Chapter I

HISTORY OF ARMS TRADE

It is important to study the development of the arms industry to understand the nature of arms trade. Impact of industrial revolution, technological innovations, availability of raw materials and skilled labour have influenced the growth of the arms industry both in the European countries and the rest of the world. The following section is a study of the growth of arms industry and arms trade since the fourteenth century.

The European Scene

New weapons were invented with the introduction of gunpowder in Europe in early fourteenth century. Till then the armies were mostly equipped with swords, lances, projectiles, javelins, pikes and longbows, etc. The armies depended on 'shock' technique. The records show that by 1326 wrought iron guns and bronze guns were beginning to be used for shooting iron balls.¹ Iron was easily available and was less expensive than bronze. Manufacture of the bronze guns was dependent on the availability of copper and tin. These were imported

---

from a few well known centres by many European countries; such as copper from Hungary, Tyrol, Saxony and Bohemia; and tin from England, Spain and Germany. But guns were cast almost everywhere by artisans who had earlier specialized in making bronze bells. By second half of the fourteenth century, cannon had developed in Western Europe — Italy, England, France, Germany and Sweden. In Hungary, the first mention of firearms dates back to 1354.²

Initially, the artisans were either hired for definite periods of time or they produced guns on specific orders. Later on government's established permanent arsenals, worked by permanent staff or temporarily hired experts. Such as those of Venice in the fifteenth century, and of Duke of Saxony in Dresden in the seventeenth century. Some arsenals were opened only when work was to be done as in the Venetian government cannon foundry in Brescia.³

During the fourteenth century, Venice and Dubrovnik were the major source of supplies to the North Western area of the Balkans and its possessions in Albania and in Romania

---


Veneta, and, to Central and Southern Balkans respectively. Most of the trade in gunpowder, firearms and saltpetre and sulphur was conducted through: (1) merchants, (2) noblemen in service of or in business association with the feudal lords and rulers of Balkan region; and, (3) through the present representatives of those feudal elements and princes.

It was found that casting bronze guns was more expensive than the iron guns. But the latter failed to achieve high degree of accuracy and were more prone to rustings and accidents than the former. Also, the iron guns were inferior and more brittle than the bronze ones. With the establishment of large armies and navies, and overseas explorations, demand for cannon rose rapidly, followed by technological advances in the field. An improvement was achieved in "grains" for the guns. The "corning" of powder now involved mechanical incorporation of the ingredients in

---


5. Ibid., p.182. Although the author here refers to the prevalent mode of arms trade in the Dubrovnik region (from evidence at the archives there), it would appear that these were the usual means or channels of arms acquisition, in general, in this period.

6. On the average bronze artillery cost 3–4 times as much as iron ordinance. But the differential costs between the two were reduced as the latter pieces were heavier than the former. For example, a Swedish 6-pounder weighed approximately 500 Kgs. in bronze and 800–1,000 Kgs. in iron cast in 1620's and 30's. Quoted in Cipolla, n.3, p.65. Footnote. See Appendix 1.1.
fixed proportions. It was more effective and highly explosive but as yet unsuitable for the cannon of this period. Enormous bombards were manufactured in this period. All guns were individual guns and lacked standardization. Towards the end of fifteenth century, the French introduced a degree of mobility to artillery (almost negligent by modern standards) — by mounting the ordnance on wheeled carriages and using horses instead of oxen to draw the heavy cannon alongside the marching cavalry. Both, qualitatively and quantitatively, most of the worthwhile European production stock came from the Southern provinces of the Low Countries — Malins, Dinant, Namur, Antwerp, Tourmai, etc., Germany and Italy. Most of the Italian produce was locally consumed till the sixteenth century, while Flemish and German artillery was sold mostly to Portugal and Spain. Portugal exchanged these guns for gold, ivory and black pepper in West Africa and spices in the Far East. It remained largely dependent on foreign equipment and gunners due to lack of skilled labour at home.

In England, one of the main centres of Iron industry was in the weald of Sussex, in Ashdown Forest, under the gunners of French origin. As the war with France became imminent in 1543, the indigenous armaments got impetus.

---

8. ibid., p.32.
By 1545, English arms industry had expanded considerably. It appears that the presence of phosphorus in limonite ores, and important gray iron together with proper kind of pouring and moulding practices helped in the successful production of cast iron guns. These did not blow up as frequently as those of the earlier design and had greater propelling power than before. The demand for these guns went up on the continent. At the same time, increase in British trade and overseas expansion also increased the demand for guns. This was followed by increasing State control, such as, through the restriction order on the export of guns in 1574 by Queen Elizabeth. Licences were granted for the export of arms, especially to friendly Protestant powers. Much of the export went to Holland and some to Spain (1619 onwards) and to France. When traders failed to obtain licences, they operated through illegal channels. The overall trade in arms was thus affected by the prevailing restrictions. It was further affected by the fuel


11. Ibid., vol. 105, no. 103, Feb. 13, 1619; vol. 122, no. 71, Aug. 12, 1621. Spain had earlier failed to obtain arms in 1574 as a result of ban on exports to Catholic powers.


13. Under the pretence of Belonging to Englishmen, Dutch ships were furnished in 1623 with English equipment. cf. F.L. Robertson, The Evolution of Naval Armament.
crisis in 1630.\textsuperscript{14}

Improvements in guns were continuously being made everywhere. Skilled labour from the Low Countries was instrumental in founding the gun foundries in Sweden and Russia (120 miles South of Moscow near Tula). According to Colbert in 1669, there were 20,000 vessels of all kinds which carried on the European trade; of these 15-16,000 belonged to Dutch, 3-4,000 to the English and 500-600 were French.\textsuperscript{15} Between 1560 and 1600, Dutch imported large quantities from England. John Browne declared in 1619 that Dutch imported half of the manufactured ordnances under licences from England.\textsuperscript{16}

In 1604 there was an iron guns foundry at Asslar west of Wetzlar in Germany and in 1620 at Marsberg in Westphalia, manufacturing for the Dutch.\textsuperscript{17} In 1670's the Swedish industry had begun to export cannon instead of the semi-finished products like bar-iron and the price of the former was 30% higher than the latter. This also contributed to the development of Swedish shipping industry.\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14} V. Barbour, \textit{Capitalism in Amsterdam in the 17th Century} (Baltimore : 1950), p.38.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Cipolla, n.3, p.48 fn.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Calendar of State Papers, Domestic 1619-23, n.10; Quoted in ibid, pp.48-9.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Cipolla, ibid., pp.50-51, p.54.
\item \textsuperscript{18} ibid., pp.54-5.
\end{itemize}
In France, production was disrupted following the civil wars in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The skilled workers migrated to other parts of Western Europe. And France became dependent on foreign supplies. Local production was low. The nobility and church were not interested in investing in gun foundries. France imported large amounts of cannon from Holland, Sweden, Denmark, Hamburg and Biscay. This period was followed by some successful developments at Perigond and Angoumois factories by 1680 and failure at Nivennais and Burgundy manufacturing establishments, followed by further migration of many more workers to Germany and Switzerland. The situation of the French industry continued to deteriorate till 1730's. Only in the second half of the eighteenth century, French arms industry revived and progressively grew stronger.

