

---

# CONTROLLING THE SUPPLY OF “TOOLS OF TORTURE”

by **Clare Turnbull**  
of the **Omega Research Foundation**

Torture remains a subject of controversy in attempts to reform China’s criminal justice system. Current information indicates that China not only routinely uses torture equipment, but is also a key exporter of such equipment to other countries.

Internationally agreed standards have condemned the use of torture since 1948, when the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted. Article 5 of the Declaration unequivocally prohibits torture, and states that “*no one shall be subject to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.*”<sup>1</sup> This Article was expanded on in the mid-1980s by the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), which states that “*no exceptional circumstances whatsoever, whether a state of war or a threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked as a justification of torture.*”<sup>2</sup>

China ratified CAT in 1988 but has done little to implement its provisions.<sup>3</sup> In 2005, nearly a decade since the initial request of the mandate, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (Special Rapporteur on Torture), Professor Manfred Nowak, spent two weeks visiting and assessing the prevalence of torture in China. Nearly two decades after China ratified CAT, the Special Rapporteur found that the practice of torture, though on the decline—particularly in urban areas—remains widespread in China.<sup>4</sup> The Special Rapporteur’s report on China commented that “(A)lthough Chinese law prohibits gathering evidence through torture and provides for punishment of those guilty of torture, the Chinese definition of torture does not fully correspond to the international standard contained in CAT. In particular, physical or psychological torture that leaves no physical trace is difficult if not impossible to punish with appropriate penalties in China (indeed, the Chinese word for torture, “kuxing,” principally connotes physical torture).”<sup>5</sup> The Chinese definition of torture thus clearly falls short of CAT’s definition of torture as “any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession.”<sup>6</sup>

The Special Rapporteur on Torture drew the following conclusions from his mission to China:<sup>7</sup>

### Positive observations:

- Government is increasingly willing to acknowledge the pervasiveness of torture
- Some measures taken at the central and provincial level to combat torture and ill-treatment
- A decline in torture practices over recent years can be observed

### Prevalence:

- Torture, though in decline particularly in urban areas, remains widespread in China.

### Factors contributing to the practice of torture:

- Incentives for interrogators to obtain confessions
- Excessive detention of criminal suspects without judicial control
- Absence of a legal concept of presumption of innocence and the right to remain silent
- Restricted access to defense counsel
- Lack of a free press, civil society monitoring and an independent judiciary
- Inability of the central government to effectively implement legal and judicial reforms at the local level

Following release of the report, Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Qin Gang said the report contained “some outstanding problems” such as incomplete information, misunderstandings of Chinese law, “unfair” conclusions and comments going beyond the rapporteur’s authority. “We have expressed regret and dissatisfaction that the rapporteur could not in all aspects objectively reflect China’s real situation,” Qin said.\*

\* Japan Economic Newswire, March 21, 2006, posted at <http://ahdu88.blogspot.com/2006/03/un-envoy-urges-to-end-prisoner-re.html>.

States and international bodies are increasingly recognizing that international obligations to prohibit torture also include the need to control the supply of the “tools of torture.”<sup>8</sup> The Special Rapporteur has argued that such controls form part of the obligations of states under CAT, and in December 2004 the UN Commission on Human Rights called upon all Governments “to take appropriate effective legislative, administrative, judicial or other measures to prevent and prohibit the production, trade, export and use of equipment that is specifically designed to inflict torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment.”<sup>9</sup>

Reports from both torture survivors and human rights defenders suggest that many of the torture techniques employed in China do not require specialist equipment. Stress positions such as forcing prisoners to kneel for extended periods or to stand in the “flying airplane” position are widely reported to be used in prisons, forced labor camps and detention centers. Basic items such as wooden clubs, soldering irons, metal bars and cigarette butts have also been used to subject prisoners to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.<sup>10</sup> And of course, psychological torture using isolation, darkness, oppressive lighting and threats, can have the same long-term effects as physical brutality. However, witness accounts also claim that specially designed policing and security equipment, including electroshock weapons and restraints, are widely used for torture in China. Torture using this kind of equipment, at the very least, could be brought under more effective international control.

