

BASIC REPORTS

NEWSLETTER ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

28 OCTOBER 1996 • NUMBER 54 • ISSN 0966-9175

NATO PROCEEDS CAUTIOUSLY ON CFE ADAPTATION

by Tasos Kokkinides

Diplomats have begun consultations on the updating of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty in Vienna, following NATO's submission of a proposal on "Scope and Parameters of the Process for Improving the Operation of the CFE Treaty" on 8 October. Though lacking concrete proposals, the NATO document does address certain Russian concerns regarding NATO expansion by calling for "a review of the group structure".

The 1990 CFE Treaty established a balance of conventional forces between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. A key area of contention in the current consultations on CFE revolves around the planned expansion of NATO into central Europe. As the result of NATO enlargement, a share of the former Warsaw Pact's arms quota would be added to the existing arsenal of the Alliance, therefore undermining the balance of conventional forces established by the Treaty.

The new NATO proposal echoes Russia's desire for "modernisation" of the CFE Treaty to reflect new post-Cold War realities. However, the Alliance is proceeding cautiously, trying to allay Russian fears while averting a complete renegotiation of the Treaty. A senior NATO official told *BASIC Reports* that "There is a political recognition on the part of NATO that the Treaty needs some updating. However, this must be balanced against the fear that negotiations will 'open up' the wrong things, in effect unravelling the Treaty." Specifically, the NATO

document declares that the discussions "...shall not include questions ... to be dealt with outside the arms control scope of the CFE Treaty." This narrow agenda is unlikely to sit well with Russia, which has proposed a more wide-ranging agenda for the negotiations, including issues not directly related to the CFE Treaty.

Although the NATO official denied any linkage between NATO expansion and the updating of the CFE Treaty, a central European diplomat confirmed that 1999 is the most likely date for the completion of Treaty revisions. This coincides with the proposed date for the first accessions to NATO.

Revising the group structure

During the CFE Review Conference in May 1996, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister G.E. Mamedov called for the "improvement" of the Treaty which would include "changing its system of limitations from the one based on groups into the national one." Although the latest NATO document tabled in Vienna goes some way to accommodate this Russian demand by accepting the need to revise the group structure, it does not reveal the Alliance's preferred course of action.

According to a US official involved in the consultations, there are a number of suggestions among the NATO 16 on how to move away from the bloc-to-bloc approach. Some countries favour the imposition of strict national upper limits, whereas others favour regional limits. In an interview, the US official also highlighted the inherent

INSIDE

UN EXPERTS' PANEL ON
SMALL ARMS FACES
OBSTACLES

by Dr. Natalie J. Goldring

UN REGISTER DATA COMPILATION

ORIGINAL DOCUMENT:

OTTAWA DECLARATION ON
ANTI-PERSONNEL LAND MINES

BASIC REPORTS

28 OCTOBER 1996 • NUMBER 54 • ISSN 0966-9175

difficulties involved in both approaches, saying “The problem with national limits is that some countries will seek to increase their CFE quota and the problem with the regional approach is how to define a region.” The NATO document fails to make a clear judgement on the Alliance’s favoured option, reflecting an apparent lack of consensus among the NATO 16.

NATO stands firm on verification

Another sticking point in the consultations stems from Russia’s concern over the financial costs involved in the intensive verification established under the CFE Treaty. On this point, the NATO document calls for the “possible enhancement of . . . [the] provisions on verification [and] . . . on Notification and Exchange of Information.” In addition, it clearly stipulates that, at a minimum, CFE adaptation must not result in “less information” or “diminished verification”.

NATO resists further disarmament

Furthermore, the NATO proposal asserts that an updated CFE Treaty “will maintain all existing categories and types of Treaty Limited Equipment (TLE) and will not lead to increased total numbers of TLE . . . or a decreased area of application”. In fact, the NATO document entrenches the status quo through its omission of any provisions for further limitations of TLE. The US official told *BASIC Reports* that “NATO will object to the freezing of the current limits or lowering of the current limits. The Alliance will want to retain the option to re-introduce US troops if the security situation in Europe deteriorates in the future.”

