The G8: Arms dealers to the world
New law has serious implications for protest

At the very end of the last Parliament in April the Serious Organised Crime and Police Bill made it into law. Its passage lacked proper debate or time for meaningful scrutiny. Indeed, obscured by the focus on the clause relating to ‘incitement to religious hatred’ (which was dropped at the last minute), the full extent of the new law was hidden from view. Anna Jones explains.

Although the full implications of the new law will not be known until its interpretation is made tangible, the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act contains a number of measures that appear to further challenge the right to protest. Firstly, one of the oldest campaigning methods in the book - street-leafleting - could potentially be criminalised. Section 125 of the Act prohibits people from pursuing “a course of conduct which involves harassment of two or more persons… by which he intends to persuade any person… not to do something that he is entitled or required to do, or to do something that he is not under any obligation to do”. The Bill defines harassment as “conduct on at least one occasion”, “in relation to two or more persons”. The commentator George Monbiot says that: “in other words, you need only approach someone once to be considered to be harassing them, as long as you have approached someone else in the same manner”. How long will it be before our work of trying to persuade the public and decision-makers that arms exports cause death and misery will in itself constitute harassment?

Extra protection for arms fairs
The second cause for concern is the new power given to the Secretary of State to designate any area a “designated site” on the grounds that it is Crown land or because “it is appropriate to designate the site in the interests of national security”. Any person entering or being present in a designated site will be committing trespass and may be liable to a fine or imprisonment for up to 51 weeks. Again, the new law may be used to make arms fairs, military bases and buildings or spaces in any way connected with government or economic power even more impenetrable and will give such businesses even greater protection.

Heave-ho Haw?
The Act has specifically made the area around Parliament (covering up to one kilometre away, so including Trafalgar Square) a designated area in which protest is automatically an offence if “authorisation for the demonstration has not been given”. Since 2001, Brian Haw has been protesting in Parliament Square at the Government’s policies towards Iraq. He is anticipating his attempted removal by police. After all, the Government clearly disapproves of his protest and the Act gives the police the power to deny his 24-hour vigil, on the grounds that it causes “disruption to the life of the community”. Similarly, Haw may have restrictions imposed on his protest, which would inevitably be broken.

Fewer ways to challenge corporate power
Sections 145–149 of the Act are directed specifically at animal rights protesters, making it an offence “to cause the organisation to suffer loss or damage of any description, or prevent or hinder the carrying out by the organisation of any of its activities”. Whether or not we agree with all tactics, the implications of criminalising the activity of certain groups of protestors and offering businesses particular protection is certainly cause for concern. How long will it be before BAE Systems’ corporate power is offered similar increased legal protection, leaving us with even fewer ways to challenge that power?

I sincerely hope that our fears about the new law are never realised. The news that the High Court has struck out almost all of the injunction sought by the arms manufacturers EDO against anti-EDO campaigners in Brighton does give us reason to hope. However, a climate of greater restrictions on legitimate protest and civil liberties must make us even more vigilant towards our rights to protest, and make us even more prepared to stand up for those rights.
Pakistan kept busy by deals with UK and with both US and China

Despite concerns over Pakistan’s human rights record, the UK has negotiated a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Pakistan that sets up joint military equipment trade and services. Aside from providing legal cover for already existing collaboration on military equipment, the MoU provides for the two countries to share information on bids and contracts, share research, and share production of military equipment.

BUSINESS RECORDER, 25/4/05

Pakistan’s support for the US’s ‘war against terrorism’ seems to have turned around the situation of a few years ago when there were more US sanctions against Pakistan than against any other country.

The US has agreed to sell approximately 25 F-16 fighter jets to Pakistan and approved two missile sales worth $180m. To allay India’s fears over the F-16 deal with its close rival, the US state department has said that it would approve aircraft sales to India and may approve missiles systems for India as well. The sale of the F-16’s to Pakistan started back in the 1980’s. Even though Pakistan paid for the jets at the time, delivery was suspended when the US imposed sanctions on Pakistan’s nuclear programme.

ISN SECURITY WATCH 10/5/05; FINANCIAL TIMES 26/3/05; GUARDIAN 26/3/05;

Pakistan seems to be fairly confident about expanding its military capacity at the moment. Just two months after the US agreed to sell F-16 jets to Pakistan, Pakistan agreed to develop a new fighter aircraft with China. This comes despite US concern over the rise of China’s military.

FINANCIAL TIMES 10/5/05

Children’s charity defends BAE Systems funding

The children’s charity NCH has defended its decision to take funding from BAE Systems. The money was given as match funding for funds raised in an initiative by BAE Systems staff. In a recent ‘Talkback’ column in the organisation’s in-house magazine, NCH’s corporate management group suggested that accepting funding did not imply an endorsement of BAE Systems products. “As you know,” the corporate management group pointed out, “ethics is not an absolute science and modern society is complicated and highly interconnected.” The charity also argued that, while some of their staff may have abhorred the work of BAE Systems, the same staff may fly with Airbus to a holiday in a country with a poor human rights record. ACTION FOR CHILDREN – THE NCH MAGAZINE, ISSUE 2, 2005

Take action

• If you would like to write to the NCH, ‘the children’s charity of the Methodist Church’ about this, the Chair is Gordon Edington and the address is 85 Highbury Park, London N5 1UD.

