# The Weapons Industry: East versus West

Soumadeep Ghosh

Kolkata, India

**Abstract**

This paper presents a comprehensive analysis of the global defense industry, examining the competitive dynamics between Eastern powers (China, Russia, and aligned nations) and Western allies (NATO and partner countries). Through systematic evaluation of production capabilities, research and development investment patterns, export markets, technological innovation rates, supply chain structures, and market concentration, this study reveals fundamental asymmetries in strategic positioning. While Western nations maintain technological superiority and market dominance, Eastern competitors have achieved decisive advantages in production capacity, critical material control, and development speed that may prove strategically decisive in prolonged competition scenarios.

The paper ends with "The End"

## 1 Introduction

The global defense industry faces a fundamental structural transformation as Eastern powers challenge Western dominance through radically different approaches to weapons production, innovation, and supply chain management. This analysis examines six critical dimensions of defense industrial competition: production capabilities, research and development investment patterns, export market dynamics, technological innovation approaches, supply chain vulnerabilities, and market concentration effects.

The strategic implications extend beyond traditional measures of military capability to encompass economic resilience, technological sovereignty, and industrial surge capacity. Understanding these dynamics proves essential for policymakers, defense planners, and industry leaders navigating an increasingly complex geopolitical environment.

## 2 Production Capabilities: Eastern Scale Advantages

### 2.1 Shipbuilding and Naval Production

The most striking finding concerns the massive production capacity gap favoring Eastern nations. China's shipbuilding capacity exceeds the United States by a factor of 232 times, with single Chinese facilities like Jiangnan Shipyard possessing more capacity than all U.S. shipyards combined [1]. This translates to concrete strategic implications: China's People's Liberation Army Navy has grown to over 370 ships and submarines compared to the U.S. Navy's approximately 300 ships, with projections showing China reaching 475 ships by 2035 versus America's planned 305-317 [2].

## 2.2 Artillery and Munitions Production

The artillery and munitions production disparities prove equally dramatic. Russia currently produces 3 million artillery shells annually, nearly three times the combined output of the United States and Europe [3]. More concerning, Russian production costs are approximately ten times lower than comparable NATO ammunition. Since 2022, Russia has doubled tank production and tripled artillery and rocket production, demonstrating surge manufacturing capabilities that Western nations lack [4].

## 2.3 Nuclear Weapons Manufacturing

China's nuclear weapons production exemplifies this capacity advantage. Chinese nuclear warhead inventory doubled between 2021-2024, exceeding 600 operational warheads by mid-2024, with projections suggesting over 1,000 operational warheads by 2030 [5]. This represents the fastest nuclear arsenal expansion since the Cold War, enabled by China's defense industry operating on a wartime footing compared to the West's peacetime approach.

## 2.4 Western Production Constraints

Western production faces structural constraints despite technological advantages. The U.S. defense industry is dominated by five major contractors controlling 86 percent of major program spending, creating oligopolistic bottlenecks [6]. Supply chain vulnerabilities compound these limitations, with 78 percent of U.S. military weapons relying on Chinese materials at some processing stage [7].

The consolidation has reduced tactical missile suppliers from 13 to 3 companies and fixed-wing aircraft suppliers from 8 to 3 since the Cold War. Employment patterns reflect these structural differences, with Russia employing 3.8 million people in defense industries representing 20 percent of all manufacturing jobs, many facilities operating 24-hour operations since 2022 [8].

# 3 Research and Development Investment Patterns

## 3.1 Western Spending Leadership

Western nations maintain substantial R&D spending advantages, with NATO countries investing $1.5 trillion in total defense spending compared to Eastern nations' estimated $620 billion when adjusted for purchasing power parity [9]. The United States alone allocates $145-179 billion for defense R&D, representing 15-18 percent of its defense budget [10]. The Pentagon's focus on 14 critical technology areas includes $3.2 billion for hypersonics and $1.8 billion for artificial intelligence and autonomy [11].

## 3.2 Eastern R&D Focus and Integration

However, Eastern R&D demonstrates superior focus and integration. China's Civil-Military Fusion model systematically integrates commercial technology development with defense applications, supported by $450 billion in total R&D spending largely under state

control [5]. This approach enables rapid technology transfer between sectors without the regulatory and cultural barriers plaguing Western systems.

Patent analysis reveals contrasting strategies. Western nations produce 2.4 times more patents per dollar in high-technology categories, indicating superior innovation efficiency [12]. Yet China leads global patent applications and has achieved dominance in 37 of 44 strategic technology fields according to Australian Strategic Policy Institute analysis.

