



## Non-Governmental Public Action Programme

### Final Research Findings Brief

#### Non-Governmental Public Action Against Chemical and Biological Weapons

##### Project aims, objectives, methods

- To generate new empirical knowledge and systematic analysis on non-governmental public action against chemical and biological weapons
2. To promote more effective non-governmental public action by empowering and connecting different research users through a deliberative and inclusionary process
  3. To contribute to academic study of the role and influence of non-governmental public action generally in global security and improved public awareness and understanding of the issues relating to WMD in the UK
  4. To investigate the use in relation to global security threats and public action of research methodologies more commonly used in other areas of social science

##### Key research findings

###### *The Global Environment*

- Growing acceptance of civil society role in CBW disarmament
- Slow improvement in civil society access to international meetings
- New developments within wider civil society filtering through to CBW civil society
- Effect of changing diplomatic environment – “multistakeholder diplomacy”

###### *The Relevant Actors*

A number of general characteristics can be applied to civil society organizations in CBW disarmament:

- Academic and technical
- Main influence exercised through “bureaucratic utilization”
- Mostly based in the West
- Small number of organizations involved
- Much individual and institutional continuity
- Well-connected to policymakers
- Reactive and risk-averse

###### *The Case Studies*

- UK 2002-03 – British civil society organizations had little success in injecting scepticism and expert opinion into WMD justifications for military action; largely reactive role; few links with anti-war movement; media focus on single straightforward narrative
- BioWeapons Prevention Project – rooted in coalition of civil society organizations wanting to create something “new and unique” in CBW field; lack of agreement over balance between networking and publications; influence of funding on BWPP activities

###### *Promoting Action*

- Encouraged critical reflection by civil society organizations of their role
- Facilitated discussions within BWPP on networking strategies
- Parliamentary briefings
- Practical proposals – briefing books for 6<sup>th</sup> BWC Review Conference and 2<sup>nd</sup> CWC Review Conference

###### *Analysis of Results*

- Civil society has had, and is having, a discernible impact on multilateral CBW disarmament, particularly as an agenda-setter and problem-framer
- Contradictory sense that civil society’s influence is limited arises partly from lack of knowledge about its role in the existing literature. However, also stems from other factors:
  - Many of civil society’s core CBW objectives have been achieved – disarmament has been “done”

- Absence of symbols and clear causal link between CBW and victims
- Low level of access to international CBW meetings
- Limited and uncertain funding base
- Long-term, low key approach suited the 1960s and 1970s but less well-suited to current environment and to preventing “backsliding” by governments
- Contribution to reducing “democratic deficit” of global governance has been limited. Mainly focused on elements such as transparency, equality and deliberation.
- Civil society organizations uphold “humanitarian” roots of CBW disarmament and focus on “global security” implications rather than “national security”.

## Policy and practice implications

- Important and growing role of civil society in CBW disarmament should be recognised by governments and should not be seen as a threat
- Civil society organizations can provide useful services to governments but there is a need for civil society organizations to carefully consider a role as “service providers” to governments – sustainability of funding, effect on independence and credibility etc
- Civil society access to international CBW meetings is only one measure of influence and such organizations need a clearer idea of the most effective “influence pathways” so that activities can be prioritised and limited funds used most efficiently
- More attention should be given to developing criteria for measuring the “effectiveness” of civil society action
- Civil society organizations in CBW disarmament need to develop more links with wider civil society

## Key publications and outputs

Daniel Feakes (with Malcolm Dando, Ian Davis, Graham Pearson, Julian Perry Robinson, Nicholas Sims and Angela Woodward), letter and briefing note to parliamentarians, 10 March 2005.

Daniel Feakes, “Global Civil Society and Chemical and Biological Weapons”, presentation to the LSE Summer School course on Global Civil Society, 15 July 2005.

Daniel Feakes (with Malcolm Dando, Ian Davis, Graham Pearson, Julian Perry Robinson, Nicholas Sims and Angela Woodward), letter to the Foreign Affairs Committee, published in *Foreign Policy Aspects of the War Against Terrorism* (HC 573) 2 July 2006.

Daniel Feakes and Caitríona McLeish. *Briefing Book: BWC Sixth Review Conference 2006*. Brighton: Harvard Sussex Program, 2006. URL:  
<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Units/spru/hsp/Briefing%20Book.htm>.

Daniel Feakes, “Civil Society’s Influence on Policy Against Biological Weapons”, paper presented to Panel WA27 of the 48th Annual International Studies Association Convention, Chicago, 28 February – 3 March 2007.

Daniel Feakes, Filippa Lentzos, Caitríona McLeish and Angela Woodward. “Making Legislation Work”. Briefing Note, 15 May 2007. URL:  
[http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/BIOS/biosecurity/pdf/MLW\\_Briefing\\_Note.pdf](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/BIOS/biosecurity/pdf/MLW_Briefing_Note.pdf)

Daniel Feakes, Caitríona McLeish, Julian Perry Robinson, Matthew Meselson. “Submission to the OPCW Open-Ended Working Group on the Second CWC Review Conference”. 18 July 2007.

Caitríona McLeish and Daniel Feakes, “Biosecurity and Stakeholders: The Rise of Networks and Non-State Actors”. *Science and Public Policy*, vol. 35 no. 1 (February 2008)

## For further information

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Units/spru/hsp/index.html>  
[d.feakes@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:d.feakes@sussex.ac.uk)