

India and the Arms Trade Treaty

September 2006

Introduction

'Some families here have lots of small, small, children. If there is another attack, which child should I carry? Or should I just flee myself?'

(Karbi mother, north-east India, living in fear of attack by militants with foreign-made weapons, 2006)

The international arms trade is out of control. A thousand people die every day because of armed violence, and many more are seriously injured. Many of the victims are women and children. In India alone, 12 people die from armed violence every day.¹

This paper sets out why the Indian government should heed the call of the thousands of Indians who have signed up to the petition for an Arms Trade Treaty (ATT – see box below), and hear the cries of those who say that no more innocent people should suffer the consequences of the lack of international regulation on the arms trade.

The Arms Trade Treaty

The idea of an Arms Trade Treaty was developed from thinking by 18 Nobel Peace Prize Laureates from over a dozen countries. The central aim of the Arms Trade Treaty is to provide a set of common minimum standards for arms transfers based firmly on states' existing responsibilities under international law. These principles can be viewed in full at www.controlarms.org and are summarised in the appendix.

In October 2006, at the First Committee of the UN General Assembly, member states will have the opportunity to vote in favour of a resolution to begin negotiations for an Arms Trade Treaty that could help make the world a safer place. India, as an emerging global power with global responsibilities, as well as a victim of illegal weapons, can lead in that change.

This paper presents three reasons why India should support the call for an international Arms Trade Treaty:

1. The Global Principles of the Arms Trade Treaty reflect India's values and Constitution.
2. Lack of regulation of the ongoing international arms trade is hurting India's citizens
3. An Arms Trade Treaty would not end India's arms production or trade in arms but only require good practice by all countries

The Global Principles of the Arms Trade Treaty reflect India's values and Constitution

'We should prevent the emergence of new ways of dealing death. The cornering of resources for weaponry must be transmuted into the sharing of resources for global development. The pursuit of dominance must be replaced by coexistence and cooperation.'

(Rajiv Gandhi, then Indian Prime Minister, Five Continent Peace Conference, Stockholm, 1988)

Rajiv Gandhi's statement reflected India's belief that arms control was a key aspect of a foreign policy based on interdependence and the promotion of peace and stability. These principles were based on the Directive Principles of State Policy set out in India's Constitution:

'Promotion of international peace and security – The State shall Endeavour to –

- (a) Promote international peace and security;
- (b) Maintain just and honourable relations between nations;
- (c) Foster respect for international law and treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another; and
- (d) Encourage settlement of international disputes by arbitration.'

India has traditionally supported initiatives to control arms. In 1959, India called for the United Nations to pay attention to the existence of large armaments and the unchecked growth of arms, which posed a threat to international peace and security. In 1965, India along with seven other nations, called for an international treaty based on the principles of non-proliferation – this treaty was to be a step towards achievement of general and complete disarmament. India was one of the first countries to ratify the Biological Weapons Convention of 1974. India is also an original signatory to the Chemical Weapons Convention, having signed it on 14 January 1993, and was among the first 65 countries to ratify the Treaty.

Recent years have seen a departure from India's earlier emphasis on disarmament. In 2005, India became the world's tenth largest military spender. In the words of one Minister, 'India needs to become self-reliant in Defence Production to effectively meet the fast changing ground realities of defence operations. India also needs to keep pace with the changes taking place by induction of new equipment, up-gradation of existing military hardware and changing over to new strategies and tactics'.³

However, the Government of India has continued to speak up for international law, stating that human rights are an 'Ancient concept [found in the] Vedas, Puranas and other ancient literature [and are an] essential ingredient of Indian culture and ethos.' It was this heritage, and the legacies of Buddha, Ashoka, Tagore, and Gandhi that led

Martin Luther King in 1959 to say: 'To other countries I may go as a tourist, but to India I come as a pilgrim', and Nelson Mandela in 1980 to praise India for an 'exemplary role in world affairs'.⁴ Now, as India emerges as a global power, people across the developing world look to India to champion the voices of the world's poor, with countries like Cambodia and Kenya, and Nobel Laureates like Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Oscar Arias, seeking India's support for an Arms Trade Treaty.

