

### WHY ALLOW BASES NEAR CITIES?

To the Editor:

"Hooray! The Titan bases will bring \$80 million to Tucson!"

**IS THIS ALL OUR LOCAL** leaders can cry at the news that 18 intercontinental ballistic missile sites soon will ring Tucson? A very dear price will be paid if these are established here.

Probably the most naive statement in defense of these bases being located near heavily-populated areas is that the people won't be in any more danger than before. Informed persons such as Sen. Stuart Symington (in his recent Tucson Sunday Evening Forum speech) believe these sites should be placed as far away from population centers as possible; others, as Ralph E. Lapp, go further to say that because the ICBM bases have such a magnetic attraction for drawing the first enemy fire, as they are our prime retaliatory force, they are obsolete and should be replaced by mobile sites.

**IT IS CALCULATED** by experts that Tucson would not receive less than 20 megatons of nuclear power in an attack because of our SAC base; Lapp predicts 100 megatons or more for areas near Titan sites—this, of course, would leave no life in Tucson and none possible for a very long time after a nuclear attack. (See Dr. James E. McDonald's article on the effects of just a 20-megaton bomb on Tucson, in the October issue of the Journal of the Arizona Academy of Science).

Great Britain has stopped work on her big missile project because she says fixed sites are useless, dangerous and prohibitively expensive. The U.S.'s Minuteman missile silos (launching pits) are to be placed in "remote areas," says a recent dispatch. Why, then, does our Air Force callously place these bases near metropolitan centers, as it is doing all over the country?

MRS. CAROL KARLIN  
3426 N. Romero