The Department of State issued a new export policy related to Unmanned Aerial Systems that is intended to provide a “disciplined and rigorous framework within which the United States will exercise restraint in sales and transfers and advance its national security and foreign policy interests.”

Slate, Asimov’s Three Laws Are Not an International Treaty: How to Make Treaties Govern “Killer Robots” (Dec. 1, 2014). Opinion piece arguing a triad of treaties to address particular aspects of artificial intelligence (AI) drone use, including a treaty on the testing and operational standards for AI drones intended for combat, a treaty on liability of AI drones, and a treaty on the use of AI drones in combat.

Politico, Do Killer Robots Save Lives? (Nov. 19, 2014). Referencing the New York Times article above, this article distinguishes between “killer robots” and “smart weapons,” suggesting that smart weapons have dramatically reduced civilian casualties over the past six decades and concluding that banning them would be the wrong decision.

New York Times, **Fearing Bombs that Can Pick Whom to Kill** (Nov. 11, 2014). The article explores current distinctions between semi-autonomous and autonomous weapons. It surveys a number of increasingly autonomous weapons systems, including: the United States’ Harpoon and Long Range Anti-Ship Missile; the United Kingdom’s Brimstone missiles; Israel’s Harpy; and Norway’s Joint Strike Missile. The article raises concerns about the large role artificial intelligence is allowed to play in determining which targets to destroy. The article also notes that there will be a meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons on Thursday to consider whether development of these weapons should be restricted under the treaty.

**CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL**

**Biological Weapons Convention**

The Guardian, **Remembering an Overlooked Treaty** (Mar. 26, 2015). March 26th marked the 40th birthday of the BWC. At the time of signing, it was the world’s first disarmament treaty that “prohibited an entire class of weapons from development, production and possession, rather than merely limiting or preventing nations acquiring weapons or provisions relating to use.” This article explores the historical context of the BWC.


**Chemical Weapons Convention**

Reuters, **Kurds Suspect Another Chemical Attack by Islamic State in Iraq** (Sep. 1, 2015). Kurdish authorities accused the Islamic State of using chemical weapons after a homemade rocket containing chemical substances was fired on September 1, 2015. The OPCW has expressed concern about the alleged use of chemical weapons but has said that either Baghdad or the U.N. Security Council would have to make a request in order for the OPCW to investigate.

U.S. Dep’t of State, **Allegations of Chemical Weapons Use in Sarmin, Syria**, Statement of John Kerry, Secretary of State (Mar. 19, 2015). Secretary of State John Kerry announced that the United States is “deeply disturbed” by a reported chemical weapons attack in the town of Sarmin, Syria. If the attack is verified, the use of chlorine as a weapon would violate the Chemical Weapons Convention, and UN Security Council Resolution 2209 condemning the use of chlorine as a chemical weapon in Syria.
Huffington Post, **U.S. to Begin Destroying Largest Remaining Stockpile of Chemical Weapons Cache** (Feb. 4, 2015). The United States is going to begin destroying its Pueblo Chemical Depot chemical weapon stockpile. The stockpile includes 780,000 artillery shells containing 2,600 tons of mustard agent. The destruction process will be finished in 2019.

OPCW, **Nineteenth Session of the Conference of States Parties** (Dec. 1-5, 2014). The CWC Conference of State Parties took place from December 1-5, 2014, in Geneva. All the resulting documents, decisions, and statements can be found through the title hyperlink. For a summary of the work of the conference, see here.

New York Times, **The Secret Casualties of Iraq’s Abandoned Chemical Weapons** (Oct. 14, 2014). This qualitative report on chemical weapons abandoned in Iraq by the Sadaam Hussein regime details the uncoordinated response of the United States services in their disposal, a choice to keep incidents secret, the failure of medical personnel to adequately treat exposed service members, and the inconsistent manner in which the exposed were granted purple hearts. It posits that the United States did not finish the clean-up job, and that areas known to contain chemical weapons and nerve agents are now under the control of ISIS.

