



A Dialogue in Ottawa: Linking Development Programming and Armed Violence Reduction

27 February 2007



Roundtable Report
by David Jackman
for Project Ploughshares
and the Small Arms Working Group
of the Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee

About the Author

David Jackman is a consultant who focuses on peacebuilding, small arms and conflict management issues. Currently he is assisting the Quaker UN Office in Geneva with a multi-year policy program focused on lessening demand for small arms. Previously he was the Associate Middle East Representative for American Friends Service Committee, based in Amman, Jordan, where he explored opportunities for regional dialogue on security issues and helped to found a regional NGO network on small arms. From 1994 to 2001, David served as Associate Representative at the Quaker United Nations Office in New York.

About this Report

The roundtable, *A Dialogue in Ottawa: Linking Development Programming and Armed Violence Reduction*, was the final event in the 2006-2007 program of the Small Arms Working Group of the Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee, and was funded by Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada. The purpose of the roundtable was to explore Canadian practice and policy, with input from international and Canadian experts, on the challenges of advancing development under the threat of armed violence. Project Ploughshares is the coordinating agency of the Small Arms Working Group.

Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee

The Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee (CPCC) is a network of Canadian non-governmental organizations and institutions, academics and other individuals from a wide range of sectors engaged in facilitating dialogue between civil society and the Canadian government for the development of peacebuilding policy and programming. The **Small Arms Working Group** of the CPCC seeks to engage the Canadian peace, disarmament, human rights and development NGO communities in the development and promotion of national and international policies and measures to reverse the diffusion and misuse of small arms and light weapons.

Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee

1216-1 Nicholas Street,
Ottawa ON K1N 7B7 Canada
(613) 241-3446 Fax (613) 241-4846
cpcc@web.ca www.peacebuild.ca

Project Ploughshares

Project Ploughshares is the ecumenical peace centre of The Canadian Council of Churches established to work with churches and related organizations, as well as governments and non-governmental organizations, in Canada and internationally, to identify, develop, and advance approaches that build peace and prevent war. Project Ploughshares is affiliated with the Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, Conrad Grebel University College, University of Waterloo.



Project Ploughshares

57 Erb Street West
Waterloo, ON N2L 6C2 Canada
(519) 888-6541 Fax (519) 888-0018
plough@ploughshares.ca www.ploughshares.ca

The views presented here do not necessarily reflect the policies of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, CPCC, Project Ploughshares, or the sponsoring churches and agencies of Project Ploughshares.

© Project Ploughshares 2007

ISBN 978-1-895722-57-4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. The path from arms control to development 1

III. Three different case studies and some lessons 2

A. City-based program, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, Viva Rio

B. National Example, Sierra Leone, UN Development Programme

C. Subregional program in West Africa, CECI and Oxfam Great Britain

IV. Global action on development and armed violence reduction 6

A. Policy level

B. Field level

C. Challenges

Appendices

I. Agenda 9

II. Participants List 10

III. Background paper 11

Linking Development and Armed Violence Reduction Programming, by David Jackman

I. Introduction

In the mid-1990s a Canadian development organizer traveled to Cambodia to become the director of a rural development program. As part of designing their new strategic plan he asked the national staff to list their five top priorities for the next period. After some deliberation they brought him the list. He looked at it and frowned.

“Perhaps I didn’t explain this exercise very well,” he said. “You’ve listed ‘security’ as your first, second, and third priorities. We can place it first, if you like, and that will leave room for four other priorities.”

“No,” they answered respectfully. “Security is first, second, and third in priority; if we can’t accomplish that, then the rest will never happen.”¹

In recent years the connection between development programming and the reduction of armed violence has become an important issue for both the development and arms control communities. For the specialists who want to control the spread of small arms and lessen violence it is clear that they will have deal with the social, cultural, and economic conditions that drive the demand for weapons. At the same time, development planners can see that the current levels of armed violence in many regions of the world are jeopardizing the achievement of any possible gains in development. But even recognizing this policy convergence, is there any evidence that such a linkage can have a positive impact in the field? Are there any relevant case studies? Are Canadian NGOs involved? What kinds of structures and processes would facilitate the linking of development and armed violence programs?

With these questions in mind, the Small Arms Working Group brought some 20 interested participants and speakers together in Ottawa in late February 2007 in what it planned would be the first in a series of dialogues about these issues.² The event drew specialists from the fields of development, conflict resolution, peacebuilding, and disarmament. The speakers came from UNDP, CIDA, and three field programs that are successfully integrating aspects of development, armed violence reduction, and small arms control. A background paper³ drafted for the event was distributed to all the participants.

II. The path from arms control to development

When bringing together different policy communities there may be problems in finding a shared terminology. Development and arms control specialists, for example, can use very different labels for similar approaches. In the arms control community armed violence reduction is addressed through “controlling the proliferation of small arms and light

¹ An anecdote told to the author by a colleague working with the American Friends Service Committee in Cambodia.

