Media Mishmash

The February 11th issue of the weekly newspaper National Enquirer (largest circulation in the United States—slant: gossip) carried a story panning the DCPA shelter program. In it, Dr. Conrad V. Chester, Chief of Health Physics' Emergency Technology Section of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, was quoted as to show him to be in opposition.

Nuclear-Warfare Experts Charge . . .

U.S. Wastes $5 Million a Year
Looking for A-Bomb Shelters

The United States spends $5 million a year looking for fallout shelters, cold-war relics that will probably never be used—and if used, would offer little or no protection.

The money is being spent by 200 Defense Dept. engineers whose job is to scour the country, inspecting buildings suitable for use as shelters in case of nuclear attack. But, say knowledgeable congressmen and nuclear-warfare experts polled by The ENQUIRER, the shelter program is a decade out of step with the realities of world politics.

"The program isn't doing any good," said Dr. Conrad V. Chester of the Oak Ridge National Laboratories in Tennessee, where scientists and statisticians monitor chances of survival among the world's superpowers. "Even if an attack did come and the American public had a three-day warning, the half of us would be wiped out in the first mass attack. Nearly 50 percent of those left would die soon after from radiation."

Sen. Vance Hartke (D-Ind.) called the whole shelter program to be nonexistent. "Once," said Hartke, "the threat of nuclear attack appeared to be very real. But today, it is an absurd ineffectiveness to protect its citizens."

Said Chester in a letter to the Enquirer's editor:
"Remarks are attributed to me which are taken completely out of context and totally misrepresent my position on the U.S. Civil Defense program. You have used my assertion that the present program is inadequately funded as an argument to further cut the funding. The United States must have a program of comparable effectiveness to protect its citizens."

"I believe you do a grave disservice to this country by publishing misleading half-truths that endanger our Civil Defense program. "If you want a sensational story, investigate the relative sizes of the U.S. and Soviet budgets devoted to protecting citizens from the dangers of nuclear war."
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The new training year for Soviet Civil Defense is now underway. Its goals have been specifically outlined by Col. Gen. A. Altunin, Soviet CD Director:

"The security of the country is insured by the Soviet Armed Forces, our country's reliable shield. But as was noted by Marshal of the Soviet Union A. A. Grechko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Minister of Defense, in his just-published book VOORUZHENNYE SYL SYOVETSKOGO GOSUDARSTVA [The Armed Forces of the Soviet State], the nature of modern warfare makes it necessary to organize reliable defense not only of particular installations, as was done during the last war, but also to have a carefully thought-out and organized system of measures to insure stable operation of the entire national economy and reliable defense of the population over the entire territory of the country.

"Civil defense, which today is a factor of strategic importance in insuring the vital activity of the state, plays a special part in fulfilling this mission."

The main effort in 1975 appears to emphasize "site exercises." These are described as comprehensive defensive exercises on the sites of various Soviet enterprises with participation by the entire population living in the area. The exercises are to be held in especially designed training facilities which have the capabilities necessary to simulate realistic emergency situations. The intent of this effort is clear. The Russians are determined that every Soviet citizen be familiar with the ways and means of protecting himself from the effects of nuclear war.

We know that the Soviet enterprises (factories, collective farms, department stores, etc.) have long had well organized CD formations and teams headed by CD chiefs with various subordinates assigned particular duties, and that all cities have CD headquarters for directing CD activities. These people have received education and specialized instruction on a continuing basis over many years and are reported to be well versed in skills necessary to perform effectively in emergency situations. However, it has been recognized that, for the proper execution of the defense plans, the entire population must be trained to react in a well organized, orderly manner when signals are given. Altunin frankly states

"A significant share of the production and office workers at enterprises have been left on the sidelines and have not reinforced their knowledge and skills at exercises. The nonworking population (housewives, pensioners) has only studied theoretically, on the basis of pamphlets, and in a number of places they have not been trained at all."

The "site exercises" are apparently to be very realistic simulations of conditions of war and are to include:

1. Assembly of command personnel and formations for readying defensive structures, building shelters, and issuing protective gear, firefighting equipment, and medical supplies;

*Research sponsored by the U.S. Energy Research & Development Administration under contract with Union Carbide Corporation.
Organizing dispersal of workers and evacuation of their families; and

Organizing rescue and restoration work, taking shelter, performing reconnaissance and decontamination work, etc.

