

# FIGHTING CHANCE

*John 8: 31-32*

*Proverbs 22: 3*

Newsletter Vol. II, No. 5

September 1988

*"In recognition of our responsibility to provide optimum protection for the American people from terrorists, accidents, and war, should deterrence fail, we also believe that a high priority should be given to civil defense."*

Civil Defense Plank  
1988 Republican Party Platform

Civil defense should be a bipartisan issue. It has been a non-partisan issue — all American political parties have ignored it. The last significant effort to strengthen civil defense was a proposal by President Reagan in 1981. He was following a civil defense plank in the 1980 Republican platform.

During the past two years, civil defense has gradually been gaining a more visible place on the conservative agenda. The continuing rise of Soviet military superiority has contributed to this, as have the efforts of the American Civil Defense Association, Doctors for Disaster Preparedness, American Conservative Union, American Homeland Defense Alliance, and Fighting Chance.

On August 8 in New Orleans I spoke before the Republican platform defense subcommittee. I was the only speaker designated for civil defense. On August 9, that subcommittee voted 14-0 to include our proposed civil defense plank in the platform. The plank was adopted by the full 106 member platform committee on August 12.

I wrote this plank for insertion at an appropriate place in the draft platform which did not make mention of civil defense. The committee adopted our civil defense plank as written.

The important words are “optimum” and “high priority.”

The word “terrorist” also has special significance. First, it broadens the base of political support to those who are blind to the war threat. Second, terrorists strike without warning. Civil defense bureaucrats like to fantasize about war scenarios in which there are days or even weeks of warning, so that they can “plan” and “manage” a response. They want to spend our resources on more bureaucrats rather than on deployed hardware, distributed food reserves, and other preparations.

One terrorist – one nuclear bomb – one American city. The only sensible way to save lives in that instance is with in-place preparations of much the same kind that would save lives during a surprise nuclear attack. These are the preparations already in place in the Soviet Union. Those international terrorists have shelters. Why don't Americans ?

We were fortunate to have an opportunity to make this presentation in New Orleans and doubly fortunate that the delegates responded enthusiastically to our proposal. This plank will help our efforts in Washington even if Vice-President Bush is not elected. If he is elected, this plank could serve as an effective launching point for a good civil defense program. Senator Quayle, the Vice-presidential nominee, is one of the Senate supporters of civil defense resolution, SR 314.

In New Orleans we were especially fortunate to have the help of the American Conservative Union and of one of the platform delegates – a *Fighting Chance* supporter. He was not on the defense sub-committee, but helped us gain access to the delegates. After our presentation, several of the defense platform delegates were also very helpful.

I presented this proposal on behalf of the American Homeland Defense Alliance, American Conservative Union, American Civil Defense Association, and Doctors for Disaster Preparedness. Their grass-roots civil defense efforts, the many outstanding pro-American defense delegates on the platform committee, and several fortuitous opportunities in New Orleans made the proposal a success.

It is tragic that a similar effort was impossible at the Democrat convention. However, even if the Democrats had not decided to write a generic platform which avoids substantive statements, their candidate is clearly continuing his established record of catering to the anti-defense elements of the Democrat party.

Regardless of the election outcome, we will work to obtain a better civil defense program. This platform statement will help influence Republican Senators and Congressmen regardless of which presidential candidate is elected.

## RELATED ISSUES

The 1988 Republican platform is the strongest homeland defense platform in recent American history. It calls for the deployment of strategic defense and a high priority for optimum civil defense. Both of the national Republican candidates have firmly endorsed these positions.

This defense platform did not happen by accident, nor is it a few unimportant words on a soon-to-be-discarded document. The political forces which are opposed to homeland defenses put forth their best effort in New Orleans. Any thoughts that the platform was unimportant were quickly dispelled when I saw the many highly-placed people who were working as hard as they could to influence every word. They were not socializing; they meant business.

About 20 people testified to the defense subcommittee. When I saw the program, I was surprised that a civil defense advocate was given a place on it. Defense is an enormous enterprise. Strategic defense is gradually gaining a proper place on the agenda. It is remarkable that civil defense was given attention and that a strong civil defense plank was adopted.

