

FIGHTING CHANCE

John 8: 31-32

Proverbs 22: 3

Newsletter Vol. I, No. 9

October 1987

FOOLS MATE

We often read references to world military or political strategy in terms of the game of chess. The earth is likened to a chess board, and we are reminded that the Soviets are master chess players. Are our players as good as theirs? Might we lose the game?

We *are* losing the game, but not as the result of master competition. My nine-year-old child can play chess well enough to obliterate the present strategy of the United States.

The goal in chess is to destroy the opponent's king, the equivalent of his homeland. Most of the game is, however, played elsewhere on the playing board. The pieces are joined in battle through dozens of relations and interrelations.

Gradually the side with the most clever, far-sighted, and careful strategy in this board-wide (world-wide) battle gains the advantage by taking the other side's pieces, while losing fewer of its own.

There are many opportunities to institute new tactics and to correct errors, but eventually one side prevails. The defending remnant falls back to protect its king, but is ultimately overwhelmed.

It is possible to lose a chess game very foolishly and very quickly, however, by not providing protection for one's king while the board-wide game is taking place. Two mechanisms are available - "fools mate" and "continual check".

In fools mate, the other player simply slips in and destroys the fool's unprotected king regardless of the state of affairs elsewhere on the board. This is the quickest and most embarrassing end to a chess game.

In continual check, the king is partially but inadequately protected. By continually threatening the king (by continually placing him "in check") the other side gains control of play elsewhere on the board. The weak player is so busy moving his king out of check that he cannot respond properly elsewhere. He therefore gradually loses the overall game and ultimately loses his king.

My nine-year-old would never permit a fools mate and can only be placed in continual check late during a losing game when he no longer has adequate pieces to protect his king. He could beat the current United States policy makers every time.

American "defense" forces have been scattered all over the earth in endless complicating circumstances, but essentially nothing has been allocated to homeland strategic and civil defense. Our king is entirely unprotected. We are, therefore, completely vulnerable to the fool's mate of a nuclear first-strike.

This American vulnerability is the single most dangerous situation which threatens the world today. In fact, if a world-wide nuclear war occurs, it is almost certain to be caused by the refusal by Americans to defend their homeland. They have invited a "fools mate", a temptation that the Soviets will find more and more difficult to resist.

The "optimists", however, hope that America will be destroyed by "continual check" instead. There is some reason for their hope, since America is obviously losing on the world-wide chess board today by the mechanism of continual check.

Each time decisive or even rational action by America is required in its deadly contest with the Soviets, that action is forestalled by fear of attack on the unprotected American homeland. We have "no-win" wars, because America is afraid to win. We sell technology to our enemies, because we are afraid they might otherwise attack us.

We initiate moral crusades against friendly countries, but refrain from effective action regarding the infinitely more immoral activities of our enemies, because, in our completely undefended state, we are afraid to criticize anyone who could attack us.

By this method of continual check, we are gradually losing our friends, our resources, and our will to resist. Eventually we may lose our homeland - the optimists hope - without a nuclear fight.

Loss on the world chess board in a well-fought competition would at least preserve our honor and integrity. Moreover, the enormous advantages of God-respecting individual freedom over the malignant despotism of the Soviets are so great that we would never lose, at least not to the Soviets.

Failure to protect our homeland by strategic defense and civil defense invites the fools mate of a Soviet first-strike. This failure is also the root cause of the "continual check" which is defeating us today.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND STRATEGIC DEFENSE

There are some people who oppose or neglect civil defense, because they say it will compete with strategic defense for resources. This has been mentioned several times during our work in the Senate offices, and it arises occasionally in the defense community outside of the government.

In the first place, there are numerous technical studies which show that strategic defense and civil defense are synergistic. If a given amount of resources are used to actually deploy homeland defenses, the maximum protection per dollar is achieved when the resources are split approximately equally between the two. This has been indisputably proven by research studies.

We live, however, in a political and human world - not in a completely objective scientific one. The human factor cannot be rigorously included in a research study.

What, for example, is the perceived deterrent value of these defenses in the minds of America's enemies?

The Soviets devote enormous resources to both civil and strategic defense. The Chinese depend almost entirely upon civil defense alone. They deter attack by assuring the survival of their people. Imagine the problems of a Soviet general who has succeeded in knocking down most of the buildings in China but who has left most of the one billion Chinese alive in their tunnels.