In a nutshell, by the middle of the seventeenth century, the European armies equipped with improved muskets, bayonets, guns, gernanades and bombards became more formidable than before. The number of field guns was usually fairly small in proportion to the size of the armies. The tactic had


had changed to one of "shock and fire". Slow rate of fire and lack of mobility of the artillery were conspicuous and hampered the land warfare. The latter was to some degree enhanced by the successful adoption of arms on European naval vessels as far back as in 1336.21

The Non-European Scene

The Non-Europeans, Southeast of Europe, too used incendiary rockets and "Greek fire" before 1331. Due to their close vicinity to Europe they absorbed the European artillery technology which as yet was in its initial phases. According to Cipolla, by 1350's and 60's cannon technology had come from Spain to North Africa and Middle East and was used by Mamluks in their wars. Moreover, he adds, that in 1364 cannons were manufactured by the Ottomans in Asia Minor.22 D. Petrovic on the other hand, writes it is difficult to give a definite date as to when Ottomans acquired arms. Yet it may be said that towards the end of the fourteenth century they had probably begun to acquire some firearms as a result of their interaction and conquests of Balkans. It is apparent from references to various measures taken to stop the trade in arms that a number of Western merchants and gun runners


22. ibid., p.90.
functioned especially in Venice, Genoa, Ancona and Florence who supplied firearms to the Ottoman Empire in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.23

Cannon was, as yet, only capable of battering down forts and walls and, therefore, was used mostly for siege operations. Irrespective of the problem of transportation, large guns were made. They failed to realize the significance of the production of light field artillery in the Western Europe. While on the sea too, Portuguese using galleys and gun manned naval vessels defeated the Turks, who still used medieval technique of ramming, boarding and galleys. In India and China, metallic guns had developed following the use of gunpowder, rockets, missiles and incendiary projectiles before the middle of the 14th century. The knowledge of gunpowder and firearms had spread from China to Korea, Japan, Java and other parts of Asia.24 The Ottomans supplied firearms to the Khanates in Turkistan, the Crimean Khanate, the Gujaratis in India, the Sultan of Atche in Sumatra, and Sultan Ahmed Gran in Abyssinia. While their rivals — the AK Koyunlu and the Safawids in Iran and the Mamluks in Egypt — acquired arms from the Europeans.25

Following contact with the Europeans, the armament race had begun in other parts of the world too. The weapons became a highly prized commodity of exchange. The Portuguese and Dutch were at first reluctant to teach the technique of their weapons on which their supremacy depended. On the other hand, the non-Europeans did not desire to remain dependent on them or to acquire weapons in exchange for pepper, good brass ordnances, etc. They usually found some Europeans prepared to teach them this art. In some cases, as in 1514-15, the Portuguese taught the Persians the art of casting guns and supplied them with firearms against the Turks.

But when the Portuguese entered the Red Sea, even the Mamluk Sultanate asked the Ottoman for help to build a navy for defence against the Portuguese. Soon the influence of the Ottoman extended to Yemen, and from there on to Abyssinia, culminating in the Portuguese - Ottoman rivalry in Abyssinia.26

Although Iran obtained its equipment from various parts of Europe, such as Russia, a large amount of war material, however, was smuggled out of the Ottoman Empire (despite the various restrictions) in the second half of the 16th century.27

In East, Chinese made slow progress even after their

27. ibid., p.207.
contact with the Portuguese. While the Japanese were more quick at adopting and learning the new technology. Korea, India and Ceylon, too became centres of production of firearms. Nevertheless, the Europeans retained their superiority. In the first half of the 17th century, a gun foundry operated by a Manuel Tavares Bocarro at Macao in Asia, was the source of all Portuguese supply to its colonies in Asia and at times to the native rulers. Their other centre was in Goa. The Dutch set up a foundary at Hirado in Japan but later shifted to Batavia. And the Spanish cast guns at Cavite in Philippines. In the following centuries, the disequilibrium and gap between Europe and rest of the world continued to increase.

Industrialisation and Arms Trade

From 1575 till the end of the 18th century mercantile capital was pre-dominant in Europe. Arsenal manufacture remained under the State control. Technological changes were very few. In France, foreign pieces were used to alter the calibres of the guns. Some attempt was made to use limited type of artillery; only powder grains had become standardized into single size but with varied strengths. Further changes

occurred in the 18th century. Use of heavier calibres was gradually reduced. With the development of ballistic pendulum, velocity of projectiles could be measured. Attempts were made at achieving sphericity and correct diameter. Light howitzer came into use. Land ordnance was classified according to the functional utility of each piece, into field, siege and coast defence weapons. Interchangeability of wheels and other parts were gradually introduced.

Important changes affecting the arms industry took place in the late 18th and 19th centuries. The process of "democratization of war" had begun with the American Revolution and spread to Europe by the time of French Revolution. Under Napoleon the concept of large national armies developed which was a break from the earlier type of armies, which were largely based on mercenaries equipped with rifles, pistols, sabers, mortars, cannons and grenades. At this time Europe was also beginning to undergo the Industrial Revolution. Quantitative production of weapons increased in order to keep the large armies well equipped.

