

FIGHTING CHANCE

John 8: 31-32

Proverbs 22: 3

Newsletter Vol. I, No. 7

August 1987

THE PROBABILITY OF WAR

Opponents of American homeland defense -- civil defense and strategic defense -- argue that these defenses raise the probability of war by making war more "thinkable." They say that Americans will be more likely to fight a war if they think that they can survive one.

They ignore the fact that the Soviets have already spent over \$150 billion to provide their people with both strategic defense and civil defense and that the Soviets have spent even larger amounts of money to build a huge first-strike nuclear arsenal.

Will passive American homeland defense make war more likely? The partial answer to this question is "yes". The complete answer is "no".

War between the United States and the Soviet Union is highly probable already. The only action that could substantially reduce this probability would be deployment of a credible American defense which the Soviets could not expect to overcome - strategic and civil defenses which our Congress has so far refused to build.

Our information, of course, is limited. There are no examples in recorded human history in which a tyrannical regime has not gone to war when faced only by weaker, inadequately defended victims. Appeasement has always led to war. This doesn't prove that there will never be a contrary example, but history has not provided one so far.

Moreover, if there is to be a contrary example, the Soviets are a poor bet to provide one. They have repeatedly attacked their weaker neighbors as they are now doing directly in Afghanistan and through proxies in Angola, South Africa, Nicaragua and elsewhere and as they did in Eastern Europe. The 95 million civilian dead during peacetime behind the Iron Curtain are also an indicator that the Soviets are unlikely to be restrained by the increased civilian deaths from modern warfare.

However, in one sense, the appeasement elements in America hope to prevail. They believe that if Americans have no defense whatever -- if war means the certain death of each American family and community -- then Americans will be afraid to fight. This is the "reason" that they oppose civil defense. Faced with the decision, "red or dead?", most Americans might chose "red" if they have no alternative whatever other than martyrdom. If, however, they have civil defense shelters, if they have any protection what-so-ever, if they have a *Fighting Chance*, they will undoubtedly choose to fight.

This is the reason that groups like the PSR oppose civil defense. They correctly fear that Americans will resist Communist tyranny if they have any chance whatever to do so. They fear that their own social standing, physical possessions, and lives might be lost if Americans resist.

But why don't they equally fear the Soviets? Why are they not concerned about the vast nuclear arsenal and the homeland defenses of this Godless, unjust, immoral tyranny? The hard core of our pro-appeasement organizations are unconcerned.

- They do not fear Godlessness, because they themselves are without reverence for or belief in God.
- They do not fear injustice, because they themselves are without respect for justice.
- They do not fear immorality, because they themselves are without morality.

They fear death and they fear loss of their social and material positions. Death might come to them if Americans resist. Whereas if Americans submit to a "new world order" under Soviet domination, they may be allowed (they hope) to keep their possessions and position -- especially if they help to bring that order into being.

History teaches otherwise. It teaches that traitors within a country are usually among the first to be slaughtered by its conquerors. It teaches that appeasement does not prevent war. Appeasement only assures that, when war comes, the suffering and destruction is much worse than it would have been without appeasement. What, then, are our real options?

- We may avoid war by the only proven historically tested method - by building homeland defenses so strong that aggressors will fear to attack us.
- We may fight and win any war that is initiated against us by having built homeland defenses strong enough to preserve most of our people and industry.
- We may continue to remain undefended. In this case we will experience the murder of most of our people and the destruction of our country. Those who remain will then fight a war under great disadvantages and with a high probability of defeat.
- We can remain undefended and "hope" (along with the architects of our appeasement) that this lack of defense will make Americans so fearful that they will not try to defend themselves. This is what the appeasement advocates mean by opposing defense and therefore making war "less probable". This option is dishonorable, suicidal, historically improbable, and entirely opposite to Biblical mandate.

Civil defense shelters, until they are nation-wide and augmented by deployed strategic defense, do raise the capability of American resistance to tyranny and therefore the probability of war.

If, however, we use a mere six months of our current military budget to deploy *now* a workable civil and strategic defense, the probability of war will decrease and freedom on this earth can be preserved. During deployment of such a system, our steel, construction, farming, and aerospace industries would boom so greatly that they would strengthen our entire economy.

Fear is a debilitating and self-defeating emotion. We must not let our country and our civilization become permanent casualties of the merchants of fear!

DR. JANE ORIENT

Dr. Jane Orient, M.D. is vice-president of Doctors for Disaster Preparedness. She is an articulate, effective, patriotic, Christian spokeswoman for the American medical community.

