

↓ #

~~10~~

Memo to File - Lunch with Martin Kaplan - Monday, April 30, 1979

Martin is attending the UNCTAD preparatory meetings representing WHO. I should point him out to Rod Nichols if he's still attending this week.

Martin simply briefed me about recent activities of Pugwash especially vis-a-vis using Pugwash as an informal vehicle for USSR-China communications. There was a Russian initiative to try to get a Pugwash statement condemning Vietnam for the invasion of Cambodia and this eventually flowered with the remarkable agreement from both Moscow and Peking that they would be willing to have Pugwash get together under certain conditions. This will include having both Vietnam and Cambodia also represented which does not seem too likely and probably won't be forthcoming. But the further background is that there may finally be a sense of need for a channel for informal discussion on arms control related questions since many of the other ones have dried up as between Moscow and Peking. There may well be a meeting in London later on this year that would reflect those possibilities. I urged Martin to be in good touch with John Lewis and the Stanford group for background information on how Chinese scientists relate to foreign policy formation over there.

Martin was also concerned about the upcoming review of the BW Treaty. I expressed my concern that the problematics of verification might surface. There has not been a shread of satisfaction with respect to any Soviet moves in compliance

with the treaty and he was well acquainted with suspicious satellite observations that had not been properly explained. However, he told me that he was quite confident that the suspect plant that the French had built near Moscow was indeed for hoof and mouth vaccine and that at least during its construction there was fairly easy French access into it. However that is no longer the case and it is very difficult to know whether the security is entirely for animal quarantine purposes. In addition as I pointed out to Martin hoof and mouth would be an ideal candidate as an economic weapon and how in the world could one ever distinguish vaccine production from BW weapons development. I suspect that if no one else on the committee for the present danger is going to raise those kinds of questions on the occasion of the five year review of the treaty and that it might be a good idea to try to spark some technical response how to answer such issues.

The last session of the CCD in Geneva has adjourned without there being any visible progress on CW and this is likely to remain the case as long as there is such an impasse as far as verification is concerned. However neither of us frets too much about that since it is not an issue of the same importance as the nuclear one. I did suggest that they think a little bit about carving out arms transfer in the CW area as something that could be subject to mutual prohibition without worrying too much about verification.

Martin also told me that there had been some allegations that the Vietnamese had used chemical weapons during their invasion of Cambodia. There were some press reports about that. Mikulik might well have some of that background but Martin might send it to me as well. That is probably a propaganda fabrication. There was some reference to yperite which is a most unlikely candidate!

I mentioned my concerns about refugees to Martin although not sure that this has much more than a domestic reference with the headaches that we are going to face trying to set up a sensible policy on how to open our border to Mexico. He mentioned that the Club of Rome and the International Council of Jurists might be very appropriate media for such further discussions. With respect to the latter he gave me the names of Neal McDermott and Paul Sighart in London. I probably should pass those on to the person from Aspen.

Finally I reinvented the wheel suggesting that Pugwash set up summer courses on strategic policy and arms control with more emphasis on the former than usually pertains. I told him that I had had some concern at Stanford that we did not have sufficient education with respect to basic military needs that made it more difficult to press the case for rational arms control where that could be brought in. It may be recalled that we had tried to recruit Admiral Zumwalt for that situation but that those negotiations broke down when the Admiral decided to run for the Senate and it was obviously

quite impossible to do that simultaneously with teaching at Stanford. What he did mention was that Scherf has been running a biennial program under the Italian arms control group. There will be another one in the summer of 1980 and this is one to watch to see if there are some people from here who might be interested in attending. He will send me the announcements of it.