

VITAMIN C

In the suggested food storage program which was discussed in the March 1988 Newsletter (Volume 1, Issue 12), we did not include vitamins. Our recommendation for a \$10 addition to provide for children will include one.

In fact, the vitamin requirements of an adult for one year can be met by the grain and beans already in the ration — providing that small portions of these items are *sprouted* before use. Sprouting provides adequate amounts of vitamin C and other essential nutrients.

The only essential nutrient not provided by our recommended ration is vitamin B-12. The normal vitamin B-12 reserves of a healthy adult are sufficient for the one or two year period during which these emergency food reserves would be utilized.

Cresson Kearny has pointed out that scurvy has been a serious problem for grain-consuming people in past military conflicts, although most of these predate modern knowledge of the requirement for vitamin C in the prevention of scurvy.

Sprouting is, however, an inconvenience which would require discipline and time under crisis conditions. Vitamin C in pure crystalline form — not in tablets — can be stored indefinitely without deterioration. It is very inexpensive and could save many lives in a post nuclear attack environment.

First, those people who do not have time, energy, knowledge, or inclination to properly sprout a portion of their stored grain would require a vitamin C supplement. Without that supplement, they would simply die a slow, painful death from scurvy.

Second, there are several unorthodox uses of vitamin C which could serve to augment expedient medical techniques. These uses are of questionable and sometimes even negative

value under normal conditions, but they could be of substantial importance in the absence of professional medical help under conditions of high stress and marginal diet.

One kilogram of vitamin C purchased by mail order from, for example, Bronson Pharmaceutical (4526 Rinetti Lane, La Canada, California 91011, (818) 790-2646) costs \$18.75 postage paid. That one kilogram will prevent death from overt scurvy for about 150 people for a period of one year which is 12.5¢ per person. Order the "ascorbic acid" form.

Twice as much, 25¢ per person, would be better in a crisis. A mere 100 kilograms or 220 pounds of vitamin C would provide a minimal post attack supply for 15,000 people if properly rationed.

Most of the vitamin C consumed in the United States is produced in *one* biochemical production facility. Most of the world wide supply comes from only a few such installations. Vitamin C would almost surely be unavailable during a serious crisis.

Also, we must consider those Americans who have become mildly addicted to the very large doses of vitamin C which have become fashionable in some health food circles.

If you are currently taking 500 mg (one-half gram) or more of vitamin C per day and especially if you are taking 5 grams or more per day, you could be in serious trouble if this dosage were suddenly cut off during a period of high stress.

Your body adapts to these large doses by mobilizing biochemical mechanisms which use vitamin C for other purposes including just burning it for energy. If the supply is cut off, it takes several weeks for the body to turn off these mechanisms.

During that period of adaptation, the body uses the vitamin C at an abnormally high rate and is much more susceptible to scurvy.

For example, if guinea pigs (which like humans require vitamin C from their food for life) are fed a large vitamin C supplement and the supplement is abruptly terminated, then the guinea pigs die of scurvy much sooner than do those which are not initially supplemented. The extraneous uses of vitamin C in the metabolisms of the supplemented guinea pigs deplete their supplies at an abnormally high rate.

Therefore, if you are habitually using vitamin C supplements, you must be sure to keep on hand at least a two to three months supply which you could use to gradually reduce your dose if a source of renewal for the supply became unavailable. Your need for the adaptation supply would be much greater in a time of high stress.

Although vitamin C is an especially important example of this principle, it is well to keep it mind regarding all medications and supplements which you habitually use.

In case these supplements become unavailable, you should have a supply on hand. If you must have the supplement for serious medical reasons, try to keep at least a two year's supply on hand and rotate your usage to keep the supply fresh.

If you do not require the supplement for a serious medical reason, keep at least a two or three months supply on hand. Then, if your source of supply is cut off, gradually reduce your dosage while you use up the remaining supply.

The health consequences of abruptly terminating nutritional and medicinal supplements during normal times are often so mild as to go unnoticed. Under the severe stress of a crisis, however, these consequences would be life-threatening for many people.

GROUND BURSTS OR AIR BURSTS

War games and attack scenarios are very popular with civil defense "planners." These are all done with paper shuffling and computers, require additional planning staffs and contracts, and generally avoid the effort of actually delivering civilian defense hardware to the American people.