A Central European official acknowledged that “no state wishes to make the legal obligation to freeze their current limits.” However, the official also said that “things may change. The discussions on the adaptation of CFE will continue perhaps until 1999 and this possibility should not be excluded.”

Opening up CFE

NATO and Russia appear to agree on the issue of extending Treaty membership to include other member states of the Organisation on Security and Cooperation in

Europe (OSCE). The NATO document calls for “the examination of the possibility of allowing voluntary accession to the treaty by individual states who might request it.” Yet according to the US official, opening up the Treaty to other OSCE states is “a low priority”. He attributed this to a perceived lack of interest in participation on the part of other countries, remarking that “there is hardly a long queue of OSCE states that want to participate.” Austrian Ambassador to the OSCE Dr Juffa Stefan-Bastel, confirmed this, saying that Austria “will not push for the opening up of CFE to other states.” However, an official from the Estonian delegation to the OSCE said that Estonia is not opposed to inclusion in the CFE Treaty, but “needs more clarity on the proposals on opening of the CFE to non-member states.” He went on to say that “we do not participate in the negotiating process and it is up to the participants to make an attractive offer.”

Officials expect protracted negotiations as NATO and Russia hammer out the details of an agreement over the coming months. The current consultations in Vienna will set the stage for the formal negotiations on CFE scheduled to begin at the Joint Consultative Group (JCG) in Vienna after the OSCE Summit in Lisbon in December. **BASIC**

**UN EXPERTS’ PANEL ON
SMALL ARMS FACES
OBSTACLES**

by Dr. Natalie J. Goldring

Although the United Nations Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms has had its first formal session and has completed its first regional workshop, many questions remain concerning the objectives and likely outcome of the panel. Uncertainties about the panel are compounded by the secrecy with which its deliberations have often been conducted. The panel’s mandate calls for it to address three issues:

- (a) The types of small arms and light weapons actually being used in conflicts being dealt with by the United Nations;**

BASIC REPORTS

28 OCTOBER 1996 • NUMBER 54 • ISSN 0966-9175

(b) The nature and causes of the excessive and destabilizing transfer of small arms and light weapons, including their illicit production and trade;

(c) The ways and means to prevent and reduce the excessive and destabilizing accumulation and transfer of small arms and light weapons, in particular as they cause or exacerbate conflict...

Barriers to progress

In attempting to fulfil this mandate, one potential stumbling block for the panel is the difficulty of reaching consensus over the scope of inquiry. For example, there is no agreement within the panel on a definition of small arms. Among the issues of concern is whether to include pistols and explosives. Panel members also disagree on the extent to which the "root causes" of conflict should be a core topic for the panel, and it is unclear how the panel will define destabilizing transfers.

Another contentious issue is the extent to which the panel will propose policy approaches for dealing with light weapons issues. Some members argue that this panel is just a first step, and that it should focus on identifying the problem, rather than trying to come up with solutions. The Colombian representative argued that the panel should do both. "The first thing we have to do is create consciousness worldwide about this problem, but of course we do have to take practical measures." She said that policy work should be based on the guidelines on illicit weapons transfers unanimously adopted by the UN Disarmament Commission. The Sri Lankan representative also emphasized the importance of dealing with the illicit trade, saying: "For us drugs and illicit arms are now both equally evil. Unfortunately the countries in the North are focusing on the drugs." A Western representative said "I think in the end we're going to do all of these things and people shouldn't get too anxious about one or the other."

There is also a significant range of knowledge among the members of the group. Several members of the panel are military experts, but the majority are diplomats from UN missions or ministries of foreign affairs and trade.

Many panel members do not have special expertise on light weapons issues.

