# CRS Report for Congress

Conventional Arms Transfers to the Third World, 1986-1993

Richard F. Grimmett Specialist in National Defense Foreign Affairs and National Defense Division

July 29, 1994



Congressional Research Service · The Library of Congress

## 

#### CONVENTIONAL ARMS TRANSFERS TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993

#### SUMMARY

The Third World continues to be the primary focus of foreign arms sales activity by weapons suppliers. During the years 1986-1993, the value of arms transfer agreements with the Third World comprised 71.7% of all such agreements worldwide. In 1993, the value of arms transfer agreements with the Third World constituted 64.2% of all arms transfer agreements worldwide.

The value of all arms transfer agreements with the Third World in 1993 was \$20.4 billion. This was by far the lowest yearly total, calculated in either nominal or real terms, for any of the years during the 1986-1993 period. The general decline in the value of new arms transfer <u>agreements</u> with the Third World seen in recent years was dramatically reversed in 1990 as the result of major new arms agreements related to the Gulf War. However, in 1991 the pattern of overall decline in the value of arms transfer agreements with the Third World resumed in an equally dramatic fashion. This pattern of decline continued in 1993. At the same time, in 1993 the value of all arms <u>deliveries</u> to the Third World (\$15 billion) was the lowest total, in nominal and real terms, by a substantial margin for any year during the 1986-1993 period. This is the sixth consecutive year since 1987 that the value of all arms deliveries to the Third World dropped significantly.

The United States has become the predominant arms supplier to the Third World since the Cold War's end. During the 1990-1993 period, the United States accounted for 52.2% of the value of all arms transfer agreements with the Third World.

In 1993, the total value, in real terms, of U.S. arms transfer agreements with the Third World rose only slightly from \$14.6 billion in 1992 to \$14.8 billion in 1993. Yet for the fourth year in a row, the United States ranked first by a substantial margin in arms transfer agreements with the Third World. The U.S. share of the value of all such agreements was 72.6% in 1993, up from 55.8% in 1992. Over 79% of all 1993 U.S. arms transfer agreements with the Third World resulted from costly new orders by Saudi Arabia and Kuwait (\$9.5 billion and \$2.2 billion respectively). The value of Kuwait's arms transfer agreements with the United States alone in 1993 exceeded the total value (\$1.8 billion) of all arms transfer agreements made by the United Kingdom (the second leading supplier) with the entire Third World in the same year.

The total value of Russia's arms transfer agreements with the Third World rose slightly from \$1.6 billion in 1992 to \$1.8 billion in 1993, ranking it third among all suppliers--with a 8.8% market share (in constant 1993 dollars).

Since the Persian Gulf War, the value of Chinese arms transfer agreements with the Third World has fallen dramatically, registering only \$300 million in 1993 compared to \$2.5 billion in agreements in 1990. As a consequence, in 1993 China ranked sixth among all suppliers to the Third World.

. .

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
MAJOR FINDINGS	5
GENERAL TRENDS IN ARMS TRANSFERS TO THE THIRD	
WORLD	
UNITED STATES	-
RUSSIA	
CHINA	
MAJOR WEST EUROPEANS	
REGIONAL ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENT VALUES	
WEAPON TYPES RECENTLY DELIVERED TO	10
THE THIRD WORLD	12
	12
SUMMARY OF DATA TRENDS, 1986-1993	17
TOTAL THIRD WORLD ARMS TRANSFER	
AGREEMENT VALUES	17
REGIONAL ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENT VALUES,	
1986-1993	22
ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD,	~~
1986-1993: LEADING SUPPLIERS COMPARED	28
ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD	
	29
	-0
ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH NEAR EAST,	
•	30
ARMS TRANSFERS TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993:	
AGREEMENTS WITH LEADING RECIPIENTS	34
ARMS TRANSFERS TO THE THIRD WORLD IN 1993:	~ ~
AGREEMENTS WITH LEADING RECIPIENTS 3	35
TOTAL THIRD WORLD ARMS DELIVERY VALUES	35
	39
ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993:	
•	41
ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD IN 1993:	
LEADING SUPPLIERS COMPARED 4	41

#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS -- CONTINUED**

ARMS DELIVERIES TO NEAR EAST, 1986-1993: SUPPLIERS AND RECIPIENTS	42
ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993: DELIVERIES TO THE LEADING RECIPIENTS	46
ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD IN 1993: DELIVERIES TO THE LEADING RECIPIENTS	46
THIRD WORLD ARMS TRANSFER DATA TABLES	49
SELECTED WEAPONS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993 REGIONAL WEAPONS DELIVERIES SUMMARY, 1990-1993	71 71
THIRD WORLD WEAPONS DELIVERIES TABLES	75
WORLDWIDE ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENT AND DELIVERIES VALUE 1986-1993	ES, 80
,	80
1986-1993	81
DESCRIPTION OF ITEMS COUNTED IN WEAPONS CATEGORIES, 1986-1993	89
REGIONS IDENTIFIED IN ARMS TRANSFER TABLES AND CHARTS	91

#### LIST OF CHARTS

CHART 1. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993: United States, Major West European, Russia, All Others Compared (Billions of Constant 1993 Dollars and Percentage of Total Agreements)	18
CHART 2. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD, 1992 AND 1993: BY SUPPLIER (As Percentage of All Agreements)	19
CHART 3. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993: United States, Russia and Major West European Compared (In Billions of Constant 1993 Dollars)	20
CHART 4. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993: By Major Supplier (In Billions of Constant 1993 Dollars)	21
CHART 5. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS, 1990-1993, WITH NEAR EAST (Supplier Percentage of Value)	23
CHART 6. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH ASIA, 1986-1989 AND 1990-1993 (Supplier Percentage of Value)	25
CHART 7. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH LATIN AMERICA, 1986-1989 AND 1990-1993 (Supplier Percentage of Value)	27
CHART 8. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN, 1985-1988 AND 1990-1993 (Supplier Percentage of Value)	32
CHART 9. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH SAUDI ARABIA, 1986-1989 AND 1990-1993 (Supplier Percentage of Value)	33
CHART 10. ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993: United States, Major West European, Russia, All Others Compared (Billions of Constant 1993 Dollars and Percentage	
of Total Deliveries) CHART 11. ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993:	37
By Major Supplier (In Billions of Constant 1993 Dollars)	38
CHART 12. ARMS DELIVERIES TO IRAN, 1986-1989 AND 1990-1993 (Supplier Percentage of Value)	44
CHART 13. ARMS DELIVERIES TO SAUDI ARABIA, 1986-1989 AND 1990-1993 (Supplier Percentage of Value)	45

#### LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRDWORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993 (In Millions of Current U.S.Dollars)	49
TABLE 1A. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993 (In Millions of Constant 1993 U.S. Dollars)	50
TABLE 1B. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993 (Expressed as a Percent of Grand Total, By Year)	51
TABLE 1C.REGIONAL ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS, BYSUPPLIER, 1986-1993 (In Millions of Current U.S. Dollars)	52
TABLE 1D. PERCENTAGE OF EACH SUPPLIER'S AGREEMENTSVALUE BY REGION, 1986-1993	53
TABLE 1E. PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL AGREEMENTS VALUE BYSUPPLIER TO REGIONS, 1986-1993	54
TABLE 1F. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRDWORLD, 1986-1993:LEADING SUPPLIERS COMPARED (In Millions of Current U.S. Dollars)	55
TABLE 1G. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRDWORLD IN 1993: LEADING SUPPLIERS COMPARED (In Millions of Current U.S. Dollars)	56
TABLE 1H. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH NEAR EAST,1986-1993:SUPPLIERS AND RECIPIENTS (In Millions of Current U.S. Dollars)	57
TABLE 11. ARMS TRANSFERS TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993:AGREEMENTS WITH LEADING RECIPIENTS (In Millions of Current U.S. Dollars	58
TABLE 1J. ARMS TRANSFERS TO THE THIRD WORLD IN 1993:AGREEMENTS WITH LEADING RECIPIENTS (In Millions of Current U.S. Dollars)	59
TABLE 2.ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, BYSUPPLIER, 1986-1993 (In Millions of Current U.S. Dollars)	60
TABLE 2A.ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, BYSUPPLIER, 1986-1993 (In Millions of Constant 1993 Dollars)	61
TABLE 2B. ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, BY SUPPLIERS, 1986-1993 (Expressed As a Percent of Grand Total,	
By Year)	62

#### LIST OF TABLES -- CONTINUED

,

TABLE 2C. REGIONAL ARMS DELIVERIES, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993    (In Millions of Current U.S. Dollars).	63
TABLE 2D. PERCENTAGE OF SUPPLIER DELIVERIES VALUE BY REGION, 1986-1993	64
TABLE 2E.PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL DELIVERIES VALUE BY SUPPLIER TO REGIONS, 1986-1993	65
TABLE 2F. ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993:LEADING SUPPLIERS COMPARED (In Millions of Current U.S.Dollars)	66
TABLE 2G. ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD IN 1993:LEADING SUPPLIERS COMPARED (In Millions of Current U.S.Dollars)	67
TABLE 2H.ARMS DELIVERIES TO NEAR EAST, 1986-1993:SUPPLIERS AND RECIPIENTS (In Millions of Current U.S.Dollars)	68
TABLE 2I. ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993:DELIVERIES TO LEADING RECIPIENTS (In Millions of CurrentU.S. Dollars)	69
TABLE 2J. ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD IN 1993DELIVERIES TO THE LEADING RECIPIENTS (In millions of Current U.S. Dollars)	70
TABLE 3. NUMBERS OF WEAPONS DELIVERED BY MAJORSUPPLIERS TO THE THIRD WORLD	75
TABLE 4. NUMBERS OF WEAPONS DELIVERED BY MAJORSUPPLIERS TO ASIA	76
TABLE 5.  NUMBERS OF WEAPONS DELIVERED BY MAJOR    SUPPLIERS TO NEAR EAST	77
TABLE 6.  NUMBERS OF WEAPONS DELIVERED BY MAJOR    SUPPLIERS TO LATIN AMERICA	78
TABLE 7. NUMBERS OF WEAPONS DELIVERED BY MAJORSUPPLIERS TO AFRICA (SUB-SAHARAN)	79
TABLE 8. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE WORLD    SUPPLIER, 1986-1993 (In Millions of    Current U.S. Dollars)	
	00

#### LIST OF TABLES -- CONTINUED

TABLE 8A. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE WORLD, SUPPLIER, 1986-1993 (In Millions of Constant 1993	BY
U.S. Dollars)	84
TABLE 8B. ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE WORLD, SUPPLIER, 1986-1993 (Expressed as a Percent of Total,	BY
by Year)	85
TABLE 9. ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE WORLD, BY SUPPLIER,1986-1993 (In Millions of Current U.S. Dollars)	86
	00
TABLE 9A. ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE WORLD, BY SUPPLIER,1986-1993 (In Millions of Constant 1993 Dollars)	87
TABLE 9B. ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE WORLD, BY SUPPLIER,1986-1993 (Expressed as a Percent of Total, by Year)	88

#### CONVENTIONAL ARMS TRANSFERS TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993

#### INTRODUCTION

The new political and economic environment created internationally by the end of the Cold War continues to have a dramatic effect on the global conventional arms marketplace as well as on arms transfers to the Third World. Arms supplying relationships have undergone notable changes as have the arms acquisition levels of several purchasing states. During the height of the Cold War, much attention was given to weapons transfers to "the Third World" or "developing" nations. These states were often the focal point of proxy conflicts and competition for influence between the West and the Communist bloc countries. Because many of these nations were poor or were controlled by undemocratic governments and were located in regions that were historic areas of tension and conflict, arms sales to them by the United States and other non-Communist countries were usually controversial. Nevertheless, for a significant period of time--at least since the 1980s--arms sales to the Third World have comprised, on average, about two-thirds of all arms sales made internationally. And, despite the Cold War's end, in 1993, both arms transfer agreements with and arms deliveries to the Third World continued to comprise roughly two-thirds of all such arms trade activity worldwide.

Post-Cold War reductions in national defense spending by most major arms exporting nations have placed continuing pressures on arms industries to seek foreign weapons contracts to replace, as feasible, declining domestic orders. In this intensifying international competition for the foreign arms market, the United States has proven to be especially successful, while other traditional weapons suppliers have had great difficulty securing new orders. United States arms sales have been significantly aided by the reputation its weapons gained as a result of their effective use during the Persian Gulf War.

Russia has been particularly hard hit by the dramatically changing international political and economic order in which the demise of the former Soviet Union has been a central factor. Russia today has few arms clients in the Third World that can pay for its weapons in hard currency or its equivalent. Most of the former Soviet Union's Cold War-era weapons clients received many of their arms through a grant military aid program or received large discounts on their purchases. That is no longer the case. Given Russia's severe domestic economic crisis, it can ill afford to give away export weapons to poor developing nations, even though in the recent past they may have been on the same ideological side of the East-West conflict. CRS-2

Instead, Russia has attempted to gain cash paying arms customers by offering advanced weapons systems at competitive prices. Since foreign arms sales have generated amounts of hard currency for Russia in the past, Moscow hopes that such sales will do so in the future. To date, Russia's efforts have led to notable arms contracts with Iran, China, and with traditional Western customers such as the United Arab Emirates and Malaysia. The United States has been critical of some of these arms deals, particularly those with Iran, but Russia has indicated that it considers its pursuit of such foreign arms sales a legitimate activity for raising needed income, and that it plans to continue the practice. Yet in spite of aggressive arms marketing by Russia, potential buyers express concerns that the continuing political and economic turmoil in the Russian Republic may render it incapable of providing timely support and spare parts needed to maintain the weapons that it sells. As long as this perception is held by prospective Third World purchasers, it will undermine substantial new arms sales by Russia.

As the conventional arms market proceeds through a major transitional period, the significance of financial considerations in the sales efforts of most traditional arms suppliers has become increasingly evident. Most arms suppliers seem to be focusing their foreign arms sales activities on wealthy states in the Near East and in Asia. Since most developing nations do not have either the cash reserves or oil wealth of Persian Gulf states or countries such as Taiwan, they are generally dependent upon obtaining loans from sellers in order to conclude new weapons purchases. Some leading arms suppliers may only be willing to supply such loans to those Third World countries most capable of repaying them. Other suppliers may well choose to not make such loans in the first place. These actions tend to concentrate major conventional arms transfers to the Third World in relatively few countries.

In the post-Cold War era, there is also a diminished threat perception in some countries that has curtailed demand for major weapons acquisitions. In other instances, purchases of major weapons systems have already been made, with these arms being absorbed into national military force structures--further reducing demand for new systems. Most of the smaller arms suppliers are likely to compete successfully only for sales of medium and lower technology items to Third World states for whom the lowest price for a basic weapon system is the critical consideration. These circumstances collectively explain much of the continuing overall decline of the Third World arms trade most recently.

It should be noted that conventional weapons transferred to the Third World do not have to be especially expensive to be deadly and pose a significant security threat within a given region, even though sales of more costly systems tend to attract the attention of policymakers. Given the growing availability of weapons production technology from a wider variety of sources, it will become more difficult to monitor some weapons transfer activities involving than in the past, since both the existence and the dollar value of weapons technology transfer agreements are harder to establish. Furthermore, given the capital flows involved in paying for major new weapons systems, some Third World arms purchasers may insist on gaining weapons production knowledge as part of any major arms purchase in the future, as a means of developing longer term independence from foreign suppliers. Some suppliers dependent on arms exports to sustain their military industrial base may be willing to conclude such deals.

The dramatic arms buildup by Iraq and its role in precipitating the Persian Gulf War led many to advocate strong measures to control similar conventional weapons transfers in the future. Members of Congress proposed measures to control weapons flows to the Near East region and both Houses of Congress passed measures requiring an arms sales moratorium to that area pending a conference of major weapons suppliers. President Bush, beginning in May 1991, launched an effort to secure agreement among the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council to limit the nature and size of their weapons sales to the Near East, and to set in place a procedure for these five nations (the U.S., the United Kingdom, France, Russia and China) to notify each other before they made any arms sales to Near Eastern countries.

This Bush initiative collapsed by the Fall of 1992 due to the inability of all participants to agree on how to achieve the overall goal of reducing arms sales to the Near East, and China's withdrawal from the talks after the United States made a major combat aircraft sale to Taiwan. The failure of the Bush proposal, however, has not deterred initiatives by some Members of Congress to advance a variety of measures to curtail the conventional arms trade, particularly in the Third World, and the nature of U.S. participation in it.

Meanwhile, representatives of American industry have sought support in Congress for legislation that would provide loan guarantees to assist them in the sale of American weaponry abroad. The Clinton Administration, meanwhile, is reviewing the potential effect of foreign arms sales on the United States military industrial base, as it continues to formulate its approach to American conventional arms transfer policy. Given these circumstances, policymakers will continue to be confronted with the question of how best to reconcile the economic interests and concerns of domestic defense industries and their employees with the goal of reducing potentially destabilizing weapons transfers to nations in the Third World.

This report provides unclassified background data from government sources on transfers of conventional arms to the Third World by major suppliers for the period 1986 through 1993. It updates and revises the report entitled "Conventional Arms Transfers to the Third World, 1985-1992," published by the Congressional Research Service (CRS) on July 19, 1993 (CRS Report 93-656F). The data in this new report completely supersede <u>all</u> data published in previous editions. Since these new data for 1986-1993 reflect potentially significant updates to and revisions in the underlying databases utilized for this report, only the data in this most recent edition should be used.

#### **CONSTANT 1993 DOLLARS**

Throughout this report values of arms transfer agreements and values of arms deliveries for all suppliers are expressed in U.S. dollars. Values for any given year generally reflect the exchange rates that prevailed during that specific year. In many instances, the report converts these dollar amounts (current dollars) into constant 1993 dollars. Although this helps to eliminate the distorting effects of inflation to permit a more accurate comparison of various dollar levels over time, the effects of fluctuating exchange rates are not necessarily neutralized. The deflators used for the constant dollar calculations in this report are those provided by the Department of Defense and are set out at the bottom of Tables 1 and 2. Unless otherwise noted in the report all dollar values are stated in constant terms. Because all regional data tables are composed of four-year aggregate dollar totals (1986-1989 and 1990-1993). they must be expressed in current dollar terms. Where tables rank leading arms suppliers to the Third World or leading Third World arms recipients using four-year aggregate dollar totals. these values must also be expressed in current dollars.

