

Palacký University in Olomouc
Faculty of Law

Bc. Martin Bureš

Activity of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons
in the context of the Syrian Civil War

Master's Thesis

Olomouc 2023

Sworn declaration

I declare that I have written my thesis on Activity of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons in the context of the Syrian Civil War independently and have cited all sources used. I further declare that the actual text of this thesis including footnotes is 126 939 characters long including spaces.

Done at Olomouc on 14.2.2023

Signature_____

Poděkování

Na tomto místě bych rád poděkoval vedoucímu mé diplomové práce Mgr. et Mgr. Ondřeji Filipcovi, Ph.D. za odborné vedení a poskytování cenných rad při tvorbě diplomové práce.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	5
1. International relations theories and weapons of mass destruction.....	9
1.1. International relations approach to WMD and their use.....	11
1.2. International relations approach to the proliferation of WMD.....	18
1.3. International relations approach to the deterrence of WMD.....	24
1.4. International relations approach to the disarmament of WMD.....	28
2. Chemical Weapons in Syria.....	33
2.1. Syrian Civil War.....	34
2.2. Important actors in conflict.....	36
2.3. Use of chemical weapons and response of international community.....	40
3. Chemical weapons disarmament.....	43
3.1. Fact finding missions.....	43
3.2. Disarmament.....	46
Conclusion.....	49
Resources.....	51
Abstract.....	58
Abstrakt.....	58
Key words.....	58
Klíčová slova.....	58

Introduction

Chemical Weapons are one of the most feared weapons which exist in modern society. Although 98% of the population live under the protection of The Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction, or in short: Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), unfortunately chemical weapons have still been used in modern times. One of the most recent uses of chemical weapons is the main issue of this thesis. Chemical weapons were used during the Syrian civil war in the most important battles mainly by President Assad and his regime forces but also by non-state actors.¹

This thesis will focus on Chemical weapons and Syria, why Syria did not sign the Chemical Weapon Convention and why it developed chemical weapons, including political and law aspects of the origin of the Syrian chemical program. What were regional and historical reasons behind the foundation of the chemical program and how chemical weapons played an important role as a deterrent and force stabilizer in the area. What was the role of state actors such as Russia, USA and Israel, or non-state actors and organisations. Thesis will be anchored with emphasis on theories of international relations and their approach to the issue of weapons of mass destruction; namely realism, liberalism, constructivism and critical theories. The most important part of this thesis will be focused on the activities of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) in Syria and the issue of disarmament. The OPCW founded Fact Finding Mission (FFM) to investigate the chemical attacks, but it definitely was not an easy task. The FFM was challenging, because all their actions occurred during the armed conflict, literally on the battlefield. FFM's role was to determine whether chemical weapons were used but not who used them. The OPCW in cooperation with UN established Joint Investigative Mechanism (JIM) and this Mechanism's role was to find the perpetrator from information provided by FFM.

There are three research questions. The first question is: *How do main theories of international relations approach the issue of chemical disarmament and which theory can best capture the current context in which Syria was for a very long time (contrary to other states) hesitant to chemical disarmament and later decided for chemical demilitarization?* International community consist of multiple states and organisations, whose behaviour, communication and relations are not always easy to understand. That is what international

¹For example Syrian Arab Republic used sarin at Khan Shaykhun on 4 April 2017. Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) used sulfur mustard at Umm Hawsh on 15 and 16 September 2016. Information is acquired from UN Security Council Report n. S/2017/904 from 26 October 2017

relations and international security could help us with, to understand the broader picture. Chemical disarmament is not an easy task to do, because chemical weapons were developed, kept and used for particular reasons, which could have differed by time, place and actors. International relations should provide a space for better understanding of the motives and intentions of the participants in this conflict.

The second question is: *Which foreign-political, security and legal factors led to the chemical armaments in Syria?* Chemical weapons in Syria surely did not appear out of nowhere, which is why it is important to describe and understand the motives of the Syrian government whether past or current, and what led to the situation that this region is currently in, who helped and supported Syrian regime or rebel forces.

The third question is: *How it went with the chemical disarmament in Syria and what was the role of the OPCW in Syrian civil war?* As written above, Syria acquired chemical weapons for a particular reason, so it is obvious that disarmament was not something that could be done overnight and that is why it is important to look at work of the OPCW. The OPCW is the organisation which is focused on chemical weapons and their prohibition. Their facts findings missions, resolutions and cooperation with actors were the most important for finding the truth about chemical weapons and their use, also their help played key role in disarmament of chemical weapons arsenal.

First chapter will be focused on the theories of international relations and their perspective on the issues concerning weapons of mass destruction. As written above, the theories used are realism, liberalism, constructivism, feminism and pacifism. Every theory has a specific perspective, some of those perspectives may overlap and some may be completely different. This chapter will provide view on the important aspects related to WMD such as proliferation, deterrence, use and disarmament. Every theory approaches those aspects with different views which are affected by different goals, perception of the world and actors in it, perception of the WMD and many more. It is important to look at it and then to apply those theories to the actual conflict, actors in it and the outcome of actions that took place during the conflict.

Second chapter will be focused on the Syrian Civil War and its brief introduction, how the whole situation began and how it escalated, then about the Syrian chemical program. The political and law aspects, meaning why President Assad developed chemical weapons and which country helped him and why. Response from the other actors linked to the conflict, such as United Nations, Russia and multiple other actors. One of the problems that prevented

easier conflict management was problem related to the vetoes by Russia during Security Council vote.

The key part of this thesis will be the third chapter. It will be focused on activities of OPCW, chemical disarmament and its political, legal and security context. Investigation of the incidents related to chemical weapons that occurred in Syria during the civil war. This conflict is one of the most internationalized conflicts in the modern times. Countless actors were and still are involved in this conflict including states, international organisations or militias and factions. All of them are influencing the character of the conflict.

Thesis is written as case study, to be precise as interpretative case study, when the civil war will be put in the contrast of international relations. The weak spot of the thesis is its descriptive character; this is due to the nature of the information and research design of the thesis. Theme of this thesis is very specific. Syrian civil war is controversial topic because there is strong propaganda from all sides of the conflict and information differs based on the author who writes about it.

The essential sources are OPCW documents such as fact finding mission's reports and resolutions and UN resolutions. The most important book related to the first chapter is Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction by S. HASHMI and S. LEE. This book consists of perspective related to WMD from the actual representatives and supporters of the named international relations. In the view of the author of this thesis is unfortunate that the book is focused mostly on the WMD in general and if anything is pointed out then it is the topic of nuclear weapons. This is an example of a problem which the author of this thesis had to tackle and which is globally related to articles and books that are written about WMD and international relations theories. It is very easy to find a book or an article that is focused on nuclear weapons from the perspective of one of the named theories, but it is more difficult to find a theoretical piece of writing focused particularly on chemical weapons. Another problem that had to be tackled during the writing is actually the open space that this thesis helps to cover. That "space" is fact that most books, articles or other theoretical pieces look at the issue of WMD only from the perspective of just one theory. This thesis tries to cover this issue and gives the comparison between international relation theories and how they approach a different aspects related to WMD for example proliferation or disarmament.

The feminist approach to weapons of mass is best captured in papers written by Carol Cohn and Sara Ruddick. Their papers are essential for part of this thesis written about feminism. Important source of information related to Syrian chemical weapons and its motivation to deploy them is paper written by M. Zuhair Diab *Syria's Chemical and*

Biological Weapons: Assessing Capabilities and Motivations. Mr. Diab is Syrian-born and was diplomat with the Syrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

1. International relations theories and weapons of mass destruction

This chapter is mainly focused on the problematic of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) from the perspective of international relations theories, namely liberalism, realism, constructivism, and critical theories such as feminism and pacifism. In general, the Scholars of political science mostly agree that threats are made of power and intent, but international relation theories disagree on how a nation reacts to these threats² and that is one of the main focuses of this chapter. This chapter also brings answer to the first research question: How do main theories of international relations approach the issue of chemical disarmament and which theory can best capture the current context?

For the purpose of further analysis it is necessary to explain why the term WMD is used when the thesis is supposed to be about chemical weapons. The reason is in fact simple and it is that most of the authors and scholars focus mostly on nuclear weapons rather than biological or chemical, however, their thoughts can be applied on these as well. Another reason is that the authors write about WMD in general, so it is easier to understand the overall concept of WMD. If sometimes different views on each of the weapons exist, then the differentiation will be used to portrait the variability of opinions.

Let's start with a little explanation of WMD. In literature we can find that some authors differentiate between three categories and some between four categories of weapons that could be described as WMD. Nowadays the term is expanding by adding weapons that are capable of killing large amount of people. The term WMD is evolving thorough time and was used for the first time in 1937, when Luftwaffe attacked Guernica.³ After the attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and also during The Cold War, the term was focused mostly on nuclear weapons. During the Gulf War, Iraq's nuclear, biological and chemical weapons programs were the main concern of Bush administration and after the war, western politicians and media used the term WMD for chemical, biological and nuclear weapons.⁴ In security community, the acronym CBRN is used, which stands for Chemical, Biological, Radiological

² KATAGIRI, N. Between Structural Realism and Liberalism: Japan's Threat Perception and Response. *International Studies Perspectives*. 2018, 19(4), pp. 325-343.

³ MALON, W. WMD: Where Did the Phrase Come from? *History News Network*, [online]. [viewed 15 March 2022]. par. 2. Available from: <https://historynewsnetwork.org/article/1522#:~:text=The%20term%20Weapons%20of%20Mass%20Destruction%20was%20first%20used%20in,the%20town%20of%20Guernica%2C%20Spain.>

⁴ WINES, M. Confrontation in the Gulf; U.S. Explores New Strategies to Limit Weapons of Mass Destruction. *The New York Times*, 1990. Section 1. p. 20.

and Nuclear Weapons. This thesis is based on three-category classification and Radiological Weapons will not be mentioned.

The first category of WMD is the nuclear weapon. The pictures of destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki contributed to broader understanding of the devastating effects of the nuclear weapons, which were put at the top level of the destruction, letting contemporary commentators think that other categories of WMD are obsolete. There is still ongoing debate whether Chemical and Biological weapons should be called WMD or not. One of the arguments on this problematic can be found in the book *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction*: “One response is that some chemical and biological weapons, if used effectively and under the proper environmental circumstances, would probably kill or maim on a level close to that of a small fission bomb. Moreover, the effects of the initial strike would be felt by people who were not present or even born at the time, through transmission, genetic mutation, and environmental pollution. Best example of environmental pollution and damage done over time is usage of Agent Orange by U.S. military during the Vietnam War. This agent contained chemical called dioxin, which is highly toxic and persistent pollutant able to cause cancers, diabetes, birth defects and other disabilities also Dioxin stays toxic in the soil for decades. According to the Red Cross were three million Vietnamese affected by this chemicals, including over 150 000 children who were born with some kind of birth defects.”⁵

So, even though chemical and biological weapons may not be comparable to nuclear weapons in the rate and extent of damage that they can immediately cause, they are, in some cases at least, descriptively closer to nuclear weapons in the total damage they have the potential of causing over time than they are to conventional weapons.”⁶ As written later in this chapter, traces of chemicals after a chemical weapon attack were found in women breast milk, which is unexpected damage caused over time that conventional weapons do not have. Author agrees with labelling chemical and biological weapons as WMD. Biological weapons could be even more dangerous than nuclear weapons. Covid-19 is not a biological weapon but it is of biological origin, if we imagine that something similar was used as biological weapon then nuclear weapons would be incomparable with that. Almost seven million people all around the world died since the beginning of the epidemic of Covid-19 until the end of the 2022. Two nuclear bombs “Little boy” and “Fat man” that were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki killed overall (immediately and after exposure to radioactive radiation) around 200 000

⁵AspenInstitute. What is Agent Orange? *aspeninstitute.org*, [online]. [viewed 11. November 2022]. Available at: <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/programs/agent-orange-in-vietnam-program/what-is-agent-orange/#:~:text=Agent%20Orange%20was%20a%20herbicide,to%20have%20harmful%20impact%20today.>

⁶HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.p. 8.

people. This comparison shows that a biological weapon could be actually more deadly. Another side of the Covid-19 pandemic is the fact that it changed whole world in ways nobody would even dream of, the best example are lockdowns, when people were locked in their homes and could not even visit their family. Although lockdowns were measures implemented by countries in order to protect people, they could also be used by the attackers for psychological oppression.

WMD has always been a problem. It is clear that soldiers, strategists and politicians had to deal with their use from an offensive perspective but also from a defensive perspective. But WMD also happened to be an issue for other actors like academic thinkers, from security specialists, through political scientists, lawyers, to medics and paramedics. This thesis will focus on the international security and international relation perspective. Since the beginning WMD were discussed by different theories, by traditional international relation theories and also by critical international relation theories. In this thesis will be discussed how those theories view different aspects of WMD. Those aspects will be discussed in individual subchapters, namely use, proliferation, deterrence and disarmament.

1.1. International relations approach to WMD and their use

As headline suggests, this subchapter is about the problematic of the use of WMD. The first theory which will be described is realism. Generally realists see international community as naturally anarchic. In this anarchy are states the only actors which are responsible for their own security, they must do what is in their powers to ensure their sovereignty and survival.⁷ Survival can be ensured by different ways. The most important are armament and the opposite is alliance with other states that are able to ensure their safety. When states seek their survival via armament or alliance other states do the same. Speaking about anarchic world, where war is always possible, it is difficult to recognize if state seeks only survival because from the perspective of other states it can be seen as an attempt for power maximization. That is a classical example of the security dilemma, because nobody can be objectively sure if others are trying to survive or dominate, so armament must lead to arms race.⁸

Realists have two different approaches related to statesmen. It depends on whether the statesman is influenced by moral ethics or not. If they do not follow ethical norms, they are more likely to develop and use WMD. Those who have high moral values

⁷ ALOLAIMY, M. Disarmament: Evolution or revolution. *World Affairs: The Journal of International Issues*, 2017. 21(1), p. 37.

⁸FILIPEC, O. *Úvod do problematiky zbraní hromadného ničení*. Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2013. pp. 19-20.

will more likely promote policies concerning WMD. Statesmen who focus on power rather than moral standards are seen as greedy leaders unable to cooperate with other statesmen and others will fear them.⁹

Authors mostly write about deterrence, proliferation, disarmament but they do not mention the use of such weapons. Even when they agree about proliferation and then deterrence as a way of securing peace, they do not speak about use. For example, the use of nuclear weapons would probably lead to mutual assured destruction, which is an important principle of why deterrence works. If someone is willing to use chemical weapons then according to realists “use of chemical weapons is more likely against targets that cannot retaliate and that do not possess chemical defenses.”¹⁰ Mutual assured destruction is dominant doctrine for structural realists. One of the possible ways in which states could use WMD is when war breaks out. “This phenomenon [confirms] the realist view captured in the sayings “war is hell” and “in time of war law is silent” that everything is permitted in warfare.”¹¹ In other words according to these sayings, WMD would be used once war breaks out, because from realists perspective war has no rules and states do what they can to survive, meaning they can even use such horrible weapons. After the war, it is only the victor who decides what is right or wrong.