Qualitative changes were most important; innovations and improvements increased as progress was made in chemistry, mechanics, metallurgy, optics and associated sciences. Rifled cannon achieved greater degree of perfection and resistance to withstand internal pressure. Elongated streamlined projectiles were developed which moved more in a straight line.
(because of stabilizing spin) than the earlier round balls. Interchangeability became an important achievement. In the mid of 19th century, the armaments industry was shaped by the inventive genius of scientists like Alfred Noble, who developed the science of explosives and combined it with the developments in the field of gun manufacture. Noble developed the technique of mixing Nitro-glycerine with a particular type of clay, the Kieselguhr, which made it less explosive and less dangerous, and, therefore easier to use. A number of new weapons were invented, especially in the 20th century. The development of wireless, airplanes, armoured tanks, lethal gases and machine guns, increased the striking power and the effectiveness of armaments during war, increased mobility and increased security by the use of armoured plate. 29

While these changes were taking place in the field of technology, the economic relations in Europe were also undergoing a change. In this phase, industrial capital began to dominate commercial capital. Mercantile capitalism gave way to the "Lassiez faire" economic policies in the 19th century. Private trade flourished and became profitable. Great number of entrepreneurs joined in. Its impact was also felt in the arms industry. State manufacture was pushed into the background as increasing privatization of arms industry

took place with the rise of political liberalism. By mid-19th century, arms trade had increased but it was relatively very small in comparison to the present day arms trade. Older weapons were used for long periods as the rate of change of technology was slow. They were also available in market for sale as surplus weapons. Small quantities of second hand, obsolescent weapons were traded to meet the demands of the colonies and other smaller markets. The ability of the arms industry to adjust itself to meet the necessary demand for weapons somewhat muted the competition amongst the manufacturers.

By the end of the 19th century most of the arms trade was primarily in the hands of the private manufacturers and dealers, such as Sir Basil Zaharoff of Vickers-Maxim, Francis Bannerman of New York City, the Krupps in Germany.

A study of the histories of these arms manufacturers and dealers reflects the nature of arms trade in this period. The development of the arms industry was based partly on the orders from national government, but largely on foreign orders. Heeringen, a Cabinet member of Germany in 1913 summed up the dependence of the nation on its arms industry in the following words,

"...It is not the case that I favour private industry. But we are dependent upon it. In critical times we must have great masses of materials immediately ready. This cannot be secured in a State factory. On the other hand, we cannot give the private firms enough orders to keep them solvent in peacetime. Hence,
they are dependent upon foreign orders. Who gets the advantage of that? Unquestionably the class they support." 30

Krupp, for example, known as the "Cannon King" of his time, was an important industrial partner of the Kaisers and Hitler of the Second and the Third Reich. In this period weapons were sold to anyone who would buy them, irrespective of their political linkages. Salesmen like Basil Zaharoff excelled in selling arms by fermenting war scares through false reports on national armaments, bribery, cheating and breaking laws. 31 During World War I many nations found their brand of weapons in enemy hands. For example, German soldiers met Belgian and Russian soldiers both armed with Krupp cannon.

Arms industry was amongst the first few industries to acquire an international character. Most of the private industries developed and invented their own weapons independently of State financial help. Moreover, these industrialists owned a chain of various other business — hotels, banks, coal and copper mines, steel making industries, electricals


and mechanical engineering, etc. — in various parts of the world. Only during a crisis did the government extend to them direct or indirect financial support. Amalgamation of arms producing firms and collaboration with firms in other countries were common. For example, Vickers-Armstrong were in partnership with Schneider-Creusot in Rumania and Poland and in various foreign subsidiaries of German arms manufacturers.

The magnitude of arms trade towards the end of the 18th century and in the 19th century was with the European powers either engaged in overseas expansion and military conquests or involved in European wars. To a lesser degree the arms trade was with other parts of the world. As mentioned above, the private suppliers had become an important source of arms and ammunition supplies. As far back as in 1793, when the British Government complained of the sale of US arms and ammunition to an agent of the French Government, the US Secretary of State, Jefferson said that,

"our citizens have always been free to vend and export arms; that it is the constant occupation and livelihood of some of them";

---

32. For example, See Gert von Klass, Krupps: The Story of an Industrial Empire (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1954), James Cleugh Trans., Appendix.

that "to suppress their callings, the only means perhaps of their subsistence, because a war exists in foreign and distant countries in which we have no concern would scarcely be expected."\(^{34}\)

Although America remained neutral, the government did not feel any obligation to prohibit the private sale of arms. This principle was restated again and again by President Wilson and others. Only when USA was a belligerent state did it impose embargoes in the interest of the nation and for its national defence. For example, USA placed restrictions on the sale of and shipment of arms in 1905 to San Domingo and in 1912 to Mexico. Britain enacted a number of laws to control the export of war materials in pursuance of treaty stipulations especially, such as in the case of Spain and the South American Colonies in 1822 and during the war between Prussia and Denmark in 1848. French followed almost the same policies. Germany allowed its manufacturers to sell to one belligerent even when the other had no access to any arms.\(^{35}\) It was commonly held that it was the problem of the belligerents to intercept the arms shipments or contrabands destined to the enemy. It was a question of any neutral state prohibiting arms trade.

---


For the first time under the Brussels Act of 1890, thirteen European states, USA, Iran, Zanzibar and Congo Free State attempted to regulate the flow of arms and ammunition to the African States to protect the aboriginal population and to put an end to the crimes engendered by the slave trade.36 However, the major focus on arms trade came after the World War I as public opinion and major powers became concerned with the problems of peace and world order.37 It was believed that the mechanizations of the "arms international" were largely responsible for the arms race and,


consequently, the war. Article 8, para 5 in the Covenant of the League of Nations stated that: "The Members of the League agree that manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections..."\(^\text{38}\)

To overcome the evil effects of this, a Permanent Advisory Commission for Military and Naval and Air questions was formed on May 19, 1920. Further, a Temporary Mixed Commission (TMC) was instituted by the League of Nations Assembly on February 25, 1921 to consider the problems of disarmament from the socio-politico-economic point of view, in addition to the military point of view.

The TMC reports bear testimony to the fact that uncontrolled arms manufacture and private arms trade had acquired international dimension and had increased the incidence of war. The TMC report of September 15, 1921 said:\(^\text{39}\)

"2. That armament firms have attempted to bribe government officials, both at home and abroad;

3. That armament have disseminated false reports concerning the military and naval programmes of various countries in order to stimulate armament expenditure;

4. ...(They) have sought to influence public opinion through the control of newspapers in their own and foreign countries;"


5. ... (They) have organized international armament rings through which the armament race has been accentuated by playing off one country against another;

6. That... (they) have organized international armament trusts which have increased the price of armaments sold to Governments".

Official inquiries into the activities of the private arms manufacturers were also held in USA and Great Britain. 40

Both the Commissions came to the conclusion that it was desirable to eliminate war profits and suggested imposition of restrictions on the profits of the armament firms in peace time in lieu of nationalization of these industries.

