

through national production in 1993, an increase over the 12 reports for 1992. As with military holdings, the quality of the submissions differed greatly. As a result, questions remain about the viability of this section. While the increase in participation in 1993 is to be welcomed, further progress is likely to be slow.

Examining the 1994 Review Process

Chalmers and Greene evaluate the work of the 1994 Panel of Experts, which aimed to "...strengthen and further develop the Register, and particularly to consider ways in which it could be expanded to cover military holdings and procurement through national production" (p. 95). They describe the review process and how it was created. As it approached there were two views on how the Register should be modified. Some countries advocated strengthening the Register's current format before it was expanded. Others lobbied for the quick expansion of the Register to include military holdings and procurement through national production. In addition, the authors examine the role of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in modifying the Register. They conclude that it had "little effect" (p. 101) on the 1994 Panel's discussions.

Furthermore, the authors analyze the issues on the Panel's agenda: first, review the Register's operation to date; second, examine proposals for its development (e.g. adding new categories of conventional weapons); third, discuss its institutional development (e.g. the creation of review mechanisms); fourth, consider ways of promoting transparency in weapons of mass destruction and transfers of high technology with military applications; and, finally, analyze the relationship between the Register as a global instrument and regional transparency and confidence building measures, including regional registers. Chalmers and Greene also examine the presentation of the Panel's report. Supporters of the Register were disappointed because the Panel failed to expand the Register to include military holdings and procurement through national production. Moreover, no significant provisions were made to significantly strengthen the existing format (e.g. in quality of reported data).

Taking Stock

In this final section, Chalmers and Greene "...summarise and assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Register as they appear after its first two years of operation, and briefly discuss its potential significance and the challenges and priorities for its future development" (p. 127). They argue that the Register has been successful in increasing transparency in international arms transfers. It has created a new international norm that states have a responsibility to be transparent in their arms sales and acquisitions. On the negative side, it suffers from a lack of participation in several key regions (most notably the Middle East). Moreover, the quality of data could be improved, and discrepancies between importer and exporter reports must be eliminated. Chalmers and Greene also analyze the Register's success in promoting the norm of transparency in holdings and procurement. Despite a growing number of submissions, most states seem reluctant to disclose information on military holdings. Furthermore, in analyzing the role of the U.S. in the Register's development, Chalmers and Greene contend that the U.S. has been critical in shaping the Register. However, the Register has been negatively affected by the largely indifferent attitude of the United States. As a result of its failure to participate