Erdem Eren DEMİR*
Atatürk University
Institute of Forensic Sciences

Mehmet Ali TEKİNER**
Turkish National Police Academy
Institute of Security Science

Aybüke A. İsbir TURAN****
Turkish National Police Academy
Institute of Forensic Sciences

Review paper
Received: 21 April 2022
Accepted: 4 August 2022
UDK: 351.75
623.4.015.4
https://doi.org/10.47152/rkkp.60.3.4

THE ROLE OF NON-LETHAL WEAPONS IN PUBLIC SECURITY

After World War II, “human rights” became a very vital issue all over the world, and with the publication of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations at the end of 1948, the subject gained an international status. In this context, the level of power to be applied by law enforcement officers in preventing the incidents and the equipment they use have started to be discussed. Equipment called “non-lethal weapons - NLW” began to be used in mass actions to end the incidents by causing less harm to both activists and third parties who were not involved in the action. The primary purpose of using NLWs is

* E-mail: erdemerendemir@yahoo.com

** E-mail: malitekiner@gmail.com

*** E-mail: aybuke.turan@gmail.com, aybukeayse.turan@pa.edu.tr

to minimize the severe human consequences during the intervention process to deter individuals from participating in the actions and to minimize the damage. Although it is called a non-lethal weapon, some negative consequences can be encountered due to the wrong or disproportionate use of this equipment, which can undermine the trust of citizens, who are not directly related to the events, in the state and naturally, the law enforcement forces, and the countries' prestige can lose. For this reason, it is necessary to know and teach the issues needed to effectively use non-lethal weapons that give new capabilities to law enforcement officers. This study aims to examine the non-lethal weapons used by law enforcement officers to investigate the legal regulations on these weapons and their ammunition at the international and national level and to provide basic information on the types of NLW and their use. The scarcity of academic studies on non-lethal weapons in the national literature increases the importance of this study. As a result of the research, it has been determined that the main way of harming people and the environment as little as possible in the process of intervention in social events is the conscious use of NLWs by law enforcement officials.

Keywords: non-lethal weapons, chemical weapons, less deadly weapons, social intervention, non-lethal weapon legislation.

1. Introduction

With regards to weapons, technologies that are often the first to come to mind are “lethal weapons”. However, there is also a technology that does not aim to kill and focuses only on weakening the target. This technology is defined as a non-lethal weapon. Nonlethal weapons (NLWs) are weapons that are less likely to kill a living target than conventional weapons and are intended to incapacitate or repel personnel without injuring them. NLWs are now considered for the full spectrum of conflicts from major theater wars to personal defense. Chemical agents that can be used as NLWs include riot control agents (RCAs), calmatives, and various types of disabling biochemical agents such as incapacitating agents (ICAs) (Balali et al., 2014). A significant number of weapons are used for military and policing purposes, which both academics and practitioners call “non-lethal” or “less deadly”. In recent years, non-lethal weapons have been increasingly used for widespread application as a way of promoting national security. Encouraged by technological developments that allow for forms of power that were not conceived in previous periods, this new tool reveals new ways of managing struggle and

conflict in today's world. Weapons such as tasers, water cannons and dazzling lasers are important and prominent examples of "non-lethal" technology. Countries have strongly encouraged the deployment of such technology as a more humane alternative to lethal power, however; history showed that non-lethal weapons do not contain an absolute zero probability of death. Non-lethal weapons can also cause death from misuse, often causing serious injuries and high levels of pain. Hence, there are human rights concerns regarding the use of such weapons.

2. The Development of Non-Lethal Weapons

The first historically known agent from agents in the category of non-lethal weapons, Chloroacetophenone was first synthesized in 1870 by the Germans. It is used as a riot control agent (Riot Control Agent-RCA) due to its potency as a lachrymatory agent. It got its fame after World War I when it was given the trade name Mace, the first American manufacturer of CN devices and sold for personal and commercial protection. Generically, it is known as tear gas (Salem et al., 2014a).

CS, or o-chlorobenzylidene malononitrile, is the current major riot control agent (RCA) used by U.S. military forces. It was originally synthesized in 1928 by Corson and Stoughton, and the U.S. Army designated the compound 'CS' for the authors' initials. CS replaced CN, chloroacetophenone, in 1959 as the U.S. Army's premier RCA due to its higher safety ratio over CN (Salem et al., 2014b).