- Follow up article published by the New York Times, **Veteran’s Burns Helped Science, Bared Lapses** (Dec. 31, 2014). Covers the story of an Air Force service member who was exposed to a chemical weapons ordinance that had been previously “destroyed” at sea but washed ashore. Following retirement, his case and attendant health issues were not tracked.
- Follow up article published in Stars and Stripes, **Veterans Hurt by Chemical Weapons in Iraq get Apology, Promise of Awards** (Mar. 26, 2015). Brad Carson, the Undersecretary of the Army apologized for the treatment of service members exposed to chemical weapons in Iraq. He announced “new steps to provide medical support to those with lingering health effects and to recognize veterans who had been denied awards.”


**CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS**

*Certain Conventional Weapons Convention*

Washington Post, **The Military's Quest for Bombs that Won't Accidentally Explode** (Apr. 14, 2015). The Army is involved in a massive effort that would eventually replace those weapons with what are called "insensitive munitions," which are less susceptible to exploding inadvertently. The technology, developed by BAE Systems uses an explosive that is far more chemically stable and able to withstand extreme heat and outside interference, including getting hit by bullets or shrapnel. Such munitions would also contribute toward meeting US obligations under CCWC Protocol V.

United Nations Office at Geneva: The 2014 Meeting of the States Parties to the CCW took place on November 13-14, 2014 in Geneva. Documents, transcripts, and audio of the meeting are available here. Timed to coincide with the meeting, Human Rights Watch and Harvard Law School’s International
Human Rights Clinic released a report calling on CCW states to condemn the use of incendiary weapons. In response, Professor Sascha-Dominik Bachmann of Bournemouth University in the UK published an op-ed “Why Incendiary Weapons are Here to Stay” in Jurist.

1907 Hague Convention VIII and Naval Mine Warfare


Ottawa Convention/ Landmines

State Department, Clear Land Mines Off the Earth, Op-Ed by John Kerry, Secretary of State (Dec. 8, 2014). Secretary of State John Kerry released the 13th annual report on U.S. progress in clearing land mines and other unexploded ordinance. Kerry stated that due to Obama’s announcement that the United States will no longer use mines outside of the Korean Peninsula, the United States will no longer procure anti-personnel land mines, will begin destroying anti-personnel land mine stockpiles not needed in Korea, and will “work to find ways that may ultimately allow us to accede to the Ottawa Convention.”

New York Times, Land Mines are Taking Smaller Toll, Group Says (Dec. 3, 2014). The International Campaign to Ban Landmines, the group that won the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize for its work promoting the Ottawa Convention, released a report finding that deaths and injuries from land mines and other unexploded ordinances fell to the lowest level ever recorded last year. It also found that the production of land mines appeared to have practically ceased, except potentially in India, Myanmar, Pakistan, and South Korea.

Oslo Convention/ Cluster Munitions

New York Times, Banned Cluster Bombs Were Used in Five Countries, Report Says (Sept. 3, 2015). The Cluster Munition Coalition reports that cluster munitions have been used in the armed conflicts in Libya, Sudan, Syria, Ukraine, and Yemen. None are parties to the Treaty, but the use has been condemned by Member States.

BBC, Ukraine crisis: Army accused of using cluster bombs (Oct. 21, 2014). Human Rights Watch is accusing the Ukranian army of using cluster munitions to shell the rebel-held city of Donetsk earlier this month. The Ukranian government denies using the weapons. Neither Ukraine, Russia, nor the United States are parties to the treaty.
Real Clear Defense, The Air Force’s Terrifying Replacement for Cluster Bombs (Oct. 16, 2014). In response to Secretary of Defense Robert Gates’ 2008 policy memorandum requiring the United States to phase out cluster munitions by 2018, the U.S. Air Force is developing a new “cast ductile iron warhead” weapon. The weapon will serve as a stopgap solution that will replace cluster bombs and provide an effective “area attack,” by raining down iron fragments from the exploded warhead.