These positive steps were not accidental. They are part of a grass roots awakening in America to the importance of protecting human life. Actual homeland defense is a natural part of that process. In a room nearby, another platform subcommittee completely obliterated the pro-abortion delegates. They put an absolutely unequivocal pro-life plank into the platform. If their plank is implemented, legalized child-killing in America will be over. The drift toward adult-killing will also be halted.

I found myself thinking that God might have decided that, if this group clearly opposed the child killing, He would give them the wisdom to defend themselves. The defense issues may have been decided not in the subcommittee on defense, but in the subcommittee on the family.

This movement will not stop if Bush and Quayle fail to win the White House. If, however, they are able to clearly communicate the pro-life and pro-homeland defense parts of their platform to the American people, they will be elected. We will still need to work very hard to get improvements in civil defense from Washington. If they are elected, however, our efforts will be more likely to meet with success.

We are not naive. We know what we are up against. Several substantial efforts for civil defense have failed during the past 40 years. To the extent we try to get our government to properly provide for the common defense, we must use the political institutions available to us. We have a chance. We must not let cynicism — perhaps even realism — prevent our taking that chance.

### **TACDA AND DDP MEET IN OCTOBER**

The combined annual meeting of the American Civil Defense Association and Doctors for Disaster Preparedness will be held October 21 through 24 in Salt Lake City, Utah at the Airport Hilton Hotel. The cost (which includes luncheons and banquet) is \$148 per person. Registration should be sent to TACDA/DDP, P.O.Box 1057, Starke, Florida 32091.

TACDA is the organization which has kept alive the torch of civil defense in the United States during the past 20 years. DDP is the parallel organization for doctors. For this reason, TACDA and DDP membership includes virtually all American defense professionals who are really serious about American civil defense.

Most of these professionals attend the annual TACDA meetings at which they rotate as speakers and audience. The format is arranged so that there are very ample opportunities to meet all of these people.

This is not a meeting where the speakers pop in for their talk, applause, and an honorarium check and then disappear quickly for the next meeting. None of them is paid and each pays \$148 to participate. Moreover, even the most famous among them sit there for all three days listening to the talks and participating in the discussions.

These men and women include scientists and engineers of the highest caliber. They open their meetings with a pledge of allegiance to the American flag and a prayer.

Typically there are fewer than 200 participants. If you wish, you can know any of them personally by the end of the meeting. Whether you are just thinking about starting some civil defense preparations or are far along in your knowledge of civil defense, this is the single event each year in which you should participate.

We look forward to it each year and look forward to seeing some of you there.

## FOOD FOR KIDS

When we recommended the storage of a food supply for adults at a cost of about \$100 per person year — now somewhat higher as a result of rising grain and bean prices, we said that we would add a supplemental suggestion for children later.

The primary ration, especially with sprouting or vitamin C supplementation as we have suggested, is sufficient for emergency nutrition for children. Of course, a wholesome diet with balanced high protein and lots of fresh vegetables is much better, but as a survival ration the wheat, corn, beans, soy oil, salt, and sprouts will suffice.

The problem comes in compliance. Small children will just refuse to eat foods which they do not like. Ingenuity and perseverance can overcome this problem in a crisis, but your time and energy may also be needed to overcome many other post-attack problems. Vitamin C can be obtained by sprouting, but sprouting may not be high on your list of priorities in a world which has suddenly become life-threatening in many ways. Child nutrition is a similar problem.

For this reason it is sensible to provide additional stored foods for children. The principle item here should be nonfat dry milk.

If you have purchased nonfat dry milk in boxes or bags and kept it for long, you know that it is easily spoiled. If you open a container, it is wise to finish it fairly quickly. Furthermore, even with a fresh batch, nonfat dry milk is notorious for having a taste that is not desirable. Also, some varieties do not dissolve completely, which contributes an additional taste problem. Where compliance of children is a primary factor, you want milk that tastes like milk.

For long term storage, milk is a product that definitely needs to be specially packed in completely sealed containers. Relatively small sealed cans are best. There are several suitable products on the market. Buy the least expensive you can find, so that you can afford a larger supply. With milk, always buy a small amount first and sample it. Keep testing your supply from time to time. If it starts to lose quality, consume it promptly, while you shop for a better product.

The best nonfat dry milk which we have purchased is produced by Maple Island, Inc. in Stillwater, Minnesota. It is available in sealed number 10 cans for long term storage. This product keeps well. Some has been stored for sixteen years without noticeable deteriora-

tion. It dissolves instantly and completely. It tastes remarkably good and much better than fresh nonfat milk.

