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Trading in arms, both legal and illegal, is highly detrimental to the health of mothers and children in the countries where armed conflict occurs. But do the powerful arms trading countries want to address the problems they are causing?

Aid workers have no doubts about the impact of armed conflict on the death and suffering of mothers and children. To prove that trading in arms makes a major contribution to poor health is challenging, because it coexists in poor countries with massive debt, corrupt bureaucracies, and natural disasters. We report on the devastating effects of legal and illegal weapons exported into poor countries in conflict in Africa and Asia.

Summary points

More than 85% of the major conflicts since the second world war have been in poor countries

During the 1990s the poorest countries of the world became saturated with arms, with brokers often supplying both sides of a conflict

Between 1986 and 1996, a major proportion of those dying as a result of armed conflicts were civilians, particularly women and children

Huge differences in the health of mothers and children exist between the poor countries undergoing conflict and the predominantly rich countries exporting arms to them

Legal trading in arms should be a responsibility of a newly configured United Nations, and much more regulation of arms manufacturing companies is needed

International laws and their aggressive enforcement should stop illegal arms trading, including its support systems

Methods

Drawing on the work of international organisations, we conducted the following analyses:

• A review of literature on conflict and arms trading
The mechanisms by which major weapons and small arms exported during 1990-2000 reached the 10 poorest countries engaged in armed conflict in 2000

The health status of mothers and children in these countries compared with the 10 largest arms exporting countries.

Armed conflict

More than 85% of the major conflicts since the second world war have been in poor countries. Fifty seven major armed conflicts occurred in 45 different locations between 1990 and 2001, involving 16 of the world's 20 poorest countries. Many of these conflicts have been longstanding. In 2000, for example, war had lasted for 22 years in Afghanistan, 35 years in Angola, and 12 years in Somalia.

Most conflicts since 1990 have occurred in countries where government armies were poorly organised; paramilitary factions acted as the driving force, using ideological or political agendas to justify their actions. Warring factions obtained arms from international backers in exchange for money, narcotics, or precious minerals. These trades led to the development of sophisticated war based economies that fostered conflict, such as the cases of diamond trafficking from Angola and Sierra Leone. (See bmj.com for analyses of the supply of weapons to the 10 countries with the highest mortality and engaged in conflict during 2000).

Once a country contains a critical number of weapons, the need for protection leads to their proliferation. The actions of paramilitary organisations, such as the indoctrination of children to kill family members, and of racketeers who use violence and intimidation to pillage local resources, contribute to destabilisation of societies. Conflicts in Uganda and the Democratic Republic of Congo illustrate these points (see bmj.com).

The trading of arms from rich countries to poor countries

During the 1990s the poorest countries of the world became saturated with arms; some originated from “legal” transfers, and many formed part of the illegal trade. The arms trade destabilised already fragmented countries, making development difficult and blurring distinctions between use for military and criminal purposes. Outside governments openly or clandestinely supplied arms to factions they favoured for political reasons or for access to resources, as did some multinational companies. Many loopholes allowed weapons to enter unstable or embargoed countries—for example, ineffective or falsified end user certificates and licensed production in or brokerage through intermediate, poorly regulated countries (box 1). Arms brokers often supplied both sides in a conflict.

Box 1: Evading the rules for legal arms trading

The rules governing export were “legally” evaded in at least three ways.

Brokering through intermediate countries

For example, British companies or individual British nationals (brokers or middlemen) did not need export licences when buying arms from another country and supplying them to a third foreign country (usually poorly resourced and governed). The United States and Germany require brokering to be licensed.
Producing arms in other countries

For example, British (unlike American) manufacturers producing arms in their overseas factories did not need export licences. In 1995, licensed production of small arms occurred in 21 developing countries, 16 of which exported them to other developing countries.\(^{12-14}\)

Exploiting the end user system

Licences to allow export may only be granted if an end user certificate defining usage is first obtained from the recipient country. In countries with poor governance, end user certificates were easy to obtain, and subsequent shipments were not subject to verification that they were being used in agreed ways.