The second important theory in this thesis is liberalism. The best way of illustrating the liberals view on this topic is the position of Henry Shue, who wrote: “I certainly believe that biological and chemical weapons are as fully unjustifiable as, I argue here, nuclear weapons are, I do not believe that very much can usefully be said about all these weapons lumped together beyond the obvious fact that the use of weapons of any of the three kinds grossly violates the principle of non-combatant immunity.”¹² Liberals share the view on chemical and biological weapons that they cannot be those who provide peace and stability to the world. However, they thought that nuclear weapons were able to do this with their power of deterrence and mutual assured destruction. This argument is older and Henry Shue thinks that world should not risk any use of nuclear weapons and everyone should get rid of it. As he wrote in his chapter in the book *Ethics and weapons of mass destruction*: “If I am correct, we

⁹ WALTZ, Kenneth N., The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 1988. 18(4), pp. 615-628.

¹⁰ MARTIN, S. B. Realism and Weapons of Mass Destruction: A Consequentialist Analysis. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 102.

¹¹ PRICE, R, TANNENWALD, N. Norms and Deterrence: The Nuclear and Chemical Weapons Taboos. In: KATZENSTEIN, P. J., *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. 1996, p. 115.

¹² SHUE, H. Liberalism: The Impossibility of Justifying Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. pp. 141-142.

have only to wait for the bluff of a nuclear power to be called, or to seem to be called, for unprecedented slaughter to begin. I see no way a liberal (or any other sane person) could willingly accept continuing indefinitely to run this risk.”¹³ Which means that Shue is convinced that mere existence of nuclear weapons brings unnecessary risk of potential slaughter and liberals do not want bear that risk.

For liberals is hard to see people dying by any weapons; they believe that person’s life should be respected. It is difficult to justify deaths of soldiers, not to mention civilians. Liberals respect self-defence and that applies even to soldiers or other men of arms, which means *kill those who are trying to kill you or do the harm to others*. In connection with self-defence, liberals cannot permit any weapons of mass destruction mostly because those weapons are not able to distinguish between soldiers and civilians.¹⁴ Walzer’s argument about the use of weapons of mass destruction, even towards non-combatant, is focused on one moment specifically, and that is when states are threatened and face extermination. Only in that moment states are excused for temporary and regretful violation of immunity of individuals such as civilians until the threat is averted.¹⁵ This argument is in conformity with his position on supreme emergency, which says that someone should use weapons that would be otherwise prohibited or immoral, if they face extreme behaviour from attackers that could lead to their extinction, so their brutal response is excusable. The only possible situation in which someone can use WMD is when supreme emergency doctrine is applied. Simply put, WMD can be used against innocent if the defender faces extinction.

The third theory is constructivism. Generally speaking, constructivists are focused on international norms and identity when dealing with politics. “International norms both constrain the realm of possible foreign policy actions, producing a narrower range of potential policy choices. Identity similarly narrows policy choices by structuring preferences and limiting what practices states find acceptable. Finnemore pointedly observes that norms best explain similar behavior across states: Norms of international society may create similar structures and push both people and states toward similar behavior.”¹⁶ It means that international rules and order help states work towards the same goal because if states follow norms and rules, it makes them more predictable.

¹³ SHUE, H. Liberalism: The Impossibility of Justifying Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 159.

¹⁴ Ibid p. 150.

¹⁵ WALZER, Michael. *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*. Basic Books, 1977.

¹⁶ HOWARD, P. Why Not Invade North Korea? Threats Language Games, and U.S. Foreign Policy. *International Studies Quarterly*. 2004. 48(4). p. 812.

This approach is best explained by Kratochwil who believes that security agreements are sets of rules. “Any foreign policy move – negotiation, appeasement, threat, commitment, or challenge – requires a shared framework to make the action understandable to all participants. Actors rely on “background knowledge” as a basis for interpreting others’ moves. It is only within this framework that action then appears “rational” or not. Playing any security “game” requires a set of rules. The more sophisticated and extended games in international politics depend on negotiated rules about what things are and how to play.”¹⁷ In other words when actors in foreign policy making, act according to all accepted framework, only then other actors understand their motives and can respond to them.

As every international relations theory, constructivism also has many offshoots, but constructivism is so divided, that this divisiveness is its very important characteristic. One of the examples is Alexander Wendt’s social constructivism. Wendt builds on realistic approach to international relations and he believes that the world is anarchic, but then he divides those anarchies into three different models with different roles of actors. The first model is Hobbes’s anarchy, where the role of enemy is important. The second model is Lock’s anarchy, focused on the role of the rival. The third and last model is Kant’s anarchy, which is based on the role of the friend.¹⁸ For the purposes of this thesis every model will be used as an important indicator for different aspect of WMD. The first model is important for the use of WMD. Hobbes’s anarchy and its role of the enemy are very close to realistic approach where you have to do everything that is in your powers to secure your survival. So this theory could be easily described as kill or be killed. In this theory, war is inevitable because of WMD and its spread. Further proliferation would lead to preemptive and preventive attacks on the enemy. WMD would be probably used and its mere existence would definitely lead to war.¹⁹

Those were classical international relations theories. The first critical theory that follows is feminism. There is not much written about WMD from the feminist’s perspective. As in other theories, even in feminism is not everything seen from just one perspective, there are different approaches and traditions among feminists. One of the traditions is called antiwar feminism, but even antiwar feminists are not united in attitude towards WMD. Some antiwar feminists are completely against wars and some are committed to nonviolence, those feminist do not reject wars as whole but can support some military actions.²⁰

¹⁷Ibid, p. 813.

¹⁸FILIPEC, O. *Úvod do...* p. 25.

¹⁹ Ibid

²⁰ COHN, C. and RUDDICK, S. A Feminist Ethical Perspective on Weapons of Mass Destruction, In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 406.

For better understanding it is important to look at just war theorists, those think about war as a defence against serious attacks on states or people. For them war is an answer to these violations and is justifiable, but antiwar feminists do share only a part of this theory. Both think that war is the last possibility after trying all other possibilities to reverse the escalating situation. When war breaks out, just war theory does not seek for nonviolent solution, but antiwar feminist look for that solution all the time, they think that even if war is already ongoing, there still can be nonviolent solution and states can go back to the normal.²¹ As in other theories is the attention mostly focused on nuclear weapons, but the viewpoints can also be applied to the chemical and biological weapons. Antiwar feminists have a clear answer to the use of the WMD and also to the question if the use would be morally permissible; the answer is a clear NO.²²

Feminists cannot be described merely as women who hate men and want to rule the world just like men do, which is a description that is worldwide spread. Many feminists fight against only a few things that are happening in the world, for example wars, arms or nuclear weapons. Their fight comes from the fact that they are mothers or lovers and they lose their loved ones in wars that they did not even ask for. All WMD can hurt women in ways that nobody intends to do. For example, after a nuclear test in the 1950s were found traces of strontium 90, which is a cancer-causing substance²³, in cow's milk and also in breast milk. These findings became an important and strong motive for women who protested against nuclear testing.²⁴ Sadly, this type of harm is mostly overlooked. The majority of experts are focused on blast and momentary damage, but WMD can actually do harm to breast milk and hurt children, not only those who were already born but also unborn ones. These extremely powerful motives drive women to fight against WMD. These feminists' opinions are close to pacifism. On the other hand, there are feminist whose opinions are in contrast with pacifism. Those were fighting for their right to be in the army and fight alongside men on the battlefield.

The last theory is pacifism. The most important position for this part is that of just war pacifists. Just war pacifists are in contrast with just war theory, but that does not mean that they are incompatible. R. L. Holmes came with the theory that just war theorist could be also

²¹ Ibid p. 407.

²² Ibid p. 415.

²³ AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY (ATSDR). Toxicological profile for Strontium. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *delaware.gov*, [online]. 2004 [viewed 12 February 2022]. Available from: <https://dhss.delaware.gov/dhss/dph/files/strontiumfaq.pdf>

²⁴ CONFLICT, PEACE-BUILDING, DISARMAMENT, SECURITY: a) weapons of mass destruction. *oecd.org*, [online]. [viewed 12 February 2022]. Available from: <https://www.oecd.org/social/gender-development/1896576.pdf>

pacifist. “They would be pacifists if they believed that the criteria that would render a war just are never in fact met. Nothing in the criteria themselves guarantees that they are met. Since they are obviously sometimes not met, it is possible that they are never met.”²⁵ According to this statement just war theorists are close to being pacifist, only if they believed that just war criteria were never met.

A just war pacifist recognizes legitimate and illegitimate use of weapons. They do not see the problem in those weapons but in the way they are used. For just war pacifists, the possibility of legitimate use of weapons in war exists. However they argue that just wars does not exist, that means there is no legitimate use of weapons in practice.²⁶ Just war pacifists’ approach to the “use” of the weapons is different from others. For example using a gun means threatening with it, throwing it or hitting somebody with it, meaning it is not necessary to fire the gun. They have the same approach to nuclear weapons (can be applied to other WMD), that means that nuclear weapons are used when states deploy them with a threat to retaliate with them.²⁷ In practice it means that there does not exist any circumstance under which it would be morally acceptable to use any of WMD.²⁸

Realism looks at community as anarchy and in anarchy war is always possible. States seek their survival. Survival is best gained via armament or alliance with powerful states. An important aspect for realists is the fact that some leaders are not influenced by morale standards, meaning that they are not able to cooperate with others and others will fear them. Even though a realist speaks about the world as anarchic, the use of WMD is discussed primarily in the context of war and during war, everything is possible. Also, the use of WMD is most likely possible against weak states that are not able to defend themselves. Liberals believe that human lives have to be protected and respected. They do not want to see any deaths. For them, the only situation in which people can kill others is when they act in self-defence. Use of WMD is forbidden mostly because these weapons cannot distinguish between civilians and soldiers. Use of WMD is available only as the last resort when states try to ensure their survival, this principle is called supreme emergency – use of forbidden if you face extinction. Realists see the world as anarchic, liberals focus on human lives and its

²⁵ HOLMES, R. L. Pacifism and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. pp. 452-453. See also: WALZER, M. *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*. Basic Books, 1977.

²⁶ DUANE, L. C. *From Pacifism to Warism: A Moral Continuum*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989. p. 19.

²⁷ HOLMES, R. L. Pacifism and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 455.

²⁸ Ibid

protection and constructivists are focused on international norms and rules. Every theory is divided into sub-theories, but constructivism is the most divided and has the most offshoots. Social constructivism has three models, the first model is the closest to realism and its vision of the anarchic world where war is inevitable and use of WMD is certain. Feminism also has many offshoots but the most important one for purposes of this subchapter is antiwar feminism which builds on just war theory, the largest difference is that antiwar feminist seek peaceful solution even after war break out. Feminists are against any use of WMD. That is what they have in common with pacifists. Pacifists build on this position even more and they are against any use of any weapon. In their language, it means that even having any weapons and threatening with them is technically usage and that is wrong.

Syria was named the state with the fourth largest chemical weapons arsenal globally and the biggest in the Middle East before they accessed to the CWC. Their stockpiles contained various weapons such as mustard gas, VX nerve agent, sarin, not weaponized ricin and chlorine. Chlorine was used during the conflict long after the destruction deadline.²⁹ In July 2012, Syria openly admitted possession of Chemical weapons, but Syrian foreign minister stated that Syria would never use those weapons against their own people, only against a foreign aggressor. But since then, Syria used chemical weapons multiple times against rebels. The Syrian government tried to blame the rebels, but everything pointed their way.³⁰ Syrian government used chemical weapons in hope to keep the regime in power and ensure their survival or to de-motivate the rebels in their future efforts. They did whatever was in their power to ensure their survival and were not ashamed to use forbidden chemical weapons in civil war which also endangered many civilians. Their actions could be seen from realist perspective as – do whatever you can to ensure your survival and during the war the law is silent hence WMD can be used.

1.2. International relations approach to the proliferation of WMD

As already mentioned in this thesis, realists see the world as anarchic where states do whatever is in their powers to ensure their survival or domination. Then the development and proliferation of WMD would be the best possible way to secure this goal. Similar vision has one of the branches of realism, specifically Structural realism, which says that under anarchy

²⁹ BENTLEY, M. *Syria and the chemical weapons taboo: Exploiting the forbidden*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016.

³⁰ Human Rights Watch. Attack on Ghouta, Analysis of Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons in Syria. *hrw.org*, [online]. 10 September 2013 [viewed 15 March 2022]. Available from: <https://www.hrw.org/report/2013/09/10/attacks-ghouta/analysis-alleged-use-chemical-weapons-syria>

states are concerned about their environment and the threats it brings to them, that leads them to increasing their arsenal to balance power, even if they have to cheat.³¹

Looking at the development of nuclear weapons and behaviour of states at that time, it is visible it was quiet simple process of domino effect. U.S developed nuclear weapons because of Germany during WWII, Soviet Union because of U.S., then France and Great Britain because of the Soviet Union, China because of U.S. and India because of China and Pakistani because of India. These states actions can be understood as a defensive mechanism. Those who did not develop nuclear weapons are the ones without resources or have guarantee from allies with nuclear weapons, or thanks to the Non-proliferation Treaty – states will not get nuclear weapons if their neighbours also keep on being a nonnuclear state. This could be applied to chemical and biological weapons too. Only states that are nonnuclear and feel some sort of threats from others are more likely to develop these weapons. These weapons are called a *poor man's nuclear weapon*. The reason is simple: it is easier to develop them, because it is cheaper and it is still a weapon of mass destruction. Realists would predict that even if states signed treaties like Chemical Weapons Convention or Biological Weapons Convention those weaker ones would be tempted to cheat on those agreements and still develop them. In near past Syria proved this prediction.³²

Among realist scholars exist numerous traditional theories that reflect disarmament like the deterrence theory and mutual assured destruction, but there are also various socially based political theories with significant disarmament offshoots, for example the law of nuclear fatalism. „Murphy's Law of Fatalism: If anything can go wrong, it will. Apparently, Murphy's Law of fatalism is a classical realist theory based on the assumption that humans are inherently evil and therefore will do wrong provided they are able to do so. The nuclear articulation of Murphy's Law of fatalism would read as: If a country has the knowhow to produce nuclear weapons, it will certainly produce them”³³ Murphy's Law of Fatalism says that people are evil beings and if they can, they do only wrong things which means that developing WMD comes naturally for them. Many realists argue that further proliferation of WMD is inevitable and with more WMD the world could be safer. The optimists argue that

³¹ KATAGIRI, N. Between Structural Realism and Liberalism: Japan's Threat Perception and Response. *International Studies Perspectives*, 2018, 19(4), p. 326.