² “CPCC Small Arms Working Group Dialogue: Exploring the development and armed violence nexus,” held in Ottawa, 27 February 2007.

³ David Jackman, “Linking Development and Armed Violence Reduction Programming,” Small Arms Working Group, February 2007. See Appendix III of this report.

weapons (SALW).” Like any other global trade this one is driven by supply and demand factors. Its supply-side aspects are familiar to arms controllers and therefore easier for them to address; the demand side factors are considered unusual. This remains true even when everyone admits the obvious: that the subject of their work is a weapons system that necessarily requires both a supply of hardware as well as a human operator who expresses his or her demand for the weapons.

To help understand how one might to tackle the “demand” or the human aspects of this weapons system, researchers at Small Arms Survey have developed a dynamic, interactive model that identifies the three main elements of demand: motivation, resources, and price.⁴ When you look at how these elements interact in the model, you can see that they include such processes as attitude change, social change, economic development, security alternatives, and controls on availability.

Many of the processes that interact in the demand model are also subjects addressed by development programs. So it is not surprising that arms control specialists are increasingly convinced that the effective control of SALW violence will depend on the use of development programs and methods (which especially focus on the motivation and resources components of the demand model). Indeed, one could turn the normal concept on its head and view the whole SALW control topic as essentially a development subject with some specialized weapons control aspects. In practice, field programs that seek to reduce armed violence use a variety of methods, including development, human rights, conflict management, governance, and weapons regulation activities. Some field programs integrate all of these aspects of work because the problem on the ground required it.

III. Three different case studies and some lessons

The case studies presented at the Ottawa meeting included one city-based program, one at the national level and one organized across a region of several countries.

A. City-based program in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, Viva Rio

The city-based program was organized in Rio de Janeiro by the Brazilian NGO Viva Rio. Their program was launched in 1994 and has grown into a multi-dimensional approach. It started with a focus on raising awareness, public mobilization, and gun control; grew to include gender issues and legislative campaigns; and eventually incorporated policing reforms, youth programming, and community development work in *favela* (slum) areas. Thus its programs integrate traditional development topics with justice reform, government regulation, and wider social change. This multiplication of approaches was developed in response to a deepening understanding of the many factors that were driving

⁴ For a fuller description see David Atwood, Anne-Kathrin Glatz, and Robert Muggah, *Demanding Attention: Addressing the Dynamics of Small Arms Demand*, Small Arms Survey and Quaker United Nations Office, Geneva, 2006, pp. 10-14. Available at www.quno.org.

the very high level of gun violence experienced in Rio. More than a decade of continuous work has generated a complex analysis that in turn has required a variety of interrelated responses. While each new stage grew in part from specific, highly shocking violent incidents, the projects created in response have been developed within a coherent structure. Over the years the Viva Rio program has worked at state, national, and international levels and remains active at all levels. It places a special emphasis on growth through partnership and networking. Currently it collaborates with over 1,000 neighbourhood groups in Rio and has helped to initiate a regional (MERCOSUR) network on gun control and an international network regarding the situation of Children in Organized Armed Violence (COAV).

Viva Rio has identified several lessons based on their experience:

- High levels of gun violence are rooted in a complex of interrelated factors. In response a multitude of interrelated programs have been developed with many partners (both civil society and government) over a long period. No single program approach (community development, policing reform, legislative change, political mobilization) by itself would have led to success.
- The first clear, quantifiable evidence of success (a drop in the annual rate of gun deaths in Rio) did not come until 2004, 10 years after the program began. Activity needed to be structured and funded on a long-term, sustainable basis.
- The programs required flexibility and a home-grown capacity to conduct research and analysis to respond to the openings offered by a newly developing political and social environment.
- The capacity of any urban neighbourhood to control its vulnerability to criminal violence depends on resources, many of which are more easily available to higher economic classes. To increase security in lower-class neighbourhoods other, more imaginative alternatives must be sought.
- Some aspects of the problem are regional or global in nature and require the development of regional structures in response.

B. National Example in Sierra Leone, UN Development Programme

The national example was an “arms and development” program organized by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Sierra Leone after a long civil war. It focused on projects in rural chiefdoms over a four-year period. UNDP based its design on an earlier, groundbreaking program for Albania that responded to the unrest and wide dispersal of small arms after a deep economic and political crisis. The planners at UNDP knew from the global experience that collecting guns by using only legal and financial incentives had generally failed. Instead, the global agency offered communities needed development inputs in exchange for their successful collection of weapons. The results were encouraging.