Schedule for panel's work not yet set

The current plan is reportedly to have three or four formal sessions for the panel, supplemented by up to three regional workshops. The first session of the panel was held in New York from 24-28 June 1996. The second session is scheduled to be held in New York from 20-31 January 1997. A final session will be held in New York in July 1997. After the final session, the group will present its report to the Secretary-General. Building on the first regional workshop, which was held in Pretoria, South Africa, 23-25 September 1996, a second workshop is tentatively planned in El Salvador or Colombia just before the January panel meeting. A third regional workshop may take place in Asia (most likely in Malaysia or Japan) in May or June 1997, and may be followed by a panel session in Tokyo.

Few panel members participate in Pretoria workshop

Some members of the panel of experts participated in a regional workshop on small arms proliferation in Pretoria, South Africa, 23-25 September 1996. Briefings emphasized regional dimensions of the light weapons trade and prospects for control. Unfortunately, financial constraints prevented many panel members from attending; the United Nations is only providing travel funds for participants from the region in which the workshops are taking place. Reportedly, only six panel members (from Belgium, Finland, Germany, Japan, South Africa and the United States) participated in the meeting. The other ten panel members -- from Belarus, Canada, Colombia, Egypt, El Salvador, Iran, Malaysia, Mali, Russia, and Sri Lanka -- did not attend.

Despite this limited representation, panel members reacted positively to the Pretoria meeting. The Colombian representative stressed that "what was done in Africa should serve as motivation for what we will have to do in Latin America....The UN is taking Africa and Latin America as the showcase of the problem, because these are the regions that are mostly harmed." The Western representative said "What I thought was most interesting was the

BASIC REPORTS

28 OCTOBER 1996 • NUMBER 54 • ISSN 0966-9175

gravity with which people took this issue. It reminded me of how we deal with nuclear weapons in the West." He also said that the group had useful conversations about what the international community could do, and pinpointed the importance of developing international norms against small arms. However, an academic who briefed the group was quite critical of the meeting, saying that the panel had missed an important opportunity by excluding all but a few local researchers, activists, and policy makers from the meeting.

Controversy over the role of NGOs

When the panel of experts began its work, UN officials actively solicited the views and materials of academics and NGO analysts. Recently, however, the process has become considerably less open. When asked about the activities of the panel, for example, a UN official refused to be interviewed, and suggested that observers should wait for the report of the Secretary-General, which will not be issued until summer 1997.

The Colombian representative said that this new caution could be in response to recent activities by the US National Rifle Association (NRA), which has reportedly applied for NGO status at the United Nations. "I have been told the NRA is saying the UN is trying to intervene in the internal affairs of other countries." Despite this activity, she said, "We rely on NGOs to pressure governments." A UN diplomat from a non-aligned country also referred to the National Rifle Association. "I know that the US [sic] Rifle Association sent a note to the Chairman of the panel protesting the work of the panel. This is the sort of publicity that might create problems. It might discourage any concrete action on these issues, at least in affected states." He added, "I recall a statement by the Chairman of the panel...who advised members of the panel that they should not leak information to outside until the report of the panel is complete....This is not a regular UN meeting where NGOs attend. This is a closed meeting of experts. Usually such meetings do not get publicity." He went even further than the UN official cited above and suggested that NGOs wait to get involved until after the First Committee takes up the panel's report in fall 1997.

BASIC

OTTAWA DECLARATION ON ANTI-PERSONNEL LAND MINES

Editor's Note: From 3 - 5 October 1996, the Canadian Government hosted a conference on the abolition of anti-personnel land mines. The discussions resulted in the fifty states present at the meeting agreeing the text of the "Ottawa Declaration". The full text of the declaration is reprinted below.