³² SAGAN, S. D. Realist Perspectives on Ethical Norms and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. pp. 84-85.

³³ ALOLAIMY, M. Disarmament: Evolution... pp. 37-38.

states behave in similar rational ways and they know that nuclear war would cause damage to everyone and there would not be a victor.³⁴

According to a French brigadier general and a geopolitician Pierre Marie Gallois, proliferation has several benefits: “First, it makes nuclear war virtually impossible as it provides every recipient with inviolable deterrence. Second, it obviates the need for expensive diplomatic actions meant to bolster suspect alliance commitments. And third, since it renders nuclear-armed states neutral and impotent, proliferation enables all states to pursue their vast economic interests: it contributes to the global economy.”³⁵ Focused only on the benefits from Gallois perspective, it can be said that proliferation is good and everyone profits from it. On the other hand, this perspective expects that all actors act the same, but it is a fact that politicians think differently than men of arms.

The difference between realism and liberalism is the fact that realists see the world as anarchic, full of threats and conflicts, but liberals seek cooperation and prosperity. An important fact for liberals is the existence of other regimes and especially those which are non-democratic. States with non-democratic regime and those who are not members of international organizations may constitute a threat.³⁶ Liberals are not those who would rush to war and fight, they believe that nations should seek cooperation with other nations via international organizations. Problems should be solved peacefully, diplomatically or via trade and investments. Another important aspect is promoting democratic values and supporting democratic institutions.³⁷ International organizations are as important as states themselves, because they are a multilateral forum for states from the whole world and sometimes supranational authorities who help overcome and exterminate anarchy that exists in international community.³⁸

Important questions according to deployment and proliferation of WMD are those which Michal Walzer answered in the book *Ethics and WMD*. Simply put, can states who possess WMD deny them to other states? And can they use a policy of selective denial? And finally, can they use force to make denial successful?³⁹ Answers are yes to all. States can deny

³⁴ SAGAN, S. D. Realist Perspectives on Ethical Norms and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 86.

³⁵ WOODS, M. Reflection on Nuclear Optimism: Waltz, Burke and Proliferation. *Review of International Studies*, 2002 18(1), p. 168.

³⁶ KATAGIRI, N. Between Structural Realism and Liberalism: Japan’s Threat Perception and Response. *International Studies Perspectives*. 2018, 19(4), p. 327.

³⁷ Ibid

³⁸ ALOLAIMY, M. Disarmament: Evolution... p. 39.

³⁹ WALZER, M. A Liberal Perspective on Deterrence and Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*,

proliferation, BUT these states have to be committed to disarmament. If they actively try to destroy their own WMD arsenal, then from liberal's perspective it is allowed to be active in non-proliferation. Selectiveness is acceptable if focused on states that are believed to be rogue and probably first-users, states that are not interested in deterrence but in actual use.⁴⁰ The answer to the last question is also yes but Walzer has condition, that states who seek proliferation are rogue or failed states. In those states there is the risk that WMD could fall into wrong hands and endanger world's politics. Walzer follows the thought of John Stuart Mill who believes that using force by liberal states is acceptable when victory of civilized liberal thoughts is the main goal. From liberal perspective usage of deterrence or actual use of conventional weapons is acceptable in these situations.⁴¹

Speaking about constructivism, it is important to follow what was started in the first subchapter. Alexander Wendt's second model of social constructivism and that is Lock's anarchy with the main role of the rival. States cooperate and try to live peacefully and respect each other. Their main goal is to keep their sovereignty. And if war occurs, then states fight with utter respect for international rules and rules of war. This approach could be described as live and let live.⁴² In other words the proliferation in this model is not that important as it would be in the first model, where destruction and survival is the main goal. Here, proliferation is important if states prepare for a war that actually should not occur. In this model states comply with international rules, so if war occurs and the states have signed Non-proliferation Treaty, then it means no proliferation for them at all and war is conducted by internationally agreed rules.

Considering WMD it is important to state that: "a fundamental principle of constructivist social theory is that people act toward objects, including other actors, on the basis of the meanings that the objects have for them. States act differently toward enemies than they do toward friends because enemies are threatening and friends are not. Anarchy and the distribution of power are insufficient to tell us which are which. U.S. military power has a different significance for Canada than for Cuba, despite their similar "structural" positions, just as British missiles have a different significance for the United States than do Soviet [Russian] missiles."⁴³ That means that according to social constructivism, the arsenal of WMD is less important than those who possess these weapons and relations those actors have

Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 166.

⁴⁰ Ibid

⁴¹ FILIPEC, O. *Úvod do...* p 25.

⁴² Ibid

⁴³ WENDT, A. Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization*, 1992. 46(2). pp. 396-397.

with each other. If their relation is good, states are willing to ignore how massive the arsenal is and if the relation is bad, then only one WMD can make these relations even worse.

Proliferation can be understood in two ways, as a deterrent or as an actual weapon that could be used in conflict. Antiwar-feminists approach to proliferation is straightforward, they see proliferation of all kinds as a tragedy and they oppose to the development and deployment on any WMD. They argue that further proliferation would lead to accidental or purposive use of WMD or better availability to terrorists for stealing and that is why they support non-proliferation.⁴⁴ Non-proliferation could be achieved through series of inspections rather than military conflicts. They argue that inspections are the best way of ensuring that states will not develop and deploy WMD.⁴⁵

As everyone would assume, the main goal of pacifism is to get rid of all weapons and especially those labelled as weapons of mass destruction. With that said, pacifists also claim that it is hypocritical from state which already has those weapons to deny acquisition for other states. If nuclear states believe that nuclear weapons can ensure peace, then those without nuclear weapons are not able to achieve peace, or are they? Should not everyone have them? These theoretical questions look good on paper but in reality we have to agree on the fact that of course it is not feasible.⁴⁶

One of the risks of having nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction is the accidental triggering of the “red button” and proliferation naturally increases this risk. Pacifists together with warists agree that it is important to decrease the risk. The best way of doing it would be complete disarmament, but that is not possible if some states think that nuclear deterrence works or having other WMD would retaliate other states. Another risk associated with proliferation is the fact that nuclear deterrence and retaliation are built on fear, so that would mean that people all around the world would live in fear every single day.⁴⁷

Dilemma about proliferation is nicely described by LeFever. “Looking to the future, the burden of proof certainly rests with those who would argue that additional national nuclear arsenal would be good for local and world stability. But an equal burden of proof rests

⁴⁴ COHN, C. and RUDDICK, S. A feminist Ethical Perspective on Weapons of Mass Destruction *Consortium on Gender, Security, and Human Rights*. 2003. Working Paper No. 104/2003.

⁴⁵ COHN, C., F. HILL, and S. RUDDICK. The Relevance of Gender for Eliminating Weapons of Mass Destruction, *The Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission*. December, 2005.

⁴⁶ HOLMES, R. L. Pacifism and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. pp. 459-462.

⁴⁷ DUANE, L. C. *From Pacifism to Warism: A Moral Continuum*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989. See also: HOLMES, R. L. Pacifism and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 462.

upon those who maintain as most spokesmen in the arms control community seem to – that all further acquisitions anywhere and in all circumstances are equally dangerous.”⁴⁸ This statement is something that author of this thesis agrees with. Looking at all the theories it can be said that two camps exist, one is mostly against any proliferation whatsoever and the other camp supports proliferation for different reasons and the right path was not found yet, because most of the arguments are hypotheses that could and in fact do not have to be met at all. What most people in this world seek is peace and live contentedly until they die, but it is difficult to say what helps us the most whether it is proliferation or disarmament.

In realists’ anarchic world, states seek survival or domination, and the best way of doing it is the development of weapons of every kind, even WMD. Structural realism believes that under anarchy states who feel threatened by others will definitely cheat, and even if they sign non-proliferation treaties, they will still secretly develop WMD. Biological and chemical weapons would be developed by weak states that feel threatened by others and do not feel secured by the alliance with others. And that is what happened with Syria and her secret chemical program. Another point of view posed by realists is that further proliferation of WMD would keep world safe – doctrine of mutual assured destruction – nobody would start war with WMD if he would face the same destiny. Liberals position on world is not anarchic; they believe that peace should be gained with communication and cooperation. That is why the important actors are international organizations. Liberals vision on WMD and proliferations is that states that already have WMD can deny proliferation to other states, but have to be committed to disarmament. Simply put, if you try to get rid of your own weapons, you can deny them to others. Also they can apply selectiveness. Those states can choose which state cannot get WMD at any cost. This position is focused on states that are described as rogue one and probably first-user. Good states can also use a force against rogue one in order to stop them from acquiring WMD. Constructivists build world around set of rules and those rules show them what and when to do. Proliferation is actually not an option for them, because states that follow the rules cannot use any WMD even if war breaks out, because even a war also has rules that should be followed. Feminists, namely antiwar feminist, see proliferations as the worst tragedy, they believe that world would be better without WMD, because world with WMD is full of threats like accidental use or possibility for stealing by terrorists and so they support absolute non-proliferation. Pacifist of course cannot support proliferation but they argue that is ironical that states who have WMD believe in deterrence theory that means having them, keeps world in safety, but only if they have them and not

⁴⁸LeFEVER, E. W. Undue Alarm Over Nuclear Spread? *The Wall Street Journal*,. 1976, p. 12.

others. Pacifists hate the idea that deterrence and retaliation works because of people's fear of accidental use or purposive use of WMD. All in all, pacifists cannot support proliferation.

One of the main reasons why Syria kept chemical weapons even after ratification of Geneva protocol is its tense relationship with Israel through modern history. Syria is also party of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and signed Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. Syria obtained chemical artillery shells from Egypt in 1973 before the start of the October War, also known as Yom Kippur War, but did not use those weapons. Reason may have been to deterrence Israel in case it would start chemical war or as a last defensive possibility. Syria is believed to have chemical weapons since then.⁴⁹

Syrian chemical program started in late 1970s or early 1980s, at that time Convention was only negotiated and Syria was only part of the Geneva Protocol and that only prohibited the use of chemical weapons and not development, means that Syria was not breaking any international law by deploying these weapons. Syrian government never admitted possession of the chemical weapons until 2012, but some of the statements suggested the existence of such weapons.⁵⁰ "In 1990 Syrian President Hafez Al Assad said: Israel is still superior technologically; and it is capable of inflicting on the Arabs human disasters in case of war. But the Arabs can, with what they have, inflict the same disasters on it."⁵¹

President Assad in 1997, after meeting with Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, after being accused by Israel that Syria was manufacturing chemical weapons stated: "Those who have nuclear weapons do not have the right to criticize others regarding any weapon which they possess. If they want disarmament, we should start with nuclear ones. We, the Arabs, are ready to get rid of other weapons."⁵² Both president Assad's statements referred to situation in Israel. He also spoke about powerful weapons that Syria possessed. Even when he did not mention particularly chemical weapons, after recent events, it can be presumed what he was talking about. Syrian actions reflected relation with Israel. And those actions would perfectly fit the realists' position on cheating in a threatening environment.

1.3. International relations approach to the deterrence of WMD

Modern realists or neorealists have their stance on possession of nuclear weapons pretty clear. Mutual possession of nuclear weapons is seen by modern realists as force for

⁴⁹ DIAB, M. Z., Syria's Chemical and Biological Weapons: Assessing Capabilities and Motivations. *The Nonproliferation Review*, 1997. 5(1), p. 105.

⁵⁰ Idid

⁵¹ Ibid

⁵² DIAB, M. Z., Syria's Chemical..., p.105.

stability and peace and not as a force for war.⁵³ Mentioning only nuclear weapons, then according to realists if a lot of states possess them then this will keep everyone in safety. Conventional weapons do not have the power to keep peace, because they do not arouse such fear.⁵⁴ The opinion of Kenneth Waltz is: “The likelihood of war decreases as deterrent and defensive capabilities increase. Whatever the number of nuclear states, a nuclear world is tolerable if those states are able to send convincing deterrent messages: It is useless to attempt to conquer because you will be severely punished. A nuclear world becomes even more tolerable if states are able to send convincing defensive messages: It is useless to attempt to conquer because you cannot.”⁵⁵ According to his vision, the world should be full of nuclear weapons; if states have multiple nuclear devices, then wars will not occur. But this would leave nuclear devices unused because no one would risk mutual assured destruction and if wars would occur, then they would be conducted by conventional weapons, because on the other hand it would send a message: they will not use nuclear weapons because we would use them too and they will not risk that, so fighting with conventional weapons is just fine.

Critics of Waltz’s view think that it cannot be applied to all states, because some states are controlled by military and not by statesmen. Military officers think differently than politicians. Realists’ view on military officers is that they think that war is inevitable and they tend towards preventive wars. Another problem is that accidental nuclear war could occur because of false warnings or technical incidents. And a large number of states with these weapons could lead to the large risk of theft by terrorist organizations.⁵⁶

Not all realists share the same view on various problematics. Between realists, multiple different approaches exist. One of them is *The Murphy’s Law of Nuclear Fatalism*. “The law of nuclear fatalism laid the seeds for the notion that a state should develop nuclear weapons to deter other states, while preventing those same states from developing such weapons. This approach thus favours non-proliferation while ruling out disarmament. Accordingly, this notion as reflected in the realist perspective of the NPT shows that the treaty has been an instrument used by dominant states to safeguard and legitimize their hold over

⁵³ SAGAN, S. D. Realist Perspectives on Ethical Norms and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 77.

⁵⁴ WALTZ, K. N. The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*. 1988 18(4). pp. 615-628. See also: SAGAN, S. D. WALTZ, K. N. *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: An Enduring Debate*. W. W. Norton & Company. New York, 1995.

⁵⁵ WALTZ, K. N. The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Better. In: BETTS, R. K. (ed.) *Conflict After the Cold War: Arguments on Cause of War and Peace*. 5th ed. New York: Routledge, 2017

⁵⁶ SAGAN, S. D. Realist Perspectives on Ethical Norms and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 86.

nuclear weapons, while denying other states access to such weapons and protecting their allies through extended nuclear deterrence.”⁵⁷ According to this statement, states with nuclear capability can deter others and block them from deployment. At the same time strengthen their position in the world order as powerful states with the ability to protect others.

