

bulletin

Small Arms and Human Security

The Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue is pleased to launch the first edition of its new *Human Security and Small Arms Bulletin*. The *Bulletin* seeks to provide accessible news and views on small arms issues from a human security perspective to a wide and diverse audience. This first edition is being distributed to over 1,500 organisations and individuals: humanitarian, human rights, development and public health advocates, government representatives, journalists and media outlets, small arms organisations, faith based communities and UN agencies. We hope this figure will grow with the *Bulletin*.

The *Bulletin* will come out three times a year, alternating between a thematic and a regional focus. Copies will be initially available in French, Spanish and English, both in hard copy and electronically. The February edition of the *Bulletin* will focus on the Middle East. Please complete and return the form on the back cover if you wish to receive the *Bulletin* in French or Spanish and/or want multiple copies.

We welcome suggestions and comments and hope that you enjoy reading the premier edition.

Cate Buchanan, Programme Manager
Human Security and Small Arms Programme
Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue

In this issue...

Moving from Words to Deeds: The UN Programme of Action on Small Arms by Mireille Widmer and Cate Buchanan *pages 1–3*

Spinning the Web: Arms Availability and Development by David Jackman, Consultant *page 4*

No Arms for Atrocities: Enact an Arms Trade Treaty by Chris Stevenson, Arias Foundation *page 5*

In Their Own Words: Views on the Biennial Meeting of States in July 2003 *page 6*

News in Brief *page 7*

Moving from Words to Deeds: The UN Programme of Action on Small Arms

Global public opinion is increasingly viewing the worldwide glut of guns and light weapons as a major global scourge—on par with HIV/AIDS, poverty and landmines. The Small Arms Survey estimates that about 640 million firearms are currently in circulation, and this figure is undoubtedly conservative due to a lack of reliable information. Human security is the prime casualty: about 300,000 people are killed every year in violent conflict and war, with small arms being the main instruments for this death and destruction; 200,000 more people die from gunshots through intentional violence, suicide and accidents. These numbers mask shattered families and countless more who survive gun violence with physical and/or psychological wounds. In addition, the global flood of weapons has several indirect impacts: the displacement of people from their homes, creating masses of refugees within states and across borders; the restriction of people's access to health services, education and food; the denial of people's ability to work and farm; and the interruption of humanitarian assistance and undermining of sustainable development.

UN 2001

In 2001 the first global conference on small arms was convened. The *UN Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All its Aspects* concluded with a Programme of Action (POA), providing a global framework for addressing elements of the problem. Among other things, the POA encourages states to better manage their arms stockpiles, in order to prevent state-held weapons from leaking into the black market. It also calls on states to better harmonise communication on small arms control policies and programmes at the national and regional levels, and it encourages the development of national action plans to identify gaps and opportunities for improvement in their relevant legislation, institutions, procedures and resource allocation. While the POA is explicitly *not* legally binding, it encourages investigation of legally-binding agreements in a couple of areas: first, to require states to mark new weapons (in order to promote traceability of firearms); and second, states controlling arms brokering activities by private citizens or companies in their jurisdiction.

The POA was bitterly negotiated with the United States, in particular, extending the conference to ensure no mention of two critical issues in the final document: global norms on civilian possession of small arms, and the prickly topic of weapons transfers to non-state armed groups.

The POA was negotiated primarily by experts in arms control, sensitive to questions of national security and national sovereignty, but perhaps not sufficiently mindful

of the linkages between small arms and human rights, health and development. While the need to restrict the supply of weapons was discussed, factors driving the demand for guns and the crucial issue of misuse of these weapons were largely left out of the debate. And so were people—who pay the ultimate price of gun violence.

However, the success or failure of the POA and related efforts must be measured by whether lives are saved and human suffering related to weapons availability is diminished. To make this clear, many NGOs and some governments are working to shift the focus of these efforts beyond national security toward 'human security'. These efforts are seeking to put people into the centre of dry, technical discussions and to draw those people most immediately affected—as well as their advocates and allies—into various political processes.

Progress report: 2003

From 7–11 July 2003 the First Biennial Meeting of States (BMS) took place to exchange information on progress in implementing the POA. Although not a negotiating meeting, it offered a useful 'reality check' to assess how states, the UN and NGOs are faring in advancing the elements called for in the POA.