A number of collectives have already conducted such drills involving their entire population, and descriptions of these performances are being held up to other areas as examples of what can be accomplished. Those particularly praised in the Soviet media have been the Khabarovsky Prommash Plant (the city of Khabarovsky has a population of 437,000), Voronezh Forge and Press Equipment Plant named for Kalinin (Kalinin’s population - 345,000) and Molodechnenskiy Rayon (Molodechno’s population - 50,000).

An article published recently points out many benefits arising from this practical training program:

"In this way the comprehensive exercise at the site combines general and particular goals with due regard for the leadership, command, and rank-and-file personnel participating, and the purpose and special features of the missions being performed. Thus, for example, particular goals are set for training the command post of the combat team, the reconnaissance, rescue, medical, and other formations. The general training goal is to prepare the site as a whole, as a single unified organism, to carry out all defensive measures skillfully, rapidly, and effectively and to test the realism of the civil defense plan."

A great deal of planning and organization is to be expected since the exercises can continue for up to 3 days. It is being stressed, however, that schedules should be worked out in such a way as to avoid involving the entire collective of the enterprise and all its formations at one time. In fact, it is recommended that really large plants formulate their plans in minute detail and hold a "site exercise" once every three years. In the meantime, practical exercises and drills and special training classes are to be held with various groups in order to prepare them for the forthcoming exercise. Nevertheless, it seems that the USSR Ministry of Defense expects to see demonstrations of this kind at the site of every Soviet enterprise during the 1975 training year.

---

"In the course of the site exercise it is possible to do a great deal of useful and necessary work for the site: above all, building and installing more equipment in defensive structures [primarily rushing the completion of construction on defensive structures envisioned by the national economic plan], laying and repairing municipal power grids and communications lines, tearing down dilapidated structures, digging out foundation pits for defensive structures, and so on.

---

Editor, The American Journal of Civil Defense:

What is your "$10 Club"? I have heard of it through the grape vine, and it may be that others would be interested in helping you put out the word on our exasperating civil defense problems.
And keep up the good work!

---

Reply: Thanks. You give us the opportunity of making a little plug we’ve been considering with some trepidation. The "$10 Club" was meant to help save Survive from extinction — and with further development it may do just that. It is based on the theory that $10 a month is a sum some of us can afford for a real conviction (although set amounts and schedules are not really intended). Some of those who now contribute are:

John E. Bex (Director, DCPA-Region II)
Herbert W. Johnson (Florida Civil Defense Director)
Karl Lundgren (Retired — Sunland Training Center)
Clifford A. Lyle (Retired — US Dept. of Agriculture)
Walter Murphey (Editor, Survive)
Evar P. Peterson (Long Beach, Ca. CD Director)
Eugene P. Wigner (Rockefeller University)
Frank Williams (Florida Legislator)

There are a few more whose names we are not at liberty to use. Supporters of Survive and an improved American civil defense program — who feel inclined to do so and whose finances permit it — are invited to join the "$10 Club" on a basis convenient to them. Contributions [tax deductible] may be sent to Carolyn Hayes, Business Manager, Survive, P. O. Box 910, Starke, FL 32091. You’ll receive our heartfelt thanks for helping to keep us fighting.

Well, that’s our pitch. Thanks to all.
This veteran — who gives an account of the shelter he built for his family — has elected to remain anonymous so that he won't be the butt of news stories.

It is curious to note that the news media, while indeed heaping ridicule on citizen shelter builders, do not turn their scorn on those who sink billions of dollars into protected installations for the survival of political, industrial and military personnel and their trappings. Neither do they take to task the Soviet Union, China, Sweden, Switzerland and other public safety-conscious countries for insisting that their peoples — all of them — be provided with A-1 shelters against the weapons of modern war.

Why?
Is it that the American citizen is not worth the trouble?

WHO SAYS HOME SHELTERS ARE OUT?
— Anonymous

On the 10th of June 1972 I finally took the big step that had been on my mind for more than ten years. It had been impossible to start prior to that time because of duty in the Air Force, and, therefore, a lack of a permanent home.

On that date I made a deposit of $50 on an old, unwanted but undamaged 22,000-pound prefabricated, reinforced concrete bomb shelter. The shelter was only one of a dozen that had been sitting around in a building contractor's yard since 1961. It had required two months of diligent searching to locate the basic portion of what has now become our family bomb shelter, wine cellar, cool storage area and conversation piece — but it was worth every minute and cent spent on it.

The total cost of the 8-ft. high x 8-ft. wide x 10-ft. long prefab was only $262.50 including state tax, or a little more than 1¢ per pound. That had to have been the best bargain per pound that either my wife or I have ever purchased!

