

nuclear weapons and their means of delivery.

But in the light of the history of disarmament negotiations, would other nations really credit a Treaty undertaking by the nuclear powers to stop the production of nuclear armaments and, if so, when - in one, three or five years time? Is it reasonable, in the present world situation, especially in view of the refusal of France and China to take part in disarmament negotiations, to expect the nuclear powers now to make any stronger commitment than they have made in Article VI of the present draft?

The answers to both questions are likely to be negative, however much we might wish them to be positive. If the history of efforts to achieve arms control or disarmament agreements teaches anything, it is to put progress ahead of perfection. The measure which we are now discussing - a partial measure just one step on the long road to general and complete disarmament - has taken seven years to accomplish. To wait for the nuclear powers to make a commitment to reduce nuclear arms is to run the risk of jeopardizing early agreement to stop dissemination.

There would then be no legal impediment to the acquisition of nuclear weapons, either as such or as devices to be used for peaceful explosions. As dissemination proceeded, there would be an increased incentive for the nuclear powers to keep ahead of those who aspired to become members of a nuclear club. In less than two decades, the number of nuclear powers has increased from one to five. Unless effective steps are taken without delay, the next few years could see that number doubled at least, with the consequent and serious increase of insecurity, which I have mentioned.