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Part II


How The USA Would Lose World War III

The policy roots of the war-losing trend in current U.S.-NATO doctrines and capabilities is the current, as always, the related doctrines of "flexible response." By the presumption that war-fighting between the principal forces of the USA and Soviet Union will escalate no further than in depth, asymptotically, on full deployment of maximum strategic ABC capabilities, the "flexible response" and related doctrines obsessedly ignore the shifting ratios of in-depth war-fighting capabilities in a war which begins with full-scale deployment of strategic ABC capabilities.

In consequence, debates over U.S. and NATO military postures and capabilities are limited to issues of "rough parity," and only considers those matters as they are defined within the framework of assumptions axiomatic to "flexible response." The issues considered are chiefly twofold. On one side, as with the SALT negotiations and related areas, the question is one of establishing parity in strategic ABC and related capabilities. On the other side, the issues focus on maintaining a marginal advantage of nuclear-augmented "conventional warfare" capabilities within the framework of "rough parity" as defined by "flexible response."

Occasionally, as again recently, critics of U.S. policy propose new emphasis on "passive" forms of civil defense measures. Although such proposals bear nominally upon some of the crucial areas of strategic capabilities ordinarily neglected of late, the policies proposed publicly so far on this matter are disgustingly pathetic in their incompetence — as we shall show summarily and conclusively.

Warfare in any age has a certain general range of technology. This technology defines a kind of "geometry" of warfare, within whose terms the standard, competent strategic doctrines and battlefield tactics of that interval of history are properly defined. A power must pursue a double sort of strategic policy. It must develop an optimal capability in terms of the existing "geometry" of warfare. It must also pioneer to develop new capabilities of warfare, and to gain a decisive advantage by gaining priority in entering into a more advanced geometry of warfare capabilities.

According to the existing geometry of warfare between powers, the order of warfare for general war between the USA-NATO and Soviet-Warsaw Pact forces is rigorously predetermined. Neither power dare deviate from that order of warfare, lest, by so doing, he donate a decisive margin of war-winning potential to the other.

The geometry of general warfare between the powers at this juncture is thermonuclear war. The essential distinction of contemporary machinery and planning of these powers is that the USA-NATO is prepared to fight a thermonuclear war within the framework of a "return to a Federalist-Whig military policy." The Soviet Union is not prepared to fight a thermonuclear war.

Occupation and pacification within a relatively brief period of war-fighting following Hour One bombardment.

In Zone Three, typified by the European theater of warfare, a self-interested Soviet policy prescribes ABC neutralization of civilian rear echelon zones and military bases in those zones by selective bombardment, adequate to neutralize military support capabilities for the period prior to their anticipated occupation, but not with the scale of lasting devastation imposed upon the USA, Canada, and Britain. As pre-assault bombardment targets approach the frontal zone of combat, the intensity is increased, including the creation of an ABC saturated "dead zone" in a band representing front lines of deployment of adversary (NATO) forces.

For the case of included warfare with China, Soviet self-interested policy dictates a different approach. No significant ground-forces occupation and pacification within a relatively brief period of war-fighting following Hour One bombardment.
Three is viewed as accessible to ground·forces·

The geometry of general warfare between the
powers at this juncture is thermonuclear war.

The essential distinction of contemporary
thermonuclear war is the bombardment of the
logistical (e., population) centers of the
adversary's homeland by saturation with ABC
(atomic, biological, chemical) weapons.

If the two powers have a rough
parity of other forces, the nation which suffers
the lesser destruction of its homeland during the
"Hour One" ABC strategic bombardment has
gained at that moment the decisive margin of in
depth war-winning potential.

From the Soviet side, their commanders have
no option but to deploy all the available ABC
capability dedicated to the logistical centers of the
United States, Canada, and Great Britain, as
the first act of general warfare on their part.

Since the U.S. commanders must respond to the
same effect against Soviet territory at no later a
point than first detection of Soviet strategic
liftoff, neither side's rational commanders will
declare any strategic weapons to counterpart
action against adversary (empty) missile silos.

According to available best current estimates, the
penalty suffered by the Soviet homeland will be upwards of 30 percent.

The approximate ratio of penalty cumulatively
depicted by the Soviet Union during World War II.
The penalty suffered by the United States will be
upwards of between 50 and 60 percent. Soviet
calculations must therefore premise Soviet
Warfare Pact war·winning capability in depth on
the combination of first-line forces' rough parity
and the qualitatively higher rate of ABC
strategic attrition suffered by the USA, Canada,
and Britain in consequence of Hour One
bombardment.