The ATT would prohibit states from authorising arms transfers where there is a clear risk that the weapons could be used in violation of the UN Charter or to commit serious abuses of human rights, serious violations of international humanitarian law, acts of genocide, or crimes against humanity. This is in line with India's Constitution and values which aim to hold back those dictators and armed militants who place no value on human life.

The call for an international Arms Trade Treaty has been supported by eminent Indians from all walks of life including Nobel Prize-winning economist Amartya Sen, Honorary President of the International Inter-Parliamentarian Union Dr Najma Heptullah, and former Scientific Advisor to the Prime Minister Professor M. G. K. Menon. In the words of Admiral L. Ramdas, Chief of Naval Staff from 1990 to 1993: 'As someone who has served in the Indian Navy around the world, I have seen the human cost of conflict and instability fuelled by uncontrolled arms sales. An Arms Trade Treaty is a crucial aspect of ensuring security for India and the whole world.'⁵

Ordinary Indians, too, are backing the call. In a six-country Ipsos MORI survey this year, 90 per cent of Indians agreed that there should be strict controls on where weapons can be exported to.⁶ Already, 20,000 Indians have given their 'faces' to a huge photo petition in support of an Arms Trade Treaty, part of a worldwide petition of over a million people from 160 countries.

The idea of an Arms Trade Treaty recognises the reality that in an ever more inter-dependent world, instability and violence anywhere can undermine development and security everywhere.

Lack of regulation of the international arms trade is hurting India's citizens

'Any weapon has only one purpose...to destroy something. My legs are lifeless; I have no sensation in them. Only the wheelchair ensures my mobility. Everything that Kashmir had in the past has been ruined in the last 15-20 years. There has been so much armed conflict...so many guns, so many weapons...they are freely available... that all humanity is destroyed. Today a human being has no value.'

(28 year old Javed, Kashmir, shot in the spine by a single bullet from a foreign-made pistol)

'It was a Monday morning when 200 militants came. They started firing guns for over an hour. They killed people, they killed cows, and they even killed our goats. We lost everything that we had in minutes...'

(Nilu Dalauja, Assam narrating the 2005 Karbi-Dimasa ethnic conflict that claimed over 100 lives in north-east India)

From the legal to the illegal

The arms trade was one of the first to globalise, and yet there are still more regulations on the international trade in music than on the international trade in arms⁷. One of the consequences of this is that weapons often move from the legal trade to the illegal trade – in fact, 80 per cent of the world's illegal weapons start off as legal weapons. The arms trade often works through long supply chains that go through several middlemen, so that a weapon may be made legally in country A, be sold to a legal buyer in country B, resold to another legal buyer in country C, resold to an illegal trader in that country and then smuggled to criminals or armed militants in country D. And, in recent years, India has often found itself in the position of country D, with civilians suffering at the hands of men with illegal weapons produced in a country where the first sale in the chain was legal. Yet, the countries in which the weapons were first manufactured take no responsibility for their use later in the chain.

Currently, in the absence of an Arms Trade Treaty there is nothing that can be done to stop this. However, if the ATT is signed, India could establish obligations for all countries in the supply chain of these weapons. The whole weapons chain needs to be tackled, not just the last link.

Where do weapons come from?

Gun Running on the Indo–Burmese Border

On December 15, 2005, Champhai police seized a number of small arms in the border village of Zokhawthar in eastern Mizoram, north-east India. The small arms seized included five Chinese SAR rifles, 300 M-16 rounds, one AK-47 magazine with five rounds and 50 GTC 40mm bombs. These arms were meant to be supplied to insurgent groups in north-east India. Three Burmese nationals were arrested in connection with the case. Champhai police confirmed that these people have been smuggling arms into the state for some time.

Source: Aman Northeast India Report on Small Arms, March 2006

India is part of a region that is flooded with arms. According to the United Nations, India is home to about 40 million firearms. The primary source for the proliferation of weapons in south Asia was the first Afghanistan war, with a further arms source in south-east Asia. The known countries of origin of illicit arms uncovered in north-east India are: China, USA, Russia, Belgium, UK, Czechoslovakia, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Thailand, Cambodia, and Bangladesh. Many of these weapons have ended up with non-state actors in India.

