

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
THE BIOLOGICAL LABORATORIES



16 DIVINITY AVENUE
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138

8 March 1980

Mr. Julian Perry Robinson
Science Policy Research Unit
Mantell Building
University of Sussex
Brighton BN1 9RF
ENGLAND

Dear Julian,

Your draft on recent allegations, etc. is very impressive and, of course, urgently needed. I can make but a few possibly useful minor comments. When it's ready for distribution, may I have a copy soonest? Also, I hope you will send copies to Mikulak and to Mr. L. Craig Johnstone, Embassy of the USA, Paris, France. If for any reason you don't send both of them copies and have no objection to my doing so, please tell me. Craig is now or soon to be political/military officer at the US embassy in Paris and has some interest in these matters. I hope you will also provide others with your piece: Congressman Leach, Berdes, Forrest Frank, various journalists, etc.

My comments:

P. 4. I thought the foot/mouth development was connected with Poulenc/Murieux France, not a Swiss firm or is it?

P. 7. You might indicate why Marburg, Lassa and Ebola are very unlikely on technical grounds.

P. 8. Similarly, you might cite one of the "remarkable errors" in Moss' article.

Pp. 12, 13, 14. In Newsweek, March 10, page 59 the new Col. Watson, a likeable man named Col. Bobby Robinson, is quoted as saying the Soviets have capability for >30 days of extensive chemical war. It is the first number to come out of the DoD in quite a while, assuming, of course, that Newsweek got it right. Thirty days' worth is the lowest estimate ever to come out of DoD, so far as I recall.

Pp. 12-14. Notice Newsweek on March 10 says 42,000T USS and 350,000T Soviets but this time it's "weapons", not agent. Their previous claim that these numbers are agents is indeed what is in Eifried (which we sent to you two days ago). The 350,000 tons figure should be given the lie, especially since it is published both ~~by Army~~ and by Newsweek: 3.5×10^6 tons of chemical weapons. Enough for 5-10 years of extensive chemical war... Eifried makes another imbecilic numerical

claim: that 3,000 Soviet tubes in one volley would, by implication, crack allied defense. Even so enormous a barrage over the 30 x 10 km area that would be involved would cause few casualties. If defenders had masked and very few even if they all fall instead into the "carrying but not wearing" category.

P. 20. Although taken "secretly" the discussion must have been evident to the Soviets, at least by the time of the DoD letter to Kastenmeier.

Pp. 24-25. Aren't holes in leaves and diarrhea also cited?

P. 28. 105-MM is a US but not a Soviet caliber.

P. 31. I thought the last sentence of paragraph 2 a bit gratuitous since the evidence for nerve agent is so flimsy. The sentence seems to give it undeserved credence.

P. 33. Safire named the Soviet officer: is that worth addressing?

P. 37. I thought the end a bit flippant for so thorough and penetrating a piece.

Next week I hope to send you Scientific American tear sheets. By all means give it to the Sunday Times or anyone you like. Wisnowsky says they welcome such advance notice.

I hope you write for Nature anyway. Their D.C. office says that Maddox hasn't taken over quite yet as editor. I'm badly over-committed, having accepted Bill Brown's invitation to join him in writing a piece for the NYT Magazine. I hope he and I can agree on its content.

In spite of the misinformation and hysteria, the possible damage may be averted if those making the decisions are given more accurate assessments. I will send the Scientific American piece out widely, accompanied with letters or conversations. I don't know many European officials and hope you can get to an appropriate group of them.

as ever,