China supplies weapons to Iraq

A Chinese state-owned company formerly linked with smuggling weapons into the US has been awarded a contract to supply weapons to the Iraqi army. The US Army approved the deal despite the fact that China opposed the war on Iraq, and that Hungary, Poland and Romania – all of which currently have forces in Iraq – could supply the same weapons.

Meanwhile, the US is still urging the EU to maintain an embargo on high-tech arms sales to China.

THE ADVERTISER, 29/4/05

Russia deal with Syria still likely

Russia is resisting strong Israeli pressure not to go ahead with the sale of anti-aircraft missiles to Syria (see Arms Trade Shorts, CAAT news issue 189). Russia’s argument is that, to come within range of the missiles, Israel would have to attack Syria. In recent talks Putin revealed he had already vetoed a contract to sell longer-range missiles to Syria on the basis that Israel would not be able to intercept them. Putin also pointed to figures for arms sales to the region, which show that Russia’s sales are worth $500m, while US sales are worth $6.8bn. INDEPENDENT, 29/4/05

Pakistan’s Defence Secretary Hamid Nawaz Khan shakes hands with the US Undersecretary for Defense Douglas Feith
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US arms Haiti despite embargo

US State Department officials and the US Embassy have confirmed that the US sent weapons to Haiti’s police force last year despite allegations of human rights abuses and a long-term arms embargo.

US officials rejected claims that $7m of arms had been shipped to Haiti in 2004 but did concede that a smaller deal had gone through.

The State Department also revealed that the US government is considering a request by the Haitian government for a further weapons deal worth $1.9m.

UN peacekeepers are currently investigating a spate of summary executions allegedly committed by the Haitian police.

SCOTLAND ON SUNDAY, 24/4/05

Bunker-busting bombs all a bluff?

At the end of April the Pentagon notified Congress of a proposed sale of bunker-busting bombs to Israel. However, according to an Israeli arms specialist, the announcement was intended as a warning to Iran as Israel already produces very similar bombs. The arms specialist is a retired general who formerly led the Israel Defence Ministry’s research and development branch. He did not suggest whether the alleged warning was initiated by the US or by Israel. This development follows speculation in the US that Israel might use bunker-busting bombs to destroy any underground nuclear plants in Iran.

THE WASHINGTON TIMES, 29/4/05

UK takes part in Brazil’s LAAD arms fair

UK arms companies, backed by senior representatives of the Ministry of Defence and the UK armed forces, had an “enthusiastic” presence at the LAAD arms fair in Brazil in April. Brazil and the UK have completed arms deals in the past, with the RAF operating the Embraer Tucano aircraft, while the Brazilian Navy has former Royal Navy ships in its fleet and flies a Super Lynx helicopter.

DESCO NEWS RELEASE, 15/4/05

BAE Systems bid to Malaysia

BAE Systems has made an early and unsolicited bid to supply two frigates to Malaysia. BAE sold two frigates to Malaysia several years ago, as part of the country’s plans to buy four. That initial deal saw delays from integrating systems on the frigate and BAE Systems had to pay a penalty for late delivery. Malaysia’s plan to buy another two ships was also delayed by the 1997 financial crisis in Asia and by Malaysia’s budget deficit. A decision over BAE Systems’ bid is unlikely to be made for several years, during which time rival bids are more than likely.

FINANCIAL TIMES, 10/5/05

Sultan of Brunei displeased with BAE Systems

BAE Systems has begun legal proceedings over a sale of three warships to the Royal Brunei armed forces. The Sultan of Brunei claims that the ships, which have a total estimated value of £600m, have not been built to agreed standards.

INDEPENDENT, 4/4/05

Singapore decides against Eurofighter

Singapore has decided not to buy the Eurofighter Typhoon. Its Ministry of Defence stated that the schedule for the delivery of the aircraft did not meet its air forces requirements.

BAE Systems denied trade press claims that the campaign to sell the Eurofighter had failed due to insufficient support from the programme’s four partner governments.

FLIGHT INTERNATIONAL, 26 APR–2 MAY AND 3–9 MAY 05

Grenade launcher for urban warfare

The Low Intensity Conflict arms exhibition in March featured a grenade launcher that can fire around corners, allowing the user to remain hidden. The grenade launcher is designed for urban warfare and manufactured by Israeli-US company Corner Shot.

JANE’S DEFENCE WEEKLY, 18/3/05
It is a little known fact that the giant information company Reed Elsevier – famous for its work in education, science and health publications, as well as massive web-based services such as the LexisNexis Total Research System used by academics and legal professionals – also plays a significant role in the arms trade. Through its subsidiary companies, Reed Exhibitions and Spearhead Exhibitions, Reed Elsevier is responsible for organising arms fairs in several countries across the world, as well as here in the UK. These include Defence Services & Equipment International (or DSEi) held bi-annually in London’s Docklands, as well as Helitech UK and The Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Showcase. For many customers and shareholders of Reed Elsevier, convinced of the company’s good reputation and ethical stance, this involvement in arms fairs has come as a rather unpleasant surprise.