#### **CALENDAR YEAR DATA USED**

All arms transfer and arms delivery data in this report are for the <u>calendar</u> year or <u>calendar</u> year period given. This applies to both U.S. and foreign data alike. United States government departments and agencies, such as the Defense Department (DOD) and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), routinely publish data on U.S. arms transfers and deliveries but use the United States <u>fiscal</u> year as the computational time period for these data. As a consequence, there are likely to be distinct differences noted in those published totals and those provided in this report which uses a <u>calendar</u> year basis for its figures. These differences result from using two very different twelve month tabulation periods. (A United States <u>fiscal</u> year covers the period from October 1 until September 30).

#### **MAJOR FINDINGS**

#### **GENERAL TRENDS IN ARMS TRANSFERS TO THE THIRD WORLD**

The value of all arms transfer <u>agreements</u> with the Third World in 1993 was \$20.4 billion. This was by far the lowest yearly total for agreements with the Third World for any of the years during the 1986-1993 period, whether measured in nominal or real terms. The general decline in the value of new arms transfer agreements with the Third World during the late 1980s was dramatically reversed in 1990 as the result of major new arms agreements related to the Gulf War. In 1991, however, the pattern of overall decline in the value of arms transfer agreements with developing nations resumed in an equally dramatic fashion. This pattern of decline continued in 1993. (table 1A) (chart 1).

In 1993, the value of all arms <u>deliveries</u> to the Third World (\$15 billion) was the lowest total by far for any year during the 1986-1993 period. This is the sixth consecutive year since 1987 that the value of all arms deliveries to developing nations dropped significantly from the previous year. These declines have been relatively steady from year to year. Deliveries values in 1993 (in real terms) were slightly more than a quarter of what they were in 1987. This pattern reflects the impact of the end of the Iran-Iraq war and the Cold War, and a winding down of other regional conflicts in the Third World (table 2A) (charts 10, and 11). However, given the surge in 1990 of new arms transfer agreements with the Third World the total value of arms deliveries may increase in future years if most of these agreements are fully implemented.

The United States has come to dominate the much reduced Third World arms market in the most recent period. From 1990-1993, the United States made \$59.8 billion in arms transfer agreements with the Third World or 52.2% of all such agreements. In the earlier period before the Cold War had ended (1986-1989), the Soviet Union was the single leading supplier, making \$77.3 billion in arms transfer agreements with the Third World or 40.5% (in constant 1993 dollars).

The Third World arms market, from 1990 onward, has been comprised of three general tiers of suppliers. In the first tier is the United States whose position far surpasses that of any other arms supplier to the Third World. In the second tier are the United Kingdom, France and Russia whose positions are notably below that of the United States, but distinctly greater than the remaining arms suppliers to the Third World. The four nations in the first two tiers have historically had the means to supply the most advanced weapons systems to developing nations in quantity and on a continuing basis. But as competition for a declining Third World arms market increases, some of them may have difficulty sustaining the market shares they have held in past. In the third tier are China, other European suppliers, and other non-European suppliers--that have generally been marginal or sporadic participants in the Third World arms trade. The names of countries in this third tier are likely to change over time, especially at its lower end, since some of these nations lack the means to be major suppliers of advanced military equipment on a sustained basis. Some of them, however, are capable of having an impact on potential conflicts within Third World regions because of their willingness to supply weapons based almost exclusively on commercial considerations, including types of weapons that other suppliers refuse to provide (tables 1A, 1F, 1G, 2A, 2F and 2G).

The Third World continues to be the primary focus of foreign arms sales activity by weapons suppliers. During the years 1986-1993, the value of arms transfer agreements with the Third World comprised 71.7% of all such agreements worldwide. In 1993, the value of arms transfer agreements with the Third World constituted 64.2% of all arms transfer agreements worldwide (tables 1A and 8A).

#### **UNITED STATES**

In 1993, the total value, in real terms, of U.S. arms transfer agreements with the Third World increased marginally from the previous year's total, rising from \$14.6 billion in 1992 to \$14.8 billion in 1993. For the fourth year in a row, the United States ranked first by a substantial margin in arms transfer agreements with the Third World. The U.S. share of the value of all such agreements was 72.6% in 1993, up dramatically from 55.8% in 1992 (tables 1A and 1B) (charts 1 and 2).

The United States' ranking in arms transfer agreements with the Third World in 1993 is directly attributable to costly new orders from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. The Saudis bought 72 F-15 fighter aircraft and associated missiles and bombs as well as expensive military support services. Kuwait purchased 256 M1A2 main battle tanks and a variety of other ground combat support vehicles as well as related ammunition and spare parts. In 1993, the total values of the arms transfer agreements of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait with the United States were \$9.5 billion and \$2.2 billion respectively. These agreements collectively constituted 79% of the value of all U.S. arms transfer agreements with developing nations in 1993. The value of Kuwait's arms transfer agreements with the United States alone in 1993 exceeded the total value (\$1.8 billion) of all arms transfer agreements made by the United Kingdom (the second leading supplier) with the entire Third World in the same year.

The signing of a few particularly large contracts for major weapons systems generally determines whether the total value of U.S arms transfer agreements in any given year is high relative to other years. The Third World agreements figure for the United States in 1993 illustrates this point. Exceptional arms agreements totals for 1990-1993 can be directly related to the Persian Gulf war. United States arms transfer agreements totals for 1990-1993 for the Near East region constituted 68% of the value of all arms transfer agreements made by all suppliers to that region during these years (table 1E)(chart 5).

#### **RUSSIA**\*

The total value of Russia's agreements with the Third World rose slightly, from \$1.6 billion in 1992 to \$1.8 billion in 1993, ranking it third among all suppliers in 1993. Russia's share of all Third World arms transfer agreements increased as well, rising from 5.9% in 1992 to 8.8% in 1993 (in constant 1993 dollars) (tables 1A and 1B) (charts 1 and 2).

During the 1986-1993 period, Russian arms transfer agreements with developing nations ranged from a high of \$27 billion in 1987 to a low of \$1.6 billion in 1992 (in constant 1993 dollars). Each year after 1987, Russian arms transfer agreement totals declined from those of the previous year, until 1993. These data document a progressive and dramatic fall in arms transfer agreements by Russia as the internal difficulties of the former Soviet Union mounted, hastening the ultimate political decision to dissolve the Union into independent states at the end of 1991. They also indicate that Russia no longer plays the leading role in the Third World arms market that it once did.

Russia has had long-standing supplier relationships with many of the leading purchasers of weapons in the Third World, relationships that were significantly motivated by Cold War considerations. Russia has provided these purchasers with a wide range of armaments from the highly sophisticated to the most basic, including a large quantity of munitions. It has also actively sought to export weapons as an important means of gaining needed hard currency.

Due to the domestic economic problems it has encountered in recent years, as well as the Cold War's end, Russia has terminated its grant military assistance program with most of its traditional arms clients in the Third World. At the same time, Russia has sought arms deals with countries such as Iran that can pay for weapons in hard currency. These developments, with the loss of Iraq as a major arms purchaser, are major factors that explain why the overall value of Russian arms transfer agreements dropped so sharply in recent years, while the value of arms agreements with Iran, by contrast, have increased. Among the weapons systems sold to Iran by Russia in recent years are MiG-29 fighter aircraft, Su-24 fighter bombers, T-72 main battle tanks and Kilo class attack submarines. Russia has also resumed an important arms supplier relationship with China, after a lapse of two decades, selling Su-27 fighter aircraft in 1991, and continues to explore the prospects of new sales of other weapons. Russia is continuing an aggressive marketing effort to sell its weapons to developing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>\*</sup>Russia is used throughout the text, tables and charts, although data for <u>all</u> years prior to 1992 represent transactions of the former Soviet Union as a whole. Russia was by far the principal arms producer and exporter of all the former Soviet republics, and the political center for decision-making by the former Soviet Union. Data for <u>1992 and 1993</u> are for <u>Russia</u> exclusively.

nations, aimed at old clients and new. It has reached agreement with Malaysia for the purchase of Mig-29 fighter aircraft and the United Arab Emirates for the purchase of armored vehicles. Other efforts by Russia to secure new clients for its arms have been less successful, due to an important degree to concerns by prospective buyers that Russia may not be a reliable supplier of the spare parts and support services needed to utilize its weapons systems, and the knowledge that comparable, if not superior equipment, is available from established Western suppliers (tables 1C and 1H).

#### CHINA

In the 1980s, China emerged as an important supplier of arms to the Third World, in large measure due to agreements with Iran and Iraq during their war. The value of China's agreements with the Third World peaked at \$5.8 billion in 1987. China ranked fifth among all suppliers in the value of its arms transfer agreements with the Third World from 1990-1993. Since the Persian Gulf War, the value of Chinese arms transfer agreements with developing nations has fallen dramatically, registering only \$300 million in 1993 compared to \$2.5 billion in 1990. China ranked sixth among all suppliers to the Third World in 1993 (in constant 1993 dollars) (tables 1A, 1G and 1H).

China's arms transfer agreements with the Third World fell sharply after 1990 because Russia displaced China as Iran's preferred arms supplier. Iraq, another important Chinese client, was barred from arms purchases by the U.N. embargo after August 1990. Beyond the Near East region, China has not had many arms clients with large financial resources or major weapons purchasing programs. China seems ill-placed to sustain a high level of arms sales to the Near East region with stiff competition from suppliers such as Russia that can provide more modern and sophisticated weaponry.

Despite the overall decline in the volume of its arms transfers, China's missiles have been of continuing interest to certain Third World purchasers. In the latter half of the 1980s, China sold and delivered CSS-2 Intermediate Range Ballistic Missiles to Saudi Arabia, Silkworm anti-shipping missiles to Iran, and anti-tank and other surface-to-surface missiles to various purchasers in developing nations. China's willingness to abide by the guidelines on missile transfers set out in the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) is ambiguous at best. China is especially sensitive to arrangements that it perceives infringe on its rights as an independent, sovereign, nation. With need to obtain hard currency, China's seems prepared to pursue arms sales opportunities it deems appropriate wherever they present themselves. China appears most reluctant to commit itself to an arms control regime that would undermine its ability to market military items or technology attractive to prospective buyers in developing nations.

#### **MAJOR WEST EUROPEANS**

The four major West European suppliers (France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy) registered a significant decline in their collective share of all arms transfer agreements with the Third World in 1993, falling to 12.7% from 28.8% in 1992. Of these suppliers, France posted a notable decrease in the value of its agreements from \$4.1 billion in 1992 to \$200 million in 1993. The value of the United Kingdom's agreements decreased from \$2.2 billion in 1992 to \$1.8 billion in 1993. Germany registered a comparable decrease from over \$700 million in 1992 to \$600 million in 1993. Italy's Third World agreements in 1993 were effectively nil, down from over \$500 million in 1992 (in constant 1993 dollars) (tables 1A, 1B) (charts 1, 2, and 3).

Throughout the period from 1986-1993, the major West European suppliers, as a group, averaged 19% of all arms transfer agreements with the Third World. Even as the Cold War wound down, the major West European suppliers have generally maintained their share of arms transfer agreements. For the 1990-1993 period, they collectively, averaged 17.9% of all arms transfer agreements with the Third World. Individual suppliers within the major West European group have had exceptional years for arms agreements, such as France in 1989 and 1992 (\$4.4 billion and \$4.1 billion respectively); and the United Kingdom in 1988 (\$24.4 billion) (in constant 1993 dollars). Such totals have reflected the conclusion of a few large arms transfer agreements with a major Third World purchaser (tables 1A, 1B, 1C and 1H).

Because the four major West European suppliers produce both advanced and basic ground, air, and naval weapons systems, they have the capability to compete successfully with the United States and Russia, for arms sales contracts throughout the Third World. Because major West European suppliers, such as France and the United Kingdom, do not often tie their arms sales decisions to foreign policy considerations but essentially to economic ones, they have provided a viable alternative source of arms for some nations to whom the United States will not sell for policy reasons. Generally, strong government marketing support for foreign arms sales enhances the competitiveness of weapons produced by these major West European suppliers. But in the post-Cold War environment, and a shrinking global marketplace, individual West European suppliers may be hard pressed to secure large new arms contracts with developing nations on a routine basis. Therefore, they may choose not to compete for sales of some weapons categories, reducing or eliminating some weapons categories actually produced. They may also seek to engage in joint production ventures with other weapons suppliers.

#### **REGIONAL ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENT VALUES**

Two significant Near East conflicts, the Iran-Iraq war, in its last years, 1986-1988, and the Persian Gulf crisis from August 1990-February 1991 played a major role in stimulating high levels of arms transfer agreements with nations in that region, during the period covered by this report. The Persian Gulf war, in particular, stimulated new demand by key nations such as Saudi Arabia and other members of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), for a variety of advanced weapons systems, not only in response to Iraq's failed aggression against Kuwait, but also to concerns about potential threats from a resurgent Iran. The end of the Iran-Iraq war, the Cold War and the Persian Gulf war have collectively led to a reorientation of efforts by arms producers in seeking sales opportunities in the Third World. Major new weapons sales have occurred recently in both Asia and the Near East regions. Data on regional arms transfer agreements from 1986-1993 reflect the particular importance of these two Third World regions as international arms markets:

#### **Near East**

- The Near East is currently the largest Third World arms market. In 1986-1989 it accounted for 56.1% of the total value of all Third World arms transfer agreements. During 1990-1993, the region accounted for 55.8% of all such agreements (tables 1C and 1D).
- The United States has dominated arms transfer agreements with the Near East during the 1990-1993 time period with 68% of their total value; in contrast, Russia and the United Kingdom collectively accounted for 45.6% in 1986-1989 (table 1E)(chart 5).

#### Asia

- Asia is the second largest Third World arms market and it is growing. In the earlier period (1986-1989), Asia accounted for 26.1% of the total value of all Third World arms transfer agreements. During 1990-1993, the region accounted for 38.1% of all such agreements (tables 1C and 1D).
- Russia ranked first in arms transfer agreements with Asia in 1986-1989 with 60.2%. This region includes some of Russia's largest traditional arms clients such as India, Afghanistan and Vietnam. The United States ranked a distant second with 18.9%. The major West European suppliers, as a group, made 9.2% of this region's agreements in 1986-1989. In the later period (1990-1993), the United States ranked first in Asian agreements with 34.9% on the strength of a major aircraft sale to Taiwan. Russia ranked second with 30%. France ranked third with nearly 16%, primarily due to a major aircraft sale to Taiwan. The major West European suppliers, together, made 24.9% of this region's agreements in 1990-1993 (table 1E) (chart 6).

#### LEADING THIRD WORLD ARMS PURCHASERS

Saudi Arabia has been, by a wide margin, the leading Third World arms purchaser from 1986-1993, making arms transfer <u>agreements</u> totaling \$67.7 billion during these years (in <u>current</u> dollars). In both the 1986-1989 and 1990-1993 periods, the value of its arms transfer agreements were very high (\$32.6 billion in 1986-1989 and \$35.1 billion in 1990-1993). The total value of all Third World arms transfer agreements from 1986-1993 was \$266.5 billion (in <u>current</u> dollars). Thus, Saudi Arabia alone was responsible for over one-fourth (25.4%) of all Third World arms transfer agreements during these eight years. In the most recent period--1990-1993--Saudi Arabia alone accounted for roughly one-third (32.4%) of all Third World arms transfer agreements (\$35.1 billion out of \$108.3 billion)(in <u>current</u> dollars). Saudi Arabia ranked first among all Third World recipients in the value of arms transfer agreements in 1993, concluding \$9.6 billion in such agreements. The principal Saudi purchase contributing to this 1993 total was a \$9 billion agreement with the United States for 72 F-15 fighter aircraft (tables 1, 1H, 1I and 1J (chart 9).

Eight of the ten leading Third World arms recipients during the 1986-1993 period registered declines in the value of their arms transfer <u>agreements</u> from the 1986-1989 period to the 1990-1993 period. Six of these were traditional customers of Russia. Iraq, which purchased \$16.3 billion in 1986-1989, bought only \$1.5 billion in the next four years, reflecting the cutoff of its arms supplies after its invasion of Kuwait in August 1990; Angola declined 87.3%, Vietnam 80.6%, India 70.2%, Cuba 61.2% and Afghanistan 38.1%. These figures reflect the diminished financial support for these countries by Russia in the post-Cold War era. Two major U.S. customers registered increases in the values of their arms transfer agreements from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993. Taiwan rose by a very dramatic amount (527%) due to a major aircraft purchase in 1992, and Saudi Arabia rose 7.7%. Egypt fell 25.8% (tables 1H and 1I).

Despite some large decreases in the values of the arms transfer <u>agreements</u> of specific nations from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993, the top ten recipient nations in both time periods still accounted for the major portion of the total Third World arms market. During 1986-1989 the top ten collectively accounted for 67.3% of <u>all</u> Third World arms transfer agreements. During 1990-1993 the top ten collectively accounted for 76.9% of all such agreements. Arms transfer <u>agreements</u> with the top ten Third World recipients, as a group, totaled \$18.1 billion in 1993 or 88.7% of all arms transfer agreements with developing nations in that year (tables 1, 1I and 1J). This reflects a growing concentration of total Third World arms purchases by relatively few countries. Between 1986-1993 the top ten collectively made 65.8% of all arms transfer agreements in the Third World (\$175.4 billion out of \$266.5 billion)(in <u>current</u> dollars)(tables 1 and 1I).

Saudi Arabia ranked first among all Third World recipients in the value of arms transfer <u>agreements</u> in 1993, concluding \$9.6 billion in such agreements. The United States was its principal supplier, selling it 72 F-15 combat fighter aircraft. Kuwait, ranking second in agreements in 1993 at \$3.4 billion, made a major purchase of 256 M1A2 main battle tanks from the United States (table 1J).

