R50.

2 September 1980

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

Dear Julian,

Sulzberger is right. The real issue is not whether or not to make binaries but whether the Army needs more chemical munitions. If the enclosed is anywhere near right, and the objective is only to force the WPO into protective gear, we have plenty. I would value your rapid comment on the estimate. Do you know how the Germans estimated their WWII requirement of 30,000 agent tons or how the US Army estimated its similar requirement in the post war period? If 2/3rds of it is artillery munitions, this is enough for about 100 U.S. WWII divisions firing 10% chemical rounds for a year. Maybe that's the logic, but why 10% Simple imitation of WWI plus a bit extra -- or something more elaborate? Another question, the Army may be using 3-5 gm/m^2 for VX. Have you run across such high estimates anywhere? Have you any comment on the value? WHO cites 0.5-5 mg/m^2, we cite 300 mg/m^2. Is the WHO value of 6 mg for the percutaneous LD_{50} valid?

It would be extremely helpful, I believe to both of us, if you could come across before too long. Any chance?

As ever,