

McElroy

JUL 18 1989

17 July 1989

Matthew Meselson
Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
Harvard University
7 Divinity Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dear Matt,

Here, finally, is my draft of the chemical weapons briefing book for your review. I hope it is relatively close to what you had in mind, especially in terms of tone. In the past couple of days I have realized that I don't know exactly how the briefing book will be used and what kinds of materials will supplement it. This had resulted throughout, I think, in a fairly neutral tone -- for me, at least -- until the very end, where I offer a prescriptive opinion. I'm sure you'll let me know where I've gone wrong. In any case, I'd welcome more information on exactly how the book will be used, and with what other materials.

At a few points in the text I either was uncertain exactly what was wanted or had questions come up as I wrote. They should be obvious, and I look forward to your comments on them. For any section which I may have left completely blank, I would appreciate something solid to work from if you have it. Usually a citation would suffice but, unfortunately, nearly all of my source material is (I hope) currently crossing the Atlantic by slow boat. Actually, for those one or two sections I haven't touched, I probably wouldn't have anything anyway. So please send ideas or source text.

You will notice that the first section is a bit long, mainly because I expanded the last subsection to include binary munitions. I suppose the whole thing could be shortened, but I have another suggestion. I felt that section 3, on the military aspects, might be unnecessarily long for non-specialist readers. What do you think about reducing section 3 to two pages, and increasing section 1, the intro, to four pages? The introduction could then have room to include an actual intro to the issues before the technical definitional discussion, as well as more on binaries -- or whatever you want.

Aside from that, here are some thoughts, questions, realizations I had during the writing (in no logical order):

- * I barely mentioned BW in an effort to keep to length limits. Now that I have a first draft on paper, I wonder if there isn't room for more BW connections. (?)
- * In some cases I suggested different subheadings. Don't forget to criticize them.
- * What level of technical detail would you like in the discussion of CWAs?

- * I realize I didn't mention the US/FRG/Libya affair in the proliferation section. There's room for it; I'll add something in the final draft unless you don't want it.
- * You may find my approach to the proliferation problem offbase. Just let me know how you'd like it handled, especially the naming of countries.
- * I think I missed chemical weapons free zones in the discussion of arms control. Let me know if you see a good spot for it.
- * I expect my list of confirmed uses of chemical weapons may raise questions. I've tried to mention them all, including the relatively minor uses of herbicides. I guess the key here are the words "significant use," but I asked myself: was British use of herbicides in Malaya, for instance, really less significant than Spanish CW in Morocco? That's why ^{they're} ~~there~~ all there, including German WW2 gassing in the concentration camps which would surely be a political mistake to leave out, to say nothing of its "significance" in a larger sense.

Well, I'm probably forgetting plenty, but expect that you will catch them all. I await your response.

Sincerely,



Rod McElroy

1917 East 29th St.
Oakland, CA 94606
(415) 534-6904

cc: WJ
JI
JPPR