

widely by region (e.g. solid in Western countries, poor in African nations). Finally, because of different interpretations of what should be reported, discrepancies were prevalent in the first two annual reports.

Wagenmakers also evaluates the progress of the 1994 Panel of Experts, convened to review the Register. Unfortunately, consensus was not achieved in any of the following areas: first, defining an arms transfer; second, adjusting the existing categories of weapons (e.g. separate the seventh category, missiles and missile launchers, into two categories); third, adding new categories (e.g. small arms); fourth, expanding the scope of the Register to include military holdings and procurement through national production; fifth, incorporating weapons of mass destruction, and, finally, creating regional registers to complement the global initiative. Despite these difficulties, Wagenmakers maintains that the Register still provides a basis for progress in arms control.

442. Zahran, Mounir. "The Conference on Disarmament and Transparency in Armaments: 1992 and 1993 (with a short postscript for 1994)." *Disarmament: A periodic review by the United Nations*. Vol. XVII, No. 1, 1994, pp. 23-38.

Zahran chronicles the role and work of the Conference on Disarmament with regards to improving the scope and utility of the UN Register of Conventional Arms. He briefly outlines the informal discussions of the conference in 1992 which provided a foundation for the 1993 ad hoc committee. By comparison, the contentious issues before the 1993 committee are reported in detail. For instance, the committee debated how to define what constitutes an "excessive and destabilizing accumulation of arms." Moreover, committee members discussed the merits of adding categories for military holdings and procurement through national production. The creation of a supplementary register to cover weapons of mass destruction and transfers of high technology with military applications was also considered.

Transparency in armaments does promote international confidence, but only up to a point. It is not a substitute for reductions in armaments. Zahran suggests that the 1994 Panel of experts consider including military holdings and procurement through national production.

A brief postscript on the 1994 ad hoc committee discussions is also included. Zahran relates that even though it is still early, there already exists "fundamentally differing approaches towards the issue of transparency in armaments" (p. 37). Some nations want limited transparency; others want more comprehensive disclosure. Debate is also ongoing on whether to increase the scope of the register incrementally, or to dramatically expand its mandate in the immediate future.

443. Zukang, SHA. "China and Transparency in Armaments." *Disarmament: A periodic review by the United Nations*. Vol. XVII, No. 1, 1994, pp. 132-139.

Zukang asserts that the first report of the UN Register of Conventional Arms was a partial success. In relating China's position on the future of the Register, he argues that