

FIGHTING CHANCE

John 8: 31-32

Proverbs 22: 3

Newsletter Vol. III, No. 11

May 1993

I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just. That His justice cannot sleep forever.

Thomas Jefferson

TAX SUPPORTED VIOLENCE

In many previous issues of this newsletter, we have described our various efforts to encourage a sensible defense policy by our federal government in Washington, D.C.

We have initiated legislation, worked with the government to distribute civil defense information throughout America, built mobile civil defense displays in cooperation with the government, strongly supported strategic defense, and taken other similar actions.

Even in a military action about which we had reservations, the Gulf War, we did all that we could to help our country. The rifle bag project was an effort for which we received letters of thanks from both President Bush and his Secretary of Defense.

At the same time, we have been critical of the failures within government programs to provide for the common defense of the American people - the most important responsibility for which that government was established by the Founding Fathers and empowered and constrained by the U.S. Constitution.

Last November we were strongly critical of President Bush for his very unwise decision to destroy America's tactical nuclear weapons. Since an election was imminent, however, we delayed sending that newsletter until after the election.

We have viewed our government as rational but wrong in its defense policies. We have done all that we can as American citizens to work toward the correction of these errors.

What do we do now?

Does the United States even have a government?

President Reagan was correct when he referred to the Soviet Union as an "evil empire." Can the continual stream of atrocities flowing from the current executive branch of the American government be referred to in the similar terms? Are there any polite adjectives to describe what these people are doing?

The greatest criticism that we can now make of President Bush is that he conducted himself in such a way as to allow the election of the current administration.

We now have the murder of unborn American children as our national policy, homosexuality as our national morality, earth and animal worship as our national religion, socialism as our national economic policy, and the massacre of peaceful American women and children as our national symbol. I was appalled to hear the individual who now calls himself President of the United States say on the radio that the people in Waco essentially 'had it coming.'

World economic markets have been delicately balanced for many reasons - including, I think, world perceptions of the odd behavior of the American government since installation of the new President. Immediately after the Waco carnage, several world markets finally turned decisively negative.

Economists are giving other explanations, world leaders are staying uninvolved, and writers (including me) are worried about speaking out for fear that we will be tarred by the smear campaign of guilt by association being waged by the government, but the markets are beginning to say what is in the investors minds and hearts. The world-wide television coverage of the Waco attack has finally broken the hopes of many concerning the reliability of the American government.

Thirty years ago, when I first became interested in investments, I subscribed for a while to a service named the "Value Line." This service attempted to determine a sort of intrinsic value for various common stocks. In the introduction of each issue, they always listed their assumptions - one of which was that there was no civil war in progress in the United States. I often chuckled at their foolishness in thinking that this caveat needed to be listed.

"Value Line" could express this reservation without danger of being misunderstood, since they were obviously an established, conservative investment service. Most people who have raised the question of civil war in America during the past 100 years have been fringe individuals who are given little credibility.

Moreover those who have advocated gun ownership as a right and responsibility, because the Founding Fathers believed that Americans should bear arms as a protection against their own government have generally been considered an anachronism - albeit a fortuitous anachronism in that this protection was put into the Constitution and therefore preserved an important property right.

What now are we to think of the tanks and armored personnel carriers flying American flags that carried out the final assault in Waco which led to the deaths of a score of innocent American children? Perhaps rifles are not enough? Perhaps every American family needs to own a modern tank? Is it proper to fly the American flag on your tank, while defending your family from the government's tanks? What in the world is going on here?

President Bush was criticized for resuming business with the Chinese butchers of Tiananmen Square. At least President Bush criticized them. This administration apparently has decided to emulate them. Aside from our rhetoric, however, let us be clear about the effects of what has happened.

First, about 100 people are dead as a result of the deliberate acts of other people who were heavily armed and paid by our tax dollars. If the nation simply mourns these dead and demands punishment for those who perpetrated this tragedy, then the matter will end there. If, however, as seems probable from the government's position, the officials who planned and ordered this atrocity go unpunished, then the level of violence in America will be turned up another large notch.

That violence will not come from mainstream Americans; it will come from those on the extreme left and extreme right of our national spectrum of behaviors. The actions of these people will, however, kill more Americans and escalate the violence further. In that event and because of the probability of that event, it is essential that Americans consider the "unthinkable."

With the central government rapidly and permanently losing the respect of a large percentage of Americans as a result of its actions toward homosexuality, abortion, environmental extremism, and the destruction of our economy, there is a danger that America will reach a level of domestic violence that leads to a chain reaction and becomes self-amplifying. We may be closer to that level than we realize.

It is essential that the people responsible for the Waco killings be punished and that the federal government make entirely clear that it does not condone their actions. This will allow our country to back away from this new level of violence before it is too late.

I do not say this, because I support the church or social positions of the people who were attacked in Waco. I don't know much about these people. Moreover, given the deluge of self-justifying propaganda that is being generated over this affair, there is very little possibility that I will ever have accurate information about them.

There are, however, some undisputed facts. These American families were living in peace. One of them had been previously tried in a court of law for a gun regulation violation and had been acquitted. A warrant had been issued recently regarding a similar charge and needed to be served. Although they have now been charged in the press with a long list of illegal activities, they were never charged with these offenses in a court of law or any other forum in which they had an opportunity to defend themselves.

The warrant was "served" by a full scale military attack by heavily armed men and aircraft against their church on Sunday. Several people were killed, but the attack failed. After a two month stand-off during which they were subjected to various forms of psychological warfare, the attack was resumed with military tanks, armored vehicles, and gas. As a result, most of the people, including a large number of children and their mothers, were killed.

