SUBJECT: CCD: ASSESSMENT OF THIRD ROUND OF INFORMAL MEETINGS ON SOVIET PROPOSAL ON NEW MASS DESTRUCTION WEAPONS (MDW)

1. INFORMAL CCD MEETINGS WITH EXPERTS ON MDW WERE HELD MARCH 14 THROUGH 17, 1977. THIS WAS THE THIRD ROUND OF INFORMAL CCD MEETINGS ON THE SUBJECT, WITH ROUNDS ONE AND TWO HAVING BEEN HELD IN 1976.

2. MAIN CARRY-OVER PROBLEM FROM PRIOR MEETINGS WAS DOUBTS ABOUT UNDERSTANDINGS OF COVER AF OF EXISTING AGREEMENTS, PARTICULARLY BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION, THAT HAD BEEN RAISED BY REPRESENTATIVES AND EXPERTS OF USSR AND SEVERAL EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES. A PRIME US OBJECTIVE THIS SESSION WAS TO ACCOMPLISH SATISFACTORY CLARIFICATION OF THIS MATTER. THAT WAS DONE, AND USSR AND EASTERN EUROPEAN OFFENDERS MADE CLEAR AND EXPICIT STATEMENTS.
AFFIRMING SCOPE OF COVERAGE OF BW CONVENTION AND A PROSPECTIVE CW CONVENTION.

3. OBJECTIVE TAKEN UP BY US DELEGATION IN AUGUST 1976 DISCUSSIONS WAS TO ENCOURAGE ACCEPTANCE OF 1948 UNITED NATIONS DEFINITION OF NDW AS WORKING BASIS FOR DISCUSSION. THIS EFFORT TOOK HOLD RATHER WELL THIS SESSION. WESTERN GROUP ENDORSED THIS APPROACH AND SPEAKERS FROM CANADA, FRG, ITALY, SW...
THIS SESSION. ALSO, DURING THE LAST MEETING (MARCH 17), A SOVIET EXPERT IN A PREPARED STATEMENT SAID THAT PRIOR TEXTS AND STATEMENTS ON DEFINITION HAD BEEN PUT FORWARD ONLY TO ASSIST DISCUSSION AND WAS NOT INTENDED TO BE DEVELOPED INTO "JURICICAL LANGUAGE" FOR AN AGREEMENT. ALSO ON MARCH 17, INDIAN REP TOOK NOTE OF USSR SEEMING ENDORSEMENT OF COMPARABILITY STANDARD IN 1948 DEFINITION BUT POINTED OUT THAT USSR HAD VOTED AGAINST THE UN RESOLUTION THAT PROMULGATED THAT DEFINITION. HE ASKED WHAT PRESENT USSR POSITION WAS ON THIS MATTER. LIKHACHEV DID NOT REPLY.

6. AS MATTERS NOW STAND, USSR PROPOSES: - A TREATY BANNING ALL NEW TYPES AND SYSTEMS OF MDW, AND B. THAT THE FOLLOWING CLAIMED NEW TYPES OF SYSTEMS BE INCLUDED IN THAT BAN:

A. SYSTEMS THAT GENERATE AND PROPAGATE LOW-FREQUENCY ACOUSTIC WAVES (INFRA-SOUND) TO KILL, INJURE OR DISTURB HUMAN BEINGS.

BEINGS AND DAMAGE BUILDINGS, ETC.

B. SYSTEMS THAT GENERATE AND PROPAGATE RADIO-FREQUENCY WAVES (INCLUDING MICROWAVE RADIATION) TO KILL, INJURE OR DISTURB HUMAN BEINGS.

C. FUEL/AIR EXPLOSIVES.

D. NUCLEAR WEAPONS BASED ON FISSIONABLE ELEMENTS ATOMICALLY HEAVIER THAN URANIUM 235 AND PLUTONIUM 239
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E. Use, for delivery of MDW to targets on the surface of the Earth, of "Aerospace" vehicles having characteristics combining those of aircraft and spacecraft or ballistic missiles, e.g. Space Shuttle.