CAAT and others went along to Reed Elsevier’s Annual General Meeting this April to challenge the board of directors over the company’s work with arms fairs. In particular we highlighted the apparent contradiction between the business of promoting arms and the company’s subscription to the UN Global Compact. This Compact commits businesses to the protection of human rights and encourages corporate responsibility for preventing and resolving conflict. Concerns were also raised from ethical investors who pointed out that Reed Elsevier no longer seemed to be the conscientious choice that it had seemed.

The company’s directors were unsurprisingly defensive of their business activities and denied direct involvement in the arms trade, despite the description on the DSEi website of DSEi as “a key event for the total supply chain providing a platform for the whole of the defence and military aerospace community”. However, some of the individual board members did try to engage with our concerns and took some time to discuss the issues after the formal meeting had ended. We were pleased to be able to give Reed Elsevier’s new chairman, Jan Hommen, a copy of ‘Where is the Love?’ – the fantastic film made by secondary school students about the DSEi arms fair which takes place right next to their school. We just hope that he finds the time to watch it.

Reed Exhibitions organises various different events around the UK throughout the year, including the London Book Fair and travel and food exhibitions. CAAT supporters have been along to some of these other (non-arms) exhibitions in the past few weeks to let visitors know of the other side of the company’s work, and to encourage people to make their concerns known to Mr Hommen. If you would like to get involved in the campaign to pressure Reed Elsevier to stop organising arms fairs, or if you know of other investors who might be concerned about this dirty part of Reed Elsevier’s business, please contact Anna at the office. Campaign postcards and leaflets are available, as well as copies of ‘Where is the Love?’ – a very useful film for anyone planning to be involved in the campaign against the DSEi arms fair. ANNA JONES

As part of CAAT’s ongoing campaign against Arms Fairs, the military hardware exhibitions which are a key part of the global arms trade, we’ve launched a new mini-website. Use it to get the low-down on arms fairs around the world, detailed information on London’s own arms fair, DSEi, and find out what you can do to help close them down.

www.armsfairs.com
BAE Systems AGM

CAAT supporters and other protestors attended BAE Systems’ Annual General Meeting this May to challenge the company’s appalling activities.

Inside
New chairman Dick Olver had only just set out the agenda when disruption began, beginning with what the Guardian described as Olver’s “baptism of fire”. Five shareholders locked themselves together and chanted “stop the trade in torture, stop the trade in death” until stewards carried them from the building. Next came a heckler shouting “they’re all murderers”. The board was clearly taken aback. Then the barrage of questions – many from CAAT supporters – began.

The board was grilled on corruption, ethics, exports and pensions for over an hour and a half. We could have asked plenty more but time ran out. Olver brushed off questions over current investigations into BAE System’s takeover target, United Defence Industries (UDI), saying that any large company in the US has a “suite of litigations” against it. Though Olver was unable to hide his frustration, he had clearly expected tricky questions.

Outside
Meanwhile a lively protest took place outside the AGM. Both old and young braved the grey day to hold banners, hand out leaflets and chat to the public (and the police on duty), making it clear that this was not a respectable company AGM.

The wonderful ‘Theatre of War’ – a street-theatre group that works with activists fighting for social justice – provided fantastic entertainment.

BAE Systems EGM
Just over a week after the AGM, BAE Systems held an Extraordinary General Meeting (EGM) to authorise the acquisition of United Defense Industries and amend a detail in its method of accounting. Documentation asserted that “no member of the BAE Systems Group is engaged in … has pending or threatened by or against it any legal or arbitration proceedings which may or have had… a significant effect on the financial position of the BAE Systems Group”. Questions about how this squared with recent Serious Fraud Office investigations into BAE Systems were deflected by Olver with the excuse that they were of “no relevance to the resolutions”. BAE Systems assured shareholders that it was “co-operating 100 per cent” with investigations, while giving nothing away about what this involved. The board was also questioned about connections to the conflict in Iraq, for UDI is one of the main suppliers of equipment to the US military in Iraq. (Similarly, Alvis, which was taken over by BAE Systems in August 2004, is the main supplier of UK armoured vehicles and tanks). Questions met the reply that UDI is supplying to the US Defence Department and that questions about Iraq were irrelevant.

Olver confirmed that, with the acquisition of UDI, around 40 per cent of its employees would now be in the US and he was looking forward to welcoming new US members onto the board. Perhaps they’ll be in position in time for next year’s AGM... ANNA JONES

Send us your Stop Week write-ups and photos!

4–12 June 2005 is Stop the Arms Trade Week. If you haven’t organised anything yet, see www.caat.org.uk for last minute action ideas you could take. If you have organised something, good luck and don’t forget to send us any write-ups, photos and cuttings of any local press coverage you get! Email or write to Beccie in the CAAT office (beccie@caat.org.uk).
Last time Britain hosted the G8 in 1998, tens of thousands of people converged on the conference centre in Birmingham to tell the world’s most powerful nations to end the international debts that obstruct development for many countries in the global South.