The Chinese would tunnel all the way to Moscow. The threat of Chinese survival itself deters war. Civil defense is so technologically simple, that there is no doubt as to its capabilities; no hope of defeating it by some new technical trick.

On the other hand, American technical capabilities are so respected that a strategic defense system would probably command more respect than it actually deserved. Moreover, strategic defense alone protects lives *and* buildings at the same time; not just lives as does civil defense.

These arguments assume, however, that something will be built. Today we have essentially no funds for the deployment of either. Is it easier to get strategic defense funds or civil defense funds?

The answer is that it is easier to get both! Each group that works honestly for the deployment of civil defense also raises the probability of funding for strategic defense deployment. Each group that works honestly for the deployment of strategic defense raises the probability of civil defense deployment. This is true so long as these groups appreciate the value of each other's efforts.

Fighting Chance works for civil defense. That is our job. That alone is difficult to accomplish. We leave no doubt, however, that we *strongly favor* strategic defense deployment. We help with this effort whenever we can.

The only point of real conflict between these two compatible aspects of homeland defense comes with regard to individual personal self-interests. This is the greed factor.

An aerospace company might see more profits if all homeland defense is strategic. A political fund raising organization may seek to belittle civil defense in favor of its strategic defense fund raising efforts or vice versa.

These flaws of human nature will always be with us. We can easily rise above them when we realize the political and scientific synergism between civil defense and strategic defense, and when we realize that both elements are essential for adequate homeland defense.

In working for the deployment of one, we enhance the chances of deployment of the other. If the end result of our efforts is the deployment of either one separately, America will be safer. If we succeed in deploying both, America and the entire world will be a much safer place to live.

SWISS CIVIL DEFENSE

Recently Mr. Eberhard Gerth, engineering representative of the LUWA company, spoke to our combined southern Oregon civil defense groups. His presentation which includes 140 slides and a video tape is very informative.

If your group is building shelters, we recommend that you call Mr. Gerth. His office is LUWA Ltd., Suite 230, 4400 East West Highway, Bethesda, Maryland 20814. Telephone (301) 652-0884. LUWA has been manufacturing civil defense equipment for 40 years.

In keeping with the Swiss policy of neutrality combined with very strong homeland defenses (a policy that has kept them entirely out of war) the LUWA company and Mr. Gerth do not engage in political activities in America. They do, however, supply technical information and shelter equipment.

The Swiss system of homeland defense is remarkable.

Since 1962 every new building in Switzerland has been required by law to have a shelter under it for all of its occupants. Also, many of the pre-1962 buildings have been equipped with shelters.

By law, these shelters must protect against nuclear blast and radiation, conventional bombs, chemical warfare agents, and biological warfare agents. The chemical warfare filters must be suitable for 2,000 hours of continuous operation. All equipment must be shock resistant and must conform to strict public standards - standards which are identical throughout the country regardless of location.

Shelter equipment manufacture is carefully monitored with units pulled frequently and randomly from the assembly lines for testing. These tests in shock tubes and related devices test each item to and beyond the point of failure. Doors, blast valves, over-pressure valves, and all other items test generally to failure at 50% higher stresses than their design requirements.

The Swiss equipment designs are so good that the Soviets were able to adopt most of them as the standard for their own civil defense system even though Soviet protection standards are considerably higher than the Swiss.

Eberhard Gerth was in Dresden during the firestorm raids of World War II. LUWA sent him to America to evaluate the market and to find out the American standards for civil defense equipment. He is, as he says, still looking for the standards. There are none.

The market? The American military have told him that they build some personnel shelters in other countries, but none in America itself. The civilian market consists primarily of **Fighting Chance** supporters who are building shelters for themselves and their communities.

Each Swiss man must enter the armed forces at the age of 18. After initial training, he goes home. He takes his weapon, ammunition, uniform, and other equipment home with him. He stores these arms at home. Each year he takes his equipment with him for additional training at government facilities.

At the age of 50 years, each man turns in his weapon and equipment and is then inducted into the civil defense forces where he serves for an additional 10 years.

By law, of course, all Swiss homes and buildings are equipped for civil defense. Low interest loans at about one-half market rate are provided for these facilities. They are estimated to add about 5% to the construction cost of new buildings. All Swiss hospitals must provide duplicate operating rooms and patient care facilities in shelters underneath the hospitals.