7. Statements by speakers for US (and others, concerning the first four) of the five MDW candidates above, said essentially the following:

-- A, B, and C are not MDW and do not come close to satisfying the comparability standard of the 1948 definition. Concerning C, it was also pointed out that fuel/air explosives are explicitly identified as conventional weapons in laws-of-war deliberations.

D would, if realized, be nuclear weapons and should be governed accordingly.

E is a delivery system, and therefore could appropriately be raised in other forums dealing with such questions (intending indirectly to convey the suggestion that this is an issue which should be addressed, if at all, in SALT). See para 10 below concerning other aspects of this item.

8. Soviet expert replied to points in para 7, above, as A, B, and C are MDW; he had explained why; those who deny it have not explained their view.

D should be placed under a separate ban, not subjected to the same agreements that now exist or may be developed covering nuclear weapons generally.

E should be subject to a ban developed in CCD, not dealt with in some other forum concerning delivery vehicles.

9. Soviet expert, with some support from the Polish expert concerning infra-sound, claimed systems A, B, and C above could have destructive effects comparable to those of
CURRENTLY-RECOGNIZED MDW BUT DID NOT SUPPORT THIS CLAIM BEYOND SAYING, IN ESSENCE, THAT THEY CAN KILL PEOPLE.

10. IN DISCUSSING "AEROSPACE" VEHICLES AS A CLASS, OF WHICH SPACE SHUTTLE IS THE CURRENT ACTUAL MEMBER OF THAT CLASS, SOVIET EXPERT STATED THAT IT COULD BE USED TO: A. PLACE MDW IN ORBIT, OR B. DELIVER MDW TO SURFACE TARGET. WHEN IT WAS POINTED OUT THAT A. IS KIND OF USUBJECT APPROPRIATE TO OTHER FORUMS CONCERNED WITH DELIVERY VEHICLES, AND ARGUED SPECIFICALLY FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A BAN IN CCD, HUNGARIAN EXPERT (ESS GENEVA 2129) PURSUED SUBJECT FURTHER. HE ARGUED THAT SPACE SHUTTLE, AS AN AERODYNAMIC VEHICLE, CAN OPERATE IN ALTITUDE RANGE FROM 30/40 KILOMETERS TO ABOUT 160 KILOMETERS WITHOUT LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
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EXECUTING ORBITAL FLIGHT. THIS MODE OF OPERATION OF AN MDW CARRIER, HE SAID (PROBABLY RIGHTLY), WOULD NOT BE PROHIBITED BY OUTER SPACE TREATY. HE THEN WENT ON TO ARGUE THAT AIR DEFENSES CANNOT HANDLE THIS FLIGHT REGIME AND THAT AMB DEFENSES WERE LIMITED BY ABM TREATY: THEREFORE, A NEW KIND OF DEFENSE WOULD NEED TO BE SOUGHT, TOUCHING OFF A NEW ARMS RACE. REFERENCE TO ABM TREATY IN THIS CONTEXT IS AMBIGUOUS AT BEST. LITERAL DEVELOPMENT OF DEFENSE SYSTEM TO BE EFFECTIVE AGAINST SPACE SHUTTLE AT ALTITUDES UP TO 160 KILOMETERS PROBABLY WOULD BE VERY MESSY WITH RESPECT TO ABM TREATY.

