

Page Denied

25 YEAR RE-REVIEW

D. C. Seen 'Far Down' A-Target

Other U. S. Areas
More Strategic,
Yarmolinsky Says

By Marie Smith
and John M. Gushko
Staff Writers

One of the Nation's top civil defense officials said yesterday he thinks an enemy planning a nuclear attack on the United States would put Washington far down on his list of possible targets.

Adam Yarmolinsky, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, offered this opinion at a luncheon of the Women's Caucus of the National Press Club. Yarmolinsky guided the Defense Department's take-over of Federal civil defense activities after President Kennedy assigned the responsibility to the Department last summer.

"A reasonably smart enemy attack, now or in the next few years, would concentrate on military targets," he said. "Few weapons could be spared for cities as such."

Unless "the Russians go mad," Washington, he said, would be spared. Yarmolinsky continued, "I can't guess, but I think there would be a much more important target than Washington as headquarters of the Air Command."

Military Targets

He said that the military targets would be the ones who would be most vulnerable to a nuclear attack. He said that the military targets would be the ones who would be most vulnerable to a nuclear attack. He said that the military targets would be the ones who would be most vulnerable to a nuclear attack.

"Casualties from blast and fire, as a result of an attack, even on military installations, would run into the millions," Yarmolinsky conceded. "But the principal danger to our civilian population would be from radioactive fallout."

He explained that while the primary blast and heat effect from a one-megaton nuclear bomb (equivalent to one million tons of TNT) could extend for as much as 10 miles from the point of explosion, the lethal radius of the fallout from the same bomb could cover several thousand miles.

Citing the President's call for some form of fallout protection for everyone, he said: "The Federal program for this year should provide shelter for up to 10 million people, or more than one quarter of the population, at a cost of less than \$4 per person."

This remark was in reference to a Nation-wide survey that the government plans to make of all public and large private buildings in an effort to locate existing space that can be used for fallout shelter.

"Since the shelters are limited," Yarmolinsky said, "they are being stocked by the Federal Government with survival essentials including packed food, water, a 10,000-calorie food ration, radiation meters and first-aid supplies."

He said a survey also will tell us what we have in the way of shelter and where it is located in relation to population, so that we can decide how much more we need and where we need it."

Shelters Urged

Meanwhile, he said, the President was urging on everyone present measures to conserve and improvise a family shelter in the neighborhood shelter. Yarmolinsky pointed to the various areas in places where the scale of private conservation shelters will be small.

STAT

It will be necessary to find existing usable space in the suburbs than in the cities, he said, because the primarily residential suburbs do not have the "core protection" provided by the subways and large parking basements that are found in cities.

But the people who live in the suburbs, he added, are those who can best afford to provide rudimentary shelter. They can provide a shelter with their own resources and could a shelter that would be a good time to build.