In liberalism, most of the papers - even the most significant ones - are written about nuclear weapons. Henry Shue and his position on deterrence: “It is an enormous mystery, as Richard Price has demonstrated, how liberals can confidently assume that biological and chemical weapons are so intolerably immoral that their very production and possession ought to be illegal, while insisting that the production and possession of nuclear weapons, and the system of nuclear deterrence that relies on possessing and threatening to use nuclear weapons, is not only perfectly legal but is, for some strategists reasoning at highly abstract levels, a brilliant breakthrough in war prevention.”⁵⁸ What Henry Shue wants to say is that he cannot understand how any liberal can believe that possession of nuclear weapons could prevent war and help the world to secure peace. Main goal of liberalism are people and their lives. So it is clearly understandable that WMD are not approved by liberals and deterrence should not be viewed as perfect tool of peacekeeping.

For constructivists it is important how identities, normative considerations and interests about nuclear use mutually shaped each other and then influenced the outcomes.⁵⁹ According to Kratochwil the game of deterrence was constituted once was constructed understanding of brinkmanship and last clear chance. Khrushchev explained that nuclear war between USA and Soviet Union did not happen because their policy makers understood that they reached the brink, which meant the last clear chance to avoid mutual destruction in nuclear war.⁶⁰

Some theorist claims that nuclear weapons can be perfect tool for deterrence, but this view is not shared between antiwar feminist, they believe that its fiction and it cannot work in reality. From a feminist antiwar perspective, having WMD as deterrents is a dangerous dream. Deterrence theory is dangerous dream that stands on perfect rationality and control of the actors because only if perfect rationality and control were possible only then system build on deterrence would be safe. Another danger of this dream is fact that more weapons produced

⁵⁷ ALOLAIMY, M. Disarmament: Evolution... p.38.

⁵⁸ SHUE, H. Liberalism: The Impossibility of Justifying Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 141.

⁵⁹ PRICE, R, TANNENWALD, N. Norms and Deterrence: The Nuclear and Chemical Weapons Taboos. In: KATZENSTEIN, P. J., *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. 1996. p. 14.

⁶⁰ HOWARD, P. Why Not Invade North Korea? Threats Language Games, and U.S. Foreign Policy. *International Studies Quarterly*. 2004. 48(4). p. 812.

and deployed make their accidental use or even purposive use more and more possible and more likely. The less weapons the better. Realists points out that not having WMD for deterrence purpose is dangerous when others have them, but from feminists perspective having WMD is greatly more dangerous than that. They also believe that development and deployment of WMD cost way too much.⁶¹ Antiwar feminist do not believe in deterrence theory.

Another tradition among feminists is called pragmatist feminism. Pragmatist feminists agree with antiwar feminists about nuclear weapons that they should never be invented, tested or deployed and if so then they should never been used or became the deterrent that prevents wars.⁶² Costs of development and deployment must be taken into account into the ethical status of deterrence. Pragmatist feminists argue that costs are not too high if looked from present perspective since most of the cost has been already spent. Antiwar feminists talk about costs mostly when they speak about further proliferation for deterrence purposes.⁶³

Carol Cohn is writing about her experiences during workshop on nuclear weapons. Workshop took place in 1984 – that is very important information, because situation has changed a lot since then and what was said about deterrence at that time probably would not be said by anybody in 21st century. But this experience says a lot about defence intellectuals that she encountered with and that helped form her approach to nuclear weapons as anti-militarist feminist. “ Another striking metaphor of patriarchal power came early in the summer program, when one of the faculties was giving a lecture on deterrence. To give us a concrete example from outside the world of military strategy, he described having a seventeen-year-old son of whose TV-watching habits he disapproves. He deals with the situation by threatening to break his son's arm if he turns on the TV again. "That's deterrence!" he said triumphantly. What is so striking about this analogy is that at first it seems so inappropriate. After all, we have been taught to believe that nuclear deterrence is a relation between two countries of more or less equal strength, in which one is only able to deter the other from doing it great harm by threatening to do the same in return. But in this case, the partners are unequal, and the stronger one is using his superior force not to protect himself or others from grave

⁶¹ COHN, C. and RUDDICK, S. A Feminist Ethical Perspective on Weapons of Mass Destruction, In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 421.

⁶² PEACH, L. J. A Pragmatist Feminist Approach to the Ethics of Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 443.

⁶³ Ibid

injury but to coerce.”⁶⁴ It is clear that strategist at that time thought differently, but it is very strange to read this explanation of deterrence when was believed, as she said, deterrence should be relation between nations with similar power, but they try to prevent the other from attacks aimed at them by sending message: do not attack us or you will feel the consequences! But in this case the lecturer said something like: do not do this and that or we will attack and you will feel the power we have!

Deterrence from pacifist perspective is not that clear topic as some might think. One point of view is the fact that deployment and development of nuclear weapons is not moral and in harmony with everything that pacifist fights for. Same goes with chemical and biological weapons or conventional weapons. But if there is chance that nuclear weapons could work as a deterrent that could stop or prevent wars and bloodshed some pacifist might approve it.⁶⁵

For neorealists is possession of nuclear weapons ideal for keeping peace rather than war. Nuclear weapons have the power to keep world safe, because of the destructive power it posses. Nobody would be willing to attack someone who can assure attackers destruction. Problems are different state structures in the world, where some states are controlled by government and some by military officers. Military officers tend to preventive wars so they will not be attacked first by others. Nuclear fatalism is actually happening right now. Only few states have nuclear weapons and they deny them to other states and they protect themselves and allies through nuclear deterrence. Liberals do not believe that WMD are the key to peace. They have people’s lives as the highest standard that should be protected and that is in contrast with WMD and deterrence is not for liberals the perfect tool for peacekeeping unlike for realists. Constructivist and their view of the world shaped by norms and rules show us that policy makers understand each other through these rules and they act according within those rules otherwise they would face consequences. Nuclear war did not occur because states realized that mutual destruction would be the only outcome which means that deterrence works in this case. Feminist and namely antiwar feminist do not believe in deterrence. For them it is dangerous to have WMD because of its accidental or purposive use that rises with numbers of states and weapons. Pragmatist feminist agree with antiwar feminists and they do not like WMD at all, those weapons should never been produced, tested, used and never used as deterrent. Pacifists hate weapons as whole, not just WMD but

⁶⁴ COHN, C. Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals. *Within and Without: Women, Gender, and Theory*.1987. 12(4). pp. 687-718.

⁶⁵ HOLMES, R. L. Pacifism and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 456.

conventional also. Between pacifists exist some that would actually approve having WMD if that would be the only possible way that would stop the bloodshed and death all around the world and it would guarantee the peace.

Syria kept their chemical weapons as a deterrent and to retaliate against Israel actions. „In November 1996, Syrian Ambassador to Cairo Issa Darwish gave a lecture and was quoted to have said that Syria would retaliate with CW if Israel attacked it with nuclear weapons. The following day, realizing perhaps that his statement was inconsistent with official policy (or he might have been misquoted), the ambassador issued a denial in which he claimed that the Arab states, particularly Syria, “do not possess weapons of mass destruction and do not threaten anyone with them.”⁶⁶ From realists approach we can say that tense relationship with Israel “forced” Syria to keep their chemical weapons against Israeli Nuclear weapons.

1.4. International relations approach to the disarmament of WMD

Realists have unified view on disarmament. It is not possible unless the world government occur. Otherwise states would more likely cheat and would keep the weapons for themselves. Realist thinks that paradoxically disarmament would lead to the use in the future. Realists are more focused on arms control rather than disarmament.⁶⁷ United States were among those who strongly supported the biological weapons convention and chemical weapons convention which prohibits biological and chemical weapons, because that would mean that only states with nuclear weapons are “in charge.”⁶⁸ The reason why Chemical Weapon Convention is possible is fact that there is general consensus about disadvantages of chemical weapons, but CWC won’t become universal until all states agree with this position, some states still believes that chemical weapons could serve as solution to some problems they face.⁶⁹

Liberals approach is the opposite of the realists. They do not believe that seeking security via amassing power is the right way, quite the opposite it is self-defeating, because more weapons produce only arm race. Absolute security is only seen as threat by others. For liberals is democracy very important. Immanuel Kant argued that is very unlikely that democracies would fight each other but it is more likely in consideration to other state

⁶⁶ DIAB, M. Z., Syria’s Chemical and Biological Weapons: Assessing Capabilities and Motivations. *The Nonproliferation Review* 1997. 5(1), p. 105.

⁶⁷ SAGAN, S. D. Realist Perspectives on Ethical Norms and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 86.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* p. 89.

⁶⁹ MARTIN, S. B. Realism and Weapons of Mass Destruction: A Consequentialist Analysis. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 104.

systems.⁷⁰ So from liberal perspective is the democratization one of the most important political changes that could help with disarmament and could end arms race.⁷¹ Liberals are part of the theorists that believes in disarmament and support agreements and restrictions that endorse disarmament such as arms control and non-proliferation treaties.⁷²

Again, it is important to continue what was started in first and second subchapter. Last model described by Wendt is Kant's anarchy, with focus on role of friend. Main goal is friendship, where states cooperate by well build friendship and every conflict is solved by peaceful solutions and WMD are no longer needed.⁷³ This model is in contrast with current world order. Current situation is far from ideal state, WMD namely nuclear weapons are important deterrent and source of political power. Future without NW is less likely possible even if nuclear disarmament is happening and numbers of these weapons are decreasing which can be seen on the fact, that 70 300 nuclear weapons existed in 1986 and estimated number of nuclear weapons in 2022 is about 12 705, but going to zero is probably never going to happen if some believe that nuclear weapons serve as deterrents and peacekeepers. Another perspective on this issue is made by nuclear taboo supporters. Constructivists see, from non-armed states perspective, disarmament as long but safe way how to secure international peace and security. The most important constructivist theory about disarmament is nuclear taboo. Nuclear taboo stands against any use of nuclear weapons in post WWII era versus anybody.⁷⁴

Antiwar feminist are against use of WMD and so is understandable that they want world without WMD. Those weapons make every conflict more dangerous. These weapons could escalate every conflict and harm much more than conventional weapons. One of the arguments against is fact that when states will rely simply on weapons they probably will not pay much of the attention to other possibilities or strategies of self-protection or problem solutions.⁷⁵

Women all around the world have been fighting against nuclear weapons and had an important role in movements focused on disarmament of these weapons. They fight as individuals but also as part of the various organizations and as part of the women-specific

⁷⁰ ALOLAIMY, M. Disarmament: Evolution... p. 40.

⁷¹ Ibid p. 41.

⁷² Ibid p. 40.

⁷³ FILIPEC, O. *Úvod do...* p. 25.

⁷⁴ ALOLAIMY, M. Disarmament: Evolution... p. 42.

⁷⁵ COHN, C. and RUDDICK, S. A feminist Ethical Perspective on Weapons of Mass Destruction Consortium on Gender, Security, and Human Rights. 2003. Working Paper No. 104/2003.

organizations. Women found it very effective to be part of women-specific organizations⁷⁶⁷⁷ because they share the attitude that their positions and views are less visible and they are not part of mainstream discussion. All this convinced them that it is more than needed to form women-specific organizations.⁷⁸

One group of pacifist, namely nuclear pacifists, might believe that retention and deployment of nuclear weapons serves a deterrent function. Every other pacifist sees disarmament of WMD as morally imperative. For them is very important that disarmament have to be universal and unilateral.⁷⁹ Well written is comparison that made Robert L. Holmes, when he compared pacifists with vegetarian and with death penalty opponents, and this comparison nicely sums everything: “If you are opposed to the use of WMD under any circumstances (either for deterrence or war fighting), then there is no reason not to get rid of them. That much is clear for the pacifist. But pacifists, for whom the problem is war itself, do not want to legitimize any weapons, conventional or nuclear ... to draw a line between legitimate and illegitimate weapons legitimizes some weapons at the same time it delegitimizes others. This makes the pacifist’s situation a little like that of a vegetarian. Confronted with the option of seeing farm animals treated humanely or inhumanely, vegetarians will, of course, prefer that they be treated humanely. But in the end they do not want to see them eaten, regardless of how they have been treated. And death penalty opponents will, of course, favour eliminating racial, ethnic, and class injustices from the criminal justice system. But they oppose the judicial killing of people whether or not they have been treated fairly. So the pacifist will be reluctant to attach great importance to WMD disarmament if that is taken to imply that conventional armament is permissible.”⁸⁰ There is summed everything that most of the pacifist fight for and that is world without weapons,

⁷⁶**Women’s Forum 2000: Away with Nuclear Weapons**

On opening the door of the 21st century, we the women of Japan make a sincere appeal for women and peoples around the worlds to unite in efforts to abolish nuclear weapons to save the human race from destruction.

On 5 August 2000 more than 1800 women met in Hiroshima to call for the abolition of nuclear weapons. They heard testimonies from women around the world on the implications of the use and testing of nuclear weapons. The Campaign has called for all member states of the United Nations to take the courageous decision to eliminate nuclear weapons.

⁷⁷**WILPF** - Founded in 1915 to protest the war then raging in Europe, the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom aims to bring together women of different political and philosophical convictions, united in their determination to study, and make known and help abolish the political, social, economic and psychological causes of war and to work for a constructive peace.

⁷⁸ CONFLICT, PEACE-BUILDING, DISARMAMENT, SECURITY: a) weapons of mass destruction. *oecd.org*, [online]. [viewed 12 February 2022]. Available from:

<https://www.oecd.org/social/gender-development/1896576.pdf>

⁷⁹ HOLMES, R. L. Pacifism and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. p. 463.

⁸⁰ HOLMES, R. L. Pacifism and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. pp. 463-464.

without every weapon not just WMD but even conventional. Those weapons do not have a place in pacifist vision of world.

Realist approach to disarmament, about nuclear weapons, is easy to understand, it is not possible. Only way how to secure that would be one world government and that is utopia. On the other hand chemical and biological weapons are easy to get rid of, because disadvantages prevail. Some states still believe that keeping CW and BW is good for them, those states are the so called rogue one. Liberals are in the opposition to realists. Seeking security by acquiring more weapons provokes other states and more weapons in one states means more weapons in the other. That is definitely not the right way. Democracy is the right way for international peace. Democratization could help with disarmament and that is what liberals want and that is why they support non-proliferation treaties and agreements about disarmament. Constructivists who support disarmament are nuclear taboo supporters. Best way how to secure international peace is get rid of these weapons. Feminists are against use of WMD, so their view on disarmament is clear. Disarmament is important for peace one of the many arguments is fact, that if states rely on weapons they will not pay attention to other solution in conflicts. Women all around the world have fought against WMD and many of them founded organizations in which they assert they position. There is only one group of pacifists that would support nuclear weapons, if they would provide peace, other pacifist believe that world should follow the going to zero plan with every weapon, not just WMD but also conventional. The most important thing is that disarmament has to be universal and unilateral!

