

# FIGHTING CHANCE

John 8: 31-32

Proverbs 22: 3

Newsletter Vol. II, No. 2

May 1988

*“Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness — these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them . . . . Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.”*

George Washington,  
Farewell Address  
September 17, 1796

## A REMNANT OR A REPUBLIC?

During the late 1960's your editor and his co-workers carried out research on the biochemistry of mental illnesses and on the possible response of those illnesses to nutritional therapies. We studied a wide variety of severities ranging from mild illnesses to the most severe mental retardation.

I remember one ward of severely retarded humans. None of these individuals had the mental abilities of a household pet. Some were kept in baskets, had grotesquely distorted

features, and appeared to be children when in fact they were of adult age. None could be toilet trained, and speech or other rational activity was entirely impossible for them.

Why were these “vegetables” kept alive? They would obviously die without continuous care. To the few parents who still occasionally visited them they were little more than a source of pain, and to themselves they were essentially useless.

Some will answer that they were kept alive out of compassion; or in a hope for some miracle cure; or by misguided laws; or by political expediency. Few, even Christians, would mention God’s laws — that isn’t fashionable today.

In fact, these “vegetables” were kept alive for a very sound reason. The emotional and financial price of their maintenance ( a small price, since only a few individuals are that debilitated) was a necessary expenditure to avoid our taking any step whatever which compromised the sanctity of human life.

The American Republic was built upon a rock of the absolute right of every human to life and the freedom to pursue peaceful values. Our Republic cannot survive a justice system which allows the killing of innocent Americans.

If the killing of innocent human beings for any “reason” once begins, there will be a gradual succession of “reasons” with no place to stop. The first step is fatal to the principles of our Republic and potentially fatal to us all. So that *first* step, even among the “vegetables”, must never be taken.

But, of course, in the 1970’s and 1980’s it was taken. That step, and the next, and the next. Today we are in the early stages of the debate concerning the killing of adults, but the killing of children for the “convenience” of their parents or the state or “society” is an accepted fact of life.

1,500,000 young Americans, *30% of our infant children*, are now being killed each year in the United States. These killings not only have approval by the government, but much of the killing is promoted and carried out directly or indirectly with tax dollars.

The explosion of a large nuclear weapon each year in the center of a major American city would cause about the same number of deaths (that is assuming no civil defense in the city).

Why, some of you are saying, am I reading this in the *Fighting Chance* civil defense newsletter? Surely this editor knows that the interjection of other, unsettling political issues might weaken his civil defense efforts. It may lower the renewal rate of this newsletter and thereby make his work more difficult.

You are reading this because *Fighting Chance* is an effort to preserve our Republic. We firmly believe that the American Republic can, in time, adequately resolve most of today's political issues — if through civil defense and strategic defense deployment we can preserve her ability to survive.

All of us, regardless of our political positions on other issues, have a stake in a good, deployed civil defense.

Child killing has, unfortunately, become a civil defense issue for several reasons.

First, if we Americans cannot offer at least some meritorious evidence to God that our Republic is worth saving, our country is likely to go the way of the many Old Testament examples of corrupt societies — with or without defenses. There just is not any possibility of standing before God in tacit approval (by inaction) of 1,500,000 infant killings each year with any hope of escaping His wrath — much less receiving His help.

Second, all of those “steps” (remember the “vegetables” and the children of the rape victims) have led to a disaster so large that it is actually a civil defense matter. A total of over 20,000,000 American infants have been killed already — *primarily by methods so brutal that they would not be permitted for dogs, cats, or even laboratory rats*. This is surely a disaster large enough to require a civil defense response.

Third, the “steps” are continuing and are spreading to our adult population with an ever-increasing list of “special” cases wherein human killing is permitted or encouraged.

The Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, and our entire American heritage demand an absolute right to life for each person. What is it that we are trying to protect, if not the sanctity of human life?

We are allowing child murder in our country on a scale that rivals Iron Curtain mass murders, and we are actually discussing its extension to our older adult population.

In a way the Soviets are even superior. They have at least built a civil defense and a strategic defense to protect those people whom they haven't killed.

Could it be that this whole process has gone so far that it is actually a sub-conscious degradation in our reverence for human life which prevents us from building homeland civilian defenses?