There are three zones of warfare for the
conduct of general thermonuclear war. Zone
One, the in-depth capabilities of adversary
homelands. Zone Two, adversary naval forces
and bases outside Zone Three. Zone Three,
theaters of ground warfare. The essential
distinction is that adversary terrain in Zone
Three is viewed as accessible to ground·forces'
turn to Federalist-Military Policy

... machinery and plant. The Soviet advantage in passive civil defense is coordinate to Soviet geography. However, it is not merely a policy to act in exploiting the passive civil-defense mentality of the Soviet geography. This policy was to Soviet counteroffensive capabilities in World War II, and it has been pursued sequentially with thermonuclear war in view. Passive civil-defense capability would have been built into the infrastructure of the U.S., giving capital-formation ratios exceeding thing in our national experience, even were target date for accomplishment in the order a decade ahead. Available, short-term assurances would provide only marginal benefits. The only policy route for effective civil defense is active civil defense. IMS and related weapons must be neutralized flight. Such weapons cannot, generally, be unqualified for military service during World War II, the assimilation of the poor into the U.S. forces, together with other young citizens, had a beneficial, upward-leveling effect upon the poor. The problem is not that the army is recruiting from the poor, but that it is recruiting largely from the poor, to the point that it is tending to become a drug-ridden ghetto.

At best, an "all-volunteer" military force converges on becoming a mercenary force, and reflects this condition in developing oligarchist military doctrines and capabilities. The issue of active civil defense illustrates the way in which Schlesinger's antiscience policies, his zero-growth policies, agree precisely with his "flexible response" and related military policies. If the reality of thermonuclear war is faced, then active civil defense becomes of the highest priority. The sort of broadly based scientific research and development efforts which produces a by-product beam-weapons vital interests of the United States, but to shaping the configuration of world and national developments to the purpose of securing world dictatorship — over as much of the world as survives war — by the oligarchist, Black Maltese forces.

Consider the doctrine which General Maxwell Taylor brought back from his reeducation by the British, the policy which was presumed to show new ways to victory through such adventures on the geopolitical rim as Vietnam. Was Taylor an American or British? In policy, he was British, not American. What of the policy which the Council on Foreign Relations employed Gordon Dean to ghostwrite for Henry A. Kissinger? That, too, was British doctrine, written on behalf of a British-trained agent returned from brainwashing at the Tavistock Institute, after a stint under British, anti-American agent William Yandell Elliott at Harvard.

Once the whole matter is viewed from the vantage point of American Federalist-Whig military and economic policies, with knowledge of oligarchial policies, the true loyalties of such wretched creatures as Kissinger, Schlesinger, Daniel Ellsberg, et al. become clear.

British Geopolitics

The adversary relationship between the USA and Soviet Union does not exist because we examined our most vital interests and so discovered the Soviet Union to be an adversary of those interests. Exactly the opposite. Since foolish, peppered Harry S. Truman and his anglophilic "Sveagull," Jimmy Byrnes, we have started from Winston Churchill's axiomatic assertion that the Soviet Union is inherently our adversary — because Churchill told us so — and have defined our interest as that which does injury to the Soviet Union. We are prepared to do battle with the Soviet Union, because that is the way in which our British masters have arranged the football schedule.

