

and biological weapons (CBW) environment. "This," he argues, "is a practical and valuable modification of the strategic landscape that does not need complicated multinational negotiations. These improved defenses bolster arms-control agreements" by making the use of chemical and biological weapons "less attractive to proliferators."¹⁰³ He also calls for NATO to issue a "specific declaration" at the start of "any crisis that it would reserve the right to take proportionately severe action against, or even to remove, any regime that used CBWs against it or its forces and to try the leaders as war criminals."¹⁰⁴

What Schulte is saying is that the West reserves the right to employ the most technologically advanced weaponry which the RMA can provide, but that it also reserves the right to deny potential adversaries WMDs and, if they are used, to retaliate with its own WMDs. Even he acknowledges the implications of this position:

"In the future we must expect that states or groups who see the United States-backed Western dominated world order as fundamentally unjust will feel entitled to search for equalizers against the military superiority that is the backbone of that world order. In this regard, we should not underestimate the importance of frustration and rage as drivers of chemical and biological developments...CBWs, because of their intrinsic nastiness, can act as conflict intensifiers and avenging symbols. The drive to ban CBWs, which is heavily supported by the Western allies, may appear to be a means of canceling out all remaining asymmetries that might threaten the West and thus make the world safe for dominance by high-technology conventional weapons, backed by American (or Israeli) nuclear power. Those who feel this way are not very interested in being dissuaded, and their arguments may even gain some support from the anti-nuclear lobby."¹⁰⁵

There is yet another complicating factor in regards to the arms control implications of the RMA. Non-Proliferation efforts focus on "so-called" weapons of mass destruction, nuclear chemical and biological and in recent years on their delivery systems long-range ballistic and cruise missiles. From time-to-time there are also efforts to control "weapons of ill repute," such as antipersonnel mines and fragmentation devices. But, "in a gaping logical disjunction, shorter-range missiles, combat aircraft, surface ships and submarines-all of which can deliver" WMD, "continue to be traded widely." Moreover, "a coordinated conventional attack can achieve levels of devastation associated with weapons of mass destruction, even on the battlefield." This was demonstrated in the Gulf War and the attacks on Yugoslavia. The RMA promises to increase the accuracy and lethality of conventional weapons "as future generations of platforms incorporate more sophisticated

¹⁰³ Paul Schulte, "Chemical and Biological Weapons: Issues and Alternatives," *Comparative Strategy* (18) (October-December 1999), p. 329.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid*, p. 334.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid*, p. 331.