Public blast shelters are provided at public buildings such as airport terminals. In one remarkable case, a dual highway tunnel under a mountain has been made convertible into a shelter. Hospital facilities and administration headquarters are inside the mountain along with partitions, beds, and all other items needed to equip the shelter. Blast doors are installed at the tunnel entrances.

This shelter is designed for 20,000 people - 10,000 in each tunnel. Each year (the second week in October this year) one of the tunnels is closed to traffic with both directions diverted to the other side. Then 10,000 people actually enter the tunnel, close the blast doors, assemble the entire shelter, and occupy it. *The Swiss are serious about civil defense.*

Imagine an America in which every man between 18 and 50 is a regular, armed member of the national defense forces; in which every man between 50 and 60 is a member of the civil defense forces; in which every home and place of business is equipped with the most modern defenses against nuclear attack, conventional bombs, chemical attack, and biological attack; and in which the government refuses to involve itself in foreign wars.

Now look at the real America in which PSR (Physicians for "Social Responsibility") politicians pander to our enemies and denounce emergency medical care facilities as war-like; in which \$300 billion is spent each year on military items but virtually none is spent for homeland defense; in which the government has involved itself in foreign wars at every opportunity and has initiated mass slaughter of civilians in those wars; and which is the proclaimed target of the best armed, most malignant tyranny in history.

Which America is most likely to survive?

SOVIET CIVIL DEFENSE

Reliable and complete information about the Soviet civil defense system is not easily available. As a closed society with a policy of secrecy in military affairs, the Soviets themselves are a poor source. The best American intelligence information about Soviet civil defense is classified and therefore secret from most Americans.

Some unclassified facts about the Soviet system were recently related to us by an American expert. (He knows the secret information, too, but he cannot reveal it.)

Soviet civil defense food storage is organized in ward or county sized units of 100,000 to 200,000 people called "Oblasts". By regulation, most food (including meat and fresh produce) must remain in frozen storage for six months before it is sold to the people. This contributes to the poor quality of Soviet "fresh foods", but it also provides a six-month supply of food within easy access of every Soviet citizen.

In addition to this six-month supply of their usual diet, the Soviets have large reserves of staple grains and beans in their farm system. Even if this is stored primarily in farming regions, the Soviets have six months of food in the Oblasts to consume while they re-establish distribution for the staples.

By contrast, most American counties have less than a 30 day supply of food. Some have less than a 15 day supply. A four-year supply of staple foods is available in storage in the American farming system (primarily as grains used as animal feed, but which are suitable for human consumption), but most of this food would not be available to Americans under post-attack transportation conditions.

The Soviet blast shelter system is modeled after the Swiss. They use copies of Swiss blast doors, blast valves, and chemical and biological air protection filters. The Soviet standard for blast shelter strength is, however, higher than the Swiss. (The Swiss valves and doors are so over-designed that they meet the higher Soviet requirements.)

Shelters for the general Soviet population are actually 60-psi or greater. (This resists most air-burst nuclear weapons even directly overhead.) People designated as essential to the function of the Soviet economy and war machine (such as factory workers and administrators who are "key workers") have 200 to 600-psi shelters. These are massive concrete structures buried 25 feet or more underground.

The "nomenklatura" or elite communists who run the Soviet Union have shelters that are 1000-psi or stronger. These are very deep, strong structures to protect the tyrants who have enslaved the Soviet peoples.

Soviet shelters are required by law to have double blast doors, independent water supplies, independent sewer systems, and independent air systems. Five square feet of floor space per person is required. This is double the wartime German requirement during World War II, and half of the current Swiss requirement.

There are 32 standard shelter variations, and all large (apparently five stories or more) buildings constructed during the last 25 years have been required to include these shelters. Sometimes the shelters have been built to accommodate the occupants of nearby older buildings as well.

Often the shelters serve as supports for large buildings. Several feet of earth is placed over the shelter, and the foundation of the above-ground building rests on the shelter.

Since a strict structural inspection of the shelter is required during construction, builders often take reinforcing steel allocated for the primary building and incorporate it into the shelter. This weakens the above-ground structure. This practice has led to shelters with as much as 15% reinforcing steel - the equivalent of over an inch of solid steel in eight-inch-thick concrete walls.