Syria agreed to disarmament of its chemical weapons after Russian and USA ultimatums, where USA threatened Syria with armed attack if they will not stop using chemical weapons and if they will not accept dismantle of these weapons.⁸¹ States without nuclear weapons has to cooperate with states that have massive arsenal and fire power like USA and Russia. Deterrence worked in this case from Russian and American perspective and disarmament was forced from higher power.

⁸¹ FRIEDMAN, David. Dismantling Chemical Weapons in Syria: Lessons, Insights, and Implications for Israel *The Institute for National Security Studies. Strategic Assessment*, 2014. 16(4).

2. Chemical Weapons in Syria

The Second chapter focuses on Syrian chemical weapons program, other actors that helped shape Syrian chemical arsenal and political decision making. The first subchapter provides information about Syrian Civil War because it is important to provide background information connected to the main topic and that is the use of chemical weapons and to show how violent and despicable this conflict was and still is. Second subchapter focuses on two most significant actors and supporters of Syria during the conflict, those actors are Russian Federation and Islamic Republic of Iran. The last subchapter in second chapter deals with use of chemical weapons during the conflict and response of international community.

For better understanding is very important to look at Syrian Civil War. This conflict has triggered events that everybody feared, such as use of chemical weapons that Syrian government possessed in their stockpiles. In order to understand the broader context is convenient to start with some historical background, circumstances that led to civil war and conflict escalations in form of usage of chemical weapons which led to Syrian chemical disarmament.

Syria is a party to Geneva protocol from 1925, which bans use of chemical weapons in war. Syria ratified the protocol in 1968 without reservations, except for the fact that it does not represent recognition of Israel. Further treaties that Syria signed are Non-proliferation treaty (NPT) and Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC) which was not ratified. Syria did not sign CWC in the past because of the relations with Israel, their condition was to eliminate all WMD in the Middle East, which did not happen. Syria finally signed and ratified CWC in 2013 after pressure from other states.⁸²

It is not very clear since when has Syria possessed chemical weapons. However it is believed that Syrian chemical weapons program started around year 1970 as a response to tense relation with Israel since Syria saw them as a threat. Chemical weapons were provided to Syria by Egypt, their natural ally in the region because they shared common state called United Arab Republic and that meant common strategic culture and politics against Israeli. Egypt provided chemical weapons to Syria in 1972 when they agreed to supply CW arsenal to Syria for six million dollars. Egypt gave Syria sarin, mustard gas, filled artillery shells and aerial bombs.⁸³ Egypt had a big chemical weapons arsenal and was not afraid to use chemical weapons in warfare, specifically in 1963-1967 in Yemen.⁸⁴ In an unclassified CIA report

⁸² DIAB, M. Z., Syria's Chemical... p. 105.

⁸³ SHOHAM, D. Chemical and Biological Weapons in Egypt. *The Nonproliferation Review*. 1998. pp. 48-58.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 1-30.

named *Implications of Soviet use of Chemical and Toxin Weapons for US Security Interests* from 1983 is written that excluding Egypt, Syria was the state with probably the most advanced chemical warfare capability and was supplied by Czechoslovakia and Soviet Union.⁸⁵ Human Rights Watch also stated, based on found evidence in Syria, that rockets used in Ghouta attacks were Soviet-produced.⁸⁶ In near past, Syria was also supplied by Germany, when between years 2002 and 2006 Germany delivered more than 100 tons of chemicals to Syria that could be used to make Sarin gas, which was used during the conflict. This information was confirmed by Angela Merkel who stated that according to findings at her disposal, chemicals were used for civilian purposes and not for making chemical weapons.⁸⁷

2.1. Syrian Civil War

The Syrian civil war started with peaceful protests against the dictatorship of their President Bashar al-Assad, who was considered a modernizer, but his neoliberal and capitalist regime with mass repression and denial of human rights caused dissatisfaction with his leadership and ended with series of protests. Protests in Syria were not that extreme compared to other Arabic countries during Arab Spring, where complete change of government was demanded. Protesters in Syria wanted an actual reform rather than Assad's complete replacement. Protests were not the cause of the civil war; the Assad's response was the cause.⁸⁸ Assad and his regime tried to please protestors with revoking 1963 Emergency Law, extending Syrian citizenship to the Kurdish minority and replacing Daraa governor. But those acts were seen mostly as was of buying the popularity rather than actual reforms that people were calling for. Syria was then suspended from the League of Arab States (Arab League) and is still suspended. Arab countries are not united on the issue of Syrian membership. For revoking the suspension, the consensus is needed.⁸⁹

At the beginning of the Arab spring, defectors from Assad's army ran away to Turkey and formed Free Syrian Army. This formation did not coordinate well because of different

⁸⁵ Director of Central Intelligence Implications of Soviet use of chemical and toxin weapons for U.S. security interests. *Special National Intelligence Estimate*. 1983. pp 1-16 . Available from: irp.fas.org/threat/cbw/sniecbw1983.pdf

⁸⁶ BOUCKAERT, P.. ATTACKS ON GHOUTA: Analysis of Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons in Syria. *Human Rights Watch report*. 2013.

⁸⁷ Old German-Syrian chemical deal. *dw.com*, [online]. 18 September 2013 [viewed 18 December 2022]. Available from: <https://www.dw.com/en/germany-confirms-past-chemical-deliveries-to-syria/a-17098815#:~:text=Germany%20approved%20deliveries%20of%20more,leaning%20coalitions%20both%20did%20so.>

⁸⁸ BENTLEY, M. *Syria and...*

⁸⁹ HUSSEIN, S. A. Arab League to Asharq Al-Awsat: Differences Persist on Restoring Syria Membership. *aawsat.com*, [online]. 3 May 2020 [viewed 4 March 2021]. Available from: <https://english.aawsat.com/home/article/2265011/arab-league-asharq-al-awsat-differences-persist-restoring-syria-membership>

views and interests. Civilian counterpart was also formed in the Istanbul in 2011; it was called The Syrian National Coalition. This coalition claimed to be government-in-exile. But even its successor, the National Coalition, were not able to deliver support, neither diplomatic nor material, to the opposition in fight with Assad's regime. Free Syrian Army lately drifted to Islamist brigades and all the chaos served to al-Qaeda militants who capitalized on the situation. A group called Jabhat al-Nusra claimed to be al-Qaeda's offshoot in Syria and later all Sunnis from the region were called to join fight against regime and they were quite successful. In 2013 the Islamic State of Iraq was officially formed, which emerged as a significant player and took control over a territory in eastern Syria and western Iraq. Groups fighting on the Syrian territory targeted even civilians who were not in their area of control. This conflict turned into the sectarian war. Assad's regime was not scared to use chemical weapons, but that exact movement forced the world to step into the conflict and disarm Syria of chemical weapons.

In 2012, the conflict was officially confirmed as Civil war by the International Committee of the Red Cross. This declaration meant that international humanitarian law applied since then to all country and to all parties, rebel and government.⁹⁰ In July 2012, a counter-terrorism law was passed by Syrian Government. This law criminalized the provision of medical care given to people who were injured by regime forces in the protests against Government. So basically, this law was conducted to justify those entire horrible things that government did to people who wanted the change of the regime and punished those who helped them, alias health workers with arrest, detention, torture or execution. Such a law violates international humanitarian law. UN Security Council issued resolution, which aimed at humanitarian help and aid routes.⁹¹ Assad used this opportunity to help civilians only in regime-controlled areas and to deny help to areas held by rebels. In 2016 Syrian American Medical Society documented 194 verified attacks on medical facilities. Syrian Network for Human Rights documented 289 attacks on ambulances and medical facilities and Syrian Arab Red Crescent bases.⁹² Physicians for Human Rights were able to register a total of 601 attacks on Medical Facilities since 2011 until 2022.⁹³ The civil war was brutal and the attacks were also targeted on medical facilities, schools, markets and all that led to the deaths of 229 119

⁹⁰ GOH, M. Red Cross Declares Civil War In Syria. *npr.org*, [online]. 15 July 2012 [viewed 4 March 2021]. Available from: <https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2012/07/15/156808427/red-cross-declares-civil-war-in-syria>

⁹¹ UN Security Council Resolution n. 2165 from 14 July 2014.

⁹² FOUAD, F.M., SPARROW A., et al. Health workers and the weaponisation of health care in Syria: a preliminary inquiry for The Lancet–American University of Beirut Commission on Syria. *Lancet*. 2017. 390.

⁹³ Physicians for Human Rights. Illegal Attacks on healt Care in Syria. *syriamap.phr.org*, [online]. [vieved 20 November 2022]. Available from: <http://syriamap.phr.org/#/en>

civilians according to Syrian Network for Human Rights, when more than 90% were killed by Syrian regime forces, Iranian militias and Russian forces.⁹⁴ All these massacres led to the biggest migration wave, when since 2011 until 2022 more than 6.8 million Syrians fled from their country.⁹⁵

From international relations theories perspective, Assad's regime could fit the realist theory, as a statesman who seeks power and is not able to cooperate. The Syrian government is doing what is best for them and what can ensure their survival. The accordance of their actions with the realist theory is supported by the fact that they already used chemical weapons against their opponents. On the other hand, Assad is a rational actor but conflicts are not always rational. So far it has not been made clear who gave the orders to use chemical weapons, if it was the Syrian government or field commanders. But realist theory focuses merely on statesmen and states and not on individuals such as field commanders, who tend to look at conflicts from the military perspective and their vision of conflict solution is different. In contrary to realist theory, using chemical weapons in this conflict does not make sense from, Syrian government perspective because those weapons made this conflict international instead of keeping it local, so instead of fighting opposition they have to deal with actors such as US or EU.

2.2. Important actors in conflict

Russia led by Putin is a significant supporter of Syria and Assad's regime. Because of its support, United Nations were not able to resolve the conflict in Syria. Russia and also China used Veto on questions concerning the Syrian issue.⁹⁶ Russia used its Veto on questions related to Syria 17 times since the beginning of the Syrian crisis in 2011 until the end of 2022.⁹⁷ The reasons are political and also military, because Russia is one of the biggest suppliers of weaponry to Syria. This statement supported the fact that weapons used during

⁹⁴Syrian Network for Human Rights. Civilian Death Toll. *snhr.org*, [online]. September 2022 [viewed 30 November 2022]. Available from: <https://snhr.org/blog/2021/06/14/civilian-death-toll/>

⁹⁵ UN Refugee Agency. Syria Refugee Crisis Explained. *unrefugees.org*, [online]. 8 July 2022 [viewed 15 December 2022]. Available from: <https://www.unrefugees.org/news/syria-refugee-crisis-explained/#:~:text=More%20than%206.8%20million%20Syrians,in%20T%3%BCrkiye%2C%20Lebanon%20and%20Jordan.>

⁹⁶ The UN Security Council has 5 permanent members, these are Russia, the United Kingdom, France, China and the United States and other 10 members that are not permanent. Vote is successful, when none of the permanent members votes against and if the overall voting has 9 votes in favour.

⁹⁷UN Library. UN Security Council Meetings & Outcomes Tables. *research.un.org*, [online]. 19 September 2022 [viewed 15 November 2022]. Available from: <https://research.un.org/en/docs/sc/quick/veto>

crisis by Syrian government were identified as Russian ones.⁹⁸ In 2020, Russia vetoed help from UN to rebel-held areas through only one border crossing.⁹⁹

Via vetoes, Russia took advantage of their role in UN as a permanent member of the Security Council to destabilise the region and block other countries in their effort to solve and deescalate the situation in Syria. Russian vetoes blocked the help of UN that could be provided to Syria. Concerning the issue of veto of a permanent member some oppose that even if one permanent member of the Security Council uses his veto in one meeting, it does not mean that they cannot reverse this veto in a later meeting. This may be the truth, but if one permanent member decides that they will veto everything related to a particular topic, this decision could prevent the Security Council from maintaining international peace and security and prevent the Security Council from fulfilling its responsibilities.¹⁰⁰ Some experts think that the Security Council has the duty to act whenever it decides that a particular situation constitutes a threat to international peace and security even if one of the permanent members decides to veto their actions. If Security Council failed to act because of the veto, it would mean the Security Council did not fulfil its duty to secure international peace and security. And this interpretation of Security Council responsibilities can be found in Article 39¹⁰¹ of the United Nations Charter.¹⁰² The word “shall” is the most important. That means Security Council has to act.

Rana Moustafa Essawy, according to veto and blocking Security Council, wrote in his paper: “In sum, this paper argues that it is not the use of the veto per se that leads to a conclusion of the Security Council's failure to exercise its function, but rather it is the cumulative effect of the use of veto in a particular situation which brings about a deadlock in the Council as if it has "ceased to deal" with such a situation within the meaning of Article 12(2) of the UN Charter. Most notably, this situation prevailed during the Cold War period and was the main reason for the adoption of the Uniting for Peace Resolution.”¹⁰³ The voting mechanism in Security Council meetings should be probably revised, because any country of the permanent members can choose to block any particular topic they want to and then the Security Council becomes incompetent. For example situations in Syria or now Ukraine

⁹⁸ BENTLEY, M. *Syria and...*

⁹⁹ UN Security Council Resolution n. S/2020/654 from 6 July 2020.

¹⁰⁰ ESSAWY, R. M. The Implied Powers Doctrine in the Fight against Chemical Weapons in Syria: Any Useful Purpose. *Military Law and Law of War Review*. 2017-2018. 56(1)

¹⁰¹ *The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.*

¹⁰² ESSAWY, R. M. The Implied Powers...

¹⁰³ Ibid

cannot be ever solved because of the role of Russia in Security Council and Russia is aware of the power they possess in their veto.

Help from Russia can be seen from different aspects of international relations. In the light of current issues and the war on Ukraine, Russian help to Assad's regime can be seen as attempt to divert attention from what was happening in Ukraine and what was Russia planning to do. It also helped to build an image of a state that is helping a regime in the Middle East. Russia used U.S. response to chemical attacks in form of military intervention for their propaganda. Russia proclaimed that U.S. subverted Syria and they stabilized the region. Russia also proclaimed that they were helping Assad's regime against terrorists. Thanks to their help, they signed a very convenient deal with Syria and thanks to that deal, Russian fleets could anchor in ports Latakia and Tartus, which moved their fleet closer to the world oceans. The deal between Russia and Syria allows Russians to use the naval facility for free for 49 years since 2017. Kremlin has sovereign jurisdiction over the Tartus base and this allows Russia to keep even nuclear powered vessels there.¹⁰⁴ Russian actions are in accordance with the realist's theory – expanding territory in terms of power with their fleets and supporting Assad's regime, and also in accordance with constructivist theory – as building image and identity.