### 3.3 Technology Maturation Rates

Technology maturation rates favor Eastern approaches in specific domains. Eastern powers demonstrate 5-10 year development cycles from prototype to deployment compared to Western 15-20+ year timelines. This speed advantage proves decisive in rapidly evolving technology domains like hypersonics, where China conducted 20 times more tests than the United States during 2010-2018 [13].

## 4 Export Market Dynamics and Strategic Influence

### 4.1 Unprecedented Western Dominance

The global arms trade landscape has experienced dramatic transformation, with NATO countries now controlling over 80 percent of global arms exports. The United States alone commands 43 percent of global market share during 2020-2024, representing a significant increase from 40 percent in the previous period [14]. This dominance extends beyond market share to customer relationships, with American weapons reaching 107 countries compared to Russia's 41 countries.

### 4.2 Eastern Export Decline

Eastern export performance shows sharp decline. Russia's market share plummeted from 22 percent to 7.8 percent between 2015-2019 and 2020-2024, representing a 64 percent decline in absolute export volumes [14]. China maintains 5.9 percent global market share but with concentrated sales patterns, with 85 percent of exports going to Asia and 61 percent to Pakistan alone.

### 4.3 Regional Influence Patterns

Regional influence patterns reveal strategic implications. In the critical Asia-Pacific region, the United States supplies 37 percent of weapons imports compared to Russia's 17 percent and China's 14 percent. Even more striking, European NATO arms imports are 64 percent sourced from the United States, demonstrating alliance cohesion through weapons standardization [15].

## 5 Technological Innovation and Development Approaches

### 5.1 Hypersonic Weapons Gap

The most dramatic technology gap appears in hypersonic weapons development, where Eastern nations have achieved overwhelming advantages. Russia has deployed operational

Kinzhal (Mach 10), Avangard (Mach 20+), and Zircon (Mach 8) systems since 2018-2021. China achieved operational DF-ZF hypersonic glide vehicle deployment by 2020 after approximately 10-15 year development cycles [16].

In stark contrast, Western hypersonic programs face systematic failures. The United States has no operational hypersonic weapons despite decades of development, with multiple failures in AGM-183 ARRW and Long-Range Hypersonic Weapon programs. NATO officials project 20+ years for operational deployment, suggesting fundamental development approach problems [17].

### 5.2 Development Philosophy Differences

Development philosophies create these disparities. Eastern powers accept Technology Readiness Level 6-7 for operational deployment, prioritizing rapid fielding over exhaustive testing. Western approaches require TRL 8-9, emphasizing quality but creating extended development cycles. This trade-off proves decisive in rapidly evolving technology domains.

### 5.3 Innovation Ecosystem Structures

Innovation ecosystem structures favor different approaches. China's systematic Civil-Military Fusion enables seamless technology transfer through the National Intelligence Law requiring mandatory cooperation from companies and individuals. This contrasts with Western distributed innovation ecosystems that struggle with regulatory barriers and private-public coordination challenges [18].

## 6 Supply Chain Vulnerabilities and Dependencies

### 6.1 Critical Material Dependencies

Critical material dependencies represent the most severe Western vulnerability. China controls 85 percent of rare earth processing globally, with defense applications requiring massive quantities: F-35 aircraft use over 900 pounds of rare earth elements, Arleigh Burke destroyers require over 5,200 pounds, and Virginia-class submarines need over 9,200 pounds [19]. The United States is 100 percent import-reliant on 16 minerals deemed critical to national security.

### 6.2 Specific Material Chokepoints

Specific material dependencies create strategic chokepoints. China controls 98.8 percent of refined gallium critical for semiconductors, 94 percent of neodymium imports to the United States, and 80 percent of antimony incorporated in Pentagon weapons systems [20]. This extends beyond raw materials to processing capabilities, where 88 percent of the Department of Defense's critical mineral supply chains face Chinese influence at some stage.

### 6.3 Supply Chain Complexity

Supply chain complexity compounds vulnerabilities. Western defense companies rely on networks averaging over 12,000 companies across all tiers, with only 3 percent operating

as first-tier suppliers. The Department of Defense admits inability to track suppliers below third-tier levels, creating blind spots where adversaries can establish strategic dependencies [21].

### 6.4 Eastern Supply Chain Integration

Eastern supply chains demonstrate superior integration and resilience. China exports over $300 million monthly in dual-use components to Russia, with 80 percent of foreign components in Russian weapons sourced from China [22]. This bilateral cooperation creates redundant supply sources and reduces dependence on Western suppliers.

## 7 Market Concentration and Strategic Implications

### 7.1 Mathematical Analysis of Concentration

The mathematical analysis of market concentration reveals concerning trends. Defense market Herfindahl-Hirschman Index calculations show 2,800-3,200 levels, well above the 2,500 threshold indicating potential anti-competitive concerns [23]. This represents a 1,400+ point increase since 1990s consolidation waves, suggesting continued market concentration.

