

305. Chalmers, Malcolm and Owen Greene. *Implementing and Developing the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms: Peace Research Report No. 32*. West Yorkshire: Bradford University, Department of Peace Studies, May 1993.

Writing before the first April 30 deadline for submissions to the UN Register of Conventional Arms, Chalmers and Greene provide "... an initial examination of the implementation, significance and potential future development of the UN Register of Conventional Arms" (p. 2). They divide their report three sections: first, an examination of the establishment, implementation and significance of the Register; second, an analysis of potential solutions to the Register's problems; and, finally, an exploration of the links between it and other transparency measures.

As an introduction to these analytical sections, Chalmers and Greene examine the international arms trade. Three tiers of arms producers are outlined: the first tier includes states at the forefront of military development (e.g. the U.S., and to a lessening degree, the former Soviet Union); the second tier consists of states who can afford only to be innovators in a certain segment of the arms market (e.g. France); and, finally, the third tier contains states which reproduce weapons using imported designs and production facilities (e.g. Brazil). Despite the danger of producing weapons for export (as the Iraq military build-up demonstrated), the impetus for selling arms remains strong (e.g. the U.S. sells arms to underwrite the cost of developing high-end technology, and former Soviet Union countries sell arms to secure hard currency).

In their first section, Chalmers and Greene examine the history of arms registers, the significance of transparency, and the development of the Register. They contend that transparency is important for a variety of reasons: first, it reduces the potential for misunderstanding between states; second, it renders preparations for surprise attacks more difficult; third, once in place, it makes it difficult for states to withdraw without arousing unwanted international scrutiny; and, finally, it strengthens domestic control over the arms industry by requiring the implementation of export controls. However, transparency, as a concept, has its problems. For instance, a compromise must be struck which does not require more transparency from one state as compared with another. Assessing the Register's performance, Chalmers and Greene assert that it is too early for definitive conclusions. Nevertheless, the establishment of the Register, with a broad base of support, is an important step forward. However, the "...biggest achievement...is in its structure rather than its content, and in the particular combination of its universality and capacity for further development" (p. 29).

In the second part, Chalmers and Greene examine the development of the Register in several categories: deepening and developing its categories, implementation review and verification issues, sanctions against non-compliance, and national governance and the Register. They contend that the Register can be developed in one of two ways. It can be expanded to include either new weapons types or more details for existing categories. Several types of weapons are examined (combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, ground-to-air missiles, missile launchers, look alike systems, mortars, and new forms of munitions) and suggestions are offered on how to include or improve these categories.