The current price from Preparedness Products for Maple Island milk is \$36.85 for a case of six cans with 3 pounds 12 ounces per can. A can makes 19 quarts of milk. This, then, is \$1.29 per gallon. The Preparedness Products telephone number is (801) 292-3481.

Preparedness Products is the same company that we suggested as a supplier of grain and beans. There have been some complaints that they have been slow in filling orders and erratic in giving price information. All of the orders we know about specifically were ultimately filled, but some were quite late.

Although we have no connection with this company, we were partially responsible for their difficulties. The food suggestion in the March 1988 *Fighting Chance Newsletter* was acted upon by some of our subscribers and was also republished by other newsletters whose editors read our articles. The result was a flood of orders which Preparedness Products, their food wholesaler, and their plastic bucket supplier were not prepared to meet. Their business increased too quickly.

In addition, soon thereafter, grain and bean prices increased dramatically which made pricing very unstable for them. They say their mark up on those items is about 8%. With farm commodities rising by 50% and fluctuating several percent each day, pricing becomes difficult for a small business.

We hope these problems are behind them, and we are pleased that many person years of food were stored as a result of our suggestion. Always look for the best price and delivery you can find. We make our best effort to provide a good suggestion as a starting point with each recommendation, but you may be able to find a better bargain.

Preparedness Products is currently giving a remarkable bargain by still offering the basic ration recommended in our March 1988 newsletter *at the same price* — \$100 per person per year in bulk and \$198 per person per year nitrogen-packed in square plastic buckets.

Grain and bean prices have come down, but they are still much higher than they were in March 1988.

The \$100 per person per year price is a terrific bargain which may not be available again.

## CAPSTONE

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has initiated a new series of courses at their Emmitsburg, Maryland school entitled the "Capstone Series." The series includes opponents as well as proponents of civil defense.

One section of the course features a speaker from the "Physicians for Social Responsibility" vs. a speaker from the Doctors for Disaster Preparedness. Jennifer Leaning is the PSR speaker. In the first course DDP President Jane Orient opposed Leaning. On June 29, in the second course, I represented DDP and opposed Leaning.

Leaning distributes the usual hard-core appeasement propaganda complete with "nuclear winter" and radioactive wastelands in handouts to the participants. She recently participated in a letter-writing effort to convince state governors not to cooperate in FEMA exercises.

In her oral presentation, however, she poses as a friend of FEMA. She claims that PSR has similar goals as those of FEMA. The PSR, she says, would support a \$500 million or even a \$1 billion budget for FEMA if FEMA would just forget about "attack preparedness" and concentrate on earthquakes and floods. PSR really has little influence upon the FEMA budget, but Leaning wants FEMA to think they do.

The PSR ploy is clever. Bureaucrats always want more money, and they divide themselves into fiefdoms within their respective agencies. The PSR hopes to set the earthquake and flood people in FEMA against the attack-preparedness people in FEMA. "Just think how much money we could all have if your group would stop making trouble by promoting nuclear attack preparedness."

I do not think that this recent group of FEMA students bought the PSR "line". At least I did my best to point out the dishonesty in PSR propaganda and the high price Americans would pay for its purchase. I also outlined the relative blame that should be placed on various groups for our current lack of nationwide civil defenses. They are, in order of importance:

1. The Department of Defense. They have the money and the responsibility. They are not building homeland defenses, and they are not educating our politicians about the urgent need for those defenses.

2. **The Politicians.** Primarily former lawyers and businessmen, they are not trained in engineering and science. They rely upon defense establishment lobbyists for their military information. Never-the-less, they are sworn to provide for the common defense. Ignorance is no excuse for failure in so important a responsibility.
3. **Pro-Defense Groups.** With all polls for decades having shown that an overwhelming majority of Americans passively favor civil defense, they should be doing a much better job of mobilizing that political force.
4. **FEMA Itself.** FEMA allows itself to serve as an excuse for the Pentagon. The Department of Defense says 'Of course we support civil defense. We support the FEMA budget, and FEMA takes care of civil defense.' The FEMA budget is then carefully kept low enough, so that it is no challenge to Pentagon programs. FEMA bureaucrats should stop pretending that they can provide realistic civil defense at low budgets. This pretense may help secure their jobs, but it allows the charade of non-preparedness to continue.
5. **The American Clergy.** The majority of American churches now preach the message that "God will take care of you." 'Go to church, donate to the church, and develop a proper relationship with God – you need not do anything else. You can then demand God's gifts on your own terms.'