The United States was founded as a nation dedicated to the fostering of scientific and technological progress domestically, and, in foreign policy, to seeking a community of principle with other nations dedicated to that same principle. It was our desire that such nations become aggregately a hegemonic force globally, eradicating the last vestiges of the
of thermonuclear warfare today is reflected in Soviet's adoption of a war-winning posture by a commitment to basic science as rational economic policy. U.S.-Soviet "flexible response" doctrines as advocated by Schlesinger (I.) has rendered U.S. capabilities a bad joke. Above, the annual Labor Day military parade: right, NATO Secretary General de Gaulle discusses strategy with a Dutch president prior to deployment; they neutralized in flight. Countermisilb's tribute marginally to this end, but antimissile measures are available to them. The development of beam theory the only reliable centerpiece for a defensive civil-defense policy in sight. Discoveries are feasible in terms of existing or already conceivable physics, and provide the effectiveness required. Where did British intelligence (IIS) such an immediate, massive slander-campaign against Major Kagan and the U.S. Labor Party collaborating with him in presenting new weapons capability? The case of James K. Schlesinger exemplifies the way in which pro-American agents within the U.S. government have created the present superior war-winning capabilities of N.A.T.O.-U.S. forces. Exposing margins of potential Soviet war-winning advantage flows, on their side, from an is on basic scientific progress more than that which had or a decade in NATO and allied nations, the developing of military capabilities to a competent doctrine. These of potential Soviet advantage are on her S.N.A.TO side by the "environmental," movement by the effects of supranational and World Bank policies' effects on formation and world-trade ratios in the 1970s sector, and by a degradation in U.S.-policy thinking and capabilities correlating with the emergence of "flexible response." While the relative trend in in-depth capabilities is upward, and by a competent doctrine, U.S.-NATO forces are relatively downward and shaped by pentagon doctrine. This is hardly underscored by the "all-or-none" against the crucial issue of thermonuclear war, in-depth capabilities. "Volunteer army" policy is exemplary of toward no in-depth capabilities.

of no use to pretend that the condition of Army is a precious military secret to be from the Soviet command. USA once means "Useless Sons Accumoluted." The army program depends upon attracting the public and white poor which a decaying U.S. industrial economy has. in effect. I toward the social-discord heap. The drug m of U.S. forces is openly advertised on the streets of West Germany. This point is that the public and white poor are not inducted into military service. from the shocking effects of the prolonged repression, which made so many poor young capability becomes national economic policy. The continuing capability of the USA to maintain strategic parity with Soviet forces depends in fact, on just such a national economic policy. Such a national economic policy repudiates every policy with which Schlesinger has been associated since the publication of his 1968 book. Conversely, the maintenance of the zero-growth policies which Schlesinger obsessively advocates demands the self-consoling delusions of "flexible response." It ought to be clear that the better the U.S.-NATO forces succeed in developing a marginal potential advantage for warfare fought according to "flexible response" doctrines, the more the Soviet commanders are obliged to nullify that capability by adhering to the order of warfare in which they have the marginal, in-depth war-winning advantage.

How is Schlesinger's policy explained? Who, really, is James R. Schlesinger? Who, better ask, was Harvard's William Yandell Elliott? Who is Henry A. Kissinger, who is Zbigniew Brzezinski, who is Admiral Stansfield Turner? What is the London Round Table? What is the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA)? What is the London International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS)? What is a Rhodes Scholar? What is Rothschild? What is Brezhnev? What is Baring? What is Rupert Murdoch? Schlesinger is, like Henry A. Kissinger, a protege of oligarchist Fritz Krammer. He is essentially an oligarchist, an agent of the Black Maltese of the British monarchy — he is an agent of the lie which has been consistently the chief adversary of the United States since the American Revolution. He is dedicated not to the expense of the evil typified by the British monarchy. It is our vital national interest, therefore, to act to strengthen the credibility of that Soviet current with its own people, by cooperating with that current according to such principles.

There are also other currents in the Soviet leadership strata, currents which define "socialism" and the interests of the Soviet Union in the Jacobin tradition of Danton, Marat, Robespierre, Jeremy Bentham, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. These currents are intrinsically our enemies, representing ultimately the same oligarchical outlook as the Black Maltese or the current crop of lunatics controlling Peking. These include the "contemporary "Bukharinists" and irrationalist currents among hard-liners.

It happens that President Leonid Brezhnev has concluded the policy we should desire of him. in May 1978 accords with Chancellor Helmut Schmidt. This was not an isolated occurrence. Pope Paul VI contributed greatly to this development, as had the Gaullists and President Giscard d'Estaing of France. Although the Americans are not great enthusiasts of the Soviet Union, they had also contributed crucially in more ways than in negotiations concerning Sino-Soviet development. Brezhnev embraced the doctrine of the Great Design, and articulated that policy repeatedly, during and after the "summit," in terms which correspond rationally and fully with vital Soviet interests in internal economic progress and general peace.

The term "Great Design" in European usage is immediately associated with the work of Gottfried Leibniz and France's Henri IV. It is Continued on Page 5, col. 1
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also associated with Frederick II Hohenstaufen of the Holy Roman Empire, and with the ecumenical policies of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa. It was the policy which governed the cooperation of French and Americans in the American Revolution, including the organization of the League of Armed Neutrality. It was the basis for the alliance between Lincoln and Czar Alexander II.