Increasing civil disobedience incidents, protests and demonstrations at that time started to force public security, and the concept of non-lethal weapons was introduced in law enforcement scenarios created to control riots. In these years, NLW technologies started to be supported by the United States of America (USA). In the report submitted by the President of the USA to the Law Enforcement and Justice Administration Commission in 1967, it was proposed to limit the use of lethal force by the police and it was aimed to increase the capabilities of the police for the use of NLW in the scope of the Street Law enacted in the USA in 1968. Riot control and elimination of the police were mentioned in most of the content of the book named "Materials and Techniques" published by Rex Applegate in 1969 (Davison, 2006). The USA, which is one of the largest producers of non-lethal technology, started using this term in the late 1990s. The primary purpose of non-lethal weapons, which are regularly used in weapon programs, is not to kill, but to neutralize the target (Hoffberger, 2017). Non-lethal technology should serve as an alternative to lethal power and contribute to the humanization of interven-

tions (Meron, 2000). In the same years, other countries such as Russia, China, Israel, France, and South Africa began investing large amounts in the development of non-lethal technology.

In this period, as a result of the developments in the military field, new spray systems were developed with the chemical irritant CS (Chlorobenzylidene Malononitrile), which led to the change of CN (Chloroacetophenone). Transition from the “rebellion” dimension to the “action” dimension in social events in terms of perception has also changed the dimension of the weapons used by the personnel during the intervention to social events. As a matter of fact, the armed forces, which maintain the social order, have started to use a wide variety of NLW’s, such as batons (iron, plastic, wood) with a lower lethality index, plastic and wooden bullets, electroshock devices and chemical gases (Davison, 2006).

Despite the increased interest in non-lethal weapons, a generally accepted definition of this concept has not been put forward. According to the description made by the United States Department of Defense, non-lethal weapons are “designed to neutralize the target; These are weapons that minimize deaths, injuries and unwanted damages and are primarily desired to be used (Sheldon, 1999). In a similar definition made by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), non-lethal weapons are referred to as “weapons designed and developed to neutralize the target with minimal unwanted damage or impact on the environment, with a low probability of death or permanent injury” (Casey-Maslen, 2010).

Fidler (2005) emphasizes that the concept should be changed to “less deadly” by some non-governmental organizations and researchers based on the deaths caused by the use of “non-lethal weapons”.

There are also exaggerated views on non-lethal weapons (NLW). Sheldon (1999), as one of the biggest supporters of the NLWs, defines these weapons as weapons that aim to defeat an enemy’s deadly power in a non-lethal way by destroying their aggressive capability and temporarily neutralizing the attackers.

Tumbarska (2017) states that although such a definition is wrong, it represents an important end of the conceptual spectrum. The description that was made shows the longstanding hope that non-lethal weapons can defeat an opponent without permanent damage to almost anything or anyone.

The non-lethal identity of a weapon comes not only from the way of use but also from its design. However, there are clearly no fundamental assumptions that these weapons have eliminated or minimized deaths. In order to maximize the flexibility in design, a lethal minimum quantitative threshold has not been determined (Mandel, 2004). Also, Mandel (2004) states that the definitional prob-

lem of non-lethal weapons poses some problems, and asks the following questions to discuss whether a weapon is lethal or not: “Is a small explosive material designed to control and demolish structures and detonated away from known human populations, a non-lethal weapon? Is it correct to classify a foam barrier as a weapon? How can one discuss the amount of damage a weapon would be appropriately classified as non-lethal? “

Because of all this it becomes almost impossible to develop a general definition that clearly shows how to distinguish between non-lethal and lethal weapons. However, despite this inherent uncertainty, it is possible to gain a general understanding of what is included and excluded from the concept of a non-lethal weapon.

3. Classification of Non-Lethal Weapons

While there are many ways to subdivide non-lethal security tools, several common typologies can be mentioned. It is possible to classify the effects of the non-lethal weapon according to the acoustic, biotechnical, chemical, electromagnetic, mechanical and optical forms of the technology. In another classification, a distinction is made between target types. In this classification, a distinction is made as counter personnel measures (including cleaning the facilities/structures of staff, neutralizing individuals, influencing crowd control, etc.) and counter material measures (including disabling equipment and facilities, blocking an area from access by vehicles, etc.) (Mandel, 2004). The classification made by Bedard (2002) is similar to the classification made by Mandel, but Bedard categorizes non-lethal weapons against personnel, against materials and equipment and against infrastructure. Fidler (1999) states that there is serious complexity in describing exactly what non-lethal weapons are, and therefore it is difficult to classify. Stating that some classifications are based on technological differences, Fidler suggests that a distinction can be made according to whether they use chemicals, biological materials, electricity, acoustics or electromagnetism as operational technology. According to Fidler, non-lethal weapons can be classified as acoustic, biological, chemical, digital, electrical, electromagnetic, environmental, kinetic, optical and psychological weapons (Table 1).

