BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

Authored by

mohammad looti

November 4, 2025

BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

Primary Disciplinary Field(s): Military Science, International Security Studies, Microbiology, Public Health, International Law

1. Core Definition

Biological Warfare (BW), often termed germ warfare or **bacteriological warfare**, constitutes a sophisticated and highly dangerous method of conflict where living organisms, or the toxins derived from them, are intentionally used to cause illness, death, or severe incapacitation among humans, livestock, or agricultural crops. This definition extends beyond the simple use of conventional explosives or chemical agents, differentiating BW through the employment and strategic release of naturally occurring or genetically modified disease-causing agents, such as **viruses**, **bacteria**, fungi, or prions. The primary objective is not merely to destroy infrastructure but to degrade the enemy's fighting capability and societal stability over a widespread area, often with a delayed and escalating effect, making it a particularly insidious and challenging form of asymmetric threat. The fundamental mechanism involves exploiting the natural transmission cycles of pathogens to initiate devastating epidemics or localized outbreaks, thereby quickly overwhelming medical systems and reducing the capacity of a targeted population to sustain defense or civil order.

Crucially, biological weapons are classified as **Weapons of Mass Destruction** (WMD) due to their inherent potential for massive casualty generation and their ability to transcend geographical and temporal barriers once released into the environment. Unlike chemical weapons, which typically dissipate relatively quickly, biological agents can replicate, spread, and mutate, presenting a prolonged public health and military challenge. The agents utilized are typically chosen for their high virulence, environmental stability, ease of mass production, and potential for aerosol dissemination, which makes dispersal across large areas highly efficient. The concept leverages the fear and panic associated with uncontrollable disease outbreaks, thus serving a dual purpose: physical incapacitation and profound psychological demoralization of the adversary.

The efficacy of **biological warfare** lies in the small quantity of material required to achieve mass effects compared to conventional weaponry; a few kilograms of an optimized agent, such as anthrax spores, could potentially affect an area that would require tons of chemical agents or high explosives. This efficiency, coupled with the difficulty in attribution and defense, has positioned BW as a serious and persistent threat to international peace and security, particularly in an era where advanced biotechnology is becoming increasingly accessible globally. This modern perception of BW frames it not just as a military tool, but as a severe existential threat requiring robust international cooperation and stringent regulatory oversight to prevent catastrophic misuse.

2. Historical Development and Etymology

The strategic use of disease and biological materials in conflict is not a new phenomenon, with historical roots stretching back into antiquity, long before the germ theory of disease was scientifically established. Early instances often involved primitive, opportunistic methods based on empirical observation of contagion. For example, in the 6th century BCE, Assyrians used rye ergot to poison the wells of their enemies. A more common early tactic involved the use of contaminated materials, such as throwing the decaying corpses of plague victims or animals over the walls of besieged cities, a practice famously employed by the Mongols during the siege of Caffa in 1346. Although the users lacked a microbial understanding, the devastating effect of inducing epidemic disease was clearly recognized as a potent military advantage.

The modern, systematic development of **biological warfare** began in the 20th century, particularly following the scientific advancements of the late 19th century that identified specific pathogens responsible for infectious diseases. World War I saw limited but documented attempts by German forces to use bacterial agents, such as glanders and anthrax, to infect livestock and horses destined for Allied forces. However, it was during World War II that biological weapons programs were formalized and industrialized by several major powers, most notably by Japan's notorious Unit 731, which conducted extensive and inhumane research on human subjects to test the efficacy of various pathogens, including plague and cholera, for aerial deployment. These activities represented a watershed moment, shifting BW from opportunistic tactics to planned, large-scale weaponization efforts involving advanced microbiological techniques.

Post-WWII, the Cold War spurred immense investment in offensive and defensive biological weapons research in the United States and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, in particular, maintained the largest and most sophisticated clandestine **biological weapons program** (known as Biopreparat), despite being a signatory to the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention (BWC). This historical context highlights the dual-use nature of biological research--where advancements in vaccinology or disease diagnostics can simultaneously inform weaponization strategies. The international community's response to these developments led directly to the establishment of the BWC, an attempt to universally prohibit the development, production, and stockpiling of these agents, marking a crucial step in international efforts to control this unique class of weaponry.