The details of what happened during the moments of the two attacks are not the issue. How many American families would be likely to act entirely rationally under such circumstances? Given the number of people and weapons involved, it is even unlikely that the trained killers who were ordered to attack them behaved in a manner that is entirely beyond reproach.

The issue is the attack itself. There was just no justification for the use of force in this way. It may have worked in Stalinist Russia, but it has no place in America. Moreover, this sort of thing seems to be becoming more and more popular with government officials.

It was reported here last year that, at 5:00 am, several military trucks filled with heavily armed assault troops and law enforcement personnel drove into Cave Junction, Oregon (seven miles from our farm) and then moved out around this rural community. They are said to have kicked in the doors of 23 homes and terrorized the occupants in what was billed as a big drug bust. According to local news accounts, this raid did not find a single drug violation.

More recently it was reported that several blocks were evacuated in Ashland, Oregon while one man was surrounded in his home. This produced a stand-off that even included the deployment of an armored vehicle from a nearby community. The man was charged with illegally cutting trees over the boundary from some property that he was legally logging. (Incidents involving exact forest boundaries during logging are common and are usually resolved by a survey and payment of compensation.)

News reports tell of a recent incident in Idaho where a man's teenaged son was shot several times in the back and his wife was deliberately shot in the head by a sniper while she was holding her infant baby in her arms. The military style assault on this family was "justified" by government bureaucrats who charged that the father had sold a shotgun that was a fraction of an inch shorter than the legal limit. There are reports of other similar incidents.

As in the Waco incident, this attack was followed by a barrage of government and press statements to the effect that the attacked people held unpopular views and were guilty of many crimes with which they had not been charged.

I do not support the views of these people who have been attacked. I do not really know anything about their views, and I doubt that I would have much in common with any of them. It is probable that many or all of them deserved arrest and then an opportunity to defend themselves in a proper court. It is very clear, however, that excessive force was used against them and was used in a way that was very likely to lead to tragedy.

While the average American has little to fear from such attacks, there is a growing perceived fear among an increasing segment of our population. Moreover, there is a segment of our population that is prone to violence. This segment will find self-justification in these events.

It may be that none of this can be stopped. With our national government now dominated by people who are enthusiastically endorsing the killing of unborn children (abortion) and are engaged in a redesign of our medical system that will include tacit killing of the old and infirm (euthanasia), their evaluation of human life may have fallen so low that the killing will just continue. With our government in the grip of people whose environmental policy amounts to little more than irrational pagan worship of animals, plants, and earth, how can we expect even lip service for the Ten Commandments?

Immediately after an event such as Waco, exaggeration is normal. It would be easy to misread the importance of the event. It would be even easier to be in error as to the timing of later events. We must, however, remember some essential facts:

First, as Americans, our families are no more safe from tyranny than are those of our other fellow Americans - regardless of what we may think of each other's idiosyncrasies.

Second, where military force in excessive amounts has been used against the citizens of other countries, that use has often resulted - eventually - in civil war.

Third, with rare exceptions in history, civil war usually leads to conditions worse than those which caused the war.

We must urge our current government to step back from this escalation of violence by punishing every one responsible for this tragedy in Waco including the Attorney General who ordered it.

FACTS AND FANCIES OF U.S. NUCLEAR DEFENSE

by Sam Cohen

Sam Cohen was the inventor of the neutron bomb. He has made many contributions to American defense particularly in the area of tactical nuclear weapons and in the use of nuclear technology for defensive purposes. His work has been widely recognized including a special medal that he received from the Pope in Rome in recognition of his contributions to world peace and to the moral doctrines related to the production and use of nuclear devices. Sam Cohen is widely known for his advocacy that America should heed the words of George Washington and withdraw from entangling alliances that threaten American survival. In Washington's day entangling alliances and foreign military adventures were unwise; in the nuclear age, such actions may prove suicidal.

Some 30 years ago, during the Kennedy administration, a determined effort was made to construct a nation-wide civil defense system. Calculations indicated that for a relatively modest price, costing on the order of \$100 per person, the great majority of Americans could be protected against a major Soviet attack - including population and military targets - and be able to emerge into the post-war world. There was little dispute over the technology involved, which was essentially digging a hole in the ground for most people and adding protection against blast and radioactive fallout.

On the other hand, if there was no serious technological barrier standing in the way, there was an insuperable ideological barrier created by influential intellectuals who held to the belief that being able to defend the American people was a sure sign that America was willing to go to nuclear war, knowing it could survive. Putting it more succinctly, not only would the U.S. be willing to risk nuclear war, if an ally like NATO or Japan were in danger of being taken over by the Soviet Union, we would actually initiate nuclear war against the USSR to prevent this from happening.

As preposterous as this was, these intellectuals had a huge effect on the U. S. Congress and the media, to an extent where civil defense was nipped in the bud despite the facts that polls indicated that overwhelmingly the American people desired such a defense to enable them to survive. As a consequence, policies were established (that still exist) where the U.S. government committed itself to defending practically everybody, including the President and key elements of the government, except its own citizens. That this was a moral travesty to the extreme, in direct opposition to the tenets of Christian Just War theory which supposedly form the foundation of Western thinking on war, was clear from the beginning. But the nuclear theology of this powerful faction prevailed over the common sense morality of the American people, and we remain defenseless against the effects of weapons of mass destruction - nuclear, chemical, and biological, all of which still pose a terrible threat to this country and can be delivered in any number of ways. One can forgive the American people for allowing this situation to prevail for so long. Most of us tend to go along with the decisions of the government on such matters, assuming, mainly wrongly, that decision makers in Washington know more than they do. But one should be less forgiving of a government that knowingly accepted a mythology, spelled policy, that deliberately put tens of millions of American lives at unnecessary risk.