This article will first examine the use of “torture tools” in China, focusing on the use and abuse of leg irons and electroshock equipment. It then focuses on the international trade in tools that have been shown to be used in the torture and ill treatment of prisoners. Finally, this article argues that the lack of regional control mechanisms facilitates the use of, and trade in, Chinese-made “tools of torture” beyond China.

---

## Some common tools of torture

### LEG IRONS<sup>11</sup>

There is a legitimate argument for the use of restraint equipment by law enforcement officials to control prisoners who pose a threat or to secure prisoners during transportation, but restraints, particularly leg irons, can easily be misused and abused. International standards have delineated the proper and permitted use of such restraints. Article 33 of the United Nations' Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners clearly states that restraints should never be applied as a punishment; that "such instruments must not be applied for any longer time than is strictly necessary;" and that "chains and irons shall not be used as restraints."<sup>12</sup>

China's own regulations on the use of leg irons contravene the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners. Regulations published for prison and labor camp wardens explicitly stipulate that "leg-irons and handcuffs may be used together on prisoners awaiting execution."<sup>13</sup> There have also been cases where prisoners have been shackled in weighted leg irons, a particularly cruel method of restraint:

**Zhuo Xiaojun** was tried and sentenced to death for "intentional killing" in September 1990. The main evidence against Zhuo was his "confession," which he testified had been extracted under torture. Zhuo alleged in his testimony that for the first 33 hours of his detention he had been suspended from handcuffs attached to the bars of a door, with his feet locked in 50kg leg irons, while his confession was extracted. An appeal in 1992 found the evidence to be insufficient, and the case was adjourned for further investigations.

Despite no new evidence being introduced, Zhuo was found guilty again at a second trial in January 2000. It is believed that he has been held with his feet and hands shackled together since his second conviction. It is not clear whether Zhuo is still being detained or whether he has been executed.<sup>14</sup>

**Zhang Sufang**, a Falun Gong practitioner, was detained in December 2000. She was taken to the detention center of Huaiyang County in January 2001, where she was held for about 10 months. Zhang alleges that while in detention she was forced to run in leg irons on several occasions. Zhang claimed in a statement that her ankles were "*torn and bloody due to the grinding of the leg irons.*" She also described being made to wear leg irons and being locked to seven other people continuously for about 20 days. Zhang claims that detention center officials used leg irons to threaten her into rejecting the Falun Gong beliefs. Zhang refused to do this and was kept in leg irons for twenty-nine days until she passed out during a hunger strike.<sup>15</sup>

These accounts are supported by the Special Rapporteur's report on China in 2005, in which he described seeing some prisoners who had been sentenced to death "handcuffed and shackled with leg-irons weighing approximately 3kg, 24 hours per day."<sup>16</sup> This continuous use of leg irons and / or handcuffs makes it impossible for prisoners to

# CHINESE DOMESTIC LAW ON TORTURE

## Definition of torture

---

- No explicit definition of torture

## Prohibitions against torture

---

- The personal dignity of Chinese citizens is “inviolable”<sup>24</sup>
- Use of torture or coercive methods to gather evidence or extract confessions prohibited<sup>25</sup>
- Judicial officers and policemen prohibited from physically abusing individuals in their custody, or instigating detainee-on-detainee violence<sup>26</sup>

## Prohibitions against extracting confessions

---

- Extracting confessions through torture prohibited
- The Supreme People’s Procuratorate stipulates only torture involving the following will be investigated:
  - Cruel methods or evil impact
  - Results of suicide or mental disorder
  - Resulting in unjust, false or erroneous cases
  - Coercing confessions or testimony by violence more than three times or against more than three people
  - Instigating others to coerce confessions or testimony

## Penalizing Torture

---

- Penalties for acts of torture stipulated in Criminal law and other regulations\*
- Investigations will not be pursued where:
  - The law is unclear or inconsistent
  - The error occurs as a result of unforeseen or unavoidable circumstances
  - The policeman is acting under the orders of a superior
  - The policeman was handling a case according to regulations on co-operation with other units.