We make an occasional spectacle out of saving a child's life by heroic measures. With the killing of over 25,000 healthy children each week, however, we are showing that these

# PETITION IN SUPPORT OF AMERICAN CIVIL DEFENSE

WHEREAS in this age of nuclear energy, the people of the United States are endangered by nuclear war, nuclear terrorist attacks, and nuclear accidents;

WHEREAS in the event of nuclear war the people are in the additional danger of starvation during the time before food production and distribution can be restored;

WHEREAS blast and radiation shelters and food storage methods have been invented which can protect people from these nuclear dangers without evacuation;

WHEREAS these shelters when properly constructed also confer protection against chemical and biological hazards of war or accident;

WHEREAS these civil defense capabilities will strengthen the effectiveness of strategic defense systems which must be deployed now in their best present form and in advanced forms as these become available;

WHEREAS blast and radiation shelters and food reserves have been provided to protect the peoples of Switzerland, the U.S.S.R. and other countries;

WHEREAS the United States Government was established to provide for the common defense of the people;

WHEREAS at present no defensive blast and radiation shelters or distributed food reserves have been provided for most of the people in the United States; and

WHEREAS the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture have the knowledge and resources to provide this essential protection:

Now, therefore, we the undersigned do hereby petition the United States Government to IMMEDIATELY commence a program for the building of nuclear blast and radiation shelters and for the storage of at least one year's supply of food for every civilian and every military person in the United States within walking distance of their homes, schools, and places of work and to complete this program within eighteen months.

Name

Address

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Please return this petition to:  
American Homeland Defense Alliance, P.O. Box 1159, Cave Junction, Oregon 97523

heroic spectacles are largely self-deluding propoganda. This is especially true when legions of American adults want to adopt and provide for children, but are prevented by red tape and bureaucrats from doing so.

Civil defense proponents are generally of two opinions. Some work for national defense on the premise that, if we work hard enough, we can save our Republic and our people.

Others believe that it is too late to save the Republic, but that we can still, with self-help and perhaps a little government help, save a "remnant." To a Christian this means a biblical "remnant". To others this means a core of tough, free individuals. To others, it means just save all lives possible from a humanitarian perspective.

I submit that we must, before God, demonstrate by at least one, dramatic act of moral regeneration that our Republic and all its citizenry are worthy of preservation. If we do not do this, then we shall probably be permitted only to save a "remnant" and to pray that the suffering and bondage of that remnant will be brief.

What better demonstration of our worthiness can we make than to stop the killing of those 1,500,000 children each year?

### **CANVASSING THE KIDS**

One civil defense supporter who teaches high school in the Rogue Valley asked 56 students to read the Petition in Support of American Civil Defense and to write a few words about their choice to sign or not sign it.

28 (or 50%) of the students said "yes" to the petition. Those who said "yes" tended to write longer and more thoughtful statements as to their reasons. The "no" students gave shorter answers which usually parroted the doomsday slogans of the unilateral disarmament brainwashing campaign.

This disarmament campaign is now being sharply expanded.

First, the National Education Association (NEA) and the Educators for Social Responsibility (ESR) are getting so-called "nuclear-age" courses into most of the public schools. The books and materials for these "courses" are filled with outright falsehoods and falsehoods of omission and are little more than pro-Soviet propoganda.

Second, the Soviet ruling class has launched a major escalation of their “peace” offensive in the West. This offensive is co-ordinated with the completion of the Soviet strategic defense, civil defense, and first-strike offensive nuclear forces. American television sets bombard the kids with the slogans of this Soviet propaganda campaign.

It is remarkable that 50% of these Rogue Valley students are still in favor of civil defense, even though that is lower than the 80% passive support in the general population.

This 50% reflects primarily the intuitive human desire for self preservation. Nearly all of the student answers — yes and no — showed complete ignorance of actual nuclear weapons effects and defense technology. The NEA and the ESR intend to keep the students ignorant and to fill the void with falsehoods.

Truth, however, is a formidable weapon. If just one mobile blast shelter display is parked across the street from a school periodically, it can undo the best laid plans of the propagandists.

## AMERICAN SOIL

With \$300 billion being spent annually by the Department of Defense and yet no homeland defense being deployed for Americans, it is worthwhile to ask: “why?”.

A large portion of this money is wasted by the bloated defense bureaucracy, and an additional portion is wasted by misdirection to Congressional porkbarrels.

Nevertheless, there are still a great many patriotic and dedicated professional military people who have substantial resources with which to defend the United States. Why aren't they taking action?