Cost of the shelter is levied against the occupying agency, rather than the construction agency which removes any incentive to skimp on construction quality.

Most Soviet shelters serve a dual, peacetime use. Typical dual uses are as recreation centers, laundry rooms, and light industry. The civil defense authority runs, however, periodic drills in their wartime use.

Civil defense is controlled by a separate branch of the Soviet armed forces. This civil defense force is estimated to include about 150,000 full time professionals and several million trained civilians.

How much of this system is complete? An unclassified American CIA report found shelters for 15 to 21% of the Soviet population in 1979-1980. However, this report also found that the number of shelters was a *linear function of the time spent looking for them* at the time the study was terminated. Since they were still in this linear region of the discovery curve, the system was probably at least 40% complete at that time.

Analogy with the Swiss system which the Soviets were copying suggests that the Soviet system is essentially complete today. An independent estimate by one American expert based on the earlier studies and the apparent momentum of the Soviet program is that their system is 75% complete today.

There are reports that some Soviet shelters do not meet their complete specifications in habitability items such as independent water or sewage systems. In physical protection, however, they do meet specifications.

FOOD RESERVES

American farmers produce about 25 billion bushels of staple grains and soybeans each year. On average, about 10 billion bushels are held in storage from year to year.

Those 10 billion bushels are sufficient to feed the entire American population for four years. About three months of that supply is actually owned by the government, while much of the other 45 months supply is under partial government control through various agricultural programs.

This assumes, of course, that the people eat grain and beans rather than meat and other products produced from grain and beans. Some Americans, especially certain "health food" groups eat this way now. In a crisis, we could all adopt new habits.

This four-year supply is about 50% corn, 20% wheat, 10% soybeans, and 20% other grains.

Therefore, the diversion of just ten percent (or about one month) of American food production into long term storage near our population centers would provide one year of food for each American in case of war. Alternatively, storage near our population centers of just 25% of the grain normally in storage elsewhere would accomplish the same purpose.

We already own one-fourth of the required grain, and our farmers would be very pleased to sell us the rest. Just a change in regulations which would revise the storage location of 25% of the current supply would do the job without purchase of any grain at all.

During the first year after an attack we would, therefore, not starve. During that year, we could restore at least the rudimentary transportation system needed to reach and utilize the other three years supply in storage elsewhere.

Moreover, during the four years that we are fed with existing supplies, we would need to restore *only ten percent* of our current farm production to assure an adequate continuing supply.

Clearly, America need not perish by starvation if she has that first increment of food stored within walking distance of her people. Today it is stored elsewhere. Today most Americans are *not* within reach of even a month's supply of food. They would starve to death before transportation and production could be restored.

WHEAT

If you can store nothing else, store enough wheat for your family, neighbors, and immediate community. The current delivered price of field-run wheat here in Southern Oregon is \$100 per ton. That is about \$30 for an amount which would sustain the life of one person for one year. In the farm belt it is cheaper. Cleaned and in nice containers, it is more expensive.

If the wheat is stored in dry, full, airtight containers it will last your lifetime and more. Purgung the containers with carbon dioxide or its equivalent will ensure even longer viable storage.

Store a hand-crank meat grinder or a hand-crank vegetable juicer with the wheat.

Yes, you read it correctly. A hand flour mill would be useful, too, but the juicer is more important.

Wheat is an ideal emergency food. One of its important properties is that it remains viable and can be sprouted after a long period in storage.

The nutritional value of *sprouted* wheat is so exceptionally high that it can serve as a sole source of nutrition for an extended period of time.

For example, if wheat is sprouted for one to two days (until the root is approximately as long as the seed) it goes through a stage in which the sprouted seed is sweet to the taste. If the sprouted seeds are passed through a meat grinder or juicer, a thick paste results which can be molded into thin loaves of bread.

The loaves can be "browned" slightly by standing in direct sunlight or near a slightly warm heat source. They should not be cooked. This bread (made from wheat and water alone) is sometimes called Essene bread, since this recipe is given in Essene texts written in Aramaic almost two thousand years ago.

This bread is so tasty that one "bakery" in Palo Alto, California thrived for years in a high rent location with Essene bread as its sole product.

This same process with extra water added during the juicing leads to a very palatable breakfast cereal with far more nutritional value than anything you can buy in a box.