The biggest arms haul destined for India to date was seized off the coast near Chittagong in Bangladesh, in April 2004. The haul – worth an estimated US\$4.5m–\$7m – included around 2,000 automatic and semi-automatic weapons, among them 1,290 Type 56-1/Type 56-2 Kalashnikov-type assault rifles; 150 T-69 rocket propelled grenade (RPG) launchers; quantities of 40mm RPG ammunition; 25,000 hand-grenades; and 1.8m rounds of small-arms ammunition. The shipment came via Hong Kong to Singapore⁸. According to Bangladeshi press reports, it included weapons of both Israeli and US manufacture. The shipment was then transported north through the Strait of Malacca to be transferred in the Bay of Bengal to two trawlers, the Kazaddan and Amanat, which ferried the weaponry to a jetty on the Karnapuli River, Chittagong. Most of the weapons that were seized in Chittagong were reportedly destined for the armed groups operating in north-east India. To date there is no explanation as to where those weapons are. An Arms Trade Treaty will require countries to be

responsible for the ultimate destination of such weapons. As things stand, we can trace a lost suitcase more easily than a weapon that has moved from the legal to illegal trade.

A Gun Runner's Route

Source of weapons: I) Tammu Bazaar, at the Indo-Burmese border
II) Mandalay

Price of the weapons: Rs 600 for a Chinese hand-grenade; Rs 25 per unit for ammunition.

Place to be supplied: The gun runner was due to supply to a woman based in Churachandpur in Manipur, north-east India, from where it would be sent to Dimapur in Nagaland, another state in north-east India.

Source: B. Nepram, *South Asia's Fractured Frontier* (Mittal Publications, 2002)

Easy availability of arms helps fuel the ongoing conflicts – north-east separatists, Kashmiri separatists, and Naxalites have all been able to get hold of foreign-made weapons through middlemen. Armed violence by Naxalites has killed 1594 people in 2005.⁹ Naxalite groups now have access to the AK series of rifles, landmines, and improvised explosive devices (IEDs), among others.

Though there are also 'Cottage industry' pistols, known as 'kattas' produced using a variety of ordinary items, including plumbing pipes and jeep steering columns these home-made weapons lack the 'quality' of foreign-made weapons and are a disappointing second choice for men who want to achieve power through fear and violence.

The rise of insecurity

The spread of illegal arms in India is fuelling demand for legal arms, as desperate citizens seek refuge in the false promise that arming themselves will protect them from attack. The majority of the estimated 40 million firearms in India are in civilian possession. In the Indian state of Uttar Pradesh alone, there are 900,000 arms licence holders, and the number of arms dealers is at present pegged at around 1,400. In the words of a gun dealer, 'Gun shops are mushrooming in the state like public telephone booths'.¹⁰

Such insecurity exacerbates poverty: the promises set out in the Government of India's Common Minimum Programme (CMP) cannot be met in the context of instability fuelled by uncontrolled weapons. The lack of an international Arms Trade Treaty is exacerbating this crisis by making it easier for criminals and militants in India to obtain weapons.

Efforts to tackle the problem

India has laws governing small arms but these have not been able to prevent a flood of arms. According to the latest official report available, the Ministry of Home Affairs Annual Report 2001–2002, a drive to curb unlicensed and illicit arms in June 2001 saw only 30 people arrested. In Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, criminals have established substantial armed groups. Despite its stringent regulation of arms transfers, exports and imports, India still faces the problem of weapons which are smuggled into the country by various groups.

