## **CHAPTER 5**

## **CONCLUSION**

Thanks to the process of globalization, the diamond industry is as transnational as it can be. Though it is inevitable for the growth of the industry, private actors such as De Beers, Rapaport Diamond Report, and the Gemological Institute of America also play a part by acting as a catalyst in connecting the trade together in the international arena. Unfortunately, globalizations also increase the act of gems trafficking as a consequence. Conflict diamonds are another problem that wil still constantly plague the gem industry for years.

As the problem in Sierra Leone was portrayed in the film, *Blood Diamonds*, in reality, the problems had been going on in Liberia, Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, Uganda, and Zimbabwe as well. In any case, the industry prefers to keep the problems discreet for their very own benefits regardless of the lives shed in search of the precious stones. While the sanctions which were imposed by the UN have already been lifted in most countries such as Liberia, Angola, Sierra Leone, and Democratic Republic of Congo, the problems still exist in Ghana and Ivory Coast.

While DeBeers is very influential in the industry in terms of their accumulation of rough diamonds and they have made several attempts to embark upon the subject of conflict diamonds, this is only successful to a certain level. Whether through their support of the Kimberly Process, many believe that this is part of the staged play to cover up the notorious issue.

Regardless of the fact that the issue of conflict diamonds has been acknowledged among the interested public, the problem is still very hard to deal with due to the very nature of the business. The problem of conflict diamonds is not the only one that is haunting the business but also the problem of diamond smuggling. Due to the sizes and the values of the stones, they are quite painless to smuggle unlike other commodities. The problems of diamond smuggling also spread out to many countries around the world including the United States, Belgium, Thailand, Hong Kong, and elsewhere. While the process of smuggling is beneficial to the traders, it is bad for the others since the states would no longer be able to govern the business in any aspect. Not only that the legitimacy of the states is crossed out but the process of transparency is also abolished as the result. Despite all the bad talks, having diamonds as natural resources is not always a bad thing when it is put into good uses such as in the case of Botswana.

For the reasons mentioned, it is important to urgently act on this matter. A single voice would not be able to make a difference without the cooperation from every sector to achieve mutual benefits. Strong measures should be adopted internationally for the betterment of everyone. The jewelry industry should not only care about their profits but take into account the lives that have been scarified for their

wealth along the way. The extra revenue from taxation could be use to improve the standard of living in each country and the lives of marginalized people would be more qualified. An international institution that has the power to punish the violators of the agreed rules should be established to set order into the industry. Transparency is needed by giving room for auditors. In addition, it is important to let everyone, especially the consumers know about the problem of conflict diamonds and diamond smuggling because only by being aware of the problem, the consumers can make the right choice of purchase. Information should definitely be available to everyone. "In the eyes of the retailer and consumer, diamonds lost all connection to their place of exploitation, only retaining commodity characteristics – the four C's: Clarity, Color, Cut, and Carat Weight. Yet Fatal Transaction campaigners were pushing consumers to ask for the 'fifth C' ... conflict before you buy your next diamond. 1"



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Philippe Le Billon, "Fatal Transactions: Conflict Diamonds and the (Anti) Terrorist Consumer," *Antipode* 38, issue 4 (2006): 778-801.