

of possible Dutch-Canadian cooperation: 1) control of small arms, and 2) resistance to the weaponization of space. In particular, he stated that should the US succeed in achieving space dominance, it would be a "destabilizing and dangerous development."

#### Discussion:

- Can it be said that the ending of the Cold War has led to the current "malaise" in NACD, and that absent the bipolar contest of yore, there no longer exists any coherent strategic rationale for arms control? In this regard, can one really generalize from the record of the European experience with conventional arms control? Might not stability, say, in South Asia require giving both sides more secure nuclear arsenals?
- While there is no alternative to dialogue on NACD, the only real achievement of the UN Conference on Disarmament was the NPT, which depended upon a particular geostrategic context that has ceased to exist.
- Like it or not, the US is going to weaponize space, and the spectre of an "arms race" in space is the product of overworked imaginations, for the reality is that no one else will be able to compete with Washington in this enterprise; in this sense, "we are better off today than we were in the 1945-1960 period".
- To the extent that arms controllers in Canada and the Netherlands evince disquiet about the RMA, does this not complicate their countries' stated determination to become more technologically relevant to the US, via the enhancement of their military capabilities?
- The reaction to the changed US attitude to arms control and disarmament should be twofold. Because effective arms control is not feasible without American support, ways and means should be found to cooperate with the US in strengthening the NACD regimes, particularly those related to WMD (as the Ottawa treaty has shown, arms control related to conventional weapons can also be successful without the US). At the same time, the long held belief in the value of multilateral arms control and disarmament should not be cast away overnight. Canada and the Netherlands share those policies and could cooperate to identify ways of bringing the NACD Agenda forward.
- Has not the tenor of this panel's presentations represented an instance of going "forward to the past," in that it skirts the real issue, namely trying to keep dangerous weapons out of the hands of irresponsible regimes?