

Date: Sun, 25 May 2003 18:19:43 -0400
From: Julian Robinson <j.p.p.robinson@sussex.ac.uk>
To: Prof M S Meselson <msm@wjh.harvard.edu>
Subject: HSP agenda

[Part 1, Text/PLAIN 154 lines.]
[Unable to print this part.]

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set.]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set.]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly.]

Dear Matt,

I'm now safely back after far too short a visit. Among the many pleasures was working once more in lovely Wood's Hole and, on the plane back, starting in on the Holmes book about Meselson-Stahl. The book is wonderful, to me, in both its conception and in its execution (though admittedly I still have a way to go) and one day you must tell me whether it is also accurate -- or at least as accurate as one might reasonably hope such a thing to be. I have never before read a biography of an experiment. When I am next visiting I shall beg a second copy (if you really do have a 'box full') to give to Brian Balmer: more than most, he would appreciate its unique character, and, as a professional observer of science, he would much benefit from it, I think.

You and I managed to pack in a good bit of HSP business during those few days, but there were also some things left undone, so, given my increasingly feeble memory, I shall try to recall them all here. Later, on specific items, I shall send more detailed messages. First, though, please tell me again your dates for Moscow and say whether there really might be a chance of my intercepting you in London either on your way out or on your way back.

Here is my recollection of our HSP agenda:

[1] WHO CBW study. On the List of Contributors to the Second Edition, we agreed on a proper rendering of the Russian names, which I will now transmit to Ottorino/Karen.

[2] Projected meeting/seminars at WHO in November. You would be willing to stay an extra day in Geneva after the 8-9 November Pugwash workshop in order to participate in discussions at WHO of post-Second-Edition work on CBW, but only if we can also visit the ICRC on that same day (Monday 10 November) to discuss criminalization with ICRC lawyers. Peter Herby has told us that he will fix something for us at ICRC that day. Should I now tell Ottorino (a) that we cannot do the seminars he is proposing, but that we could (b) participate in a half-day CBW-related meeting? If (b), should the meeting be in the morning or afternoon, and whichever it isn't should you or I propose to Peter for the ICRC session?

[3] Agenda for the November Pugwash workshop in Geneva. Dear Graham, in his e-mail to us dated 10 May, has proposed an agenda under the general title "The BWC Intersessional Process Towards the Sixth Review conference". If we think this too narrow/boring, we need to come up with an alternative quite soon otherwise Martin may rush forth. Richard Burgess has offered to contribute a paper, if invited, on the US DHHS and DA biosecurity regulations. We did not talk about this.

[4] Bulletin 60. By asking Fiona to cover the 33rd Session (24-27 June) of the OPCW Executive Council in PITH, we in effect postponed the copy date for the June issue from 13 June by 2-3 weeks -- indeed, until July, I hope no later than its first week. That gives us more time to (a) produce an Editorial about the outcome of the First CWC Review Conference and the importance of a process now being set in motion to solve the 'law enforcement' problem, and (b) to decide whether we want to accept dear Graham's offer, in his e-mail of 10 May, to provide an Invited Article on 'Security and Oversight of Pathogenic Microorganisms and Toxins'. Given that we drew a blank on Ledogar, I would be happy to go with Graham's

suggestion (which fits squarely into this year's agenda for the New Process) provided we can indeed do the Editorial.

[5] Fundraising. We wrote emergency project-funding letters to Christine Wing at Ford and Kinette Benedict at MacArthur and also a good core-funding proposal, which we sent, as a draft for comment, to MacArthur, warning Ford that we would be sending it to them also, in due course. Next step is to send the core-funding proposal to Sloan and, after that, to others in the light of the foundation data you downloaded from the internet and of the advice received from Phil Heymann (about approaching the Bill Gates Foundation, Ted Turner Foundation, Soros via Neier, Johnson Foundation, &c). Also, Margaret Hamburg at NTI may be expecting something from us following your visit to NTI on 6 May. In Europe, I shall not hear until the middle of next month at the earliest about the three project-funding proposals Sussex has put in to European Commission and UK Research Council organs; all are for a 2004 start. The University of Sussex will have to take its decision on renewal of Dragffy's contract by the end of June at the latest. Daniel and I will be working on proposals to Wellcome and to Rowntree (the latter in the hope that Dando and the Bradford cuckoos haven't entirely ejected us from the Rowntree nest), but any success will be too late to save Dragffy.