Table 1. *An Example of Classification for Non-lethal Weapons According to Their Technology*

Technology Type	Examples	Target
Acoustic	- High Frequency Sound	Staff
	- Low Frequency Sound	Staff
	- Multiple Complex Sound	Staff
	- Treble Sound	Staff
Biological	- Biodegradable Microbes	Materiel
	- Disease Microbes	Staff
	- Disease Carrying Arthropods	Staff
Chemical	- Riot / Chaos Control Agents	Staff
	- Sedatives	Staff
	- Nausea / Vomiting Indicators	Staff
	- Deodorizing Agents	Staff
	- Abrasives	Materiel
	- Super lubricants	Materiel/Staff
	- Adhesives	Materiel/Staff
	- Brittle Agents	Materiel
Digital	- Computer Viruses	Materiel
	- Computer Worms	Materiel
Electrical	- Electric Shock	Staff
	- Electrical System Disruptors	Materiel
	- Electronic Noise Makers	Materiel
Electromechanical	- Electromagnetic Pulses	Materiel/Staff
	- Microwaves	Materiel/Staff
Environmental	- Weather Changers	Materiel/Staff
	- Ionospheric Modification	Materiel
	- Herb Killers	Staff
Kinetic	- Water ball	Staff
	- Air Cannon	Staff
	- Blind Object Mines	Staff
	- Blind Object Ammo	Staff
Mechanic	- Iron Thorn	Materiel
	- Robots	Materiel
Optical	- Lasers	Material / Staff
	- Flash Bombs	Staff
	- Cloakers	Materiel
	- Holographic Projections	Staff

Source: Fidler, 1999: 61

4. Non-lethal Weapon Types

There are many types of NLWs. Batons, gas cartridges and water cannons (TOMA) can be given as examples of the NLWs, which are the most known among the people. Apart from these, there is a wide range of products from chemical irritants to electric weapons, from adhesive foams and gels to weapons using laser technology.

The batons, which are defined as “short, thick stick” and “sticks made of rubber used by the police” in the Turkish Language Association’s Contemporary Turkish Dictionary, are used by law enforcement officers to ward off protestors and neutralize them. The use of batons creates a physical pain as well as a psychological effect on target people (İBB, 2019). The use of batons is included in the expression of the use of material force in Article 16 of the Law on Police Duties and Authorities (PVSK) No 2559:

“Material power; It refers to handcuffs, batons, pressurized water, tear gas or dust, physical barriers, police dogs and horses and other service vehicles used by the police against people who resist or outside of body force.” (PVSK, Article 16).

Batons are made of wood and plastic materials and polycarbonate materials due to their flexibility and lightness. Generally, it is divided into three classes as long Cop (70-90 cm tall), medium Cop (50-60 cm tall), short Cop (30-45 cm tall).

The first use of chemical weapons in the modern sense was in the First World War. During the war, the Germans attacked with chlorine and mustard gas and the French with phosgene gas. Although the use of chemical weapons is prohibited with the Geneva Protocol signed after the war, it is known that Italy used chemical weapons in Ethiopia, Japan used them in Manchuria and the USA in Vietnam (Deniz, 2018).

Tear, aggressive and emetic chemical gases are used during the intervention to social events. These chemical compounds, known as gas bombs and used to neutralize the masses, are named according to their structure and abbreviations are placed on the gas bomb cartridge and capsule. There are four types of gas bombs commonly used (TMMOB, 2019):

CS - Chlorobenzylidene Malononitrile ($C_{10}H_5ClN_2$): In addition to its liquid form, CS can also be found in the form of a white, crystalline powder. After exposure to this gas, its effect occurs between 20-60 seconds and disappears within 10-30 minutes. These gases can be found in the form of grenades as well as in 37/38 mm gas cartridges (Evancoe, 1993).