After drawing up plans for the entire project, including the hole into which I intended the shelter to be placed I obtained a building permit from the county in which we reside. In addition to the prefabricated shelter my plans included a baffled entrance-stairwell-stor-
At this time I laid out the foundation for the adjacent structure — the entrance well that would accommodate the stairs, and a radiation buffer wall, leading down to the prefab. The entrance well, when completed, measured 8-ft. high x 8-ft. 8-inches wide x 12-ft. long (a little longer than the prefab itself) and included an additional elongated shelter room plus space for a portable toilet. The basic construction design was adapted from various civil defense pamphlets that I had accumulated through city and county agencies. Total length of the shelter with the entrance-storage section joined to the prefab section is 22 feet.

Our particular shelter contains a great deal more reinforcing bars than generally called for in civil defense plans, but that was purely a matter of my own personal preference. The ceiling is constructed of 6-inch thick reinforced concrete with the rebar on 6-inch centers. Construction of the ceiling involved plywood being held up by horizontal 2-inch by 6-inch wooden beams on vertical 4-inch x 4-inch wooden uprights and the concrete being poured onto the plywood. After the concrete was allowed to dry for about one month the plywood, beams, etc. were all torn out and disposed of. This part of the project was very interesting to an amateur such as myself, but should not scare off anyone that is conscientious and willing to ask questions when in doubt about the ability of materials to hold heavy loads.

Incidentally, I was amazed at the willingness of both county and private engineers to offer technical assistance without cost or obligation. People with engineering backgrounds seem to have a vastly greater appreciation of the practicality of blast and fallout shelters than do those in other fields.

After completing the ceiling, I continued upward with concrete blocks around the stairwell to ground level. As with the prefab, all of the compartment that I constructed was also covered with consecutive layers each of cold tar and tar paper. Dirt fill was then dumped over the entire project, except of course the entrance. The dirt fill back up to ground level provides the real protection against blast, heat, and fallout, and so it is important that it contains no materials such as leaves, trash, etc.

The entire construction of the shelter, including installing a 1/4-inch steel door, required about two years to complete. Two men working together could undoubtedly do the same job in considerably less than one year even if they were both amateurs like myself. If the entrance chamber was cut down to one utilizing a steel ladder, I see no reason why the same two amateurs couldn’t produce a very acceptable shelter in a matter of a couple of months.
I am now leisurely working on the interior installing shelves, lights, wine bottle racks, etc. I have had no difficulties with condensation or other moisture problems. One of the earliest equipment installations was an air blower utilizing electric or hand power, but I have never had to use it except to demonstrate its operation. This is not to say that I do not feel that an air blower is necessary. It would be vital in a true emergency. By utilizing a wrought-iron gate that does not block air flow, and leaving the solid steel door open, I have eliminated moisture problems to date.

In the course of my travels involving this project I have talked with many people concerning subjects ranging through the entire spectrum of civil defense. Most people thought that the shelter was a very good idea. Only one, at the time of the purchase of the prefab and while it was still sitting above ground in the construction yard, stated that it wouldn't do any good in case of a major war. Since it has been installed under three feet of dirt and grassed over, no one entering it seems to be at all skeptical about the value of it. The only doubts expressed concern their lack of knowledge as to just what nuclear weapons can do and their lack of knowledge as to what they can or should do in case a nuclear war begins.

I have been pleasantly surprised to learn of the existence of four other operational private home shelters in my immediate vicinity. If I have located that many I can assure you that there must be several times that number in the area. It has been only after I mention my shelter that anyone has volunteered information about theirs.

My desire to remain anonymous is based entirely upon observation of a large segment of our "patriotic" news media and their ability to ridicule anyone that does not follow their line of thinking. I hope that my experiences in providing protection for my family will be of benefit to others, but I am not interested in "running the gauntlet" for the financial betterment of unscrupulous newsmen.
Veteran Defense Civil Protection Agency-Region Two Director John E. Bex is an old hand at dealing with disaster. In 1972 he helped pull the Mid-Atlantic states through the agony of Hurricane Agnes. In this article he examines the curious compulsion of disaster victims to ignore the lessons of disaster and to expose themselves repeatedly to avoidable danger.

DISASTER AMNESIA

— John E. Bex

After centuries of experience with disaster we still don’t act rationally in dealing with them. We don’t learn from disaster history. It’s still the absurd old story of “too little too late.”