Since then, every G8 meeting has seen protestors raise similar issues, and this year will be no different. Among the protests will be a march through Edinburgh organised by Make Poverty History, a huge coalition of charities and campaign organisations. As the name suggests, the coalition wants to see effective measures to eradicate global poverty involving not just debt cancellation, but also changes to unfair global trade rules that operate at the expense of poorer countries.

Protest has focussed on the G8 because those countries effectively control financial institutions that determine the winners and losers in the global system. But they also represent something else: of the G8 nations, only Japan doesn’t make it into the world’s top ten arms exporters.

On the receiving end
In 2003 alone, the G8 countries exported major conventional weapons worth in excess of $24 billion. Whilst some of these exports were to other G8 or richer countries, the majority were to the world’s poorer countries. Furthermore, the US Congressional Research Service estimates that in 2003 around 89 per cent of arms transfers to the global South came from just five members of the G8: the US, Russia, France, Britain and Germany.

It’s fairly obvious that money which countries in the global South spend on fighter jets or missile launchers is money that isn’t spent on health, education and poverty alleviation. The figures in this regard are alarming. According to the United Nations, seven countries in the global South spend more on the military than on health and education combined, with others coming close. In addition, small arms exports fuel conflicts, such as that in the Congo, with obvious and catastrophic impacts on development. In other places, military spending by one country can provoke a regional arms race, India and Pakistan being an obvious example.

Pushing the sales
But what right do western governments have to dictate how countries in the South spend their money? It might be a valid question were it not for the enormous amounts the G8 nations spend on aggressively promoting arms sales. In 2001, the British government approved the sale to Tanzania of a military air traffic control system manufactured by BAE Systems. The system cost $40 million, yet half the population of Tanzania lacks access to clean water. International bodies criticised the deal, saying that a civilian system costing an eighth of the price

What is the G8?
The US, UK, West Germany, France, Italy and Japan first met as a group of ‘major industrial democracies’ in 1974, with Canada joining in 1975. Russia was gradually integrated through the 1990s to make a forum of eight nations.

The G8 meets annually with each member state hosting the summit in turn. The EU sends representation and other countries can attend as spectators or sometimes as guest speakers.

The G8 has no formal democratic mandate but its member countries control over half the votes at World Bank and IMF meetings and dominate the World Trade Organisation. This makes the G8 annual summit the basis on which a self-selecting and unaccountable group influences the fate of the rest of the world.
would work far better, but Tony Blair himself insisted the deal should go ahead.

**Sales support mechanisms**
This is just a part of the support that G8 leaders lend to their own arms industries. CAAT has long campaigned against the existence of Britain’s Defence Export Services Organisation, which puts a staff of 600 civil servants at the disposal of UK arms companies. In 2004, DESO spent £107,000 of taxpayers’ money to “represent the Ministry of Defence in support of the UK Defence Industry” at just one arms fair, the Africa Aero and Defence exhibition in South Africa. DESO maintains offices around the world to help sell arms to countries that can ill afford them, and who often have poor human rights records.

The UK is not alone, though. All the G8 countries with established arms industries also have similar support mechanisms, including facilities to underwrite arms sales. In the US, the arms industry benefits from tax breaks, low-cost loans, export credit guarantees, research and development costs paid for by the taxpayer and military aid to poorer countries to buy US weapons. The Italian state actually owns a 32 per cent share in Italy’s largest arms company, Finmeccanica, whilst the French state also has shares in Thales. Most Russian arms exports are made through Rosoboronexport, the Russian state arms exporter. In February 2005, Chancellor Schröder of Germany took a six-day trip to the Middle East with arms company executives, specifically to sell German defence goods. This is normal behaviour for G8 ministers.

**Revolving door**
These examples are just the tip of the iceberg. All these countries feature a revolving door at the highest level between defence ministries and arms companies. While the US, UK and others push ‘free trade’ policies on the global South – telling them to cut back on welfare spending and open their markets – a system of corporate welfare exists for arms giants like Lockheed Martin, BAE Systems, EADS and Thales.

Even though G8 agreements like the global non-proliferation initiative seek to stop chemical, biological and nuclear weapons from falling into the hands of terrorists, it has been an anathema to the G8 countries to seek to control more conventional weapons. Foreign Secretary Jack Straw has talked of presenting an Arms Control Treaty to this year’s G8 summit. The details are not yet available but, while controls on arms sales are to be welcomed, it is hard to see how they can be effective given the G8 countries’ continuing financial and political support for the global arms trade. If it is to make a real impact on poverty, the G8 must substantially change its agenda, and end its complicity in pushing arms to the rest of the world.

CAAT’s new G8 briefing is now available from [www.caat.org.uk/g8](http://www.caat.org.uk/g8) or in print from the office.

CAAT will be heading to Scotland in July to oppose the arms trade policies of the G8 countries.

