

Criterion 8: Development

India

UNDP Human Development Report¹

GDP per capita (PPP US\$)	2,670
Life expectancy at birth 2000–5	63.9
Adult Literacy Rate (percent)	61.3
Human Development Index (HDI) 2002	0.595 (0.563 in 2000)
HDI ranking	127 (out of 177)
Education	4.1% of GDP
Health	0.9% of GDP
Defence	2.3% of GDP

World Bank²

Aid dependency	0.29% of GNI
Total external debt	17.3% of GNI

India is classed by the UNDP as a medium development country.³ The economy grew at a rate of 8 percent in 2003.⁴ India's social indicators are above the South Asian average, with 99 percent of primary school-age children enrolled in schools, and infant mortality rates slightly lower, at 65 per thousand births, than the South Asian average rate of 68 per thousand births.⁵

Nevertheless, 29 percent of the population still live below the national poverty line of US \$1 per day.⁶ Income distribution remains very unequal, with the top 20 percent of the population receiving 46.1 percent of national income and the bottom 20 percent receiving 8.1 percent.⁷ India's population, now more than 1.2 billion, is growing at a rate of 1.7 percent annually.⁸ India is now home to a quarter of the world's poor people; DfID has stated that "progress towards Millennium Development Goals in India is central to world performance."⁹ India is the largest recipient of UK bilateral aid,

¹ UNDP Human Development Report 2004, (UNDP), <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/>.

² World Development Indicators 2004, (World Bank, April 2004), <http://www.worldbank.org/data/wdi2004/index.htm>.

³ Op cit, UNDP Human Development Report 2004.

⁴ World Development Indicators database: India Data Profile, (World Bank, July 2004) <http://devdata.worldbank.org/external/CPProfile.asp?SelectedCountry=IND&CCODE=IND&CNAME=India&Ptype=CP>.

⁵ 'India at a glance,' World Bank Group, February 2004, http://www.worldbank.org/cgi-bin/sendoff.cgi?page=%2Fdata%2Fcountrydata%2Faag%2Find_aag.pdf.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ US Department of State Country Reports on Human Rights 2003: India, <http://www.state.gov/g/rls/hrpt/2003/27947.htm>.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ 'Country Profiles: India' DfID, 10 November 2004, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/countries/asia/india.asp>.

receiving £156 million in the period 2002–2003, with aims of further increases up to £300 million.¹⁰

Despite the significant development challenges, in terms of purchasing power parity (PPP), in 2003 India had the 3rd largest defence budget in the world.¹¹ Moreover, India's military expenditure has undergone an annual average increase of 4.9 percent over the 10-year period 1994–2003.¹² This high level of military spending seems set to continue, as India has undertaken a massive procurement programme, including the purchase of 126 Mirage jets and six submarines from France, the Admiral Gorshkov aircraft carrier from Russia, and 66 Hawk jets from the UK, while at the same time India is seeking to buy between 1,200 to 1,500 howitzers.¹³ This procurement programme has prompted an increase in India's defence budget to \$19.1 billion in 2004,¹⁴ the biggest ever allocation to defence for India.

Arms export licences to India	2003	Jan–Mar 2004	Apr–Jun 2004
Value of SIELs granted (£m)	86.5	35.5	18
Number of SIELs granted (refused/revoked)	953 (78)	223 (21)	220 (7)
Number of OIELs granted (refused/revoked) with regard to India	82 (0)	13 (0)	26 (1)
Number of incorporation SIELs granted (refused/revoked)	9 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)
Number of SITCLs granted with India as destination	n/a	n/a	0
Number of OITCLs granted with India as destination	n/a	n/a	2

Although the level of health and education combined was higher than military expenditure in 2003, the latter still accounted for 15 percent of Government spending in 2003,¹⁵ and India spends almost three times more on defence than on health. Indeed the fact that India is the largest recipient of bilateral aid from the UK suggests that the Government recognises the serious development challenges facing the country. It is of great concern, therefore, that the UK Government has issued a total of 1,396 SIELs to the value of £140 million and as many as 121 OIELs for the period January 2003–June 2004, an amount which must be regarded as excessive, regardless of any specific judgements that have been made concerning India's legitimate defence needs.