**Conventional Forces Europe (CFE)**


**Open Skies Treaty**


**CYBER**

United Nations General Assembly, International Code of Conduct for Information Security (Jan. 13, 2015). On January 9, 2015, China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan—the states of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization—proposed a revised version of its 2011 International Code of Conduct for Information Security for adoption by the United Nations General Assembly. The proposed code is a set of non-binding, voluntary measures that focuses on state sovereignty and state actors’ role in Internet governance, seeks to develop confidence-building measures in information security, and does not specifically recognize the application of international law to cyberspace.

**LAW OF THE SEA**

NY Times, Russia Stakes New Claim to Expanse in the Arctic (Aug. 4, 2015). Russia formally claimed a vast area of the Arctic Ocean, including the North Pole, as part of its continental shelf exclusive economic zone under the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. Russia submitted a similar claim in 2002, but the United Nations rejected it for lack of scientific support.
NUCLEAR

Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)

The Economist, The Nuke Detectives (Sept. 5, 2015). This article details some of the new equipment available to detect illicit nuclear weapons activities. In addition, it notes that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization recently reached "the optimal number" of sensors for global coverage of secret nuclear weapon testing. Although it is still installing more sensors, the CTBTO currently operates 170 seismic stations, 11 underwater hydroacoustic centers, and 96 labs and radionuclide-sampling facilities around the world.

Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF)

Politico, Not So Fast: Calls Grow to Ban Hypersonic Weapons (Aug. 10, 2015). Disarmament advocates are deeply worried that a potentially devastating new arms race between the United States, Russia, and China is already underway with little public debate, prompting growing calls to ban the new class of "hypersonic" weapons before it is too late.

Defense News, Russia Threatens “Consequences” If US Deploys Missiles (June 11, 2015). Russia’s Foreign Ministry released a statement warning the United States that deploying land-based missiles in Europe would “mean complete destruction by the American side of the regime of the treaty with all its attendant consequences.” However, Russia “urge[ed] the United States to ensure the full implementation of the INF, [and] not to threaten the feasibility of this document.”

New York Times, U.S. Says Russia Failed to Correct Violation of Landmark 1987 Arms Control Deal (June 5, 2015). The State Department reported on Friday that Russia had failed to correct a violation of a landmark arms control accord between Washington and Moscow that prohibits intermediate-range ground-launched missiles. Ms. Gottemoeller told Congress in December that the development of ground-launched cruise missiles had proceeded far enough that Russia had "the capability to deploy it."

Fox News, US Might Deploy Missiles in Europe to Counter Russia (June 4, 2015). The Obama administration is publically weighing a range of aggressive responses to Russia's alleged violation of a Cold War-era nuclear treaty, including deploying land-based missiles in Europe that could preemptively destroy the Russian weapons. The administration is considering three options for responding militarily to Russian missile treaty violations: defenses to stop a treaty-violating missile, the "counterforce" option to attack a missile preemptively and the "countervailing strike capabilities" option that implies the potential use of nuclear forces.

Washington Post, Stop the Nuclear Treaty Breakdown Before it Escalates (Dec. 28, 2014). The Editorial Board of the Washington Post published this editorial calling for Russia and the U.S. to resolve this issue now, rather than restarting an arms race or “carelessly ditching” the INF.

Washington Post, US Weighs Steps Against Russia for Violation (Dec. 10, 2014). At a hearing before the House of Representatives, Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Rose Gottemoeller said that the United States was taking three steps in response to Russia’s alleged violations.
of the INF Treaty: 1) reviewing a series of diplomatic, economic, and military measures to protect the interests of the United States and our allies and encourage Russia to uphold its nuclear arms control commitments, 2) reviewing potential economic measures in response to Russia’s violation, and 3) assessing options in the military sphere to ensure that Russia would not gain a significant military advantage from its violation of the INF Treaty.