CN- Chloroacetophenone (C_8H_7ClO): When I am exposed to CN, a chemical gas with apple blossom scent, tears occur and a burning sensation occurs in

other affected areas. This chemical compound, which causes redness on the surfaces it touches on the skin, causes tears in the eyes, blood, allergies, etc. While it shows effects, its effects begin to disappear when you go out to clean air (Deniz, 2018).

CR-Dibenz [b, f]1,4-oxazepine (C13H9NO) is more potent but less toxic than CS. The irritating effects on the eyes and skin irritation are more transitory than those of other RCAs such as CS. Vesication or contact sensitization is not associated with CR exposure. Part of its high safety profile is due to its low volatility, which mini- mizes its effects on the pulmonary system. It does not degrade in water and thus persists in the environment. The effects on the skin or eyes do not appear to be persistent. Reversible slight redness and mild chemosis were observed in rabbit eyes after a single application of a 1% solution of CR, and after the application of a 5% solution of CR, moderate conjunctivitis with normal corneal and eyelid tissues was reported. On contact with the skin, CR elicits transient erythema lasting for 1–2 h, with a burning sensation lasting 15–30 min on the exposure site but without any vesication, contact sensitization, or delay in the healing of skin injuries, even under adverse conditions. The burning sensation is more intense and lasts longer on exposure to CR than CS. Many areas of the skin are resistant to irritation, including the ears, nose, scalp, palms of the hands, knees, and the lower legs (Balali et al., 2014).

DM: Chlorodihydrophenarsazine ($C_{12}H_9AsClN$): Being a less used agent than other gases, DM can cause nausea-vomiting and diarrhea.

Oleoresin Capsicum: It is a water-insoluble oil that is soluble with organic solvents, obtained as a result of the extraction of chili pepper or cayenne pepper, known as chili pepper. At the end of the dissolution process, with the evaporation of the solvent, a wax-like substance remains and this substance is called “Oleoresincapsicum”. Since natural pepper gas production requires an expensive technology, it is also produced synthetically (TTB, 2011).

Various types of gas are used extensively by security forces all over the world under the name of tear gas or demonstration control agents to suppress social events. The most important effects of these NLWs are; They cause severe irritation on the eyes, nose, respiratory tract and skin.

These NLWs, which are used as shock guns, are called taser guns, and these devices can deliver electrical current to the target person for a period of 2-5 seconds. Taser guns are devices that are designed to neutralize a person through short and repetitive electrical impulses that are shaped like a barb and distributed through electrodes attached to insulated wires (Kleinig, 2007). While 2 seconds of current may be sufficient to neutralize a general aggressor or a person who

poses a danger, the duration of the current can be increased by 5 seconds for people who are out of control, insane or are in great danger.

One of the most used intervention tactics in social events is the dispersal of the activist group using water cannons. One of the tools used for this purpose is TOMA (Social Events Intervention Vehicle) and the other is water panzer. These tools can throw the water very far with pressure. The aim here is to disperse the more passive activists in the activist group. In addition, they undertake violent acts (Molotov, explosives, flammable materials, etc.). There is also the ability to throw gaseous water mixed with the gas substance according to the action style of the activist group (Keskin, 2012). The effectiveness of TOMAs can be increased by using chemicals that are not harmful to health.

These NLWs, which are used to capture criminals who attempt to escape, receive great support from the public because they enable them to capture the target without harming them. Nets with different features can be used in net shooting rifles. Nets with pepper powder placed on them have the ability to neutralize the target even if the net is not fully entangled in the target. Stun webs contain 60 KV of electricity, neutralizing it with the current on its target. Blocking webs that enable the detection of the target with a sensor placed at the tip of the web bullet and open when it approaches the target are also used with these weapons (Flint, 1995; Grudowski, 1995).

Kinetic impact bullets, which have almost no lethal effects compared to lethal ammunition fired with firearms, are a special ammunition with high deterrence due to the pain it inflicts and is one of the most accepted measures in the world in terms of use. These non-lethal weapons (NLW), whose bullet core or shots are completely made of rubber in place of metal, do not cause permanent damage to muscle tissue when fired from distances over 10 meters. However, it is not recommended to be used at ranges below that distance, as it causes permanent damage for shots from closer than 10 meters. Many different NLWs such as rubber bullet, plastic bullet, impact bullet, baton round, bean bag round and attenuating energy projectile are used under the title of kinetic impact bullets (Deniz, 2018).