Along with many other anti-arms groups, CAAT will be supporting the Faslane blockade on the 4th July – two days before the G8 government leaders meet at Gleneagles. The blockade has been organised by Scottish and British CND and Trident Ploughshares. This looks set to be a huge collective action at the largest military base in Scotland. It will send a clear message to world leaders that global militarism and oppression is unacceptable.

It would be fantastic to see as many CAAT supporters at the blockade as possible. Transport, accommodation, training and support will all be available to ensure that the action is huge, safe and successful. For information about the action or for an action briefing contact Anna at the office or see the Faslane action website: [www.faslaneg8.com](http://www.faslaneg8.com)
Recent revelations on bribery and corruption

A long history
CAAT has uncovered documents at the National Archives showing how the UK Government secretly authorised bribery on arms sales from the Defence Export Services Organisation’s genesis in the mid-1960s to at least the late 1970s.

In 1967 the Director of Army Sales in the Ministry of Defence was asked by the UK’s embassy in Venezuela whether the Government was prepared to countenance bribery. He replied: “I am completely mystified by just what your problem is … People who deal with the arms trade, even if they are sitting in a government office … day by day carry out transactions knowing that at some point bribery is involved.” He continued: “Obviously I and my colleagues in this office do not ourselves engage in it, but we believe that various people who are somewhere along the train of our transactions do. They do not tell us what they are doing and we do not inquire. We are interested in the end result.”

Another top-level Department of Trade and Industry paper in 1976 set out government knowledge of bribery saying that: “most of the special commissions are paid into accounts in third countries – the implications of corruption are thus clear. We are alone among advanced industrial countries, through the Exchange Control, in knowing about these payments and authorising them.”

A 1977 enquiry into suspicious secret payments in a deal to Saudi Arabia was fended off by the Ministry of Defence saying that officials did not want to know the identity of those who received millions in secret cash. “It is accepted government practice to avoid over extensive inquiries,” wrote the then permanent secretary, Sir Frank Cooper. “We must have regard for the risk of unnecessary interference.”

Following this, the Ministry of Defence issued a formal directive to civil servants requiring arms firms to state formally that they were not engaged in any improper acts. The Government still turns a Nelsonian blind eye – as evidenced by the recent report into the Export Credits Guarantee Department’s (ECGD) anti-bribery procedures.

Could do better – 1
Each year, some countries that are part of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) are reviewed on the extent to which they have implemented the anti-bribery convention. In 2004 it was the turn of the UK to come under scrutiny and the resulting report, published in March 2005, is damning.

The OECD’s team found that it is “surprising that no company or individual has been indicted or tried for overseas bribes”. This comment was made because of the UK’s participation in such corruption-prone areas as arms exports and energy. CAAT is less than surprised because, as the history above shows, there is a cultural willingness by the authorities to turn a blind eye to corruption.

Inadequate anti-corruption laws were also highlighted by the OECD. Though strengthened in 2001 to incorporate the provisions on bribery in the OECD’s Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises into UK law, nothing has happened following a consultation in 2003 on more thorough-going changes.

Another criticism was of the poor law enforcement. It is carried out by several agencies including, in the case of arms exports, the Ministry of Defence police. None of these agencies have adequate resources.

A generous summary of the OECD report on the UK is ‘could do better’.

Could do better – 2
The Commons Trade and Industry Committee reported in March on its investigation into the shenanigans regarding the ECGD’s anti-bribery measures. Tougher measures had been introduced in May 2004 only to be weakened in December 2004 after sustained lobbying by BAE Systems, Airbus and Rolls Royce. The companies had, in essence, told the ECGD that they were not going to accept procedures under which they had to name their agents. Patricia Hewitt, then Trade and Industry Secretary, backed the companies.

The Trade and Industry Committee was pretty scathing about the ECGD’s about-turn. It stated: “The payment of commission or fees to agents is generally recognised to be a common method of paying bribers, and in our view ECGD was right to attempt to get access to information on agents as part of the implementation of its anti-corruption policy. We have no doubt that its decision not to require such information…weakens that policy.”

The multi-party Committee also wondered why these three companies could not accept the May procedures when others could. We can speculate on the answer to this.

Keep an eye on the web
The text of the 2005 CAAT Lecture, on the subject of corruption and given by Joe Roeber in February, is now on the website www.caat.org.uk

Keep an eye on the site for a new report by Nicholas Gilby on the history of the UK arms trade and corruption.

1 http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,1417088,00.html

‘A long history’ is by Nicholas Gilby; other sections are by Ann Feltham.
Working for peace in Colombia

Former CAAT volunteer
June Holmes writes on her experience with Peace Brigades International

“I volunteered with CAAT for several years – writing articles, wading through Jane’s Defence Weekly, lying in the road outside arms fairs – and learning a lot about the arms trade and human rights abuses in the process. It was this that, in part at least, inspired me to start working with Peace Brigades International (PBI). PBI is an international NGO that promotes and protects human rights through the provision of protective accompaniment to threatened human rights activists and ‘peace communities’. There are currently PBI teams in Indonesia, México, Guatemala and where I’m writing from now, Colombia.