What most Americans don't know is that before assuming the presidency, Ronald Reagan was an impassioned advocate of civil defense. (I know because the person who for many years before had been his closest and most influential adviser on national security matters told me this.) Yet, when he came to power in Washington he did essentially nothing to put some meaning into our meaningless civil defense program. Unfortunately, despite his best intentions, he decided, on the advice of another group of intellectuals, that we could best defend ourselves against nuclear ballistic missile attack (seemingly forgetting that these weapons and other weapons of mass destruction could be delivered in a number of ways) by developing and deploying a massive anti-missile system, now known as the Strategic Defense Initiative (for a while known as Star Wars until it became obvious that high-tech space defense systems would not be practical into the foreseeable future.).

It is not the purpose to debate SDI feasibility here. (The military-scientific community has been split for years on this issue, which in effect says that we still don't know enough to decide on this issue.) Far more meaningful would be to make two salient observations.

First, the SDI program is now almost a decade old with no system deployed so far. Nor is it likely that anything will emerge during this decade for technical and political reasons. Most important are the political ones, where those who regard SDI in the same ideological vein as civil defense continue to exert huge influence on the government and the media and the practical fact of the matter that we are forbidden by treaty (the ABM treaty of 1972) from realistically testing ABM weapons. The Clinton administration has declared itself in favor of staying with the treaty, which practically guarantees that such testing will not be conducted, and to make any deployment decision in the absence of exhaustive (and enormously expensive) testing would be irresponsible to the

extreme. Reagan may have had the best of intentions for SDI but as the saying goes "the road to hell is paved with good intentions" and in the context of current and projected politics it may be a cold day in hell before any approach to SDI emerges as an effective defense system. And even if this were to happen, SDI by itself doesn't even begin to deal with delivery of mass destruction weapons by aircraft, ships, saboteurs, terrorists, etc. So here we are, tens of billions of dollars having been spent and billions more being spent each year, with little to show or expect.

Second, despite the high moral ground President Reagan took in announcing the SDI program ("Isn't it better to save lives than to take them?"), by no means has the U.S. been taking a truly moral approach in its SDI program. From the very beginning it was decided that any SDI system to be deployed would be based on non-nuclear kill mechanisms. For reasons again having to do with the nuclear mythology which has determined our security policies, we have deliberately deprived ourselves of what could be by far and away the most, if not the only, effective SDI system that might be developed. On the very face of it, this decision has been ludicrous at best: Why do we find it so compelling to destroy an incoming megaton warhead with a defensive mechanism whose energy release may be millions-fold less, simply because it is non-nuclear? (David may have slain Goliath with a stone from a sling, but would he have refrained from using a mini-nuclear warhead had such weapons existed in Biblical times?) Worse yet, it can be argued, to refrain from using nuclear defensive weapons can be construed as grossly immoral. What is more moral: Shooting down a megaton hydrogen warhead, which might result in millions of American lives being taken, with a kiloton nuclear warhead (the most apropos being a neutron warhead, which 20 years ago we actually developed for the Sprint ABM anti-missile system) or needlessly risking lives by employing non-nuclear defensive technologies of far less effectiveness and certainly far greater cost, which may amount to tens of billions of dollars. (All the evidence to date indicates the Soviets many years ago developed a simple nuclear ABM system based on advanced surface-to-air missiles. There is no reason to believe that they have followed the U.S. example and plan to replace this system with a non-nuclear one. Unlike the U.S., the Soviets, in their official military doctrine, have never placed a moral stigma on the use of nuclear weapons. To the contrary, they have regarded nuclear weapon use far more along Just War lines than has the U.S., with emphasis on preserving society to meet political ends rather than irrationally destroying it or allowing it to be destroyed.

In the real world of limited U.S. defense budgets, which are likely to decrease substantially in the years ahead, in the best interests of American survival in a world where the threat of weapons of mass destruction will remain with us, the time has come to finally provide the American people with a defense we know can work and can readily afford. For the reasons given here, the decision should be made to establish a national civil defense system, which most Americans have wanted and which practically guarantees far greater protection at far less cost than might result from pursuing non-nuclear missile defense weapons. As for the funding, although it can be argued that any number of U.S. military forces can be reduced to provide funding for civil defense, the realities of the defense budget being what they are (not very realistic or rational, but still political realities) the monies required should be taken from the SDI budget, which should be reduced to pre-SDI levels and remain there until our anti-nuclear policies change - if they ever do.

At the same time, to further reduce casualties from mass destruction weapons, we should reestablish a nation-wide air defense system which can be highly effective in dealing with airborne threats. This can be accomplished most expeditiously and cheaply by bringing home our air defense weapons we have dispersed around the world to protect allies, rather than Americans, from attack. (Still another example of the strange morality underlying U.S. military policy.)

Can these changes in our defense policy and posture be effected within a reasonable period of time? Past experience would say no, but the present U.S. disillusionment with the government and its policies, as indicated by the recent national elections, offers some hope that a U.S. populace, becoming aware of the facts regarding their survival, might sufficiently affect worried politicians to produce some results. We'll never know unless we try and never has the time been better for trying.

DDP and TACDA MEETINGS

The annual meeting of Doctors for Disaster Preparedness, DDP, will be held in San Francisco, California during the weekend of August 13-15. Application for attendance can be made by writing to DDP, 1601 N. Tucson Ave. Suite 9, Tucson, AZ 85716. This meeting will feature an outstanding group of speakers on the subject of civil defense and related subjects. DDP meetings in recent years have featured very outstanding groups of speakers and participants. They have been both stimulating and informative.