In Sierra Leone UNDP organized an improved variant of the Albanian model. It began with a disarmament phase that included sensitization, collection, and verification stages, all of which were supported by local training programs. This local activity was supported nationally with improvements in border controls and gun control legislation. Once a

community was verified as gun free, it qualified for a development project chosen earlier by the community. Over its life the program funded 50 development projects that established schools, micro-credit projects, and other initiatives. The program partners included a local NGO (for sensitization programming), district councils, the police, and the national government. Coordination through an easy-to-organize networking structure harmonized the many partners and activities to avoid duplication of efforts and to sustain a lengthy national program. Typically the disarmament activities in each chiefdom were completed over a two- or three-month period. Community decision-making on a development project took longer. By the time the program ended, the overall level of violence had declined in the targeted rural areas and the social dynamic and overall community perception of security were more positive.

The lessons the organizers took from the Sierra Leone program were:

- Context is everything in a project that depends on attitude change. Designing an effective program required a thorough knowledge of the political, economic, social, and cultural factors that are driving the need to acquire and hold weapons.
- Hard evidence is necessary as a basis for evaluation, especially for a pilot program used to validate a model approach. Obtaining such evidence was difficult in a heavily damaged, post-war society that had retained very little baseline data and had only a very minimal capacity to collect and analyze new data.
- This program led to reduced violence in rural areas, but it could not be extended to the capital city's urban environment, which experienced a sharp increase in armed violence during the same time period. The rural projects worked through established community structures, but these were not clearly discernable in a city filled with large numbers of marginalized, unattached young people displaced by a long period of war.

C. Sub-Regional Programme on Small Arms in West Africa, CECI & Oxfam GB

The Sub-Regional Programme on Small Arms in West Africa was a pilot project organized by two external partners, CECI⁵ from Canada and Oxfam Great Britain, with support from the Canada Fund for Africa and the West Africa Peace and Security Initiative administered through CIDA. This program, organized in four West African countries⁶ over a two-year period, was designed to reduce the proliferation of small arms in a region where weapons and the insecurity they cause have many cross-border effects. The result has been improved security and more economic opportunity in host areas and a diversified and well-trained capacity for further integrated work on small arms and development in the region.

The program was intentionally carried out through extensive collaboration with national and regional partner organizations. At the national level partners included development- and small arms-focused NGOs. Regionally there was advice and cooperation from diverse actors: Interpol (policing, security); ECOWAS (economic and political); and WAANSA⁷ (small arms control). Each organization opened a door into their respective

⁵ Centre d'Étude et de Coopération Internationale, based in Montréal, Québec.

⁶ Senegal, Guinée Bissau, Gambia, and Guinée Conakry.

⁷ West Africa Action Network on Small Arms, an affiliate of the global IANSA NGO network

sectoral networks, creating a very strong basis for appropriate and easily accepted programming, choosing local partners, and solving problems as they arose. The small number of international staff involved and the organizers' strong commitment to involving and training regional and local partners contributed very substantially to the sustainability and success of the program.

After a design phase conducted with the national partner NGOs, the program was implemented in four stages that focused on capacity building (including an exchange visit to a mature SALW program in Mali), sensitization, arms collection and development projects, and monitoring (through a comparative legislative study and regional meetings). As in the Sierra Leone project described above, there was a major emphasis on extensive dialogue and education at the local level, but the regional scale of the work allowed for much more extensive training and programming. It also created the basis for ongoing regional work linking arms control and development issues. The initial partners CECI and Oxfam GB are designing a follow-up program for the region on "Security and Development." The title indicates the intended shift toward broader content and a more integrated style of work.

The lessons and challenges identified by this regional program include:

- Linking small arms and development programming may seem novel, but the program methodology was based on a very familiar and well-practised regional development model. Only the small arms subject content and a few specialized partners (police, security forces) were new, unfamiliar elements.
- The new topic did not require the creation of new structures or organizations. The work was conducted by existing development, conflict, or small arms NGOs.
- The systematic effort to incorporate extensive training and capacity-building activities helped to build strong local ownership and sustainability. It also helped to support the wide dissemination of information and learning.
- The many diverse actors engaged in the program greatly increased its sustainability.
- The small arms subject matter opened new opportunities for contact and communication among communities, NGOs, and government sectors such as security and police. They learned that they had common interests and complementary strengths and that mutual respect is possible.
- The exchange visit early in the program helped to convince civilian organizations that police forces could be trusted and national political structures could demonstrate real commitment.
- The Programme had a very short time frame (two years) to accomplish a very complex process. While there were many positive results, few weapons were collected, relative to the number estimated to be held by civilians. An unanswered underlying question remains about the extent to which the target communities recognized a necessary connection between security and development.

IV. Global action on development and armed violence reduction

As the Sierra Leone example illustrates, UNDP was an early advocate for linking programs on small arms violence and development.⁸ It began this approach in the late 1990s by assisting in a small arms collection program at the request of the government of Mali. By the time of the UN conference on small arms in 2001 UNDP was speaking clearly to the international community about the need for action on small arms issues in support of sustainable development. To date the agency has supported 50 states in their national efforts to control small arms.