## Falling short of international standards

---

- No explicit prohibition against mental torture as required
- Prohibiting and penalizing torture limited to acts committed by judicial officers and policemen; international standards reach to acts committed at the consent or with the acquiescence of a public official<sup>27</sup>
- No exclusionary rule; confessions procured through torture can still be used in court as long as the confession does not form the basis of the charge

\* See, e.g., Articles 247 and 248 of the Criminal Law; the Regulations on the Use of Police Instruments and Weapons by the People’s Police; the Supreme People’s Court’s Measures Concerning the Punishment of Judicial Personnel of the People’s Court Who Break the Law during Trials, and Disciplinary Measures Concerning Judicial Personnel of the People’s Court; and the Rules on the Handling of Criminal Cases by Public Security Authorities.

---

eat or use the toilet without help from other prisoners. It is clearly an “inhuman and degrading” practice that serves only as an additional punishment for someone subjected to the stress and grievance associated with a death sentence.<sup>17</sup>

## **ELECTROSHOCK EQUIPMENT<sup>18</sup>**

The number of reports of electroshock equipment being used for torture in China exceeds that of any other country.<sup>19</sup> There is continued debate over the legitimacy of using of such equipment in policing: for example, using projectile stun devices as a less than lethal alternative to firearms.<sup>20</sup> However, there is no justification for the routine use of electroshock equipment in prisons, forced labor camps and detention centers, where prisoners do not pose a threat to public safety. Their availability within detention facilities does, however, invite their use for torture and ill treatment.

Following are some reported cases of the use of electroshock equipment in China:

**Gao Rongrong** was reportedly sent to the Longshan Forced Labor Camp in July 2003 after appealing for the Chinese government to end the persecution of Falun Gong practitioners. Gao managed to escape from the labor camp in October 2004 and described being handcuffed to a pipe and tortured for seven hours with electric batons in May 2004. Falun Gong Web sites published photos of burns that Gao sustained to her face, head and neck. Gao was detained again in March 2005, and after allegedly suffering further torture in detention, she died in a hospital in Shenyang City, Liaoning Province on June 16, 2005.<sup>21</sup>

**Ye Guozhu** was sentenced to four years’ imprisonment in 2004 after campaigning against Olympics-related forced evictions. While in detention in Beijing, he was reportedly suspended from the ceiling by his arms and was beaten with electroshock batons for refusing to “admit his guilt.”<sup>22</sup>

**Palden Gyatso**, a Tibetan monk, spent 33 years in Chinese prisons and labor camps before escaping, smuggling with him some of the tools of his Chinese torturers. He described his experiences as follows: *“This is the worst thing—an electric cattle prod. They use this on your body. If they press that button, your whole body will be in shock. If they do it for too long, you lose consciousness but you do not die. If they press this button, you can die. They used it all the time on my body. They tortured me because I was speaking out for independence and I will continue to speak out.”*<sup>23</sup>

## **“Torture equipment”: Production and sale in China**

A study on the worldwide manufacture of electroshock equipment between 2000 and 2004, conducted by the Omega Research Foundation<sup>28</sup> for the Special Rapporteur on Torture, found that no country had more domestic suppliers of electroshock equipment than China.<sup>29</sup> While there are limitations to this survey,<sup>30</sup> it is clear that Chinese

factories now produce electroshock equipment on a wide scale, possibly with external assistance: in 1997, the managing director of a Scottish company admitted selling electroshock batons to China seven years earlier, claiming that “the Chinese wanted to copy them.”<sup>31</sup> The Omega Research Foundation has identified at least 60 Chinese companies and factories either manufacturing or distributing electroshock weapons since 1990.<sup>32</sup>

The availability of these “tools of torture” arguably invites the ill treatment of prisoners within China. In addition, Chinese companies have made use of thriving export markets. Electroshock equipment has been exported from China to countries with documented cases of electroshock torture, including Cambodia and Indonesia.<sup>33</sup> Also, suppliers in the United States and Russia have offered electroshock equipment identical to that manufactured in China. Since China is arguably the leading production center for such equipment, there is clearly a need for controls not only on domestic use, but also on the international trade and export of “policing” and “security” equipment commonly used in torture and ill treatment.