The human rights situation here is extremely serious. Human rights defenders are killed or ‘disappeared’ with blood-chilling regularity, and the yearly UN recommendations routinely urge the Colombian state to sever the well-documented links between the armed forces and illegal paramilitary groups. Within this context, PBI works alongside human rights defenders who risk their lives campaigning for social justice, an end to impunity and the right to truth and reparation. The people we accompany receive sinister invitations to their own funerals, anonymous phone calls and threats to the lives of their children. Our presence is designed to prevent the worst scenarios from materialising.

Since 1998, PBI Colombia has accompanied ‘peace communities’ villages of internally displaced people who have designated their communities as neutral zones, where no-one bears arms and armed groups are asked to stay away. Since its founding in 1997, the San José Peace Community has registered 156 murders, without one single conviction. On 21st February, a further eight lives were added to that total, when five adults and three children were brutally murdered. Among the dead was Luis Eduardo Guerra (pictured), a community leader accompanied by PBI since 1998, whose death has stunned the international solidarity movement. Eyewitness accounts place responsibility with the Colombian army. PBI, along with Amnesty International, is calling for a full and impartial investigation to clarify the facts and bring those responsible to justice.

We are continuing to accompany the community of San José and consider it a privilege to work alongside such brave and inspiring individuals. We hope that with the help of the international community this tragedy can be made to matter and a line can be drawn under San José’s bloody past. The determination and courage of the people I’ve met there deserve nothing less.”

Peace Brigades International
www.peacebrigades.org
info@peacebrigades.org
020 7324 4628

Early Day Motion 333, supported by over a third of MPs in the last Parliament, called on the Government to freeze all military and security assistance to Colombia until the bonds between the state and paramilitary forces are severed. The UK sends more than a million pounds of military aid to Colombia each year, some of which is for ‘counter-narcotics’. The UK Embassy in Colombia has said it considers insurgent groups to be narcotics traffickers, while President Uribe has classified human rights organisations and trade unions as insurgents. The blurring of the lines between counter-insurgency and counter-narcotics is terrible as it is during counter-insurgency operations that the vast majority of human rights violations occur.

The Government has told CAAT that UK military aid is “primarily Explosive Ordnance disposal training and British military education”, presumably meaning the “human rights training” provided is a secondary consideration. The Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) denies that collusion between the Colombian military and paramilitaries is “deliberate Colombian Government policy” even though the UN has to routinely call for the severing of such ties.

An FCO factsheet says that if UK military aid ended “the significant reductions in murders and kidnappings…would be reversed”. Hard evidence for this incredible claim about the efficacy of UK military aid has yet to be produced. As with Indonesia and many other human rights abusing states, ending UK military aid will not stop atrocities on its own. But continuing UK military aid won’t reduce human rights abuses or solve Colombia’s conflict either – for that at least the hard evidence is there for all to see.

NICHOLAS GILBY

UK military aid for Colombia
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**Lobby your MP on Wednesday 13 July**

CAAT is supporting a Lobby of Parliament organised by the Palestine Solidarity Campaign and the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament on Israel’s weapons of mass destruction. One of the demands is for an embargo on the sale of all UK and EU military equipment to and purchases from Israel, as well as the breaking off of all military contact between the UK and Israel.

Besides meeting your MP between 2pm–7pm on that day, you can also attend a meeting in one of the Parliamentary Committee Rooms between 4pm–6pm. The speakers will include Mandy Turner, who wrote CAAT’s report *Arming the Occupation: Israel and the arms trade*, available on CAAT’s website or from the office priced £3.

Full information about the Lobby can be obtained from mary.brennan@blueyonder.co.uk.

**ECO privatisation and cuts**

The Department of Trade and Industry has confirmed that it is examining options to outsource the work of the Export Control Organisation (ECO). This comes on top of staff cuts in the ECO – it had 166 staff in 2003–4 falling to 136 by 31 March 2005 and the budget suggests that there will be 109 staff a year later.

The ECO must stay within the public sector and be given adequate resources if it is to do its job properly. To privatise it or to cut its staff sends a message that controlling arms exports is a low priority. This is not something which is appropriate when the UK Government is trying to get UK companies to understand and adhere to the rules, as well as when it is encouraging overseas governments to improve their export controls. The Government’s apparent lack of commitment to strict export controls seems to be reinforced when the ECO’s staff numbers are contrasted with DESO’s 600. ANN FELTHAM

**Write to your new MP about DESO**

If you didn’t write to your candidates during the election campaign, now is an ideal time to write to your MP (at the House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA), particularly if s/he is new. CAAT would like to know MPs’ individual views about the Defence Export Services Organisation (DESO), the part of the Ministry of Defence with 600 civil servants dedicated to promoting arms sales overseas. Please send copies of any responses to Ann at the CAAT office.

**New ‘Call the Shots’ campaign pack**

Arms companies wield immense influence and political power within government. They enjoy privileged access to decision-makers that the general public can only dream of. This distorts government policies into arms company wish-lists instead of serving the interests of the wider public.

**Influence**

CAAT believes the disproportionate political influence of arms companies is a key reason for the government’s continued support for arms exports. This campaign is therefore a vitally important one.