95% of American physicians are **not** members of the "Physicians for Social Responsibility". Of the remaining 5%, most would not be members if they learned the truth about PSR claims. Well-meaning people, including physicians, are often easily fooled by false statements about nuclear war, since they usually have so little valid information about it.

Unfortunately the small core of well-funded liars who inhabit the central PSR organization have been successful in gaining substantial amounts of media and public attention. If we are to get homeland defenses for the United States, Doctors for Disaster Preparedness and other groups like them must be given more support and a stronger voice.

We are privileged to publish here two articles written by Dr. Orient. We have available a video tape of an interview with Dr. Orient and a presentation by her on the subject of medical self-help in civil defense. This video tape is available from **Fighting Chance** for \$29.50 postage paid. Alternatively, we will send this video tape free to any **Fighting Chance** supporter who joins Doctors for Disaster Preparedness as a regular member prior to November 1, 1987.

Regular DDP memberships are \$40 and can be sent to Dr. Orient at 1601 North Tucson Blvd. #9, Tucson, Arizona 85716. Please send a note also to **Fighting Chance** informing us that you have joined DDP, so that we will know to send you the videotape. DDP has a category of membership for those who are not doctors, so you do not need to be a physician to join DDP.

"Star Wars": The Downfall of Goliath?

by
Jane M. Orient

So David prevailed over the Philistine with a sling and with a stone, and struck the Philistine and killed him; there was no sword in the hand of David.

I Samuel 17:50

In the time of King Saul, the Philistines sent a challenge to the Israelites: defeat our champion Goliath, or become our servants. Now Goliath was nine and a half feet tall, and the throw weight of his spear was 600 shekels (over 15 pounds). When they saw him, the Israelites were terrified. But God did not send Saul to the negotiating table to surrender his people into slavery. Instead, He sent David to kill the giant, for the Israelites' cause was just. Despite his fearsome armaments, Goliath was felled by a primitive kinetic energy weapon.

Today's weapons are far more dreadful than those of Goliath. But proponents of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) believe that, like Goliath, they are vulnerable. Missiles have an aluminum skin the thickness of a shirt cardboard. Once on their way, nuclear warheads travel at speeds near 10,000 miles per hour. A collision with any object -- even a piece of gravel -- could destroy them.

The problem is that the gravel has to be in the right place at the right time. Advances in computers and in sensors that detect heat have made it possible to build "smart rocks" that find and intercept their targets. In June 1984, the U.S. Army tested an advanced version of a rock in a sling: the Homing Overlay vehicle. This little rocket managed to set itself on a collision course with a missile fired 4000 miles away. The impact turned the missile into a fine powder. A nuclear warhead could have been transformed into a harmless falling star.

At present, we have no defenses against nuclear weapons, but rely on the policy called Mutual Assured Destruction, or MAD: a strategy that holds the civilian populations of the "superpowers" as hostages.

Our nuclear arsenal is appropriate for the MAD strategy. More than 80% of our strategic nuclear warheads are, like the V-2 rocket (Vergeltungswaffe) of Hitler, weapons of vengeance. The majority are based on submarines hidden at sea. Submarine launched weapons are retaliatory, or "second strike" weapons because they are not accurate enough to knock out hardened military targets. They are only good for destroying cities and killing people.

In his so-called "Star Wars" speech of March 1983, President Reagan asked whether it wouldn't be better to save lives than to avenge them. He proposed a radical change: from a policy of pure revenge, to a policy that emphasizes defense. In the ensuing debate, religious groups have played a prominent role. Nearly 30 Protestant and Catholic groups have formed a coalition to support the President's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). On the other side, a group of 24 religious agencies launched a nationwide media campaign against SDI.

Supporters of SDI say that self-defense is justifiable, whereas revenge is always wrong. Opponents of SDI raise a number of ethical questions:

1. SDI would start an arms race in the heavens (or "drag the heavens down into hell," as the Union of Concerned Scientists expressed it).
2. SDI would be too expensive.
3. It is a front for building ever more terrifying offensive weapons.
4. It would violate the ABM Treaty.
5. It is fraudulent, because no defense against nuclear weapons is possible.

Let us consider these objections in turn:

1. It is already too late to prevent the intrusion of weapons into space. After all, missiles travel through space on the way to their targets. Should space provide safe passage for weapons of mass destruction, while defensive weapons are banned? A more serious concern is fear of accelerating the arms race. However, SDI advocates point out that the *defensive* arms race has so far been one-sided. The Soviets are already spending \$40 billion per year on civil, air, and missile defense.