Dazzling weapons, a kind of energy weapon, are used by law enforcement agencies, especially against people in a moving vehicle. This kind of NLW can be used to capture moving targets from short distances up to several kilometers depending on the model.

Dazzling weapons, including tools such as laser or light emitting diodes (LED), can be used in high-risk cases especially as an alternative to firearms use. There are various mechanisms such as a rangefinder in the device to prevent the

target person from being blind. Dazzling weapons are generally used to deactivate the person in these situations. These devices are used only in exceptional situations, such as counter-terrorism operations, due to the possibility of burning eyes and causing permanent blindness (Deniz, 2018).

Sticky foam is one of the weapons developed for intervention in social events. Such foams harden immediately after being sprayed anywhere and prevent the movements of individuals. When the sticky foam is sprayed on an aggressive or demonstrator, it neutralizes the person or persons by sticking them to each other or where they are, thanks to the adhesive in its content (Fischetti, 1995). Based on its general chemical structure, 95% water and 5% polymer, adhesive slippery gels are a new product that can be used in the future to prevent a vehicle escaping by law enforcement or individuals who cause problems by trying to enter a building (Barry and Morganthau, 1994).

Weapons produced with laser technology are products that are in the NLW category and cause serious anxiety. Laser guns, which are adjusted to cause temporary blindness, cannot show the desired effect if the target has night vision binoculars or a similar product in the eye of the target, or if there is a device used by special teams and army units (Fischetti, 1995).

5. Legal Regulations Regarding Non-Lethal Weapons in the World and in Turkey

The increasing spread of non-lethal technology in both military and policing contexts has become an issue for international lawyers from the perspective of humanitarian law and human rights law (Hoffberger, 2017). The dominant philosophy of international law is positivism. For a long time, in the field of international law, the development and use of weapons that cause unnecessary injuries or unnecessary suffering has been studied.

Prohibiting the use of explosive loads lighter than 400 grams and signed in 1868, St. Petersburg Declaration was the first international agreement to impose restrictions on the conduct of the war. It is a fundamental document in this field, as it makes a logic that the needs of war must comply with the laws of humanity. While efforts to regulate new military technologies have been developed in the international arena in the last 150 years, there are two main ways in terms of law. The first is the determination of common principles and rules regarding all means and methods of war, and the second is the signing of international agreements that prohibit or restrict the use of certain types of vehicles (chemical and biological weapons, anti-personnel mines, etc.) (Tumbarska and Petkov, 2017).

Obligations and treaties to the international community are regulated by a combination of customary law. This may have important consequences for the law of war. Because small states are not strong in blocking the use of some technologies owned by the big ones. Therefore, weaker states may refuse to ratify international agreements or consent to the development of relevant norms (Ticehurst, 1997). However, a 2005 study on the Red Cross revealed that the principles and rules contained in treaty law were widely accepted in practice and greatly influenced the formation of customary international law. Many of these principles and rules are now part of customary international law. Therefore, agreements are binding for all states regardless of their ratification (Henckaerts, 2005).

Conventional, biological, and chemical weapon control regimes severely limit the potential use of non-lethal weapons. This limitation further exacerbates the problems identified by the concept of non-lethal weapons. Calling weapons non-lethal does not subject them to a lower international legal scrutiny in connection with gun control regimes. However, some important potentially non-lethal weapon technologies such as acoustic and electromagnetic weapons are not affected by current weapon control disciplines because they do not fall under any of the existing agreements on conventional, biological and chemical weapons. While the relevant principles can be derived from the conventional weapon regime applicable to acoustic and electromagnetic weapons, such a practice is not required under any existing agreement. At present, international legal analysis of the use of these weapons would essentially fall under the principles of customary international law, such as the duty not to cause unnecessary injury or unnecessary suffering (Fidler, 1999).