Our families and our civilization are in dire peril, and God has already taken care of us. He has given us the knowledge to build defenses and the resources and skills to do so. Too many of our churches, however, want to test God. They refuse to accept these gifts. They want God to save them on their own terms – without effort or expense or responsible action.

6. **The so-called "peace groups" like PSR.** These I hesitate to list, since I am not sure they need be a negative factor. Left alone, they can cause a little trouble. When challenged they hurt their own cause more than they help it. Americans are just not ready for unilateral surrender.

If the PSR had not provided us with Helen Caldicott and her absurd pronouncements, the pro-defense groups would be wise to invent her. When "peace group" slogans are properly advertised and answered, they anger the American people and can be used to accelerate deployment of homeland defenses.

## PROTECTIVE GARMENTS

Shelter, ventilation, water, post-attack food supplies, and nuclear survival training are so urgently needed by all Americans, that we worry each time we point out some additional item which could be purchased. The private resources of a small number of informed and motivated Americans are the only source of civil defense protection for all Americans at the present time.

Yet there are numerous contingencies which are of interest to informed individuals. The book, *Nuclear War Survival Skills*, helps with many of these contingencies by providing expedient methods for dealing with them.

Protective clothing is one of these contingencies. Clothing is of little value in protection against initial nuclear explosion effects except for protection from flash burns. White or light-colored clothing provides valuable protection against thermal radiation which can burn unprotected skin. Clothing also has value for protection during the period of life-threatening fallout radiation which can last from a few days to a few weeks after a nuclear attack.

Clothing itself offers virtually no direct protection from gamma radiation. However, if fallout remains on the skin, short-range beta radiation can cause serious beta burns on the skin. If fallout is ingested with inhaled air, much of it remains in the lungs where it can cause beta burns and serve as a continuing source of gamma radiation. Even at low levels this can lead eventually to lung cancer. Moreover, if fallout is carried into a shelter on the clothing or skin of a contaminated person, it serves as a source of gamma radiation to the shelter occupants which diminishes the protection of the shelter.

These problems need not arise if you have a properly constructed and supplied fallout shelter. Just do not go outside until the fallout radiation is no longer life-threatening. There are, however, situations which could cause you to emerge early. You might need to get some essential item which was mistakenly not stored in the shelter, or you may need to rescue someone who has survived but needs help to get into the shelter.

In those circumstances you would want to fashion expedient protective clothing or to have available a commercial garment. We have not conducted a market survey of protective garments and do not have appropriate test facilities to evaluate them. However, we recently learned about one which appears to be a cost-effective product.

The RPA IIA Particulate Protective Garment produced by Redicorp Protective Materials, Inc., P.O. Box 462, Fairfax Station, Virginia 22039 is currently available from the factory for \$59 in extra small, small, and medium and \$69 in large and extra large sizes. Their usual suggested retail price is \$99. Redicorp's telephone number is (703) 938-2928.

This suit provides whole-body protection, a large transparent visor, and filtration based on fabric rather than a gas mask. It is shown in the photograph below. It is rated as impermeable to aerosols and particulates of 0.3 microns or larger. It is less expensive and appears to be easier to use than others which we have seen advertised.



## BURNS

The fluid replacement kit which we recommended in the March 1988 newsletter is assembled from items found in your local grocery store — sugar, baking soda, and Lite salt. It is suitable for saving lives from dehydration. For example, administration of ingredients worth about one dollar can save the life of a cholera victim as described by Dr. Orient on the Emergency Medicine Presentation Video Tape.

In the case of burns, fluid replacement can be accomplished with ordinary salt water alone. Dr. Orient recommends one teaspoon of ordinary table salt per quart of water. The burn victim drinks 4 to 8 quarts during the first 8 hours, 4 to 8 quarts during the next 16 hours, and as much as tolerable thereafter.

Our March 1988 article recommends the sugar, baking soda, and Lite salt formulation for all victims of dehydration including burns. While this will work satisfactorily, burn victims require only ordinary salt water. This is more likely to be available and does not use up scarce ingredients which may be needed for disease victims. The other ingredients are specific to replace intestinal fluid loss as in the intestinal diarrhea caused by cholera.