2. The economic question is certainly important. A system based on currently available technology, instead of more exotic lasers, would cost about \$60 to \$120 billion. For comparison, the Soviets have about \$500 billion invested in their missile forces, and the MX missile program has been projected to cost between \$30 and \$50 billion. Defending the weapons we have might make more sense than building more of them. The Pentagon estimates that defensive weapons are from three to five times less expensive than offensive ones.

3. Defensive weapons are designed to destroy bombs, not to kill people or to damage their property. The "death beam" idea makes good science fiction. But the power of the SDI weapons is far too small to make them useful offensive weapons.

4. While some have argued that even research might violate the ABM Treaty, Soviet Minister of Defense Grechko stated before the Soviet Presidium in 1972 that the Treaty placed no limitations whatsoever on the conducting of research concerned with defending their country from nuclear missile strikes.

From a moral standpoint, if one party violates a contract, the other party is no longer bound by it. The best known of the alleged Soviet violations of this treaty is the phased array radar at Krasnoyarsk, which has been under construction for about 12 years. It is possible that the Soviets are preparing to "break out" of the treaty.

5. It is true that no defense has ever been perfect. Goliath's shield failed him, and he died.

But even a leaky shield could still save millions of lives in the event of war. More importantly, it would help prevent war by making a first strike unlikely to succeed.

Many scientists believe that the main obstacles to SDI are political, not technical. Even before the Army's experiment, physicist and disarmament advocate Freeman Dyson wrote prophetically, in his book *Weapons and Hope*:

A Successful David and Goliath experiment, with a two-pound rocket killing an intercontinental missile,could be a historical turning point. It could mark the beginning of a change in the way people think about nuclear

weapons. It would show nuclear weapons in a new light, as clumsy brutish things outwitted by a cheaper and more agile adversary. The death of Goliath could be the death of an era, the end of the unquestioned technical supremacy of nuclear weapons.

Dyson cautioned against the hazards of "Defense Unlimited," of placing too much faith in the wonders of Science. Yet the Scriptures also warn us against undue faith in politics: "Put not your trust in princes" (Psalm 146:3).

Without defenses, the United States, confronted with nuclear blackmail, might someday be forced to choose surrender, or the suicidal vengeance of MAD. Against the might of the Philistines, the Israelites seemed to be in a similar dilemma.

Until David put his trust in the Lord, and gathered five smooth stones.

Suggestions for Further Reading:

Beilenson, Laurence, *Survival and Peace in the Nuclear Age*, Chicago: Regnery/Gateway, 1980.

Dyson, Freeman, *Weapons and Hope*, New York: Harper & Row, 1984.

Ehrlich, Robert, *Waging Nuclear Peace*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985.

Jastrow, Robert, *How to Make Nuclear Weapons Obsolete*, Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1985.

Lefever, Ernest, and Hunt, Stephen, *The Apocalyptic Premise: Nuclear Arms Debated*, Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1982.

Nuclear War: The Ethics of Nontreatment

by
Jane M. Orient

Socially responsible physicians say that if a disease is untreatable, then the only option is prevention. Take cancer, for example. If a person gets cancer, a rapidly fatal course cannot be ruled out. Yet treatment programs are permitted to drain resources that could be devoted to prevention.

We have radiation therapy centers, rather than media centers to warn people about getting cancer. We spend millions of dollars on cancer surgery, when behavior modification classes are so much cheaper. We use toxic and expensive drugs for chemotherapy, instead of reducing "suspected carcinogens" in the drinking water to undetectable levels. What is it that stops us from reordering our social priorities?

The problem is that patients who get cancer expect to have something done for them. Something to stop the cancer from spreading. Something to relieve the symptoms.

Doctors are not willing to say: "Too bad. You stopped smoking, but it was too late." Or "you should have stopped breathing the radon in your house." They do not offer a cyanide capsule. Instead, they radiate anything that might be radiation sensitive, and operate on anything operable, suggesting that cancer might be curable. (And often it is!) They give morphine, even though the availability of opiates might give people the idea that cancer is thinkable.

The only situation in which doctors have insisted on a "prevention only" approach is in the "final epidemic," a problem they liken to cancer: nuclear war. For this, International Physicians For the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

Of course, members of IPPNW are just as fervently against war as the rest of us are. But fervor doesn't necessarily assure a correct diagnosis or effective therapy.