Given the economic and social problems facing India, Saferworld believes that the UK Government should not be supporting massive military procurement by the Indian Government, with all the implications it has for the Indian economy and for regional stability. In this regard, it is also important to acknowledge the potential impact Indian defence procurement is likely to have on Pakistan's defence budget, and the adverse implications this might have on development in both countries (see Pakistan entry below).

In view of the very high levels of bilateral aid now granted to India by the UK Government, under criterion 8, Saferworld would expect a presumption of denial over the granting of export licences for high-value major conventional weapons transfers from the UK to India unless a clear defence need can be demonstrated. In general terms, however, Saferworld would expect the UK Government to operate maximum restraint with regard to the export of arms to India.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ The figures in PPP dollar terms are converted at PPP rates (for 2000), calculated by the World Bank, based on comparisons of gross national product (GNP). *SIPRI Yearbook 2004*, Table 10.4, p312.

¹² Ibid, p333.

¹³ BBC News, 'India's ever-increasing defence budget' BBC, 10 November 2004 http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/3876401.stm.

¹⁴ *The Military Balance 2004/2005*, IISS 2004, p313.

¹⁵ Op cit, *SIPRI Yearbook 2004*, p333.

Nigeria

UNDP Human Development Report¹⁶

GDP per capita (PPP US\$)	860
Life expectancy at birth 2000–5	51.5
Adult Literacy Rate 2002 (per cent)	66.8
Human Development Index (HDI) 2002	0.466 (0.439 in 2000)
HDI ranking	151 (out of 177)
Education	n/a
Health	0.8% of GDP
Defence	1.1% of GDP

World Bank¹⁷

Aid dependency	0.85% of GNI
Total external debt	82.3% of GNI

Nigeria is classed by the UNDP as a country of low development.¹⁸ African governments – led by South Africa, Nigeria, Senegal and Algeria – continued to work under the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), and the related African Peer Review Mechanism. NEPAD is focused on economic development, but unusually, explicitly recognises that 'peace, security, democracy, good governance, human rights and sound economic management are conditions for sustainable development.'¹⁹

Nevertheless, economic and social rights, such as the right to health and the right to an adequate standard of living, remain unfulfilled for many Nigerians.²⁰ Seven out of ten Nigerians live on less than the International Poverty Line of US\$1 per day.²¹ The poorest 20 per cent of Nigerians have access to only 4.4 per cent of the country's income or consumption.²² While adult literacy rates have risen only marginally over the last few years,²³ and there has actually been a longer-term reduction in the completion of primary education.²⁴

Nigeria is the largest oil producer in Africa. Oil exports account for 98.5 percent of Nigeria's total exports. However, little of this wealth is distributed within the Niger Delta – the centre of Nigerian oil production – or to the Nigerian people as a whole. Most of the population of approximately 130 million are rural and engaged in small-scale agriculture. Increasing unemployment is a problem and inadequate infrastructure, endemic corruption, and general economic mismanagement hinders economic growth, while much of the country's wealth remains concentrated in the hands of a small elite. Corruption, opaque government contracting practises, and other systems favour the wealthy and politically influential while wages and benefits have not kept pace with inflation.²⁵

Nigeria is classed by the UNDP as a severely indebted country.²⁶ Despite this, Nigeria's defence budget continues to increase. In 2004, it stood at \$572 million, an increase of just under \$100 million from the previous year.²⁷ Nigeria's defence expenditure has increased by \$300 million over the last 9 years.²⁸

¹⁶ *UNDP Human Development Report 2004*, (UNDP), <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/>.

¹⁷ *World Development Indicators 2004*, (World Bank, April 2004), <http://www.worldbank.org/data/wdi2004/index.htm>.

¹⁸ *Op cit*, *UNDP Human Development Report 2004*.

¹⁹ *Human Rights Watch World Report 2003: Nigeria*, (Human Rights Watch), <http://www.hrw.org/wr2k4/4.htm>.

²⁰ 'Nigeria: Are Human Rights in the Pipeline?' Amnesty International, 9 November 2004, <http://web.amnesty.org/pages/ec-nigeria2004-eng>.

²¹ *Ibid*.

²² *Ibid*.

²³ Adult Literacy Rate stood at 62.6 (1999), 63.9 (2000), 65.4 (2001) and 66.8 (2002- most recent figure), *UNDP Human Development Reports 2001–2004 inclusive* (UNDP).

