

Should Honeywell stop making munitions?

A Response from
Clergy and Laymen Concerned
to Honeywell

Should Honeywell stop making munitions?

A Response from Clergy and Laymen Concerned
to Honeywell

Criticism of Honeywell for supplying weapons to the Department of Defense has been increasing and the company has been singled out as the target of a national protest. We have discussed these matters at length with the protest leaders whose sincerity and good intentions we do not question. We have since 1969 published consistent statements on our policies. We have continued to review these policies. In view now of a deliberate campaign of harassment aimed primarily at Honeywell we believe we must further clarify our position on Honeywell's defense activities so that the public can make a reasoned judgment on the basis of facts.

1. Our campaign against Honeywell, Inc. is an educational one, not one of harassment, aimed at one goal: to make Honeywell cease and desist making all anti-personnel weapons.

Our critics would apparently have Honeywell either discontinue military contracting entirely or cease production of selected munitions items. It appears to be their position that industry should, in view of today's unpopular war, refuse to do business with the U.S. Department of Defense, or at least exercise a unilateral decision-making function to limit the type of weapons to be made available to our forces—and that this would hasten the end of a war we all want finished.

We cannot agree with this reasoning. So long as a military or defense establishment of some sort is needed, and most Americans agree that one is needed, the ultimate decision as to types and quantities of weapons to be available and used must be the respon-

This response of Clergy and Laymen Concerned to Honeywell's position, April 1972, has been printed for Honeywell employees, Clergy and Laymen Concerned constituents, and other concerned citizens.

(NOTE: The Clergy and Laymen Concerned [CALC] response is inserted in bold face between the paragraphs of Honeywell's statement.)

July 1972

sibility of the Department of Defense, monitored by the national administration and Congress and representatives of all the people.

2. **Clergy and Laymen Concerned** is not suggesting that the United States not have a defense system nor have we argued that Honeywell cancel all contracts with the Defense Department. It is our view that Honeywell's production of anti-personnel weapons and the use to which they have been put in Southeast Asia have caused thousands of civilian deaths. There is ample evidence to support this view in such government documents as the Senate Sub-committee Reports on Refugees of 1970 and 1971 as well as the report issued by the General Accounting Office in early December 1971 at the request of the same Senate Sub-committee on Refugees.

It is essential for the survival of our democracy that corporations carry out public policies declared by elected representatives of the people. It would be intolerable if every corporation in the land had its own domestic and foreign policies and attempted to use its power to implement them.

A difficult to understand aspect of the current protest is the idea of laying at the doorstep of any corporation the responsibility for an unpopular and tragic war. Honeywell has been on record for a number of years as wanting the war ended as quickly as possible. Honeywell people share the same human feelings and respect for life that our critics claim as their justification.

3. **Every citizen has a responsibility to help shape domestic and foreign policy.** Voting once every few years is only the beginning of our responsibility as citizens. When a democratic government is guilty of an error,

the citizen is still responsible in part for that error.

Many people realize that corporations, Honeywell included, spend a lot of time and money in and out of Washington impressing elected and appointed government officials with their views on such items as: import-export quotas, the degree of government control of industry, and on many other domestic and international issues which affect the corporation. Corporations spend millions of dollars lobbying on issues they believe are vital to their corporate interest. We do not, therefore, find it convincing to have Honeywell "pass the buck" of responsibility to our elected officials with respect to the production of anti-personnel weapons.

Another idea expressed that we feel needs comment is that the war is somehow good for Honeywell's business. From any standpoint we would prefer to conduct business in a world of peace. War is wasteful. It uses tax dollars that could be better utilized to strengthen the economy and meet the needs of our society.

4. **Clergy and Laymen Concerned has never made or suggested the analysis referred to above.**

It is apparent that the current wave of protest has as its principal emotional appeal the idea that certain weapons are more horrible than others and that those who make them are war criminals.

