

RMA will vary according to the magnitude of such capabilities, the nature of any conflict and the political situation. States with large conventional forces and even an limited WMD capability can raise the cost of intervention to the United States or even deter it. But there is the threshold issue that complicates any predictions about how states will respond to RMA use and potential WMD counter-responses. Will small and weak states risk retaliation by nuclear weapons if they employ WMDs against American forces or the United States itself? Will Washington cross the line if its troops are attacked by chemical weapons? Just as the various scenarios point to no conclusive answer on the action-reaction dynamic of RMA use, so too are the arms control possibilities varied. Some states may be amenable to arms control and abandon a WMD capability to respond to the RMA, while others, depending on their security situation and the character of their governments may wish to retain it and reject WMD arms control measures.

However, concern about WMD is very much on the international agenda and much has been done to establish new norms. In some areas of arms control, such as nuclear weapons, progress has been made. Given the other factors that affect the international security environment, and the very uncertainties associated with the RMA, there is reason to conclude that arms control will survive the RMA. Thus the future international security environment is likely to be one where *both* the RMA and arms control will present competing, but not always mutually exclusive, claims for the enhancement of international strategic and political stability.