Saudi Arabia was by far the leading recipient of arms <u>deliveries</u> in the Third World in 1993, receiving \$6.4 billion in such deliveries. Saudi Arabia alone received 42.7% of the total value of all arms deliveries to the Third World in 1993 (tables 2 and 2J).

Arms <u>deliveries</u> to the top ten Third World recipients, as a group, constituted \$13.3 billion, or 88.7% of all arms deliveries to the Third World in 1993. Six of the top ten recipients were in the Near East region (tables 2 and 2J).

#### WEAPON TYPES RECENTLY DELIVERED TO THE THIRD WORLD

Regional <u>weapons</u> <u>delivery</u> data reflect the diverse sources of supply of conventional weaponry available to Third World nations. Even though Russia, the United States and the four major West European suppliers dominate in the delivery of the fourteen classes of weapons examined, it is also evident that the other European suppliers, and non-European suppliers, including China, are capable of being leading suppliers of selected types of conventional armaments to developing nations (tables 3-7).

Weapons deliveries to the Near East, the largest purchasing region in the Third World, reflect the substantial quantities and types delivered by both major and lesser suppliers. The following is an illustrative summary of weapons deliveries to this region by supplier from table 5 for the period **1990-1993**:

#### **Russia**:

- 600 tanks and self-propelled guns
- 290 artillery pieces
- 450 APCs and armored cars
- 1 major surface combatant
- 2 submarines
- 60 supersonic combat aircraft
- 30 helicopters
- 220 surface-to-air missiles (SAMs)
- 80 anti-shipping missiles

#### **United States:**

- 792 tanks and self-propelled guns
- 933 APCs and armored cars
- 225 supersonic combat aircraft
- 66 helicopters
- 1,265 surface-to-air missiles (SAMs)

#### China:

- 360 artillery pieces
- 60 supersonic combat aircraft
- 140 surface-to-surface missiles
- 60 anti-shipping missiles

#### **Major West European suppliers:**

- 190 artillery pieces
- 45 minor surface combatants
- 70 supersonic combat aircraft
- 1,080 surface-to-air missiles (SAMs)
- 120 anti-shipping missiles

#### All other European suppliers:

- 270 tanks and self-propelled guns
- 720 artillery pieces
- 270 APCs and armored cars

#### All other suppliers:

- 100 APCs and armored cars
- 150 artillery pieces
- 130 supersonic combat aircraft
- 130 surface-to-surface missiles

Large quantities of major combat systems were delivered to the Near East region from 1990-1993, especially, tanks and self-propelled guns, armored vehicles, artillery pieces, supersonic combat aircraft, and air defense missiles. While some of the deliveries totals to the Near East in certain categories during 1990-1993 are lower than those made during the 1986-1989 period--at a time when the Iran-Iraq war and the Cold War were critical factors in precipitating them--they nonetheless represent significant levels of arms transfers. The United States, the major West Europeans, Russia, China, and all other non-European suppliers collectively, made significant deliveries of supersonic combat aircraft to the region. Russia, the United States, and all European suppliers collectively, other than the four major West Europeans, were the principal suppliers of tanks and self-propelled guns. These two weapons categories-supersonic combat aircraft and tanks and self-propelled guns--are especially costly and are an important part of the dollar values of arms deliveries of Russia, the United States, and the major West European suppliers to the Near East region during the 1990-1993 period. The cost of naval combatants is also significant and the delivery of two submarines and one major surface combatant by Russia and forty-five minor surface combatants by the major West European suppliers during this period also contributed notably to the total value of their respective deliveries to the Near East for these years.

It is also important to note that some of the less expensive weapons systems delivered to the Near East can be very deadly and create a significant security threat within the region. In particular, from 1990-1993, China delivered 60 antishipping missiles, Russia delivered 80, and the major West Europeans, collectively, delivered 120. China also delivered 140 surface-to-surface missiles, while all other non-European suppliers collectively delivered 130. These data further indicate that a number of suppliers, other than the dominant ones, delivered large quantities of weapons such as artillery pieces and armored vehicles to the Near East from 1990-1993. China delivered 360 artillery pieces, European suppliers--excluding the four major West Europeans--delivered 720 artillery pieces and 270 APCs and armored cars, as well as 270 tanks and self-propelled guns. All other non-European suppliers collectively delivered 150 artillery pieces and 100 APCs and armored cars.

#### **DEFINITION OF THE THIRD WORLD AND REGIONS**

The Third World category includes all countries <u>except</u> the United States, Russia, the former Soviet Union, Europe, Canada, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand. A listing of countries located in the regions defined for purpose of this analysis--Asia, Near East, Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa--is provided at the end of the report.

#### UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL ARMS EXPORTS EXCLUDED

U.S. <u>commercial</u> sales and deliveries data are <u>excluded</u>. This is done because the data maintained on U.S. commercial sales agreements and deliveries are significantly incomplete and are less precise than those for the U.S. Foreign Military Sales (FMS) program, which accounts for the overwhelming portion of U.S. conventional arms transfer agreements and deliveries. There are no <u>commercial agreement</u> data comparable to that for the FMS program maintained on an annual basis. Annual <u>commercial deliveries</u> data are obtained from shipper's export documents and completed licenses returned from ports of exit by the U.S. Customs Service to the Office of Defense Trade Controls (PM/DTC) of the State Department, which makes the final compilation. This approach to obtaining commercial deliveries data is less systematic than that taken by the Department of Defense for government-to-government transactions.

The annual <u>rank</u> of the United States in the period from 1986-1993 has possibly been affected once--in 1991--by exclusion of the existing data on U.S. commercial arms <u>deliveries</u> to the Third World. Since the total values of all U.S. deliveries are understated somewhat by exclusion of commercial arms deliveries figures, those commercial data are provided here to complete this portion of the available record. The values of U.S. commercial arms deliveries to the Third World for <u>fiscal</u> years 1986-1993, according to the State Department, were as follows:

FY 1986	\$1,523,605
FY 1987	\$2,698,316
FY 1988	\$1,990,913
FY 1989	\$2,599,205
FY 1990	\$1,749,002
FY 1991	\$1,596,629
FY 1992	\$537,016
FY 1993	\$494,354

(In thousands of current U.S. dollars)

#### SUMMARY OF DATA TRENDS, 1986-1993

Tables 1 through 1J (pages 49-59) present data on arms transfer agreements with Third World nations by major suppliers from 1986-1993. These data show the most recent trends in arms contract activity by major suppliers. <u>Delivery</u> data, which reflect implementation of sales decisions taken earlier, are shown in Tables 2 through 2J (pages 60-70). To use these data regarding agreements for purposes other than assessing general trends in seller/buyer activity is to risk drawing conclusions that can be readily invalidated by future events--precise values and comparisons, for example, may change due to cancellations of major arms transfer agreements. Both data sets reflect the comparative order of magnitude of arms transactions by arms suppliers with Third World buyers expressed in dollar terms.

What follows is a detailed summary of data trends from the tables in the report. The summary statements also reference tables and/or charts pertinent to the point(s) noted.

#### **TOTAL THIRD WORLD ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENT VALUES**

Table 1 shows the annual <u>current</u> dollar values of arms transfer agreements with the Third World. Since these figures do not allow for the effects of inflation, they are, by themselves, of somewhat limited use. They provide, however, the data from which tables 1A (constant dollars) and 1B (supplier percentages) are derived. Some of the more notable facts reflected by these data are summarized below.

- The value of all arms transfer agreements with the Third World in 1993 was \$20.4 billion. This was by far the lowest yearly total, in both nominal and real terms, for arms transfer agreements with the Third World for any of the years during the 1986-1993 period (tables 1 and 1A) (chart 1).
- In 1993, the total value, in real terms, of United States arms transfer agreements with the Third World increased slightly from the previous year, rising from \$14.6 billion in 1992 to \$14.8 billion in 1993. For the fourth year in a row, the United States ranked first by a substantial margin in arms transfer agreements with the Third World (tables 1A and 1B) (chart 4).
- Although the total value of U.S. arms transfer agreements with the Third World increased slightly from 1992 to 1993, the U.S. share of all such agreements increased dramatically from 55.8% in 1992, to 72.6% in 1993 (tables 1A and 1B) (charts 1, 2).

CHART 1

## **ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993** UNITED STATES, MAJOR W. EUROPEAN, RUSSIA, ALL OTHERS COMPARED

(billions of constant 1993 dollars and % of total agreements)



## ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD



 (France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy)

#### CHART 3

### ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993 U.S., RUSSIA, AND MAJOR W. EUROPEAN



## ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993: BY MAJOR SUPPLIER

CHART 4









- The total value of Russia's agreements with the Third World rose slightly from \$1.6 billion in 1992, to \$1.8 billion in 1993. Russia's share of all Third World arms transfer agreements increased slightly as well, rising from 5.9% in 1992, to 8.8% in 1993 (in constant 1993 dollars) (tables 1A and 1B) (chart 2).
- The four major West European suppliers, as a group, (France, United Kingdom, Germany and Italy) registered a notable decline in their collective share of all Third World arms transfer agreements between 1992 and 1993. This group's share fell from 28.8% in 1992 to 12.7% in 1993. The collective value of this group's arms transfer agreements with the Third World in 1993 was \$2.6 billion compared with a total of \$7.5 billion in 1992 (in constant 1993 dollars) (tables 1A and 1B) (charts 1, 2, 3 and 4).
- In 1993 the United States ranked first in Third World arms transfer agreements at \$14.8 billion. The United Kingdom ranked second at \$1.8 billion, while Russia ranked third at \$1.8 billion (tables 1A, 1B and 1G) (charts 1 and 2).

#### **REGIONAL ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENT VALUES, 1986-1993**

Table 1C gives the values of arms transfer agreements between suppliers and individual regions of the Third World for the periods 1986-1989 and 1990-1993. These values are expressed in <u>current</u> U.S. dollars.<sup>\*\*</sup> Table 1D, derived from table 1C, gives the percentage distribution of each supplier's agreement values within the regions for the two time periods. Table 1E, also derived from table 1C, illustrates what percentage share of each Third World region's total arms transfer agreements was held by specific suppliers during the years 1986-1989 and 1990-1993. Among the facts reflected in these tables are the following:

#### Near East

- The Near East is the largest Third World arms market. In 1986-1989 it accounted for 56.1% of the total value of all Third World arms transfer agreements. During 1990-1993, the region accounted for 55.8% of all such agreements (tables 1C and 1D).
- The United States has dominated arms transfer agreements with the Near East during the 1990-1993 time period with 68% of their total value. By contrast, in 1986-1989, Russia and the United Kingdom collectively accounted for 46% of agreements, while the United States held a 16.9% (table 1E).

<sup>\*\*</sup>Because regional data are composed of four-year aggregate dollar totals, they must be expressed in <u>current</u> dollar terms.



- For the period 1986-1989, the United States concluded 61.4% of its Third World arms transfer agreements with the Near East. In 1990-1993, the U.S. concluded 72.3% of its arms agreements with this region (table 1D).
- For the period 1986-1989, the four major West European suppliers collectively made 81.5% of their arms transfer agreements with the Near East. In 1990-1993, the major West Europeans made 41.7% of their arms agreements with the Near East (table 1D).
- For the period 1986-1989, China concluded 76.4% of its Third World arms transfer agreements with nations in the Near East. For the more recent period, 1990-1993, China concluded 45.7% of its Third World arms transfer agreements with nations in the Near East (table 1D).
- For the period 1986-1989, Russia concluded 30.6% of its Third World arms transfer agreements with the Near East region. For the period 1990-1993, Russia concluded 25.3% of its Third World arms transfer agreements with the Near East region (table 1D).
- In the earlier period (1986-1989), the United Kingdom ranked first in arms transfer agreements with the Near East with 23.6%. Russia ranked second with 22%. The United States ranked third with 16.9%. The major West European suppliers, as a group, made 32.3% of this region's agreements in 1986-1989. In the later period (1990-1993), the United States ranked first in Near East agreements with 68%. Russia ranked second with 8.4%. France ranked third with 5.3%. The major West European suppliers, as a group, made 13.2% of this region's agreements in 1990-1993 table 1E) (chart 5).

#### CHART 6

## ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH ASIA (SUPPLIER PERCENTAGE OF VALUE)



 (France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy)

#### Asia

- Asia is the second largest Third World arms market. In the earlier period (1986-1989), Russia ranked first in arms transfer agreements with Asia with 60.2%. This region includes some of Russia's traditionally largest arms clients such as India, Afghanistan and Vietnam. The United States ranked second with 18.9%. The major West European suppliers, as a group, made 9.2% of this region's agreements in 1986-1989. In the later period (1990-1993), the United States ranked first in Asian agreements with 34.9% on the strength of major aircraft sales to Taiwan and South Korea. Russia ranked a close second with 30%. France ranked third with 16%, primarily due to a major aircraft sale to Taiwan. The major West European suppliers, as a group, made 24.9% of this region's agreements in 1990-1993 (table 1E).
- Asia was the only region that showed an increase in its share of arms transfer agreements from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993 (increasing to 38.1% from 26.1%) (table 1D).
- Asia was an arms market dominated by Russia in the 1986-1989 period with 60.2% of all arms transfer agreements. However, in the most recent period, 1990-1993, the United States and Russia collectively dominate, with the United States holding 34.9% of Asian agreements and Russia 30% (table 1E).

## ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH LATIN AMERICA (SUPPLIER PERCENTAGE OF VALUE)

CHART 7



.

\* (France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy)
#### Latin America

In the earlier period (1986-1989), Russia ranked first in arms transfer agreements with Latin America with 63.7%; the greatest portion of which were with Cuba. The United States ranked second with 10.2%. The major West European suppliers, as a group, made 13.8% of this region's agreements in 1986-1989. In the later period (1990-1993), Russia ranked first in Latin American agreements with 46.1%. The United States ranked second with 27.6%. The major West European suppliers, as a group, made 15.4% of this region's agreements in 1990-1993. Latin America also registered a major decline in the total value of its arms transfer agreements from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993, dropping from \$13 billion in the earlier period to \$4.6 billion in the latter. This decline is attributable to termination of the Soviet military aid program to Cuba, and the end of the Cold War related conflict in Nicaragua (tables 1C and 1E) (chart 6).

#### Africa (sub-Saharan)

In the earlier period (1986-1989), Russia ranked an overwhelming first in agreements with Africa (sub-Saharan) with 73.9%. The major West European suppliers, as a group, made 6% of this region's agreements in 1986-1989. The United States made 2.1%. In the later period (1990-1993), Russia ranked first, although its share of sub-Saharan African agreements notably declined to 29.5%. The United States ranked second with 6.9%. The major West European suppliers, as a group, made 9.8% of this region's agreements in 1990-1993. Sub-saharan Africa was the largest regional market in the Third World for all other non-European suppliers more recently. This group of suppliers collectively made 34.4% of this region's agreements in 1990-1993. Africa (sub-Saharan) also registered a major decline in the total value of its arms transfer agreements from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993, dropping from \$15 billion in the earlier period to \$2 billion in the latter. This decline reflects the ending of major Cold War related conflicts in this region (tables 1C and 1E).

#### ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993: LEADING SUPPLIERS COMPARED

Table 1F gives the values of arms transfer agreements with the Third World from 1986-1993 by the Third World's top eleven suppliers. The table ranks these suppliers on the basis of the total <u>current</u> dollar values of their respective agreements with the Third World for each of three periods--1986-1989, 1990-1993 and 1986-1993. Among the facts reflected in this table are the following:

- The United States ranked first among all suppliers to the Third World in the value of arms transfer agreements from 1990-1993, and a close second for the entire period from 1986-1993.
- Russia ranked second among all suppliers to the Third World in the value of arms transfer agreements from 1990-1993, and first from 1986-1993.
- The United Kingdom ranked fourth among all suppliers to the Third World in the value of arms transfer agreements from 1990-1993, and third from 1986-1993.
- France ranked third among all suppliers to the Third World in the value of arms transfer agreements from 1990-1993, and fourth from 1986-1993.
- China ranked fifth among all suppliers to the Third World in the value of arms transfer agreements from 1990-1993, and fifth from 1986-1993.
- Of the top eleven arms suppliers to the Third World from 1986-1993, only the United States registered a substantial <u>increase</u> in the value of arms transfer agreements with the Third World from the period 1986-1989 to the period 1990-1993 (The United States increased 133.8%). France and Germany registered increases of 13.5% and 12% respectively.
- Seven of the top eleven arms suppliers to the Third World from 1986-1993 registered significant <u>decreases</u> in the value of their arms transfer agreements from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993. Of the dominant arms suppliers, the United Kingdom registered the largest <u>percentage decline</u> from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993 at 75.8%, while Russia fell 68.4%. China declined 67.9%. Of the lesser suppliers, Poland registered a 88.9% decline, North Korea a 72.7% decline and Spain a 45% decline, between the same two time periods.

#### ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD IN 1993: LEADING SUPPLIERS COMPARED

Table 1G ranks and gives the values of 1993 arms transfer agreements with the Third World by the top ten suppliers. Among the facts reflected in this table are the following:

• The United States, the United Kingdom, and Russia, the top three arms suppliers to the Third World in 1993--ranked by the value of their arms transfer agreements--collectively made agreements in 1993 valued at \$18.4 billion, 90.2% of all arms transfer agreements made with the Third World by all suppliers.

- In 1993, the United States was by far the leader in arms transfer agreements with the Third World, making \$14.8 billion in such agreements, or 72.6% of all arms transfer agreements.
- The United Kingdom ranked second and Russia third in arms transfer agreements with the Third World in 1993, each making about \$1.8 billion in such agreements.
- China ranked a distant sixth in arms transfer agreements with the Third World in 1993, making only \$300 million in such agreements, while France ranked a distant eighth at \$200 million.

#### ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH NEAR EAST 1986-1993: SUPPLIERS AND RECIPIENTS

Table 1H gives the values of arms transfer agreements with the Near East nations by suppliers or categories of suppliers for the periods 1986-1989, 1990-1993 and 1986-1993. These values are expressed in <u>current</u> U.S. dollars. They are a subset of the data contained in table 1 and table 1C. Among the facts reflected by this table are the following:

- For the most recent period, 1990-1993, the principal arms purchasers of the United States in the Near East region, based on the value of agreements, were: Saudi Arabia (\$30.4 billion), Egypt (\$4.4 billion), Kuwait (\$3.8 billion) and Israel (\$1.1 billion). The principal arms purchasers of Russia were: Iran (\$3.7 billion), Syria (\$500 million), and the United Arab Emirates (\$400 million). The principal arms purchaser of China was Iran (\$1.1 billion). The principal arms purchasers of the four major West European suppliers, as a group, were: Saudi Arabia (\$2.7 billion), Israel (\$1.2 billion), Oman (\$900 million). The principal arms purchasers of all other European suppliers collectively were: Saudi Arabia (\$1.3 billion) and Syria (\$400 million). The principal purchasers of all other suppliers, as a group, were Iraq (\$800 million) and Iran (\$700 million) (in current dollars).
- For the period from 1990-1993, Saudi Arabia made \$35.1 billion in arms transfer agreements. Its principal suppliers were: the United States (\$30.4 billion) and the four major West European suppliers, as a group, (\$2.7 billion). Iran made \$5.7 billion in arms transfer agreements. Its principal suppliers were Russia (\$3.7 billion), and China (\$1.1 billion). Kuwait made \$5.7 billion in arms transfer agreements. Its principal suppliers were the United States (\$3.8 billion) and the major West Europeans (\$1.9 billion) Egypt made \$4.6 billion in arms transfer agreements. Its major supplier was the United States (\$4.4 billion) (in current dollars).

- The value of arms transfer agreements by Russia to major clients in the Near East fell dramatically from the 1986-1989 period to the 1990-1993 period. The largest percentage declines involved arms agreements with Libya, falling from \$3 billion to nil, Iraq, falling from \$6.1 billion to \$200 million (-96.7%) and Syria, falling from \$5.2 billion to \$500 million (-90.4%) (in <u>current</u> dollars).
- The value of arms transfer agreements between Russia and Iran increased dramatically during the period from 1986-1989 and the 1990-1993 period, rising from nil in the earlier period to \$3.7 billion in the later period (in <u>current</u> dollars). In the most recent period (1990-1993), Russia was Iran's leading arms supplier, a position held by China in the 1986-1989 period.
- The value of arms sales agreements by the United States with Saudi Arabia and with Kuwait rose dramatically from the 1986-1989 period to the 1990-1993 period. Agreements with Saudi Arabia rose from \$4.1 billion in the earlier period to \$30.4 billion in the later period, over a 641% increase. Saudi Arabia made 86.6% of its arms transfer agreements with the United States during 1990-1993. Agreements with Kuwait rose from \$2.2 billion in the earlier period to \$3.8 billion in the later period (a 72.7% increase)(in <u>current</u> dollars). These increases are generally attributable to the Persian Gulf crisis following Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in August 1990.

## ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN (SUPPLIER PERCENTAGE OF VALUE)

CHART 8



 (France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy)

## ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH SAUDI ARABIA (SUPPLIER PERCENTAGE OF VALUE)

CHART 9

. .



\* (France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy)

#### **CRS-34**

#### ARMS TRANSFERS TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993: AGREEMENTS WITH LEADING RECIPIENTS

Table 1I gives the values of arms transfer agreements made by the top ten recipients of arms in the Third World from 1986-1993 with all suppliers collectively. The table ranks these recipients on the basis of the total <u>current</u> dollar values of their respective agreements with all suppliers for each of three periods--1986-1989, 1990-1993 and 1986-1993. Among the facts reflected in this table are the following:

- Saudi Arabia has been, by a wide margin, the leading Third World arms purchaser from 1986-1993, making arms transfer <u>agreements</u> totaling \$67.7 billion during these years (in <u>current</u> dollars). In both the 1986-1989 and 1990-1993 periods, the value of its arms transfer agreements was consistently high (\$32.6 billion in 1986-1989 and \$35.1 billion in 1990-1993). The total value of all Third World arms transfer agreements from 1986-1993 was \$266.5 billion (in <u>current</u> dollars). Thus, Saudi Arabia alone was responsible for over one-fourth (25.4%) of all Third World arms transfer agreements during these eight years. In the most recent period--1990-1993--Saudi Arabia alone accounted for nearly one-third (32.4%) of all Third World arms transfer agreements (\$35.1 billion out of \$108.3 billion). Saudi Arabia ranked first among all Third World recipients in the value of arms transfer agreements in 1993, concluding \$9.6 billion in such agreements (in <u>current</u> dollars) (tables 1, 11 and 1J)(chart 9).
- Eight of the ten leading Third World arms recipients during the 1986-1993 period registered declines in the value of their arms transfer <u>agreements</u> from the 1986-1989 period to the 1990-1993 period. Six of these were traditional customers of Russia. Iraq, which purchased \$16.3 billion in 1986-1989, bought only \$1.3 billion in the next four years, reflecting the cutoff of its arms supplies after its invasion of Kuwait in August 1990; Angola declined 87.3%, Vietnam 80.6%, India 70.2%, Cuba 61.2% and Afghanistan 38.1%. These figures reflect the diminished financial support for these countries by Russia in the post-Cold War era. Two major U.S. customers registered increases in the values of their arms transfer agreements from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993. Taiwan rose by a very dramatic amount (527%) due to a major aircraft purchase in 1992, and Saudi Arabia rose 7.7%. Egypt fell 25.8% (tables 1H and 1I).
- Despite some large decreases in the values of the arms transfer <u>agreements</u> of specific nations from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993, the top ten Third World recipient nations in both time periods still accounted for the major portion of the total Third World arms market. During 1986-1989 the top ten collectively accounted for 67.3% of <u>all</u> Third World arms transfer agreements. During 1990-1993 the top ten collectively accounted for 76.9% of all such agreements. Arms transfer <u>agreements</u> with the top ten Third World recipients, as a group,

totaled \$18.1 billion in 1993 or 88.6% of all arms transfer agreements with the Third World in that year (tables 1, 1I and 1J). This reflects a growing concentration of total Third World arms purchases by relatively few countries. Between 1986-1993 the top ten nations collectively made 65.8% of all arms transfer agreements in the Third World (\$175.4 billion out of \$266.5 billion)(in <u>current</u> dollars)(tables 1 and 1I).

#### ARMS TRANSFERS TO THE THIRD WORLD IN 1993: AGREEMENTS WITH LEADING RECIPIENTS

Table 1J names the top ten Third World recipients of arms transfer agreements in 1993. The table ranks these recipients on the basis of the total <u>current</u> dollar values of their respective agreements with <u>all</u> suppliers in 1993. Among the facts reflected in this table are the following:

- Half of the top ten Third World recipients of arms transfer agreements in 1993 were in the Near East. The other half were in Asia.
- Saudi Arabia ranked first among all Third World recipients in the value of arms transfer agreements in 1993, concluding \$9.6 billion in such agreements. The United States was its major supplier, primarily due to a \$9 billion agreement for 72 F-15 fighter aircraft.
- Arms transfer agreements with the top ten Third World recipients, as a group, in 1993 totaled \$18.1 billion or 88.6% of all arms transfer agreements with the Third World.

#### TOTAL THIRD WORLD ARMS DELIVERY VALUES

Table 2 shows the annual <u>current</u> dollar values of arms <u>deliveries</u> (items actually transferred) to Third World nations by major suppliers from 1986-1993. The utility of these particular data is that they reflect transfers that have occurred. They provide the data from which tables 2A (constant dollars) and 2B (supplier percentages) are derived. Some of the more notable facts illustrated by these data are summarized below.

• In 1993, the value of all arms deliveries to the Third World (roughly \$15 billion) was the lowest of any year during the period from 1986-1993. This is the sixth year in a row when arms deliveries to the Third World declined from the previous year's total. This pattern reflects the impact of the end of the Iran-Iraq war and the winding down of other major regional conflicts in the Third World as well as the end of the Cold War (table 2A) (charts 10 and 11).

- The U.S. share of all deliveries in 1993 was 51.3%, up from 45.3% in 1992. Russia's share of all arms deliveries to the Third World in 1993 was 10%, down from about 13% in 1992. In 1993, the United States, for only the second time in the 1986-1993 period, ranked first in the value of arms deliveries to the Third World (table 2B).
- The total value of all arms deliveries by all suppliers to the Third World from 1990-1993 (\$90.1 billion) was substantially less than the value of arms deliveries by all suppliers to the Third World from 1986-1989 (\$185.5 billion)(in constant 1993 dollars), a decline of 51.4% (table 2A).
- During the years 1986-1993, arms deliveries to the Third World comprised 73.8% of all arms deliveries worldwide. In 1993, the percentage of arms deliveries to the Third World was 66.6% of all arms deliveries worldwide (tables 2A and 9A).

.

CHART 10

### ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993 UNITED STATES, MAJOR W. EUROPEAN, RUSSIA, ALL OTHERS COMPARED

(billions of constant 1993 dollars and % of total deliveries)





#### **REGIONAL ARMS DELIVERY VALUES, 1986-1993**

Table 2C gives the values of arms deliveries between suppliers and individual regions of the Third World for the periods 1986-1989, and 1990-1993. These values are expressed in <u>current</u> U.S. dollars. Table 2D, derived from table 2C, gives the percentage distribution of each supplier's delivery values within the regions for the two time periods. Table 2E, also derived from table 2C, illustrates what percentage share of each Third World region's total arms delivery values was held by specific suppliers during the years 1986-1989 and 1990-1993. Among the facts reflected in these tables are the following:

#### **Near East**

- The Near East region has historically been dominant in the value of arms deliveries received by the Third World. In 1986-1989, it accounted for 53.2% of the total value of all Third World arms deliveries. During 1990-1993, the Near East region accounted for 64.4% of all such deliveries (tables 2C and 2D).
- The Near East region ranked first in the value of arms deliveries from most suppliers in both time periods (table 2D).
- For the period 1986-1989, the United States made 67.8% of its Third World arms deliveries to the Near East region. In 1990-1993, the U.S. made 74.4% of such arms deliveries to the Near East region (table 2D).
- For the period 1986-1989, the United Kingdom made 90.2% of its Third World deliveries to the Near East region. In 1990-1993, the United Kingdom made 94% of such deliveries to the Near East region (table 2D).
- For the period 1986-1989, 86.4% of China's arms deliveries to the Third World were to nations in the Near East region. In the more recent period, 1990-1993, 51.1% of China's Third World arms deliveries were to nations of this region (table 2D).
- For the period 1986-1989, Russia made 33% of its Third World arms deliveries to the Near East region. In 1990-1993, Russia made 34.8% of such arms deliveries to the Near East (table 2D).
- In the earlier period (1986-1989), Russia ranked first in the value of arms deliveries to the Near East with 29.6%. The United States ranked second with 17.4%. The United Kingdom ranked third with 15.8%. The major West European suppliers, as a group, held 24% of this region's delivery values in 1986-1989. In the later period (1990-1993), the United States ranked first in Near East delivery values with 36.2%. The United Kingdom ranked second with 25.4%. Russia ranked third with 14.7%. The major West European

suppliers, as a group, held 37.1% of this region's delivery values in 1990-1993 (table 2E).

Asia

- The Asia region ranked second in the value of arms deliveries from most suppliers in both time periods. For the period 1990-1993, Russia made 50.6% of its Third World deliveries to the Asia region. Germany made 29.4%, while the United States made 21.1% (Table 2D).
- In the period from 1986-1989, Russia ranked first in the value of arms deliveries to Asia with 67.9%. The United States ranked second with 11.8%. The major West European suppliers, as a group, held 7.4% of this region's delivery values in 1986-1989. In the later period (1990-1993), Russia ranked first in Asian delivery values with 52.5%. The United States ranked second with 25.2%. China ranked third with 8.5%. The major West European suppliers, as a group, held 8.9% of this region's delivery values in 1990-1993 (table 2E).

#### Latin America

• In the earlier period (1986-1989), Russia ranked first in the value of arms deliveries to Latin America with 64.2%. The United States ranked second with 8.8%. The major West European suppliers, as a group, held 14.7% of this region's delivery values in 1986-1989. In the later period (1990-1993), Russia ranked first in Latin American delivery values with 42.6%. The United States ranked second with 20.6%. The major West European suppliers, as a group, held 23.2% of this region's delivery values in 1990-1993 (table 2E).

#### Africa (sub-Saharan)

• In the earlier period (1986-1989), Russia ranked an overwhelming first in the value of arms deliveries to Africa (sub-Saharan) with 73.6%. The major West European suppliers, as a group, held 8.2% of this region's delivery values in 1986-1989. The United States made 2.6% of Africa (sub-Saharan) deliveries. In the later period (1990-1993), Russia ranked first in sub-Saharan Africa delivery values with 42%. China ranked second with 14%. The other non-European suppliers as a group collectively held 14% of this region's delivery values in 1990-1993. The major West European suppliers, as a group, held 14% The United States made 5.6% (table 2E).

#### ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993: LEADING SUPPLIERS COMPARED

Table 2F gives the values of arms deliveries to the Third World from 1986-1993 by the Third World's top eleven suppliers. The table ranks these suppliers on the basis of the total <u>current</u> dollar values of their respective deliveries to the Third World for each of three periods--1986-1989, 1990-1993, and 1986-1993. Among the facts reflected in this table are the following:

- Eight of the eleven leading suppliers of arms to the Third World during 1986-1993 registered moderate to substantial declines in the values of their deliveries from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993 (in <u>current</u> dollars). The United States, the United Kingdom and Germany registered increases. If expressed in constant dollars, the total for the United Kingdom declined.
- Russia was the leading supplier of arms to the Third World from 1986-1993. The value of its deliveries to the Third World fell from \$73.4 billion in 1986-1989 to \$23.3 billion in 1990-1993, a 68.3% decrease (in <u>current</u> dollars). The United States ranked second during 1986-1993. The value of its arms deliveries to the Third World increased from \$21 billion in 1986-1989 to \$26.8 billion in 1990-1993 (in <u>current</u> dollars).
- The United Kingdom, the third leading supplier, registered only a slight increase in the value of its deliveries to the Third World, rising from \$14.3 billion in 1986-1989 to \$14.9 billion in 1990-1993 (in current dollars).
- Of the leading arms suppliers to the Third World from 1986-1993, Poland registered the greatest <u>percentage decline</u> (90%) in the value of its arms deliveries to the Third World from the period 1986-1989 to the period 1990-1993. Italy registered the second greatest <u>percentage declines</u> (75%) in the value of its arms deliveries to the Third World between the two time periods.

#### ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD IN 1993: LEADING SUPPLIERS COMPARED

Table 2G gives the values of arms deliveries to the Third World in 1993 by the top eight suppliers. The table ranks these suppliers on the basis of the total dollar values of their respective deliveries to the Third World in 1993. Among the facts reflected in this table are the following:

• The top three suppliers of arms to the Third World in 1993 collectively delivered nearly \$12.8 billion in arms to the Third World in 1993, 85.3% of all arms deliveries made to the Third World by all suppliers.

- In 1993, the United States ranked first in the value of arms deliveries to the Third World, making \$7.7 billion in such deliveries. This is the second time the United States has led in such deliveries during the 1986-1993 period (with the possible exception of 1991 if commercial arms deliveries during <u>fiscal</u> year 1991 are included in U.S. totals).
- The United Kingdom ranked second in arms deliveries to the Third World in 1993, making \$3.6 billion in such deliveries.
- Russia ranked a distant third in arms deliveries to the Third World in 1993, making \$1.5 billion in such deliveries. This is the sixth year in a row that Russian arms deliveries have declined from the previous year.

#### ARMS DELIVERIES TO NEAR EAST, 1986-1993: SUPPLIERS AND RECIPIENTS

Table 2H gives the values of arms delivered to Near East nations by suppliers or categories of suppliers for the periods 1986-1989, 1990-1993 and 1986-1993. These values are expressed in <u>current</u> U.S. dollars. They are a subset of the data contained in table 2 and table 2C. Among the facts reflected by this table are the following:

- For the most recent period, 1990-1993, the principal arms recipients of the United States in the Near East region, based on the value of their arms deliveries were: Saudi Arabia (\$10.8 billion), Egypt (\$3.5 billion), Israel (\$2 billion) and Kuwait \$1.9 billion). The principal arms recipients of Russia were Iran (\$3.4 billion), Syria (\$1.9 billion), Yemen (\$800 million) and Libya (\$700 million). The principal arms recipients of China were: Iran (\$1.3 billion) and Saudi Arabia (\$800 million). The principal arms recipients of the four major West European suppliers, as a group, were: Saudi Arabia (\$16 billion), Iraq (\$2.1 billion) and U.A.E. (\$1.5 billion). The principal arms recipient of all other European suppliers collectively was: Saudi Arabia (\$1.8 billion). The principal arms recipients of all other suppliers, as a group, were: Iran (\$400 million) and U.A.E. (\$300 million)(in <u>current</u> dollars).
- For the period from 1990-1993, Saudi Arabia received \$29.8 billion in arms deliveries. Its principal suppliers were the four major West Europeans, as a group, (\$16 billion) and the United States (\$10.8 billion). Iran received \$5.3 billion in arms deliveries. Its principal suppliers were Russia (\$3.4 billion), and China (\$1.3 billion); Egypt received \$3.9 billion in arms deliveries. Its principal supplier was the United States (\$3.5 billion); Iraq received \$2.9 billion in arms deliveries. Its principal suppliers were: the four major West Europeans collectively (\$2.1 billion) and Russia (\$400 million);

#### CRS-43

U.A.E. received \$2.6 billion in arms deliveries. Its principal suppliers were the four major West Europeans collectively (\$1.5 billion) and the United States (\$600 million). Kuwait received \$2.4 billion in arms deliveries. The United States was its principal supplier. Syria received \$2.2 billion in arms deliveries. Its principal supplier was Russia (\$1.9 billion)(in <u>current</u> dollars).