CAAT needs your help to stop arms companies calling the shots. If we want to end the export of weapons around the world, and the subsidising of these exports, we need to end the influence that arms companies have over government.

**The pack**

The Call the Shots campaign pack contains a background briefing, campaign action guide, petition, postcard, leaflet, poster, sticker and CAAT’s version of the happy families card game.

To order your free copy of the Call the Shots campaign pack, contact Patrick at the CAAT office.
The government’s arms export report for October - December 2004 was released in April this year. With 228 pages listing licences approved for the export of weaponry around the world it demonstrated business as usual. Ian Prichard checks the details.

The arms export report gives (1) the destinations of arms exports; (2) details of what is exported; and (3) the value and volume of some of the exports - although this is sometimes covered in an ambiguous way. The report does not, however, provide any information on the arms-exporting companies involved.

Fuelling conflict
So many countries are featured that it’s hard to know where to begin. Perhaps an obvious place is with arms exports to countries where armed conflict is taking place. A 2004 report by Project Ploughshares in Canada listed 28 such countries. Of the 28, the UK licensed arms to a fair number. These were Algeria, Angola, Kenya, Nigeria and Senegal in Africa; to Colombia in South America; to Afghanistan, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and the Philippines in Asia; to Serbia & Montenegro and Russia in Europe; and to Israel and Iraq in the Middle East. All these exports were approved during the course of a mere three months. Most of the other countries identified by Ploughshares were under EU or UN arms embargoes and so off-limits for legal UK arms sales.

As well as countries actually in conflict, there are others in situations of tension and engaging in arms races where supplying weapons would seem equally inflammatory. In the October–December 2004 period, licences were approved to both China and Taiwan as well as to both India and Pakistan.

This licensing took place despite Criterion 3 of the UK government’s arms export guidelines, which states that: “The Government will not issue licences for exports which would provoke or prolong armed conflicts or aggravate existing tensions or conflicts.”

Criterion 4 of the guidelines states that: “The Government will take into account... the existence or likelihood of armed conflict between the recipient and another country.”

We don’t have the space to consider the countries that break other criteria such as “the respect of human rights” or “the existence of a risk that the equipment will be diverted”.

What the data looks like
There are several different types of licences covered by the data. Single Individual Export Licences (SIELs) provide the more detailed information and are the figures most often quoted. Some examples of SIEL data are given in the table below.

However, there is a trend for the increasing use of Open Individual Export Licences (OIELs) which cover multiple shipments of an often vast range of military equipment. In the October–December 2004 report one OIEL covered nearly 200 categories of equipment. The end results of this trend are a decrease in monitoring and control by the Government, and a decrease in transparency for the rest of us.

The quarterly and annual arms export reports can be found on the Foreign & Commonwealth Office website – www.fco.gov.uk

### Single Individual Export Licences approved Oct–Dec 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Number of licences</th>
<th>Examples of equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>£19.5m</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>components for ground based radars, components for military utility helicopters, machine tools, technology for the production of military aero-engines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>£278.5m</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>components for aircraft machine guns, components for military utility helicopters, military communications equipment, military training aircraft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>£29.5m</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>armoured personnel carriers, assault rifles (50), components for submachine guns, technology for the use of assault rifles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>£2.5m</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>aircraft military communications equipment, armoured plate, gun mountings, technology for the development of large calibre artillery ammunition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>£19.0m</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>armoured all-wheel drive vehicles, components for military utility helicopters, military aero-engines, sniper rifles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>£2.0m</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>components for aircraft radars, imaging cameras, military aero-engines, military electronic equipment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fundraising

By Kathryn Busby

I’d like to start by thanking everyone who returned the leaflet from the last issue and suggested friends, family and colleagues who would like to receive a sample copy of CAATnews. There was a brilliant response and as a result we have been able to send out introductory packs to more than 200 new people.

Running for CAAT
Moving on to another great success, our congratulations go to Maya Goia, who ran the Hastings Half Marathon on 13th March and raised £145 in sponsorship for CAAT. Thank you Maya for all the time you dedicated to training and fundraising for this event.

Jump for CAAT
For those of you seeking an adrenaline rush, CAAT has an exciting new opportunity - sponsored skydiving. Joe Tatton-Brown has generously offered to pay for two CAAT supporters to take a static-line parachute jump. The participants will receive a full day’s training from specialist instructors and then on the following day will do a static-line jump from an altitude of 3,000 feet. There will be no cost to you, but we will ask you to raise at least £500 in sponsorship. The training centres are used widely across the voluntary sector, are especially good for beginners and - of course - they have absolutely no military connections. Please get in touch if you are interested.

Walk for CAAT
Or, if you fancy something less extreme, how about a sponsored CAAT walk? A walk could be an ideal way for supporters from different parts of the country to meet each other and have an enjoyable day out, as well as raising funds for CAAT. I would love to hear what you think, so please do let me know if you would be interested in taking part. Ideas for where we could walk are also very welcome.

Ethical investment
Finally, you will see below an advert from ‘Investing Ethically Ltd’, a Norwich-based independent financial advisory firm with a commitment to ethical investment. The company is directly regulated by the Financial Services Authority and was founded by Alan J Kirkham, an experienced Independent Financial Advisor who has been involved in the green movement for many years.