Moreover, DDP does more than just write about civil defense. DDP members and leadership have been active in community education work and in efforts to promote civil defense at the national level. The mobile shelter display built by Fighting Chance for the State of Arizona has been widely used by DDP - most recently in Phoenix at the Maricopa County Fair. The DDP meeting this year is being organized by DDP President, Dr. Howard Maccabee. The children and I will participate in this DDP meeting in San Francisco and look forward to visiting with those of you who are able to attend.

Speakers who are already scheduled for the meeting are Edward Teller, father of the hydrogen bomb; Petr Beckmann, America's foremost advocate of nuclear power; Lowell Wood, director of the project that produced the "brilliant pebble" strategic defense device and expert on manned exploration of the planets; Hugh Ellsaesser, a prominent climatologist; Aaron Wildavsky, an expert on risk assessment; Donald Chev, an expert on earthquakes; Jerry Kaplan, an expert on medical response to disastrous fires; Sharon Packer, an expert in grass roots organization of community civil defense; Jane Orient speaking about the dangers of the Clinton program for socialized medicine, and Art Robinson, speaking about pseudoenvironmentalist threats with special emphasis on myths about carbon dioxide.

This meeting includes a formal agenda of presentations by the speakers. It also follows a format that is conducive to substantial and productive discussions between all of the speakers and attendees. In addition to the speeches, luncheons, dinner, and discussions, the meeting will feature a tour of the Lawrence Livermore Radiation Laboratory during the afternoon of August 13. Formal speeches - each 40 minutes long with an additional 15 minute discussion period - will begin the morning of August 14.

In addition to the annual DDP meeting, the annual meeting of The American Civil Defense Association, TACDA, will be held October 10-13 at the Le Baron Hotel in Colorado Springs, Colorado. We suggest that you write to TACDA, P.O. Box 910, Starke, FL 32091 for a program and application form. Many civil defense advocates participate in both the DDP and TACDA meetings. Both meetings are quite worthwhile. If you have time and resources to attend just one meeting, then we suggest the DDP meeting in San Francisco. If you attend both the DDP meeting and the TACDA meeting, then you will have participated in all such events that will be held this year in the United States.

Fighting Chance does not have an annual meeting. We do have several shelter displays here in Oregon, and we built the Federal and State shelter displays that are used in various parts of the United States. Many people have come to visit our displays here in Oregon and to learn about civil defense. We welcome these visits which constitute a continuing seminar in civil defense for American families. You are welcome at any time, but it is best to give us a day or two notice when possible. DDP, TACDA, and Fighting Chance are the three primary groups working for civil defense in the United States. Each of these groups requires public support to continue with their work. All three are non-profit public foundations, so donations to them are fully tax-deductible.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION

Most Americans are environmentalists. They are concerned about the optimization of their own environments. They are careful to avoid actions that are harmful to the environments of others.

There are some people who toss litter from their automobile windows, but they are a small group. There are people who knowingly pollute streams, wantonly destroy irreplaceable natural resources, set forest fires, and engage in other types of anti-environmental behavior, but the number of such people is very small indeed. They have no support whatever from most Americans.

There is also a small group of people who are pseudoenvironmentalists. They pose as champions of the environment in order to further their own personal agendas. Actually, their actions are harmful to the overall environment of our country.

The pseudoenvironmentalists include not only the leadership and employees of some "non-profit" organizations that are in the "environmentalism" business, but also some businessmen who promote pseudoenvironmentalist causes that they believe will enhance the profitability of their own businesses. There is even a growing profession of "environmentalist executives" who occupy positions in corporations for the purpose of making the businesses look environmentally responsible. These executives promote all sorts of environmentally harmful projects in the name of public relations.

They promote, for example, paper recycling and generate advertising campaigns that promote their companies as being at the forefront of conservation efforts through their paper recycling programs. In fact, the proper way to recycle paper is simply to burn it. This turns the paper back into carbon dioxide. The carbon dioxide is then utilized by trees to make more wood. The wood is then manufactured into high quality paper. Where air quality is a problem, the burning needs to be carried out under conditions of nearly complete combustion, so that very little smoke will be produced.

The wrong way to recycle paper is to gather old paper in great piles; bale it with expensive machines and labor; transport it with trucks and trains that use large amounts of fuel; and then combine it with expensive chemicals in specialized manufacturing facilities that turn it into poor quality, second-hand paper. This is a high-cost, wasteful procedure. It is carried out only for the political purpose of convincing uninformed Americans that something "environmentally conscious" is being done.

I recall a conversation with the president of a company specializing in the disposal of radioactive waste. I told him about some conclusions another scientist and I had reached about radioactive waste disposal.

This waste is dangerous only if it remains concentrated in discrete locations. A disposal site for radioactive waste is a dangerous place unless a great many expensive precautions are taken. The site remains dangerous for a very long time. Why are people putting this waste in such concentrated locations? Radioactivity is all around us. If the waste were properly dispersed, then it would be no danger at all.

For example, we carried out some calculations showing that if all radioactive waste were properly pulverized and dissolved and then dispersed widely in the oceans, its presence there would be virtually undetectable. Slight variations in isotopic composition and the availability of sensitive measuring methods would allow its detection. The level of background radiation and toxic materials in the oceans would be, however, entirely unaffected. This procedure would cost very little

compared with current procedures and would assure that radioactive materials were not stored in concentrated locations where they pose a danger and large ongoing expense.

This executive was technically trained. He stated that our suggestion was a good and sensible one and might well be the best way to approach this problem. Then, however, he said, "Let me tell you why that will never be done. It will never be done, because there are now 200,000 professionals employed in the United States alone in various aspects of the radioactive waste disposal business. This industry will never permit an approach that diminishes those 200,000 jobs."

Add the opposition of this industry to the howls that would be heard from pseudoenvironmentalist organizations about "dumping waste in the oceans," and one can see that our current environmentally and economically damaging methods of waste disposal are most likely to continue.