## WATER IN YOUR SHELTER

One famous civil defense scientist, who shall remain nameless here so that we can continue to tease him by threat of exposure, recently had a floor-level flood in his shelter. It unfortunately damaged some stored items and required additional construction. The shelter was not water tight, and the water table under the shelter shifted unexpectedly.

One advantage of welded steel tank shelters is that they are dry inside. That is an advantage *if they have been supplied with an adequate water supply*. His shelter may have been flooded, but it still would have saved the lives it was designed to preserve.

A shelter really needs only three absolutely essential things. Without any one of these three, the occupants will die — or at least be forced out of their shelter which may mean death in a nuclear attack environment.

The shelter must physically protect its occupants from direct and indirect nuclear weapons effects; it must supply an adequate amount of air for breathing and, if necessary, cooling; and it must supply water for drinking. This should be at least 15 gallons for each occupant — the minimum amount for a two week period.

In fact, since one cannot live at all without air or water, it would be better to provide these in a modest fallout shelter than to provide a first-rate blast and fallout shelter with inadequate ventilation or water. There is a chance that you might only be exposed to a moderate blast and fallout danger — one that could be mitigated by a relatively poor shelter. There is no chance at all that you can live two weeks without air or water.

Regardless of what other water supply you have, the shelter should have three five-gallon containers of water or their equivalent for each occupant. These provide a backup for other water supplies which might fail, and they provide additional radiation barriers if piled in doorways or other openings. We much prefer several small containers to one large one. They are easier to handle and are redundant. All are unlikely to be broken at once.

Our model shelter is designed for three water supplies. It has a gravity fed spring, a ground water well, and the individual water containers. Even if it also had a large attached water tank, it would still need those individual containers.

Pipes to water reservoirs can break, reservoirs can break, wells and springs can go dry and water courses can change direction, but those individual water containers will still be in the shelter.

Suppose you have no shelter in which to put the water containers? Everyone has some sort of shelter or potential shelter. That is part of the message in *Nuclear War Survival Skills*. Even if the best you could do would be to throw together a core fallout shelter in your house with a radiation protection factor of about 10 or so, that might still save your life — if you have water. You can go without food for 30 days, but not without water.

If you have not already done so, you should immediately store, in five gallon or smaller containers, about 15 gallons of water for each person who may depend upon your preparations. Put in a little chlorine bleach in accordance with the instructions in *Nuclear War Survival Skills*.

You don't think chlorine is good to drink? Fine. Store it that way anyway. You can do it quickly and then replace it with fancier water later if you get around to it. The chlorine won't kill you immediately — dehydration will.

## **FIGHTING CHANCE COMMERCIAL POLICY**

*Fighting Chance* is a non-profit project supported primarily by donations and also by sales of newsletters, books, video tapes, and other informational items such as the shelter plans. Our principle costs are for printing, postage, and production of informational materials.

We do not directly or indirectly sell any civil defense products other than information. We usually buy samples of the products we recommend, but we pay the same price as everyone else and receive no royalties or other payments from the suppliers.

We are receiving an increasing number of commercial offers regarding our mailing list, product recommendations, and sales opportunities. As strong advocates of free enterprise, we are pleased by these offers and do our best to help commercial interests — just as we help private individuals.

However, we never loan or rent our mailing list to anyone. We believe that many *Fighting Chance* supporters prefer this.

Also, we do not financially involve ourselves with the sale of civil defense products or other commercial activities, because we believe that the credibility of our public efforts to support civil defense would be diminished by that involvement. This is not necessarily as it should be, but we must function in the real political world of today.

## WEAPONS AND HOPE

Intellectual Freeman Dyson is author of a book entitled *Weapons and Hope*, (Harper & Row, New York). He is a brilliant physicist who has worked on some of America's military research. He is also an inhabitant of American "academia." In his chapter on shelters, he provides some interesting insights about shelter technology based on his observations of Swiss shelters and American academics:

*"After I came back from Switzerland to the United States, I began to talk to some of my friends about my impressions of the Swiss shelter program. I quickly learned that this is not an acceptable topic of conversation in polite society. Almost nobody in the United States wants to hear about shelters. If you persist in talking about shelters, people excuse themselves and move away. According to the majority opinion in American academic circles, anybody who takes shelters seriously must be either an idiot or a lunatic."*

The key word here is "academic." In the real world, where most Americans live, polls repeatedly indicate a majority favorable to shelter protection. The 106 members of the Republican platform committee who voted without dissent to include our civil defense plank in the platform were neither idiots nor lunatics. They also were not academics.

