

## **The Incorrect Term “Tactical Herbicides” Was Derived From The Army Manual 3-3 “Tactical Employment of Herbicides”**

Factually, we know they were used. Yet because the criminal Alvin L. Young invented the term "tactical herbicides" in 2006 as part of a contract for DOD, after stating in his Letter to Ms. Cleary that the herbicides used against the Viet Cong were the same herbicides used in Burma, Thailand, the Republic of China (Taiwan), the Philippines, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand, and the DOD (and please remember JSRRC is part of the DOD) will not be honest, we continue to have to fight our own government.

In the Forward of the contract, Professor Young defines "tactical herbicides" as those used in Vietnam, or with permission of the State Department. And we know where he got the term, i.e. the Army Field Manual 3-3, **Tactical Employment of Herbicides**. We also know that the Army Field Manual says that these were "commercial herbicides" adapted for military use. What does that mean exactly? Adapted by mixing 2,4-D and 2, 4, 5-T one for one, or adapted a Hayes sprayer on a C-123?

We also know that herbicides used on the perimeters of Thailand bases had to be approved by the US Embassy (i.e. the State Department). Declassified documents state categorically that the herbicides used had approval from the embassy.

So I can conclude that the DOD and the DVA are not telling the truth. Two years ago, at the 4th Triennial Vietnam Symposium at Texas Tech, I was a member of a panel with the project officer of the IOM AO project, and a world known professor of environmental health sciences. The two offered completely different pictures of the herbicides used. The professor was definitive concerning dioxin and 2,4,5-T effecting the human immune system. If it does, the DOD, DVA, and IOM/NAS could not list any of the diseases on the list below. So someone is lying, and if one could conclude the professor had no hidden agenda, you may draw your own conclusion.

Legally, and those of you who are lawyers know that the fact JSRRC cannot confirm something is not legal authority for the DVA or the BVA to deny, i.e. lack of information does not constitute negative information, but no one in Congress challenges the legislative precept of the law. Added to that, it is almost certain that the DOD knows whether the Navy or Coast Guard may or may not have transported herbicides, but just as Dow and Monsanto were, as contractors, protected by the Government, so it would be with the Merchant Marines, and so if the Government contracted ships to transport the product, they would also be protected. When the process is misused, legislation must be used to fix it, or juris prudence. But that would mean a large lawsuit against the DOD and DVA at the highest level and even then there are many examples of the executive branch ignoring precedent from the judicial branch, as well as interpreting legislation incorrectly, and purposely.

Finally, as we are discussing it, there is no such thing as presumption outside of Vietnam, it is based on PL. 98-548 which did not preclude the possibility of direct exposure. Finally, while I have seen several here today gone tomorrow renditions of M21-1MR, have you seen the C & P Service May 2010 bulletin?

Kurt Priessman

kpriessman@msn.com