**A sting stick purchased from a Chinese supplier by students as part of the Dispatches program “After School Arms Club” broadcast in April 2006. Photo: Robin Ballantyne, The Omega Research Foundation.**

Such equipment extends beyond electroshock equipment and restraints. For instance, at least four companies in China manufacture or trade in “sting sticks” or “wolf sticks” (shown in the photograph at left), a heavy steel bar with spikes. Such equipment can have no legitimate policing use except for torture, ill treatment or the excessive use of force. There have been reported cases of equipment matching the description of a sting stick used in Nepal<sup>34</sup> and Tibet, although there is no information on where the particular equipment used was manufactured.<sup>35</sup>

The Omega Research Foundation is unaware of any current international restrictions on trade in implements such as sting sticks. They are so easily procured that even a group of British school students were able to import one from a Chinese supplier.<sup>36</sup> This sale of a sting stick to teenagers who were not old enough to drink alcohol or vote was exposed in a UK television documentary. The program highlighted the need for international regulations governing the trade in policing and security equipment, including a “catch-all clause” to cover unique items such as sting sticks that may not otherwise be covered in control lists of well-known policing and security equipment.<sup>37</sup>

A “catch-all clause” would also help restrict the trade in “dual-use” technologies. Dual use equipment is that which may have a legitimate purpose, such as use in policing or investigation, but also has the potential to be used in torture, such as shackles. A more mundane and therefore harder to regulate example would be pliers, which can be utilised in a number of domestic functions, but can also inflict pain when used in torture. It would be unreasonable to call for export controls on pliers, but a catch-all clause could require exporters to request a government export decision if they received a large order for pliers from an end-user such as a Chinese prison, where there might be a reasonable suspicion of use in torture.

In 2002, the Chinese government reviewed and updated its export control regulations covering international arms transfers by the government.<sup>38</sup> It remains unclear whether these revised regulations cover policing and security equipment such as electroshock devices and leg irons.<sup>39</sup> In any case, it is almost impossible to measure the effectiveness

---

or impact of these revised regulations, because China has not published information about its exports of military, security and police equipment since 1996, and prior to that date only reported (to the UN Register of Conventional Arms) on transfers of large military equipment.<sup>40</sup>

## Controlling the trade in “tools of torture”

The European Union (EU) imposed an arms embargo against China in June 1989 in response to the brutal repression which had culminated in the massacre at Tiananmen Square.<sup>41</sup> The embargo covers large military weapon systems, but doesn't cover police and security equipment, devices that this report has shown to be used in torture and repression in China. The embargo, now under renewed debate, was an important statement of the EU's intolerance of the Chinese government's actions, but has had very little impact on actually reducing the incidence of repression and torture in China.

Ensuring that China meets its international obligations requires a mechanism capable of monitoring and regulating the country's domestic and international export trade in military, security and police (MSP) transfers. A legal instrument of this kind should increase transparency in the reporting of MSP equipment transfers, and ban the manufacture and trade in inherently abusive equipment.

### **DOMESTIC CONTROL**

A domestic control mechanism would limit access to “tools of torture” and would make it more difficult for Chinese police and security forces to get hold of MSP equipment. It would also impede international transfers, specifically countries where recent cases of electroshock torture have been documented, from acquiring electroshock weapons from China.

