

the latest CIA report, will be invulnerable to attack at least until the end of this century, in 15 years time, and there is no evidence to suggest they will be more vulnerable in 30 years time than they will be in 15 years time. Both sides also have bomber forces which present a completely different problem to a potential attacker from fixed land-based missiles.

Thirdly, according to the calculations made by the strategic theorists, which assume that any country planning a first strike against fixed land-based missiles will have to devote at least two missiles to the destruction of every target, neither side can plan on a first strike against land-based missiles without planning to explode at least 1,000 warheads. Scientists in the Soviet Union, as in the United States and Europe, have come to the conclusion that the explosion of 1,000 warheads would mean suicide even for the successful perpetrator of a first strike against an enemy's retaliatory forces. In fact, the concept of the nuclear winter, which would wipe out human life and perhaps even plant life in the whole of the Northern Hemisphere, is now generally accepted, although there is an interesting argument between scientists about how many warheads exploded over which targets under which climatic conditions will make it impossible to grow grain in Canada and even in the United States. The concept of nuclear winter, however, is now generally accepted although, in the United States, I believe some officially-sponsored studies have still to be completed.

What strikes me most, as a chap who spent six years in the army in the last war, is this: nobody since Hiroshima and Nagasaki has actually used nuclear weapons in a war situation. To extrapolate from underground tests of single weapons, in remote locations, what precisely will happen if you were to detonate 1,000 warheads against enemy targets is a very, very dangerous and precarious exercise. The big thing about nuclear weapons is that we know that they will be more destructive and dangerous to the survival of the race than any other weapons, but none of us has the slightest idea what, in fact, would happen if they were used not on test grounds but in actual war. Anybody who has been involved in world war — I am one of the last people active in politics, along with your chairman, who was so involved — will know what an enormous difference there is between real war and theoretical war.

I think one of the great problems, from which the world is suffering at the present time, is that strategic nuclear policy is decided, certainly on the Western side and, I suspect, also on the Soviet side, by a quite miniscule, tiny élite of middle-ranking bureaucrats and