1. GDR EXPERT PICKED UP A LINE THAT HAD BEEN OPENED BY USSR IN AUGUST 1976 SESSION. HE TALKED AT SOME LENGTH ABOUT "COMBINATION" WEAPONS IN WHICH A CHEMICAL OR BIOLOGICAL AGENT WOULD BY ITSELF HAVE A MILD EFFECT, UBT WOULD SENSITIZE THE ORGANISM TO REACT ADVERSELY TO PHYSICAL STIMULI (E.G. LOUDNOISES, FLASHING LIGHTS) WITH PERHAPS LETHAL EFFECT. SUCH WEAPONS, HE SAID, WOULD CONSTITUTE A NEW MDW AND WOULD NOT COME WITHIN THE COVERAGE OF THE BW CONVENTION OF A CW CONVENTION. HIS NET CONCLUSION IS THAT AGREEMENTS COVERING INDIVIDUAL TYPES OF WEAPONS (E.G., CHEMICAL OR BIOLOGICAL) ARE NOT ENOUGH, AND AN UMBRELLA LIKE THAT PROPOSED BY USSR IS NEEDED. THIS IS A SORT OF VIGOROUS EXTENSION OF THE QUESTIONS REISED BEFORE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION AS TO WHETHER SUCH A SINGLE-TYPE AGREEMENT MIGHT WEAKEN THE GENEVA PROTOCOL OF 1925. IT IS NOT CLEAR WHETHER THIS IS A SERIOUS CONCEPTUAL PROBLEM OR JUST ANOTHER INDICATOR OF NEED FOR CAREFUL DRAFTING OF -- FOR EXAMPLE -- A NEW CW AGREEMENT.
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12. BULGARIAN EXPERT SPOKE ON RADIOLOGICAL WEAPONS AND ADVOCATED THEIR PROHIBITION WITHIN FRAMEWORK OF SIVIET MDW PROPOSAL. INDIAN REP ASKED WHAT US POSITION WAS ON RW IN CONTEXT OF MDW. US REPATED THAT, ON BASIS OF 1948 DEFINITION, RADIOLOGICAL WEAPONS ARE WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION. HE FURTHER SAID THAT CCD MAY WISH TO TAKE UP SUBJECT OF RW AGAIN AT A TIME CONSISTENT WITH CCD PRIORITIES. POLISH EXPERT, IN A BURST OF CREAPIVITY, SUGGESTED THAT MEANING OF TERM RADIOLOGICAL WEAPONS BE EXTENDED TO INCLUDE ACOUSTIC WAVES. FORTUNATELY, 1948 DEFINITION REFERS TO RADIOLOGICAL WEAPONS BY USE OF TERM "RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS"
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AGU 13,1976) IN ARGUING PROBABLE NEED FOR APPROACHING ANY AGREEMENTS ON NEW TYPES OF SYSTEMS ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS, US EXPERT MENTIONED NEED TO DEAL APPROPRIATELY WITH VERIFICATION IN MDW DISCUSSIONS. US DEL HAS REFRAINED FROM ANY FURTHER REFERENCE TO VERIFICATION IN ORDER TO AVOID GIVING ANY IMPLICATION THAT SOVIET PROPOSAL IS OTHERWISE ACCEPTABLE. FURTHER, EXERCISING SUBJECT OF VERIFICATION IN THE ABSTRACT COULD ONLY HAVE IRRITATED SOVIETS ANYWAY.

14. IN STATEMENTS IN AUGUST 1976 AND EARLIER, SOVIETS REFERRED -- WITH NO SPECIAL EMPHASIS -- TO DESIRABILITY OF REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE TO SEEK OUT AT INCIPIENT STAGE POTENTIALITIES FOR NEW MDW. THIS NOTION LAY DORMANT UNTIL DISCUSSIONS THIS TIME, WHEN IT WAS SET IN MOTION -- WITHOUT PRIOR MENTION TO US OR WESTERN GROUP -- BY UK EXPERT (GARNETT) IN HIS FIRST STATEMENT. HIS WARM REFERENCE TO SUCH A SCHEME SEEMED TO APPEAL TO CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE AND (PERHAPS ONLY INITIALLY), TRADELEGATION. SUBSEQUENT DISCUSSION IN WESTERN GROUP (GENEVA 2095), WITH HELP OF CANADIAN AND NETHERLANDS EXPERTS, SUBSTANTIALLY LOWERED ZEAL FOR INTERNATIONAL LITERATURE REVIEW ARRANGEMENT, BUT DID NOT ENTIRELY SET IT ASIDE. US EXPERT AGREED TO, AND DID, INCLUDE IN STATEMENT REMARKS ABOUT NEED FOR VIGILANCE WITH RESPECT TO EMERGENT MDW POSSIBILITIES AND AT SOME DISTANCE IN STATEMENT, ALSO MENTIONED AVAILABILITY OF SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE AS A HELP IN PERCEIVING WHAT MAY BE IN PROSPECT. IN RECIPROCATION, UK AND CANADIAN SPEAKERS ALTHOUGH PRIVATELY STILL EXPRESSING A BENT IN THAT DIRECTION, REFRAINED FROM ADVOCACY OF ANY SPECIFIC CCD ACTION (E.G., ESTABLISHMENT OF EXPERTS GROUP TO REVIEW PERIODICALLY SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE FOR SIGNS OF MDW POTENTIALITIES). IN WESTERN GROUP (AND PERHAPS MORE WIDLY) THERE WAS A VIEW THAT USSR SHOULD LIMIT OFFICIAL USE
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BE OFFERED SOME "WAY OUT" OF THEIR POSITION ON MDW AND THAT WAY OUT SHOULD INVOLVE REALIZATION OF SOMETHING SPECIFIC AND/OR FORMAL IN CCD. THAT VIEW WAS ALMOST SURELY PART OF BASIS FOR EXPRESSIONS FROM CANADA, NETHERLANDS AND UK SUMMARIZED ABOVE, AND OF OTHER COUNTRIES NET OUTCOME OF LAST WESTERN GROUP MEETING WAS TO DECIDE TO WAIT AND SEE WHAT IS DONE NEXT BY USSR RATHER THAN TRY TO FEND OFF USSR ADVOCACY OF NEW MDW TREATY BY OFFERING THEM INSTEAD A CCD ARRANGEMENT OF PERIODIC REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE. AS OF NOW, THE "WAIT AND SEE" VIEW HAS PREVAILED AND NO "WAY OUT" HAS BEEN SUGGESTED TO USSR.