A significant part of the answer may be illustrated by the pentagon's policy toward shelters for American soldiers. They have built and are building some shelters for the troops. The Army Corps of Engineers manages to make these shelters cost far more than they should (and sometimes for rather poor protection), but they are building them.

They are building these shelters, however, only *outside* of the United States. The military does not provide blast, radiation, chemical, and biological warfare protection for American soldiers if they are stationed inside the boundaries of the United States.

No war has been fought on American soil in the last 123 years. Even though the largest and most powerful military force the world has ever known has now been assembled with the expressed intent to fight and win a war against Americans on American soil, the United States military continues to reject the possibility that our 123 year string of good fortune may be at an end.

Why do they adopt this myopic view?

First, there is the tendency of peacetime military establishments to prepare to fight the "last" war — especially if they were victorious in it. The American military makes many preparations to repel a Soviet attack on Western Europe, even though that is unlikely to be Soviet strategy.

Clearly, the Soviet intent is to be strong enough in Europe that they will not have to fight a war there. The INF Treaty is now markedly increasing their strength.

Why would the Soviets want to destroy a neighboring, wealthy and malleable treasure-chest like Western Europe in a war which would spread secondary weapons effects over the Soviet Union, when the only enemy which keeps them from taking Western Europe without a fight is in North America?

Planning to resist a Soviet attack on Europe is a transparent and futile bluff. Aside from the argument given above and also the great difficulty of successfully resisting so formidable an enemy so far from us and so close to his own borders, there is the very implausible argument that America — completely undefended against 10,000 to 20,000 Soviet nuclear weapons — would commit suicide to save Western Europe.

If we had built a strategic defense and a civil defense (as have the Soviets), the argument that we would fight for Europe would be more plausible.

Why, then, do we keep 250,000 American soldiers in Europe 43 years after the last war? The maintenance cost of that force alone is greater than the cost of providing America with homeland defenses.

These soldiers are hostages. The idea seems to be that if 250,000 Americans may die in a Soviet attack, we would have to fight for Europe whether or not it meant death for 150 million Americans at home.

Our soldiers were also there to give protection to our European-based strategic nuclear forces. With these formidable weapons in place, the Soviets knew that they would be forced

to fight a nuclear war in Europe if they attacked the United States — a very undesirable prospect for them. The INF Treaty is now eliminating that Soviet problem.

Second, the military bureaucrats (as distinct from our actual fighting men and women) probably realize that any significant move to erect fortifications inside the United States would elicit a public and political response detrimental to their own self-interests.

As long as most Americans do not think that fortifications for soldiers on American soil will ever be needed or useful, they will be content to support the current defense program.

Fortifications for our troops on American soil, however, would focus attention on the failures of our military planners, on our transfers of technology to our enemies, and on our own failure to deploy strategic and civil defenses.

This attention would undoubtedly lead to increased military expenditures, but not for the current crop of bureaucrats and their carefully feathered nests.

When these reasons to avoid actual protection of American soil are joined to the entrenched self-interest of tens of thousands of military contractors and planners to keep getting funds for their own programs and therefore to oppose other demands on the \$300 billion, it is clear why deployment of strategic and civil defense is not being funded.

We also, of course, have a gaggle of “useful idiots” who keep trying to disarm us by negotiation. Mainstream Americans, however, keep pouring out that \$300 billion each year. They want to be defended. Their soldiers, sailors, and aviators want to defend them and to deter war. And — with a proper grassroots expression of outrage — we may be able to give them a real chance to do so.

Polls show that over 100 million Americans would sign the “Petition in Support of American Civil Defense”. Let’s get busy. We need at least one hundred signatories from each of you.

### **THE BEST ENEMY MONEY CAN BUY**

On the afternoon of January 24, 1966 an Air India Boeing 707 slammed into the top of Mont Blanc on the border between Italy and France. All aboard were killed, and all but four of the 117 people were entombed in the glaciers of the high Alps. As the glaciers move slowly from the mountain, their bodies will emerge on the valley floor sometime during the next century.

Aboard that airplane was Dr. Bahba, head of nuclear energy development in India, and most of his staff. Also aboard was the engineer in charge of the design and construction of all chemical plants for Union Carbide International, a division of the American corporation, Union Carbide. That engineer was your editor's father, Edward H. Robinson.

My father and his staff designed many Union Carbide chemical plants both inside and outside of the United States (not the one in Bopahl). It is likely that some of the polyethylene or other petrochemical products which you used this year came from one of those plants.