Lown and Chazov restrict their differential diagnosis to only one scenario: "a first strike by the United States against Soviet land-based missiles." What about the other possibilities? For example, a *Soviet* first strike, coupled with Soviet civil, air, and antiballistic missile defenses against a ragged retaliation? This scenario was actually rehearsed in 1982, and is rather more likely than the converse. The Soviet arsenal, which has increased relentlessly, boasts up to 10,000 first strike warheads. The U.S. arsenal, which has diminished substantially in terms of both megatonnage and number of warheads since the 1960s, has about 1000 warheads sufficiently accurate for a pre-emptive attack on military targets. Of course, there are other scenarios as well: accidental launch, terrorist attacks, nuclear blackmail, and so on.

Presumably, Lown and Chazov know that there are different types of cancer. But they seem to think that all conceivable nuclear wars would be alike: untreatable. IPPNW ridicules the idea of defenses. Still, despite Chazov's touted influence, the Soviet Union has spent, according to CIA reports, \$150 billion on strategic defense over the past 10 years, and apparently continues to spend \$3 billion annually, on civil defense alone. All citizens have 124 hours of civil defense training. Soviet medical students perform field exercises in simulated zones of nuclear destruction. They are taught about the second line

of prevention: preventing casualties due to blast, burns, radiation sickness, and epidemic disease. While IPPNW indulges in the exercise of counting up burn beds and pronouncing them inadequate, Soviets build shelters to prevent the burns.

After Chernobyl, a disaster that wasn't prevented, 450 medical brigades were mobilized. Once the order to evacuate was given, 45,000 people were transported from Pripyat in about two and a half hours. Over the next week, another 95,000 people (and about 20,000 cows) were evacuated, using a medical response plan developed for nuclear war in the 1960s. Many thousands of lives may have been saved by this plan.

This second-order prevention requires advance preparation. It is not possible to figure out how to get everyone out of town, to put blast doors on the subways, to dig fall-out shelters, or to stockpile enough food to last through a failed harvest, on 20 minutes notice. While members of IPPNW protest that in any disaster, including war, they will try to help the injured, they are doing their best to maximize the number of casualties, and to make supplies and equipment unavailable for aiding them.

As to first-order prevention, what does IPPNW have to offer? First, a history of failed arms control agreements. Second, a suggestion, published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, to force our best college students to study in the Soviet Union as hostages. Third, opposition to American defenses and weapons systems, to assure that all, including the elderly and babes in arms, will continue to serve as hostages without even leaving home. Finally, a "significant, unilaterally sponsored initiative" (unilateral disarmament?).

Somehow, IPPNW believes that these methods might be made to work, if only we could mobilize world public opinion. People must be convinced that nuclear war would be Doomsday. Speakers from IPPNW and its American branch, Physicians for Social Responsibility, roam through the country doing the "bomb run," getting people to think about being vaporized. And what about those who aren't fortunate enough to be in the 15% of the U.S. that could be subjected to lethal blast damage? As if the effects of fall-out, the destruction of industry, and other known weapons effects were insufficient, more horrors are promised: an AIDS-like disease run rampant, a cancer epidemic, deformed babies (if there are babies at all), starvation, lakes frozen solid, darkness at noon, a plague of insects, and so on and on.

Some of these apocalyptic horrors seem to be pure speculation or even fantasy, while others are wild exaggerations of the well-known hazards of radiation. The predictions are backed by the authority of prominent physicians, who openly advocate using their position of public trust to get their viewpoint accepted without question. They claim to present the data. But they are very selective. For example, they speak of the people killed in basement shelters during the Hamburg firestorm, and neglect to mention that 85% of the people in the area survived.

Clearly, members of IPPNW believe that the end justifies the means, and that to save the world, the sacrifice of scientific integrity is an affordable price. They would also jeopardize the existence of the United States as a free nation. Still, there is something worse that a physician could do.

If these physicians are absolutely certain that they can forever prevent the use of nuclear weapons, they are having omnipotence fantasies. If they are *not* 100 percent certain, then they are proponents of human sacrifice: of the thousands or millions of victims who would suffer agonizing, *preventable* injuries and death in the event that a nuclear weapon ever detonates on an American city. As they "pound nails into the lid of the coffin of civil defense" (their expression), they should think about the human souls inside.