Moreover, your juicer can make food out of many other unlikely items. A very nutritious food is simply the juice of grass and non-toxic weeds. Humans cannot digest cellulose, and therefore cannot graze as do animals. Approximately 80% of the high nutritional content of green plants is, however, water soluble. Once separated from the cellulose fibers by means of a juicer, the water soluble substances make excellent human food.

In principle, you could accomplish the same thing by chewing the grass and not swallowing the fiber. I have not tried this and am not anxious to do so.

The important point of all this is that when grain (or grass seed) is brought to life by sprouting and growth, it produces a vast array of vitamins and other nutrients which improve its value as a survival food. When the sprouts are very young, as with the Essene bread, the nutritional value of the living plants is available in an optimum combination for human use.

You can, of course, just chew up the sprouts without processing them at all. Faced with starvation, this would probably not seem too bad. Unless you have available a wide range of other good foods and supplements, you should not cook or grind your wheat. As a sole source of nutrition, sprouted wheat is better than flour.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The very small American government civil defense program is presently a part of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA. This agency is directed by General Julius Becton, a very able and accomplished retired military officer. His civil defense staff is quite capable and knowledgeable about civil defense.

FEMA operates under a Presidential directive to emphasize self-help civil defense. In other words, the American people are "on their own" with perhaps a few pamphlets on nuclear weapons effects published and distributed by FEMA.

FEMA is also directed by Congress to emphasize self-help, in that their budget is too small to do anything else. The entire FEMA budget is about 50 cents per American per year. That 50 cents must also protect us from floods, earthquakes, and all other such disasters.

Therefore, FEMA employs about 5,000 part-time and full-time employees scattered throughout the nation's communities who are supposed to distribute self-help information and serve as emergency planners. Compare this with the Soviet system described above.

Recently General Becton enforced a requirement that these 5,000 people include nuclear attack preparedness and participation in FEMA attack related exercises in their activities (as distinct from earthquakes and floods). "Peace" groups have screeched so raucously that legislation has been introduced which, if passed, would remove this requirement.

The root problem here is the whole concept of FEMA. Earthquake response may be "managed"; flood response may be "managed"; but the idea of "managing" a nuclear war is ridiculous.

The doomsday crowd is definitely wrong in claiming that nuclear war is unthinkable, because it will terminate humanity. But anyone who thinks in terms of a "managed" response to a nuclear attack under the direction of a group of administrative paper-shufflers is equally wrong.

General Becton should command an entire branch of our armed forces with the sole purpose of providing protection from nuclear weapons effects for every American citizen - civilian or military.

Moreover, that force should spend nearly all of their resources on pre-attack preparedness. In other words, save American lives; feed Americans for a year after the attack; and rely on American good sense and initiative to do the rest. No part of the preparations whatever should be left for implementation after a crisis develops.

For this General Becton needs not a few cents per American, but a one-time expenditure of about \$300 per American plus \$10 per American per year. He needs not a paper shuffling "agency", but a professional military force. He needs not a self-help program, but a program which fulfills the Constitutional requirement to provide for the common defense.

Concerted, effective, grass-roots political efforts by thousands of dedicated Americans is the only way to get General Becton the tools he needs to do this job.

ECONOMIC FEAR

In our September newsletter we mentioned that markets tend to fall more rapidly than they rise, because fear is a stronger emotion than greed. The American stock market has now provided a most remarkable example of this principle.

Imagine the fear which gripped the S & P 500 stock index trading pit when this index had fallen over \$40,000 per contract (five times the margin requirement) in less than six hours.

This economic weakness (or rather this crash as a result of America's economic errors) could not come at a worse time.

Economic crises are nothing new. We seem determined to repeat old errors every generation or two. People lose money, economic hardship results, and eventually (in spite of government meddling) the American economy heals itself and continues to produce.

This particular crisis is occurring, however, at a time when America faces a terrible threat from the greatest military power the world has ever known. Weakness now - military or economic or both - may prove fatal.

If this crash continues, many families will have fewer resources to use for self-help civil defense. Politicians will be less able to appropriate resources for national homeland defense. Organizations like **Fighting Chance** will have even more limited resources with which to work for homeland defense. The Soviets will be further emboldened by our economic weakness added to military weaknesses and a weakened will to resist.