He was a very fine engineer, and I would like to be proud of his accomplishments. Today, however, those accomplishments are being perverted in a manner which can only make me ashamed.

Union Carbide is an active member of the semi-secret Soviet-American organization which calls itself the "U.S. - U.S.S.R. Trade and Economic Council" (USTEC).

USTEC is the primary organization which now implements the transfer of American technology to the Soviet Union. A substantial part of the modern Soviet war machine has been built by means of the technology and resources which USTEC members and their counterparts have transferred from America to the Soviet Union.

Over 95 million innocent human beings have been slaughtered behind the Iron Curtain in peacetime at the hands of the Soviet Nomenklatura and people under their control. That Nomenklatura (the elite Communists who run the Soviet empire) now controls the greatest military force the world has ever known - a force which could not have been built without the resources and knowledge transferred to it by the members of USTEC and their counterparts in America and other Western nations.

Is there an appropriate word for the evil that this organization has done and continues to do other than "treason"?

That resources generated by my father's life work and by the life work of millions of his contemporaries (who built the resources of the USTEC power brokers) are being used to build the Soviet war machine is an outrage.

USTEC members include American Express, Armco Steel, Coca Cola, Dow Chemical, Chase Manhattan, Cargill, Kodak, Occidental Petroleum, Xerox, and a list of about 300 other members. The full list is a secret for obvious reasons.

They even have a journal in which American technology is advertised for Soviet acceptance. The ads in this journal are exemplified by one proclaiming "We Are Growing Closer and Closer Together" which pictures a map of America and the Soviet empire with a common border along the entire American East Coast — with Western Europe and the Atlantic Ocean no longer in existence. Under the map, an American corporation hawks its wares for Soviet customers.

This ad, by Archer Daniels Midland Company (Its Chairman Dwayne O. Andreas is being hailed as the new Armand Hammer. Hammer became rich transferring American products to the Soviets.) shows only two cities, Moscow and Decatur, Illinois, the Archer Daniels headquarters.

Archer Daniels supplied part of the food supplies for the Soviet civil defense system.

In another ad in the USTEC journal, Union Carbide brags about the 200,000 ton per year polyethylene plant which they completed in the Soviet Union in 1984 — polyethylene rope with which to hang the West.

There is a permanent Soviet space station in orbit today which was built in part with American technology and resources. A space station which is testing strategic defense technology for the Soviet Union plus weapons to destroy American satellites. America, of course, has no space station, and her scientists are being denied the resources necessary to build a strategic defense.

Among the millions of human ideas and accomplishments which have made that space station and military hardware a reality there are probably one or two that originated in the Indian and American brains which died that day on Mont Blanc.

Surely we owe better than this to our past. If we can no longer relate to the lives of the American patriots who gave us this experiment in freedom 200 years ago, we should at least feel some obligation to our immediate forebears — the recent generations of Americans whose hard work and accomplishments built our industrial and scientific resources.

Through USTEC "Americans" are giving the legacy of recent generations to a tyranny which is intent on the destruction of human freedom.

Corporations are huge enterprises. In most cases the USTEC component of an American corporation is probably a small and almost unnoticed malignancy within the whole.

These corporations are today made up of thousands of dedicated individuals, most of whom have no knowledge that USTEC exists.

If you would like more information about USTEC, write to the United States Department of Commerce or to USTEC itself at 805 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022. Ask for a membership list and a copy of their journal. They will probably refuse to give you this information.

Better sources of information are the books: *The Best Enemy Money Can Buy* by Antony C. Sutton, published by Liberty House Press in Billings, Montana (\$12.95 purchased from *Fighting Chance* or Liberty House) and *Red Carpet* by Joseph Finder, reprinted by ABER (\$9.95 purchased from ABER at P.O. Box 8204, Fort Worth, Texas 76124).

### CIVIL DEFENSE – THE SUPERIOR TECHNOLOGY

As we have repeatedly stated, we are as strongly in favor of *strategic* defense deployment for America as we are of *civil* defense deployment. Research has clearly shown that in the face of the current Soviet threat, the most effective defense which can be deployed involves approximately equal expenditures on civil and strategic defense.

If expenditures are minimal, this situation becomes distorted. For example, in the case of almost no money, the most effective action is to provide a copy of *Nuclear War Survival Skills* to every American and hope for the best. FEMA could, of course, do that now – even with its small budget.

If we would just divert six months of our current military budget to these objectives, we could quickly build an overwhelmingly effective antimissile and anti-aircraft strategic defense and shelter and food reserve civil defense system. Such a system would almost surely deter any attack on America in the near term.