- The value of arms deliveries by most suppliers to most of their clients in the Near East region fell notably from the 1986-1989 period to the 1990-1993 period. An especially dramatic decline in the value of arms deliveries by Russia to Iraq occurred, falling from \$10.9 billion to \$400 million (-96%)(in <u>current</u> dollars).
- The value of arms deliveries by Russia to Iran increased dramatically during the period from 1986-1989 and the 1990-1993 period, rising from nil in the earlier period to \$3.4 billion in the later period. In the most recent period (1990-1993), Russia ranked first in the value of arms deliveries to Iran. China ranked second with \$1.3 billion in deliveries (in <u>current</u> dollars).

## ARMS DELIVERIES TO IRAN (SUPPLIER PERCENTAGE OF VALUE)

CHART 12



 \* (France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy)

#### CHART 13

### ARMS DELIVERIES TO SAUDI ARABIA (SUPPLIER PERCENTAGE OF VALUE)



• The group of all other European suppliers registered a massive decline in the total value of its arms deliveries to Iran from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993, falling from \$2.9 billion in the earlier period to \$100 million in 1990-1993.

#### ARMS TRANSFERS TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993: DELIVERIES TO THE LEADING RECIPIENTS

Table 2I gives the values of arms deliveries made to the top ten recipients of arms in the Third World from 1986-1993 by all suppliers collectively. The table ranks these recipients on the basis of the total <u>current</u> dollar values of their respective deliveries from all suppliers for each of three periods--1986-1989, 1990-1993 and 1986-1993. Among the facts reflected in this table are the following:

- Saudi Arabia and Iraq, were, by a wide margin, the top two Third World arms recipients from 1986-1993, receiving deliveries valued at \$55.6 billion and \$22.7 billion, respectively, during these years (in <u>current</u> dollars). The total value of all Third World arms deliveries from 1986-1993 was \$238.6 billion (in <u>current</u> dollars) (see table 2). Thus, Saudi Arabia and Iraq were responsible for 23.3% and 9.5%, respectively, of all Third World arms deliveries during the 1986-1993 time period--nearly one-third of the total.
- Nine of the top ten Third World arms recipients registered declines in the values of their arms deliveries from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993. Nearly all of these declines were substantial and some were enormous. Angola fell 90.3%, from \$7.2 billion to \$700 million; Iraq fell 85.4%, from \$19.8 billion to \$2.9 billion; Vietnam fell 80.1%, from \$6.7 billion to \$1.3 billion; India fell 77.2% from \$13.6 billion to \$3.1 billion. Cuba fell 66.7% from \$6.3 billion to \$2.1 billion; Syria fell 59.3% from \$5.4 billion to \$2.2 billion; Afghanistan fell 40.7% from \$9.1 billion to \$5.4 billion; Iran fell 38.4% from \$8.6 billion to \$5.3 billion; (in <u>current</u> dollars).
- The one country that registered an increase in the value of arms delivered to it was to Saudi Arabia (15.5%) from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993, a jump from \$25.8 billion to \$29.8 billion (in <u>current</u> dollars).

#### ARMS TRANSFERS TO THE THIRD WORLD IN 1993: DELIVERIES TO THE LEADING RECIPIENTS

Table 2J gives the names of the top ten Third World recipients of arms <u>delivered</u> in 1993. The table ranks these recipients on the basis of the total <u>current</u> dollar values of their respective deliveries from <u>all</u> suppliers in 1993. Among the facts reflected in this table are the following:

- Saudi Arabia was by far the leading recipient of arms deliveries in the Third World in 1993, receiving \$6.4 billion in such deliveries. Saudi Arabia alone received 42.7% of the total value of all arms deliveries to the Third World in 1993 (tables 2 and 2J).
- Arms deliveries to the top ten Third World recipients, as a group, constituted \$10.2 billion, or 88.8% of all arms deliveries to the Third World in 1993. Six of the top ten recipients were in the Near East region (tables 2 and 2J)
- Some Third World nations, other than Saudi Arabia, received significant arms deliveries in 1993. Egypt received \$1.4 billion. Iran and Israel each received \$1 billion in arms deliveries.

#### Table 1

#### ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993\*

	(in millions of current U.S. dollars)								
		TOTAL							TOTAL
	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1986-1993
United States	3,312	5,048	8,652	7,396	14,580	13,530	14,116	14,835	81,469
Russia**	16,200	22,000	13,800	11,700	11,100	5,700	1,500	1,800	83,800
France	1,000	2,800	1,200	3,900	3,000	2,900	4,000	200	19,000
United Kingdom	800	500	20,600	800	1,300	300	2,100	1,800	28,200
China	1,800	4,700	2,500	1,600	2,300	500	300	300	14,000
Germany	500	1,400	200	400	400	1,100	700	600	5,300
Italy	600	200	200	300	200	100	500	0	2,100
All Other European	7,300	2,500	1,900	3,100	1,300	1,400	900	200	18,600
All Others	2,300	2,500	2,800	1,700	1,800	1,000	1,200	700	14,000
TOTAL	33,812	41,648	51,852	30,896	35,980	26,530	25,316	20,435	266,469
Dollar inflation index (1993=1.00)***	0.7883	0.8135	0.8434	0.8771	0.9034	0.9484	0.9677	1	

\*Third World category excludes the U.S., Russia, former U.S.S.R., Europe, Canada, Japan, Australia and New Zealand. All data are for the calendar year given except for U.S. MAP (Military Assistance Program) and IMET (International Military Education and Training) data which are included for the particular fiscal year. All amounts given include the values of weapons, spare parts, construction, all associated services, military assistance

and training programs. Statistics for foreign countries are based upon estimated selling prices. U.S. commercial sales contract values are excluded.

All foreign data are rounded to the nearest \$100 million.

\*\*Prior to 1992 reflects data for the former Soviet Union.

\*\*\*Based on Department of Defense Price Deflator

.

#### Table 1A

#### ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993 (in millions of constant 1993 U.S. dollars)

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	TOTAL 1986-1993
United States	4,201	6,205	10,258	8,432	16,139	14,266	14,587	14,835	88,925
Russia	20,551	27,044	16,362	13,339	12,287	6,010	1,550	1,800	98,943
France	1,269	3,442	1,423	4,446	3,321	3,058	4,134	200	21,292
United Kingdom	1,015	615	24,425	912	1,439	316	2,170	1,800	32,692
China	2,283	5,778	2,964	1,824	2,546	527	310	300	16,532
Germany	634	1,721	237	456	443	1,160	723	600	5,974
Italy	761	246	237	342	221	105	517	0	2,430
All Other European	9,260	3,073	2,253	3,534	1,439	1,476	930	200	22,166
All Others	2,918	3,073	3,320	1,938	1,992	1,054	1,240	700	16,236
TOTAL	42,892	51,196	61,480	35,225	39,827	27,973	26,161	20,435	305,190

#### Table 1B

#### ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE THIRD WORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993

(expressed as a percent of total, by year)

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1 <b>993</b>
United States	9.80%	12.12%	16.69%	23.94%	40.52%	51.00%	55.76%	72.60%
Russia	47.91%	52.82%	26.61%	37.87%	30.85%	21.49%	5.93%	8.81%
France	2.96%	6.72%	2.31%	12.62%	8.34%	10.93%	15.80%	0.98%
United Kingdom	2.37%	1.20%	39.73%	2.59%	3.61%	1.13%	8.30%	8.81%
China	5.32%	11.29%	4.82%	5.18%	6.39%	1.88%	1.19%	1.47%
Germany	1.48%	3.36%	0.39%	1.29%	1.11%	4.15%	2.77%	2.94%
Italy	1.77%	0.48%	0.39%	0.97%	0.56%	0.38%	1 <b>.98%</b>	0.00%
All Other European	21.59%	6.00%	3.66%	10.03%	3.61%	5.28%	3.56%	0.98%
All Others	6.80%	6.00%	5.40%	5.50%	5.00%	3.77%	4.74%	3.43%
[ Major West European*	8.58%	11.77%	42.81%	17.48%	13.62%	16.58%	28.84%	12.72% ]
TOTAL	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

\*(Major West European category includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, Italy.)

#### Table 1C

#### REGIONAL ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993\*

(in millions of current U.S. dollars)

	A	Asia		Near East		Latin America		o-Saharan)
	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93
United States	7,773	14,442	14,992	41,226	1,328	1,260	316	136
Russia**	24,800	12,400	19,500	5,100	8,300	2,100	11,100	600
France	700	6,600	6,900	3,200	900	200	400	100
United Kingdom	1,300	2,800	20,900	2,500	200	300	300	0
China	2,000	1,800	8,100	1,600	0	0	500	100
Germany	1,600	800	400	1,900	300	0	0	0
Italy	200	100	400	400	400	200	200	100
All Other European	2,100	1,300	11,300	2,100	600	200	700	300
All Others	700	1,100	6,100	2,600	1,000	300	1,500	700
[ Major West European***	3,800	10,300	28,600	8,000	1,800	700	900	200 ]
TOTAL	41,173	41,342	88,592	60,626	13,028	4,560	15,016	2,036

\* All foreign data are rounded to the nearest \$100 million.

\*\*Prior to 1992 reflects data for the former Soviet Union.

\*\*\*(Major West European category includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, Italy.)

Source: U.S. Government

. .

#### Table 1D

#### PERCENTAGE OF EACH SUPPLIER'S AGREEMENTS VALUE BY REGION, 1986-1993

	А	sia	Near	Near East		Latin America		Africa (Sub-Saharan)		TOTAL
	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93	1986-90	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93
United States	31.84%	25.31%	61.42%	72.25%	5.44%	2.21%	1.29%	0.24%	100.00%	100.00%
Russia	38.93%	61.39%	30.61%	25.25%	13.03%	10.40%	17.43%	2.97%	100.00%	100.00%
France	7.87%	65.35%	77.53%	31.68%	10.11%	1.98%	4.49%	<b>0.9</b> 9%	100.00%	100.00%
United Kingdom	5.73%	50.00%	92.07%	44.64%	0.88%	5.36%	1.32%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
China	18.87%	51.43%	76.42%	45.71%	0.00%	0.00%	4.72%	2.86%	100.00%	100.00%
Germany	69.57%	29.63%	17.39%	70.37%	13.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Italy	16.67%	12.50%	33.33%	50.00%	33.33%	25.00%	16.67%	12.50%	100.00%	100.00%
All Other European	14.29%	33.33%	76.87%	53.85%	4.08%	5.13%	4.76%	7.69%	100.00%	100.00%
All Others	7.53%	23.40%	65.59%	55.32%	10.75%	6.38%	16.13%	14.89%	100.00%	100.00%
[ Major West Euro pean*	10.83%	53.65%	81.48%	41.67%	5.13%	3.65%	2.56%	1.04%	100.00%	100.00% ]
TOTAL	26.09%	38.08%	56.14%	55.84%	8.26%	4.20%	9.52%	1.88%	100.00%	100.00%

\*(Major West European category includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, Italy.)

#### Table 1E

#### PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL AGREEMENTS VALUE BY SUPPLIER TO REGIONS, 1986-1993

	Asia		Near	Near East		merica	Africa (Sub-Saharan)	
	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93
United States	18.88%	34.93%	16.92%	68.00%	10.19%	27.63%	2.10%	6.68%
Russia	60.23%	29.99%	22.01%	8.41%	63.71%	46.05%	73.92%	29.47%
France	1.70%	15.96%	7.79%	5.28%	6.91%	4.39%	2.66%	4.91%
United Kingdom	3.16%	6.77%	23.59%	4.12%	1.54%	6.58%	2.00%	0.00%
China	4.86%	4.35%	9.14%	2.64%	0.00%	0.00%	3.33%	4.91%
Germany	3.89%	1.94%	0.45%	3.13%	2.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Italy	0.49%	0.24%	0.45%	0.66%	3.07%	4.39%	1.33%	4.91%
All Other European	5.10%	3.14%	12.76%	3.46%	4.61%	4.39%	4.66%	14.73%
All Others	1.70%	2.66%	6.89%	4.29%	7.68%	6.58%	9.99%	34.38%
[ Major West Euro pean*	9.23%	24.91%	32.28%	13.20%	13.82%	15.35%	5.99%	9.82% ]
TOTAL	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

\*(Major West European category includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, Italy.)

#### **CRS-55**

## TABLE 1F. Arms Transfer Agreements with the Third World, 1986-1993: Leading Suppliers Compared (in millions of current U.S. dollars)\*

Rank	Supplier	Agreements Value 1986-1989
1	U.S.S.R.	63,700
2	U.S.	24,408
3	<b>U.K</b> .	22,700
4	China	10,600
5	France	8,900
6	Germany (FRG)	2,500
7	North Korea	2,200
8	Spain	2,000
9	Poland	1,800
10	Yugoslavia	1,700
11	Czechoslovakia	1,600

Rank	Supplier A	greements Value 1990-1993
1	U.S.	57,061
2	Russia/U.S.S.R.	20,100
3	France	10,100
4	U.K.	5,500
5	China	3,400
6	Germany (FRG & Unified)	2,800
7	Czechoslovakia (Unified & Separa	ate) 1,200
8	Spain	1,100
9	South Korea	900
10	Italy	800
11	North Korea	600

Rank	Supplier Ag	greements Value 1986-1993
1	Russia/U.S.S.R.	83,800
2	U.S.	81,471
3	U.K.	28,200
4	France	19,000
5	China	14,000
6	Germany	5,200
7	Spain	3,100
8	North Korea	2,800
9	Czechoslovakia (Unified and Separ	ate) 2,800
10	Italy	2,100
11	Poland	2,000

\*All foreign data are rounded to the nearest \$100 million. Where data totals are the same, the actual rank order is maintained.

Source: U.S. Government

# TABLE 1G. Arms Transfer Agreements with the Third World in 1993:Leading Suppliers Compared(in millions of current U.S. dollars)\*

Rank	Supplier	Agreements Value 1993
1	U.S.	14,835
2	U.K.	1,800
3	Russia	1,800
4	Germany	600
5	North Korea	300
6	China	300
7	Brazil	200
8	France	200
9	Spain	100
10	Czech Republic	100
11	Poland	100

\*All foreign data are rounded to the nearest \$100 million. Where data totals are the same, the actual rank order is maintained.

.

Source: U.S. Government

#### Table 1H

#### Arms Transfer Agreements with Near East by Supplier 1/ (in millions of current U.S. dollars)

Recipient Country	<b>U.S</b> .	Russia	China	Major West	All Other	All	Total
				European 2/	European	Others	
1986-1989					400		0.500
Algeria	0	2,100	0	0	400	0	2,500
Bahrain	600	0	0	100	0	0	700
Egypt	5,300	600	100	100	100	0	6,200
Iran	0	0	2,700	700	3,000	2,300	8,700
Iraq	0	6,100	2,200	2,600	3,800	1,600	16,300
Israel	1,900	0	0	0	0	0	1,900
Jordan	100	600	0	300	200	100	1,300
Kuwait	2,200	200	0	200	500	700	3,800
Lebanon	0	0	0	0	0	0 400	0
Libya	0	3,000	0	0	600 1.000	400	4,000
Morocco	200 0	0 0	0 0	100 0	1,000 0	0	1,300 0
Oman	0	0	0	300	0	0	300
Qatar Saudi Arabia	4,100	0	3,000	23,800	1,100	600	32,600
	4,100	5,200	3,000	23,800 0	400	200	5,800
Syria Tunisia	200	3,200 0	0	0	400 0	200	200
U.A.E.	200 300	0	0	600	0	100	1,000
Yemen	0	1,600	0	000	0	100	1,700
I CHICH	v	1,000	v	v	U	100	1,700
1990-1993							
Algeria	0	100	0	0	0	0	100
Bahrain	300	0	0	0	0	0	300
Egypt	4,400	0	0	0	0	200	4,600
Iran	0	3,700	1,100	100	100	700	5,700
Iraq	0	200	0	400	100	800	1,500
Israel	1,100	0	0	1,200	0	0	2,300
Jordan	100	0	0	0	0	0	100
Kuwait	3,800	0	0	1,900	0	0	5,700
Lebanon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Libya	0	0	100	0	0	200	300
Morocco	100	0	0	100	0	0	200
Oman	100	0	0 0	900 500	0 0	0	1,000 500
Qatar Saudi Arabia	0 30,400	0 200	300	2,700	1,300	200	35,100
	.50,400 0	500	300	2,700	400	200	900
Syria Tunisia	100		0	0	400	100	200
U.A.E.	600	400	0	100	0	400	1,500
Yemen	0	400	0	0	0	400	1,500
remen	v	v	Ū	Ŭ	v	v	v
1986-1993							
Algeria	0	2,200	0	0	400	0	2,600
Bahrain	900	0	0	100	0	0	1,000
Egypt	9,700	600	100	100	100	200	10,800
Iran	0	3,700	3,800	800	3,100	3,000	14,400
Iraq	0	6,300	2,200	3,000	3,900	2,400	17,800
Israel	3,000	0	0	1,200	0	0	4,200
Jordan	200	600	0	300	200	100	1,400
Kuwait	6,000	200	0	2,100	500	700	9,500
Lebanon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Libya Morocco	0	3,000	100	0	600 1.000	600	4,300 1,500
Morocco	300	0	0	200	1,000	0 0	1,500
Oman	100	0	0	900 800	0	0	1,000 800
Qatar Saudi Arabia	0 34,500	0 200	0 3,300	800 26,500	0 2,400	800	67,700
Saudi Arabia	34,300 0	200 5,700	3,300 0	20,500	2,400	200	6,700
Syria Tunicia	300	5,700	0	0	000	200 100	400
Tunisia U.A.E.	900	400	0	700	0	500	2,500
V.A.E. Yemen	900	400 1,600	0	700	0	100	1,700
I CINCII	v	1,000	0	v	v	100	1,100

0=data less than \$50 million or nil.

1/ All data are rounded to nearest \$100 million.

2/ Major West European includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy totals as an aggregate figure.

