

categorization might conceivably arise if the modified toxin were changed to such an extent that it could not be shown to be modelled on a known toxin. However, such a situation, while possible in theory, is difficult to foresee in practice, given the multiplicity of known biologically active peptides.

There has been great progress in science and technology since the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention entered into force. There has also been debate about the implications of these changes for the Convention. The United States' review leading to its renunciation of toxins concluded that toxins of that time could not surpass or replace the lethal chemical warfare agents then available. Although this conclusion may have been valid in the scientific and technical climate of 1970, thus reducing concerns about verification of a convention encompassing toxins, this may require reevaluation in the reality of the 1990s. Of course, at issue will not only be "what" some might consider needs to be done in terms of verification, but also "how" to do it.

1.5 Terminology: Distinctions and Ambiguity

The terminology "chemical and biological weapons", often mentioned together and abbreviated CBW, is misleading. It combines chemical, biological, toxin, and possibly riot control agents and herbicides. These agents have grossly different effects. Toxin agents are considered by some to blur the distinction between