There are no nice weapons. It is one of the tragedies of humanity that weapons exist at all, but the stern lesson of history is that those who cherish freedom must be prepared to fight for freedom.

Anti-personnel weapons of the type most frequently criticized have the same purpose as hand grenades, conventional bombs or bullets. They were not devel-

oped for use against civilian population as has been charged. They were developed for use against military targets and are effective because they cover a wider area than conventional explosives. To the best of our knowledge that is how they are used.

We flatly reject the charge that manufacturing these weapons makes Honeywell people war criminals. This is a slanderous charge that is utterly devoid of merit. It appears to us that few international lawyers agree with such charges and no court of the United States has entertained this argument.

5. There are legal conventions which govern how war is to be fought. These conventions are the law of the United States of America and they form the general basis for our resisting Honeywell's production of anti-personnel weapons and their subsequent use in Southeast Asia. We believe that anti-personnel weapons cause, in the words of the law, "unnecessary suffering."

While Honeywell maintains that their weapons were "not developed for use against civilian populations," the fact is that in the government documents referred to under item #2 these are exactly the persons who are paying the high price in the air war in Indochina. The question that poses itself is quite clear: assuming that Honeywell did not produce the weapons to be used against civilians, are the primary casualties of the ongoing air war, what is Honeywell's corporate responsibility?

It does not suffice, as far as we are concerned, for Honeywell either to deny that the air war is going on, to suggest that they did not make their weapons for the killing of civilians, or to suggest that it is simply a matter for our elected representatives to settle. We believe they have to assume a por-

tion of responsibility for the ongoing death and destruction of civilians caused by the deployment of weapons they produce for the war.

Finally whether or not Honeywell officials and/or employees can be considered war criminals may be a complicated legal issue; however, Honeywell does bear responsibility for weapons it produces and any attempt on the part of the company to suggest otherwise is an act of simple irresponsibility.

Finally, we would like to comment on the accuracy of the literature being circulated in the campaign against Honeywell. The Clergy and Laymen Concerned are distributing a leaflet listing twelve types of alleged anti-personnel weapons supposedly manufactured by Honeywell. Of the items described five have never been produced by Honeywell.

These are the BLU-52 munitions, defoliation bomb-lets, the XM-3 chemical detector, chemical cluster bombs and the Gravel mine. Honeywell is doing development work on one part of a Special Purpose Infantry Weapon (SPIW) and is developing the XM-627 non-hazardous riot control cartridge. Neither of these items has been produced and the description of SPIW in the leaflet is almost completely inaccurate.

Honeywell has produced the remaining five munitions which are described in the literature with varying degrees of accuracy (BLU-26 bomb, BLU-54/B mine, fuel air explosive weapon, M224 fuze and Rockeye II munition). Until now our critics probably would have had no way to know this, but Honeywell is now in production on only one of the munitions described, Rockeye II, and this weapon is an anti-tank weapon, not an anti-personnel weapon. Thus Honeywell is not now in the production on any so-called anti-personnel weapons, although we are prepared to resume production should the government request us to do so.

6. There are three primary issues involved in the question of research and public documentation of what Honeywell does or does not produce. First, the Corporate Information Center (CIC) of the National Council of Churches was the official body designated by Clergy and Laymen Concerned (CALC) to do research on Honeywell's production and development of anti-personnel weapons. It is clear from the Honeywell statement that they used an article in American Report, a weekly newspaper published by Clergy and Laymen Concerned, as the basis of their criticism for "our research." The fact is that the article in American Report did not use CIC research and, furthermore, was never intended to be the authoritative document on which the organization's campaign would rest.

More important, however, is the fact that the CIC did submit to Honeywell, Inc., by registered mail on March 24, 1972, all of the research that they had produced for CALC asking that the corporation make such corrections as were necessary to assure that CALC would not be promulgating misinformation. This request was received by Honeywell but CIC did not receive any response from them until after the corporation issued its statement, "Should Honeywell Stop Making Munitions?", to the press on April 18, 1972 criticizing CALC's "research" — the article in American Report which was never distributed as the "official word" of CALC's Honeywell Campaign.