The Geneva Conference of 1925 was convened to consider the supervision of international trade in arms and related war equipment. It, however, remained a convention whose concern was with: a) publicity of arms deals/trade, and b) problem of equity in arms trade and not with arms production. Therefore, a Special Committee was set up in 1926 to deal with the problems related to the manufacture of armaments. At the 1932 Disarmament Conference, regulation of controlled

manufacture and flow of arms and munition was considered to be the central issue with regards to the problem of disarmament. The important issues included: Should the private manufacture and trade be abolished or controlled by the government/s of the individual country/-ies, or managed through an international organization?

Although it was suggested that "the abolition of private manufacture and the concentration of the manufacture of arms in the hands of the State would establish a more clearly defined distinction between war production and peace production.....", the Conference did not solve the problems arising on the question of utilization of war industries during the peace times.41 The League of Nations also began the publication of Armaments Year Book annual in 1924. Although the data was incomplete and incomparable yet it was the only source of information available. It was hoped that such publicity would create public opinion and, thereby, help to curb the excesses of arms trade.

Besides the attempts of the League of Nations, St. Germain Convention organised by the Allied Powers in 1919

was an attempt to regulate arms traffic with the help of defeated European states and certain countries of the Middle East and Africa. USA, however, refused to ratify it. Finally, the TMC was entrusted with the task of submitting necessary proposals on disarmament to the Council. The USA made isolated attempts at regulating naval armaments under the Treaty of Washington in 1922. The Geneva Convention of 1925 dealt exclusively with supervision of international arms trade. At the Disarmament Conference of 1932 a number of proposals were made but as we have mentioned no agreement was reached.

In June 1934, USA proposed a comprehensive national system of licensing for manufacture and trade in arms which was to be submitted to permanent and automatic supervision. Also, the sale and purchase of those arms was to be prohibited whose use had been forbidden by international conventions. It was accepted by the Special Committee in 1934.\(^42\) The overall outcome was that the question of equity was resolved. That is, equal treatment to all producers and non-producers, state and private manufacture, was accepted. The necessity of establishing an international surveillance system for licensing and publicizing the production and trade of arms

was also accepted. However, there was no consensus on the kind of system that was to be established for international surveillance.

The result of these changes was the transformation of the nature of arms trade to some extent. The arms trade now passed into the hands of governments, but the private dealers still retained considerable autonomy.43 Despite all this, embargoes were not very effective during the interwar years. For example, when all efforts to stop the conflict between Bolivia and Paraguay failed the League's Chaco Commission (1934) requested all nations "to help bring the war to an end by refusing to supply the belligerents with arms and ammunitions". Yet, all commercial relations continued, arms trade remained uninterrupted; both American and British firms continued to supply the belligerents while all the nations were engaged in settling the dispute. When President Roosevelt moved the resolution in the House of Representatives to prohibit the sale of arms or ammunition in USA, the emphasis on export was missing.44 Furthermore, under the Treaty of Versailles, Germany was prohibited from manufacturing arms, yet we find that by 1929 it supplied thirteen nations and by 1930 twenty two nations. Also, rearmament of Germany under Hitler gave impetus to its arms industry in the 1930's.

Only after the World War II, did the arms trade pass into the hands of the States. The USA too opened up its arsenal markets to the European nations to prevent a Nazi conquest of Europe. Later on, the arms trade increased as decolonization proceeded in Africa and Asia. Arms aid became an official policy of the donor countries in the post-war period. The arms race was, further, fermented by the ideological conflict between the West and the East; between the World Capitalism and Socialism on the one hand, and the increasing needs of the Third World Countries on the other.
II. **Arms Trade in the Inter-war Period**

The nature of arms trade was a continuation of the 19th century policies of the private munition suppliers. "Anti-national traffic in arms" continued through the 1930's. Despite the almost paranoiac concern for secrecy in this period, we find that the Germans, the Russians and the Japanese had access to the latest American and British weapons. There was lack of concern for technical weapons secrets during the interwar period, and they traded in the latest and modern weapons. This is the characteristic of the arms trade in the interwar period and can be explained as a result of the continued uncontrolled private trade. The sale of arms was used as an instrument of diplomacy by the governments. At the same time, all nations tended to increase control over export licenses. For example, in 1919, Great Britain began to issue general licenses to prevent the excess arms stock from falling into the enemy hands.²

---

1. This phrase is used to explain the fact that the private suppliers supplied arms to both the home troops and the opponents. For example, USA continued to sell arms to Germany and Japan in the 1930's; and German firms to Holland, Romania, Greece and Yugoslavia till the eve of the World War II.

In the moderately oligopolistic arms market, the multiple client relations were extensive, cutting across alliances. In other words, this mode of acquisition of arms created client relationships incongruent with overall diplomatic constellations. The nature of arms industry was multinational. The works of Lehmann-Russbudt and Engelbrecht-Hanighen, etc.\(^3\) throw light on the interconnected and well established directorship and stock-holdings of these major industries. And the state control over arms trade was as yet incomplete.

The degree of technological changes was high in the interwar period.\(^4\) For example, the rate of turnover of a new generation of aircraft and armour was high -- the USA and Britain appear to have produced new model aircraft in all categories about every year or two. The unit cost of weapon system production and comparatively less in the post-war period and therefore, the number of the prototypes developed was large. The number of powers striving to achieve independent arms production capability was high. However, as increasingly

\(^3\) Cited in Section I above, n. 37.

rapid qualitative changes took place in the 1930's, the number of middle range powers producing weapons independently was reduced. Moreover, as war became imminent, the R & D programs gave way to increasing the actual defence production.

Countries like UK, USA, Italy, Germany, Czechoslovakia and France were the independent producers of major weapon systems in the interwar period. They include -- fighters, combat aircrafts, transport aircrafts, trainer and utility aircrafts, aircraft engines, tanks and armoured cars, and naval vessels. Some other European countries such as Sweden, Yugoslavia had achieved considerable independence in designing, developing and producing many of the above mentioned weapon systems, but remained dependent on foreign powers for aircraft engines, supplies of airforces, naval engines and fire control equipment. In addition to these, Russia and Japan developed their design by late 1930's. Largely all their products were the result of copying and licensing of Western models. Besides the European producers, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico and China achieved significant developments of light aircrafts. China and Brazil were also able to satisfy their internal demand for warships. China and Mexico demonstrated very limited capability for license production and development of some of their own small arms. While rest of the countries of Afro-Asia and Latin America remained dependent on European powers for their weapons.
Major American sales of combat aircrafts were concentrated in Latin America and China; and Japan's sales to Thailand in late 1930's. In the transport aircraft category USA was the major supplier to Latin America. Italy made inroads in Latin America in late 1930's and made significant sales of its light Fiat-Ansaldo tanks. Great Britain was the biggest supplier of submarines and warships, and Italy the second largest. Italy sold these to Argentina, Brazil, Thailand, Turkey, and Greece.

