

CW

April 9, 1970

Mr. Archibald Alexander
Bernardsville, N.J. 07924

Dear Archie,

I hope you won't mind receiving the rather hurried comments I've placed in the text of your excellent paper. For more than a week, I will not be able to do more.

My remark about CW treaties at the meeting was not very well thought out, I'm afraid. I certainly do believe that a treaty renouncing possession of chemical weapons for military purposes is a hopeful approach. But, like you and Pete, I shy away from treaties that try to nail down all the possibilities of evasion. Rather, I think each nation must ask what is needed as a minimum to permit it to join the treaty and then try to achieve those ends with rather broad language in the treaty dealing with

- 1) Verification of use.
- 2) Possible complaint mechanism for allegations of preparations.
- 3) Verified destruction of stocks for US and USSR.

As for language, one might have to settle for "chemical munitions and agents or intermediates intended for use in chemical munitions." This brings in the element of intent and surely is a defect. Yet it may be the only way to get a ~~treaty~~ and, as you explain, having no treaty on CW has costs and risks of its own.

It was good to see you again.

Warm regards,