²⁴ In 1990 Primary Completion Rate stood at 72%, in 2002 (latest figures) it stands at 67%. *Op cit*, *World Development Indicators 2004*.

²⁵ *US Department of State Country Reports on Human Rights 2003: Nigeria*, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2003/27743.htm>.

²⁶ *Op cit*, *UNDP Human Development Report 2004*.

²⁷ *The Military Balance 2004/2005*, IISS 2004, p349.

²⁸ In 1994, military expenditure stood at USD 221. In 2003, it stood at USD 519. *SIPRI Yearbook 2004*, p350.

Arms export licences to Nigeria	2003	Jan–Mar 2004	Apr–Jun 2004
Value of SIELs granted (£m)	17.5	5.5	42
Number of SIELs granted (refused/revoked)	30 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)
Number of OIELs granted (refused/revoked) with regard to Nigeria	11 (0)	7 (0)	12 (0)
Number of incorporation SIELs granted (refused/revoked)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Number of SITCLs granted (with Nigeria as destination)	n/a	n/a	0
Number of OITCLs granted (with Nigeria as destination)	n/a	n/a	0

According to the UNDP, the level of military expenditure is above the expenditure for health in Nigeria.²⁹ Given the low level of development in the country, the upsurge in the value of SIELs and number of OIELs issued to Nigeria in the first 6 months of 2004 as compared to all of 2003 is of considerable concern under criterion 8.

It may be that some or all of the licences issued during the 18 months from January 2003, including **large calibre artillery** and **armoured all wheel drive vehicles**, are intended for use by Nigerian peacekeeping forces under the auspices of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Monitoring Group (ECOMOG). However, as no information is included in the UK Annual or Quarterly Reports regarding the end-user, doubts will continue to persist over the use of the equipment. Moreover there is evidence that with ECOMOG based in Nigeria, some of the equipment is being diverted and misused, with one estimate that 50 percent is being used for criminal purposes.³⁰

The massive increases in Nigeria's military expenditure in the absence of any evidence of significant improvements in the development situation in the country means that, under criterion 8, Saferworld would expect a presumption of denial to operate with regard to the exports of high-tech and high-value major conventional weapons to Nigeria, unless a clear defence need can be demonstrated. In general terms, however, Saferworld would expect the UK Government to operate maximum restraint with regard to the export of arms to Nigeria.

Pakistan

UNDP Human Development Report³¹

GDP per capita (PPP US\$)	1940
Life expectancy at birth 2000–5	61.0
Adult Literacy Rate (per cent)	41.5
Human Development Index 2002	0.497 (0.522 in 2000)
HDI ranking	142 (out of 177)
Education	1.8% of GDP
Health	1.0% of GDP
Defence	4.7% of GDP

World Bank³²

Aid dependency	3.4% of GNI
Total external debt	44.7% of GNI

²⁹ Health (% of GDP 2001) compared against Military expenditure (% of GDP 2002), Op cit, *UNDP Human Development Report 2004*.

³⁰ Mohammed Ibn Chambas, Executive Secretary of ECOWAS, speaking in March 2004. Op cit, 'Nigeria: Are Human Rights in the Pipeline?' *Amnesty International*.

³¹ *UNDP Human Development Report 2004*, (UNDP), <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/>.

³² *World Development Indicators 2004*, (World Bank, April 2004), <http://www.worldbank.org/data/wdi2004/index.htm>.

Pakistan is classed by the UNDP as a country of low development.³³ The economy grew at a rate of 5.8 percent in 2003³⁴ and the country rose two places on the UNDP's Human Development Index.