A look at the appendix I shows the nature of overall arms trade during this period. Most of the weapons were sold to European powers, much less to the independent countries of Afro-Asia and Latin America. In the remaining colonial regions, the major arms suppliers were the respective colonizing countries. Moreover, Europe remained the theatre of war in the first half of the 20th century and, thus, the major focus of rearmament and re-equipment for its defence. The overall trade in major weapons was in the hands of Great Britain, USA, Italy, France, Germany, Czechoslovakia and, Japan.

5. Trade with present day Third World countries will only be discussed.

6. See Appendix I, Table 1.2. However, a look at the tables 4.3 and 4.4 for total sale of arms and ammunition for the same period reflects a different ranking

F.N. continues.....
During the interwar period these powers were also the major licensers. The important licensing agreements signed during the 1930's by the European powers with the independent countries of the Afro-Asian and Latin American continents were the following: 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licensor</th>
<th>Licensee</th>
<th>System/s Licensed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Avro 634 (aircraft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Destroyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Douglas U-38 fighter bomber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Curtiss Hawk, Vought Corsair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Fairchild KR-34 Trainer, Vought Corsair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Curtiss Falcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Focke-Wulf Stieglitz trainers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous F.N.

from the one mentioned above. This obvious discrepancy is because the data for total arms and munition sale is based on the statistical data in the League of Nations, wherein only quantities of small arms and related munition and their values are recorded. Sales of major weapons are omitted. Moreover, some of the European suppliers specialized in particular weapon system/s while others in small arms, such as, USA in aircrafts while Belgium and Czechoslovakia etc. in the latter category. Therefore, we find that the scale of overall trade would inevitably be different than that for the major weapons. Table 1.5 highlights the fact that despite an appreciable fall in 'exports in general', exports of armaments' continued at almost the same level from 1931 to 1936; in fact, it increased towards 1936 (and before the World War II).

A look at the table 1.6 highlights the nature of arms trade of the independent countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia. Most of them acquired armaments, especially the major weapons, from various different suppliers. It would not be appropriate to use the terms 'West Bloc', 'Axis Powers' and 'Soviet Bloc' as Robert Harkavy has done to analyze the pattern of arms trade in the interwar period. These terms more appropriately describe the World War II and the post-war reality. There were no power blocs in this period. Bilateral agreements or alliances did not prevent the participants from joining similar agreements with other powers. For example, a non-aggression pact between Germany and Russia did not prevent Germany from having agreement with England. Therefore, it is not feasible to describe the international system as tripolar. However, shifts from one country to another can be observed from the detailed data in Appendix I, Table 1.6 and 1.7.

Latin America was important for the USA even during the interwar period. In 1920's efforts were made to liquidate

8. Robert Harkavy, ibid.
the system of American protectorates in the Caribbean. Nevertheless, USA's influence remained paramount. In 1921-22, the Washington Conference was held with a view to maintain 'status quo' with regard to fortification and naval bases in the territories and possessions of America, Great Britain and Japan. To the Americans, defence of the hemisphere was important for the defence of the North American continent. During the World War I, USA had sent military missions to Latin America for limited purposes. Congressional legislation of 1922 made the emergency mission sent to Brazil in 1918 and the naval training missions sent to Peru permanent. The US army also maintained a number of its representatives and one-man mission in Guatemala, Cuba, Brazil and Panama which were only intermittently active till 1937. Between 1920 and 1938, the USA had sent 32 military missions to Latin America.

---

9. Washington Conference was held from November 12, 1921 to February 6, 1922 to limit the naval armaments race especially. The USA, Great Britain, and Japan agreed to the limitation ratio of 5:5:3 and total tonnage limit of 525,000 tons and 315,000 tons. Furthermore, total tonnage that might be allotted to aircraft carriers was limited to 135,000 tons and 81,000 tons. For details of the Conference proceedings, see, Foreign Relations of the United States, 1922 (Washington: Government Printing Office), pp. 1-384.

On the other hand, during the 1920’s and 1930’s Germany and Italy had active military missions in Latin America. They liberally gave advice, arms and also indoctrinated the recipients. A non-aggression pact was signed by Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Paraguay, and Uruguay in 1933 and joined by Colombia and Panama in 1934 and 1936 respectively. Furthermore, any neutrality plans proposed during the 1930’s by the USA for the hemispheric defence were turned into consultative pacts. The countries of Latin America had no formal alliances with Germany and Italy. Yet they exhibited strong cross country acquisition pattern especially in the 1930’s. However, other countries which remained within the West Bloc at the outbreak of war made mutually advantageous agreements with the USA. For example, in 1939, Pan American contract was signed whereby the American air force could be deployed "in the defence of the critical Natal area." The allocation of


$12,000,000 for the development of network of airfields for the functioning of its army and navy was raised to $19,000,000 to allow the program to be extended to Bolivia and Paraguay.

Another example is that of Brazil which received armaments from multiple suppliers. In 1940, when USA wanted to station its troops in Brazil for defence purposes, Brazil asked for armaments worth $250,000,000 which was finally settled at $100,000,000 through the Import-Export Bank. These were, however, only supplied in 1942 when the Lend Lease program became functional.13 Thus, we see that Inter-American cooperation was a result of the bargains made with guns and tanks and large supplies of modern weapons. However, in order to reduce their dependence on America, most of the Latin American countries continued to diversify their arms trade.

With the collapse of colonialism in Latin America, most countries became independent in mid-19th century;14 followed by an "era of predatory militarism" in general,15 wherein the leaders of the revolutionary armies consolidated

14. Except Panama and Cuba.
15. Exceptions were Chile, Costa Rica and Brazil.
their own position as the new ruling elite, militarism began
to decline towards the end of the century, and was progressivel
replaced by the civilian rule. Army officers, high churchmen
and the large latifundistas -- the tripartite elite -- contin-
ued to remain dominant till World War I. Economic develop-
ments, development of national armies, professionalization of
the armed forces, import of technology imparted greater polit-
tical stability and curbed militarism. With the introduction
of modern technology and military methods by the French and
German missions in the late 19th century, increasingly pro-
fessional values were inculcated in the armed forces of the
Latin American countries.

