

May 24, 1989
Letter, John R. Redick to Ben Sanders

Citation:

"Letter, John R. Redick to Ben Sanders", May 24, 1989, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Contributed by Michal Onderco from the private papers of Benjamin Sanders.
<https://wilson-center-digital-archive.dvincitest.com/document/260440>

Summary:

John Redick offers his assessment of the Guernsey meeting of the PPNN.

Original Language:

English

Contents:

Original Scan

Annex 4

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA



DIVISION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

CONFERENCES AND INSTITUTES

May 24, 1989

Mr. Ben Sanders
240 E. 27th Street
New York, NY 10016

Dear Ben:

Thank you so much for including me in the Guernsey meeting. I enjoyed the Core group meeting as well as the Conference of Diplomats. I thought the conference went quite well both in substance and organization.

I thought you might find useful my responses to the questions raised in the one page handout dated May 15. Question A 1: As a member of one of the three briefing teams I did not feel the repetition was particularly hard on us. It was a comfortable pace spread over a day and a half, and certainly no one could complain about that kind of schedule. A2: The repetition improved the quality of the presentations, as we polished up our act and became more precise. By the third time we really sounded quite good, at least in the Regional group. A3: In regard to the Regional group I do feel we had too many topics to deal with effectively in the time allotted for each presentation. Perhaps, a way to improve on this is to divide into two Regional groups, but this would have made it a more complex process. A4: I heard relatively little comment from anyone on the conference system; certainly no complaints, except that we had inadequate time in the Regional group. A5: I thought the conference system was adequately explained in advance, but then I read the material you so kindly sent me. It was quite apparent that not all had, including some of the briefing teams as well!

B. When I initially saw the list of participants I was quite uneasy about the unevenness in knowledge. Certainly some of the diplomats were very senior experts who could have been easily doing the briefing themselves. In fact the process worked, at least for the Regional group, because the more senior participants became quickly involved in the discussions on a par with the presenters. The result was a higher level of dialogue which I feel benefited some of the less knowledgeable participants.

Mr. Ben Sanders
May 24, 1989
Page Two

C. Interventions by the less knowledgeable participants were uneven from group to group. Some may have felt a little reluctant to enter into the dialog between members of the briefing teams and the more knowledgeable participants. It is difficult to say this is absolutely true, because they might have been reluctant to say anything even had the dialog not been underway. All in all it worked very well, and better than I felt it might.

D. Someone had to move so there is no particular right or wrong about whether participants or briefing members should be mobile. As a couple of the rooms were quite small it is possible the participants may have felt a little cramped. Again, I felt the process worked quite well.


E2. From our brief conversation on my departure I gathered there is sentiment by some to change your process and engage only senior diplomats in a future conference. Such a shift would certainly change the objective, as I understand the exercise, and I think this would be unfortunate. The goal of educating the younger diplomats is a valid one and worth continuing. This does not argue against a future special meeting between the Core Group and some selective heads of delegations to the Review Conference. Should you organize such a meeting I would think the process would be different: discussion rather than briefings.

A couple of miscellaneous points: I felt, to some extent, that the Regional briefings were perhaps too much weighted toward a U.S. perspective, given the fact that the chairman and a leading member were both former U.S. government officials. This is no criticism of either individual: both are outstanding. However, if I felt this (in regard to our discussions on such topics as nuclear weapon free zones, CTB etc.,) I wonder if participants from third world countries might have felt this even more strongly?

Finally, regarding the question of media, I urge you to consider not de-emphasizing this as you approach the Review Conference time. It seems to me that this is the time when you will be best positioned to benefit from professional media assistance.

I hope these suggestions are helpful and that you are pleased with the overall progress of your fine project. With warm regards to Shirley.

Yours truly,


John R. Redick
Associate Professor

cc: John Simpson