In our view, these exercises are useful when they are used to evaluate the worst damage our enemies are capable of inflicting, so that we can prepare and protect ourselves. This is particularly true of radioactive fallout estimates, since tens of millions of American lives could be saved from fallout with even the small amounts of money currently allocated to civilian defense.

Unfortunately, most of these exercises describe what the bureaucrats *hope* the Soviets will do, rather than what they are able to do. These hopes fit in well with decisions to spend our meager civil defense funds on paper shuffling rather than hardware.

We are told in the latest FEMA evaluations, for example, that the Soviets will use minimum force and will not kill civilians intentionally.

The Soviets recently intentionally killed over one million innocent Afghan civilians, and more than 95 million innocent civilians have been killed behind the Iron Curtain in "peacetime". Nevertheless, the peace-loving Soviets, who have built a giant first-strike

nuclear arsenal, are going to risk losing World War III by leaving as many Americans alive as possible. Does this seem reasonable?

With these benevolent assumptions in mind, FEMA has produced its latest fallout map which shows about half of the United States and over 120 million Americans in areas of "Low Fallout Risk" (by "low" they mean less than 3000 Rad cumulative short term dose).

About half of these people would be killed by a dose of only 300 Rad, and not one person among them could survive a 3000 Rad exposure without a properly built fallout shelter. This is "low risk?"

There is a bizarre irony in the gradual convergence of our civil defense authorities and the doomsday merchants who advocate unilateral disarmament. The latter group claims that no defense is possible, so none need be built, while the former group (having spent most of our meager civil defense funds on paper shuffling) argues that the threat is "manageable" by desk-bound planners if we just hire a few more of them. They also want shelters for these planners, so they can be available to manage the war. Both groups are talking nonsense.

In any case, if you are wavering on the comfortable edge of protecting yourself against "only" 3000 Rads, consider this:

For many years it has been accepted that the Soviets would use ground bursts only on targets which require destruction in the ground. The book *Fighting Chance* (and even one of our recent video tapes) makes this statement which has been virtually universal opinion among nuclear defense scientists.

Air burst explosions spread destruction over a much larger area, when only "soft" targets must be destroyed. They are much more efficient. They also produce much less fallout than ground burst explosions. The assumption that most of America will be attacked by air burst nuclear weapons makes the calculated fallout risk much lower.

The Soviet nuclear inventory is now so large, however, that efficiency is no longer as important as it once was. Moreover (and this is the frightening part), *the smaller nuclear weapons in use today will spread less fallout on the Soviet Union if they are exploded as ground bursts on America rather than as air bursts over America.*

The larger weapons deployed in the 1950's and 1960's would inject fallout into the upper atmosphere for transport around the globe both if they were ground burst or air burst. The smaller weapons deployed today produce significant high atmosphere fallout only if they are air burst.

The Soviets could avoid most fallout from explosions in the United States by ground bursting all of their weapons (even though this would greatly increase fallout in the United States).

With major fallout coming into the Soviet Union from the European battlefield, this may have been a marginal consideration. But now that the INF Treaty is eliminating that battlefield, the advantage is greater.

By ground bursting all of their weapons in the United States and not fighting a nuclear war in Europe, the Soviets could get their own fallout levels down to truly "Low Risk" levels.

Quite obviously this is just more "war games scenarios" (but at least it didn't cost hundreds of thousands of your tax dollars).

The important point is that severe fallout radiation could be *anywhere* and even virtually everywhere in the United States for a few days following a nuclear attack. During those few days all of our lives may depend on good fallout protection, so we had better provide some.

Those of you who took our offer to reduce your subscription price by \$20 if you store a years supply of food for 20 people can even build a worthwhile fallout shelter out of that food and the water storage which should go with it. Try for the square plastic buckets — they stack better.

BUREAUCRATS

Bashing bureaucrats is easy. (They work so hard at making themselves good targets.) It is also easy to stand outside a situation without responsibility for action and to complain about those who must get the job done.

We have had extensive experience with the Federal health research bureaucracy which, like the civil defense bureaucracy, wastes a very large part of its resources.

Nevertheless, within that health research bureaucracy there are a few individuals who make the system produce the little that it does. These dedicated civil servants (sometimes independently wealthy individuals who stay at their jobs solely for altruistic reasons) save many lives through their impact on our health care system.