According to experts, international law does not provide sufficient clarity on NLW and treaties and other legal instruments have not been adapted to modern weapon capabilities (Koplow, 2005). An important fact to be aware of is that contrary to the potential military applications of NLW, which are mainly determined by international agreements, the potential use of non-lethal weapons by the police is largely subject to domestic law (Tumbarska and Petkov, 2017). The most important legal legislation authorizing the use of NLW in terms of international agreements is the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). Examples of the articles of the ECHR on this subject are the right to life (Article 2), the prohibition of torture (Article 3), the right to liberty and security (Article 5), the right to respect for private and family life (Article 8), thought, conscience. and freedom of religion (Article 9), freedom of expression (Article 10), freedom of assembly and association (Article 11), prohibition of discrimination (Article 14) and the right to property (Protocol No. 1, Article 1). It is also stated within the scope of

the Convention that if any national law conflicts with the ECHR, priority will be given to the ECHR.

The basic laws, regulations and guidelines for the use of NLW in Turkey can be given as examples:

European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, Law on Meetings and Demonstrations No 2911, Provincial Administration Law No 5442, Law No 3201 on Police Organization (1937), Law No 2803 on Gendarmerie, Duties and Powers, 2559 Police Duties and Authority Law (PDAL) No.2692, Coast Guard Command Law.

Regulation on Police Riot Police, Regulation on the Implementation of the Law on Meetings and Demonstrations, Regulation on Duties and Powers of the Gendarmerie, Regulation on Judicial and Prevention Searches, Regulation on Apprehension, Detention and Statement Taking

Riot Special Team Directive, Directive on Preparing and Implementing Safety and Public Order Plans JGY 117 (1992), Directive Regarding Operations Procedures and Principles of Personnel Assigned in Social Events, Directive on Recruitment of Negotiators in Social Events, Gendarmerie Directive, Directive on Principles of Intervention to Social Events- 2013, Directive on the Use, Storage of Tear Gas, Gas and Defense Rifles and their Equipment and Ammunition and Training of User Personnel

Article 16 of the PDAL titled “Using Force and Weapons” paves the way for the police to use NLW such as batons, handcuffs, pressurized water, tear gases, tear dusts (Aydın, 2016).

6. Uses of Non-Lethal Weapons

The end of the cold war and the increase in the number of peace operations for regional conflicts brought new problems with it. It is discussed in military circles how to combat the uprisings and uncontrolled crowds that may occur in the operation area. One of the remedies suggested for the solution is the use of non-killing weapons. Although it is not possible to say that using these weapons alone will bring a solution in all cases, they provide some options to decision-makers.

NLWs are weapons that can be used in all stages of peace, tension, post-operational stabilization due to their features. These operations involve close and constant contact between friendly forces and non-combatant civilians. Some non-combat military operation scenarios involve paramilitary forces or armed groups that pose a real but misidentified threat. In these situations, the military

forces' task is more directed towards prevention. In other words, military forces successfully pursue their duties by preventing individuals or groups from carrying out activities aimed at disorder and pillage or assault, harassment and other threats.

Changing values, expectations and most importantly, humanity, whose level of consciousness and education increases, will be both the target and the user of these weapons. Knowing in which areas these weapons can be used will be a decisive element in understanding them and developing strategies for them. In this context, the development of systems that can create an effect beyond rubber bullets or tear gas bombs with rapidly developed technologies and that will paralyze the whole country, even beyond the individuals, is increasingly on the agenda. The increase of local turmoil in today's world is not only directed towards peace operations, but also aimed at bringing stability and peace under permanent control. In this respect, although these weapons are used for now and predominantly in local events, it will also make it possible to use the varieties that are being developed for strategic purposes.

NLWs are used effectively in various task areas. Some of those; to neutralize the agitators in the crowd, to keep the angry crowds under control, to appease individuals in cases where law enforcement intervenes, to separate the conflicting groups or to create forbidden zones, to neutralize the infrastructure, to neutralize the command, control, communication, computer and intelligence systems Helping to intervene in hostage-taking terrorists, in the transfer of criminals, in preventing illegal settlements, in inter-tribal fights, in patrols, in guard places, in social events, in suppressing prison events, in the control of chaos (field and water fight, honour issues, etc.), the resistance of those who resist using force It is known as task areas such as crushing.

Although the areas of use of the NLW by law enforcement officers are limited to the aforementioned areas, it is possible to use these weapons in situations that authorize law enforcement officers to use force. However, while intervening in any event during this use, it should be used within the legal framework and in a measured way.

In Turkey, the principles of using NLW are applied in line with the ECHR. Convention on the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, the member states of the Council of Europe; It is the document that strongly expresses their commitment to the values of democracy, peace and justice and the respect for the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individuals living in these countries through these values.