Nevertheless, 33 percent of the country's population lives below the national poverty line³⁵ and infant mortality rates, at 76 deaths per one thousand births, are higher than the South Asian average of 68. The UK DfID has warned that Pakistan 'faces huge challenges in meeting the Millennium Development Goals, tackling poverty and inequality and providing essential services to the poor'.³⁶ Adult literacy rates are falling³⁷ and the percentage of Pakistani children enrolling in primary education is 73 percent compared with the South Asian average of 95 percent.³⁸

The US State Department described Pakistan as "poor" with "great extremes in the distribution of wealth."³⁹ During 2003, the Government pursued several economic reforms designed to alleviate poverty, however, inefficiencies have stymied Government efforts to decrease high poverty levels and create employment opportunities.⁴⁰

Despite these developmental challenges, Pakistan spends a relatively large amount of GDP on the defence sector. On a purchasing power parity (PPP) basis, Pakistan had the 15th largest defence budget in the world in 2003,⁴¹ and for each year since 1998, it has been among the top 12 major recipients of weapons.⁴² In June 2004, the Government decided to increase the defence budget by nearly 20 percent to \$3.3 billion.⁴³ This decision was criticised in a report by the Manhub-ul-Haq Development Centre, which stated that "years of high-deficit spending" had resulted in short-term economic growth and a complete failure of long-term economic investment necessary to improve social services, such as health, education and sanitation.⁴⁴

Arms export licences to Pakistan	2003	Jan-Mar 2004	Apr-Jun 2004
Value of SIELs granted (£m)	29.5	6.5	3
Number of SIELs granted (refused/revoked)	240 (14)	32 (3)	42 (3)
Number of OIELs granted (refused/revoked) with regard to Pakistan	19 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)
Number of incorporation SIELs granted (refused/revoked)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Number of SITCLs granted (with Pakistan as destination)	n/a	n/a	0
Number of OITCLs granted (with Pakistan as destination)	n/a	n/a	0

It is of serious concern that Pakistan spends significantly more on defence than on health and education combined. Considering Pakistan's high levels of military expenditure over the past few years, under criterion 8, Saferworld would expect a presumption of denial over exports to Pakistan of high-value major conventional weapons unless a clear defence need can be demonstrated. It is of serious concern therefore that the value of SIELs during the 18 months from January 2003 amounts to £38 million, a figure already above the combined three-year period from January 2000 to December 2002. Given Pakistan's serious developmental problems, Saferworld would expect the UK Government to operate maximum restraint with regard to the export of arms to Pakistan.

33 Op cit, *UNDP Human Development Report 2004*.

34 *World Development Indicators database: Pakistan Data Profile*, (World Bank, July 2004) <http://devdata.worldbank.org/external/CPProfile.asp?SelectedCountry=PAK&CCOD=PAK&CNAME=Pakistan&PTYPE=CP>.

35 Ibid.

36 'Country Profiles: Pakistan' DfID, 10 November 2004, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/countries/asia/pakistan.asp>.

37 In 2000 Adult Literacy rates stood at 43%, in 2001, Adult Literacy rates stood at 44% but in 2002 – most recent figures – they have decreased to 41%. *UNDP Human Development Reports 2000, 2001, 2002*.

38 Op cit, *World Development Indicators database: Pakistan Data Profile*.

39 *US Department of State Country Reports on Human Rights 2003: Pakistan*, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrprt/2003/27950.htm>.

40 Ibid.

41 The figures in PPP dollar terms are converted at PPP rates (for 2000), calculated by the World Bank, based on comparisons of gross national product (GNP). *SIPRI Yearbook 2004*, Table 10.4, p312.

42 Op cit, *SIPRI Yearbook 2004*, Appendix 12A, p475.

43 'India increase defence budget by 27 percent' <http://www.paktribune.com/news/index.php?id=70148>.

44 'Pakistan: Human development report calls for changes in the economy' IRIN, 10 November 2004, <http://hdrc.undp.org.in/APRI/Mreaction/13jan2004.htm>.

South Africa

UNDP Human Development Report⁴⁵

GDP per capita (PPP US\$)	10,070
Life expectancy at birth 2000–5	47.7
Adult Literacy Rate (percent)	86.0
Human Development Index (HDI) 2002	0.666 (0.697 in 2000)
HDI ranking	119 (out of 177)
Education	5.7% of GDP
Health	3.6% of GDP
Defence	1.6% of GDP

World Bank⁴⁶

Aid dependency	0.6% of GNI
Total external debt	22% of GNI

South Africa is classed by the UNDP as a medium development country.⁴⁷ Its economy grew at a rate of 3 percent in 2002, average wages rose by 10 percent, while the average consumer inflation rate was 9.2 percent.