Trade in major conventional weapons

In 1972, poor countries received 48% of their weapons free from the United States and the Soviet Union. By 1982 donations had declined to around 14%, but the total value of exports to non-oil producing developing countries had doubled, leading many into debt.\(^{15}\) During the 1990s the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council were the main manufacturers and exporters of major conventional weapons, delivering 65-96% of their exported arms to developing countries between 1997 and 2000 (table 1).\(^{16}\) Arms were supplied to countries on both sides of the various conflicts, reducing the resources available for health and education. For example, the United Kingdom, United States, Russia, Germany, and Canada supplied both India and Pakistan with weapons despite Pakistan spending less than 1% of its gross domestic product on health.\(^{17}\) Many weapons exported to poor countries were second hand, often accompanied by trained military support; some were sold from vast stockpiles left over from the cold war.\(^{18,19}\)

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Trade (millions of constant (2000) US dollars)</th>
<th>Percentage of total arms exports going to developing countries*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>68 040</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>21 833</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>18 797</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>11 887</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5 568</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2 537</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1 586</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other European countries</td>
<td>12 991</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other countries</td>
<td>7 884</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151 123</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *Defined as all countries except United States, Russia, European countries, Canada, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand.
Trade in small arms and light weapons

Although the poorest countries struggled to afford major weapons, they could buy small arms. The AK 47 rifle, for example, can be bought in Africa for a bag of maize and in Afghanistan for $10 (£6.45, €10). It needs little maintenance and with minimal training can be a deadly weapon, even when used by young children. Apart from being cheap and easy to manufacture, small weapons are also readily transported, smuggled, and hidden.

In 47 of 49 major conflicts between 1990 and 2000 small arms and light weapons were the main weapons used, causing incalculable human suffering. They continually threaten development and have been the principal weapons used in conflicts characterised by abuse of human rights. An estimated 600 million small arms and light weapons exist—one for every 10 people on earth. They are responsible for the vast majority of conflict casualties, and in 2001 they were implicated in more than 1000 deaths a day, mostly of mothers and children.

Small arms are not included in the control of major arms trading. The UN register of conventional arms is mainly concerned with the threat that major weapons pose to international or regional stability, rather than stability within countries. Indeed, the UN acknowledges that the challenge posed by small arms “involves security, humanitarian and developmental dimensions.” The UN supports the need to control the proliferation of small arms but is challenged by the fact that the five permanent members of the Security Council are among the main suppliers. Despite attempts by the United States and the European Union to work together to combat the small arms trade, the United States and some members of the EU (United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, and Belgium) are among the main exporters. The International Action Network on Small Arms coordinates more than 340 organisations from 71 countries to prevent the proliferation and misuse of small arms and light weapons.

Illegal arms trading

Although 80-90% of the global trade in small arms is legal, trading in illegal arms (defined by the UN as exports that violate national or international law) accounts for over 50% of all weapons in circulation. As most poor countries have minimal systems to regulate the ownership of weapons, this definition applies only to arms exported to countries under mandatory arms embargoes from countries where licensing systems exist. Most illegal arms start out legally and become illegal by brokered sales, theft, and corruption, most often when non-state actors are supplied for political or economic reasons.

(Credit: CHILD ADVOCACY INTERNATIONAL)

“Home” for this Afghan family is a tent in a refugee camp. The baby was born here.
In the 1990s, sophisticated ploys reminiscent of other organised crimes such as drugs trafficking were used to distribute illegal weapons. For example, cargo aircraft supplying weapons flew circuitous routes, often at night using their own navigation systems, multiple landings, changes of aircraft, or falsification of aircraft registration. Pilots and planes were registered to “flags of convenience” and sometimes delivered during an “emergency landing” close to receiving factions. In Africa, where many countries have poor accountability, bureaucracy, customs procedures, and air traffic control, it was easy to complete illegal deliveries. The US Bureau of Intelligence and Research and Amnesty International reported that air charter companies from the United Kingdom and Belgium supplying arms to Rwanda, Congo, and Sierra Leone were unknown to and untouchable by law enforcers in their countries of origin.\textsuperscript{v14} \textsuperscript{w32}