The transnational nature of the industry, however, means that no domestic control mechanism could prevent all such equipment from reaching torturers. While 34 out of the 53 companies (64 percent) world-wide found to be manufacturing electroshock equipment were based in the Asia Pacific region, predominately in China, a significant number of these companies are not mainland Chinese.<sup>42</sup> They include several companies based in Taiwan that maintain factories in mainland China. These cross-border operations suggest the need for international regulations and controls.

### **REGIONAL CONTROL**

One solution could be a regional model similar to the regulation that the European Commission (EC) has recently implemented “concerning trade in certain goods which could be used for capital punishment, torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.”<sup>43</sup> This trade regulation prohibits European Union countries

---

from importing and exporting “goods designed for the execution of human beings” (e.g. gallows, guillotines and electric chairs), and certain goods with no other use than for torture or ill treatment (including electroshock belts). The trade regulation also requires government export authorization for a range of policing and security equipment, including restraint chairs, leg irons, shackles and thumb-cuffs; portable electroshock devices; and certain chemical irritant devices such as pepper sprays.<sup>44</sup>

The EC trade regulation also covers dual-use technologies with a catch-all clause for equipment with applications in weapons of mass destruction. EC Dual Use Regulation No. 1334/2000 has a 72-page list of controlled dual-use items (such as “acoustic beam forming software” and “filament winding machines”), but none of these items have applications in torture.<sup>45</sup> The Regulation does, however, include a provision (Article 4) for controlling goods not on the list, if either the government or the exporter suspects the goods are intended for use in weapons of mass destruction, or for military equipment in embargoed countries.<sup>46</sup> In this respect it could serve as a model for a catch-all clause for equipment with applications in torture for the Asia-Pacific region.

The EC trade regulation is not a perfect model. A recent Amnesty International report<sup>47</sup> exposed loopholes that still allow a range of “torture tools” to be traded from the EU without control, and the regulation does not control transfers of equipment internally within the EU. And of course, any mechanism is only as good as its implementation at the domestic level. However, it is the first international control on such equipment, and is likely to become more effective as it is adapted and strengthened over the coming years. Given that the current lack of regional control mechanisms in the Asia-Pacific region can only facilitate China’s trade in tools of torture, a mechanism modelled on the EC’s ground-breaking legislation could at least serve as a step forward.

The centrality of the Asia Pacific region to this global trade in “torture tools” means that an Asian trade control mechanism is even more urgently required. An Asian regional association could design and implement such a regulation, perhaps modeled on the EC “torture trade” regulation. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) would be the most obvious choice, but mainland China, Taiwan and South Korea are not members, and given their dominant role in electroshock weaponry and security equipment trade, any meaningful regional controls must include all three. Political agreement between these three states is difficult, but without trade controls, Chinese companies will continue to profit from the trade in the tools of torture; domestic police and security forces will continue to have access to equipment with which to torture prisoners; and torture equipment will continue to be supplied to torturers and human rights abusers in other countries.

## Notes

1. *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, <http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>.
2. *The Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment and Punishment*, <http://www.hrweb.org/legal/cat.html>.
3. China was first reviewed by the Committee Against Torture in May 2000, during which time



---

the Committee expressed concern about the widespread prevalence of torture and the lack of an effective investigative organ in China. Conclusions and recommendations of the Committee against Torture: China, UN Doc. A/55/44, May 9, 2000, paras.106–145. China will next be revied in May 2008.