Initially, UNDP's interventions were focused on addressing the availability, or supply, of weapons in any given setting. But reducing the supply of weapons says nothing about whether a community has become safer or more secure, nor does it say if a community's development prospects have improved. UNDP's approach to small arms issues has broadened to include not only the weapons themselves, but the impact of small arms availability and misuse on human development, and the factors that prompt people to acquire weapons. UNDP's work on small arms is therefore increasingly conceptualized in terms of armed violence prevention and/or reduction.

A. On a policy level:

UNDP is supporting the United Kingdom's Armed Violence and Poverty Initiative (AVPI), which focuses in part on needed research and analysis, and the OECD's work to develop guidelines on how to integrate armed violence into development programming. Along with the Swiss government, UNDP organized the Geneva Ministerial Summit in June 2006. So far, 49 countries, including Canada, have endorsed the Declaration's measures to reduce the negative impact of armed violence on sustainable development. Other UN agencies and groupings are working in a parallel manner. UNICEF has just announced a research program to collect information globally about how young people under the age of 18 are affected by armed violence and how their involvement with gun violence can be reduced. Another consortium of UN agencies and outside organizations has launched a new set of operational standards regarding demobilization, disarmament, and reintegration (DDR) programs in post-conflict situations. The new guidelines explicitly integrate development and security elements.

B. At field level:

UNDP is emphasizing the use of *integrated programs*, which address all relevant aspects of small arms issues, including DDR, mine action, justice, and security sector reform. This integration can only be achieved successfully if these interventions are mainstreamed into UNDP country programs to foster the linkage with other areas of practice such as democratic governance or the rule of law. The implication is that these components are embedded into the activities and sector priorities of other UN agencies and are reflected in national development frameworks or strategies. This integrated

⁸ The following description of UNDP activity is adapted from the paper presented at the Ottawa meeting by Jackie Seck, a UNDP staff member based in New York.

approach is already in operation in Kenya and Uganda. In 2005, Burundi identified the reduction of armed violence as a key element in its development planning strategy and in close consultation with the UN country team has integrated the issue of small arms proliferation into its UN Development Assistance Framework. In a parallel development, Burundi also insisted that small arms issues be closely linked to the reform of its security sector.

C. Challenges:

Promoting and implementing an integrated approach to development and armed violence may generate resistance on the part of some host countries for a number of reasons. Issues related to small arms control, conflict, and violence are often politically sensitive and may reflect badly on a government's capacity to rule effectively. Other governments may have concerns over possible aid substitution and aid conditionality if they incorporate small arms issues into their national development frameworks. In addition, some states do not perceive that they have the institutional capacity to undertake broader policy initiatives and, indeed, some of them suffer a lack of institutional memory created by political instability, particularly in post-conflict situations.

In the face of these objections, it is important to remind states that there are clear success stories of governments that are addressing small arms violence through integrated development programming. With more research there will be even more concrete proof that this approach can pay off in more sustainable, long-term progress in development. As Viva Rio's work in Rio de Janeiro shows, hard evidence of success may take a decade or more to appear. (This point is underlined negatively by the more limited progress shown by the shorter programs in Sierra Leone and West Africa mentioned above.) Changing the attitudes and perceptions of people—and governments—can be a long process, so the ability of the global system to demonstrate its commitment over a long period is essential for success.

So far, Canada has shown some formal support for the integration of development planning with efforts to reduce armed violence and improve security systems. DFAIT has supported some of the crucial, early efforts to understand the demand for small arms. Canadian diplomats have helped to advance the development approach in small arms negotiations and have endorsed the Geneva Declaration. In contrast, Canadian development organizations, including CIDA, have been less engaged. While a few, such as Oxfam Canada and CECI, have launched some relevant programming, others have held back. CIDA itself does not have a declared policy on armed violence or peacebuilding, let alone one on small arms control, and none seems likely soon. Meanwhile, there is a growing international need for relevant research initiatives and the creation of youth-focused programming, to mention just two of many possible priorities.⁹ The Geneva Declaration process offers a real opportunity for effective collaboration on

⁹ For a more extensive listing and analysis of further avenues for work see "Setting a New Agenda for Demand Work: Next Steps in the Comprehensive Approach to Small Arms Control, Key Findings from the Workshop, 17 January 2007," Quaker UN Office, Geneva, March 2007. Available at www.quno.org.

policy development, political advocacy, and field practice. Perhaps, as more evidence becomes available, Canadian organizations will choose to take a more prominent role in this emerging area.

APPENDIX I Roundtable Agenda

27 February 2007, 10:30am – 4:30pm
CANADEM Board Room, 1 Nicholas St, #1102
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

Roundtable Objectives:

1. To provide information on, and analysis of, the linkages between development and armed violence/small arms reduction.
2. To explore the participation of the development community in efforts to reduce armed violence and control small arms.

