

~~ADMINISTRATIVE USE ONLY~~

*Last page. Lederberg  
on board?*

MEMORANDUM FOR: MEMORANDUM FOR: David B. Low  
NIO/AL

*C. [Signature]*  
(b)(3)

FROM:   
Chairman, DCI BCW-Toxin Working Group

SUBJECT: Washington Post Outlook Article by Saul Hormats  
"One Expert Doubts...", 26 Feb 84

1. Hormats repeats a number of statements often found in recent "negative" stories on Yellow Rain. The thrust of the statements is that the State Department case for violations of Arms Control Treaties or Agreements in BCW Matters rests on interviews with refugees. He states that based on these reports "several hundred combinations of agents and delivery systems seem to have been used." He then concludes that since U.S. weapons are not like those reported in Southeast Asia, and since the best evidence put forth by the U.S. State Department consists of "moldy twigs, leaves, and rock scrapings" that "Congress has been misled."

2. The State Department utterances, even the briefest and least detailed, do not make such claims:

- o Refugee reports are actually given as reasons to investigate alleged CW use, never as evidence alone.
- o Sample data includes blood, urine, autopsy tissue, gas masks, and controls. There are several dozen positive samples reported. Key samples, e.g., autopsy tissue or gas masks have been tested in two or three independent laboratories.
- o Analysis of all data has led the Department of the Army to conclude that a very limited number of kinds of weapons have been used, not hundreds.
- o Congress has based its judgment on much more than refugee reports and State Department Unclassified White Papers...Three special National Intelligence Estimates, and internal/finished intelligence papers by over a dozen analysts in every NFIB Agency...plus at least one

*[Handwritten scribble]*

~~ADMINISTRATIVE USE ONLY~~

SUBJECT: Washington Post Outlook Article by Saul Hormats "One Expert Doubts...", 26 Feb 84

hundred classified briefings of (especially) non-"scientific" intelligence data.

3. The arithmetic the author uses to conclude that "8,000 tons of bombs dropped from the air" would have to be a tremendous logistical problem" is based on the assumption that Fusarium itself would be the agent dropped. The author seems to have no concept of how chemical/biological material is produced...i.e., by growth, from organisms like fungi to be sure, but then separated, filtered, extracted, freeze dried in some cases, to weights and volumes only miniscule fractions of original feedstock. Raw growth medium plus original organisms are hardly weapons themselves. Similarly, preparations of antibiotics which utilize exactly the same methods end up being effective in gram quantities...not pounds or tons. An independent study by the National Academy of Sciences supported the government's contentions about mycotoxin effects on humans, and low dose requirements in animals and humans to cause severe blistering and even death...with tissue half-lives of three weeks, not three days.

4. The errors the author makes in military CW tactics are obvious even to myself, a non-CW, non-military officer. The Chemical Research and Development Center at Edgewood, Maryland is preparing a detailed point-by-point rebuttal. Similarly, a CW officer now assigned to State/INR has written a 4-page rebuttal, the Director of ACDA's Office for Verification and Intelligence has written a rebuttal to the Washington Post, and Congressman Larry Pressler is also publishing a rejoinder. I will forward these to you as I receive copies.

5. One true statement in the article is "Evidence of chemical or biological attack is unmistakable to an experienced observer." The drafters and contributors of the SNIEs and the State Department White Papers included:

- o About a half-dozen military officers with Army Chemical Corps specialty certifications.
- o About one dozen Intelligence Officers who are full-time specialists in Soviet CW R&D, Doctrine, and Special Intelligence

~~ADMINISTRATIVE USE ONLY~~

SUBJECT: Washington Post Outlook Article by Saul Hormats "One Expert Doubts...", 26 Feb 84

- o An Army medical team trained in CW-injuries, epidemiology, and tropical-refugee medicine who visited the field and examined many dozens of victims.
- o Army civilian and military CW bench scientists from Edgewood Chemical Systems Laboratory, Ft. Detrick, Maryland, the Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Command, FSTC, and FTD.

6. The National Estimates were very heavily reviewed prior to publication. And the material was briefed to about one hundred scientists from whom critical comments were solicited. The groups included The Defense Science Board, the JASONS, the President's Science Advisor and Technical Staff, and others. The most technical material was reviewed by outside chemists, physicians and toxicologists from Columbia School of Medicine, University of Minnesota, University of Texas, University of Tennessee, Rutgers University, National Academy of Sciences, University of Pennsylvania, California Institute of Technology, Rockefeller University, MIT, CARGILL, and more. A selected sub-group of these scientists with codeword clearances reviewed the papers line-by-line prior to publication. Each comment and suggestion they had (with no exception) was included in the final publication.. The implication by the author of the Outlook article (and others) that specialized technical review did not occur, or that scientists in the Intelligence Community expressed "doubts" in the major conclusions given to State is incorrect.



(b)(3)

~~ADMINISTRATIVE USE ONLY~~