Towards a Global Ban on Anti-Personnel Mines Declaration of the Ottawa Conference

Following consultations with relevant international agencies, international organizations and non-governmental organizations, the states represented at the Ottawa conference, the "Ottawa Group", have agreed to enhance cooperation and coordination of efforts on the basis of the following concerns and goals with respect to anti-personnel mines:

1. a recognition that the extreme humanitarian and socio-economic costs associated with the use of anti-personnel mines requires urgent action on the part of the international community to ban and eliminate this type of weapon.
2. a conviction that until such a ban is achieved, states must work to encourage universal adherence to the prohibitions or restrictions on anti-personnel mines as contained in the amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons.
3. an affirmation of the need to convince mine affected states to halt all new deployments of anti-personnel mines to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of mine-clearance operations.
4. a recognition that the international community must provide significantly greater resources to mine-awareness programs, mine-clearance operations and victim assistance.

BASIC REPORTS

28 OCTOBER 1996 • NUMBER 54 • ISSN 0966-9175

5. a commitment to work together to ensure:
- the earliest possible conclusion of a legally-binding international agreement to ban anti-personnel mines;
 - progressive reductions in new deployments of anti-personnel mines with the urgent objective of halting all new deployments of anti-personnel mines;
 - support for an UNGA 51 resolution calling upon member states, inter alia, to implement national moratoria, bans or other restrictions, particularly on the operational use and transfer of anti-personnel mines at the earliest possible date;
 - regional and sub-regional activities in support of a global ban on anti-personnel mines; and,
 - a follow-on conference hosted by Belgium in June 1997 to review the progress of the international community in achieving a global ban on anti-personnel mines.

[5 October 1996]

US MAINTAINS DOMINANCE OF WORLD ARMS MARKET

On 3 October, the United Nations released the fourth annual UN Register of Conventional Arms, providing information on imports and exports of major conventional weapons in calendar year 1995. As of 23 October, 92 governments had submitted information to this year's Register. 22 countries reported exports of weaponry in the categories covered by the Register in 1995; 39 countries reported imports of weaponry in that period. Data on weapons exports, compiled in this issue of *BASIC Reports*, confirms continued US dominance of the international market in major conventional weapons.

The United States led all other suppliers in five of the seven Register categories: battle tanks, armoured combat vehicles, combat aircraft, attack helicopters and missiles and missile launchers. Russia reported the most exports of large calibre artillery systems, and the second highest

number of exports of both armoured combat vehicles and combat aircraft. (*See summary of export submissions in this issue for additional information on rankings.*)

As in prior years, numerous states have not submitted any information to the Register, hampering comparison and cross-checking of data. For example, countries receiving US weaponry according to the US return that, to date, have not filed submissions for 1995 include: Bahrain, Colombia, Egypt, Kuwait, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates.

Compilation of Exporter Submissions to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, Calendar Year 1995

Data compiled by Susannah L. Dyer

The following tables provide data on weapons exports for calendar year 1995 as reported by participating states in their export submissions to the Register. Information from suppliers' export submissions on the number of weapons transferred is included in the tables, along with any description of the transferred weapons provided by the exporting country. Details submitted by the supplier on "State of Origin," "Intermediate Location," or "Comments on the transfer" are not included in the tables.

Where applicable, information from importing countries on the number and type of weapons received has also been included for comparative purposes. *These details from a recipient state's import submission are provided only on those transactions that are reported by a supplier in the Register; transactions reported by a recipient but not listed in the supplier's export submission are not listed below.*

The tables reflect supplier and recipient information published by the United Nations as of 23 October 1996, as contained in United Nations General Assembly Documents A/51/300, A/51/300/Add.1, and A/51/300/Add.2. The tables are roughly based on those developed by the Monterey Institute of International Studies for their analysis of the Register data in previous years.

