Pentagon Argument for Using Tear Gas

Washington

eign Relations Committee informal interpretation that curity affairs, told the For- proposed ratification with the Defense for international se- | The administration has Nutter, assistant secretary of

argued yesterday that tear caused by secretary that tear burning them to death with legitimate, humane weap napalm. Nutter appeared be reviously used by Secretary of State William P. GRo-partment officials that the barty of war."

Nutter's line of reasoning complaints from State De-previously used by Secretary of State William P. GRo-partment officials that the barty of war."

that the use of tear gases to | the treaty would not prevent | eon date, and yesterday he

ons of war that should not fore the committee to urge tary of State William P. GRobe abandoned by the Senate ratification of the 1925 gers before the committee—
Imited States.

Geneva Protocol banning failed to impress Senator J. chairman.

pear before the committee last week because of a lunch-Nutter had declined to ap-

For example, G. Warren chemical and biological war- W. Fulbright, the committee treaty, Fulbright observed in by Fulbright, Nutter acknowclined to appear. balanced" hearings on the vited to testify but had de- troops so that they could be the Joint Chiefs had been inan opening statement that ledged that tear gases could

Nutter contended that tear | air attack. N.Y. Times Service

Washington

flush enemy troops out of the United States from conmade clear he was not gases were different from The Defense Department bunkers in South Vietnam tinuing to use tear gases and speaking for the Joint Chiefs other lethal and nonlethal argued yesterday that tear caused "less suffering" than plant killers.

of Staff.

subjected to artillery fire or also be used to flush out In response to a question