

tant to release details of what they bought or sold, who they bought it from or sold it to, and how much was paid. Analysts rely on three annual sources of information, each of which has its own strengths and weaknesses:

- the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (a government agency), which publishes the dollar volume of the arms trade by year and country. It gives no details of the weapons traded or the sources of the information, and thus cannot be checked for accuracy.
- the International Institute for Strategic Studies (an independent institute), which publishes details of the types of the weapons in states' arsenals, but no aggregate data on weapons flow.
- the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (an independent institute), which publishes details of the flow of major weapons to the Third World, but includes neither all weapons nor all recipients.**

Keeping in mind that all the following figures are only tentative, Tables I and II list the top suppliers and recipients in the 1982-1986 period.†

TABLE I Arms Suppliers, 1982-1986

Supplier	Market Share (million dollars)	Market Share (percent)
Soviet Union	87,100	37
United States	51,400	22
France	20,500	9
Britain	6,925	3
West Germany	6,685	3
Italy	4,625	2
Other Developed	10,980	5
Poland	5,125	2
Czechoslovakia	4,775	2
Other Warsaw Pact	6,775	3
China	6,475	3
Other Developing	21,195	9
Total	232,560	100

** The full titles are: US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, *World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers*; International Institute for Strategic Studies, *The Military Balance*; Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, *World Armaments and Disarmament Yearbook*.

TABLE II Top Ten Arms Recipients, 1982-1986

Recipient	Dollar Value (millions)	Percentage
Iraq	31,740	14
Saudi Arabia	16,715	7
Syria	10,830	5
Libya	10,160	5
India	9,275	4
Iran	8,405	4
Cuba	7,830	3
Egypt	7,640	3
Vietnam	6,935	3
Soviet Union	5,550	2
Total of the top ten	115,080	50
World Total	232,560	100

The first thing one notices from the two tables is that both the supply and demand sides of the market are concentrated: the top ten recipients and top two suppliers account for more than 50 percent of all arms transferred. But although the arms trade is concentrated between a few major buyers and sellers one should not neglect the general increase in spending on arms, and on the military, throughout the world. Forty-four states increased their real spending on arms imports between 1977 and 1986, and 87 states spent more (in constant dollars) on their military. Although the money spent in Bangladesh or North Yemen may not be much in global terms, it can have a great effect on development priorities.

The second striking feature is that the top nine major clients are in the developing world, and six of them are in the Middle East (broadly defined). Overall, 78 percent of the \$37 billion of arms traded in 1986 went to the Third World. It was not always like this. In the 1950s and early 1960s, the main customers were the European states which were rebuilding their military establishments and arms industries after World War II. East Asian states (from Korea to Vietnam) were the second largest recipients, as a result of the Indochina (Vietnam) and Korean wars.

Three sets of events upset this pattern. First, the decolonization of African and Asian states that began in 1948 with

† These tables are derived from the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, *World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers, 1987*. Although no details of the sources of information are given, the figures for the Soviet Union appear to be somewhat inflated, as previous editions show the United States and Soviet Union with virtually identical shares. The figure for "other developing" states is also probably underestimated.