10: 00 am	Welcome and introductions Chairperson: Ken Epps, Small Arms Working Group and Project Ploughshares
10:15	Opening speaker: Jacqueline Seck, UNDP “Why does the control of small arms and armed violence require the active involvement of the development community?”
11:00	Session I: Making the link between gun violence and development “Viva Rio’s efforts to advance development in Brazil through small arms programs” – Rubem Cesar, Viva Rio, Brazil
12:00	Lunch (provided)
1:00 pm	Session II: Integrating small arms reduction into development programs— the Canadian experience Panelists: Yallena Cica, CIDA; Suzanne Dumouchel, CECI–Sub-Regional Programme for Small Arms and Light Weapons in West Africa; Zoe Dugal, CANADEM–UNDP Arms for Development project, Sierra Leone
2:30	<i>Break</i>
2:45	Session III: Exploring policy priorities—multilateral processes on armed violence and reduction David Jackman, Consultant, Quaker UN Office
4:15	Adjournment

1. Vivien Carli, McGill University
2. Yallena Cica, Canadian International Development Agency
3. Robin Collins, World Federalist Movement - Canada
4. Zoe Dugal, CANADEM
5. Susanne Dumouchel, CECI
6. Ken Epps, Project Ploughshares
7. Nadia Faucher, Inter pares
8. Rubem Cesar Fernandes, Viva Rio, Brazil
9. David Jackman, Quaker United Nations Office, Geneva
10. Zahra Hassan, University of Ottawa
11. Hilary Homes, Amnesty International Canada
12. Frank Jewsbury, CAMEO Landmines Clearance
13. Janice Kopinak, health consultant
14. Aqiyla Lawrence, McGill University
15. David Lord, Canadian Coordinating Peacebuilding Committee
16. Yves Morneau, Canadian Institute for Conflict Resolution
17. Jacqueline Seck, Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, UN
Development Programme
18. John Seibert, Project Ploughshares
19. Darryl Whitehead, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs,
Carleton University

*Background paper for the
CPCC Small Arms Working Group Dialogue:
Exploring the development and armed violence nexus*

Linking Development and Armed Violence Reduction Programming

The Secretary-General of Norwegian Church Aid emphasized the need to uphold and protect human dignity, which encompasses human development, human rights and human security, and focuses primarily on the safety and welfare of individuals and their communities. [He] stressed that the illicit proliferation of small arms and light weapons clearly jeopardizes this agenda worldwide, and that it is therefore a matter of utmost importance to mainstream the issue of small-arms proliferation and misuse into the development agenda, as well as to integrate development into small-arms initiatives, including the UN Programme of Action process.¹⁰

In recent years there has been a convergence in analysis that has led the development, small arms, and security communities to investigate the links between development and armed violence issues. This interest has been driven, on the one hand, by the need to ensure sustainable development programs in the many places where they are threatened by armed conflict and gun violence, and, on the other hand, by the realization that the effective control of armed violence and small arms proliferation depends in part on supportive development programming. These links have been explored actively by development agencies such as the UK's Department for International Development (DFID), the UN Development Programme (UNDP), and by international NGOs such as Oxfam. The OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) has concluded that security is fundamental to long-term growth, sustainable development, and poverty reduction in developing countries. In 2006, during the lead-up to the UN's review conference on small arms, a clear majority of member states stated their belief that development and small arms control were integrally connected. More dramatically, in June of that year the ministers of 42 northern and southern states (including Canada), endorsed the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development. This growing policy consensus has been given a practical expression by programming on the ground in Brazil, Cambodia, Southeast Europe, East Africa, and elsewhere. In turn these programs have provided the experience base for policy conferences such as the one at Wilton Park organized by DFID in 2003 and the two organized by PRIO in Oslo in March and December 2006.

¹⁰ From a summary of the presentation by Atle Sommerfelt, Secretary-General of Norwegian Church Aid, in Anne Thurin, "Integrating Development into the UN Programme of Action Process, Report and Recommendations from an Expert Seminar, Oslo, 22–23 March 2006," PRIO, Oslo, 2006, p. 1.

Even with all this activity there continue to be real questions about just how extensive and deep the links are between development and armed violence and what kinds of success can be expected from programs that link these policy areas. Efforts to track these policy and program linkages have taken two routes. One path explores the effects of armed violence on development programming. The other path, a mirror image of the first, traces the effect of development programs on levels of armed violence.