The seizures of these weapons, though not by any means a true measure of the real extent of illicit weapons trafficking, assist the authorities in a statistical assessment of

the size of the problem. For example, in Jammu and Kashmir and the north-eastern areas alone, the security forces have, since 1990, seized approximately 39,000 AK series (see box below). The markings and types of weapons confiscated clearly indicate that these are brought into India through illicit channels from outside the country. 'Arms captured in Jammu and Kashmir can equip nearly four to five divisions of battalions in India. In Bihar a pistol can be bought for a price varying from Rs 2500 to Rs 4000 while a carbine fetches Rs 5,000. An AK rifle costs 1 lakh and more. In the state of Manipur, an armed group, the United National Liberation Front (UNLF) has over 2,500 weapons in its armoury. This includes grenade launchers, assault rifles of the AK series, rocket propelled guns' (Air Commodore Prashant Dikshit (Retd), Defence Analyst).¹¹

Recovery of Arms from Terrorists/ Militants in Jammu and Kashmir, 1990–2004

AK Rifles & Pistols:	36, 273
Universal Machine Guns:	996
Rocket Launchers:	774

Source: Ministry of Home Affairs Report, 2003–2004

On 15 January 2005, the Indian army seized a huge cache of arms in the state of Manipur in the north-east. Raids on the 'general headquarters' of the Peoples' Liberation Army, the biggest armed group in Manipur, led to the recovery of 77 weapons, including 56 Kalashnikov rifles.

The box below lists types of arms seized in India.

Types of Arms Seized in India

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. M 14 | 9. Pistols/revolvers |
| 2. M 16 | 10. Chinese hand-grenades |
| 3. M 20 | 11. Rocket-propelled grenades |
| 4. M 22 | 12. Rocket launchers |
| 5. G-series | 13. Sten-guns |
| 6. AK-47/56/74 | 14. General purpose machine guns |
| 7. Light machine guns | 15. Self-launching rifles |
| 8. Carbines | 16. Air defence guns |

Source: B. Nepram, South Asia's Fractured Frontier (New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 2002)and author's inputs

India cannot tackle this problem through domestic legislation alone but needs other countries to play their part too, and the best framework for this is an international Arms Trade Treaty that would commit all countries to shared standards and promote responsibility throughout the weapons supply chains. The ATT would oblige states to ensure that all arms transfers are authorised by all governments involved in the transfer. This is quite simply the requirement that states exercise control over the weapons that pass, by any means, from their jurisdiction to another jurisdiction. It means that each agreement for the provision of weapons must be reviewed individually, and each scrutinised in light of other obligations under international law. An Arms Trade Treaty would make it harder for weapons to move from the legal to illegal trade and would help make India safer.


An Arms Trade Treaty would not end arms production or trade for India but only require good practice by all countries

The notion of an international Arms Trade Treaty is sometimes perceived to be 'against' the production and trade in arms for legitimate defence needs. This is inaccurate. Instead, an Arms Trade Treaty is about shared good standards that benefit all. Producers have a right to sell and buyers have a right to buy but those rights are not absolute; they confer responsibilities and legal obligations. Sales that fuel instability are in no-one's long-term interests and this is why the Arms Trade Treaty seeks to control the arms trade.

India's defence industry

India has the largest defence industry on the subcontinent (see the figure below which illustrates defence expenditure over recent years). This makes the country's state-owned munitions factories a significant source of arms exports to smaller neighbouring nations, such as Nepal, Myanmar (Burma), and the Maldives.¹² The Government is now seeking a more global scope for arms exports. India is also the largest arms importer in the developing world, purchasing some \$15bn in weapons every year, a figure expected to rise to \$50bn by 2015, and is now developing closer ties with other international arms suppliers.

In the past several years, the Government of India has ushered in phased liberalisation to the defence industry. According to the Defence Minister, the Government has come up with a policy on strengthening arms production. In a recent speech the Minister said: 'Today, India is going through an epochal transformation and is emerging as a formidable economic and political power. We are confident in facing the global challenges in the new economic milieu and are moving forward to scale greater heights. While India's progress on the economic front is a welcome sign, it needs to equally address its strategic and security concerns. India needs to become self-reliant in Defence Production to effectively meet the fast changing ground realities of defence operations.'¹³



Source: *Indian Budget Documents*¹⁴

An Arms Trade Treaty would not end arms production or trade for India but only require good practice by all countries. And global 'restrictions' on irresponsible arms transfers, applied to all countries, would be in India's enlightened self-interest.