BASIC REPORTS

28 OCTOBER 1996 • NUMBER 54 • ISSN 0966-9175

EXPORTS

Country	Category	Importer Country	# of Items (exporter)	# of Items (importer)	Description (provided by exporter)	Description (provided by importer)
Argentina	LCA	Venezuela	18	NP	105mm gun (reconditioned)	
Belgium	ACV	UK	21	21	21 CVR-T SCORPION	
Belgium	ACV	Mexico	97	136	97 AMX 13	AMX-13
Belgium	Cbt Acft	Poland	1	No Rpt	1 MIRAGE V	
Canada	ACV	Saudi Arabia	212	NP	Light Armoured Vehicle (LAV)	
Canada	ACV	Australia	82	67	Light Armoured Vehicle (LAV)	ASLAV light armoured vehicle variants
China	Tank	Pakistan	51	NP		
China	ACV	Pakistan	20	NP	Tank repair vehicle	
China	Ship	Thailand	1	2		H.T.M.S.
China	MMI	Iran	18	NP		
Czech Republic	ACV	Hungary	2	No Rpt	ICV type BVP1	
Czech Republic	ACV	Uruguay	60	NP	APC type OT-64	
Czech Republic	LCA	Latvia	26	26	gun 100 mm	Cannons with a calibre of 100 mm
Czech Republic	LCA	Latvia	26	26	mortar 120 mm	Minethrower with a calibre of 120mm
Czech Republic	LCA	Lithuania	18	18	mortar 120 mm	120mm Mortar Vehicle for dragging
Czech Republic	Cbt Acft	Bangladesh	8	NP	advanced jet trainer L-39ZA	
Czech Republic	Cbt Acft	Egypt	1	NP	advanced jet trainer L-59	
Czech Republic	Cbt Acft	Poland	6	10	MIG29	MIG-29
Czech Republic	Cbt Acft	Tunisia	6	NP	advanced jet trainer L-59	
Finland	ACV	Norway	31	31	SISU XA-185	PASI XA-186 APC
France	Tank	UAE	25	NP	Tanks Leclerc	
France	Cbt Acft	Spain	3	No Rpt	Mirage F-1	
France	Atk Helo	Argentina	4	No Rpt	Fennec navy version	
France	Atk Helo	Brazil	2	2	Fennec	AS 550 A2 FENNEC helicopter
France	MMI	Chile	8	No Rpt	Exocet	
France	MMI	Oman	1	NP	ITL70	
France	MMI	Qatar	2	NP	ITL70	
Germany	ACV	Austria	3	3	Jaguar I	TD JAGUAR 1
Germany	ACV	Greece	100	100	MTW-M113	M113A
Germany	ACV	Sweden	225	225	MT-LB	225 MT-LB
Germany	ACV	Sweden	5	5	MTP-LB	5 MTP-LB
Germany	ACV	Sweden	2	2	BMP-1	2 BMP
Germany	LCA	Netherlands	15	15	Howitzer FH-70	FH-70 TOWED HOWITZER

BASIC REPORTS

28 OCTOBER 1996 • NUMBER 54 • ISSN 0966-9175

EXPORTS (continued)