15. NO SUGGESTIONS WERE MADE FOR FURTHER ROUNDS ON THIS SUBJECT; HOWEVER, INDIAN REP SAID HE SAW A NEED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION. USSR REP SAID HE WOULD HAVE MORE TO SAY LATER.
16. THIS TIME, THERE WERE NO US/USSR BILATERAL MEETINGS AND NONE WERE PROPOSED.

17. AS OF THE END OF THIS FOUND STATUS IS AS FOLLOWS:
A. USSR STILL ADVOCATES THEIR PROPOSAL;
B. THE WESTERN GROUP WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE SUBJECT GO AWAY BUT DOUBT THAT IT WILL;
C. EASTERN EUROPEANS ARE DOING WHAT IS EXPECTED OF THEM;
D. INDIA AND A FEW OTHERS SAY THEY LIKE THE SOVIET PROPOSAL;
E. OTHER CCD PARTICIPANTS HAVE REMAINED SILENT;
F. DEFINITIONAL SUBJECT HAS ARRIVED AT A STAGE WHERE THERE IS FAIRLY WIDE SUPPORT (COMPLETE IN WESTERN GROUP) FOR CARRYING ON WITH THE 1948 UN DEFINITION OF MDW. SOVIETS HAVE STAYED SILENT ON THIS, BUT HAVE UTILIZED PRINCIPLE OF COMPARABILITY CONTAINED IN ABOVE DEFINITION.
G. FINALLY, ATTRITION IMPOSED ON USSR PROPOSAL HAD EFFECTIVELY REDUCED THEM TO ARGUING WHAT THEY STARTED OUT WITH, I.E., THAT THE FUTURE IS UNCERTAIN AND THAT THE "BAD" PARTS OF THAT FUTURE SHOULD BE PROHIBITED IN ADVANCE IN GENERAL LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
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TERMS. THEIR ATTEMPTS TO BE SPECIFIC AS TO DEFINITIONS OR EXAMPLES OF NEW MDW HAVE NOT FLOURISHED.

18. IN EARLY STAGES LAST YEAR SOME DELEGATIONS CAME TO THE TABLE WITH AN OPTIMISTIC VIEW THAT SOVIET PROPOSAL WAS A PROMISING START ON DEVELOPMENT OF LIMITATIONS ON COMPETITION IN QUALITATIVE ARMS ADVANCEMENT; HOWEVER, THE ABSURD CHARACTER OF SO MUCH OF WHAT SOVIETS HAVE DONE IN "CLARIFYING" THEIR PROPOSAL HAS DISCOURAGED MUCH OF THE ORIGINAL OPTIMISM. THIS POINT WAS WELL STATED BY SWEDISH SPOKESMAN IN AUGUST 1976 AND QUALITY OF SOVIET PERFORMANCE HAS NOT IMPROVED. SORENSON
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