But what about the future? What about chemical weapons, biological weapons, terrorist and covert delivery of nuclear weapons, and other technologies which may not require delivery by large numbers of airplanes or missiles? What about radioactive fallout from a small nuclear war in the Middle East or Asia where more and more unpredictable regimes are acquiring nuclear weapons?

Until now, each offensive technology has bred an equivalent defensive technology. That is the reason why we must have a large continuing strategic defense research program. We will always need to develop new defensive systems as changes in technology occur.

In addition, it is important to realize that civil defense (including equivalent protection for our homeland based military personnel) has two unique major advantages.

First, it is fully developed *now*. There are no technological problems which can delay its deployment. This technology has been fully tested against all available threats and is very, very simple to build.

Second, civil defense is effective against a wide range of dangers including most postulated future threats.

Once people are protected inside a blast and radiation proof container, it is a simple matter to isolate their air supply by filters which are impervious to chemical and biological weapons. These filters are required today on the air supplies for all Swiss shelters.

Moreover, even if a nuclear weapon were delivered by covert means (by, for example, a terrorist), civil defense shelters would be very effective. Who is willing to say that there will never be one bomb, one terrorist, and one American city? Certainly strategic defense could not prevent the delivery of such a bomb.

Actually strategic defense would help deter a terrorist bombing. In today's world, a weak America is subject to all sorts of insults and atrocities including many terrorist acts. Certain governments supply most of the resources for these acts. In a world inhabited by a strong America, secure behind a strategic shield, our enemies would be much less likely to aid terrorists, especially with high technology. The threat of American retaliation would be much more credible.

If terrorists gave warning to a city into which they had placed a bomb by, for example, making a blackmail demand, then the people could immediately occupy the shelters. This would decrease casualties by a factor of ten or more if the bomb were eventually exploded.

If these terrorists could not be located or eliminated, the population could gradually leave the city in small groups without subjecting very many people to danger at once.

If terrorists exploded a bomb without warning, many more people would die, but many could still be saved by immediately occupying the shelters and thereby escaping secondary weapons effects such as fires and radiation from fallout.

In each case, the entire American civil defense system could be easily cost-justified by the lives saved in a single terrorist incident.

Even nuclear accidents, however improbable, could be easily dealt with by civil defense preparations.

It just does not make any sense at all to live in the nuclear age (and the biological and other advanced-weapons-ages to come) without providing simple protection against accidents or intentional mass murder.

We accept 40,000 deaths per year as the penalty for living in the automobile age, but we also provide as many safety precautions as reasonable. We build most of our buildings with wood and other flammable materials, but we provide ourselves with fire protection.

We take many personal risks in life, but, if we have dependents, we buy life insurance.

That is, in the final analysis, what civil defense is all about — insurance. Insurance in an age of dangerous technologies. These technologies have saved many lives, but they can destroy even more lives if we do not take proper precautions.

Even if the Soviets were not there — even if human nature had changed so that world war were no longer a threat, in the nuclear age nuclear insurance still makes sense.

If the threat of war were not so high, I don't know whether or not I would have postponed work on cancer and degenerative diseases in order to work on civil defense. In all likelihood I would not have learned enough about civil defense to accurately evaluate which area in which I might make the greatest contribution to optimizing the quality of human life.

However, regardless of this and no matter what I was trying to accomplish, I would certainly sign the "Petition in Support of American Civil Defense". You will find that most Americans feel the same way.

Let's get this job done — this, and the general homeland defense job which goes along with it. Then we can get on with the more productive and optimistic pursuits of life in spite of the tragic failings of our enemies.

As one United States Senator said to me in support of immediate deployment of civil defense:

*"I think we should just dig in and tell the Russians to (expletive deleted)".*

He is right. And I for one — along with most other Americans — am fed up with being bothered with this nuclear threat.

We got tired of potholes in our highways last year, so Congress appropriated \$88 billion to fix the problem. A similar amount of subsidy for the steel, concrete, and construction workers will build a shelter system.

## SHELTER ALTERNATIVES

In *Fighting Chance* and in many of our publications we emphasize blast and radiation shelters constructed from cylindrical steel tanks.

There are many different ways to build suitable shelters. These vary widely in cost and in the level of protection. Also, cost varies according to the amount of one's own labor which is traded for reduced expenditures of money.