Nevertheless, measured against many Millennium Development Goal targets,⁴⁸ South Africa's standards are falling. For example, in the last five years, life expectancy at birth has fallen below the level it stood between 1970 and 1975,⁴⁹ and the probability, at birth, of surviving to age 65 is extremely low – particularly for the male population.⁵⁰

On 19 November 2003 the government announced an Operational Plan for Comprehensive Treatment and Care for HIV and AIDS, “founded upon the principle of universal access to care and treatment of all, irrespective of race, colour, gender and economic status”. But of the estimated 5.3 million people living with HIV/AIDS, only a tiny proportion of those requiring anti-retroviral drug therapy have access to it.⁵¹

The distribution of income and wealth remains highly skewed along racial lines and between urban and rural citizens. In 2003, approximately 60 percent of the black African population and approximately 3 percent of the white population lived below the poverty line. Official unemployment remains high at approximately 30 percent. The country suffers from a significant shortage of skilled workers, and many black citizens are ill-educated, poorly housed, and unemployed.⁵²

People living in rural areas have particular difficulty in accessing health care services, education, and social services. Although access to public schooling for children is widely available and enrolment has increased since 1994, there are wide disparities in schools' resources: about 40 percent of state-run schools – mostly those in rural areas – have no electricity, and approximately 30 percent have no clean water.⁵³ Physical access to education in rural areas is of particular concern. Some pupils have to walk up to thirty kilometres each day getting to and from school, exposing children to significant dangers as well as contributing to high drop-out rates.⁵⁴

Despite South Africa's significant developmental challenges, the country's defence budget continues to increase steadily each year,⁵⁵ while military expenditure in 2003

⁴⁵ *UNDP Human Development Report 2004*, (UNDP), <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/>.

⁴⁶ *World Development Indicators 2004*, (World Bank, April 2004), <http://www.worldbank.org/data/wdi2004/index.htm>.

⁴⁷ *Op cit*, *UNDP Human Development Report 2004*.

⁴⁸ *Op cit*, *World Development Indicators 2004*.

⁴⁹ Life expectancy at birth 1970–75 stood at 50.3. In 2000–5, it stands at 47.7, *Op cit*, *UNDP Human Development Report 2004*.

⁵⁰ Probability at birth of surviving to age 65 2000–5. Female 37.7% of cohort; Male 24.9% of cohort, *Ibid*.

⁵¹ *Amnesty International Report 2004: South Africa* (Amnesty International), <http://web.amnesty.org/report2004/zaf-summary-eng>.

⁵² *US Department of State Country Reports on Human Rights 2003: South Africa*, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2003/27752.htm>.

⁵³ *Human Rights Watch World Report 2003: South Africa*, (Human Rights Watch), <http://hrw.org/english/docs/2003/12/31/safric7010.htm>.

⁵⁴ *Ibid*.

⁵⁵ *The Military Balance 2004/2005*, IISS 2004, p350.

showed an increase of 45 percent from 1999.⁵⁶ These increases are compounded by the 1998 Strategic Defence Procurement Package (SDPP) for the purchase of warships and military aircraft from the UK and other European suppliers. The package cost \$4.8 billion and is spread over a 12-year period, which began in 2000–01.⁵⁷ Still on order from the UK are: 8 British Aerospace/SAAB Gripen fighter aircraft (UK and Sweden) and 12 British Aerospace Hawk 100 fighter trainers (UK).⁵⁸ In the fiscal year 2003–04, the SDPP took up over 39 percent of the entire defence budget.⁵⁹

In securing the SDPP, the South African Government promised offsets, part of which would create 65,000 new jobs over a period of 7 years.⁶⁰ However, according to a recent study by Paul Dunne and Guy Lamb, offsets seldom live up to their promise.⁶¹ Dunne and Lamb argue that while there is likely to be an initial positive impact on job creation in local defence firms in South Africa, the dependence on foreign suppliers for inward investment and the retention of an arms production capacity “with very limited linkages to the civilian economy” means that it is unlikely offsets will either generate the number of jobs that have been promised or be sustainable in the longer-term.⁶²

Arms export licences to South Africa	2003	Jan–Mar 2004	Apr–Jun 2004
Value of SIELs granted (£m)	31	2	32.5
Number of SIELs granted (refused/revoked)	146 (0)	34 (0)	48 (0)
Number of OIELs granted (refused/revoked) with regard to South Africa	92 (0)	15 (0)	25 (0)
Number of incorporation SIELs granted (refused/revoked)	12 (1)	1 (0)	2 (0)
Number of SITCLs granted (with South Africa as destination)	n/a	n/a	0
Number of OITCLs granted (with South Africa as destination)	n/a	n/a	0