#### **CRS-58**

# TABLE 11. Arms Transfers to the Third World, 1986-1993:Agreements with the Leading Recipients(in millions of current U.S. dollars)\*

Rank	Recipient	Agreements Value 1986-1989
1	Saudi Arabia	32,600
2	Iraq	16,300
3	Iran	8,800
4	Afghanistan	8,400
5	India	8,400
6	Angola	7,100
7	Vietnam	6,700
8	Cuba	6,200
9	Egypt	6,200
10	Syria	5,800
Rank	Recipient	Agreements
		Value
		1990-1993
1	Saudi Arabia	35,100
2	Taiwan	13,800
3	Kuwait	5,700
4	Iran	5,700
5	Afghanistan	5,200
6	South Korea	5,100
7	$\mathbf{Egypt}$	4,600
8	China	3,100
9	India	2,500
10	Malaysia	2,400
Rank	Recipient	Agreements Value
		1986-1993
1	Saudi Arabia	67,700
$\overline{2}$	Iraq	17,600
3	Taiwan	16,000
4	Iran	14,500
5	Afghanistan	13,600
6	India	10,900
	Egypt	10,800
8	Cuba	8,300
õ	Viete en	8,000

8,000

8,000

\*All foreign data are rounded to the nearest \$100 million. Where data totals are the same, the rank order is maintained.

Vietnam

Angola

Source: U.S. Government

9

10

## TABLE 1J. Arms Transfer Agreements with the Third World in 1993:Agreements with Leading Recipients

(in millions of current U.S. dollars)\*

1	Saudi Arabia	9,600
2	Kuwait	3,400
3	China	1,300
4	South Korea	1,100
5	Malaysia	600
6	Thailand	600
7	Iran	600
8	Egypt	300
9	Oman	300
10	Burma	300

\*All foreign data are rounded to the nearest \$100 million. Where data totals are the same, the actual rank order is maintained.

Source: U.S. Government

١

#### Table 2

#### ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993\* (in millions of current U.S. dollars)

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	, 1991	1992	1993	TOTAL 1986-1993
United States	6,031	6,823	4,561	3,580	5,200	5,919	8,037	7,675	47,826
Russia**	16,700	19,300	20,000	17,400	13,100	6,400	2,300	1,500	96,700
France	3,700	2,200	1,000	1,400	4,500	1,200	500	300	14,800
United Kingdom	2,700	3,900	3,600	4,100	3,700	3,800	3,800	3,600	29,200
China	1,300	2,100	3,000	2,400	1,500	1,400	800	900	13,400
Germany	400	600	400	300	500	1,100	200	400	3,900
Italy	700	500	300	200	100	100	100	0	2,000
All Other European	3,800	4,700	4,200	2,200	1,500	700	1,400	200	18,700
All Others	1,800	2,400	3,200	2,100	1,000	600	600	400	12,100
TOTAL	37,131	42,523	40,261	33,680	31,100	21,219	17,737	14,975	238,626
Dollar inflation index (1993=1.00)***	0.7883	0.8135	0.8434	0.8771	0.9034	0.9484	0.9677	1	

\*Third World category excludes the U.S., Russia, former U.S.S.R., Europe, Canada, Japan, Australia and New Zealand. All data are for the calendar year

given. All amounts given include the values of weapons, spare parts, construction, all associated services, military assistance and training

programs. Statistics for foreign countries are based upon estimated selling prices. U.S. commercial sales delivery values are excluded.

All foreign data are rounded to the nearest \$100 million.

\*\*Prior to 1992 reflects data for the former Soviet Union.

\*\*\*Based on Department of Defense Price Deflator.

#### Source: U.S. Government

#### Table 2A

## ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993 (in millions of constant 1993 dollars)

									TOTAL
	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1986-1993
United States	7,651	8,387	5,408	4,082	5,756	6,241	8,305	7,675	53,505
Russia	21,185	23,725	23,714	19,838	14,501	6,748	2,377	1,500	113,587
France	4,694	2,704	1,186	1,596	4,981	1,265	517	300	17,243
United Kingdom	3,425	4,794	4,268	4,674	4,096	4,007	3,927	3,600	32,791
China	1,649	2,581	3,557	2,736	1,660	1,476	827	900	15,387
Germany	507	738	474	342	553	1,160	207	400	4,381
Italy	888	615	356	228	111	105	103	0	2,406
All Other European	4,820	5,778	4,980	2,508	1,660	738	1,447	200	22,131
All Others	2,283	2,950	3,794	2,394	1,107	633	620	400	14,182
	47 102	52 272	AT 727	28 200	24 426	22 272	19 220	14.075	275 612
TOTAL	47,103	52,272	47,737	38,399	34,426	22,373	18,329	14,975	275,613

#### Table 2B

#### ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993 (expressed as a percent of total, by year)

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
United States	16.24%	16.05%	11.33%	10.63%	16.72%	27.89%	45.31%	51.25%
Russia	44.98%	45.39%	49.68%	51.66%	42.12%	30.16%	12.97%	10.02%
France	9.96%	5.17%	2.48%	4.16%	14.47%	5.66%	2.82%	2.00%
United Kingdom	7.27%	9.17%	8.94%	12.17%	11.90%	17.91%	21.42%	24.04%
China	3.50%	4.94%	7.45%	7.13%	4.82%	6.60%	4.51%	6.01%
Germany	1.08%	1.41%	0.99%	0.89%	1.61%	5.18%	1.13%	2.67%
Italy	1.89%	1.18%	0.75%	0.59%	0.32%	0.47%	0.56%	0.00%
All Other European	10.23%	11.05%	10.43%	6.53%	4.82%	3.30%	7.89%	1.34%
All Others	4.85%	5.64%	7.95%	6.24%	3.22%	2.83%	3.38%	2.67%
[ Major West Euro pean*	20.20%	16.93%	13.16%	17.81%	28.30%	29.22%	25.93%	28.71% ]
TOTAL	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

\*(Major West European category includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, Italy.)

#### Table 2C

#### REGIONAL ARMS DELIVERIES, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993\*

(in millions of current U.S. dollars)

	Asia		Near East		Latin An	nerica	Africa (Sub-Saharan)		
	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93	
United States	5,247	5,658	14,236	19,949	1,134	1,064	377	159	
Russia**	30,100	11,800	24,200	8,100	8,300	2,200	10,800	1,200	
France	1,600	500	5,400	5,400	900	500	400	100	
United Kingdom	900	600	12,900	14,000	100	100	400	200	
China	900	1,900	7,600	2,400	0	0	300	400	
Germany	500	800	700	900	400	500	100	0	
Italy	300	100	600	100	500	100	300	100	
All Other European	3,400	700	10,200	2,800	600	200	700	300	
All Others	1,400	400	5,800	1,400	1,000	500	1,300	400	
[ Major West Euro pean***	3,300	2,000	19,600	20,400	1,900	1,200	1,200	400 ]	
TOTAL	44,347	22,458	81,636	55,049	12,934	5,164	14,677	2,859	

\*All foreign data are rounded to the nearest \$100 million.

\*\*Prior to 1992 reflects data for the former Soviet Union.

\*\*\*(Major West European category includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, Italy.)

Source: U.S. Government
#### Table 2D

# PERCENTAGE OF SUPPLIER DELIVERIES VALUE BY REGION, 1986-1993

	A	sia	Nea	r East	Latin America Africa		Africa (Sub-	Africa (Sub-Saharan)		TOTAL
	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93
United States	24.99%	21.09%	67.81%	74.35%	5.40%	3.97%	1.80%	0.59%	100.00%	100.00%
Russia	41.01%	50.64%	32.97%	34.76%	11.31%	<i>9.44%</i>	1.00 %	5.15%	100.00%	100.00%
France	19.28%	7.69%	65.06%	83.08%	10.84%	7.69%	4.82%	1.54%	100.00%	100.00%
United Kingdom	6.29%	4.03%	90.21%	93.96%	0.70%	0.67%	2.80%	1.34%	100.00%	100.00%
China	10.23%	40.43%	86.36%	51.06%	0.00%	0.00%	3.41%	8.51%	100.00%	100.00%
Germany	29.41%	36.36%	41.18%	40.91%	23.53%	22.73%	5.88%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Italy	17.65%	25.00%	35.29%	25.00%	29.41%	25.00%	17.65%	25.00%	100.00%	100.00%
All Other European	22.82%	17.50%	68.46%	70.00%	4.03%	5.00%	4.70%	7.50%	100.00%	100.00%
All Others	14.74%	14.81%	61.05%	51.85%	10.53%	18.52%	13.68%	14.81%	100.00%	100.00%
[ Major West Euro pean*	12.69%	8.33%	75.38%	85.00%	7.31%	5.00%	4.62%	1.67%	100.00%	100.00% ]
TOTAL	28.87%	26.26%	53.15%	64.36%	8.42%	6.04%	9.56%	3.34%	100.00%	100.00%

\*(Major West European category includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, Italy.)

#### Table 2E

# PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL DELIVERIES VALUE BY SUPPLIER TO REGIONS, 1986-1993

	Asia		Near ]	Near East Latin A		ıerica	Africa (Sub-Saharan)	
	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93	1986-89	1990-93
United States	11.83%	25.19%	17.44%	36.24%	8.77%	20.60%	2.57%	5.56%
Russia	67.87%	52.54%	29.64%	14.71%	64.17%	42.60%	73.58%	41.97%
France	3.61%	2.23%	6.61%	9.81%	6.96%	9.68%	2.73%	3.50%
United Kingdom	2.03%	2.67%	15.80%	25.43%	0.77%	1.94%	2.73%	7.00%
China	2.03%	8.46%	9.31%	4.36%	0.00%	0.00%	2.04%	13.99%
Germany	1.13%	3.56%	0.86%	1.63%	3.09%	9.68%	0.68%	0.00%
Italy	0.68%	0.45%	0.73%	0.18%	3.87%	1.94%	2.04%	3.50%
All Other European	7.67%	3.12%	12.49%	5.09%	4.64%	3.87%	4.77%	10.49%
All Others	3.16%	1.78%	7.10%	2.54%	7.73%	9.68%	8.86%	13.99%
[ Major West European*	7.44%	8.91%	24.01%	37.06%	14.69%	23.24%	8.18%	13.99% j
TOTAL	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

\*(Major West European category includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, Italy.)

# **CRS-66** ·

# TABLE 2F. Arms Deliveries to the Third World, 1986-1993: Leading Suppliers Compared

(in millions of current U.S. dollars)\*

Rank	Supplier 1	Deliveries Value 1986-1989
1	U.S.S.R.	73,400
2	U.S.	20,995
3	<b>U.K</b> .	14,300
4	China	8,800
5	France	8,300
6	Poland	2,000
7	Czechoslovakia	1,800
8	Italy	1,700
9	Germany (FRG)	1,700
10	North Korea	1,700
11	Brazil	1,700
Rank	Supplier	Deliveries Value 1990-1993
1	U.S.	26,831
2	Russia/U.S.S.R.	23,300
3	U.K.	14,900
4	France	6,500
5	China	4,600
6	Germany (Unified & FRG)	2,200
7	Czechoslovakia (Unified & Separa	ate) 700
8	Canada	600
9	Spain	600
10	Belgium	600
11	North Korea	500
Rank	Supplier	Deliveries Value
		1986-1993
1	Russia/U.S.S.R.	96,700
2	U.S.	47,826
3	U.K.	29,200
4	France	14,800
5	China	13,400
6	Germany	3,900
7	Czechoslovakia (Unified & Separa	•
8	North Korea	2,200
9	Poland	2,200
10	Italy	2,000
11	Spain	2,000

\*All foreign data are rounded to the nearest \$100 million. Where data totals are the same, the actual rank order is maintained.

,

# TABLE 2G. Arms Deliveries to the Third World in 1993:Leading Suppliers Compared(in millions of current U.S. dollars)\*

Rank	Supplier	Deliveries Value 1993
1	U.S.	7,675
2	United Kingdom	3,600
3	Russia	1,500
4	China	900
5	Germany	400
6	France	300
7	South Africa	100
8	Spain	100
9	Czech Republic	100

\*All foreign data are rounded to the nearest \$100 million. Where data totals are the same, the actual rank order is maintained.

# Table 2H

# Arms Deliveries to Near East by Supplier 1/ (in millions of current U.S. dollars)

Recipient Country	U.S.	Russia	China	Major West	All Other	All	Total
1986-1989				European 2/	European	Others	
Algeria	0	2300	0	0	400	0	2,700
Bahrain	300	0	0	300	0	0	600
Egypt	2400	500	200	800	300	300	4,500
Iran	0	0	2800	800	2900	2100	8,600
Iraq	0	10900	2100	1400	3800	1600	19,800
Israel	2400	0	0	0	0	0	2,400
Jordan	200	800	0	600	200	100	1,900
Kuwait	200	200	0	300	0	400	1,100
Lebanon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Libya	0	2400	0	0	1100	400	3,900
Morocco	200	0	0	100	500	0	800
Oman	0	0	0	300	0	0	300
Qatar	0	0	0	200	0	0	200
Saudi Arabia	8100	0	2500	14200	300	700	25,800
Syria	0	4800	0	0	600	0	5,400
Tunisia	100	0	0	100	0	0	200
U.A.E.	200	0	0	700	100	100	1,100
Yemen	0	2400	0	0	0	100	2,500
1990-1993							
Algeria	0	400	0	0	0	0	400
Bahrain	500	0	0	0	0	0	500
Egypt	3500	200	0	0	100	100	3,900
Iran	0	3400	1300	100	100	400	5,300
Iraq	0	400	200	2100	100	100	2,900
Israel	2000	0	0	200	0	0	2,200
Jordan	100	0	0	0	0	0	100
Kuwait	1900	0	0	200	200	100	2,400
Lebanon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Libya	0	700	100	0	0	0	800
Morocco	100	0	0	0	200	0	300
Oman	100	0	0	100	0	0	200
Qatar Reguli Associa	0	0	0	100	0	0	100
Saudi Arabia	10800	200	800	16000	1800	200	29,800
Syria Tunisia	0 100	1900 0	0 0	0 0	200 0	100 0	2,200 100
Tunisia U.A.E.	600	200	0	1500	0	300	2,600
Yemen	000	800	0	1500	0	0	800
I emen	v	000	Ū	v	v	v	000
1986-1993							
Algeria	0	2700	0	0	400	0	3,100
Bahrain	800	0	0	300	0	0	1,100
Egypt	5900	700	200	800	400	400	8,400
Iran	0	3400	4100	900	3000	2500	13,900
Iraq	0	11300	2300	3500	3900	1700	22,700
Israel	4400	0	0	200	0	0 100	4,600 2,000
Jordan Kumunia	300 2100	800	0 0	600 500	200 200	500	3,500
Kuwait Lebanon	2100	200 0	0	0	200	0	3,500 0
Libya	0	3100	100	0	1100	400	4,700
Morocco	300	3100 0	100	100	700	400	1,100
Oman	100	0	0	400	0	0	500
Qatar	0	0	0	300	0	0	300
Saudi Arabia	18900	200	3300	30200	2100	900	55,600
Syria	0	6700	0	0	800	100	7,600
Tunisia	200	0,00	Ő	100	0	0	300
U.A.E.	800	200	Õ	2200	100	400	3,700
Yemen	0	3200	ů 0	0	0	100	3,300
	-		·	-	-		-

0=data less than \$50 million or nil.

1/ All data are rounded to nearest \$100 million.

2/ Major West European includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy totals as an aggregate figure.

# TABLE 2I. Arms Deliveries to the Third World, 1986-1993: **Deliveries to the Leading Recipients** (in millions of current U.S. dollars)\*

Rank	Recipient	Deliveries Value 1986-1989			
1	Saudi Arabia	25,800			
2	Iraq	19,800			
3	India	13,600			
4	Afghanistan	9,100			
5	Iran	8,600			
6	Angola	7,200			
7	Vietnam	6,700			
8	Cuba	6,300			
9	Syria	5,400			
10	Egypt	4,500			

Rank	Recipient	Deliveries Value 1990-1993
1	Saudi Arabia	29,800
2	Afghanistan	5,400
3	Iran	5,300
4	$\mathbf{Egypt}$	3,900
5	India	3,100
6	Iraq	2,900
7	Taiwan	2,800
8	U.A.E.	2,600
9	Kuwait	2,400
10	Syria	2,200

Rank	Recipient	Deliveries Value 1986-1993			
1	Saudi Arabia	55,600			
2	Iraq	22,700			
3	India	16,700			
4	Afghanistan	14,500			
5	Iran	13,900			
6	$\mathbf{Egypt}$	8,400			
7	Cuba	8,400			
8	Vietnam	8,000			
9	Angola	7,900			
10	Syria	7,600			

\*All foreign data are rounded to the nearest \$100 million. Where data totals are the same, the actual rank order is maintained.

.

Rank		Deliveries Zalue 1993
1	Saudi Arabia	6,400
2	$\mathbf{Egypt}$	1,400
3	Iran	1,000
4	Israel	1,000
5	Kuwait	800
6	Taiwan	700
7	South Korea	700
8	United Arab Emirate	s 500
9	China	400
10	Pakistan	400

# TABLE 2J. Arms Deliveries to the Third World in 1993:Deliveries to the Leading Recipients(in millions of current U.S. dollars)\*

\*All foreign data are rounded to the nearest \$100 million. Where data totals are the same, the actual rank order is maintained.

#### SELECTED WEAPONS DELIVERIES TO THE THIRD WORLD, 1986-1993

Other useful data for assessing arms transfers to the Third World by suppliers are those that indicate <u>who</u> has actually <u>delivered</u> numbers of <u>specific</u> <u>classes</u> of military items to a <u>region</u>. These data are relatively "hard" in that they reflect actual transfers of specific items of military equipment. They have the limitation of not giving detailed information regarding either the sophistication or the specific name of the equipment delivered. However, these data will show <u>relative trends</u> in the delivery of important classes of military equipment and will also indicate <u>who</u> the leading suppliers are from region to region over time. Data in the following tables set out actual deliveries of fourteen categories of weaponry to the Third World from 1986-1993 by the United States, Russia, China, the four major West European suppliers as a group, all other European suppliers as a group, and all other suppliers as a group.