1. The effects of armed violence on development

As a major contribution to understanding policy linkages and assessing the impact of programming, DFID commissioned the Armed Violence and Poverty Initiative (AVPI)¹¹ at the University of Bradford in the UK. The reports in 2005 and 2006 from this study have provided a good deal of basic analysis, based on case studies of 10 country situations.¹² The reports have also outlined some of the ambiguities in this policy area. For example, regarding the basic terminology an APVI researcher noted that

The links between SALW (small arms and light weapons) usage/possession and poverty are diffuse and difficult to disaggregate and demonstrate. Many of the impacts are indirect, and disentangling SALW impacts from the impacts of armed violence is very difficult in practice....The term “armed violence,” therefore, is used as a rubric to include SALW availability, but also the social and political nexus in which they are used. In addition, the term “armed violence situations” is employed; this embraces more than simply the availability of arms and violent acts carried out by SALW to include the totality of a situation in which armed violence is persistent and endemic.¹³

Even with this proviso, the APVI was able to identify some clear lessons regarding development and armed violence. In general their study concluded the following. “Armed violence has a greater impact on poverty in poorer countries; the degree to which the state is able to continue providing social services affects the level of impoverishment; [and] there is often no great distinction between levels of violence in conflict, post-conflict and non-conflict countries.”¹⁴ The APVI was able to list clear ways that armed violence has an impact on poverty through

Direct casualties—Men (particularly young men) were the main perpetrators and victims of armed violence in each of the Bradford case studies. This has significant poverty implications through the costs of health

¹¹ For the full report see Mandy Turner, Jeremy Ginifer and Lionel Cliffe, “The impact of armed violence on poverty and development: Full report of the Armed Violence and Poverty Initiative,” Centre for International Cooperation and Security, University of Bradford, March 2005.

¹² Algeria, Brazil (Rio de Janeiro), Chechnya, El Salvador, India (North East), Kenya (Nairobi and North), Nepal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, and Sudan (South).

¹³ Owen Greene, “Understanding Small Arms and Development: Recent progress and emerging priorities,” a paper presented at the expert seminar “Integrating Development into the UN Programme of Action Process,” Oslo, 22–23 March 2006, p. 1.

¹⁴ Greene, p. 1.

care for victims, reducing labour power and skills, as well as increasing the number of female-headed households.

Displacement—After casualties, the biggest direct impact of armed conflict (but not of violent criminality) is the creation of refugees and internally displaced people.

Macro-economic costs—Armed violence slowed economic growth, deterred investment, disrupted socio-economic activity, and was an overall drain on the economy in each case study.

Reduced social expenditure and service delivery, and increased social needs—In most of the case studies, the heavy financial cost of armed violence meant that the share of government expenditure going to the security sector rose, and provision of social services fell, particularly medical care and education. This has a knock-on impact on the spread of treatable illnesses and mortality rates, as well as the capacity of the local population to address developmental needs.

Disruption of trade—In all of the case studies dealing with armed conflict, supplies and transportation were severely disrupted. In the majority of the case studies, loss of trade and access to markets negatively impacted on people's livelihoods.

Loss and depletion of livelihoods—There was a decline in the livelihoods of the majority of households, especially in rural areas, in each of the case studies.

Weakening social capital—In most of the case studies, armed violence eroded trust within and between communities, and undermined traditional governance and dispute resolution mechanisms.

Emergence of exploitative alternative political economies—Armed violence transformed economic activities in all of the case studies, normally leading to increased criminal activity (such as trafficking in guns, drugs, people, and natural resources) that impoverished the many while benefiting the few. These were normally dependent on the use, or threat, of arms. Politics was often criminalized.

Disruption of development and humanitarian aid—Armed violence can lead to a 'culture of withdrawal' where development agencies are unable to deliver services in insecure areas. Aid workers are increasingly targets of violence and the costs of logistics and security have significantly increased, diverting resources from their intended recipients.¹⁵

DFID's Kate Joseph, like other observers, has pointed out that these factors constitute the biggest obstacles to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) because, "on the one hand, poverty and underdevelopment increase the risks of insecurity, while on the other poor people cite insecurity as one of their greatest concerns.... DFID has come to recognize that security should be seen as a basic

¹⁵ Greene, pp. 1-2.

entitlement of the poor, like health or education. Arms play an important role in this dynamic.”¹⁶

2. The effect of development programs on levels of armed violence

In the world of small arms control, linking armed violence and development programming is a major part of the “comprehensive approach” to controlling the proliferation of these weapons. “Comprehensive” in this formulation means addressing weapons controls through a balance of supply and demand measures. The demand for arms is seen to reside in the need of community members to address their perceived insecurity by the acquisition and use of weapons. This insecurity may have many dimensions: physical, social, ethnic, and economic. Weapons—small arms—are viewed as a tool to achieve and maintain greater security, as an individual or group.