The meeting was structured in four sessions. In the main session, at the opening of the conference, states reported on their national implementation of the POA. Then regional/global organisations and NGOs made two half-day presentations on their efforts to implement the POA. NGO presentations were focused around thematic areas. Men and women from around the globe working as part of the International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA) made presentations to the delegates in French, English, Spanish, Arabic and Russian—demonstrating both the breadth of the problem and of the network.

Finally, in the last session, national delegations were encouraged to speak out on a list of six thematic clusters:

- Weapons collection and destruction efforts/stockpile management/disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of former combatants (DDR);
- Capacity building/resource mobilisation/institution building;
- Marking and tracing of firearms;
- Linkages to terrorism, organised crime, trafficking in drugs and precious minerals;
- Import and export controls/illicit weapons brokering;
- Human development/public awareness and culture of peace/children, women and the elderly.

Governments and NGOs also organised numerous side events, including the release of several new publications. IANSA presented an extensive report on the implementation of the POA.¹ It noted a strong correlation between national implementation of the POA and the existence of regional agreements on small arms. The Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue launched *In the Line of Fire*²—a survey of humanitarian and development workers' perceptions of the impact of weapons availability on

personal safety and operational effectiveness, and *Putting People First*—the product of a dialogue process between Human Security Network states, NGOs and UN agencies.³

In all, 79 states submitted reports to the UN Department of Disarmament Affairs. This response is encouraging, given the difficulty of compiling such reports. (A joint UNIDIR–UNDP–UNDDA project with the Small Arms Survey as a technical consultant helped nearly 20 lesser developed countries submit reports.) These reports come in many formats, making any attempt at comparison hazardous. This analysis will simply highlight a number of points: references to human security concerns; references to areas that were neglected or left out in the POA, such as civilian possession, transfers to armed groups, demand factors and misuse; and references to the challenges of implementing the POA, of which states should take heed in the run-up to the next Biennial Meeting in 2005.

Taking responsibility

It appears from both national reports and statements delivered at the BMS that many governments still do not take responsibility for the problem of small arms violence within their states. Countries clearly affected by small arms violence often project blame for their problems solely on foreign arms manufacturers and exporters. Moreover, while paying lip service to the severity of the gun violence problem globally, several governments proclaimed that they have no problem to deal with. Argentina was a notable exception. It presented detailed statistics highlighting a sharp increase in the level of gun related crime and violence in the country during 1991–2001. While fewer than half of all homicides were conducted with a firearm in 1991, this proportion grew to more than three-quarters by 1997.

Many of the reports constituted self-congratulatory statements, with little effort made to identify areas in need of further attention. For instance, while many countries provided detailed statistics of illegally-held weapons confiscated, seized and/or destroyed, very few reports contextualised this figure by providing the number of weapons remaining in circulation.⁴ This ongoing lack of reliable data reflects the lack of transparency around both the arms trade and robust implementation of the POA.

The African island-state of São Tomé et Príncipe, however, engaged in serious self-analysis, providing a useful example to other states. The government took responsibility for having distributed relatively large quantities of weapons in 1991–1992 to owners of plantations and industries. The report then proceeded to clearly identify areas in need of attention, such as stockpile management, record keeping, enforcement of existing gun laws and the need to update legislation from 1929 governing civilian possession of firearms.

The successful implementation of the POA depends on many factors. The lack of adequate financial resources is often mentioned, raising the responsibility not only of donor countries and agencies but also of international organisations such as the UN and the World Bank. The

Republic of Congo-Brazzaville for example noted that the World Bank excludes disarmament from the list of activities covered by its loans, thereby limiting arms collection and destruction efforts. (The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)/International Organisation for Migration (IOM) implemented disarmament programmes up through 2002.) The Central African Republic also pointed to the lack of training available for personnel responsible for controlling arms trafficking, and the sheer porosity of its borders with, for example, with the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)—ten control posts for a border of 2,500 km—or the Sudan—three control posts for a border of 1,800 km. Indonesia and Jamaica reported similar problems due to their extensive maritime borders.

Human security on the radar?