In 2003, India exported 80 Howitzers to Myanmar, whose Government has been described by ASEAN as an 'army-ruled country [whose] human rights record, particularly the treatment of pro-democracy icon Aung San Suu Kyi, has embarrassed its neighbours.'¹⁵ The Howitzer guns have a high trajectory which can clear hilltops and low mountains. The arms consignment was despatched overland in Indian army trucks from the Eastern Command's 33rd Corps headquarters at Binaguri in Bengal. Until then, China was the main supplier of weapons to the Burmese military. Defending India's ties with Myanmar, Rao Inderjit Singh, junior Minister for Defence Procurement, said in July 2006: 'We don't choose our neighbors'.¹⁶ But India can choose to support an Arms Trade Treaty that would enable it to discontinue its irresponsible arms sales without simply being replaced by a more willing supplier.

The benefits of an Arms Trade Treaty for foreign policy

The boxed example shows how India would have benefited from an Arms Trade Treaty in its recent interaction with Nepal:

India and Nepal

India was for several years the biggest supplier of arms and ammunition to Nepal. This continued even after the takeover of power by the King, and some of these arms were used to suppress a peaceful movement for democracy led by the leaders from the seven parliamentary parties and civil society. Although India justified the sales on the grounds that weapons were needed to confront violence by Maoists, the conflict actually saw a rise in Maoist support and power. The legacy of those sales was such a thorn in Nepal-India relations that in June 2006 India agreed to cancel all the arms debt inherited by the new Government – a reported 100 crore rupees – as well as make substantial new aid pledges, so that, in retrospect, it is plain that the sales failed to meet even the narrowest financial objectives.

Yet India felt that it had little choice about whether to arm the Nepali King's dictatorship because, as the well-known argument goes, even if India refused to sell arms to Nepal, another country would not hesitate to do so. This is exactly what happened. In July 2005, India and a number of other countries eventually suspended military supplies in protest at the King's takeover, and China and other countries moved to provide alternative supplies. China dispatched truckloads of arms and ammunition to Nepal, and Nepal's army chief Pyar Jung Thapa also visited Pakistan where he was reported to have accepted a Pakistani offer of training for Nepalese troops.

Thus a progressive move by India to uphold peace and prevent the fuelling of conflict was thwarted by the lack of any global agreement on the regulations of arms transfers; in plain terms, the lack of an ATT undermined India's foreign policy.

Sources: The Indian Express, 9 June 2006

The UN's 2005 Human Development Report notes: 'Putting the threat posed by violent conflict at the heart of the development agenda is an imperative, not just to save lives today but to save the future costs of humanitarian aid, peacekeeping and reconstruction – and to reduce the global threats posed by a failure to advance human security.'

An ATT would establish a common set of legally-binding international standards, which would prevent competitor arms export countries from stepping in to supply arms when responsible exporters will not. An Arms Trade Treaty would not challenge India's national security nor impede India's capacity for self-defence.

Conclusion

The arms trade is out of control, fuelling conflict and poverty around the world. There is an emerging call for the governments of the world to agree to an international Arms Trade Treaty (ATT).

India should back this call for an Arms Trade Treaty because:

- The Global Principles of the Arms Trade Treaty reflect India's values and Constitution
- Lack of regulation of the international arms trade is hurting India's citizens
- An Arms Trade Treaty would not end India's arms production and trade but only require good practice by all countries.

Indian Nobel Laureate Amartya Sen wrote in the *International Herald Tribune* in June 2006: 'My own country, India, has good reason to use whatever influence it has, especially with the growing recognition of its importance in the global world. This is not only because reduction of armed conflicts fits well into the global objectives that were championed by India when it struggled for independence and sought a global voice, but also because India itself suffers a great deal from the illicit movement of arms that feed local insurrections and terrorist acts'.¹⁷