3. Mechanisms and Agents

The agents used in **biological warfare** are typically categorized based on their effects, ease of dissemination, and lethality, often following the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) classification system (Categories A, B, and C). Category A agents represent the highest risk, posing a threat to national security due to their high mortality rates, ease of transmission, and potential for causing public panic and mass disruption. Examples of Category A agents include

Bacillus anthracis (the causative agent of anthrax), the variola virus (smallpox), *Yersinia pestis* (plague), and botulinum toxin (though technically a toxin, it is treated similarly due to its lethality). These agents are favored because they can be efficiently disseminated as aerosols, inhaled deep into the lungs, and often require complex containment and medical countermeasures.

The primary mechanism of action involves aerosolization, where microscopic particles containing the pathogen are released into the air, allowing inhalation exposure across a large population. This method bypasses natural immune defenses present in the skin or digestive tract and rapidly introduces the agent to the respiratory system. Once inside the host, the pathogen replicates, overwhelming biological functions or releasing potent toxins that cause catastrophic system failure. For example, **anthrax spores**, when inhaled, germinate in the lungs and release toxins that lead to hemorrhagic mediastinitis and shock, often resulting in death within days if untreated. The incubation period--the time between exposure and symptom onset--is a critical factor; longer incubation periods allow exposed individuals to travel widely before symptoms appear, maximizing secondary transmission and complicating containment efforts.

Furthermore, modern threats increasingly involve genetically modified organisms (GMOs). Advances in synthetic biology and genetic engineering theoretically allow hostile actors to enhance existing pathogens, increasing their virulence, making them resistant to current antibiotics or vaccines, or altering their transmissibility mechanisms. This technological evolution complicates defense significantly, as established countermeasures may quickly become obsolete. Beyond human pathogens, **biological warfare** extends to anti-crop and anti-livestock agents, such as fungal rusts or foot-and-mouth disease, designed to destabilize the economic and food supply chains of a nation, demonstrating a comprehensive spectrum of biological threat vectors designed to compromise national resilience.

4. Legal and Ethical Frameworks

The international community has historically struggled to regulate **biological warfare** due to the difficulty of verifying compliance and the dual-use nature of relevant research. The foundational legal instrument governing BW is the 1972 **Biological Weapons Convention** (BWC), formally known as the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction. The BWC is significant because it was the first multilateral disarmament treaty banning an entire category of WMDs. It mandates that State Parties neither develop, produce, stockpile, nor acquire biological agents or toxins "of types and in quantities that have no justification for prophylactic, protective or other peaceful purposes."

Despite its global acceptance, the BWC suffers from a critical weakness: the lack of a formal, legally binding verification mechanism. Unlike the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), which

established the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) with extensive inspection powers, the BWC relies heavily on national implementation measures and voluntary confidence-building measures (CBMs). This deficit allows states or non-state actors operating under state protection to maintain clandestine programs, as evidenced by the former Soviet Biopreparat program which continued for years after the BWC entered into force. Efforts to strengthen the BWC, including negotiating a verification protocol in the late 1990s, ultimately failed due to political disagreements, leaving the treaty primarily reliant on political commitment rather than verifiable disarmament.

Ethically, the use of **biological weapons** is almost universally condemned under **International Humanitarian Law** (IHL), or the laws of armed conflict. The indiscriminate nature of biological agents, their potential to harm civilians far from the battlefield, and the irreversible environmental and public health consequences violate core IHL principles, such as the prohibition against unnecessary suffering and the requirement for distinction between combatants and non-combatants. The global norm against BW is extremely strong, rooted in the profound humanitarian distress caused by infectious diseases. Furthermore, the proliferation of biotechnology raises difficult ethical questions regarding the moral responsibility of scientists and researchers to prevent their knowledge and tools from being weaponized, mandating strict oversight of dual-use research activities.

5. Threat Assessment and Proliferation

The threat posed by **biological warfare** remains high due to several converging factors: technological advancement, global instability, and the rise of non-state actors. The democratization of biological science means that advanced genetic engineering techniques, once confined to state-level laboratories, are now accessible in academic settings and increasingly to determined, resourceful individuals or terrorist organizations. The 2001 anthrax attacks in the United States demonstrated that a highly organized individual could successfully weaponize and disseminate a lethal biological agent using relatively simple, non-state infrastructure, causing widespread fear and significant disruption, even if the total casualty count was limited. This incident highlighted the vulnerability of modern societies to even small-scale, highly targeted biological attacks.