7. Conclusions

In all countries of the world, there are some differences between the violence that law enforcement officers use in their operations against actions. However, the essence of the work is primarily to neutralize those who are in the focus of action, to affect those who are not in the primary level with the action from the operations as little as possible, and to keep the environmental damage to a minimum. Since the second half of the 20th century, the importance given to human rights has started to increase gradually in the world, which has led law enforcement officers to reconsider the methods of intervention in the protests and the level of violence they apply. Studies to investigate less lethal weapons led to the creation of a category called non-lethal weapons in 1990. These weapons, defined as NLW, have also changed the size of the weapons used by the personnel during the intervention in social events. Over time, various NLWs, such as batons with a lower lethality index, plastic and wooden bullets, electroshock devices, and chemical gases, have been used by law enforcement officers. Before any intervention in social events, an effective negotiation process must be experienced by law enforcement agencies. In case a consensus cannot be reached with the negotiations, the continuation of the action and the intensity of the action, despite the necessary warnings in accordance with the legislation, necessitates the intervention. During the intervention phase, the training of law enforcement officers, their anger control, their ability to control their behaviors and their correct guidance are important factors that determine the level of “proportionate” or “disproportionate” use of force in termination of actions. The George Floyd incident in the USA in May 2020 can be given as a recent example of the negativities that may arise in cases where anger control cannot be carried out. George Floyd, a Black American, died as a result of police pressure on his neck while being detained by the police. With the rapid spread of the incident on social media, protests started in many regions of the USA, and the demonstrations spread to European countries in the ongoing process. As seen in Floyd’s example, some events serve as a spark that ignites social movements. A similar situation was experienced during the Gezi Park events in Turkey in 2013, and social accumulation came to light with the cutting down of trees. When we look before the events that started with the fuel increase in 2018 in France, it is seen that the increase made caused the explosion of the accumulation arising from the economic problems in the country. The yellow vests movement in France should not be evaluated differently from the social movement that emerged after the Floyd incident. A spark that ignited accumulations has turned into a social movement. It is thought that the important point here is the reflection of a negativity experienced individually or individually to all law

enforcement officers. When the actions of a team of security personnel with a personality and psychology that cannot handle the phenomenon of power are evaluated together with the communication speed of social media, it can be evaluated as an act made by all law enforcement agencies. In this context, social media is a power that must be taken into consideration in security-related applications, as in all areas of life. It is necessary to work on a number of methods that will ensure the spread of positive security force movements, such as the spread of negative movements on social media. In general terms, the methods of intervention to collective events clearly stated in international conventions and the use of equipment in practice cannot give the desired result in the field due to some differences in the legal regulations of the states. For this reason, although legal regulations are made on a national scale according to international conventions; From time to time, unwanted results may be encountered in applications performed by law enforcement officials. At this point, it is seen that in order to solve the aforementioned problems, international organizations encourage states to use and develop NLWs in accordance with the legislation put into effect to minimize deaths and injuries. In addition, in order to prevent fatal and injury accidents, it is emphasized by the said organizations that the use of NLW ammunition in social interventions should be reduced by attaching importance to personal protection of law enforcement officers such as helmets and shields. Compared to firearms, the NLWs offer the opportunity to intervene and control incidents without causing any vital harm to law enforcement, suspects or people outside the incidents.

As a result, today no positive or negative events are kept secret, news is spreading very quickly. This situation necessitates law enforcement officers to act more consciously during the intervention process.

References

- Aydın, D. (2016) Toplantı ve Gösteri Yürüyüşlerine Müdahalenin Esasları. *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi, 65*(4), pp. 3283-3308.
- Barry, J. and Morganthau, T. (1994) Soon, Phasers on Stun, *Newsweek, 123*(6), pp. 24-26.
- Bedard, E. R. (2002) *Non Lethal Capabilities: Realizing the Opportunities*. Center for Technology and National Security Policy, National Defense University.
- Casey-Maslen, S. (2010) Non-Kinetic-Energy Weapons Termed “Non-Lethal*”. Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law*, pp. 1-86. https://