We are just getting to know some of the FEMA bureaucracy. Indications are that, there too, there exists a small group of dedicated professionals who would like to provide a civil defense system which works. They are trapped. If they quit, they can't get the job done. If they stay, they get bashed right along with their incompetent colleagues — bashed by people with whom they inherently agree.

We must keep complaining regardless. By these complaints we make it easier for the good bureaucrats to get the system to do its job. In fact, when the good ones only want to get mail from us in plain brown wrappers, that will be an indication that we are really doing our job.

With that said, and with our sincere and proper respect for those Federal employees who are really trying to obtain a civil defense for America (some of whom have been trying for their entire careers) let's look at a comparison for this past year.

ITEM	FEMA CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM	FIGHTING CHANCE
Federal Funding	\$130 Million	None
Employees	5000	None
Expedient Shelter Demonstrations Built	None	Five
Permanent Demonstration Shelters Built	None	Four
Civil defense Books Published and Distributed	One	Two
Local Civil Defense Groups Started	None	Five
Audio & Video Tapes Produced and Distributed	None	Three
Shelter Construction Consultations for Private Citizens — Personal Help	No Program	About 200
New Grassroots National Civil Defense Initiatives	They are studying how to do it	Two
Individual Americans Sent Civil Defense Materials	Less than 100,000	Over 300,000

Fighting Chance distributed about 80 tons of civil defense literature to individual Americans. Incredible as it may seem, we estimate that this even exceeded FEMA's paper output — excluding their internal consumption.

The American Civil Defense Association, the Doctors for Disaster Preparedness, some individual authors, a few vendors of survival supplies, and the *Fighting Chance* project supplied virtually all of the practical civil defense information offered to the American people during this past year. Yet their entire combined resources were far less than 1% of FEMA's.

As our combined efforts start to increase the FEMA budget (it is increasing this year for the first time), we should insist that those new funds be spent on actual hardware to protect or educate Americans.

If we get a major appropriation for food reserves or civilian or military shelters, most of the funds should be designated for hardware. This and a short time required for deployment would assure that most of the money actually buys nuclear protection, regardless of the bureaucrats.

Recently, your editor participated in a FEMA meeting in which they were asking for advice about how to motivate Americans to provide personally for their own civil defense. One suggestion I made was that they establish a rule that the only FEMA personnel who could be assigned to try to so motivate Americans must be people who had already personally provided for themselves and their families.

(This was not a very popular suggestion. It was made at the multimillion dollar FEMA training center in Maryland where there are no shelters at all. They do have copies of Cresson Kearny's book, but as far as we were able to determine, no shovels are available either.)

Some of our other suggestions to FEMA are being given careful consideration.

Bureaucracies are always a problem. (Fortunately, the Soviets have them, too.) However, the mature, older bureaucracies are the worst. The FEMA civil defense bureaucracy is mature only at the \$130 million level. It has a few competent people. It has a few more dedicated employees in local communities.

If a realistic budget for immediate deployment of a sensible civil defense program were passed, there would be a good chance that the job could be properly done before the bureaucracy expanded to absorb the money. The key would be a carefully drafted law and short term leadership which is determined to do the job.

ONE AT A TIME

The Russian patriot, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn was once asked how the Soviets, a then small group, had managed to enslave the Russian people. How could such a small group put many times their number to death and into the Gulag concentration camps?

Solzhenitsyn replied,

“They came for us one at a time.”

The Russians failed to help each other, each one hoping that he would escape the purges. They hid in their homes hoping that their door would not receive that fatal knock.

A Soviet nuclear attack would kill millions of Americans at a time — not frightened individuals one by one. (A surrender would lead to that.)

We are, however, being subdued like the Russians — *one at a time*.

It is *one at a time* that each American decides to work for his country’s homeland defense or not; to turn his back on his heritage or not; to devalue human lives other than his own or not; to implement God’s laws or not.

As each of us individually decides to be a part of America’s problems or a part of her defense, we make the same decision as those Russians who decided whether to hide behind their doors or to help their neighbors.

The summation of all those individual decisions will decide whether or not America falls to the Soviets as did Russia.

As an incentive in these individual decisions, consider a statement by another prominent Russian as quoted in the December 1987 *Journal of Civil Defense*. This Russian is revered by the current Soviet leadership.

“It does not matter if three-fourths of mankind is destroyed; all that counts is that ultimately the last quarter should become Communists.”

V. I. Lenin