December 4, 2002

Dear Marc,

I am sorry for the long delay, but I have been trying to catch up ever since we returned from Italy.

You're right. I should have been explicit. I wrongly believed that I had made clear that if all or most states had nuclear weapons, the world would be a worse one. I did point out that most states don't need them; that it's foolish to have them if they're not needed; and I gave examples of states acting on that realization.

I don't, however, know what you mean by drawing a line. It is inordinately hard to keep a state that badly needs nuclear weapons from getting them. International politics remains a self-help system, and states that arrogate to themselves the task of running it always fail. What about this has changed?

I did have another problem with your review. Yes, wars have often occurred without states being able to control the decision to start them. One of the many deep differences now is that in the presence of nuclear weapons, states no longer stumble into major wars.

We'll be here until we visit Berkeley around February 10 (our first since leaving in 1998). We can further the discussion when you come east. I wonder, e.g., what old norms against attacks on population centers you have in mind. When you come, we'll provide an H&H bialy.

Best,

[Signature]