What is wrong here? What is generally wrong is that special interests are defining the environment too narrowly. They are defining it in terms that are beneficial to their own interests. The Illinois Valley Basin of Southern Oregon in which we live serves as a good example.

We have a remarkably beautiful natural environment. The air is clean, the water pure, the forests lush, and the wildlife abundant. Most of the more than 10,000 people who live here do so, because they enjoy this natural environment. There is little industry here, and jobs are scarce. More than half of the population is retired people who have migrated here from other areas.

Rainfall averages 57 inches per year with the lowest year of this recent 10 year drought having been 44 inches. In each of two years during that drought, we received 100 inches of rain. Moreover, the temperatures are mild and the rain is concentrated on certain days and weeks and in certain seasons. Usually the weather is sunny.

The overwhelming majority of the people who live here are environmentalists. This includes our loggers, farmers, miners, and business people as well as our large retirement group. We surely do not want to change the natural beauty that we currently enjoy.

There is, however, a new industry here. It employs a handful of pseudoenvironmentalists. Networking with the national organizations they have developed a mailing list of 17,000 people throughout America to whom they send propaganda. This propaganda claims that the people who live in this valley are destroying the environment. It suggests that this destruction will continue unless donations are sent to this group to fight for the rights of our fish, forests, and streams. Well-meaning Americans, not knowing the truth, have sent hundreds of thousands of dollars to this group to save the Illinois Valley Basin and its native environment.

These pseudoenvironmentalists live quite well from the proceeds of this propaganda campaign. Ironically, they themselves have become the worst problem of environmental pollution that is faced by the people of this Valley. Our environment is all aspects of our surroundings that affect our sense of well-being and our enjoyment of life.

For example, when a couple retires and moves to an area such as this, they often buy a modest home and a few acres with the savings that they have accumulated during their working years. With a low income, they budget their future carefully with funds set aside for property taxes and other fixed expenses that they must meet. Then they arrange their lives for maximum enjoyment of their retirement years. All of these things contribute to their personal environment.

Then when political agitators start to propagandize for policies that will end logging and agriculture, diminish the local tax base, and sharply raise property taxes, the environment of that retired couple is thereby polluted. Even if the agitators have not yet been successful, they have partially spoiled life for the retired couple who now must worry each day that forces beyond their control may raise their property taxes so high that they will be forced to sell their home and abandon their retirement dream. This is a form of environmental pollution just as surely as it

would be if the agitators had been dumping garbage in the mountain stream that flows past the retired couple's home.

When a local farmer who has been planning to spend part of his summer making improvements to his farm abandons those improvements, because he hears that regulations being promoted by these agitators may make it impossible for him to farm anyway - on land that has been farmed for 150 years and with resources that have been saved by several generations of his family, the environment of that farmer has been polluted.

The farmer's love for the land and for the wildlife that is nurtured in the meadows, ponds, and streams within his farm turns to something else - its is no longer love - it is anxiety and unhappiness. This, too, is a form of environmental pollution.

The founding fathers of the United States knew about and anticipated this form of pollution. They referred to the preservation of domestic tranquility. They established a government dedicated to the preservation of political and economic liberty - to the preservation of private property and the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

These rights are not respected by pseudoenvironmentalists. They seek undeserved economic and political power over the people of the United States. The fundamental rights of the American people are an impediment to their efforts. They pose as friends of entities that cannot speak for themselves - the forests, fish, streams, plants, and animals. They are not interested in the truth about these entities. They only wish to use their own positions as self-proclaimed champions of the environment to further their own power.

I have watched as the community in which we live, the Illinois Valley Basin, comes under the same sort of pseudoenvironmentalist attack that is polluting thousands of communities across our country. In this Valley the very people who have lived in harmony with nature - the people who are responsible for the fact that our Valley remains one of the natural jewels within the United States - are being smeared continually by the paid propaganda of a pseudoenvironmentalist business that has insinuated itself into our lives.

Pseudoenvironmentalism is a new form of pollution. It has no more support in our community than do the older forms of pollution. It trades largely upon lies and misinformation. Each of us must, as responsible citizens, make an effort to help prevent this sort of environmental pollution in our communities.

On the broader basis of our whole nation, this pseudoenvironmental pollution is becoming a greater and greater problem. It is quite popular with certain elements within the new administration in Washington. They are especially interested in promoting pseudoenvironmentalist lies about carbon dioxide and the use of coal, oil, and natural gas.

In its research program on carbon dioxide, the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine is trying to do its part in gathering the truth about the biological effects of carbon dioxide. We hope that our efforts in combination with those of scientists working in other institutions will construct a shield of truth between the American people and the damaging effects of pseudoenvironmentalist lies about carbon dioxide, a new form of environmental pollution.

AMERICAN CIVIL DEFENSE PROSPECTS IN 1993

During the past seven years, Fighting Chance has initiated and carried out many projects on behalf of American civil defense. These have included books, newsletters, video tapes, legislative initiatives, public shelter displays, and other projects with two general objectives. The first objective

has been to raise the probability that the American government will provide widespread civil defense capabilities for the American people. The second objective has been to provide the best information possible to American families that want to provide civil defense protection for themselves.

Even though our work toward a national civil defense system has sometimes seemed quixotic and politically unrealistic, it has had realistic objectives and consequences. Even if no national civil defense system is built, our work raises awareness and increases the probability that useful actions may be taken in a future crisis. Also, our national work has raised awareness among individual Americans and caused some of them to take action for themselves.

In these efforts, Fighting Chance - its volunteers, donors, and supporters - has become the most effective voice on behalf of American civil defense in the United States during the seven years of its existence. At present, our work with individual families is continuing in much the same way that it has during the past few years. Government propaganda has not significantly diminished the number of Americans seeking to provide civil defense for their own families, although, compared to the population of our country, this has always been a very small group.