Country	Category	Importer Country	# of Items (exporter)	# of Items (importer)	Description (provided by exporter)	Description (provided by importer)
Germany	Atk Helo	Hungary	20	20	Mi-24	Mi-24
Germany	Ship	Greece	2	2	Fast Patrol Boat 148 Class	FPBGs 148
Germany	Ship	Indonesia	3	3	Coastal Patrol Boat	Parchim
Germany	Ship	Turkey	1	1	Frigate MEKO 200T	MEKO 200 TFF
Israel	Cbt Acft	Sri Lanka	3	NP	"KFIR"	
Israel	M/MI	USA	20	18	"POPEYE"	
Italy	LCA	Brazil	18	18	105 mm Howitzers	105/14mm Otomalera
Kazakstan	Cbt Acft	Russia	4	4	SU-4M	
Kazakstan	Cbt Acft	Russia	2	No Rpt	MIG-29	
Netherlands	Ship	Greece	1	1	1x Frigate (KORTENAER CLASS)	FF S CLASS
Poland	Tank	Iran	70	NP	T-72	
Poland	Tank	Sierra Leone	2	NP	T-72	
Rep. of Korea	ACV	Malaysia	47	47	K-200 Series Track Type	Korean Infantry Fighting Vehicles
Rep. of Korea	Cbt Acft	Philippines	3	No Rpt	F-4A	
Romania	ACV	Turkey	1	No Rpt	Personnel armoured carrier RN-94 6x6	
Romania	ACV	Rep. of Moldova	80	80	Armoured personnel carrier type TAB-71	TAB-71
Romania	LCA	Poland	1	No Rpt	125mm tank gun	
Russian Fed.	ACV	Algeria	150	NP		
Russian Fed.	ACV	Cyprus	18	18		BVP-3
Russian Fed.	ACV	Kuwait	91	NP		
Russian Fed.	ACV	UAE	122	NP		
Russian Fed.	ACV	Turkey	70	70		APC (BTR-80)
Russian Fed.	LCA	Kuwait	9	NP		
Russian Fed.	LCA	India	201	202		
Russian Fed.	Cbt Acft	Viet Nam	6	6		5: SU 27 SK; 1: SU 27 UBK
Russian Fed.	Cbt Acft	India	10	10		
Russian Fed.	Cbt Acft	Malaysia	18	18		MIG 20 Aircraft Series 20/39 UB
Russian Fed.	Cbt Acft	Kazakstan	12	19		MIG-29
Russian Fed.	Ship	China	1	1		
Slovakia	Tank	UNPROFOR	6	N/A	T-66	
Slovakia	ACV	Algeria	48	NP	BVP-2	
Slovakia	ACV	Germany	8	No Rpt	OT-810	
Slovakia	ACV	Algeria	1	NP	OT-66	

BASIC REPORTS

28 OCTOBER 1996 • NUMBER 54 • ISSN 0966-9175

EXPORTS (continued)

Country	Category	Importer Country	# of Items (exporter)	# of Items (importer)	Description (provided by exporter)	Description (provided by importer)
Slovakia	LCA	Ecuador	6	NP	122mm BM vs. 70	
South Africa	ACV	United Nations	15	N/A	Vehicle, Mamba MK2 (4x4) 11 Man APC	
South Africa	ACV	United Nations	2	N/A	Vehicle, Mamba MK2 (4x2) 7 Man APC	
South Africa	ACV	Uganda	10	NP	Vehicle, Mamba MK2 (4x4) 11 Man APC	
South Africa	ACV	Cote d'Ivoire	3	NP	Vehicle, RG12 (4x4) Riot Control	
South Africa	ACV	Cote d'Ivoire	10	NP	Vehicle, Mamba MKII (4x4) 11 Man APC	
South Africa	ACV	Angola	3	NP	Vehicle, Casspir MK II B Mine Protected	
Switzerland	ACV	Denmark	10	No Rpt	MOVAG Eagle 4x4 (armoured reconnaissance vehicle)	
Ukraine	Tank	Poland	2	2	Battle Tank T-72B T-72BK	T-72
Ukraine	Tank	USA	2	No Rpt	T-55AD	
Ukraine	Tank	Uganda	60	NP	T-55	
Ukraine	ACV	Slovak Rep.	6	6	Infantry Fighting Vehicle BMP-2K	BVP-2
Ukraine	ACV	Uganda	2	NP	Tractor BTC-4	
Ukraine	Cbt Acft	Yemen	4	NP	SU-22	
Ukraine	MMI	Malaysia	131	No Rpt	Air-to-air missiles R27R1 (470-1)	
Ukraine	MMI	Viet Nam	14	No Rpt	R27R1 (470-1)	
Ukraine	MMI	Slovak Rep.	14	No Rpt	R27R1 (470-1)	
UK	Tank	Oman	12	NP		
UK	ACV	Botswana	10	NP		
UK	ACV	Indonesia	27	No Rpt		
UK	ACV	Pakistan	5	NP		
UK	ACV	Bulgaria	23	No Rpt		
UK	ACV	Haiti	2	NP		
UK	ACV	Gabon	1	No Rpt		
UK	ACV	Kuwait	66	NP		
UK	ACV	Oman	3	NP		
UK	LCA	Brazil	18	18		105 mm LIGHT GUN
UK	LCA	Austria	34	34		[16] M109A2; [18] M109A3
UK	LCA	Botswana	3	NP		
UK	Cbt Acft	Oman	4	NP		