In a world awash with uncontrolled weapons of death and destruction, it is time to find solutions. A globally-agreed understanding to regulate the arms trade can be a way out of the crisis. India's leadership in this is critical because it is a victim but also because its voice is heard by the G8 and the rest of the developing world. India's role at the UN General Assembly in October 2006 will be closely watched by the world. India's Prime Minister Manmohan Singh is conscious of India's global presence. In his speech to the UN General Assembly in 2004, he noted, 'What is required for the international community to successfully deal with global challenges, whether they be security challenges, economic challenges or challenges in the sphere of the environment, are the existence of international institutions and a culture of genuine multilateralism...each of us has to be prepared to take on new obligations and larger responsibilities relevant to the needs of our times...we are confident that in an inextricably interdependent world that we live in, our commitment to the common good...will be resolute and firm.'¹⁸

Appendix: compilation of global principles for arms transfers

The following Principles bring together States' existing obligations in respect of international transfers of arms and ammunition. The Principles are proposed by a diverse group of non-governmental organisations¹⁹. The Principles reflect the content of a variety of international instruments including: international and regional treaties, declarations and resolutions of the United Nations and other multilateral and regional organisations, and model regulations intended for national legislation. Some of the Principles reflect customary and treaty law, while others reflect widely accepted emerging norms. The compilation indicates the best general rules for effective control of international transfers of all conventional arms and ammunition. The rules reflect States' obligations under international law while also recognising States' right to legitimate self-defence and law enforcement in accordance with international standards.

Principle 1: Responsibilities of states

All international transfers of arms and ammunition shall be authorised by all States with jurisdiction over any part of the transfer (including import, export, transit, transshipment and brokering) and carried out in accordance with national laws and procedures that reflect, as a minimum, States' obligations under international law. Authorisation of each transfer shall be granted by designated State officials in writing only if the transfer in question first conforms to the Principles set out below in this instrument and shall not be granted if it is likely that the arms or ammunition will be diverted from their intended legal recipient or re-exported contrary to the aims of these Principles.

Principle 2: Express limitations

States shall not authorise international transfers of arms or ammunition that violate their expressed obligations under international law.

These obligations include:

- A. Obligations under the Charter of the United Nations – including:
 - a. Binding resolutions of the Security Council, such as those imposing arms embargoes;
 - b. The prohibition on the threat or use of force;
 - c. The prohibition on intervention in the internal affairs of another State.

- B. Any other treaty or decision by which that State is bound, including:
 - a. Binding decisions, including embargoes, adopted by relevant international, multilateral, regional, and sub-regional organisations to which a State is party;

b. Prohibitions on arms transfers that arise in particular treaties which a State is party to, such as the 1980 UN Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, and its Protocols, and the 1997 Convention on the Prohibition of Anti-Personnel Mines.

C. Universally accepted principles of international humanitarian law – including:

a. The prohibition on the use of arms that are of a nature to cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering;

b. The prohibition on weapons or munitions incapable of distinguishing between combatants and civilians.

Principle 3: Limitations based on use or likely use

States shall not authorise international transfers of arms or ammunition where they will be used or are likely to be used for violations of international law, including:

A. breaches of the UN Charter and customary law rules relating to the use of force;

B. gross violations of international human rights law;

C. serious violations of international humanitarian law;

D. acts of genocide or crimes against humanity;

Principle 4: Factors to be taken into account

States shall take into account other factors, including the likely use of the arms or ammunition, before authorising an arms transfer, including the recipient's record of compliance with commitments and transparency in the field of non-proliferation, arms and munitions control, and disarmament.

States should not authorise the transfer if it is likely to:

A. be used for or to facilitate terrorist attacks

B. be used for or to facilitate the commission of violent or organised crime;

C. adversely affect regional security or stability;

D. adversely affect sustainable development;

E. involve corrupt practices;

F. contravene other international, regional, or sub-regional commitments or decisions made, or agreements on non-proliferation, arms control, and disarmament to which the exporting, importing, or transit States are party;

Principle 5: Transparency

States shall submit comprehensive national annual reports on all their international arms and ammunition transfers to an international registry, which shall publish a compiled, comprehensive, international annual report. Such reports should cover the international transfer of all conventional arms and ammunition including small arms and light weapons.

Principle 6: Comprehensive Controls

States shall establish common standards for specific mechanisms to control:

- A. all import and export of arms and ammunition;
- B. arms and ammunition brokering activities;
- C. transfers of arms and ammunition production capacity; and
- D. the transit and trans-shipment of arms and ammunition.