Propaganda about the alleged new safety of the world has had a substantial effect, however, upon our financial support. Donors are less worried and they provide fewer resources with which to work. Since we are a debt free, volunteer effort, we are able to continue. Some aspects of our work have been reduced (such as the frequency of this newsletter), and we lack the resources for new projects.

Nevertheless, we are continuing and will do so for the foreseeable future. Even if the chances of significant national action were to become entirely non-existent, we have become a source of information that is not available elsewhere. The efforts invested in our books, literature, shelter designs, video tapes, and other information continue to be valuable for many Americans. There is nowhere else that they can obtain this depth of reliable information.

Aside from this, however, are the chances of significant national action still high enough to warrant efforts at that level? Under President Reagan they certainly were. Under President Bush they decreased dramatically. Under Clinton? Does anyone really know what this administration will do next? Do they know themselves?

As far as I am able to tell so far, there is no discernible reason to believe that the Clinton administration could be induced to take any action whatever on behalf of American civil defense. Paradoxically, however, more than any administration in recent times, the Clintons are very likely to involve America in a catastrophe requiring civil defense. They appear to be promoting a combination of American weakness (both economic and military), American vulnerability, international meddling, and diplomatic unsophistication that is very dangerous indeed. Moreover, the technology to amplify the dangers from weapons of mass destruction has continued to proliferate.

I predict that in the years just ahead civil defense will proceed as follows:

1. A small number of American families will provide some protection for themselves. Some will build shelters, others will store supplies, and still others will just accumulate a few books and some knowledge that may be helpful in a crisis.

2. The American government will do nothing whatever to provide civil defense for the American people except for those bureaucrats and politicians in the "continuity of government" program - until a major crisis forces government action. The shelter program for government officials will continue to be quietly funded, because those providing the funds are those who are provided protection from the program.

3. A crisis will occur, as a result of misguided policies of the United States government, that will mandate the building of civil defense - after the crisis has occurred or begun. We can only pray

that the nature of the initiating crisis is such that American deaths are few and that an American response is possible.

4. If this crisis allows response, the past and ongoing educational work of Fighting Chance will raise the probability that a correct response is made.

5. In any case, the work that we have been fortunate to do on expedient civil defense education with the guidance and help of Cresson Kearny will be helpful to many people.

It is our job, at present, to keep alive the efforts that we have initiated. We hope that these efforts will not be necessary. I have little hope that we shall be so fortunate.

HEALTH REFORM

The Clintons, with homosexuality and abortion firmly entrenched in their administration, are now bringing their political prowess to bear on the American health care system. We can expect their program, if enacted, to bring higher taxes, poorer health care, and euthanasia by default to many older Americans who will be ultimately deprived of access to the best medical care. In a planning effort that has taken over two floors of the Executive Office Building and employs 500 planners working under the direction of the unelected and unappointed Mrs. Clinton, the health care for all Americans is being revised in entirely secret sessions.

The American Association of Physicians and Surgeons, AAPS, under the leadership of its Executive Director, Dr. Jane Orient, filed suit against this secret process. The Federal Court ruled against the Clintons and in favor of AAPS. As a result, the Clintons were forced to hold a public meeting on health care reform. The meeting was presided over by the Clintons' Vice-President and several members of the Clintons' cabinet. Each speaker at the meeting was allowed a 3-minute statement. The Clintons demanded that written copies of the statements be submitted to them in advance.

In order to preserve her opportunity to speak and to avoid censorship, Dr. Orient submitted an innocuous written statement - but then said what she really wanted to say at the meeting with the television cameras rolling. This was an unwelcome surprise to federal planners. Dr. Orient's statement at that meeting, which is reprinted below, has received very wide acclaim in the national press. Dr. Orient has worked actively for many years on behalf of American Civil Defense. At the DDP meeting in San Francisco August 13-15, there will be an opportunity to hear her speak.

She advocates a medical savings account program and more emphasis on catastrophic health insurance - all paid for by individual free-market transactions. She opposes a "basic benefits package" dictated by government in which Americans are forced to use their money only for that medical care dictated by Washington bureaucrats. In short, she advocates freedom; she opposes fascism.

STATEMENT OF JANE M. ORIENT, M.D., ON BEHALF OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS BEFORE THE WHITE HOUSE TASK FORCE ON HEALTH CARE REFORM, GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 29, 1993:

"I am Jane Orient, Executive Director of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons and one of 50 Past Presidents. I am in the solo practice of private medicine in Tucson, AZ. I speak as a physician who is bound by the Oath of Hippocrates. By my Oath, I must refrain from doing harm to my patients, and I must abstain from mischief and corruption. I may not promise my patient a three-minute remedy and then give her a deadly potion. Furthermore, I must follow that method of treatment which according to my ability and judgment I consider for the benefit of my patients. I may not subordinate my judgment to that of a secret council. I may not sacrifice my patient's welfare to a social

agenda. I may not deny my patient a cancer treatment or heart surgery, so that his resources can be used to benefit someone with a higher social priority, such as a person who is entitled to a free checkup.

I want the best medical care for my patients and for all Americans. We cannot provide the best until we get the cost down. We will not lower costs by abolishing the Oath of Hippocrates and destroying the patient-physician relationship. The Oath of Hippocrates dates to the fifth century B.C.; the acceleration of American medical costs dates to 1965.