After Honeywell publicly criticized the inaccuracy of "the literature being circulated in the campaign against Honeywell," they then sent a letter to the CIC on April 20 responding to CIC's research on Honeywell's military contracting by saying only that the

information in the April 18 statement "should be helpful to you." On June 5, CIC finally received a more thorough review of their research. Both CALC and CIC sought Honeywell's cooperation in assuring that the research for the Honeywell Campaign would be accurate. We have no interest in disseminating misinformation about Honeywell — the instances of the corporation's development and production of anti-personnel weapons being substantial enough without the distortion of misinformation.

The second issue concerns the specific research itself. There is no question that the article in American Report contained misinformation about Honeywell's production of anti-personnel weapons. For example, it is clear from our more recent research that Honeywell never did produce the Gravel mine (only the dispensers); that it never produced the BLU-52 chemical bomb; and that it is not now in production of the Guava bomblet. There were also other pieces of misinformation in the American Report article.

On the other hand, it is also clear from research completed in July 1972 that Honeywell does still develop and/or produce anti-personnel weapons or parts of anti-personnel weapons used in the continuing air war in Southeast Asia. For example, between October and December of 1971, Honeywell received nearly \$3 million for two contracts to do research and development on "area denial munitions." (In military usage, "area denial" means making a region unfit for enemy use and can be accomplished by seeding the area with anti-personnel mines or spreading long-lasting tear gas over a wide area. In guerilla warfare, the "enemy" lives among the people; that means "making an area unfit for enemy use" also renders it un-

fit for civilian inhabitation.) There are several more examples of new contracts going to Honeywell to produce and develop anti-personnel weapons and components. (For a full up-date report as of July, 1972, see our document "Honeywell Research Up-date, July 1972.")

Furthermore, there is ample evidence that Rockeye II, which Honeywell acknowledges that it is continuing to produce, is used as an anti-personnel weapon, not solely as an anti-tank weapon. The Defense Market Survey, September 1971 reports that "the USN no longer has a requirement for the CBU-24 (the Cluster Bomb Unit using the "guava" bomblet); it is replacing them with the Rockeye II."

What is clear from all of the above is the fact that Honeywell has given no indication that they intend to stop developing or producing anti-personnel weaponry. It is also true that contracts come into the company and are completed frequently before our research gives an indication that Honeywell has even received the contract. In short, people outside of any system—be it governmental, business, or religious—will frequently receive information after-the-fact and if there is no authoritative way within the system to verify the research, there will always be the possibility of producing some misinformation.

However, we believe that the basic issue of Honeywell's involvement in production and development of anti-personnel weapons will exist no matter if, on some occasions, our research is a little late and contains some—but we would argue not many—errors. We will continue to ask Honeywell, Inc. to verify research that we intend to disseminate and

we would hope that Honeywell would see its way clear in assisting us in making such corrections as are necessary before we distribute our research.

In conclusion, we would like to say as we have in the past that we respect the rights of all individuals to express their opinions. We continue to be willing to talk with responsible critics of our actions, but we will continue to resist the kind of harassment that is currently occurring. We believe the vast majority of Americans will support us.

7. It is all good and well for Honeywell to say they will respect the rights of individuals to disagree with their judgments. We are not here talking about a matter of simple disagreement in a democracy. Tens of thousands of Indochinese civilians are being killed while Honeywell holds out to us the right to debate these issues. We believe the stakes are so high in terms of civilian deaths, casualties, and refugees that the corporation is going to have to do more in the next period of time than simply suggest that it is willing to dialogue on this most critical issue.



475 RIVERSIDE DRIVE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10027

All orders must be prepaid

\$.20 ea.; 10 for \$1.00; 50 for \$4.50; 100 for \$8.00