It signifies, first of all, that under conditions that nations cooperate economically to bring the world under the domination of a policy of forced scientific and technological development, that the mutual benefits accruing to each participating nation are a greater increase of gross and per-capita wealth among each nation than each nation could accomplish by itself. This benefit becomes the greatly expressed vital interest of those nations, a commonality of interest in cooperation which binds them to political cooperation in serving a common global purpose.

This policy is pursued with the knowledge that more than merely a commonality of material interests is fostered. By creating a climate among peoples determined by forced scientific and technological progress, the emphasis thus placed upon the development of the creative-mental potentialities of the individual, and upon the realization of the benefits of the individual's powers of innovation, create within individuals and in relations among individuals and nations those moral commitments and qualities which we associate with humanist republics.

It is the United States' most vital interest to pursue such a policy, if necessary, resorting to war to remove stubborn obstacles to its realization.

The British have an opposite policy. During the 20th century, this policy is associated with a specific doctrine known as geopolitics. That doctrine was developed by a team of Lord Milner, the Webbs, Halford Mackinder, and others, and is the same doctrine articulated by Major-General Professor Karl Haushofer and by Haushofer's protege, Adolf Hitler. The two world wars of this century have been caused by British efforts to implement that geopolitical doctrine. The threat of World War III, in which China replaces Germany in British strategic schemes, arises solely from the influence that doctrine over U.S. policy-making, and for no other reason.

We shall continue to prepare to fight war, and shall increase the effectiveness of our forces and their weapons, until that final battle against oligarchism is either fought or until the last oligarchist government submits peacefully to our will.

Most of the academic argument employed by apologists for geopolitical doctrines is really mumbo-jumbo for the edification of the foolishly credulous. The true basis for the damnable doctrine is really quite simple. Since the 1780's, the British monarchy's principal continuing fear has been that an alliance of economic cooperation, based on fosterine
apologists for geopolitical doctrines is really a mumbu-jumbo for the edification of the foolishly credulous. The true basis for the damnable doctrine is quite simple. Since the foundation of the League of Armed Neutrality in 1780, the British monarchy's principal, continuing fear has been that an alliance of potentially-uncooperative powers, capable of scientific and technological progress, would develop among France, Germany, and Russia. There is no other true reason for all the grand geopolitical cookbook created in the pretext of arriving "objectively" at the discovery of the significance of the Eurasian heartland's alleged magical properties.

This is the British design of "geopolitics" had the potential success of Hontonau's and Witte's efforts directly in view. As Milner, the Webbs, and others first formulated the geopolitical doctrine at the onset of this century. Also, they recalled not only 1760-1783, but what might have come of cooperation between Napoleon and Russia's Czar Paul I if the British intelligence services had not successfully assassinated Paul I. (Watch carefully the British doctors gathered amicably around Russian heads of state!) The British had suffered their most disastrous defeat of the 18th century in 1862, as 35 years of subversion of the United States was blown away through the Lincoln alliance with Czar Alexander II.

That was the reason the British organized the damnable Balkan disturbances preceding World War I, and why World War I occurred — granting that the westward drive of Germany reflected a bad miscalculation by the British. Although the Black Malsee did in fact organize the February 1917 Revolution, Lenin's capabilities represented another point of miscalculation on the British-Maltese part. Instead of a Russia tucked neatly into Barings', Rothschild's and Samuel's portfolios, and the carving-away of Eastern Europe, the Ukraine and Caucasus, as the British had planned to accomplish through their version of the Russian revolution, Lenin created a unified Russia potentially a more difficult adversary for London than Czar Alexander II had been.

Lenin survived long enough to design the special mission for Soviet diplomat Chicherin which resulted in the Rapallo agreement. Every leading signatory to that agreement in Western Europe soon died, usually assassinated, excepting Britain's own Lloyd George — some in terrorist operations prefiguring the British use of terrorists to assassinate Dresner Bank's Jurgen Ponto and Mercedes Benz's Hanns-Pietro Schleicher, dear reader. Do not make an ass of yourself by pretending that you doubt that the British — which is to say Black Malsee-Zionist forces — did not murder Ponto and Schleicher!