Costs skyrocketed because the government got into medicine. Costs will not decrease until we get the government out of medicine; out of private physicians offices, where regulations are driving physicians out of business, especially in rural areas and inner cities; out of hospitals, where compliance costs add a huge administrative overhead; out of the pharmaceutical industry, where government adds \$250 million to the cost of marketing a single new drug; out of the medical marketplace, where government intervention has destroyed the normal economic mechanisms that keep costs reasonable in a free market. We need to bring patients back into the financial equation.

We must allow patients to benefit from their prudent spending and saving decisions. All Americans should be permitted to use pre-tax dollars to establish a medical savings account. To preserve excellence in American medicine, we must preserve patients' freedom of choice not turn it into the sham of picking Monolith A or Monolith B, both offering the same government-dictated benefits package. If the government forces us all into a bureaucratically managed system, we will still have something called "health care," delivered by persons called "health care providers." But such a system will have no place for ethical physicians, whose Oath forbids them to accept a situation of conflict of interest with their patients.

Government bureaucracy has never controlled costs. The promise of universal access to comprehensive service under a global budget and government rules is, in a word, bankrupt. Government officials do not take an oath to do no harm. What a government system can accomplish is to destroy the art and science of medicine in these United States of America.

CARBON DIOXIDE

The carbon dioxide experiments are under way. For four months, beginning in late October, virtually all of our time was utilized in the building of the laboratory and equipment and in starting the work. Many people, in addition to the children and I, helped with the work. The Manly Foundation provided funds to begin construction of a laboratory here for the continuation of our work on metabolic profiling. Although the carbon dioxide lab room itself was separately funded, the integration of this lab into the profiling lab provided it with essential support facilities and common areas. Therefore this Manly Foundation help has been essential to the high quality research effort on carbon dioxide that we now have in progress.

Our friends from the Midwest, who built the Chapel described in an earlier issue of this newsletter, came here on three separate trips to provide most of the construction work on the lab. They did a truly remarkable job. With their usual flair for the impossible, they converted a large hay storage and farm implement area into a research facility of exceptionally high quality. The example these people set in their Christian ministry of work and example is one that few of us could equal. It sets a standard that we can aspire to reach.

Funds for the required research equipment came from donations to the Institute primarily by individuals who are recipients of this newsletter. These were largely in response to our fall 1992 issue entitled "Global Lies." Where possible we have built the equipment ourselves. Parts for this

equipment and some sophisticated electronics and analytical equipment, however, required purchase. These donations made this possible. We also received some special technical help from friends with particular skills, and we have been generously helped by carbon dioxide research scientists in other institutions who have shared their expertise with us. These experiments will require about three years for completion. It is possible that, during that time, we will have some interesting preliminary results.

Beginning in January, we received a six month loan from LI-COR corporation of a sophisticated carbon dioxide analyzer that they manufacture. This analyzer is essential to the atmospheric control system in the chambers. LI-COR has also given us essential technical help. We were very fortunate in April to receive a special donation that has allowed us to purchase this analyzer and a monitoring analyzer, so that we will be able to carry on the work over the necessary three year period.

As an aside, I would like to share with you a very unusual text that is published by LI-COR. There is a small engineering company in Lincoln, Nebraska that markets specialized equipment for use primarily in research. Last November they began to market an excellent DNA sequencer that they have developed over an eight year period and at substantial financial risk. This Model 4000 sequencer sells for about \$75,000. The market for this machine is the research world in which secular humanism and political correctness have gained an unfortunate (and I hope temporary) influence during recent years. In this world, with a product essential to the health of their company, LI-COR must compete with every means at their disposal. Political incorrectness is not deemed desirable.

I was astonished and delighted to see, therefore, on the technical specifications page of their Model 4000 DNA Sequencer, a declaration that I have never seen in any form from any other company during my thirty year research career. In bold face print, it reads:

"The Model 4000 DNA Sequencer represents over 8 years of development. From the very beginning it was a faith project. Many of us at LI-COR are Christians and the Model 4000 is the result of much prayer. We wish to give credit to God for any accomplishments and not take credit ourselves."

This thought is much the same as ours concerning any outcome that we are able to obtain in the carbon dioxide experiments. In fact, we have received so much help in this and in our civil defense work that I sometimes feel more like an observer here than an essential participant. Starting the carbon dioxide work, although it has required more resources and work than most other projects we have done in the last few years, has been typical.

First, we were provided with this opportunity for work. While starting the work, resources and volunteers accumulated toward its progress. Then, as we proceeded, it became obvious that we had received too much help to back out, but not enough help to go forward to a successful conclusion. Each time (and there were several), however, that it looked as though we would fail, something would happen to allow us to continue. At present, the lab is built and functioning. We do not have the resources necessary to pay for the electricity, food, carbon dioxide, and other ongoing expenses during the coming months and years. If the past is a guide, however, these resources will be provided.

The laboratory consists of a 900 square foot, temperature controlled room that is clean and well-lighted with lights that cycle from day to night over the experimental chambers. The chambers consist of four rooms within the large room. These chambers have transparent plastic walls (the plastic was donated by ICI Corporation) and are about 110 square feet each. Each chamber is held at a different carbon dioxide level by a computerized laboratory automation system that the children and I constructed.

The computer, by means of attached valves, switches, and analyzer, is continuously measuring the carbon dioxide levels in the chambers and adjusting the flow of carbon dioxide into each chamber in order to keep it at the desired level. Fresh air is continuously pumped into each of the chambers. There are numerous small aspects of the system that are essential to its operation. For example, a pressure transducer (donated by Motorola) corrects for atmospheric pressure changes in the analysis system. Humidity measurements in the chambers verify the air flow and temperature consistency between them. A back-up battery power system assures operation for several hours in case of power failure. This allows us time to start a farm diesel generator in case of long outages which are common here during winter months.