*Sputnik News,* New Consultations with US on INF Treaty Issues Unlikely: Russian Foreign Ministry (Oct. 20, 2014). Russia’s Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov said that the United States and Russia will not likely hold further consultations regarding alleged INF Treaty violations in the near future. Both sides came together to discuss the alleged violations on September 11 in Moscow, but neither were satisfied with the responses they heard. Both sides did agree to continue talking and Russia does not intend to leave the treaty regime unless its security interests are threatened.

*New START*

*Air Force Times,* Effort to Overhaul Nuclear Missile System Expected to Begin this Fall (July 11, 2015). An Arms Control Association review of internal Air Force documents notes that the Air Force plans to spend $62.3 billion over the next 30 years on 642 missiles, including a next-generation intercontinental ballistic missile system. Consistent with New START reduction limits, only 400 of these missiles would be operationally deployed.

*Washington Post,* Russia to Increase Nuclear Arsenal as U.S. Plans More Firepower in Europe (Jun. 16, 2015). In a statement earlier this week, Russian President Vladimir Putin announced that Russia will acquire 40 intercontinental ballistic missiles “capable of overcoming any, even the most technically sophisticated, missile defense systems.” The announcement came after the U.S. confirmed plans to place more heavy equipment in NATO countries in Eastern Europe and the Baltics. Secretary of State John Kerry said that Putin “may be ‘trying to move in the opposite direction’ or Russia’s obligations under the New START arms-reduction treaty.”

*International Business Times,* US-Russia Tension May Force Moscow to Change Approach to Nuclear Arms Treaty; Military Budget “Untouched” Amid Crisis (Jan. 15, 2015). Mikhail Ulyanov, head of Russia’s Foreign Ministry Security and Disarmament Department, said that continued U.S. hostility may change the way Russia views the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. However, Ulyanov said that the treaty is still in effect, the implementation process is progressing, and neither side has any complaints about the other with regard to the treaty.

*Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT)*

*The White House,* Statement by the President on the 45th Anniversary of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (Mar. 5, 2015). President Obama’s statement reaffirms the United States’ commitment to “the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons” and provides a brief overview of the United States’ efforts to comply with the NPT.
ASIL Insights, **The Cases against the Nuclear Weapons States** (May 12, 2015). This *Insight* analyzes obligations arising under the NPT in the context of the Marshall Islands' application before the ICJ. The *Insight*’s author, Dr. Marco Roscini, Professor of International Law at the University of Westminster School of Law in London, argues that the NPT “requires parties to pursue good faith negotiations in order to adopt effective measures on the cessation of the arms race and nuclear disarmament as well as a treaty on general and complete disarmament. It does not oblige the parties to successfully conclude such negotiations by achieving an agreement—a result that is beyond the power of any individual state—although the negotiations, to be meaningful, must be conducted with a view of reaching this result.”

**Nuclear Weapon Free Zones**

The Washington Post, **A Nuclear-Free Middle East is Worth Imagining, Even if it’s Fantasy** (June 15, 2015). In this opinion piece, the author argues that the best way to remove the Iran nuclear threat is to create a Middle East nuclear-free zone, something that has been on the U.N. agenda since the 1960s. However, with Israel not a party to the NPT, moving forward “has not and will not happen.”

The Washington Post, **U.N. Nuclear Conference Collapses Over WMD-Free Zone in the Middle East** (May 22, 15). At the Treaty on Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons review conference, the United States and several allies rejected the conference’s final document. The United States and Britain did so because they "refused to accept the establishment of an ‘arbitrary’ deadline to hold a conference on a zone that would be free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.” Canada objected to such a process that did not include Israel, which has not signed the NPT.

**Nuclear Misc.**

Washington Post, **California Missile Test: Social Media Nightmare or Exactly What the Navy Wanted?** (November 9, 2015). The Navy’s recent evening flight test of an unarmed Trident II D5 missile off the coast of California resulted in a large audience – and a social media explosion. While some question the wisdom of the timing of the test, others emphasize that the visibility only contributes to the strategic deterrence mission.