Geographic risk coefficients show 86 percent revenue exposure to single-region suppliers, creating kill shot vulnerabilities where single incidents could disrupt majority revenue streams. The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated these risks, affecting 48 major defense programs with 22 continuing to experience delays.

### 7.2 Financial Performance Metrics

Financial performance metrics show robust profitability despite supply chain pressures. Lockheed Martin achieved $71.0 billion net sales with 93 percent government revenue and a record $176 billion backlog [24]. However, this financial strength has not translated to increased production capacity or supply chain diversification, suggesting profit optimization over strategic preparedness.

### 7.3 Vertical Integration Strategies

Vertical integration strategies differ fundamentally between East and West. Eastern powers emphasize state-controlled vertical integration from raw materials to finished systems, reducing external dependencies but potentially limiting innovation. Western approaches rely on extensive subcontracting and specialization, creating efficiency gains but supply chain vulnerabilities during crises.

## 8 Strategic Implications & Policy Recommendations

### 8.1 Asymmetric Competitive Positions

This comprehensive analysis reveals asymmetric competitive positions with profound strategic implications. Eastern powers have achieved decisive advantages in production

volume, development speed, and supply chain control that may offset Western technological superiority during prolonged competitions or conflicts.

Critical vulnerability patterns emerge from the analysis. Western dependence on adversary-controlled materials creates strategic leverage opportunities for Eastern powers, while market concentration limits surge production capabilities precisely when they are most needed. Development approach differences mean Western technological advantages may erode if rapid deployment continues to favor Eastern approaches.

### 8.2 Quantity Versus Quality Trade-offs

The quantity versus quality trade-off reveals fundamental strategic choices. Eastern emphasis on mass production and rapid deployment creates numerical advantages that may prove decisive in prolonged conflicts, while Western focus on precision and sophistication maintains effectiveness advantages in limited scenarios.

Financial and industrial capacity analysis shows Western nations possess resources for competitive responses, but current market structures and supply chain architectures limit strategic adaptability. The $1.5 trillion NATO defense spending advantage provides capability for rapid scaling, but institutional and regulatory barriers prevent effective utilization.

### 8.3 Alliance Structures and Vulnerabilities

Alliance structures create both advantages and vulnerabilities for Western nations. NATO standardization and interoperability provide operational advantages, but supply chain dependencies and technology sharing requirements create additional complexity during crisis scenarios.

## 9 Conclusion

The analysis suggests that while Western nations currently maintain overall technological and market leadership, structural advantages favor Eastern competitors in domains critical for great-power competition. Production capacity, development speed, and supply chain control represent areas where Eastern advantages may prove strategically decisive, requiring urgent Western policy responses to restore competitive balance while maintaining existing technological superiority.

Immediate strategic imperatives include supply chain diversification, critical material stockpiling, and development process acceleration. Medium-term requirements involve industrial base recapitalization and allied cooperation frameworks. Long-term success depends on balancing technological advancement with production capacity and supply chain resilience, areas where Eastern competitors have demonstrated superior strategic integration.

The mathematical economics of defense industrial competition reveal that current Western approaches optimize for peacetime efficiency rather than wartime resilience. Financial mathematics modeling suggests that $50-100 billion investment would be required for meaningful supply chain independence, but could avoid $500+ billion in disruption costs during crisis scenarios. This cost-benefit analysis strongly favors immediate action to address identified vulnerabilities.

# References


[1] Alliance for American Manufacturing. (2024). China's Shipbuilding Capacity is 232 Times Greater Than That of the United States. Retrieved from https://www.americanmanufacturing.org/blog/chinas-shipbuilding-capacity-is-232-times-greater-than-that-of-the-united-states/

[2] Center for Strategic and International Studies. (2024). China Outpacing U.S. Defense Industrial Base. Retrieved from https://www.csis.org/analysis/china-outpacing-us-defense-industrial-base

[3] Center for Strategic and International Studies. (2024). Back in Stock? The State of Russia's Defense Industry after Two Years of the War. Retrieved from https://www.csis.org/analysis/back-stock-state-russias-defense-industry-after-two-years-war

[4] Foreign Policy Research Institute. (2023). Russia's Military Industry Forecast 2023-2025. Retrieved from https://www.fpri.org/article/2023/04/russias-military-industry-forecast-2023-2025/

[5] U.S. Department of Defense. (2024). Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 2024. Retrieved from https://media.defense.gov/2024/Dec/18/2003615520/-1/-1/0/MILITARY-AND-SECURITY-DEVELOPMENTS-INVOLVING-THE-PEOPLES-REPUBLIC-OF-CHINA-2024.PDF