BASIC REPORTS

28 OCTOBER 1996 • NUMBER 54 • ISSN 0966-9175

EXPORTS (continued)

Country	Category	Importer Country	# of Items (exporter)	# of Items (importer)	Description (provided by exporter)	Description (provided by importer)
UK	Cbt Acft	Malaysia	4	5		HAWK Series 100-200
UK	Cbt Acft	UAE	4	NP		
UK	Atk Helo	Pakistan	1	NP		
UK	Ship	Brazil	1	1		Frigate '22' type
USA	Tank	Egypt	274	NP		
USA	Tank	Kuwait	16	NP		
USA	Tank	Portugal	13	12		M60
USA	Tank	Saudi Arabia	89	NP		
USA	Tank	Thailand	24	No Rpt		
USA	ACV	Egypt	299	NP		
USA	ACV	Greece	91	No Rpt		
USA	ACV	Israel	28	400		M-113
USA	ACV	Kuwait	46	NP		
USA	ACV	Lebanon	319	NP		
USA	ACV	Saudi Arabia	306	NP		
USA	LCA	Australia	1	1		5" MK 45 MOD 2
USA	LCA	Egypt	7	NP		
USA	LCA	Greece	10	9		MLRS
USA	LCA	Israel	6	No Rpt		
USA	LCA	Japan	9	No Rpt		
USA	LCA	Rep. of Korea	90	30		M-109 (self-propelled artillery)
USA	LCA	Spain	28	28		M-100 howitzer 203 MM
USA	LCA	Thailand	1	20		
USA	Cbt Acft	Argentina	40	No Rpt		
USA	Cbt Acft	Australia	1	1		P-3B Orion
USA	Cbt Acft	Egypt	31	NP		
USA	Cbt Acft	Finland	4	4		F-18D Hornet
USA	Cbt Acft	Greece	8	24		A-7
USA	Cbt Acft	Israel	2	No Rpt		
USA	Cbt Acft	Rep. of Korea	8	8		F-16
USA	Cbt Acft	Portugal	1	No Rpt		
USA	Cbt Acft	Saudi Arabia	4	NP		
USA	Cbt Acft	Spain	6	12		[6] EF-18 (C-15), [6] EF-4C (CR-12)

BASIC REPORTS

28 OCTOBER 1996 • NUMBER 54 • ISSN 0966-9175

EXPORTS (continued)

Country	Category	Importer Country	# of Items (exporter)	# of Items (importer)	Description (provided by exporter)	Description (provided by importer)
USA	Cbt Acft	Switzerland	3	No Rpt		
USA	Cbt Acft	Thailand	20	18		[12] F-16A/B; [6] A-7, P-3
USA	Atk Helo	Bahrain	6	NP		
USA	Atk Helo	Colombia	2	NP		
USA	Atk Helo	Greece	5	20		AH-64A APACHE
USA	Atk Helo	UAE	12	NP		
USA	MMI	Australia	32	59		Standard Missiles and MK41 missile launchers
USA	MMI	Denmark	3	No Rpt		
USA	MMI	France	30	No Rpt		
USA	MMI	Germany	1	No Rpt		
USA	MMI	Greece	2208	16		HARPOON
USA	MMI	Israel	6	No Rpt		
USA	MMI	Italy	246	No Rpt		
USA	MMI	Japan	126	119		
USA	MMI	Rep. of Korea	125	122		[31]Harpoon Missile; [1]MK-48 Torpedo Vertical Launching System; [88]AMRAAM
USA	MMI	Malaysia	12	No Rpt		
USA	MMI	Netherlands	40	No Rpt		
USA	MMI	New Zealand	2	No Rpt		
USA	MMI	Spain	2	No Rpt		
USA	MMI	Thailand	2	No Rpt		
USA	MMI	Turkey	84	No Rpt		
USA	MMI	UK	114	114		