The Rapallo intervention by Lenin not only revived British terror of French-German-Russian economic cooperation. Lenin's initiative produced enduring results in Germany, where sections of German industry and German military factions associated with von Seeckt kept the option alive, to be picked up by forces around von Schleicher. It is now freshly revived in the combination of the Brenner agreements and the May 1978 Schmidt-Greizhein accords. France, Germany and the Soviet Union are in the process of reviving the policies of the authors of the League of Armed Neutrality.

It was for related reasons that top British secret-intelligence operative for Germany, Houston Chamberlain, endorsed the assignment of geopolitician Major-General Professor Karl Hauser to groom Hitler and to write Hitler's Mein Kampf. (Let us not have any silly nonsense of objections on this matter: the record is overwhelmingly clear.) It was the Bavarian Wittelsbach apparatus which created Hitler, and which assigned Heinrich Himmler, Rudolf Hess, Ernst Roehm, Hermann Goering, and various other key figures to the project. The Wittelsbach sabotage from within the U.S. government and powerful policy institutions blocked Roosevelt to a significant degree. The Byrnes nomination of his protege, Harry S. Truman, to the vice-presidential nomination for the 1944 election laid the seeds for future disaster, as, shortly after his inauguration Roosevelt died, leaving the Byrnes designation in the White House. Churchill's "Cold War" policy, a central feature of a far broader subversion and manipulation of the United States, ensured that Roosevelt's postwar policy, for bringing Stalin into Great Design agreements with the United States, was wrecked.

Abraham Lincoln (l) possessed the required qualities of a "philosopher king" survival through the Civil War. Those characteristics today are met in only one candidate: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. (r.)

The fact that central Europe no longer has the potential for mounting an assault against the Soviet Union is key to many aspects of British policy. First, it is key to NATO policy. The U.S. ground forces in Germany are strategically a bad joke — and everyone close to the situation knows that. This state of affairs is not an oversight. The British know that NATO positions in Germany are untenable for the case of general warfare, and have only a subordinate strategic significance, a short-term secondary role in any general confrontation. No high-level British or British-influenced policymaker currently cares about the in-depth combat capabilities of U.S. ground forces in Germany.

It is to be seriously doubted that even leading British circles actually believe that "flexible response" has the slightest correspondence to reality. It is virtually certain that some British top circles view "flexible response" as a deception operation. The long-term British strategic objective is either to bluff the Soviets into submission, step by step, or, that failing, to arrange a Pacific-centered thermonuclear war, in which the United States and the Soviet Union, plus China, annihilate large portions of one another, leaving the surviving portions of the world under Black Malsee hegemony. The "China option," openly presented by the British and their agents as a "geopolitical" option, represents a certain kind of new design for the old geopolitical scenarios which set two previous world wars into motion. What has occurred in U.S. policy since the inauguration of shallow, peppy Harry S. Truman is that U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union is predominantly determined not in Washington, but in London. Instead of a U.S. Soviet policy based on first defining U.S. interests, and gauging Soviet policies and in which those same specific qualifications of a "philosopher king" are indispensable in the office, reasonably assured of getting through the difficult period, one dare not risk another mediocrity like a Nixon, in times, such as Eisenhower above all, tolerate immoral "leaders" who flitter hither and yon points of agreement with a constituency of a mutually-consensus, "a candidate for all the time."

This is a period of grave danger, and officials are no longer selected. But in an increasing number of cases frauds which range in the percent or more of the vote are will, in general, not act to halt practices, dispensing with the crimes as "mere irregularities" including the U.S. Congress, has to consider legislation which mandates courts to null elections — too many officials fear that their election, or at least, depended upon vote fraud.

This is no longer in fact a dem領 the controllers of vote fraud oligarchs which selects the win despite the voters. Our youth are being destroyed, Dionsysiac counterculture such as New York City are in arrest of drug users or drug public streets, or before our pub At this moment, despite the outrightly fraudulent official
In respect to realization of such U.S. lists, London has predominantly determined Soviet policy. We are in that respect merely the "veto" of the British monarchy—rd Milner prescribed at the opening of this gy.

We have been important exceptions to this. Second Atom-for-Peace and the Nixon-istration's Rogers Plan are examples of portant thrust in correspondence with U.S. interests. The 1972 Nixon treaty with it is potentially a very important an to that list. Until we fully explore such as the Bronfman-backed Permeid and its links to the Kennedy nation, we must leave our minds open question whether Kennedy might have into a direction parallelizing Eisenhower's n's.

realities of history, including wars in nations which should not have fought other at that time, warns us against the presumption that a proper U.S. policy, a design policy, would guarantee against war with the Soviet Union. The realities in the Soviet Union are our deadly enemies, degraded oligarchists in guise. If that force should come to the Soviet Union, relations between the world become most difficult.