Often only a bit of forethought and effort could clearly have prevented great loss of life, suffering, and property damage. The human race seems to suffer from a grand collective amnesia in regard to disasters, so that the same mistakes are repeated, often within the time span of a single generation — or less.

Why is this? Pessimistic conclusions about mankind and its capabilities are easy to make, just as similar cynical remarks about individuals are easily made. They are probably unjustified in the deepest historical sense. Mankind has made immense progress in many respects and shows itself capable of facing and solving other important problems. And the problem of disaster is preeminently a soluble problem. In any event, irrespective of one’s attitude, the problem itself remains with us.

An important fact about disasters is that they are for modern nations in modern times actually rare events insofar as particular individuals are concerned. For any individual or even any city or small region a disaster, like a major flood or tornado or earthquake or explosion, is more often than not a once-in-a-lifetime sort of happening. To a statistician or historian looking at an entire nation or continent, there is indeed a regularity, a cycle, an inevitability about almost every type of classic disaster. The individual doesn’t normally grasp this scheme of repetition.

There is then a psychological peculiarity in contemplating the risks of rare events that gives all of us a sort of irrational inertia. To illustrate this, let us suppose the bizarre case of an “execution lottery.” In this situation a person is offered a prize of say $50 if he will allow his head to be placed under a guillotine and chopped off if he loses. Now the chances in his favor of winning the $50 rather than being executed may be made very large, say a million to one. Still I believe that the average person, in his ordinary frame of mind, would tend to reject this offer flatly. And he would probably continue to do so even if the odds in his favor were made much larger, even a billion to one. We simply do not weigh death and $50 on the same scale.

So, let’s attempt a somewhat deeper analysis:

There seems to be something peculiar to the problem of disaster which has made mankind strangely backward in facing up to it. Of course, disasters are the horrendous sort of thing which people would much prefer to avoid thinking about altogether. (The refusal to take protective measures against nuclear attack possibilities is today’s classic example.) This simple avoidance tendency must be given due weight in any explanation, but there are other factors coupled with it which are probably still more decisive.

Yet in daily life we take chances and in effect bet our life and safety frequently for more trivial amounts, for odds that are much less than a billion to one — or a million to one — in our favor. We do this not merely in driving a car or crossing the street or taking an airplane ride, but in regard to all sorts of possible accidents and
disasters which are remote but still more likely that a billion or a million to one shot.

We treat sufficiently rare events as though they all had a probability of zero, since we do not and probably could not keep worrying about a swarm of extremely remote probabilities. The low probabilities for rare events does not influence our behavior, since we have far too many other things to worry about.

Nevertheless, as Charlie Chan once put it, "Rare events permit themselves the luxury of occurring." Things like earthquakes do happen, even in areas where a serious earthquake disaster is only a once-every-other-generation affair. And when the rare event does occur and lives are lost, we become aware once again of the possibility and regret the tragedy — especially when we realize how preventable much of it was. Most loss of life and most damage in most disasters are indeed preventable and at costs which are small fractions of actual disaster losses.

Clearly, if anything is to be done to control the rare occurrence called disaster it must be done at a higher level than the individual. Individuals generally do not even think about rare events to any degree let alone do something about them. Action should be taken, for instance, at the national level, and it has not been taken. That is one big reason why so many disasters still inexcusably bring much greater tragedy to our people than they need to.

"PROBLEM FALLS BETWEEN TWO STOOLS"

Unfortunately, the American political system with its two-year Congressional elections and its four-year presidential elections — which make it so responsive to the popular will (including popular apathy) — contribute a further disadvantage. The short time spans which are forced thereby on the thinking of both legislative and executive officials are simply inadequate to deal with the disaster problem. Analysis, planning, monitoring, and preventive action must extend over decades. The necessary breadth of perspective in terms of both time and space has been lacking. That is why we remain at such a primitive stage in regard to disaster prevention. We have hardly reached the level of consciousness of the problem.

If we are ever to move out of this stone age approach to disasters something more is required than even the best of the piecemeal efforts now being applied. For example, we need to add at least one or two more levels of disaster monitoring along with what is now being done. In many cases at the local scene, once we get beyond a couple of minor officials there is no one who is worrying about the problem and no one who is responsible. Instead of a depth of monitoring and surveillance, of check and recheck, which the deadly seriousness of these life-and-death matters would seem to demand, the monitoring is extremely thin if it exists at all.

When responsibilities, such as they are, are scattered at the upper echelons among a multitude of different offices and agencies in ad hoc fashion, is it any wonder that the problem falls between two stools, as it were? It is time to replace do-nothingness with action, to replace meandering bureaucratic growth with practical planning and synchronized teamwork that will pay off in real disaster control.