Another important actor in this conflict is Iran. Iran strongly supports Assad's regime since the moment Syria supported Iran in its war with Iraq. Both states also strongly oppose Israel. Iran massively supports Syria with weapons.¹⁰⁵ Iran was smuggling arms to Hezbollah and Syria played a key role in the smuggling, Hezbollah in return has been involved in the crisis in a bid to safeguard the regime.¹⁰⁶ “The Assad regime has provided crucial access to Iranian proxies, including Lebanese Hezbollah, Hamas, and Palestinian Islamic Jihad, allowing Iran to move people, weapons, and money to these groups through Syrian territory.”¹⁰⁷ Iran helped Syria with their chemical program by supplying equipment, chemicals, provided technical training and also provided Iranian scientists.¹⁰⁸

The relations between Syria and Iran are nicely summed in a statement made by the senior foreign affairs advisor to Iran's Supreme Leader Ali Akbar Velayati, who said during the press conference in 2013 that “Syria is the golden ring of resistance against Israel, and if it

¹⁰⁴ Dettmer, J. Russia Expands Military Facilities in Syria. *voanews.com*, [online]. 12 May 2021 [viewed 10 December 2022]. Available from: https://www.voanews.com/a/middle-east_russia-expands-military-facilities-syria/6205742.html

¹⁰⁵ BENTLEY, M. *Syria and chemical...*

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid*

¹⁰⁷ FULTON, W. HOLLIDAY, J. WYER, S. IRANIAN STRATEGY IN SYRIA. *A joint report by AEI's critical threats project and institute for the study of war*. May 2013. p. 9.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid*.

weren't for Syria's active government the country would become like Qatar or Kuwait. Iran is not prepared to lose this golden counterweight."¹⁰⁹ Both countries work together and support each other mostly thanks to Israel, who is their joint enemy. Iranian strategy was to preserve the Assad regime for as long as possible, but they also prepared the environment for a change in the government to ensure cooperation post-Assad so their influence in the region was secured.¹¹⁰ According to rebels in Syria was Iran also smuggling weapons to Syria.¹¹¹ Besides weapons, Iran also sent military specialists to help Assad. They were not sent to fight for Assad, but their role was to guide and train the Syrian forces. Iran does not share borders with Syria, so Iranians were able to travel to Syria via Turkish border thanks to the fact that they do not need visas to enter Turkey. Others could come to Syria via border with Iraq.

Help provided by Iran to Syria can be seen from the international relations perspective with help of the Realist theory. Iran was helping Assad to secure the survival of his regime, because they wanted to secure the survival of their closest ally in a "fight" against its biggest enemy in region, which is Israel. Looking at this triangular relation between Syria – Iran – Israel from the social constructivism it is easy to understand why Iran and Syria help each other. Iran is willing to overlook the fact that Syria uses chemical weapons, they are also willing to help them build chemical arsenal because they are considered as allies and their arsenal of WMD has a positive meaning for them. On the other hand, they both oppose Israel and hate them for their nuclear arsenal. Israeli arsenal of the WMD has different meaning for those states and because of that they help each other.

2.3. Use of chemical weapons and response of international community

During the conflict chemical weapons were widely used. In a study conducted by Tobias Schneider and Theresa Lütkefend is written that in the Syrian civil war, chemical weapons were used in 336 attacks since the beginning of the conflict until 2019 (when the study was conducted).¹¹² After ongoing problems with the use of chemical weapons even after signing Chemical Weapons Convention, which prohibits the use of such weapons, many states like U.S., UK or France issued threats to Assad's regime, saying that if they keep using

¹⁰⁹ Ali Akbar Velayati answering Nasim's question: The 2+1 Coalition does not have a narrow perspective because it is not connected to anyone party. *nasimonline.ir*, [online]. 27 March 2013 [viewed 15 December 2022]. Available from: <http://www.nasimonline.ir/TextVersion/Detail/?Id=506386&Serv=24>.

¹¹⁰ FULTON, W. HOLLIDAY, J. WYER, S. IRANIAN STRATEGY IN SYRIA. *A joint report by AEI's critical threats project and institute for the study of war*. May 2013. p. 9.

¹¹¹ SAUL, J. HAFEZI, P. Iran boosts military support in Syria to bolster Assad. *reuters.com*, [online]. 21 February 2014 [viewed 18 January 2023]. Available from: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-syria-crisis-iran-idUKBREA1K09U20140221>

¹¹² SCHNEIDER, T. and T. LÜTKEFEND. Nowhere to Hide: The Logic of Chemical Weapons Use in Syria. *Global Public Policy Institute* [online]. 2019 [viewed 20 November 2022]. Available from: https://www.gppi.net/media/GPPi_Schneider_Luetkefend_2019_Nowhere_to_Hide_Web.pdf

these weapons, they will use force against them. These statements were released in 2013, but first use of the force took place in 2017 by U.S. strike force. Many states reacted differently to this attack. Some states supported U.S. However, others stated that such a use of force violates the international law, and the last camp declared that airstrike was an understandable response for the situation, but a political solution is more than needed.¹¹³ EU was the one who reacted in the way that they understand the use of air force by U.S. and they understand that the main intention was “to prevent and deter the spread and use of deadly chemical weapons.”¹¹⁴ But they also added that “The EU firmly believes that there can be no military solution to the conflict and is committed to the unity, sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of the Syrian State. Only a credible political solution, as defined in UNSCR 2254¹¹⁵ and the 2012 Geneva Communiqué will ensure peace and stability in Syria and enable a decisive defeat of Da'esh and other UN-designated terrorist groups in Syria.”¹¹⁶

Let's look back to 2013, when the most important incident occurred and when the famously declared “red line” was crossed. That incident was GHOUTA attack, in which the deadliest use of chemical weapons since the Iran-Iraq war occurred. The published number of casualties differs from 281 to 1729.¹¹⁷ The Secretary-General condemns that the use of chemical weapons in Ghouta is a war crime and a grave violation of the 1925 Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare and other international laws. The Mission stated, based on evidence provided to them, that incident that happened on 21 August 2013 in Ghouta involved usage of chemical weapons. Surface-to-surface rocket containing the nerve agent Sarin were used.¹¹⁸ Attacks were conducted by Syrian government as everything pointed their way. As mentioned above the chemical that was used was Sarin. Syrian Government officially acknowledged possession of chemical weapons.¹¹⁹ And Syrian Government already used Sarin in warfare before, specifically in Saraqeb¹²⁰ on 29 April 2013 and in Jobar in April

¹¹³ ESSAWY, R. M. The Implied Powers...

¹¹⁴ Council of the EU. Declaration by the High Representative on behalf of the EU on the US strike in Syria. *consilium.europa.eu*, [online]. 7 April 2017 [viewed 18 March 2021]. Available from: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2017/04/07/hr-declaration-us-strike-syria/>

¹¹⁵ UN Security Council Resolution n. S/RES/2254 from 18 December 2015

¹¹⁶ Council of the EU. Declaration by the High Representative...

¹¹⁷ Ghouta chemical attack. *en.wikipedia.org*, [online]. Edited 13 January 2023 [viewed 17 January 2023]. Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ghouta_chemical_attack

¹¹⁸ UN General Assembly Security Council Report n. A/67/997-S/2013/553 from 16 September 2013

¹¹⁹ MacFARQUHAR, N. SCHMITT, E., Syria Threatens Chemical Attack on Foreign Force. *nytimes.com*, [online]. 23 July 2012 [viewed 17 January 2023]. Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/24/world/middleeast/chemicalweapons-wont-be-used-in-rebellion-syria-says.html>

¹²⁰ National evaluation. Chemical attack of 4 April 2017 (Khan Sheikhoun) Clandestine Syrian chemical weapons programme. *diplomatie.gouv.fr*, [online]. [viewed 17 January 2023]. Available from:

2013. Another factor was presence of hexamine and hexafluorophosphate¹²¹, which are also parts of chemical weapons possessed by Syrian government. Rockets used in this attack were also linked to Syrian government, because their usage by Syria was documented before.¹²² The chemical attacks on Ghouta were part of many indiscriminate, widespread and deliberate attacks against civilians in areas that were held by opposition, which were conducted by Syrian Government. Civilian casualties rose dramatically from 4% in 2011 to 48% in 2012, because Syrian government has pursued a strategy of collective punishment against the civilians in opposition-held areas.¹²³ Ghouta attack was the most crucial one, because this attack forced the outside actors to step into the conflict and take care of Syrian chemical disarmament. This will be described in the last chapter of this thesis.

From realists perspective President Assad could be seen, based on the provided information, as statesman who is not influenced by moral ethics. That is why his regime developed and used CW during the conflict. Thanks to the tense situation in the region and with Israel, Syria could develop the CW because they sought survival via armament. As realist believe chemical weapons can be used against targets that cannot retaliate and do not have the necessary defence abilities, this statement supports the fact that Syria used chemical weapons against rebels and civilians. Also dangerous weapons as WMD would be used once war breaks out and conflict in Syria was declared as Civil War in 2012 and CW were used since then. On the other hand realism focuses on states and statesman as the main actors. Until now it is not clear who gave the orders to use chemical weapons. If those who gave the orders were field generals, then realism could not apply to this scenario.

Liberalist highly value human lives. For them is difficult to justify deaths of any soldiers, not to mentions civilians. In correlation with this is highly impossible to see any actions of Assad and his regime from liberalist perspective. Even if the self-defence, which is the only possible way in which liberals accept killing of other, is taken into account, then it still cannot be applied to this case, because liberals cannot permit usage of WMD. That is because of the nature of WMD, which are not able to distinguish between combatants and civilians. Even liberalist doctrine of supreme emergency cannot be applied to this case,

https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/170425_-_evaluation_nationale_-_anglais_-_final_cle0dbf47-1.pdf

¹²¹ Ibid

¹²² HIGGINS, E. Volcanoes in Damascus. *bellingcat.com*, [online]. 15 July 2014 [viewed 17 January 2023]. Available from: <https://www.bellingcat.com/resources/case-studies/2014/07/15/volcanoes-in-damascus/>

¹²³ Civil Rights Defenders. Eastern and Western Ghouta Sarin Attack. *crd.org*, [online]. [viewed 10 January 2023]. Available from: <https://crd.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/EASTERN-GHOUTA-SUMMARY-EN-final.pdf>

because Syria and Assad's regime did not face the extermination. Behaviour of the rebels did not suggest that Assad and his regime would face extinction.

Constructivists emphasize international norms and rules. From their perspective was Assad unpredictable international actor, because Syria did not access to CWC prior international pressure related to usage of CW. Meaning that Syria was feared for having and potentially using CW. And even after accession to CWC Syria still used CW during the conflict, which means that other actors could not understand their motives, because Syria was not playing by agreed international set of rules. Syrian motives could be probably understood from Wendt first model of anarchic world. That is the Hobbes's anarchy, the role of the enemy. When Assad could feel unsecured in ensuring his and regime's survival in their fight against rebels and could tend to preemptive and preventive attacks with use of CW.

Assad and his regime have probably nothing in common with feminists or pacifists as both mostly oppose using any WMD and under any circumstances. Antiwar feminists would look after peaceful solution after civil war broke out in the Syria, which is in absolute contrast with regime's actions. From just war pacifist Syria was using CW long before they actually used them on battle field. For just war pacifist was mere deployment considered as use of CW.

3. Chemical weapons disarmament

The last chapter is focused on activities of OPCW and chemical disarmament of Syrian stockpiles as well as on the investigation of the incidents related to chemical weapons during the conflict. The first subchapter focuses on founding and investigations of and OPCW Fact Finding Mission in Syria and second subchapter focuses on the problematic with disarmament in Syria.

Syria became the last member to Chemical Weapons Convention in 2013 after international pressure was exerted. Even after their accession to CWC, the incidents which involved use of chemical weapons in the territory of Syria were still reported. In 2013 U.S. and Russia sent letter to United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General. After Syria decided to accede to the Chemical Weapons Convention U.S. and Russia expressed their determination to ensure destruction of the Syrian chemical weapons program. They suggested that if Syria will not comply, if they transfer or use chemical weapons then the Security Council should impose measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the UN and also the applications of the article VIII of the Chemical Weapons Convention.¹²⁴

3.1. Fact finding missions

The Director-General announced the creation of an OPCW Fact-Finding Mission in Syria on 29 April 2014. Target of FFM was to found facts about alleged use of chemical weapons for hostile purposes in Syria.¹²⁵ Syrian government gave consent for the FFM and assured their security. FFM in Syria was first mission that occurred in such circumstances such as cross confrontational lines and face security risks. Mission was conducted in an active war zone and was later rated as “Very High Risk Mission”.¹²⁶ FFM was fully supported by United Nations. This support encompassed: „the provision of safety and security support and advice to the OPCW; the provision of logistical support; and assistance with liaising and coordinating, in particular, with opposition representatives on the security, logistical, and operational aspects of the OPCW FFM, as may be required, for the safe access and movement of OPCW personnel, any accompanying United Nations personnel, and their equipment and samples within the areas to be visited in the Syrian Arab Republic, including liaising with the opposition representatives for the purposes of making available persons for interviews.“¹²⁷

¹²⁴ UN General Assembly Security Council Letter n. A/68/398-S/2013/565 from 24 September 2013.

¹²⁵ OPCW Technical Secretariat Report of FFM n. S/1191/2014 from 16 June 2014.

¹²⁶ Ibid

¹²⁷ Ibid

Security in Syria was managed through Office of United Nations Department of Safety and Security in The Syrian Arab Republic (UNDSS Syria).¹²⁸

The framework of FFM was drafted and finalized in FFM Strategic Concept of Operations known as CONOPS. „The CONOPS describes the establishment by the Director-General of the FFM as signalling the determination of the OPCW that, despite the difficult security situation prevailing in the SAR; it will take serious notice of allegations of use of chemical weapons. By making every effort to bring to light the facts surrounding these allegations, the international community can bring to bear its influence on those who might consider such actions immune from censure”¹²⁹ The ultimate authority to make the final decision whether mission will proceed or not rested with the Director-General (OPCW) and the Secretary General (UN).¹³⁰ Activities of FFM in Syria included interviews with casualties, witnesses or treating physicians; collecting and analysing relevant documents like clinical histories, autopsy findings, admission records etc.; collection of environmental samples, biomedical and post-mortem samples; analyses of munitions.¹³¹

The Vice Minister of the SAR met with the OPCW Advance Team that was responsible for preparations a planning of activities. The Government of the SAR assured mutual determination to achieve the success of the FFM and also requested expectation of the independent and impartial observations of the situation. FFM had the full support from the SAR authorities at the highest levels that included politicians and military. The Minister also stated that SAR did not learn about any incident that would indicate that chemical weapons were used, that applied reports from all local authorities and hospitals excluding those in rebel held-areas. The Minister also stated that National Commission had been established and their job is to investigate any incidents that could occur. Syrian government’s position on the use of chemical weapons was that several terrorist groups were trying to obtain and use chemical weapons. In Tartous and Al-Bayda were captured chemicals from armed opposition, stated SAR Government. Another their statement was that the opposition was smuggling chemicals from neighbouring countries and seized chemical Factory near Aleppo. Several information were provided to FFM by Syrian government such as documents, social media videos and other.¹³²

¹²⁸ OPCW Technical Secretariat Report of FFM n. S/1191/2014 from 16 June 2014.

