STANFORD UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305 • (415) 321-1200

STANFORD UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE Department of Genetics

APR 7 1970

Mr. Kenneth Yalowits
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
State Dept. Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 2045/

Dear Mr. Yalowitz:

In response to your phone call. Please feel free to use my columns and the additional material I enclose herewith in any way you see fit. I have expressed myself on BW mainly via my column; however, I am also enclosing a couple of versions of the testimony I gave before Repr. Zablocki's subcommittee. This also has a good deal of other material that would be useful to you.

There is some merit in the view that the U.S. "gave up nothing" in disavowing biological weapons, if the narrow interests of the U.S. are in question. It can hardly be a bargaining point in trying to win compensatory concessions in other areas that we are sensitive to the need to forfend disastrous epidemics. Small countries might feel that they could make a bid for great nower at great risk with EW

that they could make a bid for great power at great risk with BW.
However, the toxins did reflect a somewhat different possibility,
for they could have been developed into very significant weapons, with
the possibility of specifically immunizing the attacking forces. It was
no inadvertence that the Army was very reluctant to have toxins swept
along with the living biological agents.

You probably already have most of the material I have gathered up here; but it may be of some use just to have these formats.

We already discussed the W.H.O. remport on "Health Aspects of C&BW".

There is also Robin Clarke's hook "We all Fall Down", and of course the chapter on "Biologicals" in Seymour Hersh's "Chemical and Biological Warfare".

Freeman Quimby, at the Legisl. Ref. Service, Library of Congress has also surely collected a great deal of material that would be of use to you.

Sincerely,

P.S. I never did get a copy of Smith's talk at Geneva.

YROBITY