A cautionary note is warranted regarding the quantitative data within these specific tables. Aggregate data on weapons categories delivered by suppliers do not provide precise indices of the quality and/or level of sophistication of the weaponry delivered. The history of recent conventional conflicts suggests, quality and/or sophistication of weapons can offset a quantitative disadvantage. The fact that the United States, for example, has not delivered the largest numbers of weapons in a category to a region does not necessarily mean that the weaponry it has transferred cannot compensate, to an important degree, for larger quantities of less capable weapons systems delivered by Russia, the major West Europeans or other suppliers.

Further, these data do not provide an indication of the capabilities of the recipient nations to use effectively the weapons actually delivered to them. Superior training--coupled with quality equipment--may, in the last analysis, be a more important factor in a nation's ability to engage successfully in conventional warfare than the size of its weapons inventory.

# **REGIONAL WEAPONS DELIVERIES SUMMARY, 1990-1993**

- The regional weapons delivery data collectively show that Russia was the leading arms supplier to the Third World of several major classes of conventional weaponry from 1990-1993. The United States also transferred substantial quantities of many of the same weapons classes, but did not match Russia in sheer numbers delivered during this period.
- The major West European suppliers were serious competitors of the two superpowers in weapons deliveries from 1990-1993, making notable deliveries of certain categories of armaments to every region of the Third World-most particularly to the Near East and to Latin

America. In sub-Saharan Africa, the major Western European suppliers were the principal competition for Russia in arms deliveries.

- Regional weapons delivery data reflect the diverse sources of supply of conventional weaponry available to Third World nations. Even though Russia, the United States and the four major West European suppliers dominate in the delivery of the fourteen classes of weapons examined, it is also evident that the other European suppliers, and non-European suppliers, including China, are fully capable of providing specific classes of conventional armaments, such as missiles, tanks, armored vehicles, aircraft and artillery pieces, to nations in the Third World should they choose to do so.
- It is noteworthy that there have been substantial quantities of specific categories of weapons delivered to individual regions of the Third World by specific suppliers from 1990-1993. Among such notable deliveries, by region, are the following:

#### Asia

**Russia** delivered 850 tanks and self-propelled guns: 750 artillery pieces: 1,920 APCs and armored cars; one major surface combatant; two submarines; 120 supersonic combat aircraft; 140 helicopters; 1,880 surface-to-air missiles (SAMs); 380 surface-to-surface missiles and 50 anti-shipping missiles. The United States delivered 85 tanks and self-propelled guns; 48 supersonic combat aircraft; 43 helicopters; and 995 surface-to-air missiles (SAMs) and 23 antishipping missiles. China delivered 500 tanks and self-propelled guns; 380 artillery pieces: four major surface combatants: 17 minor surface combatants: two guided missile boats; 110 supersonic combat aircraft; and 40 anti-shipping missiles. The four major West European suppliers collectively delivered ten major surface combatants, one submarine, 40 helicopters, and 430 surface-to-air missiles. All other European suppliers as a group delivered 170 artillery pieces; one major surface combatant, 40 helicopters, and 300 surface-to-air missiles (SAMs). All other non-European suppliers collectively delivered 60 tanks and self-propelled guns; two major surface combatants; 23 minor surface combatants, and 110 supersonic aircraft.

#### **Near East**

**Russia** delivered 600 tanks and self-propelled guns; 290 artillery pieces; 450 APCs and armored cars; one major surface combatant; two submarines; 60 supersonic combat aircraft; 30 helicopters; 220 surface-to-air missiles (SAMs); and 80 anti-shipping missiles. The **United States** delivered 792 tanks and selfpropelled guns; 933 APCs and armored cars; 225 supersonic combat aircraft; 66 helicopters, and 1,265 surface-to-air missiles (SAMs). **China** delivered 360 artillery pieces; 60 supersonic combat aircraft; 140 surface-to-surface missiles and 60 anti-shipping missiles. The four **major West European suppliers** collectively delivered 190 artillery pieces; 45 minor surface combatants; 70 supersonic combat aircraft; 1,080 surface-to-air missiles (SAMs) and 120 antishipping missiles. All other European suppliers as a group delivered 270 tanks and self-propelled guns, 720 artillery pieces and 270 APCs and armored cars. All other suppliers collectively delivered 150 artillery pieces; 100 APCs and armored cars; 130 supersonic combat aircraft; and 130 surface-to-surface missiles.

#### Latin America

**Russia** delivered 200 tanks and self-propelled guns; 100 artillery pieces; 70 APCs and armored cars; one submarine; 10 supersonic combat aircraft; 10 helicopters; and 20 anti-shipping missiles. The **United States** delivered 64 subsonic combat aircraft and 58 helicopters. The four **major West European suppliers** collectively delivered 40 tanks and self-propelled guns; 80 APCs and armored cars; five major surface combatants, 10 supersonic combat aircraft and 80 helicopters. All other European suppliers collectively delivered 10 helicopters. All other non-European suppliers as a group delivered 60 surface-to-air missiles (SAMs).

#### Africa (sub-Saharan)

**Russia** delivered 20 tanks and self-propelled guns; 60 artillery pieces; one major surface combatant; 10 supersonic combat aircraft and 10 helicopters. **China** delivered 1,330 artillery pieces and 20 supersonic combat aircraft and 30 surface-to-surface missiles (SAMs). The four **major West European suppliers** collectively delivered 70 tanks and self-propelled guns and 40 APCs and armored cars. **All other European suppliers** collectively delivered 40 tanks and selfpropelled guns and 100 APCs and armored cars. **All other non-European suppliers** as a group delivered 110 tanks and self-propelled guns; 120 artillery pieces; 120 APCs and armored cars and 10 supersonic combat aircraft.

#### Table 3

#### Numbers of Weapons Delivered by Major Suppliers to the Third World 1/

Waamana Ostanau	U.S.	Duranta	China	Maine Mant		A.II
Weapons Category	0.5.	Russia	China	Major West European 2/	All Other European	All Others
1986-1989				European 2/	culopean	Outers
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	596	3800	210	140	760	305
Artillery	760	4290	2120	380	1100	1155
APCs and Armored Cars	627	6600	670	370	1720	345
Major Surface Combatants	0	11	1	17	7	4
Minor Surface Combatants	4	58	15	67	76	118
Guided Missile Boats	ò	0	4	2	0	2
Submarines	0	10	Ó	2	2	1
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	327	440	80	120	10	70
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	20	120	30	60	0	0
Other Aircraft	169	250	30	110	240	240
Helicopters	117	640	0	300	40	50
Surface-to-Air Missiles	1025	11970	720	1830	440	1520
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	0	1800	100	0	0	230
Anti-Shipping Missiles	96	580	210	350	0	10
1990-1993						
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	877	1670	500	130	350	210
Artillery	254	1200	2070	260	910	280
APCs and Armored Cars	963	2440	40	190	370	280
Major Surface Combatants	0	3	4	15	1	2
Minor Surface Combatants	10	24	28	59	11	45
Guided Missile Boats	0	0	2	0	0	0
Submarines	0	5	0	1	0	0
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	273	200	190	80	0	250
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	88 104	0 90	10 80	70 70	0 140	30 190
Other Aircraft	104	90 190	80 0	140	140 50	190 20
Helicopters Surface-to-Air Missiles	167 2260	2100	180	140	50 300	20 60
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	2200	380	140	1510	300	130
Anti-Shipping Missiles	23	150	140	120	0	0
	20	150	100	120	U	U
1986-1993						
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	1473	5470	710	270	1110	515
Artillery	1014	5490	4190	640	2010	1435
APCs and Armored Cars	1590	9040	710	560	2090	625
Major Surface Combatants	0	14	5	32	8	6
Minor Surface Combatants	14	82	43	126	87	163
Guided Missile Boats	0	0	6	2	0	2
Submarines	0	15	0	3	2	1
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	600	640	270	200	10	320
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	108	120	40	130	0	30
Other Aircraft	273	340	110	180	380	430
Helicopters	284	830	0	440	90	70
Surface-to-Air Missiles	3285	14070	900	3340	740	1580
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	0	2180	240	0	0	360
Anti-Shipping Missiles	119	730	310	470	0	10

1/ Third World category excludes the U.S., Russia, former U.S.S.R., Europe, Canada, Japan, Australia and New Zealand. All data are for calendar years given.

2/ Major West European includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy totals as an aggregate figure.

NOTE: Data relating to surface-to-surface and anti-shipping missiles by foreign suppliers are estimates based on a variety of sources having a wide range of accuracy. As such, individual data entries in these two weapons delivery categories are not necessarily definitive.

#### Table 4

#### Numbers of Weapons Delivered by Major Suppliers to Asia and the Pacific 1/

Weapons Category	U.S.	Russia	China	Major West European 2/	All Other European	All Others
1986-1989				Lutopean 2/	Luiopean	Olliela
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	128	2010	180	0	0	0
Artillerv	317	2210	180	40	450	170
APCs and Armored Cars	288	4350	410	30	400	10
Major Surface Combatants	200	4000	4,5	10	7	4
Minor Surface Combatants	0	19	9	9	8	46
Guided Missile Boats	0	0	3 4	0	ő	0
Submarines	0	7	0	1	2	Ő
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	165	190	60	30	õ	40
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	0	60	20	0	õ	0
Other Aircraft	19	150	20	20	20	õ
Helicopters	76	210	0	50	0	10
Surface-to-Air Missiles	335	4580	220	940	330	0
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	0	1280	0	0	0	0
Anti-Shipping Missiles	86	310	Ő	60	ů 0	Ő
And Chipping Micones	00	010	Ŭ		Ū	v
1990-1993						
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	85	850	500	0	40	60
Artillery	76	750	380	40	170	10
APCs and Armored Cars	21	1920	40	30	0	40
Major Surface Combatants	0	1	4	10	1	2
Minor Surface Combatants	0	9	17	9	3	23
Guided Missile Boats	0	0	2	0	0	0
Submarines	0	2	0	1	0	0
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	48	120	110	0	0	110
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	24	0	0	20	0	0
Other Aircraft	57	60	50	40	50	0
Helicopters	43	140	0	40	40	10
Surface-to-Air Missiles	995	1880	80	430	300	0
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	0	380	0	0	0	0
Anti-Shipping Missiles	23	50	40	0	0	0
1986-1993						
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	213	2860	680	0	40	60
Artillery	393	2960	560	80	620	180
APCs and Armored Cars	309	6270	450	60	0	50
Major Surface Combatants	0	8	5	20	8	6
Minor Surface Combatants	0	28	26	18	11	69
Guided Missile Boats	0	0	6	0	0	0
Submarines	0	9	0	2	2	0
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	213	310	170	30	0	150
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	24	60	20	20	0	0
Other Aircraft	76	210	70	60	70	0
Helicopters	119	350	0	90	40	20
Surface-to-Air Missiles	1330	6460	300	1370	630	0
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	0	1660	0	0	0	0
Anti-Shipping Missiles	109	360	40	60	0	0

1/ Excludes Japan, Australia and New Zealand. All data are for calendar years given.

2/ Major West European includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy totals as an aggregate figure.

NOTE: Data relating to surface-to-surface and anti-shipping missiles by foreign suppliers are estimates based on a variety of sources having a wide range of accuracy. As such, individual data entries in these two weapons delivery categories are not necessarily definitive.

#### Table 5

#### Numbers of Weapons Delivered by Major Suppliers to Near East 1/

Weapons Category	U.S.	Russia	China	Major West European 2/	All Other European	All Others
1986-1989				Luiopean 2/	Culopean	Outers
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	445	960	30	0	670	190
Artillery	260	770	1870	230	520	580
APCs and Armored Cars	270	1410	220	170	1680	170
Major Surface Combatants	0	3	0	2	0	0
Minor Surface Combatants	0	10	0	37	42	37
Guided Missile Boats	0	0	0	2	0	0
Submarines	0	3	Ō	0	0	1
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	124	150	10	80	0	0
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	0	40	0	30	0	0
Other Aircraft	28	30	10	50	160	90
Helicopters	1	200	0	90	30	0
Surface-to-Air Missiles	425	5000	500	780	110	1220
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	0	520	100	0	0	230
Anti-Shipping Misslles	10	210	210	230	0	10
1990-1993						
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	792	600	0	20	270	40
Artillery	158	290	360	190	720	150
APCs and Armored Cars	933	450	0	40	270	100
Major Surface Combatants	0	1	0	0	0	0
Minor Surface Combatants	3	4	7	45	3	7
Guided Missile Boats	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submarines	0	2	0	0	0	0
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	225	60	60	70	0	130
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	0	0	0	10	0	10
Other Aircraft	15	10	10	30	30	80
Helicopters	66	30	0	10	0	10
Surface-to-Air Missiles	1265	220	70	1080	0	0
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	0	0	140	0	0	130
Anti-Shipping Missiles	0	80	60	120	0	0
1986-1993						
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	1237	1560	30	20	940	230
Artillery	418	1060	2230	420	1240	730
APCs and Armored Cars	1203	1860	220	210	1950	270
Major Surface Combatants	0	4	0	2	0	0
Minor Surface Combatants	3	14	7	82	45	44
Guided Missile Boats	0	0	0	2	0	0
Submarines	0	5	0	0	0	1
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	349	210	70	150	0	130
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	0	40	0	40	0	10
Other Aircraft	43	40	20	80	190	170
Helicopters	67	230	0	100	30	10
Surface-to-Air Missiles	1690	5220	570	1860	110	1220
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	0	520	240	0	0	360
Anti-Shipping Missiles	10	290	270	350	0	10

1/ All data are for calendar years given.

2/ Major West European includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy totals as an aggregate figure.

NOTE: Data relating to surface-to-surface and anti-shipping missiles by foreign suppliers are estimates based on a variety of sources having a wide range of accuracy. As such, individual data entries in these two weapons delivery categories are not necessarily definitive.

#### Table 6

#### Numbers of Weapons Delivered by Major Suppliers to Latin America 1/

Weapons Category	U.S.	Russia	China	Major West European 2/	All Other European	All Others
1986-1989				Earopour 2/	Ediopodii	Guidio
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	23	260	0	0	0	40
Artillery	130	370	ő	80	90	70
APCs and Armored Cars	16	310	0 0	40	0	20
Major Surface Combatants	0	1	ŏ	40 5	0	20
Minor Surface Combatants	4	17	0	3	0	10
Guided Missile Boats	<b>4</b> 0	0	0	0	0	2
Submarines	0	0	0	1	0	0
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	38	10	0	10	10	10
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	20	0	0	10	0	0
Other Aircraft	117	50	0	30	60	120
Helicopters	40	100	0	100	10	10
Surface-to-Air Missiles	-0	1310	0	0	0	0
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anti-Shipping Missiles	0	40	0	60	0	0
Aur-Subbing missies	U	40	0	60	U	U
1990-1993						
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	0	200	0	40	0	0
Artillery	20	100	0	20	0	0
APCs and Armored Cars	0	70	0	80	0	20
Major Surface Combatants	0	0	0	5	0	0
Minor Surface Combatants	7	3	0	4	0	6
Guided Missile Boats	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submarines	0	1	0	0	0	0
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	0	10	0	10	0	0
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	64	0	0	30	0	10
Other Aircraft	23	10	10	0	40	30
Helicopters	58	10	0	80	10	0
Surface-to-Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	60
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anti-Shipping Missiles	0	20	0	0	0	0
1986-1993						
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	23	460	0	40	0	40
Artillery	150	470	0	100	90	70
APCs and Armored Cars	16	380	0	120	0	40
Major Surface Combatants	0	1	0	10	0	0
Minor Surface Combatants	11	20	0	7	0	16
Guided Missile Boats	0	0	0	0	0	2
Submarines	0	1	0	1	0	0
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	38	20	Ō	20	10	10
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	84	0	Ō	40	0	10
Other Aircraft	140	60	10	30	100	150
Helicopters	98	110	0	180	20	10
Surface-to-Air Missiles	0	1310	Ō	0	0	60
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	Ō	0	Ō	0	Ō	0
Anti-Shipping Missiles	ō	60	ō	60	Ō	ō

1/ All data are for calendar years given.

2/ Major West European includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy totals as an aggregate figure.

NOTE: Data relating to surface-to-surface and anti-shipping missiles by foreign suppliers are estimates based on a variety of sources having a wide range of accuracy. As such, individual data entries in these two weapons delivery categories are not necessarily definitive.

#### Table 7

#### Numbers of Weapons Delivered by Major Suppliers to Africa (Sub-Saharan) 1/

Weapons Category	U.S.	Russia	China	Major West	All Other	All
				European 2/	European	Others
1986-1989						
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	0	570	0	140	90	75
Artillery	53	940	70	30	40	335
APCs and Armored Cars	53	530	40	130	40	145
Major Surface Combatants	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Surface Combatants	0	12	6	18	26	25
Guided Missile Boats	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submarines	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	0	90	10	0	0	20
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	0	20	10	20	0	0
Other Aircraft	5	20	0	10	0	30
Helicopters	0	130	0	60	0	30
Surface-to-Air Missiles	265	1080	0	110	0	300
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anti-Shipping Missiles	0	20	0	0	0	0
1990-1993						
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	0	20	0	70	40	110
Artillery	0	60	1330	10	20	120
APCs and Armored Cars	9	0	0	40	100	120
Major Surface Combatants	0	1	0	0	0	0
Minor Surface Combatants	0	8	4	1	5	9
Guided Missile Boats	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submarines	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	0	10	20	0	0	10
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	0	0	10	10	0	10
Other Aircraft	9	10	10	0	20	80
Helicopters	0	10	0	10	0	0
Surface-to-Air Missiles	0	0	30	0	0	0
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anti-Shipping Missi <del>les</del>	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986-1993						
Tanks and Self-Propelled Guns	0	590	0	210	130	185
Artillery	53	1000	1400	40	60	455
APCs and Armored Cars	62	530	40	170	140	265
Major Surface Combatants	0	1	0	0	0	0
Minor Surface Combatants	0	20	10	19	31	34
Guided Missile Boats	0	0	0	0	0	0
Submarines	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supersonic Combat Aircraft	0	100	30	0	0	30
Subsonic Combat Aircraft	0	20	20	30	0	10
Other Aircraft	14	30	10	10	20	110
Helicopters	0	140	0	70	0	30
Surface-to-Air Missiles	265	1080	30	110	0	300
Surface-to-Surface Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anti-Shipping Missiles	0	20	0	0	0	0

1/ All data are for calendar years given.