4. United Nations Press Release. *Special Rapporteur on Torture Highlights Challenges at End of Visit to China*, <http://www.unhchr.ch/hurricane/hurricane.nsf/0/677C1943FAA14D67C12570CB0034966D?opendocument>. The Special Rapporteur's report in full can be accessed at <http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G06/117/50/PDF/G0611750.pdf?OpenElement>.
5. United Nations Press Release. *Special Rapporteur on Torture Highlights Challenges at End of Visit to China*, <http://www.unhchr.ch/hurricane/hurricane.nsf/view01/677C1943FAA14D67C12570CB0034966D>
6. Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment, *ibid*.
7. Special Rapporteur on Torture, Report, Mission to China, UN Doc. E/CN.4/2006/6/Add.6, March 10, 2006.
8. For an overview of the issue of tools of torture, see Amnesty International. *Stopping the Torture Trade*, [http://web.amnesty.org/aidoc/ai.nsf/afec99eadc40eff880256e8f0060197c/322965ebce4b1979802569fa003ec90e/\\$FILE/ATTO31DE/act400022001.pdf](http://web.amnesty.org/aidoc/ai.nsf/afec99eadc40eff880256e8f0060197c/322965ebce4b1979802569fa003ec90e/$FILE/ATTO31DE/act400022001.pdf).
9. United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. *Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Commission on Human Rights resolution 2002/38*, [http://www.unhchr.ch/Huridocda/Huridoca.nsf/\(Symbol\)/E.CN.4.RES.2002.38.En?Opendocument](http://www.unhchr.ch/Huridocda/Huridoca.nsf/(Symbol)/E.CN.4.RES.2002.38.En?Opendocument).
10. Amnesty International. *Torture – A Growing Scourge in China – Time for Action*. 2001, <http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/engASA170042001>.
11. To avoid confusion, this article uses the term “leg irons” to refer to all forms of leg restraints, cuffs and shackles.
12. The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. *Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners*, [http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/h\\_comp34.htm](http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/h_comp34.htm).
13. Amnesty International. *Stopping the Torture Trade*, [http://web.amnesty.org/aidoc/ai.nsf/afec99eadc40eff880256e8f0060197c/322965ebce4b1979802569fa003ec90e/\\$FILE/ATTO31DE/act400022001.pdf](http://web.amnesty.org/aidoc/ai.nsf/afec99eadc40eff880256e8f0060197c/322965ebce4b1979802569fa003ec90e/$FILE/ATTO31DE/act400022001.pdf).
14. Amnesty International. *Torture – A Growing Scourge in China*, *ibid*.
15. Clear Harmony. The Torture Experienced by Practitioner Ms. Zhang Sufang from Henan Province, <http://www.clearharmony.net/articles/200610/36216.html>.
16. Special Rapporteur on Torture, Report, Mission to China, UN Doc. E/CN.4/2006/6/Add.6, March 10, 2006, para. 68.
17. United Nations Press Release. *Special Rapporteur on Torture Highlights Challenges at End of Visit to China*, <http://www.unhchr.ch/hurricane/hurricane.nsf/view01/677C1943FAA14D67C12570CB0034966D>.
18. This refers to a wide range of electric batons and guns, also known as “stun” batons / guns.
19. Based on ongoing analysis of Amnesty International and other human rights documentation relating to China, currently conducted by the Omega Research Foundation.
20. For a variety of credible arguments on the Taser debate, see <http://web.amnesty.org/library/index/engamr511392004>; <http://www.aclunabraska.org/ACLU%20Taser%20study.pdf>; [www2.taser.com/company/pressroom/Documents/TASER%20Intl%20Press%20Kit%2004%2025%2007.pdf](http://www2.taser.com/company/pressroom/Documents/TASER%20Intl%20Press%20Kit%2004%2025%2007.pdf).
21. Falun Gong Human Rights Working Group. *The World is Watching*. 2005, <http://flghrwg.net/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=1271&Itemid=>; “Gao Rongrong Tells Story of Torture on Video Before Her Death,” *The Epoch Times*, August 22, 2005, <http://en.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-22/31481.html>.
22. Amnesty International. *Will China Honour its Olympic Promises?* 2006, <http://web.amnesty.org/wire/October2006/China>.
23. Amnesty International. *Trading in Terror*, [http://web.amnesty.org/library/pdf/POL340112001ENGLISH/\\$File/POL3401101.pdf](http://web.amnesty.org/library/pdf/POL340112001ENGLISH/$File/POL3401101.pdf).
24. Article 38, PRC Constitution.