According to the latest UNDP Human Development Report, the military expenditure of South Africa is below the level of health and education combined.⁶³ However, many human development standards in South Africa are falling. In view of the significant developmental challenges faced by South Africa and the lack of a clear external security threat, Saferworld would question the scale of the current South African procurement drive and, under criterion 8, expect a presumption of denial with regard to exports from the UK to South Africa of high-value military equipment unless a clear defence need can be demonstrated. In general terms, Saferworld would expect the UK Government to operate maximum restraint with regard to the export of arms to South Africa.

A major concern remains the multi-billion dollar arms deal that involves a number of European arms companies, including BAE Systems. Allegations of corruption have stalked the deal in relation to South African officials’ misuse of power,⁶⁴ BAE’s role in securing the deal,⁶⁵ the provision of ‘offsets’ with the promise of 65,000 new jobs,⁶⁶ and the loan agreements which surrender parts of South Africa’s economic and financial policies to European banks and governments.⁶⁷

The South African Government was recently taken to court by Economists Allied for Arms Reduction-South Africa (ECAAR-SA) on the grounds that this deal was

⁵⁶ SIPRI Yearbook 2004, Table 10A.3, p351.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Wrigley C, ‘The South African deal. A Case study in the Arms Trade’, CAAT, June 2003 <http://www.caat.org.uk/information/publications/countries/southafrica-0603.pdf>.

⁵⁹ ‘Manual hails failure of arms application’ *iafrica.com*, March 4 2004, <http://iafrica.com/news/sa/307477.htm>.

⁶⁰ Dunne, J.P. & Lamb, G. ‘Defence Industrial Participation: The South African Experience’ 1 February 2004, <http://carecon.org.uk/Armsproduction/Papers/DunneLamb.pdf>.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Health (% of GDP 2001) + Education (% of GDP 1999–2001) stands at 9.3, while military expenditure (% of GDP 2002) stands at 1.6. Op cit, *UNDP Human Development Report 2004*.

⁶⁴ Hawley, S. ‘Turning a Blind Eye: Corruption and the UK Export Credits Guarantee Department.’ *Corner House*, July 2003.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Press Statement by ECAAR-SA, ECAAR-SA, 19 August 2004, http://www.armsdeal-vpo.co.za/special_items/statements/ecaar_petition.html, Also, see analysis above.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

“strategically, economically and finically irrational.”⁶⁸ ECCAR-SA argued that the money should have been used for poverty alleviation,⁶⁹ and highlighted EU member states’ lack of consideration of the EU Code criterion 8 in supporting this procurement.⁷⁰ In March 2004, Judge Andre Blignault rejected the case in the Cape Town High Court on the technicality that ECAAR-SA should have given primary focus to the original Cabinet decision to acquire the arms package, and not, as was the case, to the financing of the deal once agreed.⁷¹

Saferworld takes the view that these contracts were ill-advised from the outset and that the UK Government should have refused related export licence applications on sustainable development grounds.

It is welcome that with regard to criterion 8 the UK Government recently changed its policy to take into account the cumulative impact of licences granted. Although it remains likely that a significant proportion of licences awarded for exports to South Africa in 2003 and the first half of 2004 are part of the procurement package agreed before 2000, the level of detail in the Annual and Quarterly Reports does not allow for identification of which licences are part of any particular deal. Therefore it is unclear how the policy change might be affecting licensing decisions in this case.

⁶⁸ ‘Arms Reduction and Sustainable Development: The South African Arms Deal, and Civil Society.’ ECAAR-SA, August 2002, www.eaar.org/Articles/SA%20Papers/Crawfordbrowne.pdf.

⁶⁹ ‘Arms Deal Challenge Rejected’ *iafrica.com*, March 4th 2004, <http://iafrica.com/news/sa/307387.htm>.

⁷⁰ Op cit, ‘Arms Reduction and Sustainable Development,’ ECAAR-SA.

⁷¹ Op cit, ‘Arms Deal Challenge Rejected’, *iafrica.com*.