

# Assessing Arms Makers' Corporate Social Responsibility

Edmund F. Byrne

---

## Erratum to: Journal of Business Ethics DOI 10.1007/s10551-006-9228-9

During the proof procedure of this article the below mentioned corrections were erroneously omitted.

CHANGE #1: Under '2. The Arms Industry Would Fail a CSR Social Equity Requirement' replace the first paragraph with the following:

Most proponents of SRI and of versions of CSR that recognize the validity of stakeholder theory require that a corporation's products and services not inflict harm unduly on people in societies where they are situated. This includes points of origin but must include points of arrival as well, especially in a globalized economy. This, however, is not the perspective fostered by the US arms industry, which seeks to apply everywhere the individualist interpretation of a right to bear arms that already obfuscates moral assessments of corporate liability in the United States. A corollary of this perspective is a convenient washing of hands known in the literature as recipient-side responsibility. Political support for

assigning responsibility to suppliers has gained some momentum in recent years, but only with regard to governments acting as intermediaries, not the actual producers (Pierre, 1997, pp. 373–380). This lacuna will be questioned further below, but for now suffice to say that as applied to the arms industry the CSR social equity requirement must take "local" to mean any place where this industry's products are located. For, horribly detrimental wars are being fought in many places with arms typically provided from afar.

CHANGE #2: Under References, insert after 'Paluso' (etc.) the following

Pierre, A. J.: 1997, *Cascade of Arms: Managing Conventional Weapons Proliferation* (Brookings Institute Press, Washington, DC; The World Peace Foundation, Cambridge, MA).

Indiana University,  
5 Riverpointe Road, Hastings-on-Hudson,  
NY 10706, U.S.A.  
E-mail: ebyrne@iupui.edu