www.geneva-academy.ch/joomlatools-files/docman-files/Non-Kinetic-Energy%20Weapons.pdf, accessed on 12.02.2021.
- Davison, N. (2006) *Bradford Non-Lethal Weapons Research Project* (BNLWRP). Occasional Paper No. 1. The Early History of Non-Lethal Weapons. Bradford: University of Bradford, Department of Peace Studies.
- Deniz, İ. (2018) *Silah ve Taktik Atı*ş, Ankara: Polis Akademisi Yayınları.
- Evancoe, P.R. (1993) Non-Lethal Technologies Enhance Warrior's Punch. *National Defense, 78*(493), pp. 26-29.
- Fidler, D. P. (1999) The International Legal Implications of Non-Lethal Weapons. *Michigan Journal of International Law*, (21), pp. 51-100. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383100184371
- Fidler, D. P. (2005) The Meaning of Moscow: Non-Lethal Weapons and International Law in the Early 21st Century. *International Review of the Red Cross*, (87), pp. 525-552. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383100184371
- Fischetti, M. (1995) Less-Than-Lethal Weapons. *Technology Review, 98*(1), pp. 14-15.
- Flint, A. (1995) They're Shooting Not to Kill. *The Boston Globe*, (30), pp. 6-7.
- Grudowski, M. (1995) Not-So-Lethal Weapons. *New York Times Magazine*, *144*(50152), pp. 40-41.
- Henckaerts, J. M. (2005) Study on Customary International Humanitarian Law: A Contribution to the Understanding and Respect for the Rule of Law in Armed Conflict. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 87, pp. 175-212. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S181638310018124X
- Hoffberger, E. (2017) Non-Lethal Weapons: The Principle Of Proportionalıty In Armed Conflict And The Right To Health In Law Enforcement. *Zbornik Pravnog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Rijeci, 38*(2), pp. 831-853.
- İBB (2019) Özel Güvenlik El Kitabı, İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi ve İstanbul Güvenlik Anonim Şirketi, https://istguven.istanbul/my_piyanist_icerik /uploads/2019/09/ozel_ guvenlik_el_kitabi_01.pdf, access on 26.02.2021.
- Keskin, H.İ. (2012) İstanbul'da Meydana Gelen Toplumsal Olayların Değerlendirilmesi, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi Adli Tıp Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Ana Bilim Dalı, İstanbul.
- Kleinig, J. (2007) Ethical Constraints on Taser Use by Police. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice, 1*(3), pp. 284-292. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pam037
- Koplow, D. A. (2005) Tangled up in Khaki and Blue: Lethal and Non-Lethal Weapons in Recent Confrontations. *Geo. J. Int'l L.*, 36, pp. 703-808.

- M. Balali-Mood, M. Moshiri and L. Etemad (2014). *Non-Ionizing Radiation*, pp. 603-608.
- Mandel, R. (2004) Non Lethal Weaponry and Post-Cold War Deterrence. *Armed Forces & Society, 30*(4), pp. 511–537. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X0403000402
- Meron, T. (2000) The Humanization of Humanitarian Law. *American Journal of International Law, 94*(2), pp. 239-278. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/2555292
- Salem, H., Katz, S. A., Feasel, M., & Ballantyne, B. (2014a). CN Gas. *Encyclopedia of Toxicology*, pp. 989–992.
- Salem, H., Katz, S. A., Feasel, M., & Ballantyne, B. (2014b). CS. *Encyclopedia of Toxicology*, pp. 1076–1081.
- Sheldon, R. D. (1999) *Non Lethal Weapons, Non Lethal Policy, and Complex Contingencies.* Naval War College, Newport USA, https://www.readcube.com/ articles/10.21236%2Fada363056, access on 10.03.2021.
- Ticehurst, R. (1997). The Martens Clause and the Laws of Armed Conflict. *International Review of the Red Cross (1961-1997), 37*(317), pp. 125-134. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S002086040008503X
- TTB (2011) *Kimyasal Silahlar Gösteri Kontrol Ajanları*, Ankara: Türk Tabipler Birliği Yayınları.
- Tumbarska, A. (2017) Non-Lethal Weapons - A Concept Difficult To Define. *Security & Future, 1*(4), pp. 138-141.
- Tumbarska, A., and Petkov, P. (2017) Non-Lethal Weapons in the Context of the Restrictions Required by International Law. In *Proceedings of Scientific Conference Actual Problems of Security* (pp. 148-158).
- Türk Toraks Derneği, (2013) Göz Yaşartan Gazlarla İlgili Merak Edilenler, https://www.toraks.org.tr/news.aspx?detail=2387, access on 26.03.2021.