It is doubtful that there are many new discoveries to be made in this area. Hundreds of different kinds of shelters have been built and tested.

After reading over 1000 research reports and articles about such tests, we chose one single technology to advocate for a nationwide system. We chose steel tanks because they are very inexpensive for their level of protection; they could be quickly constructed nationwide by an industry that is already in place; and they have undergone such extensive testing that critics cannot responsibly contend that they might not work.

Our cost estimates were based upon new construction of mass produced shelters. The overall system could take advantage, therefore, of substantial economies of scale.

It happens that, at the present time, as a result of the environmentalist attack upon the fuel distribution industry, large numbers of surplus tanks are available at scrap metal costs and even below. Surplus tanks have become so numerous that in some locations they are currently available with no cost at all except for cleaning and transport.

Surplus tanks usually are available from industry in small quantities even without this unusual current surplus. This current surplus is a temporary situation. With the current surplus, many *Fighting Chance* supporters have been building metal blast shelters at overall prices as low as those which could be achieved in a large-scale program.

Steel shelters also have the advantage that they can be properly constructed by the many thousands of American steel fabricating shops without special knowledge other than a good set of plans. This eliminates the extra cost of contractors, shelter specialists, and other middlemen. The entire shelter budget can go into labor and materials.

These shelters provide superb protection against blast for little more than the cost of an excellent fallout protective structure. In fact, with the current surplus, the overall cost is less per square foot than normal frame construction.

Nevertheless, these shelters still cost a significant amount of money which not everyone can afford. In several instances recently this problem has been solved by groups of families building a shelter together and sharing the cost.

It is very important to get the best protection you can afford. It is equally important, however, not to delay action because you cannot afford the cost.

Everyone can at least afford a copy of *Nuclear War Survival Skills*. The techniques described therein would save Americans in a great many locations. The information provided will certainly raise your chances of survival. Also, the principles of fallout protection described in that book enable you to improve your protection in a thoughtful manner beyond expedient shelter.

Fallout shelters alone might, if widely available, save a great enough number of Americans to preserve the nation. The blast threat is much worse today than it was 20 years ago, so many fallout shelter occupants would die. Fallout radiation protection should be your first priority — with additional protection added as you can afford it.

Still, it is important not to delude yourself about the threat. Thirty years ago, Federal planners began with a standard protection factor of 1000 for fallout shelters — there had to be 1000-fold reduction in radiation exposure by being inside the shelter.

When they couldn't find enough such structures, they reduced the standard to 200. Ultimately, they reduced the standard to 40. At 40 they could find enough fallout shelters in existing buildings for most Americans, although many were inadequate in other ways such as ventilation.

It is commendable that they did the best they could, even though it was not as much as desirable. They should not, however, have tried to cover up their problems by minimizing the threat and implying that 40 was safe enough.

This bogus standard allowed low protection factors to leak into their designs of even expensive specific purpose shelters and weaken the value of their specifications.

It is extremely important to follow carefully approved plans. The steel shelters which we advocate work. They have been very carefully researched. The expedient shelters in *Nuclear War Survival Skills* have been extensively researched. There are many other published shelter designs that are excellent.

Beware, however, of the recommendations of arm-chair survivalists who sagely give you their evaluation of the "threat" in your location and then clue you in to their innovative solution.

In most well developed sciences, the answers to questions usually appear quite simple. It is the poorly understood subjects which look complicated. Simplicity, however, can be misleading.

Thousands of very intelligent scientists and engineers have developed the science of nuclear weapons protection into the simple appearing procedures which are known today.

Most of them did that work so that people like yourself could survive a nuclear disaster. Don't deprive them of that reward by brewing up a home remedy with your favorite survivalist and getting yourself unnecessarily killed in the bargain.

To repeat; be sure to get some nuclear disaster insurance in the form of shelter and stored food . Provide as much of this insurance as you can afford for yourself and those around you.

If you have any questions about these things — food or shelter design — please call us at (503) 592-4142. We definitely do not know all of the answers. We do know enough to avoid serious error, and we know where to get any answers which we may not have immediately available. After substantial study and having built nine model shelters and helped with many more, we are beginning to thoroughly understand the subject.

*Fighting Chance* and its volunteers do not sell anything except the informational items which you see on our price list. We do not accept consulting fees or other remuneration. As part of this project we are determined to give as much help as possible to individual Americans who are trying to provide protection for themselves.

The more we help, the more we learn how to help. In this way all of our civil defense work becomes more effective.