**The human costs of conflict**

The international arms trade is the substrate for global armed conflict, causing enormous human suffering, and mothers and children are the most vulnerable people. According to Unicef, between 1986 and 1996 two million children were killed in armed conflict, six million were seriously injured or permanently disabled, and countless others were forced to witness or take part in violence.\textsuperscript{w5} A major proportion of victims were civilians, particularly women and children.\textsuperscript{w5} \textsuperscript{w33} \textsuperscript{w34} In her report to Unicef, Graça Machel stated that “Wars have always victimised children and other non-combatants, but modern wars are exploiting, maiming and killing children more callously than ever.”\textsuperscript{w5}

The indirect effects of armed conflicts cause most fatalities in mothers and children and include\textsuperscript{w5} \textsuperscript{w25} \textsuperscript{w35} \textsuperscript{w38}

- Food deprivation\textsuperscript{w39}
- Spread of disease, in part due to disruption of public health systems
- Psychological and emotional damage (two thirds of Angolan children had witnessed murder)\textsuperscript{w5}
- Disability
- Separation of families (in 1995, 20\% of Angolan children were separated from their families)\textsuperscript{w5}
- Loss of education
- Sexual abuse of children, including deliberate rape to drive out ethnic minorities
- Child abduction, torture, and slavery\textsuperscript{w10}
- Child soldiers (in 1998, for example, at least 300 000 children aged under 18 were soldiers).\textsuperscript{w40} \textsuperscript{w41}

Another consequence of conflict is displacement. In 1997, 13.2 million people were refugees and 4.9 million were internally displaced,\textsuperscript{w42} disproportionately more of whom were women and children than in the source population.\textsuperscript{w43} In Rwandan refugee camps child mortality was as high as 300 per 100 000 per day.\textsuperscript{w44} Child mortality in displaced communities was more than 60\% higher than among non-displaced children in the same country.\textsuperscript{w45} In contrast, in 2001 the United States and the United Kingdom, two major arms exporters, provided haven for only 4.3\% and 1.2\% of the world’s refugees (which totalled 12 million).\textsuperscript{w33} \textsuperscript{w46}

Huge differences in the health of mothers and children exist between the 10 poorest countries undergoing conflict in 2000 and the predominantly rich countries that exported arms to them (directly or indirectly) (table \textit{2}).\textsuperscript{w47} \textsuperscript{w48} Scaling each country to a population of 50 million gives figures of 2009 children aged under 5 years dying each day and 46 667 mothers dying each year during pregnancy or childbirth in the poorest country (Sierra Leone) compared with 15 children per day and 91 mothers per year in the country supplying the most arms (United States). Arms exports
cannot be said to have directly caused this disparity, but to believe that they have not contributed would be unrealistic. These differences are so great that they question the humanity of arms exporting countries (box 2). Armed conflict and weapons trading may thus be seen as a form of maternal and child abuse.

Table 2.

Health status of mothers and children in the 10 index countries at war in 2000 and the 10 largest arms exporting countries, scaled so that the populations of all countries are of equal size (50 million)\textsuperscript{7,48}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 poorest countries engaged in conflict during 2000</th>
<th>No of children aged &lt;5 dying each day</th>
<th>No of women dying during pregnancy and childbirth each year (1995 data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>46 667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>34 466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>19 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>37 368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>24 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>42 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>44 922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>40 385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>3 903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>25 907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 countries exporting the most arms in the years 1996-2000</th>
<th>No of children aged &lt;5 dying each day</th>
<th>No of women dying during pregnancy and childbirth each year (1995 data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health status of mothers and children in the 10 index countries at war in 2000 and the 10 largest arms exporting countries, scaled so that the populations of all countries are of equal size (50 million)\textsuperscript{7,48}
Box 2: Example of arms trading to opposing sides of the conflict

The Democratic Republic of Congo is a strategically important country rich in natural resources. The country became independent in 1960, and Mobutu Sese Soko became president in 1965. Despite corruption and abuses of human rights, the United States supplied Congo with $300 million worth of military hardware and $100 million worth of military training over the next 30 years. Laurent Kabila came to power in 1997, and fighting broke out in 1998; the forces from eight countries became embroiled. The United States has helped to build the arsenals of eight of the governments involved. Weapons also flowed into this part of Africa illegally, with brokers operating out of many countries, including the United Kingdom, France, and Belgium.

