

Figure II

Should Conventional Weapons be Part of a Non-Proliferation Policy Agenda?

CON

- no "zero" prohibition for control exists, as exists with weapons of mass destruction
- states have a legitimate right to build arsenals for self-defense, and to determine their composition
- dominant powers in the system are also major weapons exporters and have an interest in maintaining exports
- the high-level political attention required to build non-proliferation regimes is absent

PRO

- conventional and unconventional weapons are inextricably linked in the regional context
- conventional arms acquisitions consume more resources in the developing world than programs for weapons of mass destruction
- measures to control weapons of mass destruction increase the desire to obtain sophisticated conventional weapons
- the "military technological revolution" is blurring the line of destructiveness between conventional and unconventional weapons in regional conflicts
- the diffusion of advanced conventional weapons will increase the difficulties faced by multilateral peace and security operations