Small arms researchers conceptualize this demand for small arms as the interaction of motivations and means. Each of these can be stimulators or inhibitors. The key is that demand is made up of both—it is a function of individual or collective ‘motives’ and individual or collective ‘means’. Motivations are usually socially constructed and embedded in various social practices and cultural norms. They can refer to people’s beliefs and attitudes, their social relations and the larger socio-cultural environment of which they are a part. Means refer essentially to resources and prices.... Put in practical terms, you can have the motive to acquire or possess a weapon, but if you lack the cash or the price is too high, you won’t be able to satisfy this preference. Conversely, you can have truly exceptional social connections with brokers or traders and prices could be low, but if you don’t want a gun, you simply won’t acquire it.¹⁷

Seen in this context, development programming offers a community many opportunities to lessen the demand for guns by influencing the *motivations* (attitudes) of potential gun owners and users and by adding to the availability of alternative, nonviolent *resources* for security. (It is also true that rising economic development indicators may stimulate an *increased* demand for weapons, if the motivations that drive gun ownership are not addressed.)

There is evidence of demand-related programming in every region of the world. This work has been carried out both in post-war and “peacetime” situations and has exploited a relatively wide range of means to tackle the root causes of armed violence in varied situations. Research conducted through workshops with practitioners around the world has identified relevant activity focused on

- Post-war transition, especially effective DDR;

¹⁶ From a summary of a presentation by Kate Joseph, Conflict, Humanitarian and Security Department, DFID, United Kingdom, in Thurin, p. 9.

¹⁷ Robert Muggah, “From Old to New: The Small Arms Demand Agenda,” a paper presented at the QUNO Workshop, Setting a New Agenda for Demand Work,” 17 January 2007, Geneva, p. 1.

- Participatory community development, addressing disparities and youth employment and training;
- Governance reform—issues of access, participation, policing, and judiciary reform;
- Psycho-social change—gender, traditional structures ;
- Conflict prevention and resolution, including training and capacity building.

By the time of last year’s Review Conference, small arms specialists were convinced that effective programming “should be concerned not only with the weapons themselves, but with the structural factors such as the root socio-economic causes of armed violence and the need for alternatives to gun-based livelihoods”¹⁸ and this led them to support the proposal by the Geneva Declaration states and others that SALW work should be mainstreamed in development programming.

What does such programming look like? In practice it combines a number of different approaches.¹⁹ Some of these lean more toward supporting a community as it gains control of the weaponry itself by

- Strengthening legislation on the ownership, use, and transfer of small arms;
- Enhancing stockpile security to prevent thefts or sales of weapons from army and police stocks; and
- Restricting the public display and carrying of guns.

Other activities are typical development projects with specialized aspects:

- Weapons-for-development programs that offer collective development incentives to communities to encourage the surrender of guns;
- Community security programs that bring together community members, local government officials, and police officers to discuss security threats and develop joint plans;
- Raising public awareness through campaigns that target key groups, for example youth at risk of getting involved in violence, or women who can help to lead a community response; and
- Providing alternative livelihoods to youth through micro-credit and training projects to help stimulate an economic alternative to armed violence.

These approaches can all be coordinated through a national action plan that surveys the security situation in a country and links government and civil society in developing an action plan that can be linked to development priorities.

In UNDP’s experience this kind of mainstreaming contributes to the overall sustainability of national development plans because it “ensures that government and national actors are in the driving seat of identifying why and how crisis challenges should be addressed at the national level. It helps to build national capacity and commitment towards reducing risk factors including those related to small arms proliferation. Mainstreaming such issues

¹⁸ “Integrating development and small arms control, IANSA policy recommendations for the RevCon,” International Action Network on Small Arms, London, 2006, pp. 3-4.

¹⁹ The following is summarized from Greene, pp. 5-6.

can also result in better co-ordination and coherence among the activities of bilateral and multilateral donors, ultimately resulting in greater levels of effectiveness and reduced transaction costs.”²⁰

What kind of evidence is there that these mainstreamed programs are effective in lowering levels of armed violence, reducing the perceived need for weapons, and supporting development goals?

Some multi-year programs have identified quantifiable evidence of success. Viva Rio, after close to a decade of integrated work that included small arms controls, awareness raising, community policing, and youth employment and training, was able to mark a levelling off of the rate of gun violence in Rio de Janeiro. In Macedonia the government has reported that the implementation of integrated Safer Community Programmes, organized with the support of UNDP’s SEESAC²¹ in nine communities, reduced crime 35 per cent all over the country, and up to 70 per cent in the piloted communities.²² There are several reports providing anecdotal evidence that levels of conflict and violence have been reduced by integrated development and conflict programming in northern Kenya. Nevertheless, as a UNDP specialist noted, “the impacts of mainstreaming armed violence [programmes] have until now not been assessed or evaluated. UNDP therefore believes that it is important to carry out an assessment of the impact of integrating/mainstreaming small arms/armed violence. This study would identify and measure the benefits, and challenges, of successful integration, and would serve as a powerful advocacy tool for practitioners in the field in their efforts toward addressing the linkage between armed violence and development.”²³

The AVPI report evaluated a number of small arms control and armed violence reduction projects in the above areas to assess their impact on development. It found that “few of the projects made a significant direct and immediate contribution to arms reduction” and “few of the projects had explicit broader development objectives and there were few direct impacts on the MDGs. However, a number of projects had some indirect impacts.”²⁴ Much more positively, the report went on to list several important *indirect* impacts on development through increasing attention to security and governance activities. These included:

- Increased perceptions of security—People felt safer as a result of many of the projects, even where actual incidents of armed violence did not seem to fall. This had a significant impact on mobility and the resumption of more normal livelihood activities.

