

thus facilitate agreement. It would also avoid arguments whether Intermediate Range Missiles which can hit Moscow should be considered strategic or not. The Soviet argument has been that it is the point of impact that matters, not the length of the flight path. However, now that the intermediate (INF) treaty has been achieved, the other negotiations will probably proceed separately, as before. (The term "shorter-range" missiles in the INF Treaty refers to missiles between intermediate and tactical, not the tactical themselves.)

The elimination of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe has been proposed, e.g., at the United Nations by Sweden. The presence of these weapons is destabilizing, because it tends to erase the "firebreak" between nuclear and conventional weapons, and might make escalation of any European war to the nuclear level more likely.

Among the tactical nuclear weapons, the neutron bomb (or enhanced-radiation weapon) has met particular objections, and has not been deployed in Europe. It is being proposed that even its stockpiling in the US for possible use in Europe should be abandoned. Its use in anti-tank warfare is of doubtful value anyway; tank crews hit by its neutrons would probably remain capable of combat for several more hours, and knowing that they would die anyway, might fight more vigorously because they had nothing more to lose (and might be angry).

Negotiations between the superpowers continue on topics on which some agreements already exist, in order to improve them. Examples are measures to prevent nuclear war (various precautionary rules directed to their armed forces) and safeguards against accidents, which could be upgraded, as already stated, by having mixed-manning of the crisis control centres.