It is entertaining to watch the natural cycles of the Northwestern forest that surrounds our home on our laboratory instruments. Since we are continuously monitoring carbon dioxide and water concentrations in the fresh air supply, we see this quite clearly. At this season, for example, carbon dioxide levels fall below 350 parts per million, PPM, during the day while the trees and other plants are engaged in photosynthesis. At night, levels rise over 420 PPM as the plants produce carbon dioxide as a metabolic product, but are not using it in photosynthesis. In fact, during the day, when clouds pass over the farm, we can see the carbon dioxide rise as photosynthesis outside slows down.

We are still working to complete two additions for the experiment. First, the automation is dependent upon so many parts that some are certain to fail over the long period of the experiments. We are, therefore, building an independent analysis system that will continuously watch the chambers and sound an alarm if anything goes wrong. The monitor system also serves as a source of spare parts for repair of the control system. In addition, we are building a carbon dioxide absorbing system for one of the chambers. This chamber is being held at ambient conditions with the air composition identical to the outside air. Since the animals in the chamber are producing carbon dioxide, their presence raises this level. We must absorb this carbon dioxide in a carefully controlled way in order to correct the level in the chamber.

We would like, of course, to use a carbon dioxide absorber like those that are used in sealed civil defense shelters. Unfortunately, these are far too costly for us to afford. We are, therefore, developing a homemade version. When this is finished, it may also provide a low cost alternative for family civil defense shelters.

At present, our chambers contain about 120 experimental mice. This will rise to about 200 mice after we complete the monitoring and carbon dioxide absorption machinery. We will also be adding two other species - one of flies and one of worms - during the course of the work. These three types of animals and the particular species have been selected, because they are very widely used in research laboratories throughout the world. By using the same species, our results are more easily understood by scientists elsewhere and more easily related to their own work.

The primary unanswered question to which these experiments are addressed is this: Do individual animals live more healthful and longer lives as a function of the carbon dioxide concentration that they breathe? We know that the burning of coal, oil, and natural gas has transferred below ground carbon, through carbon dioxide, into the carbon in the tissues of plants and animals. For this reason, plants, especially trees, are growing more rapidly and more abundantly throughout the world. As plants increase, so do animals. Therefore, the plant and animal population of the world has increased as a result of man's use of coal, oil, and natural gas.

That there are more animals, however, does not mean that each individual animal has a better life. Since human biochemistry is closely similar to that of animals, the quality of our life is a question, too. Experiments have proven that individual plants do better in relatively higher carbon dioxide concentrations as compared with those present on the earth today. Plants should be especially sensitive, since they use carbon dioxide in photosynthesis. Is man better off in higher concentrations of carbon dioxide, too? This, ultimately, is a question that must be answered.

Political agitators, in a world wide effort, are trying to convince people to allow them control over carbon dioxide with the claim that it is a dangerous substance that will cause "global warming." They want to control it, in reality, because virtually all human activity, including breathing, produces carbon dioxide. Control of carbon dioxide would give them enormous power over the freedom and activities of all people.

The problem for them is that their effort is not based on the truth. It is based upon a lie. First, carbon dioxide will not cause "global warming." Second, carbon dioxide has many benefits - especially its role in the increasing abundance of the earth's plant and animal populations. As a result, this gaggle of international elitists (including one who is now Vice-President of the United States) is making a concerted effort to suppress the truth of research findings about carbon dioxide - especially the large amount of research work that demonstrates its role in increasing the health and abundance of trees and agricultural crops.

This carbon dioxide fraud is probably the most extensive and most dangerous pseudoscientific, pseudoenvironmentalist attack that has yet been made upon the minds, freedom, and quality of life of the people of the United States. This fraud cannot be fought by rhetoric and publicity alone. It must also be fought with the best research facts that can be gathered through good experimental work.

We have identified one important question in this field of research that can be answered with the minimal resources available to us. We hope, through this work, to contribute to useful knowledge. Depending upon the outcome of the experiments, we may also learn something of value about the optimization of human health. We are proceeding according to highest scientific standards and will publish our ultimate results in the usual scientific journals.

Last week, however, we received advice about another way to proceed. Although we shall not do this, you may be interested in this proposal that came from a great American patriot who has devoted his life to the defense of the United States and has come to understand the ways in which our government fails to work: Sam Cohen - the inventor of the neutron bomb and co-developer of many defensive and tactical nuclear weapons.

Sam Cohen, during a visit here last week, proposed that we immediately release a (false) report that the preliminary results of our work indicate that carbon dioxide is very dangerous to human health and that all efforts should immediately be made to reduce production of this harmful substance. This would immediately make us popular with the global-government-and-controls people. We would receive nationwide and worldwide publicity, and we could easily obtain a virtually unlimited amount of money to finance our work. No more would we need to slowly cobble together our experiments as volunteers with almost no resources.

Instead, with virtually unlimited budgets, we could hire others to build and operate the fanciest machinery imaginable. We could spend our time on the talk shows and at international conferences. As our prestige and reputation in the media grew and our laboratory expanded, we would become major figures in the debate about carbon dioxide. Then - at the right moment and before we could be stopped - we would announce from our artificially exalted position that our further research indicated the opposite of our initial conclusions. Carbon dioxide is beneficial after all.

It is not always possible to tell when Sam Cohen is kidding. On the other side of the smoke cloud of his cigar, sits a brain that has great experience with the factors that have stood between the American people and a proper foreign policy and technological defense in the nuclear age. He has found ways, throughout the nuclear age that he helped initiate, to help our government in spite of itself. Where else can you find a man who has received international recognition for his humanitarian work for world peace during which he has often advocated first use of nuclear devices in selected circumstances. In any case, we shall not be adopting Sam's suggestion. We are hopeful that we shall be able to make a useful contribution anyway.