

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF MOLECULAR AND CELLULAR BIOLOGY



Matthew Meselson
Thomas Dudley Cabot Professor
of the Natural Sciences

7 Divinity Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
Tel: (617) 495-2264
Fax: (617) 496-2444
msm@wjh.harvard.edu

October 18, 2006

Raymond Jeanloz
Professor of Earth and Planetary Science and Astronomy
491 McCone Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-4767

Dear Raymond,

In thinking about BW it is important to distinguish effectiveness in causing casualties from utility in advancing the interests of a state.

There is no doubt that BW has the potential of casualty production over large areas. But for a state like the US the utility of BW overall would be negative. For lethal casualty production the US has already deployed an overwhelming nuclear capability. Even with conventional weapons, the US capability for lethal casualty production is very great. The overriding US interest lies in keeping states that do not have mass destructive capability from obtaining it.

The argument regarding so-called "non-lethal" biological weapons is given in two of the enclosed papers: "The United States and the Geneva Protocol of 1925" (written for Henry Kissinger in 1969) and the article by Han Swyter published as part of a symposium in the PNAS in January 1970. Swyter had been in the Office of Systems Analysis in the OSD at Defense where he was closely involved in the creation of the OSD position for the Nixon review.

I enclose two additional items about BW. The Pugwash Conference paper was written two years after my first exposure, at ACCDA, to BW problems. The other, about toxins, was written for Kissinger.

Finally, you may be interested to see a chapter Julian Robinson and I have recently written about the "Yellow Rain" for a book to be put out by the Naval Post-Graduate School.

As ever,