- 
25. *PRC Criminal Law*, Article 247.
  26. *PRC Criminal Law*, Article 248.
  27. International prohibitions are against the involvement of a public official directly or at the instigation or consent or with the acquiescence of a public official or another person acting in an official capacity; and infliction of the act for a specific purpose, such as extracting a confession, obtaining information, punishment, intimidation, discrimination. See: *Convention Against Torture*.
  28. The Omega Research Foundation has used open source information to compile information over a number of years on companies that manufacture and trade in military, security and police equipment.
  29. The other countries in the top four were Taiwan, the United States and South Korea. These four countries accounted for 77 percent (41 out of 53) of the manufacturers identified.
  30. This analysis has several limitations. Firstly, identifying a company as a manufacturer can be difficult, as many companies claim to be manufacturers when in fact they are simply distributing products made by others. Secondly, establishing the number of manufacturing companies does not establish the actual number of electroshock weapons produced and exported. Thirdly, identifying which company (or even country) was responsible for manufacturing electroshock weapons is also complicated by the growth in the use of “drop shipping,” i.e., a process in which an online marketer takes an order and payment for an item, and then purchases it from a wholesaler, who ships the merchandise to the client.
  31. Crowley, M. *Trading in Shock*, 2000, <http://www.newint.org/issue327/trading.htm>.
  32. Information from Omega Research Foundation archives.
  33. Crowley, *ibid*.
  34. “He has lost his right eye after being subjected to an indiscriminate baton charge by the Police during a peaceful torch rally on 11 May 2003 in Ratnapark, Kathmandu. Mr Sharma sustained severe injuries to both his eyes because the Police allegedly hit him several times with iron-spiked sticks and specifically targeted his eyes.” Quoted from the Asian Human Rights Commission—Urgent Appeals Program, <http://www.ahrchk.net/ua/mainfile.php/2003/461/>.
  35. Tibet Justice Center. *Violence and Discrimination Against Tibetan Women*, <http://www.tibetjustice.org/reports/women/iii.html>.
  36. Norton-Taylor, R. *Pupils import torture tools to highlight UK arms loopholes*, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/armstrade/story/0,,1742627,00.html> [Accessed 08.05.07].
  37. A Dispatches programme for Channel 4, “The After School Arms Club” aired April 3, 2006.
  38. Amnesty International. *Sustaining Conflict and Human Rights Abuses*. 2006, <http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/ENGASA170302006>.
  39. The Economic and Commercial Office of the Chinese Embassy in the UK was contacted to request details of equipment covered by these revised export regulations, but no response had been received at the time of writing.
  40. China’s most recent white paper on its military, “China’s National Defense in 2006,” does not include a section on weapons export. For a full English translation of the white paper, see [http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2006-12/29/content\\_5547029.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2006-12/29/content_5547029.htm).
  41. European Council Declaration on China: Madrid, 26–27 June 1989. See also Amnesty International. *EU- China and Human Rights Since Tiananmen*. 2004, [http://www.amnesty-eu.org/static/documents/China\\_briefing\\_EN.doc](http://www.amnesty-eu.org/static/documents/China_briefing_EN.doc)
  42. The 34 Asia-Pacific companies 14 in China, seven in South Korea, one in India and 12 in Taiwan.
  43. The Official Journal of the European Union. *Council Regulation (EC) No 1236/2005 of June 27, 2005*, [http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l\\_200/l\\_20020050730en00010019.pdf](http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_200/l_20020050730en00010019.pdf).
  44. Oleoresin capsicum (OC) and pelargonic acid vanillylamide (PAVA).
  45. The full list can be accessed at <http://www.dti.gov.uk/files/file8985.pdf>.
  46. The Official Journal of the European Communities. *Council regulation (ec) no 1334/2000 Of 22 june 2000*. <http://www.dti.gov.uk/files/file8989.pdf>
  47. Amnesty International. *European Union: Stopping the Trade in the Tools of Torture*, 2007, <http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/engACT400022001>.