Many of the national reports mentioned issues that were left out of the POA in 2001 due to their contentious nature. Colombia, Kenya and Sri Lanka all stated the need to discuss limits on transfers of weapons to non-state armed groups.⁵ Numerous countries alluded to the need for all states to adequately regulate civilian possession of firearms by noting the restrictions in place in their jurisdiction. The problem of misuse of weapons by state forces was regularly referenced, such as when the DRC reported that armed bandits and “certain uncontrolled elements of the Army and the Police” are often neutralised and condemned to prison terms, or when Canada stressed the importance of the *Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials*. Particularly encouraging, in June 2003 members of the Andean Community adopted an Action Plan on small arms that addresses misuse of these weapons by state security forces.

Factors driving demand figured into many countries’ reports. The United Kingdom noted that “reducing demand or the perceived need for guns will require a commitment to long-term, sustainable development and poverty reduction, improving public security in communities, public awareness and education activities, and projects to provide alternative livelihood opportunities, including those for former combatants.” Bénin stressed the importance of public security by emphasising that the likelihood of citizens arming themselves is inversely proportional to their trust in the state’s ability to guarantee the security of people and property. This point is central to the human security approach, which argues that “national security” is meaningless if it does not ensure the security of citizens. Canada explicitly called for “a people-centred approach to security policy that focuses on pervasive threats to the safety of people and their communities.”

An encouraging number of states raised the problem of state-sanctioned arms transfers—another area that was off limits in 2001. Kenya, Canada and the United Kingdom amongst many others expressed support for better management and monitoring of ‘legal’ arms transfers, while Costa Rica declared that indiscriminate

small arms sales and their availability constitutes the main threat to the security of civilians, jeopardising social stability, economic development, democratic governance, rule of law and respect for human rights. Most national reports by European Union (EU) countries specifically referred to human rights when spelling out the conditions placed on export and transit of weapons; guided by the EU Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers, arms supply is generally forbidden to or through areas where there is a risk that the supplies will be used to suppress human rights. This development is particularly encouraging since EU candidate countries, including many Eastern European nations, are currently harmonising their legislation to comply with EU norms. Canada and Switzerland reported similar provisions, but too many states do not mention any specific guidelines used for granting export licences or subject authorisations to nebulous categories of “foreign policy imperatives.”

In conclusion

There has been some progress since 2001 but it has been slow and inconsistent. A major obstacle to constructive debate continues to be the stubborn refusal by a number of states to adopt a broader vision on the issue. The participation of many states in this process is more cosmetic than proactive. While they pay lip-service to the need to combat small arms violence, they take little responsibility and even less action.

Nonetheless, the UN meeting did provide a critical opportunity to highlight the rising human cost and encourage the efforts of those who are prioritising action against this preventable death toll. In her summary of the meeting, the Chairperson, Ambassador Kuniko Inoguchi, noted an “increased awareness of the disastrous human consequences of the use of illicit small arms.” It remains to be seen how this “awareness” will translate into action, and whether states will indeed act on these concerns and develop meaningful regional and global agreements, as well as policy, institutional and legislative reforms at the national level.

Further information

National reports are available at <http://disarmament.un.org>
All national reports and national statements are also available on the database maintained by Small Arms Survey, www.smallarmssurvey.org
International Action Network on Small Arms, www.iansa.org

Notes

1. IANSA (2003), “Implementing the Programme of Action 2003: Action by States and Civil Society”, produced by the Biting the Bullet consortium.
2. Joint project by the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue and the Small Arms Survey. Summary and full text version available at www.hdcentre.org/Programmes/smallarms/sasurvey.htm
3. The 13 member states of the Human Security Network are Austria, Canada, Chile, Greece, Ireland, Jordan, Mali, Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand, and South Africa as an observer. See the publication “Putting People First” for an HSN endorsement, available at: www.hdcentre.org/Programmes/smallarms/hsn.htm
4. Exceptions are Congo-Brazzaville—which then deplores the lack of external funding for weapons collection—the Netherlands and the Philippines.
5. Bangladesh, Brazil, India, Mexico, Nepal, Rwanda, Switzerland, Nigeria for the African Group, Myanmar for ASEAN and Italy for the European Union also referred to this issue in their statements.