Example of arms trading to opposing sides of the conflict

Recommendations

Better regulation of legal manufacture and trading in arms

Legal trading should be a responsibility of and regulated by a newly configured United Nations that is more representative of poor nations, as well as financially less dependent on countries that manufacture arms. Legal arms should be traded only for defense (article 51 of the UN charter) and must not worsen existing conflict, cause human rights violations, or impede development.

(Credit: CHILD ADVOCACY INTERNATIONAL)

Displaced, orphaned, malnourished, ill, or killed—the consequences of the arms trade

Much more regulation of arms manufacturing companies is needed, particularly for companies that have overseas factories. The middlemen (brokers trading outside their own countries) who buy, sell, and transport arms to countries without adequate governance are most important. In parallel, tighter international regulation is needed of shipping agents and money launderers (including many reputable banks) who remain above the law by sidestepping the current weak controls. In many respects it would be better to make all brokering activities illegal (as they are with the drugs trade) and permit dealing of arms only through the UN. Brokers and company owners should be indicted for war crimes if they break international embargoes or provide arms illegally through negligence or intent. In addition, loans for the purchase of weapons by poor countries should be subject to UN approval.

The UN must do more to influence the United States, a country that exports the greatest number of weapons, refuses to accept an international criminal court, and is one of only two states
refusing to ratify the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Regrettably, in 2001, the US undersecretary of state at the first UN conference on small arms insisted that only illegal trading should be addressed and that the United States would resist any agreement that infringed the “right to bear arms.”

Transparency is also important. Only seven of the world's 190 countries publish regular data on small arms exports, and only three of these provide details on the numbers and kinds of weapons involved. All weapons and ammunition should be branded to enable tracing.

Important steps forward have been taken. Attempts to develop an ethical foreign policy in the United Kingdom have resulted in annual reports of licences granted for the exports of weapons, including small arms. In 1998 an EU code of conduct on arms exports was agreed, as well as a moratorium by the Economic Community of West African States on imports, exports, and manufacture of small arms and light weapons into west Africa. An innovative proposal for controlling arms, “the international code of conduct,” has come from a commission of Nobel peace laureates and is based on ethical criteria within international humanitarian law.

Economic arguments in the United Kingdom have revealed the cost of the arms trade to taxpayers. The British government has also supported economic regeneration in Bulgaria and Ukraine, countries dependent on the arms industry. However, links between the trade in arms and commodities such as oil mean that for powerful arms exporting countries the resulting economic advantages in terms of all trade are complex and probably substantial.

Programmes of weapons collection and destruction intended to demilitarise countries have included food, medical care, and education for individuals or communities that surrender weapons. Perhaps the country that has provided the weapons should provide the compensation.

**Better prevention of illegal manufacture and trading in arms**

International laws and their aggressive enforcement should stop illegal arms trading, including its support systems, such as money laundering and smuggling. An international police force (perhaps better termed an international family protection force) working closely with national police is needed to arrest and charge the hundreds of criminally active illegal arms dealers, most of whom are already known and on databases. Banks and companies supporting illegal trading should be targeted. Enhanced control of borders to detain aircraft, ships, or vehicles and arrest and charge people responsible for smuggling would have an impact. Many illegal arms dealers are based in rich, relatively well governed countries, so stopping them should be possible.

Investigations by the UN into breaches of arms embargoes often result in information about the state and individual actors involved and lead to expressions of concern but no action. No one has been convicted of violating UN arms embargoes. The UN seems to be powerless to act, and it clearly needs to find a way of mobilising states to accept an international family protection force as well as giving more power to the international criminal court. Tragically, trafficking of arms to Africa seems to be low on the world's priority list. One possible way forward could involve the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, within which is a draft protocol against the illicit manufacture of and trafficking in firearms.

**Conclusion**

The real question raised by the above analysis is whether powerful arms trading countries want to address the problems they are causing. Children and mothers in poor countries seem to be regarded as much too unimportant and expendable. Somehow the UN has to find a way of creating a system
that ethically regulates legal arms trading, and the international community needs to establish a protection force to address illegal trading.

Empty arms: the effect of the arms trade on mothers and children
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Analyses of the supply of small arms and major weapons to the 10 countries in the world having the highest under 5-year mortality rates and being engaged in conflict in the year 2000.

