

WM W. STONE, Jr. B. G., USA(ret)
571 Toyopa Drive
Pacific Palisades, Calif. 90272

Prof Matthew Pirelson

JUN 1 1971
Play 1971

Dear Matt,

I just returned from an extended tour of the Orient with my wife - our first real honeymoon - and found your note asking my comments on the statements by you and Dr. George Bundy to the Senate Foreign Relations Cmte in late March on the Geneva Protocol.

I suspect anything I have to say may have been overtaken by events and also much of it has been said before. So I will limit my comments to points that I don't think you and I have discussed directly previously. Also I must be general as I have not had any contact with the CW area since the AAS meeting in December 1970.

Concerning your paper, on page 8, lines 5, 6 and 7, what was originally conceived in 1965 as the primary use for CS disappeared gradually as the character of the war changed and the fighting moved out of the cities and villages.

On page 12^{lines 4-6} - I do not believe "a small bomber force" could deliver nerve agent sufficient to kill "a large proportion of persons in a major city." Near surface, stable air conditions simply do not exist in major cities although they are common in open country. On the same page, lines 12-15, I would think that less wealthy nations would be more apt to

2
build up BW capabilities if the major nations did not have deterrent stockpiles of CW agents. To rely solely on a nuclear deterrent does not seem to be reasonable.

To me much of the anti CW and BW sentiment misses the point. No one likes war - least of all soldiers. We all want to prevent war and are all for disarmament but with suitable controls, i.e. inspection. Trust, hope and faith where history gives us no reason to have faith, are not enough when national destiny is involved. I believe we should be all out for disarmament and arms control, but we should start from the top - nuclear weapons - strategic first. Then tactical, and then work down the scale: BW weapons next, then CW, then conventional aircraft bombs, etc. But always with suitable controls and inspection.

In the same vein, on page 13, line 8 & 9, it seems to me defensive CW efforts are required regardless of our policy on CS if the smaller nations are to deter the use of lethal CW against themselves.

Concerning Mr Bandy's statement, I agree with him that the use of CS and the herbicides has not influenced the overall course of the war although in the small scale view has helped individual actions in varying degrees. I also agree with his scepticism of "extreme assertions by either supporters or opponents" of these weapons.

Another aspect of these papers, and almost all discussions of CW and BW relative to disarmament,

That has always disturbed me, is that CW and
 BW are particularly horrible forms of war. War
 in any form is horrible and should be avoided if
 at all possible. It seems to me we should concentrate
 on first problems first - i.e. control of nuclear weapons -
 and that lacking solution of that problem in a way
 that preserves our national security. The efforts
 that are spent on urging unilateral disarmament
 in the CW and BW areas are largely wasted and, in
 fact, dangerous.

Thanks for sending me yours and
 Mr. Banerji's statement. I have a great deal of
 respect for you, your opinions and the energy that
 you devote to national and world wide problems
 without compensation

Our basic point of difference is the trust
 we each would place in forces which wish us no
 good.

All my best, Sincerely
 Bill Stone

I hope we can work together again some day.
 Note my new address. Come see us when you are
 in Los Angeles.