[6] The Tregonning succession. You will have seen Scott Spence's favourable response to our offer. We now need to ensure a reply from DG Pfirter to the letter from us that will possibly reach him the day after tomorrow. Since we have asked Fiona not to visit Sussex in June, shall we instead ask Scott to do so before he takes over from her? That could make a fair bit of sense.

[7] The Luis Moreno Ocampo proposal. His suggestion, when we met him in Phil Heymann's office on 20 May, was that we should think of aligning our projected HSP workshop at the Hague Academy of International Law with the public hearings that he is contemplating holding in The Hague, prior to the end of September, on the subject of a possible ICC Prosecutor's Plan regarding War Crimes relating to CBW -- a plan that would enunciate a message for business corporations contemplating the CBW-weapons market. I think he is now expecting to receive from us, rather soon, a 1-2 page paper with suggestions for such public hearings, including thoughts about industry sponsorship (Carpenter/Walls?) and associated networking (I had mentioned BWPP).

[8] The Commentary on the HSP draft criminalization convention. The outstanding task is for the (mixed) contributions of the three students to become properly integrated into the original draft. You reckoned that input from Nick Dragffy would, at this stage, be premature. I have not yet seen anything beyond the original text.

[9] Sandy's book-purchases for SHIB. I was very glad to be able to take away the Sidel book. I am also hoping for a sight of Thomas Graham, Disarmament Sketches: Three Decades of Arms control and International Law (2002), which Sandy says you still have.

[10] HSPOP-1. Even though I am hoping to get a complete MS to Palgrave in August, we did not talk much about this -- other than about the possibility of your contributing to the US case-studies section a text drawing from the Howard assessment of CS operations during the Vietnam War. That would be really great, if you can find the time. For my part, I am starting work on integrating Sandy's new Eisenhower/Kennedy/Johnson documents into the chronology on policy, employment and technical developments concerning disabling chemicals. When you are in Moscow, will you keep your eyes open for a possible author of a case-study on the Moscow theatre siege?

[11] My paper on the 'law enforcement' chemicals problem. Under the label 'Item 421Rev2' you have in your computer the latest (10 May) version of the paper I presented at the Oegstgeest Pugwash workshop in April. Should you have a chance to look at it, do please tell me of any improvements that need making to it. I am currently expanding the paper in the light of new data and revising it in the light of comments received. My plan then is to disaggregate it into contributions to

HSPOP-1 and possibly also to submit it for publication in some journal, possibly the London International Affairs.

[12] Richard Guthrie. I told you that he has now been offered my old job at SIPRI. I think he will accept the offer, in which case he will leave HSP come the end of August. We have been paying him so little that his departure will not actually save us all that much money, but the gap will need to be filled. My plan is to assign Bulletin DTP duties to an existing HSP Sussex person, most probably to Caitriona McLeish, and to buy (the very expensive) Quark Express DTP software so that she is not compelled to use Richard's DOS Ventura, which is excellent but difficult and does not run under the Windows to which which most people are nowadays more accustomed than DOS. She'll need to go on a training course, I think, but her partner should be able to advise. Done expeditiously, such an arrangement should mean that we would not be dependent on Richard for production of Bulletin 61 in September. I would be quite keen on his remaining involved, while at SIPRI, in further development of the HSP data-bases, especially the development backwards in time of the CBW Events Data-Base. As for the website, I propose putting Carolyn in charge, assisted by the University Computer service (which offers website guidance) and Caitriona. Their first task will be to redesign the HSP websites for mounting solely (if you agree) on a Sussex server and then to post full texts of the latest HSP papers, as well as the Bulletin, &c.

I know I have probably forgotten some things, but that seems quite enough for the moment.

As ever,
Julian