Countries below ranked in order of worst under 5 year mortality rates.

Sierra Leone

Between 1991 and 2000 internal conflict raged between the Sierra Leone government and rebels comprising the Revolutionary United Front (RUF). The latter committed many brutalities, including amputations.

From October 1997 to June 1998 there was a mandatory UN embargo (1132) to both sides and from June 1998 this was continued for the RUF (1171) (1). From 1997 there was also a non-mandatory EU embargo.

Prior to resolution 1132, the US authorized small arms to be exported to Sierra Leone. Major weapons were imported from Belarus, Ukraine, South Africa and Russia (2). Sierra Leone also produced major weapons under license from Slovakia (2). Nationals from UK and Belgium allegedly broke embargos (3). Weapons reaching the RUF allegedly originated in Ukraine,
Slovakia, Liberia, and Bulgaria (3). The UN recognised that Belgium and Switzerland were laundering precious stones to pay for the weapons and banned all exports of diamonds (UN 1306) (4, 5). The UN also described how 68 tons of arms from Ukraine were sold to Burkina Faso, subsequently forwarded via Liberia to the RUF (6). Arms from Western countries (US, France, Germany, Italy, UK, Denmark, Canada and Finland) were authorized or delivered to Bulgaria, Ukraine, Slovakia and Burkina Faso at the same time they were allegedly supplying Sierra Leone (2).

Angola

Like Sierra Leone, Angola was rich with diamond mines and offshore oil, which gave it the ability to trade for weapons. Following independence in 1975, multiple factions engaged in conflict. In 1994, a UN peacekeeping force backed a peace agreement. However, further fighting resumed in 1998 rendering hundreds of thousands homeless. Fighting only ended in 2002, by which time Angola’s infrastructure had been largely destroyed.

A mandatory UN arms embargo against the main rebel faction UNITA was established in 1993 (UN 864) (1).

During the 1990s, government forces were authorized to receive small arms from the US and major weapons from South Africa, Russia, Portugal, Brazil, Poland, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Kazakhstan, Hungary, Ukraine, Slovakia, and Belarus (2). Allegedly in breach of embargoes, arms reaching UNITA originated in Bulgaria, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Namibia, Romania, Russia, South Africa, Uganda, and Ukraine (3). These arms were allegedly transited through Togo, Burkina Faso, Congo-Brazzaville, Cote d’Ivoire, and Zambia (3). UNITA allegedly also received > $250 million (£160.3 million, €250.9 million) in covert military aid from the US (7). As with Sierra Leone, those countries allegedly providing UNITA with weapons, received arms from Western and Eastern Block countries. In 1993, a French oil company allegedly provided arms worth £350 million ($546.1 million, €547.9 million)(8).

Afghanistan

Following its occupation in 1979, the USSR poured weapons into Afghanistan (9). The US backed factions of anti-soviet forces from 43 countries with several billion dollars while Saudi Arabia provided logistic support (10). Via Pakistan, an estimated 400,000 AK-47 assault rifles (from US), anti-aircraft missiles (from US and UK), vast amounts of Italian-made anti-personnel mines, and millions of rounds of ammunition were imported (9).

By 2000, there were >2.6 million refugees in Pakistan and Iran and up to 750,000 internally displaced (11).

In 1996, non-mandatory UN (1076) and EU arms embargoes were established. In 2000 a mandatory UN embargo (1333) was placed on supplying the Taliban (1). Brokers in Pakistan allegedly supplied the Taliban with weapons, many from China, with financial backing from Saudi Arabia (12). The Taliban were also allegedly supplied with arms from Pakistan (3) and from a broker who bought arms from Bulgaria, Pakistan and Romania (13). The Northern Alliance received arms from Russia (2) and allegedly from Iran (12).

Despite the above, Pakistan, Bulgaria, and Romania were authorized to receive small arms and took delivery of major weapons from Western Countries (US, UK, Germany, South Africa, Israel, Italy, Canada, France, Sweden, and the Netherlands), China, and Eastern Block countries (Russia, Belarus, Slovakia, Moldova, Slovakia, and Ukraine) (2).
Somalia

During the period 1990 to 2000, warring factions devastated the country. In 1993, a UN humanitarian effort relieved famine but withdrew in 1995 following heavy casualties. Most families acquired weapons for protection. (14) A mandatory UN embargo (733) was established in 1992 (1).

