

File 01 101

IN REPLY PLEASE QUOTE  
RÉFÉRENCE À RAPPELER



DEFENCE RESEARCH BOARD

CONSEIL DE RECHERCHES POUR LA DÉFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE  
MINISTÈRE DE LA DÉFENSE NATIONALE  
CANADA

DEFENCE RESEARCH ANALYSIS ESTABLISHMENT  
NATIONAL DEFENCE HEADQUARTERS  
OTTAWA ~~XX~~ ONTARIO

CENTRE D'ANALYSE POUR LA DÉFENSE  
QUARTIER-GÉNÉRAL de la DÉFENSE NATIONALE  
OTTAWA ~~XX~~ ONTARIO

8 September 1972

Dr. Mathew <sup>f</sup>Musselson,  
Harvard University,  
The Biological Laboratories,  
16, Divinity Avenue,  
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts.

Dear Dr. <sup>f</sup>Musselson,

Please accept my apologies for not having replied for over a year to your letter of 26 August 1971, accompanying your very helpful notes on the US section of the CBW arms control piece. Its progress has been hindered by the rapid developments in the field and by my own peripatetic existence. With the cessation of my position at Queen's I was fortunate enough to obtain a half-time position at the Defence Research Analysis Establishment in Ottawa, working on arms control, with special reference to MBFR. Combined with an interesting War Studies Seminar at the Royal Military College this should have enabled me to bring the CBW piece to as rapid a conclusion as events would allow. Unfortunately, in October the death of my close friend Frank Marzari, who was initiating a strategic studies programme at UBC, left a gap which they asked me to fill. Under the circumstances I felt obliged to accept, although it involved commuting to Vancouver every other week. Between these jobs I have only recently been able to get at the CBW paper but enclose the results. These emphasize the inter-relationship between the process of control and the development of military technology, pointing to the need to update the limitations on CBW. Much of the supporting material has been cut in the interests of clarity and length; if this could be used elsewhere please let me know.

Having obtained a full-time University post near Halifax I hope to incorporate revisions rapidly, and, as a private individual, can say that Canada's changed position perhaps offers a way out of the impasse over ratifying the Protocol by avoiding the question of whether or not CS and herbicides were covered by the Protocol, and simply stating that these will not be used by Canada's military forces. Presumably this applies even in peacekeeping or internal security operations. My impression after a recent visit to the UK was that their general hard-line in foreign policy extends to CS and that they would only alter their position as part of a general move along these lines. The US remains, of course, crucial and Mr. Richard Moose, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Staff, whom I recently had the pleasure of meeting at a Conference on a CTB, seemed sceptical of progress in the near future. But one can but hope and this paper is at least a small effort in the right direction, insignificant beside your work.

With many thanks for your continuing assistance.

Yours sincerely,

*Robert Ranger*

Robert Ranger.

My new address is:

Department of Political Science,  
St. Francis of Xavier University,  
Antigonish, Nova Scotia.