If we adopt a policy consistent with at base and develop our military lies in accordance with the potentialities from dirigist policies of scientific and social progress, we have a policy which fits with the most effective means for any eventuality.

The Tasks of The President

Washington was a great Presiden
cy Adams did this nation service be knowledge of most, in our foreign Secretary of State, as President, and War President of the Whig forces, they the scene, after 1828. Franklin was a powerful President, with it moments, including the moment he Lord Mountbatten to Churchill, as sad. However, we have had no master Abraham Lincoln, Lincoln, ives, figures as Henry C. Carey and M. D. Kelley, was the nearest man to the king's eve, to occupy the by a rump Democratic Party under of outright traitors, and hampered by sociably the New York and Boston in his Republican Party, he had to for each degree of freedom of action.

The loss of the aging Winfield Scott Secretary of War Stanton sabotaged tion of the war in many ways. Seward was a saboteur. Basing himself largely in Whigs, and the emergence of his and Grant and Sherman, the nation through a realization of its industrial potentials, military policy, and Federalist monetary measures—accomplishments, in the face of the war and massive treason from within, predates of his character. As his was a Neoplatonic intellectual stature which no

sliding into a depression— with Treasury Secretary W. M. Blumenthal and Fed Chairman G. W. Miller overtly working to effect a collapse of the U.S. dollar and a deep depression. Blumenthal's office has even taken under serious study a proposal to liquidate the sovereignty of the United States, by placing the USA under "IMF conditions."

At this moment of writing, the USA has no economic policy, no foreign economic policy, and is even—so far—unable to accept a rescue of the U.S. dollar and economy when our allies in France, Germany, Italy, Saudi Arabia, and elsewhere beg us to accept this rescue.

What is U.S. policy? Read daily the elements of the British press directly controlled by British intelligence. Reuters news service, the London Times, the Financial Times, the London Economist, the London Observer, Daily Telegraph, the Beaverbrook press, the Murdoch press, the Thompson press. From this press compile the day's official line of British intelligence for U.S. domestic and foreign policies. Within 48 hours that same line will pour, printout fashion, from the mouths of Henry A. Kissinger, James R. Schlesinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and sundry representatives of what Capitol Hill terms the "Zionist Lobby." U.S. policy is, generally, what the British monarchy prescribes it to be.

Our military policy is sheer lunacy. Our deteriorating relative capacities are a direct reflection of our British-designed military policy. There is a direct and necessary connection between Schlesinger's zero-growth energy and antiscience policy and his "China option" and "flexible response" babblings.

In one term, beginning January 1981, a new President must reverse all this, and establish for our nation new policies and institutions consistent with the intent of our Constitution, policies and institutions which will secure the world for our posterity for at least 50 years to come.
In one term, beginning January 1861, a new U.S. President must reverse all this, and establish for our nation new policies and institutions consistent with the intent of our Constitution, policies and institutions which will secure the world for our posterity for at least 50 years to come.

This writer is the only visible candidate or prospective candidate who has the special qualifications for that duty. Many others are useful and talented, and have a leading role to perform in accordance with that capability. They lack the breadth and depth of intellectual development, the ability to make important conceptual leaps, and to leap to the right conception in that process. They are one-sided or two-sided talents: they are not "philosopher kings" in the genre of Abraham Lincoln and this writer.

It is not proposed that we wait for 1861 until proceeding along the necessary lines. We must move as rapidly in the proper directions as possible under the Carter Administration. That progress will be a necessary preparation for the decisive work to be performed by the incoming administration. That general perspective also governs the new military policy outlined here.

1. The Military Intent of the U.S. Constitution

The principal English-speaking colonies of the United States were established during the 17th century, most of them by that republican faction in England known as the Commonwealth Party. By the early decades of the 18th century, the initial tasks of colonization had been completed, so the effect that those colonies had already reached a maturity of development suitable to the establishment of a new nation rooted in the best republican aspirations of the English Commonwealth.

During the period 1763-1766, it was clear to leaders of the future nation, leaders grouped around Benjamin Franklin, that the deterioration of England under the Stuarts, House of Orange, and Guelphs, since 1660, had brought the majority of the English people and their institutions to such a poor moral condition that there was no prospect that those people would undertake a restoration of the Commonwealth without some great weakening and humiliation of the ruling British oligarchy from without. It was clear to Benjamin Franklin and his associates that the Americans would live and British people could no longer live under a common government.

