

generation would therefore perpetrate a grave moral wrong on posterity by continuing nuclear testing.

It may be said that from the humane and moral standpoint, these arguments are sound, but that, if considerations of defence and national security require them, nuclear weapons tests must go on, notwithstanding their undesirable effects. But does continued testing improve the security of any nation? In the short term, it may be claimed that nuclear testing is required in order to effect or restore a balance in weapon power. But is there any reason to think that national security can be maintained over the years in this way? In my view, there is not. A protracted competition in this sphere -- between super-powers already armed to a degree hardly imaginable -- can only increase international tensions, and the ultimate danger of nuclear war. The major nuclear powers are themselves in agreement that continued testing increases the pace of the armaments race. In a joint statement released last August 27 by the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the President of USA we read the following sentences: "USA and UK cannot emphasize too strongly the urgency we attach to the problem of ending all nuclear testing once and for all. For the safety and security of all of us, this deadly competition must be halted and we, again, urge ^{the} Soviet Government to join with us in meaningful action to make this necessity a reality".

The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR has been equally firm in spelling out the grave consequences of continued testing. In a letter addressed by him to Prime Minister Macmillan in April of this year, he wrote as follows: "Throughout the world the peoples are justly expressing their indignation not only because nuclear tests lead to the fouling of the atmosphere and may in some degree have a harmful effect on peoples' health and their moral and physical condition, but also -- and this is the most important point -- because the race