	RMA Effectiveness	Responses	Arms Control Implications
State 1.	 tactically effective potential longer conflict concern about WMD response might deter military action high levels of damage may raise moral issues 	- use RMA against the United States. - threaten or use WMD	 provide justification for more development of RMAs make efforts to control WMDs of the target state difficult justify retention by the United States of nuclear weapons justify extended deterrence to neighbouring countries complicate verification efforts because of lack of trust and consensus yet highlights the importance of continued efforts to control WMDs
State 2.	 tactically and strategically effective less potential for longer conflict use of RMA against WMD facilities 	- WMD response at a low threshold and therefore more problematic	 potential for arms control given disunity of WMD options depending on the size of the conventional forces and political will but reinforces benefits of RMA for the United States.
State 3.	 tactically and strategically effective under certain conditions where weak conventional forces provide few targets RMA effectiveness is limited and potential for longer conflict 	 settlement due to lack of options guerilla attacks WMD used in terrorist-style attacks 	 political pressure to accept arms control possible but dedication of government or factions may make this difficult justifies acquisition of capabilities to disrupt RMA use

TABLE III: ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIC AND ARMS CONTROL SCENARIOS

State 1. - significant conventional capability, significant WMD, and moderate RMA capability.

State 2. - moderate conventional capability and significant WMD capability.

State 3. - limited conventional and WMD capability

3