Regardless of future events, this crash has made our job more difficult. We have, however, no choice other than to redouble our efforts and accomplish our goal of American security.

ON THE AGENDA

World War II put civil defense on the political agenda of that generation of Americans. The invention of nuclear weapons and their use in war placed civil defense high on the agenda of the 1950's. The emerging Soviet threat caused President Kennedy to put civil defense at the top of his political agenda early in his administration.

President Kennedy's successors were, however, very unwise in their policies toward American homeland defenses. Gradually, civil defense slipped off the agenda of most American political leaders.

Public opinion polls throughout the past 25 years have shown that homeland defense, especially civil defense, has remained a high priority for most Americans. Most of them think of their \$300 billion annual expenditure as a "defense" expenditure. They think that somehow they are being defended by all that money.

When the specific issue of civil defense is asked about today, over 80% of Americans are in favor of it. Many are shocked when they confront the fact that America lacks this type of protection.

As with all political issues, most people are passive. They expect the politicians to present them with an opportunity to vote on the relevant issues and then to carry out the mandate of the voters. This, of course, does not always happen.

Sometimes the politicians do as they please, regardless of the vote. At other times, the politicians just fail to bring an important issue before their constituents. The latter has been the situation for civil defense (with only a few exceptions) during the past 25 years.

Civil defense must become an important part of the political agenda of a significant American political group. That group need not be the majority party. If a minority block puts the issue forward in a forceful way, it will be adopted by the majority group. This will happen, because an overwhelming fraction of the American voters are passively *pro*-civil defense.

"Passive" is a key word here. I do not claim that a significant fraction of Americans are going to build shelters in their back yards or engage in prudent food storage. However, the opinion polls are clear. Put civil defense before the voters with a *clear, truthful* delineation of the facts, and they will vote for it.

For this to occur, however, we must put civil defense back on the political agenda. It must, once again, be a part of the political debate.

Fighting Chance has partially accomplished this goal. There is no doubt that, if we continue to receive help from our highly motivated supporters, **Fighting Chance** will put civil defense back on the American political agenda.

How much progress have we made so far?

The following is a partial list of prominent individuals and organizations who have endorsed and/or distributed *Fighting Chance*:

- Phyllis Schafly of the Eagle Forum
- Howard Phillips of the Conservative Caucus
- The Conservative Book Club
- The American Conservative Union
- Gary North of *Remnant Review*
- Tom Anderson of *Straight Talk*
- Don McAlvany of the *McAlvany Intelligence Advisor*
- Petr Beckmann of *Access to Energy*
- Daniel Graham of *High Frontier*

- R. E. McMaster, Jr. of *The Reaper*
- W. A. Johnson of *Daily News Digest*
- *The Gary Allen Report*
- Hal Bryan of *The Hard Money Investor*

Clearly the civil defense message of **Fighting Chance** is becoming a part of the "conservative" agenda. More copies of *Fighting Chance* have been purchased than of any other book about civil defense that has ever been published in the United States.

In addition to this rise to significance on the "conservative" agenda, **Fighting Chance** is putting civil defense on the agenda of an important segment of Christian America. We present this message often to Christian groups, and the response is very favorable.

Does all this mean that civil defense is a "conservative Christian" cause? No. Civil defense is an imperative for *every* thinking American who wishes to continue to live in freedom.

However, the rapid adoption of the **Fighting Chance** message by prominent "conservative" and "Christian" groups puts that message on the American political agenda.

Our job is to keep the message there and to strengthen it. Some political candidates are already giving indications that they may include civil defense in the 1988 campaigns.

When politicians start running on this issue, they will win with it. With enough work, we can assure that they will do it.

As Senator Everett Dirksen said: "When we feel the heat, we see the light!"

With 510,000 books in print and growing support from dedicated American individuals and organizations, **Fighting Chance** is beginning to turn up the heat.

■ The Sense of the Senate Resolution on civil defense ■
 ■ has been introduced by Senators Symms(ID), Helms(NC), ■
 ■ and Wilson(CA) with co-sponsorship by Senators ■
 ■ Armstrong(CO), Cochran(MS), Gramm(TX), Hecht(NV), ■
 ■ Humphrey(NH), Quayle(IN), and Wallop(WY). It will be ■
 ■ brought to a vote as soon as possible. ■