"A DECREASED REQUIREMENT FOR OFFENSIVE WEAPONS"

Inasmuch as looking to Washington for leadership has been well established as a way of life in our society, the following are some positive steps that may merit immediate consideration for improving America's response capability for all types of disasters at the grass roots. (After all saving lives and property is what government is all about.)

- It is timely that the Congress conduct overview hearings pertaining to Defense Civil Preparedness Agency's mandated efforts. (They are operating under Public Law 920 passed in 1950 and since amended.)
- There is need for a public statement from the highest levels of government concerning the seriousness of the threats, the need and importance of the civil defense mission.
- There needs to be a mutual agreement between State, Federal and local governments as to who has the responsibility for planning and preparation to minimize the effects of either man-made or natural disasters wherever they strike.
- Consideration for handling these responsibilities most efficiently at the Federal level should be through a single agency.
- Proper levels of readiness preparation should be determined jointly as goals to be reached across America.
- Funding for such objectives should be thoroughly understood by proper Congressional committees in order that adequate funds can be provided for beyond a twelve-month period. (36 months or 60 months cycle.)
- Modern management tools should be developed and implemented at all levels of government so that a credible handle for determining direction and progress is available at all times. (Flying by the seat of your pants is old hat.)
- Professional standards should be established for personnel at all levels of government and adhered to to the letter, thus counteracting political decisions that might speed up or slow down progress toward security goals.
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Congress should make it indelibly clear that performance standards be implemented at state and local levels and that DCPA has full authority to cut off funding for anything less than standard performance.

Civil Preparedness is "common defense." It is and should be a part of our national strategic deterrence. With this thought in mind, funding might be more properly handled as part of the Defense budget, rather than in the select Appropriations Subcommittee for Treasury, Postal Service and General Government as it is presently funded. This should result in Civil Preparedness having the opportunity to compete for Defense dollars and should result in a new mix in our overall Defense strategy.

There are those who believe that adequate Civil Preparedness could result in a decreased requirement for offensive weapons. This is a thought worth considering.

Teddy Roosevelt in 1905 stated that the greatest prize in life is being able to work hard at a job worth doing. Civil Preparedness for America is this type of job. Let us do now what is required.

Lefever indicates that CBS relies heavily on the New York Times as a news source. He summarizes an October 9, 1972 Times news item as follows:

"The continued stream of Soviet civil defense publications indicated that, despite the aura of goodwill engendered by the SALT I agreement, the Soviet Union was continuing its active program of preparing its population to survive a nuclear war. The Soviet Civil Defense Agency in its 40th year had a new chief. General A. T. Altunin, whose appointment as Deputy Minister of Defense suggested an upgrading of the civil defense program."

But, he points out, this news and other significant civil defense news was ignored in favor of items of lesser importance.

TV and National Defense expertly puts the finger on what is wrong with TV News — and how it poorly serves the interests of fair and accurate reporting. It is a shocking expose of TV bias. Lefever quotes NBC's David Brinkley as saying: "News is what I say it is. It's something worth knowing by my standards.

Walter Cronkite of CBS has a somewhat different view: "We should not decide what is good and what is bad for people. . . . Because then people are denied the information that democracy entitles them to have."

However, he also says: "We're big. And we're powerful enough to thumb our nose at threat and intimidation from Government. I hope it stays that way."

Lefever appears to feel that the thumb-nosing has a somewhat wider target than government. He counsels:

"It should be recognized that all TV news programs are designed to hold the interest of a broad and diverse audience. Hence, they seek to entertain as well as to inform. They attempt to provide a panoramic view of current developments, but they gravitate toward bad news rather than good, the exception rather than the rule, and focus on the dramatic, visual, and human interest aspects of the story."

Mr. Lefever has done a remarkably fine job. TV and National Defense deserves to go on the "must read" list of all who are involved with civil defense — as well as those who are otherwise concerned with the state of the union and its survival.
New House Armed Services Committee Chairman Melvin Price on March 17th reaffirmed upcoming civil defense “Overview” hearings. They would probably take place, he said, “after June.” The USCDC-NASPD* delegation also saw— at Congressman Price’s suggestion— Ralph Marshall, one of the committee’s professional staff members.

On March 18th the delegation conferred with Jim Smith, professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and Administrative Assistant Preswell of Senator John C. Stennis’s office. Stennis is Chairman of the Senate committee.