Chile first invited a German mission in 1885 as its
army lacked both in knowledge and technique and was equipped
with obsolete weapons. Prussian General Emil Koerner reorga-
nised them along European lines and sent some outstanding
officers to Germany for training. In 1890's a War Academy
was set up. German influence remained strong till World
War I. Argentina, Uruguay and Bolivia too engaged German
instructors in 1899. By 1905 in Colombia, Venezuela, Paraguay,
El Salvador, Ecuador and Nicaragua German influence had come
indirectly from the Chilean military school through training
of personnel. French military missions and instructors had

16. Fritz T. Epstein, n. 11.
predominant influence in Brazil, Peru, Guatemala and also in Ecuador.\textsuperscript{17} The US training activity was different from that of Europeans.\textsuperscript{18} Five major wars had been fought between 1825 and 1883 in Latin America but with the rise of professional national armies regional wars lessened, producing greater domestic and regional peace and stability, except for the Chaco War in 1932-34.

Latin American countries were, in general, politically immature, economically backward and lacking in social awareness at the turn of the century. During the World War I, only Cuba and Brazil were involved directly as suppliers of military aid. Seven of the eight countries which declared war on the "Axis powers" were financially dominated by USA or UK. Five countries broke off relations and seven including Argentina, Chile, Colombia and Mexico remained neutral (although Mexico was pro-German in the beginning). These countries became the source of strategic raw materials and food stuffs to the Allies.

In the interwar period, internal changes took place; State became more active and social mobility increased. Army officers once more began to take over power. As middle class became politically and economically more influential,

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{18} Edwin Lieuwen, n. 11, p. 33. That is, US Government first intervened militarily then proceeded to reorganise the forces of the occupied country, eg. Haiti (1915-34), Dominican Republic (1916-34), Nicaragua (1926-31) and Panama (1918-19).
the army tended to dissociate itself increasingly from the old elite. French cultural influence was lost and replaced by the USA, just as USA had replaced UK in Latin America in matters of finance.

Till 1930, the Latin American republics were mainly preoccupied with strengthening of their own defence forces. The Montevideo (1933), the Buenos Aires (1936), and the Lima Conferences (1938) basically reiterated the principles elaborated in the Declaration of Inter-American solidarity.

On the eve of the Second World War, 15 Latin American States received a total of 29 military missions -- 11 from Italy, 9 from USA, 4 from Germany, 3 from France and 1 from Spain and Chile. With the outbreak of Second World War and increasing threat to the American Continent, politico-


21. World Peace Foundation, Documents on American Foreign Relations (Boston, 1939-46), vol. 1, pp. 68-69; US Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Appropriations Navy Department, Appropriations Bill for 1940, 76th Congress, 1st Session, March 27, 1939, p. 58. In 1939, Chile sent mission to Venezuela; USA to Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, Haiti and Peru. In next two years US missions were also sent to Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Nicaragua and Venezuela.
military cooperation between the USA and the Latin American States increased. The war also cut off arms supplies to South America from Germany and Italy. The USA taking advantage of the situation offered to supply them with spare parts, and won their cooperation in patrolling the neutrality zone and stationing its troops in their countries. 22 Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay signed an agreement to maintain a tripartite patrol operations along the eastern sea coast of South America (1939). Procedures for joint action were also established by Uruguay and Argentina to defend the Plata area in event of attack. 23 The USA was also concerned with averting possible subversions in the area. A number of "Axis" agents were active aided by local minority elements of German, Italian and Japanese origin.

In 1940, a general agreement was reached between the USA and other Latin American republics on the question of close military collaboration and cooperation for the defence of the Western Hemisphere (Argentina, Bolivia, Paraguay and Panama were not approached). Thus, the USA gained the use of sea, air transit and land bases in Latin America. Training facilities were extended to personnel of these countries. 24

24. New York Times, January 25, February 1, April 8, August 10, 12, 1941.
Personnel of Latin American countries was utilised and given practical training in manoeuvres with US fleet units in the Caribbean. Exchange of rank officers began. Credits were extended for the purchase of arms. Thus, USA had successfully ousted its all other European rivals by 1940 by providing both military and economic assistance to Latin American countries. Brazil supplied manpower during the Second World War. By 1942 all but Chile and Argentina had declared war on the Axis Powers. During the war, Latin America had expressed the Inter-American solidarity by giving support to the cause of the Allies.

In the Sub-Saharan Africa, Liberia and Ethiopia were the only two independent countries. In the 19th century Ethiopia's army was formed by Meneliks who lacked any kind of training. However, they captured permanent garrisons in the Southern provinces in the last decade of the 19th century. Till 1935, the army was composed of the standing army instituted by the Meneliks and which formed the paid standing garrison of each province, numbering about 10,000 men in 1930-1; rest of them, approximately 3,000,000 men were drawn at the time of war from the chiefs and their retainers. A number of irregulars too joined at the time of war.

Only Emperor's personal troops and the Imperial guard had any training to use the arms. Some of these officers and some Russian officers trained others in 1919.
A Belgian mission came to train the army in 1929 and stayed on till 1935. An additional Belgian and 2 Swiss officers came in 1931, and 5 men Swedish team came in 1934 to aid in training the Ethiopian army. Little information is available on its arms trade. It imported rifles from France and the French influence was strong in the first two decades of the 20th century. But the loosely organized army lacked proper transport and had little equipment. Almost everyone bore a rifle, and often a sword and shield. The Belgian trained Royal bodyguard increased in number to 2500 by 1935. They were armed with modern equipment, including a 5-ton tank which the Duke of Abruzzi had presented to the king during his visit in May 1927. In 1931, under the French instructions, the airforce began to get organized.