²⁰ Marc-Antoine Morel, United Nations Development Programme, Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, “Integrating Small Arms Measures into National Development Planning Strategies: Lessons learned from UNDP small arms programming,” paper presented at the expert seminar “Integrating Development into the UN Programme of Action Process,” Oslo, 22–23 March 2006, pp. 4-5.

²¹ South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms.

²² Statistics reported in a direct communication from Alain Lapon, the Macedonia Small Arms Project Manager and also referred to in the Government of Macedonia statement to the UN Review Conference on small arms in New York, 28 June 2006, p. 3.

²³ Morel, p. 12.

²⁴ This quote and the list below are from Greene, pp. 6-7.

- Enhanced governance—A number of the projects helped to strengthen legislation, increased the capacity of the government to address small arms control, and made governance structures more responsive to public pressure.
- Entry point to security sector reform—Engaging law enforcement agencies in small arms control was often a useful starting point to work with them to address broader reform and capacity building issues.
- Increased civic participation—The ability of communities (especially women) to participate in debates on public policy is key to poverty reduction. Some projects succeeded in creating open and participatory debates on sensitive weapons issues.
- Improved trust between the public and state—A number of projects built confidence between security forces, civilian government authorities, and local communities. The development of such partnerships is important for small arms control and development.

Perhaps in summary it is most accurate to say that most of the integrated armed violence and development programs have only begun recently and have not yet been evaluated. The collecting of such evidence, designing projects in a way that will facilitate such research, and developing their inherent “measurability” are all important priorities identified at a very recent expert meeting in Geneva.²⁵

3. Where to from here?

Really, the work on integrating armed violence and development is only just beginning. The NGO participants at the Oslo conference in March 2006 identified a number of structural connections needed to further develop the issue. Here are a few:

36. To encourage development partners, including aid agencies and international development institutions, to take measures to ensure that they have the mandates, policies, capacities and programmes in place to enable them to assist countries in developing and implementing development policies and programmes into which SALW issues are appropriately integrated.

37. To ensure that the World Bank and other International Financial Institutions have the policies, capacities and programmes to support such integrated development—SALW programmes in affected countries....

40. To strengthen UN and other international mechanisms and guidelines for peace-support programmes in countries emerging from conflict, to help to ensure appropriate integration of SALW reduction and control, and armed-violence reduction, with post-conflict reconstruction and development programmes. In this context, the UN Peace-Building Commission should help to ensure such integration.²⁶

²⁵ “Setting a New Agenda for Demand Work: Next Steps in the Comprehensive Approach to Small Arms Control” organized by the Quaker UN Office, 17 January 2007, in Geneva, Switzerland. A report on the event is forthcoming at www.quono.org.

²⁶ Thurin, pp. 22-23.

Meanwhile the Geneva Declaration process can help to encourage states to begin adding armed violence reduction and SALW programs to their national development plans. There is already progress in this direction evident in the national plans for Kenya and Uganda. Similarly, in Burundi the national peace commission is pressing for integration of SALW programs, which is supported by UN DPKO efforts to promote SSR in the country. In a related effort, Oxfam, along with other national and local NGOs, is engaged in a growing integration of development and armed conflict work. In Kenya a *national steering group on peacebuilding and conflict response* coordinates actions by government and civil society, facilitates consultation and provides support to NGO peacebuilding efforts. This structure connects with local peace and development committees that engage elders, women, and youth in direct action.

There are many possible avenues for developing further research, policy, and practical activity on the integration of armed violence and development programming. The expert meeting mentioned above concluded by identifying some 20 different global structures and processes that are highly relevant. There are now both political and policy carriers for this work.

What role will Canadian organizations take in this emerging global field? Several initial steps could include:

- Surveying the experience of Canadian NGOs with development projects in areas affected by armed violence, including any efforts to mitigate, prevent, or reduce the violence and/or work on critical issues such as youth employment and training, community security, dialogue processes, etc.;
- Forming a working group of NGOs and some interested federal departments to a) explore and potentially engage with the Geneva Declaration action plan; and b) to follow and participate in relevant policy dialogue in the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC);
- Initiating projects by CIDA and partners specifically designed to include the systematic collection of data on the impact of focused development programming on levels of armed violence; and
- Seeking an active connection of Canadian-funded development projects with integrated national development plans that include security, conflict management, and small arms elements (e.g., Kenya, Uganda, Burundi).