Spinning the Web: Arms Availability and Development

No one ever said that inserting the real world into diplomatic dialogue was easy. In July 2001 UN Member States completed negotiations at the *Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects*. The last phrase in the event's ponderous title was an attempt by the majority of states to include reference to the wide range of interrelated forces driving the illicit trade. Unfortunately, when it came down to agreeing to the consensus Programme of Action (POA), most of those "aspects" received only nominal attention. Perhaps this was to be expected because the negotiations, after all, were conducted by arms control specialists. They are used to reaching agreement by paring issues down to the essentials of weapons hardware and traditional security requirements. More to the point, some small arms exporting and recipient states did not want their world of military security priorities—and its supporting weapons trade—constrained by human rights, humanitarian and development obligations.

While such views kept any reference to the wider reality of the small arms trade out of the POA's operative paragraphs, they did not prevent other states and NGOs from bringing the issues forward, both within the conference process and outside it. Indeed, in the case of the relationship of small arms to development issues, UNDP, UNICEF, OXFAM, World Vision, the Quakers, amongst others offered ideas and examples based on their practical experience. Since 2001 this work has continued with contributions in the form of regional workshops, projects in areas affected by severe gun violence, and in a workshop organised by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) to further thinking about this complex nexus.

The ways in which development programming and armed violence interact are varied and interconnections often complicated. Subjects such as post-war reintegration of ex-combatants, youth job training, community policing, conflict-sensitive programming, rehabilitation of child soldiers, involvement of women in peacemaking, weapons collections and a multitude of other aspects have been the focus of projects and reports. Often many of these elements have been combined into multi-dimensional programming. This breadth has strained the limits of traditional development planning and deterred some development agencies from taking up the new agenda. However, others have been more willing. In the 1990s the Swedish International Development Agency began contributing directly to peacemaking programs. A decade later, Canada's equivalent was supporting practical violence reduction with a Peacebuilding Fund; DFID had organised a formal small arms unit; Germany's GTZ had launched programs in crisis

prevention, security sector reform and small arms; and the UNDP was undertaking an extensive range of small arms reduction and development programs.

Still, most development agencies have remained uninvolved. While it was easily seen that weapons proliferation and violence were having a direct, disastrous effect on development programs worldwide, it was not clear that the agencies themselves were equipped or financed to deal with the problem. Small arms reports might recommend that development policies should incorporate elements that would reduce levels of arms availability, manage conflicts and lessen the civilian demand for weapons, but development officials resisted the addition of these goals to their already long list of priorities. In response, the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue is mobilising the development community through another door. By focusing on the issues of staff safety and operational effectiveness, gauged through a global survey, the Centre and the Small Arms Survey are encouraging development NGOs and UN agencies to focus on small arms. For a report from the first phase in which 600 people provided responses (see the information on page six).

Meanwhile, DFID has initiated a small arms discussion amongst government agencies. In April this year it brought together small arms experts and development agencies "to discuss ways and means of integrating arms controls into development policy and programmes." Interestingly, the meeting's informal process kept the door open to new thinking. Reports from small arms projects that were using recognised development methodology were eye-openers for some development officials. The willingness of the workshop participants to look for realistic openings within the constraints faced by development agencies opened possibilities for collaborative problem solving. The workshop report also recommended some steps forward, including, inter alia:

- The creation by arms specialists of programme and best practice guidelines that are accessible to development practitioners and that address development goals;
- An integration of small arms reduction into national development policy frameworks aimed at poverty reduction;
- Encouraging ownership from violence affected states; and
- The inclusion of armed violence data in the conflict assessments mandated by development agencies.

At the recent UN Biennial Meeting of States (see lead article), there were many statements that linked small arms and development. Perhaps by the Review Conference in 2006 this will have become a common understanding reflected in a new, expanded program of action.

David Jackman is an independent consultant based in Canada and currently working on small arms demand issues for the Quaker UN Office and other agencies.