Proliferation risks are amplified by the ease of concealment. Unlike nuclear or large-scale chemical weapons programs that require massive, detectable infrastructure (e.g., specialized reactors or production plants), a biological weapons facility can be disguised as a legitimate vaccine production plant, university lab, or fermentation facility. This "biological camouflage" makes monitoring and intelligence gathering extremely difficult. States concerned with strategic parity, or those seeking an asymmetric advantage against technologically superior conventional forces, are particularly motivated to develop or acquire biological capabilities, viewing them as a cost-effective deterrent or offensive tool.

The concept of a "new threat to peace," as referenced in the source content, accurately reflects the current environment where pathogens are recognized as potential weapons available to diverse actors, not just powerful states. The globalized nature of travel and commerce means that a deliberate biological release in one region could rapidly become a worldwide pandemic, blurring the lines between natural public health crises and intentional acts of war. Consequently, international security bodies, including the United Nations Security Council, must treat potential BW proliferation and use with the highest priority, requiring rapid detection capabilities and coordinated international response mechanisms to mitigate cascading health and economic disasters.

6. Defensive Measures and Preparedness

Defending against **biological warfare** is fundamentally different from conventional military defense; it is primarily a public health and intelligence challenge. Effective defense requires a layered approach encompassing biosecurity, biosurveillance, medical countermeasures, and robust civilian resilience. Biosecurity measures focus on preventing the theft, misuse, or accidental release of dangerous pathogens from research laboratories by implementing strict access controls, inventory systems, and personnel reliability programs. This is essential for preventing the 'insider threat' which could facilitate weaponization efforts.

Biosurveillance involves the continuous monitoring of human, animal, and plant populations for unusual disease patterns that might indicate a deliberate biological attack rather than a natural outbreak. This requires integrating data from hospitals, veterinary services, and environmental sensors, utilizing advanced analytical tools to detect anomalies quickly. Early warning is paramount, as the effective use of medical countermeasures, such as vaccines, antibiotics, and antiviral drugs, is highly time-dependent. Stockpiling these medical supplies and developing effective distribution plans are crucial components of national preparedness strategies, ensuring that critical medical resources can reach affected populations before the disease spreads uncontrollably.

Furthermore, military and civil defense planning must incorporate strategies for rapid decontamination, casualty management, and maintaining continuity of government and essential services during a biological event. Because many biological agents are difficult to detect until symptoms appear, preparation also includes advanced research into novel detection technologies and diagnostic tools that can identify specific strains of pathogens rapidly in environmental samples. Ultimately, preparedness against **biological warfare** must move beyond traditional military doctrine and integrate expertise from microbiology, epidemiology, logistics, and intelligence, recognizing that the first responders in a biological attack are often healthcare professionals and public health officials.

7. Debates and Criticisms

Despite the universally recognized severity of the threat, the field of **biological warfare** remains subject to significant debates concerning definition, utility, and appropriate response strategies. One core debate centers on the concept of 'dual-use' research, where scientific findings intended for beneficial purposes (e.g., curing diseases) could easily be misapplied to create more effective weapons. Critics argue that overly restrictive regulation of dual-use research stifles essential public health advances, such as pandemic preparedness, while proponents argue that ethical oversight boards and heightened transparency are necessary to prevent catastrophic misuse of powerful biotechnologies like CRISPR gene editing.

Another major criticism revolves around the actual military utility of BW. Historically, biological weapons have been difficult to control, susceptible to meteorological conditions, and pose a significant risk of 'blowback'--unintentionally infecting the attacker's own forces or population. Some military analysts argue that the operational complexities and low reliability make BW a weapon of terror and disruption rather than a decisive military instrument. However, this view is challenged by the catastrophic potential of genetically engineered agents and the psychological impact they wield, which can achieve strategic goals (e.g., crippling a nation's economy or political stability) without necessitating a traditional ground invasion.

Finally, there is ongoing debate regarding the adequacy of the international legal framework. Critics maintain that the BWC is toothless without a mandatory verification mechanism, allowing states to pursue clandestine research under the guise of defensive programs. This has led to calls for strengthening the BWC through mandatory inspections or enhancing international cooperation on forensics to improve attribution capabilities--the ability to reliably identify the perpetrator of a biological attack. Improving attribution is seen as critical for establishing credible deterrence, as the anonymity afforded by BW is one of its most appealing features to hostile actors.

Further Reading

Biological Weapons Convention (BWC)
CDC Biological Agents and Toxins
International Humanitarian Law and Biological Weapons
Unit 731 and Japanese Biological Warfare Program
World Health Organization (WHO) on Biological Weapons