Dyson discusses the twin claims that shelters will not work and that they are "destabilizing." It is remarkable that the same people who deride shelters as useless simultaneously argue that they would dangerously shift the so-called balance of power. What they really mean is that shelters would upset the balance of terror. Terrified people are easier to control. People with shelters are considerably less terrified.

As one of our top physicists, a professional academic, and by no means a political advocate of a nationwide shelter system, Freeman Dyson's statement on shelter effectiveness is worth quoting:

*"If we disregard present-day political constraints and consider the effectiveness of shelters as a purely technical question, the charge of technical ineffectiveness is not supported by the evidence. Properly constructed shelters are, from a technical standpoint, remarkably effective. This does not mean that any feasible shelter system would guarantee the survival of a society after a full-scale nuclear attack. It means that, in any situation short of a full-scale attack, a properly constructed shelter system has a good chance of making the difference between the life and the death of a society. And in any situation, up to and including a full-scale attack, a properly constructed shelter system has a better chance of saving your life than any other weapon system which you could buy for the same money. Shelter systems are, in the jargon of the experts, cost-effective. A dollar's worth of shelters gives better protection than a dollar's worth of anything else. The case for technical ineffectiveness of shelters is much weaker than the case for technical ineffectiveness of ABM. The major problems in building an effective shelter system are human and not technical."*

### **PICKETING THE PENTAGON**

On July 1 Robert Billings and Pete Shearer from the American Conservative Union and I picketed the Pentagon. Robert Billings is ACU Legislative Director and Pete Shearer is ACU Legislative Assistant.

As shown in the photograph, we carried signs which said "Soviets Have Civil Defense — Why Don't Americans" and "American Soldiers Need Shelters Too." With these signs on display, we passed out Petitions for American Civil Defense at the main Pentagon subway and bus entrances.

Picketing our opponents will do very little good. Picketing our friends may help.

The Department of Defense has \$300 billion per year with which to defend America. That is enough money to do the job — if it is spent wisely. Their current policy of not deploying homeland defenses for America is very unwise.

There are many patriotic and capable people in the United States Department of Defense. Without the efforts which they have made, the free world would already have ceased to exist. As always in government, however, their efforts are impeded by bureaucracy and the misdirected self-interest of some of their coworkers.

In preparing to win the last war rather than the next, in assuming no war will be fought on American soil and therefore leaving America without nuclear-age defenses, and in squandering our military resources on all sorts of foolish projects, the undesirable elements within the "defense establishment" have feathered their own nests at the expense of American security. By public protest we can strengthen America's friends within the Department of Defense and weaken their opponents.

In Washington, when one advocates deployment of civil defense or strategic defense, the immediate objection is financial. Where will we get the money for these expensive projects? Although they are relatively inexpensive and are very cost-effective compared with other government programs, they are viewed as "new" programs which must compete with the multitude of special interests clamoring for money.

In order to have an opportunity for funding, homeland defenses must be seen as the logical recipients of money which has already been appropriated or is going to be appropriated by the momentum of current programs. The problem is that our \$300 billion annual defense budget, (a small fraction of which would be sufficient to deploy homeland defenses), is already divided between thousands of defense fiefdoms which do not want additional competition.

Does everyone really believe that half of our current military budget should be spent on the homeland defense of Western Europe, while virtually none is spent on the homeland defense of the United States? Yet entrenched special interests in the American military and American industry who are benefiting from those European expenditures are determined to keep these twisted priorities in place.

Public protest, especially by *pro*-defense groups, could upset overall Pentagon funding. With the anti-defense orientation of the press, it is realistic to suggest that at least a 5% reduction in the \$300 billion might eventually result from even small regular public protests. The Pentagon bureaucrats know this. I think that they would give substantial resources to strategic and civil defenses in order to avoid loss of even larger amounts to public dissatisfaction.

In New Orleans I asked a retired Army general why there are no personnel shelters provided for American soldiers on military bases in the United States. Aside from an occasional command post, our troops are just sitting ducks for Soviet strategic weapons. He