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN TABLES:

	<u>UN Register category</u>	<u>Abbreviation</u>
I	Battle Tanks	Tanks
II	Armoured combat vehicles	ACV
III	Large calibre artillery systems	LCA
IV	Combat aircraft	Cbt Acft
V	Attack helicopters	Atk Helo
VI	Warships	Ship
VII	Missiles and missile launchers	M/MI

NP: Non-participant. Recipient state did not participate.

N/A: Not applicable. Recipient state not a Member State.

No Rpt: Not reported. Recipient state participated in Register but did not report this transfer.

BASIC REPORTS

28 OCTOBER 1996 • NUMBER 54 • ISSN 0966-9175

**SUMMARY OF SUPPLIER SUBMISSIONS TO THE
UN REGISTER OF CONVENTIONAL ARMS FOR 1995**

	Battle Tanks	Armoured Combat Vehicles	Large Calibre Artillery Systems	Combat Aircraft	Attack Helicopters	Warships	Missiles and Missile Launchers
Argentina	0	0	18	0	0	0	0
Belgium	0	118	0	1	0	0	0
Canada	0	294	0	0	0	0	0
China	51	20	0	1	0	0	18
Czech Republic	0	62	70	21	0	0	0
Finland	0	31	0	0	0	0	0
France	25	0	0	3	6	0	11
Germany	0	335	15	0	20	6	0
Israel	0	0	0	3	0	0	20
Italy	0	0	18	0	0	0	0
Kazakhstan	0	0	0	6	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Poland	72	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rep. of Korea	0	47	0	3	0	0	0
Romania	0	81	1	0	0	0	0
Russian Fed.	0	451	210	46	0	1	0
Slovakia	6	57	6	0	0	0	0
South Africa	0	43	0	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	0	10	0	0	0	0	0
Ukraine	64	8	0	4	0	0	159
United Kingdom	12	137	55	12	1	1	0
United States	416	1089	152	128	25	0	3033
TOTAL	646	2332	335	182	52	8	3241

BASIC REPORTS

28 OCTOBER 1996 • NUMBER 54 • ISSN 0966-9175

BASIC Reports is a bulletin on international security politics published by the British American Security Information Council, an independent research organization that analyzes government policies.

Director	Daniel Plesch
Deputy Director	Dr. Natalie J. Goldring
Analyst	Nicola Butler
Analyst	Susannah L. Dyer
Analyst	Sami Fournier
Intern	Charlotta Hagman
Program Assistant	Joel Johnston
Administrative Assistant	Valerie Kemball
Intern	Rachel Kerr
Analyst	Tasos Kokkinides
Intern	Alistair Millar
Analyst	Geraldine O'Callaghan
Senior Analyst	Stephen W. Young

This issue of **BASIC Reports** was co-edited by Susannah L. Dyer in Washington and Bronwyn Brady in Edinburgh. **BASIC Reports** is published every 6-8 weeks as developments warrant. Subscriptions are \$25 per year for individuals and non-profits, and \$50 per year for corporations and governments.

BASIC US	BASIC UK
1900 L Street N.W.	Carrara House
#401	20 Embankment Place
Washington D.C. 20036	London WC2N 6NN
Phone: (202) 785-1266	Phone: (171) 925-0862
Fax: (202) 387-6298	Fax: (171) 925-0861
E-mail: basicusa@igc.apc.org	E-mail: basic@gn.apc.org

Internet Website: <http://www.igc.apc.org/basic/>
Gopher: <gopher://gopher.igc.apc.org:70/11/orgs/basic/>

BASIC
1900 L STREET, NW
SUITE #401
WASHINGTON, DC 20036