

miscalculation becomes greater the larger the number of countries which deploy such weapons, and the larger the stockpiles and the more diversified the weapons they hold. If a nuclear conflict were to erupt, however it started, not a single state could feel itself secure."

That is why states without nuclear weapons should forego their right to acquire or develop them. That is also why those non-nuclear states who are asked to accept this self-denying ordinance have a legitimate right to expect tangible assurance that they will not become the victims of nuclear attack. Otherwise they cannot be expected to have that enhanced feeling of security which is the object of this enterprise.

Hence the significance of the statements made in Geneva by the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, who have reaffirmed that they will introduce a resolution in the Security Council under which they would give assurances of assistance, either through the United Nations or unilaterally, to any party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty not possessing nuclear weapons, if that state were the victim of an act or threat of aggression in which weapons were used.

This affirmation has been belittled by some as having little meaning. And yet, given the existence of powers with nuclear weapons and capacity, what stronger assurance could any state without nuclear weapons have, short of becoming an ally of one of the nuclear powers?