¹²⁹ Ibid

¹³⁰ Ibid

¹³¹ Ibid

¹³² Ibid

It is important to describe what FFM found in their investigations, what actually happened in Syria and what people went through. In the third report of FFM (other reports were similar), related to attacks in three villages named Talmenes, Al Tamanah and Kafr Zita, is written about attacks that occurred in those areas. 32 out of 37 interviewees heard or saw helicopters with barrel bombs and those who did not see or hear the helicopters were indoors. The explosions were described as less loud compared to conventional attacks. The number of casualties was high because people did not have proper knowledge of how to escape and where, they did not know that they had to escape upwind and to higher ground. Instead they hid in basements and chlorine, because of its density, settled down in those basements. Other factors that resulted in higher number of casualties were residential area and night time attacks.

Medical staff that helped victims was exposed to chemicals because they used common medical equipment such as gloves and surgical mask, which did not provide protection from toxicity. The smell after the bomb exploded was described as strong and suffocating, irritation to eyes and nose and smelled like household cleaning detergents. One of the interviewees was fire-fighter and he observed that after explosions of the barrels with chemicals, there was no fire afterwards as it is after conventional weapons attacks. From the info that the Mission collected they found out that predominant symptoms were coughing, shortness of breath and tearing of the eyes among many other symptoms like vomiting, diarrhoea, fatigue, feeling of burning face etc.¹³³

From information from this report is visible that people in Syria suffered a lot and actually were not provided with sufficient health care and as written above some health care workers were persecuted when they tried to provide it. At the beginning of the conflict the situation in Syria and use of chemicals were overlooked. The breakthrough was the attack that occurred in Ghouta. USA believes that more than 1 400 people were killed during attack in Ghouta. After the attack, the Secretary of State John Kerry issued a threat to Assad that if he will not hand over every single bit of his chemical arsenal within the week then military strike on his nation will be held.¹³⁴ Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov hours after Kerry's statement stated: "If the establishment of international control over chemical weapons in that country would allow avoiding strikes, we will immediately start working with Damascus. We are calling on the Syrian leadership to not only agree on placing chemical weapons storage

¹³³ OPCW Technical Secretariat Report of FFM n. S/1230/2014 from 18 December 2014.

¹³⁴ HJELMGAARD, K. Kerry to Assad: Turnover chemical weapons to prevent strikes. *eu.usatoday.com*, [online]. [viewed 19 Januray 2023]. Available from: <https://eu.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2013/09/09/syria-kerry-hague/2784809/>

sites under international control, but also on its subsequent destruction and fully joining the treaty on prohibition of chemical weapons.¹³⁵ Syria welcomed the deal between USA and Russian Federation about elimination and destruction of chemical weapons.¹³⁶

3.2. Disarmament

The first step towards the disarmament for Syria was the accession on 14 September 2013 to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons. USA and Russian Federation agreed on their joint determination to ensure the destruction of Syrian chemical arsenal. Both states expressed that extraordinary procedures were necessitated by the prior use of these weapons in civil war. They were also determined that the most effective control over Syrian chemical weapons could be achieved by destruction of the largest amount of weapons possible and outside of Syrian borders and under supervision of OPCW. Their goal was the removal and destruction of all chemicals, related material and equipment in the first half of 2014. To achieve accountability of their chemical weapons, Syria had to provide the immediate and unlimited right to inspect all sites in Syria.¹³⁷ Syria submitted the detailed information about its chemical arsenal including location and form of storage and development facilities on 19 September 2013.¹³⁸

Security Council voted unanimously on 27 September 2013 to secure and destroy Syria's chemical weapons even though China and Russia previously vetoed resolutions concerned with the Syrian issue.¹³⁹ Destruction of the weapons began on 6 October 2013 and was finished way after the scheduled deadline. The deadline was 6 February 2014. OPCW stated that the destruction of all declared weapons by SAR was completed on 4 January 2016.¹⁴⁰ But unfortunately this is not where the story ends. More chemical attacks were documented after that date when OPCW found that Sarin was used for example in an attack

¹³⁵BORGER, J. and P. WINTOUR. Russia calls on Syria to hand over chemical weapons *theguardian.com*, [online]. 9 September 2013 [viewed 19 January 2023]. Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/sep/09/russia-syria-hand-over-chemical-weapons>

¹³⁶LUCAS, R. and M. LEE. Syrian official: Chemical weapons deal a 'victory'. *eu.usatoday.com*, [online]. [viewed 19 January 2023]. Available from: <https://eu.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2013/09/15/syria-weapons-deal-victory/2816731/>

¹³⁷OPCW Executive Council Paper n. EC-M-33/NAT.1 from 17 September 2013.

¹³⁸OPCW Executive Council Decision n. EC-M-33/DEC.1 from 27 September 2013.

¹³⁹LEDERER, E. M. and M. LEE. UN Security Council unanimously votes to secure and destroy Syria's chemical weapons stockpile. *independent.co.uk*, [online]. 28 September 2013 [viewed 19 January 2023]. Available from: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/politics/un-security-council-unanimously-votes-to-secure-and-destroy-syria-s-chemical-weapons-stockpile-8846101.html>

¹⁴⁰OPCW. Destruction of declared Syrian chemical weapons completed. *opcw.org*, [online]. 4 January 2016 [viewed 19 January 2023]. Available from: <https://www.opcw.org/media-centre/news/2016/01/destruction-declared-syrian-chemical-weapons-completed>

on rebel-held Khan Sheikhoun. At least 87 people died in that attack.¹⁴¹ As a response to these attacks and to the Syrian denial of usage and stockpiling of chemical weapons, OPCW suspended Syria's voting rights in 2021. That is the first time in OPCW history that any state has received this sanction. Two thirds of nations had to vote in favour for this sanction to apply. 87 nations voted in favour, 15 were against and 34 were absent.¹⁴²

Reports about use of chemical weapons proved, that CW were used after Syria finalised disarmament of CW. Syrian actions proved realist's theory that disarmament is not possible and states would cheat and would keep the weapons for themselves and used them again in the future. Syria believed that CW could help them in the fight against rebels and that is the reason why they kept and hid them from OPCW.

Disarmament of CW in Syria is in contrast with Liberals perspective on the issue of disarmament. Liberals believe that best way to disarmament is to promote democracy in states but even if Syria is considered to be democratic in practice Syria shows signs of an authoritarian regime with one ruling party. Even if Syria welcomed agreement between U.S. and Russia about disarmament and expressed complete submission to the plan, the reality was different and disarmament was done to satisfy international community.

Social constructivism could be the one constructivist theory, that could describe why Syria cheated with their disarmament. According to social constructivism WMD have different meaning for every international actor. From this perspective Syria could see Israel's nuclear weapons as such a big threat, thank to their tense relations, that they decided to keep CW at any cost. But Constructivist mostly tends to approach disarmament as safe way how to secure international peace and security, which is in contrast with Syrian actions.

Antiwar feminists' welcome disarmament with open arms, because, as pictured in the Syria, the WMD make every conflict more dangerous and violent. One of the anti-war feminists' arguments, that actually proved to be real during the conflict, was argument about reliance on the WMD. If states rely on WMD they will not work towards other solution of the conflicts. That supports the fact that Syria cheated disarmament and still relied on CW in the conflict.

Pacifists are in contrast with everything that happened in Syria. Some pacifist could actually approve CW if they would work as peacemaker. In other words, if CW could work as

¹⁴¹ BBC. Syriawar: Sarin used in Khan Sheikhoun attack, OPCW says. *bbc.com*, [online]. 20 April 2017 [viewed 19 January 2023] Available from: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-39648503>

¹⁴² CORDER, M. States suspend Syria's OPCW right over chemical attacks. *we.archive.org*, [online]. 21 April 2021 [viewed 19 January 2023]. Available from: <https://web.archive.org/web/20220524194220/https://apnews.com/article/netherlands-chemical-weapons-damascus-the-hague-syria-ab2da467f4a4d9336010a141e5178276>

deterrent which would stop the bloodshed, then some pacifist would approve them. But that clearly has not happened in Syria. Pacifists desire a world without not only WMD but also conventional weapons and that is something that will not happen in Syria, or probably anywhere else.

Conclusion

Focuses of this thesis were chemical weapons and Civil War in Syria. What were regional and historical reasons which led to development and deployment of Syrian chemical weapons. What was the role of the state actors or non-state actors and organisations in the conflict. What were the reasons why Syria did not sign the Chemical Weapon Convention. Thesis focused on the OPCW actions in Syria and the issue of disarmament. Investigations of FFM were the most challenging in the history of OPCW, because they were conducted on the battlefield and on numerous occasions faced unpleasant situation like shooting and bomb dropping. But the role of the FFM and JIM were the most crucial for finding the perpetrator and finally disarmament of Syrian chemical weapons. Thesis was anchored with emphasis on theories of international relations. Actions of Assad's regime were compared and put in correlation with international relation theories.

The research questions of the thesis were three. The first question was: *How main theories of international relations approach the issue of chemical disarmament and which theory can best capture the current context in which Syria was very long time (contrary to other states) hesitant to chemical disarmament and later decided for chemical demilitarization?* Every international relations theory which was used for the purposes of this thesis was used in correlation with actions of Syrian government. The theory that is closest to capturing current context is realism. Multiple aspects of Syrian actions were in conformity with realism, such as usage against weak target without defence capabilities or cheating with disarmament and usage of CW after proclaimed disarmament.

The second question was: *Which foreign-political, security and legal factors led to the chemical armaments in Syria?* Chemical armament in Syria was done mostly thanks to the tense relations with their neighbouring country Israel. When Syria signed Geneva protocol from 1925, their condition was that this signature does not represent recognition of Israel. Syria was reluctant to sign CWC until all WMD were eliminated from the Middle East. Fact that Israel has nuclear weapons was strong driving force for all manner of armaments. Syria was not member of CWC until 2013, so from legal perspective Syria was not breaking any international rules regarding CW development. The biggest historical supplier of CW was Egypt and the biggest supporter of Syria in the present is Russia and Iran.

The third question was: *How it went with the chemical disarmament in Syria and what was the role of the OPCW in Syrian civil war?* The OPCW founded a FFM whose role was to investigate chemical attacks. The OPCW in cooperation with UN established a JIM whose

role was to find the perpetrator of those attacks from information provided by FFM. Syria cooperated with the OPCW and destroyed the entire declared chemical arsenal in two and half years from the beginning of the destruction. The OPCW declared completion of the task on 4 January 2014. The reality was in fact different and more chemical attacks were documented in near future. From this point it can be stated that disarmament of CW in Syria was not completed and the OPCW was deceived by Syrian government.

Consequences of this conflict are felt by the whole world. Everyone is able to find videos and photos of people who were struck by the conflict and not just by conventional weapons but also chemical weapons or by the fact that they had to leave their home and look for shelter in different countries which culminated in the biggest migration crisis. Syria is country that couldn't handle their national problems peacefully without bloodshed. President Assad and his regime were not able to negotiate with their opponents and chose violence instead of diplomacy. Thanks to their important allies Russia and Iran they were able to gather munitions and international backup. Security Council of United Nations was unable to solve the problem thanks to the Russians vetoes. Even though Syria was forced by international community to disarm their chemical arsenal, Assad's regime still used their chemical weapons in the conflict.

Even though realism can best capture the current context of Syrian civil war, the reality is far more complicated than the theory. Theories and especially realism view states as unitary actors, but there is difference between government rhetoric and situation on the battlefield, where the officers are making the most important decisions. Submission of Syria to the disarmament can be seen as pragmatism of the government and as an attempt to survive. Because Syria, ravaged by civil war, could not afford U.S. intervention. Since the Ghouta attack weeks passed before the investigation was conducted on site in Syria. There was plenty of time for Syrian government to hid or destroy evidence. From the evidence collected is clear that this statement is not just presumption but reality. Because declared CW were destroyed but CW were still used afterwards. The topic of Syrian civil war has a lot of potential for further exploration, for example where the migration crisis leads and what it brings to the states that were affected the most by the migration. This includes not only changes in the composition of the population but also political opportunities for political parties. Some political parties can build their agenda around fear of foreigners and gain more voters who do not like immigrants. Other parties can use it for support of their social sensitivity.

Resources

LITERATURE:

BENTLEY, M. *Syria and the chemical weapons taboo: Exploiting the forbidden*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016. ISBN 978-1526104724

COHN, C. and RUDDICK, S. A feminist Ethical Perspective on Weapons of Mass Destruction. *Consortium on Gender, Security, and Human Rights*. 2003. Working Paper No. 104/2003.