No Arms for Atrocities: Enact an Arms Trade Treaty

On 9 October 2003, the International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA), Amnesty International, Oxfam International, the Arias Foundation, Project Ploughshares, and other organisations worldwide launched an international campaign to strictly regulate the supply and use of weapons. The purpose is to make people safer by stopping the supply and flow of weapons to those who use them for atrocities around the world. The campaign calls on governments to provide community safety and human security for their citizens, reduce the demand of arms and uphold domestic laws. A cornerstone of the campaign is a demand that states negotiate a tough, binding Arms Trade Treaty.

Irresponsible arms transfers fuel violent conflict, undermine sustainable development, and contribute to countless human rights violations throughout the world. One need only review a list of recent and ongoing zones of conflict and atrocity to recognise the role of governments in fuelling and facilitating systematic abuses of international human rights and international humanitarian law. The Great Lakes Region, Afghanistan, Indonesia, Burma, Israel, Central America, Colombia and Sierra Leone are some of the areas that are being or have been torn apart by murders and torturers armed with foreign weaponry.

The consequences are felt for years after the weapons have filled their immediate purpose. Many of the weapons destined for armies or paramilitary forces are now found in the hands of gangs, teenage boys on the streets or untrained private security guards. More still are being reshipped to guerrilla or paramilitary groups elsewhere, ready to fuel another war and destroy yet more lives. Sensitised to these issues by the tragic wars in Central America in the 1980s, Oscar Arias led six other Nobel Peace Prize laureates in unveiling an International Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers in 1997. The Code provided a comprehensive, global and transparent mechanism for regulating all weapons transfers, in compliance with international human rights standards and humanitarian law.

The initiative has subsequently expanded, and a core group of supportive organisations drafted a model Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) which now carries the support of 19 individuals and organisations honoured with the Nobel Peace Prize, as well as various other organisations and government representatives.

The central aim of the Arms Trade Treaty is to provide a set of common minimum standards for the control of arms transfers and a workable operative mechanism for the application of these standards, which are based firmly on states' existing responsibilities under international law.

Current binding agreements concerning international human rights, international humanitarian law, and peaceful coexistence establish a number of important limitations on states' freedom to transfer weapons. The ATT would not impose a completely new normative framework on state behaviour. Instead, it would clarify existing law, give it the force of renewed commitment and apply it consistently and effectively to the trade in weapons in order to protect people against human rights violations, war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide.

The international campaign is timely in its launch. Governments and companies alike are stating their concerns regarding the proliferation of small arms. The war on terror is calling for dramatic increases in exports on arms and military aid—often to governments with poor human rights records. The United Nations has recently published several investigative reports on violations of its arms embargoes (legally binding on all states). And in 2001 governments recognised the need for stronger arms export regulations and international criteria for arms transfers, while several politically binding regional agreements were negotiated.

For success, actions on several levels must be taken. At the community level, organisations will need to work to make people safer from armed violence through projects like micro-disarmament, security sector reform and public education programs.

At the national and regional levels, coalitions of NGOs must work to establish the strongest possible systems of control on arms transfers. The relationship of the ATT to such initiatives is symbiotic, because it sets a clear benchmark based on the strongest possible standards under international law. Conversely, the ATT and international campaign benefit from the momentum and consensus built through the development and improvement of national and regional systems.

Controlling the trade in weapons is only one part of a much broader effort to prevent violent catastrophes around the world. However, the importance of such work should not be underestimated. Those engaged in human rights abuses and war crimes receive more than military support when they receive weapons. They also receive a powerful signal that weapons' exporters—often among the world's most powerful states—are willing to disregard their own responsibilities to protect international human rights and humanitarian law, and instead are willing to turn a blind eye to atrocity. By working towards tough, legally binding rules to regulate the arms trade, means are being developed to cut off the flow of weapons to human rights abusers and an important bulwark against genocide is being built.

As His Holiness the Dalai Lama said, "We must all carry the responsibility of making this idea materialise."

Further information

For more on the ATT: www.armslaw.com

For information on the campaign: www.controlarms.org

Chris Stevenson works for the Arias Foundation

■ In Their Own Words

What did you think of the New York Biennial Meeting of States in July 2003?

Dr. Olive Kobusingye

Injury Control Centre
Uganda

The meeting was energising for those of us working amidst the chaos and havoc caused by gun violence. It was evident there were many diverse interests, not all necessarily complementary. It was useful as a reality check, and there was a clear sense that NGOs and many states are determined to stay the course, and to come to the aid of those whose lives are constantly at risk of these weapons.