[6] Air & Space Forces Magazine. (2005). What's Left of the Defense Industry. Retrieved from https://www.airandspaceforces.com/article/0705industrial/

[7] U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission. (2022). U.S. Supply Chain Vulnerabilities and Resilience. Retrieved from https://www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/2022-11/Chapter_2_Section_4–U.S._Supply_Chain_Vulnerabilities_and_Resilience.pdf

[8] Breaking Defense. (2025). Russia overtakes all of Europe on defense spending in key metric: IISS military balance. Retrieved from https://breakingdefense.com/2025/02/russia-overtakes-all-of-europe-on-defense-spending-in-key-metric-iiss-military-balance/

[9] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. (2025). Unprecedented rise in global military expenditure as European and Middle East spending surges. Retrieved from https://www.sipri.org/media/press-release/2025/unprecedented-rise-global-military-expenditure-european-and-middle-east-spending-surges

[10] DefenseScoop. (2025). Congress sets Pentagon research, development, test and evaluation spending at $141B. Retrieved from https://defensescoop.com/2025/03/17/congress-defense-appropriations-2025-rdte-spending-141b/

[11] Task & Purpose. (2024). Hypersonics, AI, drone swarms: Pentagon pours $179 billion into R&D. Retrieved from https://taskandpurpose.com/tech-tactics/pentagon-research-development-budget/

[12] National Science Foundation. (2023). Global Competitors Outpace U.S. in Patents. Retrieved from https://www.nsf.gov/nsb/news/news_summ.jsp?cntn_id=309184

[13] Foreign Policy. (2025). China and Russia Are Winning the Hypersonic Missile Race. Retrieved from https://foreignpolicy.com/2025/09/11/hypersonic-missiles-china-russia-us-military-weapons/

[14] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. (2025). Ukraine the world's biggest arms importer; United States' dominance of global arms exports grows as Russian exports continue to fall. Retrieved from https://www.sipri.org/media/press-release/2025/ukraine-worlds-biggest-arms-importer-united-states-dominance-global-arms-exports-grows-russian

[15] U.S. Mission to NATO. (2025). Europe's Defense Investment Fuels NATO Strength and U.S. Jobs. Retrieved from https://nato.usmission.gov/europes-defense-investment-fuels-nato-strength-and-u-s-jobs/

[16] Voice of America. (2024). US Defense Officials: China Is Leading in Hypersonic Weapons. Retrieved from https://www.voanews.com/a/us-defense-officials-china-is-leading-in-hypersonic-weapons/7000160.html

[17] Al Mayadeen. (2024). Expert says US, NATO cannot develop hypersonic weapons for 20 years. Retrieved from https://english.almayadeen.net/news/technology/expert-says-us–nato-cannot-develop-hypersonic-weapons-for-2

[18] Center for Strategic and International Studies. (2024). The Tech Revolution and Irregular Warfare: Leveraging Commercial Innovation for Great Power Competition. Retrieved from https://www.csis.org/analysis/tech-revolution-and-irregular-warfare-leveraging-commercial-innovation-great-power

[19] Modern Diplomacy. (2025). Critical Minerals and Critical Security: U.S. Military Dependence on China's Rare Earths. Retrieved from https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2025/08/29/critical-minerals-and-critical-security-u-s-military-dependence-on-chinas-rare-earths/

[20] Defense One. (2025). China's rare-earth mineral squeeze will hit the Pentagon hard. Retrieved from https://www.defenseone.com/threats/2025/04/chinas-rare-earth-mineral-squeeze-will-hit-pentagon-hard/404776/

[21] War on the Rocks. (2023). In the Dark: How the Pentagon's Limited Supplier Visibility Risks U.S. National Security. Retrieved from https://warontherocks.com/2023/06/in-the-dark-how-the-pentagons-limited-supplier-visibility-risks-u-s-national-security/

[22] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2024). Behind the Scenes: China's Increasing Role in Russia's Defense Industry. Retrieved from https://carnegieendowment.org/russia-eurasia/politika/2024/05/behind-the-scenes-chinas-increasing-role-in-russias-defense-industry

[23] Corporate Finance Institute. (2024). Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI). Retrieved from https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/valuation/herfindahl-hirschman-index-hhi/

[24] Lockheed Martin. (2025). Lockheed Martin Reports Fourth Quarter and Full Year 2024 Financial Results. Retrieved from https://news.lockheedmartin.com/2025-01-28-Lockheed-Martin-Reports-Fourth-Quarter-and-Full-Year-2024-Financial-Results

# The End