ASIL Insights, **Iran, Nuclear Weapons, and International Law: What Might the Final Agreement Add?** (June 19, 2015). This *Insight* argues that it is already illegal under international law for Iran to acquire nuclear weapons, and that because of this, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is unlikely to add anything new because what is needed is an increase in political will to comply with existing obligations.

AP, **Surveillance Law Lets Us Ratify Nuclear Terrorism Treaties** (June 8, 2015). President Obama’s signature onto the USA Freedom Act of 2015 allows the United States to formally ratify the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism and the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material. The Senate provided its advice and consent to both treaties in 2008, but had not passed legislation needed to bring U.S. domestic law in line with its international obligations.
Boston Globe, *Russia Ends US Nuclear Security Alliance: Accord Worked to Keep Stockpiles Secure* (Jan. 19, 2015). At a December 16 meeting in Moscow, Russia informed the United States that it was ending its cooperation on the Cooperative Threat Reduction programs. Established in the 1990s by influential Senators Nunn and Lugar, the programs provided US help to Russia to destroy weapons and nuclear-powered submarines, pay workers’ salaries, install security measures at nuclear weapons facilities, and conduct training programs for Russian personnel. Russia’s decision will not affect arms control treaty inspections.

Foreign Policy, *Led Zeppelin Comes to Washington* (Jan. 7, 2015). The Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor System (JLENS) has deployed aerostats above Baltimore at the Aberdeen Proving Ground to watch for cruise missiles and drones sent to attack Washington D.C. The JLENS blimps are meant to respond to Russian attack submarines patrolling the East Coast of the United States with nuclear-powered, submarine-launched cruise missiles (SLCMs). This article discusses the program, and the “decaying relationship between the United States and Russia.” It suggests that arms control is the best available countervailing mechanism for Russian nuclear-armed SLCMs.


New York Times, *A Former Ground Zero Goes to Court Against the World’s Nuclear Arsenal* (Dec. 27, 2014). The Marshall Islands have filed memorials in its application to International Court of Justice against the world’s eight declared nuclear power and Israel. The Marshall Islands claim that the nuclear weapons states have violated their legal obligation to disarm, and want the ICJ to order the start of negotiations for a convention to ban atomic arsenals (like those already in place for chemical and biological weapons).

U.S. Naval Institute News, *Next Generation U.K. Boomers Benefit from U.S. Relationship* (Dec. 17, 2014). Following the Scottish decision to remain part of the United Kingdom, the UK’s strategic deterrent program will keep its current facilities. The Vanguard replacement, the Successor, is being developed with assistance from the United States. The UK is also participating in the Trident missile life-extension program.

AFP, *US Rejects Calls for Treaty Eliminating Nukes* (Dec. 10, 2014). Adam Scheinman, US Special Representative for Nuclear Nonproliferation, rejected calls for a treaty immediately eliminating nuclear weapons and suggested “step-by-step” reductions would be more practical and realistic. The remarks came at a conference in Vienna. Of the nuclear weapon states, the United States, the United Kingdom, Pakistan, and India attended, while Russia, China, France, Israel, and North Korea did not.

USA Today, *Russia Boycotts Nuclear Summit Planning Meeting*, (Nov. 4, 2014). Russia did not attend a planning meeting for the 2016 Nuclear Security Summit. U.S. and European officials said it was not clear whether Russia intended to boycott the Summit itself or was merely boycotting the meeting based on recent disputes with the United States and European countries over sanctions and Ukraine. The
summits are a gathering of countries aimed at finding agreement on ways to prevent terrorists from obtaining weapons-grade nuclear material.

**SPACE LAW**

*TheSpaceReview*, Understanding the Legal Status of the Moon: Is the “Common Heritage of Mankind” Suitable for the Moon and its Resources (Mar. 2, 2015). This essay addresses the legal status of the Moon, using the existing legal framework of the Outer Space Treaty and argues in favor of using the Moon Treaty as a follow-on framework. Taking into account the current state of space exploration and other legal systems similar to the one of the Moon, such as the Deep Sea Bed Area, it concludes that the Moon could be considered the Common Heritage of Mankind.