COHN, C. and S. RUDDICK. A Feminist Ethical Perspective on Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. pp. 405-435. ISBN 978-0-511-21190-4

DUANE, L. C. *From Pacifism to Warism: A Moral Continuum*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989. ISBN 9781439903124

FILIPEC, Ondřej. *Úvod do problematiky zbraní hromadného ničení*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2013. p. 184. ISBN 978-80-244-3810-8

HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. ISBN 978-0-511-21190-4

HOLMES, R. L. Pacifism and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. pp. 451-469. ISBN 978-0-511-21190-4

MARTIN, S. B. Realism and Weapons of Mass Destruction: A Consequentialist Analysis. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. pp. 96-110. ISBN 978-0-511-21190-4

PEACH, L. J. A Pragmatist Feminist Approach to the Ethics of Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. pp. 436-450. ISBN 978-0-511-21190-4

PRICE, R, TANNENWALD, N. Norms and Deterrence: The Nuclear and Chemical Weapons Taboos. In: KATZENSTEIN, P. J., *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997, pp. 99-129 ISBN 0-231-10468-5

SAGAN, S. D. and K. N. WALTZ. *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: An Enduring Debate*. 3rd ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2012. ISBN 978-0393920109

SAGAN, S. D. Realist Perspectives on Ethical Norms and Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. pp. 73-95. ISBN 978-0-511-21190-4

SHUE, H. Liberalism: The Impossibility of Justifying Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. pp. 139-162. ISBN 978-0-511-21190-4

WALTZ, K. N. The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Better. In: BETTS, R. K. (ed.) *Conflict After the Cold War: Arguments on Cause of War and Peace*. 5th ed. New York: Routledge, 2017. ISBN 978-1138290693

WALZER, M. A Liberal Perspective on Deterrence and Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: HASHMI, S. and S. LEE. (eds.) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Religious and Secular Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2004. pp. 163-167. ISBN 978-0-511-21190-4

WALZER, M. *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*. Basic Books, 1977. ISBN 071391162X

RESOLUTIONS, REPORTS:

OPCW Executive Council Decision n. EC-M-33/DEC.1 (2013)

OPCW Executive Council Paper n. EC-M-33/NAT.1 (2013)

OPCW Technical Secretariat Report of FFM n. S/1191/2014 (2014)

OPCW Technical Secretariat Report of FFM n. S/1230/2014 (2014)

UN General Assembly Security Council Letter n. A/68/398-S/2013/565 (2013)

UN General Assembly Security Council Report n. A/67/997-S/2013/553 (2013)

UN Security Council Report n. S/2017/904 (2017)

UN Security Council Resolution n. 2165 (2014)

UN Security Council Resolution n. S/2020/654 (2020)

UN Security Council Resolution n. S/RES/2254 (2015)

PERIODICS

ALOLAIFY, M. Disarmament: Evolution or revolution. *World Affairs: The Journal of International Issues*, 2017, 21(1), pp. 32-47.

COHN, C. Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals. *Within and Without: Women, Gender, and Theory*. 1987. 12(4). pp. 687-718.

COHN, C., F. HILL and S. RUDDICK, The Relevance of Gender for Eliminating Weapons of Mass Destruction, *Disarmament Diplomacy* 80 [online]. 2005 [viewed 20 February 2022]. Available from: https://genderandsecurity.org/sites/default/files/the_relevance_of_gender_for_eliminating_weapons_of_mass_destruction_-_cohn_hill_ruddick.pdf

DIAB, M. Z., Syria's Chemical and Biological Weapons: Assessing Capabilities and Motivations. *The Nonproliferation Review*, 1997, 5(1), pp. 104-111.

ESSAWY, R. M. The Implied Powers Doctrine in the Fight against Chemical Weapons in Syria: Any Useful Purpose. *Military Law and Law of War Review*, 2018, 56(1), pp. 93-134.

FOUAD, F.M., A. SPARROW, et al. Health workers and the weaponisation of health care in Syria: a preliminary inquiry for The Lancet–American University of Beirut Commission on Syria. *Lancet*. 2017. 390(10111), PMID: 28314568.

FRIEDMAN, D. Dismantling Chemical Weapons in Syria: Lessons, Insights, and Implications for Israel *The Institute for National Security Studies. Strategic Assessment*. 2014. 16(4).

FULTON, W., J. HOLLIDAY and S. WYER. IRANIAN STRATEGY IN SYRIA. *A joint report by AEI's critical threats project and institute for the study of war*. 2013.

HOWARD, P. Why Not Invade North Korea? Threats Language Games, and U.S. Foreign Policy. *International Studies Quarterly*. 2004. 48(4). pp. 805-828.

KATAGIRI, N. Between Structural Realism and Liberalism: Japan's Threat Perception and Response. *International Studies Perspectives*. 2018, 19(4), pp. 325-343.

LeFEVER, E. W. Undue Alarm Over Nuclear Spread? *The Wall Street Journal*. 1976, p. 12.

SHOHAM, D. Chemical and Biological Weapons in Egypt. *The Nonproliferation Review*. 1998. pp. 48-58.

SHOHAM, D. The Evolution of Chemical and Biological Weapons in Egypt. *Ariel Center for Policy Research. Policy Paper*. 1998. 46. pp. 1-30.

WALTZ, K. N. The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*. 1988 18(4). pp. 615-628.

WENDT, A. Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization*, 1992. 46(2). pp. 396-397.

WINES, M. Confrontation in the Gulf; U.S. Explores New Strategies to Limit Weapons of Mass Destruction. *The New York Times*. 1990, Section 1. p. 20.

WOODS, M. Reflection on Nuclear Optimism: Waltz, Burke and Proliferation. *Review of International Studies*, 2002 18(1), p. 163-189.

INTERNET RESOURCES

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY (ATSDR). Toxicological profile for Strontium. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *delaware.gov* [online]. 2004 [viewed 12 February 2022] Available from: <https://dhss.delaware.gov/dhss/dph/files/strontiumfaq.pdf>

Ali Akbar Velayati answering Nasim's question: The 2+1 Coalition does not have a narrow perspective because it is not connected to any one party. *nasimonline.ir*, [online] 27 March 2013 [viewed 15 December 2022]. Available from: <http://www.nasimonline.ir/TextVersion/Detail/?Id=506386&Serv=24>.

Aspen Institute. What is Agent Orange? *aspeninstitute.org*, [online]. [viewed 11. November 2022]. Available at: <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/programs/agent-orange-in-vietnam-program/what-is-agent-orange/#:~:text=Agent%20Orange%20was%20a%20herbicide,to%20have%20harmful%20impact%20today>.

BBC. Syria war: Sarin used in Khan Sheikhoun attack, OPCW says. *bbc.com*, [online]. 20 April 2017 [viewed 19 January 2023]. Available from: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-39648503>

BORGER, J. and P. WINTOUR. Russia calls on Syria to hand over chemical weapons *theguardian.com*, [online]. 9 September 2013 [viewed 19 January 2023]. Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/sep/09/russia-syria-hand-over-chemical-weapons>

BOUCKAERT, P. ATTACKS ON GHOUTA: Analysis of Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons in Syria. *Human Rights Watch report* [online]. 2013. [viewed 15 November 2022]. Available at: hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/syria_cw0913_web_1.pdf ISBN: 978-1-6231-30534.

Civil Rights Defenders. Eastern and Western Ghouta Sarin Attack. *crd.org*, [online]. [viewed 10 January 2023]. Available from: <https://crd.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/EASTERN-GHOUTA-SUMMARY-EN-final.pdf>

CONFLICT, PEACE-BUILDING, DISARMAMENT, SECURITY: a) weapons of mass destruction. *oecd.org* [online]. [viewed 12 February 2022]. Available from: <https://www.oecd.org/social/gender-development/1896576.pdf>

CORDER, M. States suspend Syria's OPCW right over chemical attacks. *we.archive.org*, [online]. 21 April 2021 [viewed 19 January 2023]. Available from:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20220524194220/https://apnews.com/article/netherlands-chemical-weapons-damascus-the-hague-syria-ab2da467f4a4d9336010a141e5178276>

Council of the EU. Declaration by the High Representative on behalf of the EU on the US strike in Syria. *consilium.europa.eu*, [online]. 7 April 2017 [viewed 18 March 2021]. Available from: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2017/04/07/hr-declaration-us-strike-syria/>

Dettmer, J. Russia Expands Military Facilities in Syria. *voanews.com*, [online]. 12 May 2021 [viewed 10 December 2022]. Available from: https://www.voanews.com/a/middle-east_russia-expands-military-facilities-syria/6205742.html

Director of Central Intelligence Implications of Soviet use of chemical and toxin weapons for U.S. security interests. *Special National Intelligence Estimate* [online]. 1983 [viewed 10 December 2022]. pp. 1-16. Available from: irp.fas.org/threat/cbw/sniecebw1983.pdf

Ghouta chemical attack. *en.wikipedia.org* [online] Edited 13 January 2023 [viewed 17 January 2023] Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ghouta_chemical_attack

GOH, M. Red Cross Declares Civil War In Syria. *npr.org*, [online]. 15 July 2012 [viewed 4. March 2021]. Available from: <https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2012/07/15/156808427/red-cross-declares-civil-war-in-syria>

HIGGINS, E. Volcanoes in Damascus. *bellingcat.com*, [online]. 15 July 2014 [viewed 17 January 2023]. Available from: <https://www.bellingcat.com/resources/case-studies/2014/07/15/volcanoes-in-damascus/>

HJELMGAARD, K. Kerry to Assad: Turn over chemical weapons to prevent strikes. *eu.usatoday.com*, [online]. [viewed 19 Januray 2023]. Available from: <https://eu.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2013/09/09/syria-kerry-hague/2784809/>

Human Rights Watch. Attackon Ghouta, Analysis of Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons in Syria. *hrw.org*, [online]. 10 September 2013 [viewed 15 March 2022]. Available from: <https://www.hrw.org/report/2013/09/10/attacks-ghouta/analysis-alleged-use-chemical-weapons-syria>

HUSSEIN, S. A. Arab League to Asharq Al-Awsat: Differences Persist on Restoring Syria Membership. *aawsat.com*, [online]. 3 May 2020 [viewed 4 March 2021]. Available from: <https://english.aawsat.com/home/article/2265011/arab-league-asharq-al-awsat-differences-persist-restoring-syria-membership>

LEDERER, E. M. and M. LEE. UN Security Council unanimously votes to secure and destroy Syria's chemical weapons stockpile. *independent.co.uk*, [online]. 28 September 2013

[viewed 19 January 2023]. Available from: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/politics/un-security-council-unanimously-votes-to-secure-and-destroy-syria-s-chemical-weapons-stockpile-8846101.html>

LUCAS, R. and M. LEE. Syrian official: Chemical weapons deal a 'victory'. *eu.usatoday.com*, [online]. [viewed 19 January 2023]. Available from: <https://eu.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2013/09/15/syria-weapons-deal-victory/2816731/>

MacFARQUHAR, N. SCHMITT, E., Syria Threatens Chemical Attack on Foreign Force. *nytimes.com*, [online]. 23 July 2012 [viewed 17 January 2023]. Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/24/world/middleeast/chemicalweapons-wont-be-used-in-rebellion-syria-says.html>

MALON, W. WMD: Where Did the Phrase Come from? *History News Network*, [online]. [viewed 15 March 2022]. par. 2. Available from: <https://historynewsnetwork.org/article/1522#:~:text=The%20term%20Weapons%20of%20Mass%20Destruction%20was%20first%20used%20in,the%20town%20of%20Guernica%2C%20Spain.>

National evaluation. Chemical attack of 4 April 2017 (Khan Sheikhoun) Clandestine Syrian chemical weapons programme. *diplomatie.gouv.fr*, [online]. [viewed 17 January 2023]. Available from: https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/170425_-_evaluation_nationale_-_anglais_-_final_cle0dbf47-1.pdf

Old German-Syrian chemical deal. *dw.com*, [online]. 18 September 2013 [viewed 18 December 2022]. Available from: <https://www.dw.com/en/germany-confirms-past-chemical-deliveries-to-syria/a-17098815#:~:text=Germany%20approved%20deliveries%20of%20more,leaning%20coalitions%20both%20did%20so.>

OPCW. Destruction of declared Syrian chemical weapons completed. *opcw.org*, [online]. 4 January 2016 [viewed 19 January 2023]. Available from: <https://www.opcw.org/media-centre/news/2016/01/destruction-declared-syrian-chemical-weapons-completed>

Physicians for Human Rights. Illegal Attacks on health Care in Syria. *syriamap.phr.org*, [online]. [viewed 20 November 2022]. Available from: <http://syriamap.phr.org/#/en>

SAUL, J. HAFEZI, P. Iran boosts military support in Syria to bolster Assad. *rueters.com*, [online]. 21 February 2014 [viewed 18 January 2023]. Available from: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-syria-crisis-iran-idUKBREA1K09U20140221>

SCHNEIDER, T. and T. LÜTKEFEND. Nowhere to Hide: The Logic of Chemical Weapons Use in Syria. *Global Public Policy Institute* [online]. 2019 [viewed 20 November 2022].

Available

from:

https://www.gppi.net/media/GPPi_Schneider_Luetkefend_2019_Nowhere_to_Hide_Web.pdf
Syrian Network for Human Rights. Civilian Death Toll. *snhr.org*, [online]. September 2022 [viewed 30 November 2022]. Available from: <https://snhr.org/blog/2021/06/14/civilian-death-toll/>

UN Library. UN Security Council Meetings & Outcomes Tables. *research.un.org*, [online]. 19 September 2022 [viewed 15 November 2022]. Available from: <https://research.un.org/en/docs/sc/quick/veto>

UN Refugee Agency. Syria Refugee Crisis Explained. *unrefugees.org*, [online]. 8 July 2022 [viewed 15 December 2022]. Available from: <https://www.unrefugees.org/news/syria-refugee-crisis-explained/#:~:text=More%20than%206.8%20million%20Syrians,in%20T%C3%BCrkiye%2C%20Lebanon%20and%20Jordan.>

Abstract

This thesis addresses chemical disarmament in Syria in contrast to the civil war. Thesis is anchored with emphasis on theories of international relations. The aim of the thesis was to find out how the disarmament of chemical weapons in Syria was conducted and what the role of the OPCW was. The thesis is written as an interpretive case study. The actions of the Assad regime are examined from the perspective of international relations theories and then compared with them. The thesis also examines other actors who played important roles in the conflict. In conclusion, the disarmament was only partially successful and further oversight of Syria is necessary.

Abstrakt

Tato diplomová práce řeší chemické odzbrojení v Sýrii v kontrastu občanské války. Práce je ukotvena v teoriích mezinárodních vztahů. Cílem práce bylo zjistit jak probíhalo odzbrojení chemických zbraní v Sýrii a jaká byla role Organizace pro zákaz chemických zbraní. Práce je zpracována jako interpretační případová studie. Činnost Assadova režimu je zkoumána z pohledu teorií mezinárodních vztahů a následně s nimi porovnávána. Práce se věnuje i dalším aktérům, kteří sehráli důležitou roli v konfliktu. Závěrem nutno dodat, že odzbrojení bylo úspěšné jen z části a další dohled nad Sýrií je nutný.

Key words

Syria, Russia, Iran, President Assad, Syrian government, Syrian civil war, Ghouta attack, chemical weapons, weapons of mass destruction, realism, liberalism, constructivism, feminism, pacifism, international relations theories, critical theories, OPCW, fact-finding mission, disarmament

Klíčová slova

Sýrie, Rusko, Írán, Prezident Assad, Syrská vláda, občanská válka v Sýrii, útok v Ghútě, chemické zbraně, zbraně hromadného ničení, realismus, liberalismus, konstruktivismus, feminismus, pacifismus, teorie mezinárodních vztahů, kritické teorie, Organizace pro zákaz chemických zbraní, průzkumná mise, odzbrojení