Writing in his autobiography, Emperor Hailé Selassie I mentions that in 1935 when Italy's intentions of war became evident, Ethiopia had no factories for the manufacture of war material ammunition, nor did it have adequate finances for making purchases abroad. And when it asked for loans from the members of the League of Nations, no help was forthcoming. Furthermore, Ethiopia had made arms agreements


27. Edward Ullendorff, trans. and annotated, The Auto-
with Great Britain, France and Italy before the outbreak of war, but even these shipments were stopped and allowed to reach Ethiopia only towards the end of the war. \textsuperscript{28} At another point the Emperor describing the position of soldiers at Shire and Tambien writes that 90\% of the rifles used were 40 years old, such as fusil gras, Schneider and similarly antiquated weapons. About 10\% had Mauser rifles and did not possess more than 125 machine guns. The cannon was mostly captured from enemy — including tanks, machine guns, rifles, ammunitions plus telephone and radio equipment. \textsuperscript{29}

Moreover, under the Ethiopian Arms Traffic Treaty of Aug. 21, 1930, British dealers could only supply armaments to Ethiopia during the 1930's through the Arms Export Prohibition Order of 1931, which forbade supplies of aircrafts, and its engines, bayonets, swords and lances to Ethiopia only. \textsuperscript{30} Despite

\begin{itemize}
  \item Previous F.N:
  \begin{itemize}
    \item \textbf{28.} Ibid., pp.257-8.
    \item \textbf{30.} Elton Atwater, n.2, p.302.
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
the scanty reports available, one can add that Ethiopia was the
only Sub-Saharan African country to receive major weapons from
outside powers. It maintained a balance between Italy, Britain,
France, and Holland in its arms trade. Till 1935, Ethiopia
purchased arms from multiple suppliers.

In North Africa and West Asia region, following were
the independent countries during the interwar period:

1) Saudi Arabia which retained its traditional absolute
monarchy,

2) Yemen which had become nominally a part of the Ottoman
Empire in 1918 and had an independent monarchy,

3) Egypt -- it was a British protectorate till 1922
when it became an independent kingdom,

4) Iraq which was under British mandate till 1930 when
it became independent, and

5) Iran which had managed to escape colonialism.

In Saudi Arabia, British influence was considerable
during the interwar period. Due to paucity of material it is
difficult to know the level or degree of arms trade. Yet it
appears that in 1930's a small regular army was brought together,
equipped mostly with British weapons. Some aeroplanes had been
acquired and the pilots trained abroad. In 1937 a training
school for pilots was established. By 1937, Saudi Arabia had
become dissatisfied with the British supplies, both qualitatively
and quantitatively. Therefore, it proceeded to negotiate with the
Germans. By then Saudi Arabia had a steady income from the
royalties of oil, exploited by the American Caltex Corporation. Meanwhile Germany too had become interested in finding a friendly connection in this region, which was otherwise "West" oriented. On 17th July 1939, the deal was finalized; the Reich government was sympathetic and ready to supply arms, including 4,000 rifles of latest variety, as gift plus cartridges, and, agreed to supply war material on order on a credit of 6 million RM.31 From these small informations it can be concluded that Saudi Arabia began to acquire qualitatively more and quantitatively larger modern consignments of armaments towards the end of 1930's from the "Axis Powers", although its consumption, need and use must have been rather limited.

Yemen rulers, like Saudi Arabia, derived their military power from tribal levies. With the help of an Italian Mission, a tribal Royal Guard was established during the interwar period. The officers were trained in Iraq at Baghdad in 1930's. Yemen apparently remained more or less isolated till 1950.

Iraq was linked to Britain by the Anglo-Iraqi Treaty of 1930. Its armed forces were, therefore, a result of the British policies and guidance. It acquired arms and equipment from Britain mostly, and later on in 1937-38 from Italy. Kramarz's notes confirm that Iraq was acquiring armaments from

Italy. During the 1941 encounter between Britain and Iraq, the latter's troops were equipped with one company of light Italian made Fiat tanks + one company of British Crossleys + 65 planes (in 6 squads) of which 4 were of British and 2 of Italian production.\textsuperscript{32}

In 1941 Germany too agreed to supply arms to Iraq.\textsuperscript{33} Iraq had acquired its naval equipment from Britain.

Egypt was closely linked to Great Britain and this relation was formalized by the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian Treaty. Egypt continued to station British troops for the defence of the Canal and its forces were equipped largely with British equipment. The Egyptian forces were further reorganized under the aegis of the British Military Mission in 1937. And, during the World War II, Britain reinforced the position of Egypt with its forces which included an Indian division.

Iran\textsuperscript{34} was faced with the problem of retaining its

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32} Kramarz's notes on status of military support for Iraq, Berlin, May 16th, 1941, Documents on German Foreign Policy, Series D, London and Washington: vol.12, no.528, Quoted in L.Hirszowicz, ibid.,p.166.
\item \textsuperscript{33} L.Hirszowics, ibid., p.375; Chronology of German-Arab Relations.
\item \textsuperscript{34} During the second half of the 19th century, Iran/Persia received arms equipment from Krupps, Germany. At the turn of the century, it appears that it was largely equipped with contraband shipments from Russia; and, during the Persian Revolution, the Royalist forces were guided by non-commissioned Russian officers. See, F.N.
\end{itemize}
independence in the interwar period. It signed a treaty with Britain in 1919 in which the latter agreed to supply the former economic and military advisors, and help organize its forces and sell arms to it. Furthermore, Iran signed a non-aggression pact with the Soviet Union in 1927. It spent almost 2/4 million pounds (= 33.5% of the total revenue) as its defence budget and considerable measures were undertaken to modernise and re-equip the army with modern weapons in the 1930's. Its manpower was low, and, therefore, the forces were not very strong. Military service had become compulsory. Its tribal strength continued to fall towards 1940. The army officers were trained at the Military Academy, Tehran. Some were sent to France and Germany for further technical instructions and to Italy for naval training. Its Gendarmerie, however, remained equipped with obsolete, and old pattern rifles (Russian, French & British). An arsenal was maintained at Tehran.

Iran ordered mountain guns from Bofors in Sweden. Moreover, equipment for the army was purchased from various factories in Germany, Czechoslovakia and Sweden. Only its

Previous F.N:


35. General Hassan Arfa, Under Five Shahs (London: John Murray, 1964), p. 226. The author says that his brother was making these purchases.

Central Division was equipped with modern weapons — 2 tanks, 4 armoured cars, 11 Citroen Caterpillars, 48 touring cars and 36 lorries. By 1940, its air force had acquired 25 fighters, 100 general purpose aircrafts and 75 trainers (=200). These were mostly British De Havilland and Hawkers. From 1936 onwards, Iran diversified its purchases from Italy and Germany, thereby reducing its dependence on Britain. Besides the budgetary allocations, considerable sums from oil royalties were spent on purchasing modern arms.

In South Asia, only Afghanistan remained an independent kingdom during the interwar period. Its army was small but in the event of war, it could mobilize a number of warlike tribesmen who were equipped with modern rifles. A Turkish military mission was active there, and the European powers aided in building its air force. It purchased a number of planes for its air force from Britain, Russia and Italy. It also signed a non-aggression pact with the USSR in 1936.