*The Guardian*, US Offers Companies Out-of-this-world Opportunity: Land Rights on the Moon (Feb. 3, 2015). The Federal Aviation Administration has taken a preliminary step to encourage commercial development of the moon. In a late-December 2014 letter to Bigelow Aerospace, the FAA said it would “leverage the FAA’s existing launch licensing authority to encourage private sector investments in space systems by ensuring that commercial activities can be conducted on a non-interference basis.” The letter was coordinated with the US Departments of State, Defense, and Commerce, as well as NASA and other agencies involved in space operations. It effectively expands the FAA’s licensing authority to US companies’ planned activities on the moon.

*State Department*, Sixty-Ninth UNGA First Committee Thematic Discussion on Outer Space (Disarmament Aspects) (Oct. 27, 2014). The United States expressed its concerns about the continued development, testing, and deployment of destructive anti-satellite (ASAT) systems, particularly debris-generating systems. The remarks also suggested that the United States is willing to consider space arms control proposals and concepts that are “equitable, effectively verifiable, and enhance the security of all nations.” However, they stated that the revised draft Treaty on the Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space, the Threat or Use of Force against Outer Space Objects (PPWT) submitted by Russia and China to the Conference on Disarmament (CD) earlier this year, does not satisfy these criteria. Instead, the United States endorses the use of non-legally binding transparency and confidence-building measures to encourage responsible actions in, and the peaceful use of, outer space, such as the European Union’s effort to develop an International Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities.

**CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY**

*Dep’t of State*, 2015 Report on Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments (June 5, 2015). Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2593a, the President submitted this report to Congress. The report assesses U.S. adherence in 2014 to obligations undertaken in arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements and related commitments. The report finds that the United States is adhering to its obligations and commitments. The report also indicates that with respect to other states, there are some compliance questions and determinations of treaty violations,
and that the United States “continues to pursue resolution of those compliance issues, where appropriate.”

- **New York Times**, *U.S. Says Russia Failed to Correct Violation of Landmark 1987 Arms Control Deal* (June 5, 2015). The reactions of several Congressmen to the report are detailed in this article. They tended to be critical of the steps taken by the Obama administration to press Russia to comply with its obligations.

**MISCELLANEOUS**


**The Washington Post**, *Why the New Army Pistol Will Use Deadlier Hollow-point Ammunition* (July 10, 2015). The Army moved a step closer to adopting a new standard-issue sidearm, dubbed the “XM-17,” which will replace the M9 Beretta with a more modern sidearm that can mount accessories under the barrel and be fitted to different sized hands. Richard Jackson, the special assistant to the U.S. Army Judge Advocate General for Law of War, is currently in the process of “myth busting” the notion that hollow points are somehow illegal to use in combat. The United States is not a signatory to the Hague Convention of 1899, though it does adhere to Article 23 of The Hague Convention of 1907, which prohibits the employment of “arms, projectiles or material calculated to cause unnecessary suffering.” But Jackson said hollow points are actually more humane than conventional ball ammunition.

**The Washington Post**, *Tracking U.S. Weapons Grows Harder in the Fog of Iraq’s Fragmented War* (Mar. 26, 2015). End-use monitoring of arms exported to Iraq has become more difficult in Iraq given the diversity of forces fighting – militias, popular mobilization units, security forces, etc. Particularly sensitive items such as Stinger missiles and night vision goggles are subject to enhanced monitoring that appears to be successful. However U.S. lawmakers “are voicing doubts about how well a relatively small team at the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad can ensure the proper custody of U.S.-provided weaponry, especially given the limitations that U.S. personnel face in moving around the country.”

**Reuters**, *Airlines Body Calls for UN to Regulate Anti-Aircraft Weaponry* (Dec. 10, 2014). In a delayed response to the Malaysia Airlines MH17 incident, the International Air Transport Association (a global body of commercial airlines) called on the United Nations’ International Civil Aviation Organization to regulate the design, manufacture, and deployment of “weapons with anti-aircraft capability” under international law.