

control, and should be applied "...within the context of the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter, the widely accepted norms of international law, and the principles of peaceful co-existence" (p. 50).

316. Laurance, Edward J., Siemon T. Wezeman and Herbert Wulf. *Arms Watch: SIPRI Report on the First Year of the UN Register of Conventional Arms, SIPRI Research Report No. 6*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Laurance, Wezeman and Wulf chronicle the development of the UN Register of Conventional Arms. They compare its data with the information collected by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), and comment on the implications of expanding its scope. If successfully developed, the Register, the first instrument to link disarmament with international peace and security, will play a key role in future arms control discussions.

Laurance, Wezeman and Wulf report that 40% of UN member states participated in the first annual Register. Despite this low participation rate, almost 98% of arms exports were reported. The information on arms imports, however, was more limited. Only seven of the top fifteen major arms importing nations (identified by SIPRI) submitted a report. Due to variations in reporting, the quality of data varies by weapons category. For instance, over 90% of the transfers of tanks can be verified since their transfer was reported by both exporter and importer nations. By contrast, only 13% of missile exchanges can be similarly verified.

The authors also compare the performance of the Register with that of the SIPRI register. They note that the information provided by each organization does not always match. Three possible explanations for these discrepancies are offered: first, the SIPRI information is incorrect; second, the information reported to the Register is incorrect; and, finally, confusion stemming from the different structures of the two registers resulted in the same transfer being reported differently. The differences between the two registers are also outlined. For instance, the Register deals only with arms deliveries, whereas the SIPRI records ongoing deals. In addition, the Register has seven different categories, while the SIPRI report has only six. These differences, inevitably, will affect how data is reported.

The authors maintain that the Register's first year was not a complete success since only 78 nations participated. However, they also contend that it is too early to pass final judgment. Such an evaluation must await the publication of several more reports to track the results over time. Nevertheless, the Register included information on several hitherto unknown transfers and, in this respect, did improve knowledge on arms transfers.

They conclude with a brief examination of ways to improve the Register. First, the categories for reporting could be deepened and widened to secure more information. Second, military holdings and procurement through national production should be included in future reports. Third, information on weapons of mass destruction should be incorporated. Fourth, information should be requested on the transfers of high technology with military applications. Fifth, as a subset of the UN Register, regional