If any of our supporters go to ‘Investing Ethically’ for financial advice, the company has offered to donate 10 per cent of their initial commission to CAAT. So, if you do contact ‘Investing Ethically’, please mention that you heard about them from us!
Campaign Against Arms Trade thrives on your participation. Some suggestions are below.

For more information on all of these contact the CAAT office on 020 7281 0297 or if you have any enquiries not covered below contact enquiries@caat.org.uk

Subscribe to a CAAT email list
Sign up to receive the monthly CAAT bulletin with the latest news and events; to receive press releases; to join the list for the CAAT Action Network and find out about nonviolent direct action to stop the arms trade; or to find out when the latest CAATnews is on the website.

Contact enquiries@caat.org.uk or visit www.caat.org.uk/lists

Make a donation
The donations of our supporters enable CAAT to struggle for a world without arms trading; without your help there would be no campaign. Support CAAT by sending us a cheque, setting up a regular standing order donation, or by taking part in a fundraising event.

Contact Kathryn (kathryn@caat.org.uk).

Contact your MP
It is estimated that every letter written to a politician represents about 80 people who care but haven’t got around to writing. If you would like to visit or write to your MP, contact the CAAT office to find out if your MP has shown an interest in arms trade issues.

On some issues it is also worth contacting your MEP. If you live in Northern Ireland, Scotland or Wales, you can also raise issues that have an impact on employment or the economy with your national representatives.

Contact Ann (ann@caat.org.uk).

Campaign locally
CAAT has a network of local contacts and groups around the UK who take responsibility for promoting anti-arms trade activity and the work of CAAT in their area. Get in contact if you would like to know what is happening in your area or if you are interested in becoming a local contact or setting up a group. All that’s needed is a willingness to raise awareness of arms trade issues in any way that you feel is appropriate.

Contact Kathryn (kathryn@caat.org.uk).

Make the news

Have you ever thought that your local newspaper, radio or TV should include details of the arms trade? CAAT’s new Media Guide is a short introduction to using the local media for arms trade campaigning. From letter writing to publicising events, this 12-page guide gives essential advice that will make our concerns relevant to the local media.

The CAAT Media Guide is available online or by post. See the CAAT website at www.caat.org.uk or send a A4 self-addressed envelope with a second class stamp to the CAAT office.

Get active!

Protest against the arms trade
A protest can confront the arms trade and illustrate that many people do not think that the arms trade is an ordinary, acceptable business. In addition, a protest can generate a lot of publicity, which will raise awareness about the company and the arms trade in general. CAAT is a non-violent organisation and any protest organised under the name of CAAT needs to be non-violent (contact the office for the CAAT guidelines).

Contact Anna (action@caat.org.uk).

Join the CAAT Christian Network
The Network raises arms trade issues within national church structures and local churches.

Contact Beccie (beccie@caat.org.uk).

Order a CAAT publication
CAAT produces briefings, reports and leaflets on a range of issues.

Contact Patrick (patrick@caat.org.uk).

Research the arms companies
CAAT has produced a range of research on the UK’s main arms companies. However, staff at the CAAT office are not able to track all arms company developments and would appreciate receiving any information you find. This can include anything from watching out for information in your local press, to undertaking basic research in your local library, to approaching a company directly for information.

Contact Ian (ian@caat.org.uk).
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Campaigns diary

4–12 June
CAAT Stop the Arms Trade Week. Local group actions around the country. Contact beccie@caat.org.uk

11 June
12 noon – National demo against Brighton arms manufacturer EDO. Assemble at The Level, Brighton. Contact 07891 405923 for further directions or info.

11 June
2pm–4.30pm – Musical protest outside the ExCel Centre, next to Custom House Docklands Light Railway station. Contact East London Against the Arms Fair (ELAAF) c/o C.I.U. Durning Hall, Earlam Grove, London E7 9AB. ELAAF meets on the second Monday of each month at 7.30pm at the Garden Cafe, Cundy Road, London E16.

12 June
Arms Trade Day of Prayer. Organised by the CAAT Christian Network. For a Day of Prayer pack, including a briefing, petition and worship materials, email enquiries@caat.org.uk

12 June
4pm – Penarth CAAT Christian Network annual service at All Saints Church, Victoria Square, Penarth. Contact 029 2071 1943.

19 June
10.30am to 3.30pm – 25th Anniversary Celebration of the Peace Pagoda, Willen Lake North, Milton Keynes. Buddhist ceremony, multi-faith peace prayers and multi-cultural peace celebrations. Lunch will be offered to everyone. Information from 01908 663652.

2–8 July
G8 Summit protests. See pages 8–9 and www.caat.org.uk/g8

4 July
Faslane anti-militarisation G8 action. See pages 8–9

13–16 September
ExCel Arms Fair (DSEi), Docklands, London. 12th September: Candlelit Vigil, outside the ExCel Centre. 13th September: demonstration against the Arms Fair, 12 noon.

See www.caat.org.uk for more information on arms trade events