SCHOOL BOARD REJECTS CIVIL DEFENSE FOR CHILDREN

While the children of the Soviet Union attend their regular classes in civil defense and the 100,000-man separate civil defense branch of the Soviet armed forces works to keep the Soviet shelter system in readiness for the children, the School Board of Grants Pass, Oregon has refused to allow the installation of civil defense shelters for the children at the public schools under their jurisdiction.

Local citizens offered to build a shelter system entirely at private expense and without the use of public funds. The shelters would protect all of the children and would also double as low maintenance classroom space. Why did this School Board reject \$850,000 worth of completely free, nuclear weapon-resistant classroom space?

In Switzerland, it is *illegal* to build a school or any other building without building a nuclear shelter underneath for its occupants. In urban China, the schools are underlain by 30-foot-deep tunnels for the same purpose. In Grants Pass, the public cannot even give free shelters to the kids. Why did this happen?

First, the Grants Pass School Board has one member who is a doctor who has been brainwashed by PSR propaganda. He repeatedly stated that if a war starts, he wants to be among the first to die. Moreover, he decided that this suicidal act would be best for the children in Grants Pass, too.

Second, the other school board members are generally uninformed about civil defense and therefore easily influenced against it. With the National Education Association and the Educators for Social Responsibility working to put anti-defense, pro-appeasement, unilateral disarmament and surrender propaganda into the public school textbooks, the arguments from the board's own PSR apologist were especially destructive.

Third, the local Grants Pass newspaper editor is rabidly against homeland defenses for America. He publishes and editorializes in favor of almost every anti-defense, pro-appeasement and surrender scenario which comes to his attention. In this case, this editor was so shocked by the proposal to defend the kids, that he ran four successive front page articles comprised of over 8000 words plus 80 square inches of photographs with biased, dishonest "reporting" along with editorial statements against civil defense which were riddled with outright falsehoods. In essence, the paper conducted a smear campaign against civil defense and its supporters. When asked about this, the owner of the paper stated that so long as the editor kept circulation up and profits favorable, he was satisfied.

What about the kids themselves, or, more relevantly, their parents? A public opinion poll in Grants Pass showed that the overwhelming majority of the people there are in favor of civil defense. What is going on here?

PSR and ESR propaganda has caused a local school board to take a foolish and incorrect action. The board members were able to read in the local paper that they were doing the right thing. This gave them courage, even though they really did not understand the issue. The school board action was opposed by a majority of the people in the community who will now be even less interested in voting more funds for the schools. This opposition has been partially hidden by the misguided policies of a local newspaper.

Most importantly, the school children of Grants Pass who could have protection from nuclear weapons provided to them by concerned local citizens are entirely without protection. They will, in the event of war, become victims of the suicide pact initiated by a doctor on their school board - just as the children of Jonestown were victims of Jim Jones and his suicide cult. In the meantime, the children remain as hostages to Soviet military power.

Why did this simple protective measure in an Oregon community merit such strong opposition? Of the three newspapers, three television stations, and various radio stations in the region, only one media outlet supported the school board - but that one newspaper did so vehemently and even to its own detriment.

Visualize the problem for the promoters of the new appeasement textbooks that will be coming into the Oregon schools as a result of the recent passage of Oregon House Bill 3223 and the NEA and ESR campaign against American homeland defense. How do you teach the kids that nuclear war is unsurvivable if there is a fully equipped blast and fallout shelter at the school for each of them?

The shelters would be physical testimony to the truth - testimony that could not be overcome by paper lies in the textbooks. That is why America's opponents must stop shelters for the kids, and it is one of the reasons why we must not let them do so.

RADIATION AND CANCER

If there is a widespread nuclear war, then there will be damaging effects on human health besides the direct effects from the weapons themselves. The worst of these effects will be the decrease in modern health care for normal illnesses and the delay in ongoing medical research as a result of the war. In addition, there will be an increase in cancer incidence and mortality.

An instructive tabulation of this effect is found in Publication 20/85 of the Home Office Scientific Research and Development Branch of the Medical Research Council of Great Britain. It was published in Fission Fragments (UK), No.37, October 1985. The summarizing table is as follows:

The lifetime risk of naturally occurring cancer (excluding skin cancer) is 20 - 25%. The natural mortality from all neoplastic diseases in England and Wales is about 2,500 per million per year in a population of all ages. Additional cancer will be induced in survivors of atomic war by their radiation exposure, roughly in arithmetic proportion to exposure, at the rate of about 100 cases of fatal cancer per million exposed per rad in air of low LET radiation. Individuals incubating cancer will usually be normally fit and active until within a short time (months or 1 - 2 years) of death. The peak mortality period varies with type of cancer as noted below.