2/ Major West European includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy totals as an aggregate figure.

NOTE: Data relating to surface-to-surface and anti-shipping missles by foreign suppliers are estimates based on a variety of sources having a wide range of accuracy. As such, individual data entries in these two weapons delivery categories are not necessarily definitive.

## WORLDWIDE ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENT AND DELIVERIES VALUES, 1986-1993

This report deals with conventional arms transfers to the Third World and all data tables to this point have reflected information relating to Third World arms transfer activity exclusively. The six tables set out below provide the total dollar values of arms transfer agreements and arms deliveries <u>worldwide</u> in the exact same format and detail as tables 1, 1A and 1B and tables 2, 2A and 2B do for arms transfer agreements and arms deliveries to the Third World.

# TOTAL WORLDWIDE ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENT VALUES, 1986-1993

Table 8 shows the annual <u>current</u> dollar values of arms transfer agreements worldwide. Since these figures do not allow for the effects of inflation, they are, by themselves, of limited use. They provide, however, the data from which tables 8A (constant dollars) and 8B (supplier percentages) are derived. Some of the more notable facts reflected by these data are summarized below. Unless otherwise noted the dollar values noted are expressed in <u>constant</u> 1993 dollars.

- The United States ranked first among all suppliers to the world in the value of arms transfer agreements from 1990-1993, and first for the entire period from 1986-1993.
- Russia ranked second among all suppliers to the world in the value of arms transfer agreements from 1990-1993, and a close second from 1986-1993.
- The United Kingdom ranked fourth among all suppliers to the world in the value of arms transfer agreements from 1990-1993, and third from 1986-1993.
- France ranked third among all suppliers to the world in the value of arms transfer agreements from 1990-1993, and fourth from 1986-1993.
- Of the named arms suppliers and supplying groups to the world from 1986-1993, only the United States registered an <u>increase</u> in the value of arms transfer agreements with the world from the period 1986-1989 to the period 1990-1993 (The United States increased 17.9%).
- Other named arms suppliers during 1986-1993 registered significant <u>decreases</u> in the value of their arms transfer agreements worldwide from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993. Russia registered the largest <u>percentage decline</u> from 1986-1989 to 1990-1993 at 75.9%, while the United Kingdom fell 73.8%. China declined 70.5%. Germany declined 54.8%.

- In 1993, the United States was by far the leader in arms transfer agreements with the world, making \$22.3 billion in such agreements, or 69.9% of all arms transfer agreements.
- The United States, Russia, and the United Kingdom, the top three arms suppliers to the world in 1993 respectively--ranked by the value of their arms transfer agreements--collectively made agreements in 1993 valued at \$27.4 billion, 85.9% of all arms transfer agreements made with the world by all suppliers.
- Russia ranked second and the United Kingdom third in arms transfer agreements with the world in 1993, making \$2.8 billion and \$2.3 billion in such agreements respectively.
- The total value of all arms transfer agreements worldwide from 1990-1993 (\$157.6 billion) was substantially less than the value of arms transfer agreements by all suppliers worldwide from 1986-1989 (\$268.1 billion)(in constant 1993 dollars), a decline of 41.2%.
- In 1993, developed nations accounted for 35.8% of all arms transfer agreements made worldwide, an increase from 32.7% in 1992, and 24.8% in 1991.

## **TOTAL WORLDWIDE ARMS DELIVERY VALUES, 1986-1993**

Table 9 shows the annual <u>current</u> dollar values of arms deliveries (items actually transferred) worldwide by major suppliers from 1986-1993. The utility of these particular data is that they reflect transfers that have occurred. They provide the data from which tables 9A (constant dollars) and 9B (supplier percentages) are derived. Some of the more notable facts illustrated by these data are summarized below. Unless otherwise noted the dollar values noted are expressed in <u>constant</u> 1993 dollars.

- In 1993, the United States ranked first in the value of arms deliveries worldwide, making \$11.1 billion in such deliveries. This is the third year in a row the United States has led in such deliveries.
- The United Kingdom ranked second in arms deliveries to worldwide in 1993, making \$4.3 billion in such deliveries.
- Russia ranked a distant third in arms deliveries worldwide in 1993, making \$2.6 billion in such deliveries. This is the first year since 1987 that Russian arms deliveries have not declined from the previous year.

- The top three suppliers of arms to the world in 1993 collectively delivered nearly \$18 billion, 80% of all arms deliveries made worldwide by all suppliers.
- The U.S. share of all arms deliveries worldwide in 1993 was 49.3%, up from 43.3% in 1992. The United Kingdom's share was 19.1%, up from 17.7%. Russia's share of all arms deliveries to the world in 1993 was 11.6%, up from 9.6% in 1992 (table 2B).
- In 1993, the value of all arms deliveries worldwide (roughly \$22.5 billion) was the lowest of any year during the period from 1986-1993. This is the sixth year in a row when worldwide arms deliveries have declined from the previous year's total. This pattern reflects the impact of the end of the Iran-Iraq war, the winding down of other major regional conflicts in the Third World, as well as the end of the Cold War (table 2A) (charts 10 and 11).
- The total value of all arms deliveries by all suppliers worldwide from 1990-1993 (\$124.1 billion) was substantially less than the value of arms deliveries by all suppliers worldwide from 1986-1989 (\$249.4 billion)(in constant 1993 dollars), a decline of 50.2% (table 9A).

#### Table 8

#### ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE WORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993\* (in millions of current U.S. dollars)

			(			liaity			TOTAL
	1986	1987	1988	1989	1 <b>990</b>	1991	1992	1993	1986-1993
United States	6,304	7,388	11,493	10,140	18,891	18,244	22,990	22,253	117,703
Russia**	21,000	25,000	20,700	15,500	11,800	5,900	1,800	2,800	104,500
France	1,900	3,600	2,100	4,400	3,400	3,400	4,300	1,100	24,200
United Kingdom	1,600	1,700	21,500	1,800	2,100	1,000	2,600	2,300	34,600
China	1,800	4,700	2,500	1,600	2,300	500	300	400	14,100
Germany	1,500	1,900	1,300	6,300	1,500	1,300	2,000	800	16,600
Italy	700	200	300	500	400	500	700	100	3,400
All Other European	10,500	8,800	4,100	4,800	1,800	1,700	1,600	600	33,900
All Others	3,000	3,700	3,900	3,300	2,500	2,000	1,800	1,500	21,700
TOTAL	48,304	56,988	67,893	48,340	44,691	34,544	38,090	31,853	370,703
Dollar inflation									
index (1993=1.00)***	0.7936	0.813	0.8362	0.8634	0.8993	0.9283	0.9797	1	

\*All data are for the calendar year given except for U.S. MAP (Military Assistance Program) and IMET (International Military Education and Training) data which are included for the particular fiscal year. All amounts given include the values of weapons, spare parts, construction, all associated services, military assistance and training programs. Statistics for foreign countries are based upon estimated selling prices. U.S. commercial sales contract values are excluded. All foreign data are rounded to the nearest \$100 million.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Prior to 1992 reflects data for the former Soviet Union.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup>Based on Department of Defense Price Deflator

# Table 8A

# ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE WORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993 (in millions of constant 1993 U.S. dollars)

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	total 1986-1993
United States	7,944	9,087	13,744	11,744	21,006	19,653	23,466	22,253	128,898
Russia	26,462	30,750	24,755	17,952	13,121	6,356	1,837	2,800	124,033
France	2,394	4,428	2,511	5,096	3,781	3,663	4,389	1,100	27,362
United Kingdom	2,016	2,091	25,712	2,085	2,335	1,077	2,654	2,300	40,270
China	2,268	5,781	2,990	1,853	2,558	539	306	400	16,694
Germany	1,890	2,337	1,555	7,297	1,668	1,400	2,041	800	18,988
Italy	882	246	359	579	445	539	715	100	3,864
All Other European	13,231	10,824	4,903	5,559	2,002	1,831	1,633	600	40,584
All Others	3,780	4,551	4,664	3,822	2,780	2,154	1,837	1,500	25,089
TOTAL	60,867	70,096	81,192	55,988	49,695	37,212	38,879	31,853	425,783

# Table 8B

# ARMS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE WORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993 (expressed as a percent of total, by year)

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1 <b>991</b>	1992	1993	
United States	13.05%	12.96%	16.93%	20.98%	42.27%	52.81%	60.36%	69.86%	
Russia	43.47%	43.87%	30.49%	32.06%	26.40%	17.08%	4.73%	8.79%	
France	3.93%	6.32%	3.09%	9.10%	7.61%	9.84%	11.29%	3.45%	
United Kingdom	3.31%	2.98%	31.67%	3.72%	4.70%	2.89%	6.83%	7.22%	
China	3.73%	8.25%	3.68%	3.31%	5.15%	1.45%	0.79%	1.26%	
Germany	3.11%	3.33%	1.91%	13.03%	3.36%	3.76%	5.25%	2.51%	
Italy	1.45%	0.35%	0.44%	1.03%	0.90%	1.45%	1.84%	0.31%	
All Other European	21.74%	15.44%	6.04%	9.93%	4.03%	4.92%	4.20%	1.88%	
All Others	6.21%	6.49%	5.74%	6.83%	5.59%	5.79%	4.73%	4.71%	
[ Major West European*	11.80%	12.99%	37.12%	26.89%	16.56%	17.95%	25.20%	13.50%	]
TOTAL	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	

\*(Major West European category includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, Italy.)

#### Table 9

# ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE WORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993

			(in millions o	of current U	.S. dollars)				
	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	TOTAL 1986-1993
United States	8,538	10,874	8,692	7,212	8,771	9,459	10,785	11,079	75,410
Russia**	21,500	23,000	22,500	19,700	15,400	6,600	2,400	2,600	113,700
France	4,400	2,900	2,000	2,200	4,900	1,600	1,400	600	20,000
United Kingdom	3,700	5,100	4,800	4,900	4,400	4,700	4,400	4,300	36,300
China	1,300	2,100	3,000	2,400	1,500	1,400	800	1,000	13,500
Germany	1,400	1,500	1,500	1,300	1,800	2,400	1,100	1,000	12,000
Italy	900	700	500	200	200	300	300	400	3,500
All Other European	6,300	7,400	6,700	3,800	2,300	1,200	2,500	600	30,800
All Others	2,600	3,300	4,400	3,100	1,600	1,400	1,200	900	18,500
– TOTAL	50,638	56,874	54,092	44,812	40,871	29,059	24,885	22,479	323,710
Dollar inflation index (1993=1.00)**	0.7883	0.8135	0.8434	0.8771	0.9034	0.9484	0.9677	1	

\*All data are for the calendar year given. All amounts given include the values of weapons, spare parts, construction, all associated services, military assistance and training programs. Statistics for foreign countries are based upon estimated selling prices. U.S. commercial sales delivery values are excluded. All foreign data are rounded to the nearest \$100 million.

\*\*Prior to 1992 reflects data for the former Soviet Union.

\*\*\*Based on Department of Defense Price Deflator.

# Table 9A

# ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE WORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993

# (in millions of constant 1993 dollars)

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	TOTAL 1986-1993
United States	10,831	13,367	10,306	8,223	9,709	9,974	11,145	11,079	84,633
Russia	27,274	28,273	26,678	22,460	17,047	6,959	2,480	2,600	133,771
France	5,582	3,565	2,371	2,508	5,424	1,687	1,447	600	23,184
United Kingdom	4,694	6,269	5,691	5,587	4,870	4,956	4,547	4,300	40,914
China	1,649	2,581	3,557	2,736	1,660	1,476	827	1,000	15,487
Germany	1,776	1,844	1,779	1,482	1,992	2,531	1,137	1,000	13,540
Italy	1,142	860	593	228	221	316	310	400	4,071
All Other European	7,992	9,096	7,944	4,332	2,546	1,265	2,583	600	36,360
All Others	3,298	4,057	5,217	3,534	1,771	1,476	1,240	900	21,493
- TOTAL	64,237	69,913	64,136	51,091	45,241	30,640	25,716	22,479	373,452

# Table 9B

# ARMS DELIVERIES TO THE WORLD, BY SUPPLIER, 1986-1993

(expressed as a percent of total, by year)

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
United States	16.86%	19.12%	16.07%	16.09%	21.46%	32.55%	43.34%	49.29%
Russia	42.46%	40.44%	41.60%	43.96%	37.68%	<b>22.7</b> 1%	9.64%	11.57%
France	8.69%	5.10%	3.70%	4.91%	11.99%	5.51%	5.63%	2.67%
United Kingdom	7.31%	8.97%	8.87%	10.93%	10.77%	16.17%	17.68%	19.13%
China	2.57%	3.69%	5.55%	5.36%	3.67%	4.82%	3.21%	4.45%
Germany	2.76%	2.64%	2.77%	2.90%	4.40%	8.26%	4.42%	4.45%
Italy	1.78%	1.23%	0.92%	0.45%	0.49%	1.03%	1.21%	1.78%
All Other European	12.44%	13.01%	12.39%	8.48%	5.63%	4.13%	10.05%	2.67%
All Others	5.13%	5.80%	8.13%	6.92%	3.91%	4.82%	4.82%	4.00%
[ Ma jor West Euro pean*	20.54%	17.93%	16.27%	19.19%	27.65%	30.97%	28.93%	28.03% j
TOTAL	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

\*(Major West European category includes France, United Kingdom, Germany, Italy.)

# DESCRIPTION OF ITEMS COUNTED IN WEAPONS CATEGORIES, 1986-1993

TANKS AND SELF-PROPELLED GUNS: This category includes light, medium, and heavy tanks; self-propelled artillery; self-propelled assault guns.

**ARTILLERY:** This category includes field and air defense artillery, mortars, rocket launchers and recoilless rifles--100 mm and over; FROG launchers--100 mm and over.

**ARMORED PERSONNEL CARRIERS (APCs) AND ARMORED CARS:** This category includes personnel carriers, armored and amphibious; armored infantry fighting vehicles; armored reconnaissance and command vehicles.

**MAJOR SURFACE COMBATANTS:** This category includes aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, frigates.

**MINOR SURFACE COMBATANTS:** This category includes minesweepers, subchasers, motor torpedo boats, patrol craft, motor gunboats.

SUBMARINES: This category includes all submarines, including midget submarines.

GUIDED MISSILE PATROL BOATS: This category includes all boats in this class.

**SUPERSONIC COMBAT AIRCRAFT:** This category includes all fighters and bombers designed to function operationally at speeds above Mach 1.

**SUBSONIC COMBAT AIRCRAFT:** This category includes all fighters and bombers, including propeller driven, designed to function operationally at speeds below Mach 1.

**OTHER AIRCRAFT:** This category includes all other fixed-wing aircraft, including trainers, transports, reconnaissance aircraft, and communications/utility aircraft.

**HELICOPTERS:** This category includes all helicopters, including combat and transport.

SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILES (SAMs): This category includes all air defense missiles.

SURFACE-TO-SURFACE MISSILES: This category includes all surface-to-surface missiles without regard to range, such as SCUDs and CSS-2s. It excludes all anti-tank missiles and all anti-shipping missiles.

**ANTI-SHIPPING MISSILES:** This category includes all missiles in this class such as the Harpoon, Silkworm, Styx and Exocet.

### **REGIONS IDENTIFIED IN ARMS TRANSFER TABLES AND CHARTS**

ASIA

NEAR EAST

EUROPE

Afghanistan Australia Bangladesh Brunei Burma (Myanmar) China Fiii French Polynesia **Gilbert Islands** Hong Kong India Indonesia Japan Kampuchea (Cambodia) Kazakhstan **Kyrgyzistan** Laos Macao Malaysia Mongolia Nauru Nepal New Caledonia **New Hebrides** New Zealand Norfolk Islands North Korea Pakistan Papua New Guinea **Philippines** Pitcairn Singapore Solomon Islands South Korea Sri Lanka Taiwan Tajikistan Thailand Turkmenistan Uzbekistan Vietnam Western Samoa

Algeria Bahrain Egypt Iran Iraq Israel Jordan Kuwait Lebanon Libva Morocco Oman Qatar Saudi Arabia Svria Tunisia **United Arab Emirates** Yemen

Albania Armenia Austria Azerbaijan Belarus Bulgaria **Belgium** Canada Czechoslovakia/ Czech Republic Cyprus Denmark Estonia Finland France Georgia Germany Greece Hungary Iceland Ireland Italv Latvia Liechtenstein Lithuania Luxembourg Malta Moldova Netherlands Norway Poland Portugal Romania Russia Slovak Republic Spain Sweden Switzerland Turkev Ukraine United Kingdom Yugoslavia/former Yugoslavia

# **REGIONS IDENTIFIED IN ARMS TRANSFER TABLES AND CHARTS (cont.)**

# AFRICA (SUB-SAHARAN)

Togo Angola Benin Uganda Botswana Zaire Burkina Faso Zambia Zimbabwe Burundi Cameroon Cape Verde Central African Republic Chad Congo Côte d'Ivoire Diibouti **Equatorial Guinea** Ethiopia Gabon Gambia Ghana Guinea Guinea-Bissau Kenya Lesotho Liberia Madagascar Malawi Mali Mauritania Mauritius Mozambique Namibia Niger Nigeria Réunion Rwanda Senegal Sevchelles Sierra Leone Somalia South Africa Sudan Swaziland Tanzania

# LATIN AMERICA

Antigua Argentina Bahamas Barbados Belize Bermuda Bolivia Brazil **British Virgin** Islands **Cayman Islands** Chile Colombia Costa Rica Cuba Dominica **Dominican Republic** Ecuador El Salvador French Guiana Grenada Guadeloupe Guatemala Guyana Haiti Honduras Jamaica Martinique Mexico Montserrat **Netherlands Antilles** Nicaragua Panama Paraguay Peru St. Kitts & Nevis St. Lucia St. Pierre & Miquelon St. Vincent Suriname Trinidad

Turks & Caicos Venezuela