J. Howard Proctor, who heads the USCDC’s special “Overview” committee, had this to say: “President Walter Hyle (USCDC) and the rest of us in USCDC and NASPD feel very good about the progress we are making to date. We’re going to follow this up with further preparations and further liaison contacts. And we’re going to need all the active support we can possibly get from civil defense people and others interested in home preparedness. We need this from all 50 states and from their counties and cities. I think that this is our big chance to lock ourselves in to a meaningful civil defense posture— maybe our last chance.”

USCDC and NASPD semi-annual conferences were being held in Washington at the same time, and Proctor delivered an “Overview” report to a joint session on the afternoon of March 18th.

* USCDC - United States Civil Defense Council
* NASPD - National Association of State Disaster Preparedness Directors

---

**Opinion . . .**

**PEACE . . . . ?? ??**

About 30 pages of the April issue of The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists are devoted to warnings of surging world armament and prescriptions for promoting peace. Editor Samuel H. Day, Jr. recommends that environmental degradation be recognized as the world’s common enemy and suggests that military enthusiasm for war be spent on fighting this enemy. Economist Ruth Leger Sivard’s article “Let Them Eat Bullets” points out that a diversion of 19% of military budgets might well finance a meaningful attack on starvation, illiteracy, disease, and overpopulation. Political Scientist Ann Hessing Cahn deplores the 6,000% increase in arms trade since 1952, and she is frankly pessimistic about control. Nuclear physicist Kosta Tsipis describes a new generation of cruise missiles capable upon impact of destroying a target with 100% probability. He makes a case against deployment, then he admits: “The accurate inexpensive cruise missile may prove to be the great equalizer among nations, but it may also prove to be the ultimate leveler of their cities.”

Peace prospects are scrutinized. William M. Rose appeals for unilateral conciliatory moves. Matthew Melko tries to draw lessons from periods of peace in 51 “societies.” And he says: “There are studies of peace movements, which usually fail. There are studies of peace treaties that terminate wars. There are studies of the inner attitudes of men that would seem to keep peace from occurring. But there are very few studies of the causes and consequences of peace itself.”

Why not? Abhorring the thought of war, scolding those involved in war preparations, and pushing plausible peace formulas certainly betray a laudable sincerity. But has this approach worked?

The answer is “No.” And this answer is clear in the April Bulletin. As long as students of peace insist on trying to market ivory tower analyses we are going to see scholars jousting with scholars and no one soiling his hands with the nuts and bolts of the problem.

If the prestigious and influential Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists wants to make its search for peace effective — and we are sure it does — why could it not look seriously at approaches which have worked and are working in today’s world? (Chief among these would be those of Sweden and Switzerland.) Would this be so bad?
"I do solemnly swear that I will support, protect, and defend the Constitution and Government of the United States and of the..."

At all levels of government oaths of office read about the same, and with their oaths office holders are charged with the sacred duty of protecting the lives and property of their constituents.

So conceived is their responsibility. How well is it applied?

In feeder lots cattle are coddled with grain feeds and special care in order to produce the "choice" grade of marbled beef our markets so proudly display.

And there is a parallel in the manner in which political leaders coddle their constituents: these latter too are "babyed" and kept well fed and well fattened and well satisfied in industrial-political confines waiting for the wholesale slaughter that the next war will produce for them.

Are we taking lessons from feeder lot operators?

Chou En-lai now says "war is inevitable" and 800 million Chinese must be provided with means for survival. And it is in the advanced stages of being done. He claims he can't understand why America refuses to protect its citizens.

Edward Teller states that if we had an all-out national commitment for civil preparedness it would take four years to provide protection for half our people and eight years to provide it for the optimum number of people.

What kind of protection are we providing our people with practically zero commitment?

When we invest billions in one military aircraft type and almost before it is produced it becomes obsolete we explain it away as a necessary sacrifice to modern research and development cycles, to "military parity" requirements, and so on. The explanations are accepted.

In civil defense we have kept 5-year-shelf-life shelter supplies for well over twice that long. What happens when finally we must write them off as obsolete and find useful ways to dispose of them? We are castigated as tin-hat, whistle-blowing fuddyduddies who have again wasted the taxpayers' money.

Sounded like a pretty good bargain to me. We gave millions of people a way of feeding themselves during catastrophe with normal food supplies cut off.

It might have even provoked a new look at giving exposed Americans the capability of really surviving a nuclear holocaust.

Too bad it didn't. "Support, protect, and defend..."?

Apparently the feeder lot syndrome has such strong appeal that it eclipses oaths of office.