States shall establish operative provisions to monitor enforcement and review procedures to strengthen the full implementation of the Principles.

NOTES

¹ <http://www.satp.org>

² Constitution of India, Directive Principles of State Policy, Part IV, p.51.

³ Indian Defence Minister's Speech at Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI) Seminar, 8 June 2005.

⁴ Nelson Mandela, letter dated 3 August 1980, ANC, <http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/mandela/awards/honour.html>.

⁵ Address at the Control Arms Hundred Day Countdown, 16 March 2006 in New Delhi, India.

⁶ India Arms Trading Research, May 2006, conducted by IPSOS-UK. For further information, please visit www.capibus.co.uk.

⁷ <http://www.hindu.com/2006/03/17/stories/2006031703031200.htm>

⁸ Interview with Bertil Lintner, South East Asia Expert working with Jane Defense Weekly

⁹ http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/india/maoist/data_sheets/fatalitiesnaxal.htm

¹⁰ *Indian Express*, March 27 2006.

¹¹ Speech delivered at Oxfam GB and Control Arms Foundation of India Seminar, India and the Call for Tougher International Arms Control Seminar, 18 May 2006, New Delhi

¹² Will the Indian Defense Industry Aim Globally? Foreign Policy Association Newsletter, December 2005.

¹³ Indian Defence Minister's Speech at Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI) Seminar, 8 June 2005.

¹⁴ Anuradha Chenoy, 'Understanding India's Defence Policies and Military Expenditures', Control Arms Foundation of India Policy Briefing, May 2005. Paper also presented at Leicester University, February 2005.

¹⁵ *South China Morning Post* (Hong Kong) May 24 2003.

¹⁶ Media Release, July 2006, <http://www.indiadaily.com/editorial/12073.asp>, 27 July 2006.

¹⁷ Amartya Sen, 'It's Time for Global Control on Small Arms', *International Herald Tribune*, 26 June 2006.

¹⁸ http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/india/document/papers/pm_un59.htm.

¹⁹ This group of non-governmental organisations includes: Africa Peace Forum, Amnesty International, Arias Foundation, Caritas International, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Non-Violence International, IANSA, Oxfam International, Project Ploughshares, Saferworld, Schweitzer Institute, Sou da Paz, Viva Rio, and Women's Institute for Alternative Development (WINAD). Additional legal advice to the group has been provided by the Lauterpacht Centre for International Law, University of Cambridge.

© Oxfam International August 2006

This paper was written by Binalakshmi Nepram. Oxfam acknowledges the assistance of Ben Phillips in its production and the support of the Control Arms Foundation of India (CAFI). It is part of a series of papers written to inform public debate on development and humanitarian policy issues.

The text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. E-mail publish@oxfam.org.uk.

For further information on the issues raised in this paper please e-mail advocacy@oxfaminternational.org.

Oxfam International is a confederation of twelve organisations working together in more than 100 countries to find lasting solutions to poverty and injustice: Oxfam America, Oxfam Australia, Oxfam-in-Belgium, Oxfam Canada, Oxfam Germany, Oxfam Great Britain, Oxfam Hong Kong, Intermón Oxfam (Spain), Oxfam Ireland, Oxfam New Zealand, Oxfam Novib (Netherlands), and Oxfam Québec. Please call or write to any of the agencies for further information, or visit www.oxfam.org.

