

states were high, middling in former Soviet Union, South American and Asian nations, and poor in Middle Eastern and sub-Saharan African countries.

Concern is expressed that discrepancies between importers' and exporters' returns did not decrease markedly in the 1994 report. Improvements must be made in this area to ensure the continued relevance of the Register as a confidence-building measure. To achieve this goal, the U.S. must play a central role since it accounts for more than half of all arms exports. On a positive note, there was an increase in the number of states that provided "background information" on their military holdings (24 reported in 1993, while 30 reported in 1994). However, there was continued reluctance to supply data on missiles and missile launchers (Canada was the only nation to do so).

The authors also analyze the 1994 Panel of Experts report, convened to discuss modifying the Register. The Panel concluded that the Register succeeded in providing data on most of the year's arms transfers. However, there were several negative results detailed in the 1994 Panel's report. First, participation in the Register continued to vary widely by region. Second, the Panel could not agree on a working definition of "arms transfer". Third, due to resistance from the Chinese representative, the Panel was unable to modify the contentious seventh category (missiles and missile launchers). Finally, an attempt to include military holdings and procurement through national production failed. Unable to reach a consensus, the Panel was forced to recommend that the Register continue to operate under the current format.

Chalmers and Greene conclude that the Register has had a good start. However, they are discouraged by the failure of the 1994 Panel to modify its format. As a temporary solution, they suggest that each state maximize its transparency by completing the background information section. This endeavour will demonstrate the continued commitment of the international community to increase transparency in armaments.

503. Chalmers, Malcolm and Owen Greene. "The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and the Asia-Pacific." In *Asia Pacific Security and the UN*, eds. Malcolm Chalmers, Owen Greene and Xie Zhiqiong, Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford: Redwood Books, 1995, pp. 129-154.

Chalmers and Greene maintain that the establishment of the UN Register of Conventional Arms represents a significant step forward in arms control. Participation in the Register (80 states in 1992, 82 in 1993) is higher than many expected, and it has grown more rapidly than comparable global regimes. The register concept, dating back to the failed attempt by the League of Nations to record arms transfers, is also chronicled, as is the series of compromises which led to the creation of the current Register in December 1991.

Citing the Register's aim of contributing to regional security, Chalmers and Greene analyze its participation rate. They argue that participation is high in Europe, South Asia, North East Asia and North America. By contrast, only middling rates are attributed to South America and poor levels are assigned to former Soviet Union states, the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa. In addition, discrepancies in the reports submitted to the