Mr. Antonio Bandeira

Viva Rio
Brazil

The meeting represented an effort on the part of the UN to stimulate, more than to demand, the implementation of the POA on the part of governments, who in general have voiced enthusiasm but taken little action. Latin American governments gave the impression that advances in arms control had been made. In reality few concrete steps have been taken beyond small changes in national legislation in accordance with the UN's recommendations. However, the meeting was useful in advancing pressure to act on marking and tracing, and brokering, for example. It also gave NGOs the opportunity not only to do what they do best—pressure governments—but also to collaborate and share expertise with government agencies and UN institutions in such a way as to make global gun control a reality.

Ambassador Rakesh Sood

Permanent Representative of India to the Conference on Disarmament
Geneva, Switzerland

The meeting was helpful as a stocktaking exercise for states. However, the small arms and light weapons issue cannot be tackled exclusively by governmental institutions. So the question is did civil society organisations and regional organisations, who have a vital input, also get new ideas about how to give a new push, including generation of resources, for implementation? If the answer is 'yes', then the meeting was also valuable.

Ms. Sharon Kellman

UNICEF
New York

For an agency like UNICEF, this meeting was very useful for assessing how priority issues for us are faring in the implementation of the UN Programme of Action. Whilst we hear a lot of references to the plight of children caught up in the crossfire of armed violence, it's harder for us to ascertain what practical and sustainable efforts are underway to address this. In the years to come we look forward to more concerted action on this front. With an estimated 300,000 child soldiers and countless more children subject to gun violence daily, we take an active interest in the political will of states on this issue.



Illustration: John Hardaker, Project X Graphics

Illegal arms hotline set-up in Solomon Islands

ABC News Online, 22 August 2003

www.abc.net.au/news/newsitems/s930289.htm

Solomon Islanders are being encouraged to “dob in” people holding on to illegal firearms after the expiry of a national amnesty that prompted the surrender of around 3,000 weapons. Regional Assistance Mission chief Nick Warner says the surrender of the weapons is an excellent response, but he is worried there are some who still have not handed in their guns. “We’ve already received a number of calls, passing on some quite interesting information,” Mr Warner said. He says the hotline will be running up to 10 hours a day, and may be extended if needed.

About 7,000 people attended a national peace rally in Honiara to mark the end of the amnesty. Some of the surrendered weapons were destroyed in front of the crowd with community representatives taking part.

French preference for handguns strongest in Western Europe

French civilians own more handguns than in any other West European country, a new report finds. According to the Small Arms Survey 2003, there are over 762,000 handguns (pistols and revolvers) registered to French citizens—more handguns than in the Czech Republic, Denmark, England and Wales, Poland, Scotland, and Sweden combined. “France is the exception to the rule in Europe, where most privately held guns are hunting rifles and shotguns,” said Aaron Karp, one of the study authors. “In fact, the ratio of handguns to long guns in France is on a par with that of the United States, where handguns are far more common than in Europe generally.”

Baghdad gun deaths are 47 times higher than this time a year ago

Associated Press, 14 August 2003

The Baghdad police don’t have official crime statistics, but the number of bodies at the city’s morgue says it all. Baghdad is in the midst of an unprecedented crime wave.

The city morgue handled 470 gunshot deaths in July. In the same month a year ago, it recorded ten gun deaths. The morgue handles all violent or suspicious deaths.

Baghdad’s acting police chief says there were criminals before the war, too—but he says everything changed afterward. Officials say a number of factors could have led to the increase in gun deaths. Saddam Hussein released many criminals from prison just before the war. Some people may be settling scores from the Saddam era.

Iraqis also say American soldiers are part of the problem. Many accuse the soldiers of opening fire randomly when they feel threatened.