<p>Oxfam America 26 West St., Boston, MA 02111-1206, USA Tel: +1.617.482.1211 E-mail: info@oxfamamerica.org www.oxfamamerica.org</p>	<p>Oxfam Hong Kong 17/fl., China United Centre, 28 Marble Road, North Point, Hong Kong Tel: +852.2520.2525 E-mail: info@oxfam.org.hk www.oxfam.org.hk</p>
<p>Oxfam Australia 156 George St., Fitzroy, Victoria 3065, Australia Tel: +61.3.9289.9444 E-mail: enquire@oxfam.org.au www.oxfam.org.au</p>	<p>Intermón Oxfam (Spain) Roger de Llúria 15, 08010, Barcelona, Spain Tel: +34.902.330.331 E-mail: info@intermonoxfam.org www.intermonoxfam.org</p>
<p>Oxfam-in-Belgium Rue des Quatre Vents 60, 1080 Brussels, Belgium Tel: +32.2.501.6700 E-mail: oxfamsol@oxfamsol.be www.oxfamsol.be</p>	<p>Oxfam Ireland Dublin Office, 9 Burgh Quay, Dublin 2, Ireland Tel: +353.1.672.7662 Belfast Office, 115 North St, Belfast BT1 1ND, UK Tel: +44.28.9023.0220 E-mail: communications@oxfam.ie www.oxfamireland.org</p>
<p>Oxfam Canada 250 City Centre Ave, Suite 400, Ottawa, Ontario, K1R 6K7, Canada Tel: +1.613.237.5236 E-mail: info@oxfam.ca www.oxfam.ca</p>	<p>Oxfam New Zealand PO Box 68357, Auckland 1032, New Zealand Tel: +64.9.355.6500 (Toll-free 0800 400 666) E-mail: oxfam@oxfam.org.nz www.oxfam.org.nz</p>
<p>Oxfam Germany Greifswalder Str. 33a, 10405 Berlin, Germany Tel: +49.30.428.50621 E-mail: info@oxfam.de www.oxfam.de</p>	<p>Oxfam Novib (Netherlands) Mauritskade 9, Postbus 30919, 2500 GX, The Hague, The Netherlands Tel: +31.70.342.1621 E-mail: info@oxfamnovib.nl www.oxfamnovib.nl</p>
<p>Oxfam Great Britain Oxfam House, John Smith Drive, Cowley, Oxford, OX4 2JY, UK Tel: +44.(0)1865.473727 E-mail: enquiries@oxfam.org.uk www.oxfam.org.uk</p>	<p>Oxfam Québec 2330 rue Notre Dame Ouest, bureau 200, Montréal, Québec, H3J 2Y2, Canada Tel: +1.514.937.1614 E-mail: info@oxfam.qc.ca www.oxfam.qc.ca</p>

Oxfam International Secretariat: Suite 20, 266 Banbury Road, Oxford, OX2 7DL, UK
Tel: +44.(0)1865.339100. E-mail: information@oxfaminternational.org. Web site: www.oxfam.org

Oxfam International advocacy offices:

Washington: 1100 15th St., NW, Ste. 600, Washington, DC 20005, USA
Tel: +1.202.496.1170. E-mail: advocacy@oxfaminternational.org

Brussels: 22 rue de Commerce, 1000 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +322.502.0391. E-mail: advocacy@oxfaminternational.org

Geneva: 15 rue des Savoises, 1205 Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: +41.22.321.2371. E-mail: advocacy@oxfaminternational.org

New York: 355 Lexington Avenue, 3rd Floor, New York, NY 10017, USA
Tel: +1.212.687.2091. E-mail: advocacy@oxfaminternational.org

Linked Oxfam organisations:

The following organisations are linked to Oxfam International:

Oxfam Japan Maruko bldg. 2F, 1-20-6, Higashi-Ueno, Taito-ku, Tokyo 110-0015, Japan
Tel: + 81.3.3834.1556. E-mail: info@oxfam.jp Web site: www.oxfam.jp

Oxfam India B55, First Floor, Shivalik, New Delhi, 1100-17, India
Tel: + 91.11.26693 763. E-mail: info@oxfamint.org.in Web site: www.oxfamint.org.in

Oxfam observer members:

The following organisations are currently observer members of Oxfam International, working towards possible full affiliation:

Agir ici (France) 104 Rue Oberkampf, 75011 Paris, France
Tel: + 33.1.56.98.24.40. E-mail: agirici@agirici.org Web site: www.agirici.org

Fundación Rostros y Voces (México) Alabama No. 105 (esquina con Missouri), Col. Nápoles, C.P. 03810 México, D.F.

Tel/Fax: + 52.55.687.3002. E-mail: correos@rostrosyvoces.org Web site: www.rostrosyvoces.org