Ethiopia and Eritrea were alleged backers of opposing Somali clans (15). Ethiopia was authorized to receive small arms from Germany, and along with Eritrea received major weapons from Russia and Bulgaria. Finland, Germany, Italy, Israel, and China delivered weapons to Eritrea, whilst Eastern Block countries (Czech Republic, Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Hungary) and USA delivered arms to Ethiopia. Arms from Djibouti and Ukraine were also implicated (3). Arms from Russia, Libya, N. Korea, Yugoslavia, and Egypt were sold in market places (16).

Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)

DRC is a strategically important country rich in minerals. After independence in 1960, Mobutu became President. Despite corruption and human rights abuses, the US supplied DRC with $300 million (£192.3 million, €301.0 million) worth of military hardware and $100 million ($65.0 million, €100.3 million) of military training over the next 30 years (17). In 1997 Kabila came to power and in 1998, fighting broke out which involved factions from 8 neighboring countries (18). The US helped build the arsenals of these 8 countries (17). Weapons also flowed into the region illegally with brokers operating out of countries, including UK, France, and Belgium (18).

In 2000, 1.3 million people had been displaced; 14 million were short of food (19). The government spent <1% of GDP on health and education and 32% of children were malnourished (10% severely so) (20). In 1993, a non-mandatory EU embargo was established (1) and allegedly nationals from Belgium violated it (3). Arms from France also reached the DRC (3).

Authorizations of small arms and deliveries of major weapons to opposing sides of the conflict are shown below (1).

To DRC and supporting countries (namely Zimbabwe, Angola, Chad and Namibia)

• Small arms authorized by US, UK, Germany, South Africa, Finland, Denmark, Canada

• Major weapons from US, France, Russia, China, Italy, Denmark, South Africa, Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Brazil, Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Poland, Libya. Yugoslavia, Belarus, Georgia, Hungary, and Moldova.

To opposing countries (namely Rwanda, Uganda, Burundi)

• Small arms authorized by US, UK, South Africa

• Major weapons from Russia, France, South Africa, Egypt, Slovakia, Ukraine, Bulgaria, Poland, and Belarus

Burundi

Between 1993 and 2000, conflict occurred between the minority Tutsi and majority Hutu tribal groups. It resulted in 200,000 deaths and hundreds of thousands of refugees and internally displaced persons. To secure its borders, Burundi also intervened in the DRC conflict above (18).
From 1996 to 1999, there was a non-mandatory arms embargo involving sales to Burundi from DRC, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia (1). Despite this, small arms were authorized by the UK in 1998 (2). From 1989 to 1998, arms worth $386,000 (£247,386, €387,228) were imported from the US, which also provided $1.3 million (£830,000, €1.3 million) in military training (17). China, France, North Korea, Russia, Rwanda, Tanzania, Zimbabwe, Uganda, and the DRC (under Mobutu) were also allegedly direct suppliers of military aid to Burundi with transit permitted through Angola, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, and DRC (21).

**Ethiopia**

An inter-state conflict with neighboring Eritrea started in 1998. Between them $1 million/day (£640,000, €1 million) was spent on war (22). Neither country produced arms so all were imported from outside countries with some brokers and countries supplying both sides.

There was a nonmandatory UN embargo in 1999 (1227) replaced by a mandatory UN embargo (1298) in 2000 that was lifted May 2001. In 1999 a non-mandatory EU embargo was placed and lifted in May 2001 (2).

Small arms were authorized for Ethiopia from Germany in 1998 and major weapons imported from Russia, Bulgaria, Hungary, US (ex-US air force), Czech Republic, Kazakhstan, and Belarus (2). Major weapons were imported to Eritrea from China, Finland, Germany, Israel, Italy, Bulgaria, and Russia (2). Militaries from both sides were trained by the US (17).

A French company attempted to transfer arms to Ethiopia via Belgium without a transit license (23). A Belgium arms broker, basing himself in South Africa, was purchasing weapons from Eastern European countries and selling them onto African countries including Ethiopia (24). There were allegations that weapons originating in Russia violated the UN embargo on both countries and that weapons originating in France violated the Ethiopian embargo (3).

