Environmental Warfare Treaty

Prospects for U.S. ratification of the environmental warfare treaty, which the Senate itself first proposed but then was in no hurry to approve, are now excellent because of a switch in strategy on the part of the Federation of American Scientists (FAS) and several major environmental groups. On 30 July the Committee on Foreign Relations voted 9-0 to report the treaty to the Senate with its approval.

As recently as last fall the FAS and the other groups, which include the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council, were opposing U.S. ratification on the grounds that the treaty is too weak and too permissive. But, since then, these groups, aware that the treaty went into force in October when Laos became the 20th nation to ratify it, have decided that the best strategy is for the United States to become a party to the treaty and to press for strengthening changes.

In 1973 the Senate passed a resolution calling for all nations to join in an Environmental Modification Convention—the name the treaty is now known by—that would ban defoliation and rainmaking of the kind done by the United States in Vietnam along with such other and possibly more far-reaching environmental warfare methods that might be invented in the future.

But later, during the Ford Administration, the draft treaty was revised at the insistence of U.S. negotiators to include a "threshold" that limits the treaty's scope to "hostile use of environmental modification techniques having widespread, long-lasting, or severe effects." These were defined as effects that would be felt for at least several months over an area of several hundred square kilometers, with serious harm to "human life, natural and economic resources or other assets."

The FAS and the environmental groups strongly objected to this change, believing that it might be argued by the military in the United States and other countries that practices such as rainmaking and defoliation are not covered. James N. Barnes, an attorney with the Center for Law and Social Policy representing these groups, has observed, for instance, that, although the defoliation campaign in Vietnam extended over large regions and caused severe and long-lasting damage, it is not clear that "individual sprayings taken alone would cross the threshold."

The groups also saw other shortcomings in the treaty, among them the fact that research and development on hostile use of environmental modification techniques would not be banned. In 1976 the groups brought suit against the State Department to require that an environmental impact statement be prepared on the treaty. Last year when the statement was finally issued, the groups found it seriously deficient.

Nonetheless, despite his clients' long-standing objections to the treaty, Barnes announced at a Senate hearing in May that the groups now favored U.S. ratification. Senator Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), the prime mover behind the treaty back in the early 1970's and now chairman of the foreign relations subcommittee on arms control, oceans, and international environment, asked Barnes and Assistant Secretary of State Thomas R. Pickering to seek agreement on what the scope of a State Department study of the treaty should be.

Pickering, whose responsibilities encompass international environmental and scientific affairs, reported to Pell in June that this has been accomplished. He and Barnes have agreed that the study, which the State Department will undertake within 6 months of Senate ratification, should cover the treaty's threshold provision and certain other matters, including the question whether R & D activities should be banned.

According to Geryld Christianson, Pell's aide for foreign relations, the senator will push for ratification of the treaty at the first opportunity, which could come either before or after the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty is disposed of. Christianson said he knows of no groups or agencies now opposing the convention. In fact, he said, the Department of Defense, like the Environmental Protection Agency and the Council on Environmental Quality, is on record as supporting it.—LUTHER J. CARTER

edited by Burt. One entry in Burt's diary, for 7 April 1962, gives the game away: "chiefly doing Howard's reply to Isaacs," Burt wrote.

One of Burt's problems in the 1960's was in responding to educationalists and psychologists who asked for his original data. From 1960 onward, Hearnshaw says, he was often asked to do so, and with two exceptions he always failed to reply. One of these was when he supplied data on the 53 sets of separately reared twins to Christopher Jencks of Harvard in 1969. Jencks' request reached Burt on 2 December 1968, and he finally replied 7 weeks later on 25 January 1969. "I apologise for not replying more promptly," he wrote, "but I was away for the Christmas vacation, and college (where the data are stored) was closed until the opening of term."

This apology, Hearnshaw shows, was untrue in every particular. Burt had not been away for Christmas; his data were not stored at college, and the college had only been closed for a week. Burt's diary shows that he spent the whole of the week from 2 January onward "calculating data on twins for Jencks." On 11 January he "finished checking tables for Jencks." What he was in fact doing was reconstructing the raw data from the correlations, working back from his answer to create wholly fallacious data. The table he provided subsequently appeared in an article by American psychologist Arthur Jensen.

Burt's invention of co-workers did not stop with Howard and Conway. During his years as editor of the *British Journal of Psychology (Statistical Section)* some 40 different people contributed reviews, notes, and letters to the journal. Of these, well over half are unidentifiable, Hearnshaw says, and "judging from the style and content of their contributions were pseudonyms for Burt." Why did he do it? This large family of characters was invented, Hearnshaw believes, to save his face and boost his ego. They enabled him to expound his views, sometimes by replying to notes written by himself under other names; and, most important of all, it enabled him to maintain the fiction that he was still actively engaged in research and the collection of data on twins.

But the fascination of Burt was that he was not simply a phony. He was a man of extraordinary knowledge and capable of considerable charm. In his retirement, living on a totally inadequate pension in a large Hampstead apartment, he earned a little money by reading manuscripts for publishers. His reports were astonishing for their length and erudition; so much so

0036-8075/79/0817-0674$00.50/0