37. Statesman's Year Book, n.14, 1931, p.1174. Also see, tables 1.6 and 1.7 on its Naval and Air Force acquisitions.

In the South East Asia region, Thailand/the Kingdom of Siam was an independent country. The bulk of its supplies came from Britain, the USA, France and its naval vessels from Italy and Japan. Its defence expenditure increased from approx. 20% in 1930 to approx. 30% in 1941. Its army increased during the 1930's and its navy doubled. Around 1938, it increasingly came under "Axis" influence.

In the North East Asia, China was the only semi-autonomous country. It acquired arms from various countries during the interwar period; exhibiting an eclectic pattern of acquisition. (See Tables 1.5, and 1.4). It signed a non-aggression pact with USSR in 1937. And, towards the end of the 1930's it replaced the Axis powers with USSR as the arms supplier. Its military expenditure was roughly about 32.5% of the total revenue in 1936-37. Although a British Naval Mission had helped to reorganize its navy in 1930, towards 1940, the naval vessels had lost all their war value due to lack of maintenance. On the one hand, China imported large quantities of armaments, on the other, it exported arms to South Africa during the interwar period.

This, in brief, gives a picture of the arms trade of the independent countries (which are a part of the present day Third World) during the interwar period.

On the other hand, in the colonized regions arms supply was predominantly from the Centre to the Periphery. That is, the colonizing country largely supplied necessary
stores of arms and ammunition and other weapon systems to its colonies. A look at the Indian case during this period highlights this character.

In 1858, when India came under direct control of the Crown, the armed forces consisting of 60,000 British and 120,000 Indian troops bequeathed by the East India Company were reorganized. The Royal Navy was entrusted the task of naval defence of India. Furthermore, the defence policy was formulated primarily for the local defence of the frontiers and to maintain internal security.

India's forces were strengthened in the 1880's as the British Government for India perceived threat from Russia and Afghanistan. As late as 1941 India remained insecure against the combined strength of the Axis powers and the Soviet Union. It was almost completely dependent on the UK for its defence. The Chatfield Committee and the Auchinleck Committee in 1938 were entrusted with the task of modernizing the Indian forces and of recommending necessary measures by which, within the limited resources available, Indian forces could be rearmed, equipped and maintained.


40. See, Chatfield Committee Report, 1938-39, Introduction, F.N. Continues...
The Chatfield Committee recommended that India should maintain units for security against external threats and to ensure internal order. The Committee advocated the principle of "joint responsibility". During the World War I India supplied 12,15,000 men overseas; and supplies of equipment and stores amounting to £80 million plus a gift of £11,35,000,000 to Britain in 1917-18, which added 30% to the national debt.

The armed forces of India greatly increased and expanded during the World War II. Besides the Indian forces British forces too existed. Till the end of 1930's India was completely dependent on Great Britain for the supplies of equipment, arms, ammunitions, transport, ships, and aircrafts. India had almost no war industry and the industrial development was limited. Britain too found it difficult to supply adequate amount of war material for India. Recruitment was reinforced during the World War II. Following reorganization of the
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43. See, Nandan Prasad, Sri, Expansion of the Armed Forces and Defence Organization 1939-45 (Combined Inter-Services Historical Section India and Pakistan, India F.N. Continues....
Indian armed forces, British troops and some of the Indian troops were released for the defence of the West Asian and the North African regions. In the meanwhile, Indian war industry developed, becoming self-sufficient/supporting in many forms of repair facilities for aircrafts, tanks and motor transport. Construction of small merchant vessels and naval crafts were undertaken at Hindustan Aeronautics Limited (HAL), Bangalore.

India became an important base for the supplies to the South East Asian theatre of war. Furthermore, Indians formed 80% of the total forces of Britain/its Empire employed in Malaya, China, Indo-China and Indonesia. A look at the defence expenditure shows that India spent exorbitant sums on defence during the interwar period in aiding the Allies. 44 As mentioned earlier, most of the arms and ammunitions imported into India were from Britain. 45

Similar sole supplier relationship was seen in the rest of the colonized regions. Accordingly, following pattern

---
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1956), Bisheshwar Prasad, ed., Official History of the Indian Armed Forces in the Second World War 1939-45 (Series); Chapter 4-12, pp.47-194.

44. See, Fig. 1.8.

45. See, Tables 1.6 and 1.7.
of acquisition of armaments was seen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Countries/Colonies importing arms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>French Indo-China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>New Caledonia and Dependencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>America</td>
<td>Guadeloupe and Dependencies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Martinique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Senegal, Comoroons, Dahomey, French Guinea, French Sudan, Ivory Coast, Niger, Mauritania, Dakar and Dependencies, Madagascar, Portuguese Guinea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phillipine Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Virgin Island, American Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Macao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Angola, Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Aden, Perim, Socotra, Sarawak, Ceylon, Cyprus, Hong Kong, India and Dependencies, Burma and Malaya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Kenya and Protectorate, Uganda Prot., Zanzibar, Mauritius, Nayasalnd, Nigeria, St. Helena, Somaliland, S. Africa, Leone, Basutoland, Bechuanaland Prot., Sierra, Swaziland, Southern and Northern Rhodesia, Seychelles, Gambia, Gold Coast, Ashanti, Northern Territories, Tanganyika, Br. Cameroons, Togoland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Indies Bahamas, Barbados, Jamaica, Leeward Is., Trinidad, and Tobago, Windward Islands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This, in brief, was the pattern of arms acquisition by the independent and the colonized parts of the present day Third World and has been studied in relation to the factors of
polarity, alliances and ideology of the interwar period. Arms aid was a rate phenomenon in this period. In most cases, we find that they acquired weapons from diverse sources in order to reduce their dependence on any one country. At the same time they tried to strengthen their own defence forces to maintain their independence and sovereignty. In fact, a careful study shows that the independent countries of Afro-Asia were only those which became 'Buffer-Zones' between two expanding rival powers or imperial powers, such as Thailand between French and British; Afghanistan between Russians and British, and so on.

In the overall analysis, the total time spent in war by the independent countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia was very little, and intensity low. Furthermore, Latin America was far away from Europe in terms of its geographic location. But they contributed their forces to aid the Allies during the Second World War. While, the independent countries of Afro-Asia were much closer to Europe and directly involved in the war, we find that as compared to the developed nations the defence forces of these countries were small, their defence budget low, and equipment old and entirely dependent on foreign supplies. Moreover, their position was affected by their relations with the existing power blocs. Lastly, most of the modernization of and increase in forces took place during and after the World War II.