March for a Gun Free Brazil

Viva Rio, 14 September 2003

In spite of heavy rains, over 50,000 people turned out to march for a Gun Free Brazil along Rio’s Copacabana

beach, in an event organized by Viva Rio this past Sunday. As an added twist, the march featured in Brazil’s hottest prime-time TV series, “Mulheres Apaixonadas” (Women in Love). The objective of the march was to put pressure on National Congress to vote and approve sweeping reforms to the country’s gun laws, banning the right to carry and calling for a national referendum in 2005 to stop commercial guns sales in Brazil. As a result of the mass mobilisation, it appears that there will be a vote on the law by the end of September.

New publications from the Centre

New publications launched by the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue in recent months include the three outlined below.

“*Putting People First: Human security perspectives on small arms availability and misuse*” sets out key priorities for enhancing human security within the context of the UN Programme of Action and beyond. It is the result of a collaborative process between the Centre, the Human Security Network, NGOs and UN agencies. It contains a Ministerial Foreword from the Human Security Network of states, and a preface by the late UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Sergio Vieira de Mello.

It is available at: www.hdcentre.org/Programmes/smallarms/hsn.htm in Arabic, French, Portuguese, Spanish and English.

“*In the Line of Fire: Surveying the perceptions of humanitarian and development personnel of the impacts of small arms and light weapons*” provides compelling evidence on the impacts of weapons on a particular segment of the civilian community who are, literally, in the line of fire. This publication is the product of the first phase of a multi-year initiative. It is the result of a collaborative process between the Centre, the Small Arms Survey, and a variety of organisations. This report analyses the responses of 600 personnel in 39 countries.

It is available at: www.hdcentre.org/Programmes/smallarms/sasurvey.htm in French, Spanish and English.

“*Two Years After: Implementation of the UN Programme of Action in the Asia-Pacific*.” This occasional paper examines how Asia-Pacific states have fared in implementation of the UN Programme of Action since 2001. While compliance has been uneven and limited, there have been encouraging national developments in Southeast Asia and the Pacific: reviews of laws in Cambodia and Australia; gun amnesty programmes in the Philippines and Solomon Islands; disarmament initiatives in Cambodia and Bougainville; and awareness-raising and advocacy by NGOs. The Asia Pacific region is beginning to tackle this complex problem. However, there is much to be done—beginning from full recognition of the impacts of small arms availability to the identification of sustainable solutions. This briefing analyses national and regional grouping statements made at the July 2003 meeting, as well as national reports submitted to the conference.

It is available at www.hdcentre.org/Programmes/Smallarms/Documents/APR3.pdf

The Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue is an independent and impartial organisation, based in Geneva, Switzerland, dedicated to dialogue on humanitarian issues, the resolution of violent conflict and the alleviation of its impacts on people. The Centre facilitates high-level, low-key dialogue amongst principal actors to armed conflict as well as other stakeholders such as NGOs and UN agencies.

This work is complemented by research and policy efforts to advance action on contemporary humanitarian challenges such as the nature of non-state armed groups, mediation techniques, war economies, the rule of law and arms availability. In 2001 the Centre established the Human Security and Small Arms Programme which undertakes a variety of projects aimed at furthering understanding about the human cost of weapons availability and misuse, as well as advocating options for action.

Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue
114 rue de Lausanne
Geneva, 1202, Switzerland

Phone: +41.22.908.1130
Fax: +41.22.908.1140
E-mail: info@hdcentre.org
Web: www.hdcentre.org

All rights reserved. The copyright of this publication is owned by the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue.

“hd | Centre for
Humanitarian
Dialogue

Join our mailing list

- I want to continue to receive a complimentary copy of the *Human Security and Small Arms Bulletin*
Preferred distribution mode E-mail Hard copy
- I want to receive multiple copies of the *Bulletin* (indicate below in which language and the quantity)
- English French Spanish ___ Number of copies

Name and title _____

Organisation _____

Position _____

Address _____

Post/zip code _____

Country _____

Telephone _____

Fax _____

Website _____

E-mail _____

Please copy and complete this form and mail it to Mireille Widmer, Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, 114 rue de Lausanne, Geneva, 1202, Switzerland, e-mail it to widmer@hdcentre.org or fax it to +41.22.908.1140

bulletin
Small Arms and Human Security

Editor

Cate Buchanan (cateb@hdcentre.org)

Design and production

Richard Jones (rmjones@onetel.net.uk)
Exile: Design and Editorial Services