	<i>Fatal cancers induced by irradiation** cases/million/rad</i>	<i>Peak Mortality</i>
<i>Leukaemia</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>5 - 10 years after irradiation</i>
<i>Bone</i>	<i>5</i>	
<i>Lung</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>20 - 30 years after irradiation</i>
<i>Breast</i>	<i>25</i>	
<i>All other</i>	<i>50</i>	
<i>Thyroid</i>	<i>5*</i>	<i>40+ years after irradiation</i>

** values taken from ICRP Publication 26.

*The induction of thyroid cancer might be 5 - 10 times greater, but most radiation induced thyroid cancers are non-fatal. Some of these could prove fatal if by 20 - 30 years after nuclear war the efficiency of treatment has not returned to the pre-war level.

Using their value of 100 additional cases of fatal cancer per million people exposed per rad, we can estimate the increase in cancer fatalities following a devastating, all-out war. 600 rads is well beyond the immediately fatal dose for most people. Without shelters, more than 95% of the people in 600 rad radiation fields will die within 6 weeks of exposure. By comparison, the usual lifetime total dose from naturally occurring background radiation today is about 10 rads.

A very high upper estimate of wartime average exposure among initial war survivors would be 100 rads during the war and another 100 rads over the years following the war. This 200 rads leads to 20,000 cases per million or a 2% death rate. These deaths occur on average 20 years after the war. When these figures are adjusted for variations in exposure and when normal life expectancy and other causes of death are taken into account, it is clearly seen that fewer than 1% and possibly as few as 0.1% of the people would die of radiation induced cancer.

Moreover, even those who suffered these deaths would have on average an additional 20 years of productive, symptom-free life before they died. Compared with other health hazards and with the political hazard of domination by a genocidal Soviet tyranny, the cancer risk from nuclear war is obviously quite small.

REQUIREMENTS FOR ASSURED DESTRUCTION

A bone-chilling preview of the past twenty years is provided by reading *Assessment of Nuclear Weapon Requirements for Assured Destruction* by Carl F. Miller, Office of Civil Defense Work Unit 3119D, URS 757-6, dated February 1970. In this report, a careful evaluation is carried out to determine the nuclear requirements to accomplish the murder of the entire population of the United States.

The author concludes that, with *only* a fallout shelter system in place, at least half of the American people could *not* be killed by the largest nuclear arsenal which could be built by the Soviet Union with over 100 years of effort. Only one possible set of events could assure the annihilation of the American people according to this study:

First, the Soviets would need to spend about \$300 billion over a 10 to 20 year period for a nuclear arsenal with large numbers of moderate sized, independently-targetable nuclear weapons.

Second, the United States would need to deploy *no* civil defense system at all for protection from fallout or blast during that same 10 to 20 year period and would need to dismantle its fallout shelter and stockpile program which was still in existence in 1970 when the report was written.

During the 17 years since this report was written the Soviets and the American Congress have done exactly these two things. Since 1970 those two governments have followed the one and only course which would assure that the American people could be completely destroyed.

SHELTER DESIGN PLANS

It is essential that **Fighting Chance** provide complete information about shelter construction. We emphasize the need to provide personal and neighborhood shelters *now*. On the other hand we have promised to have our shelter design book out within a few months. When do you really need to build the shelters - now or next year? We need the shelters *now*.

We have filled in somewhat with personal help by telephone, shelter descriptions in this newsletter, and literature references. As an additional help, we now have shop engineering drawings available.

These are large shop engineering drawings. They are not pretty advertising fliers. If you hand them to a local steel fabricator, the fabricator can build a complete shelter from them. Several entryway configurations are shown.

WARNING! If you use these drawings to build a shelter, build it *exactly* as specified. If you feel an irresistible urge to play with the design, telephone us. We can advise you regarding custom designs.

These steel shelters provide very low cost protection. They are not, however, just tin cans in the ground. Many aspects of their shape and fabrication are essential to their function. These aspects are not immediately obvious without extended explanations. These explanations will be available later in the book. The explanations are available to you now by telephone. Our telephone number is (503) 592-4142.

SHELTER ENGINEERING DRAWING SET - \$20.00

Fighting Chance

P.O. Box 1279

Cave Junction, Oregon 97523

Available only until the shelter design book is published.