**Rwanda**

Conflict between the Tutsis (15%) and Hutus (80%) was longstanding. The deaths of the Presidents of Rwanda and Burundi in a plane crash in 1994 sparked a Hutu uprising. The genocide that followed claimed 800,000 lives, mostly Tutsis and moderate Hutus. After the genocide 2 million largely Hutus fled into neighboring Burundi, Tanzania, Uganda, and DRC. Members of the militia that perpetrated the genocide remained in DRC and formed armed factions. Most refugees returned to Rwanda which, despite substantial international assistance and political reforms, continues to suffer.

In 1997, to stop incursions from DRC by ex-Rwandan armed factions, Rwanda allied with Uganda and DRC rebel groups to oust Mobutu (25). This led to better mineral mining deals for US companies (17). Kabila came to power but Rwandan armed factions remained in the DRC and stepped up their incursions into Rwanda. In August 1998, Rwandan and Ugandan forces entered the DRC to support a new rebel movement against Kabila. (See DRC above).

A mandatory UN embargo (918) was established in 1994, suspended in 1995, and ceased in 1996. In 1995, a mandatory UN embargo (1011) on arms to Rwandan rebels, including arms for neighboring countries if they were for use in Rwanda, was established (2). Rwanda was authorized to receive small arms from South Africa and major weapons were imported from South Africa, France, Egypt, Russia, Slovakia, and Belarus. After the 1994 genocide, US provided $75 million (£47.4 million, €74.2 million) of emergency military assistance (26) and $324,000 (£297,663, €324.971) in arms transfers (17).
In violation of the UN embargo on the rebels (UN 1011) weapons allegedly originated from Eastern Bloc countries, China, France, Israel, Italy, Libya, Russia, Seychelles, and South Africa. Nationals from UK, US, South Africa, and Belgium allegedly violated the embargo (3).

Zambia, Uganda, Tanzania, Niger, Kenya, Ghana, and DRC were also allegedly implicated in violating the embargo. For these latter African countries, the US, UK, South Africa, France, Ireland, Canada, Denmark, and Germany authorized the sale of small arms while US, UK, South Africa, Italy, Spain, and Eastern Bloc countries delivered major weapons to them.

Pakistan

Antagonism between India and Pakistan over Kashmir has persisted since partition in 1947 and continues. There have been no arms embargoes but years of sanctions have resulted in Pakistan manufacturing its own weapons. Licences to do so were provided by UK, Italy, France, China, and Slovakia.

Authorized supplies of small arms (in bold) and major weapons (in italics) for both India and Pakistan are shown below.

- To Pakistan – from **UK, US, South Africa, Germany, Canada** UK, Russia China, France Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, Belarus, Ukraine, Lebanon

- To India – **from UK, US, Germany, Canada** / Russia, South Africa, UK, Italy, Israel, Poland, Slovakia, Ukraine, and Kyrgyzstan

UK, Russia, France, Germany, and Italy failed to back the US in placing economic embargoes on India in 1998 after India tested nuclear arms (27). Arms to both sides of this conflict were authorized by or supplied from UK, US, Germany and Russia (28) despite 1 million troops dug-in on the Pakistan-Indian border and the threat of nuclear war (29).

Pakistan has the greatest number of guns per capita in the world. From 1950 to 1996, the US government donated to Pakistan surplus small arms (118,640 weapons) (30).

Uganda

After independence in 1962, the reign of Idi Amin (1971-1979) resulted in 300,000 deaths. President Museveni from 1986 has brought stability (25, 31).

During the 1990s Uganda was and remains now in conflict with the Lords Resistance Army (LRA) (32), a group of extremely brutal paramilitaries based in Sudan which has regularly raided Uganda and kidnapped boys and girls to indoctrinate into serving their armed activities. Uganda has also been involved in the conflict in DRC (see above).

There were no embargoes on arms to Uganda. Small arms to Uganda were authorized by US, UK, and South Africa and major weapons imported from South Africa, Belarus, Bulgaria, Poland, and Ukraine (2). was authorized small arms by the UK and received major weapons from Poland, Belarus, Ukraine, China, and Kyrgyzstan.
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