The American colonies had achieved a level of popular culture typified by an approximate 90 percent adult literacy rate, more than double that existing in England at that time, and the living standards and productivity of Americans were approximately double those of Englishmen in comparable titles of employment. The British monarchy and its supporting oligarchy were determined to prevent the Americans from enjoying the scientific and technological progress to which they aspired. The British declared their determination to stifle industrial development from the American colonies, to drive the colonies into a perpetual state of bucolic backwardness, and to impose upon the colonies kept in that backward condition a system of usurious tax-farming to the advantage of economic doctrines of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton represented a solution to the critical problem of Britain indebtedness through the mobilization of the credit of the United States in a national bank, and through the increase of the social productivities of our nation and its people through the forceful fostering of scientific and technological progress. These measures in the monetary, fiscal, and economic policy domains complemented a constitutional and civil law designed to universal public education and the promotion of cultural progress.

Under the leadership of President Washington, President John Adams and his major general Alexander Hamilton, the U.S. military capability existing at the close of the first decade of the U.S. Constitution was of extraordinary quality. This capability was retained under President Adams's immediate successors in office, to our nation's great peril during 1812-1815. The experience of the second year of the war with England was reflected in the great advances in West Point programs from 1813 through the close of the Administration of President John Quincy Adams and under the leadership of Commandant Thayer.

Although the work of 1816-1828 was savagely undermined under Andrew Jackson and Martin Van Buren, John Quincy Adams and collaborators, such as General Winfield Scott, maintained the continuity of the nation's Federalist-Whig military tradition within an important section of the officers corps and associated circles into the Civil War period.

The destruction of U.S. military policy under Andrew Jackson and Martin Van Buren had been not coincidental. Jackson and Van Buren halted the U.S. policy of fostering scientific and technological progress, dissolved the Second National Bank, and raised in a manner exhibited in the Panic of 1837. With Jackson and Van Buren, as later under Pierce and Buchanan, the fundamental intent of the American Revolution and Constitution was betrayed in a most treacherous way. The military policy of the Federalists and Whigs, which emulated the British doctrine of "cabinet warfare" and its successors: the republic must realize its characteristic advantage, the benefits of scientific and technological progress, by the establishment of a universal militia, well-trained, well-equipped and ably led — through which a republic develops a decisive advantage in in-depth, fighting capabilities over an adversary nation of comparable size.

The correctness of Federalist-Whig military policy was demonstrated afresh in U.S. national experience by the Civil War. It was shown that the attempts to employ those battle tactics which emulated the British doctrine of "cabinet warfare" were folly. Generals such as Grant and Sherman introduced republican principles of warfare. Combining the potentialities of Lincoln's dirigist credit and fiscal policies for promotion of industrial growth, and Lincoln's universal militia policies, Grant deployed the advantage of in-depth war-fighting capabilities to deplete the adversary's in-depth capabilities for continued war-fighting.

Despite the sometimes savage dissipation of U.S. military capabilities during the late 19th
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century and during the present century, the Federalist-Whig military policies, as reflected chiefly in the Civil War experience, survived to serve the United States well in the qualities of its officer corps in two world wars during this century. But for obstacles to U.S. military policy created by Winston Churchill and others, the last world war would probably have been won a year earlier than it was.

2. Republican Military Policy

A republic is a nation which is dedicated to fostering of general scientific and technological progress in the work and general experience of all its citizens, and which pursues that policy both to the end of cultivating the development of the individual citizen's creative-mental potentialities and to providing improved opportunities for the individual citizen to realize his improved mental powers to the advantage of society generally.

The adversaries of a republic are of two principal types. The primary adversaries of a republic are those forces, known in history as oligarchists, who oppose generalized scientific and technological progress, as progress is properly practiced by a republic. The secondary adversaries of a republic are those forces which ally themselves directly or in fact with oligarchist forces to injure a republic's pursuit of the indicated policies of progress.

The function of the military policy of a republic is to enable the republic to defeat those adversaries.

The strategic principles governing the military policy of a republic are based on realizing the unique sort of potential war-fighting advantages of republics and the matching unique disadvantages of states pursuing oligarchist policies.

The central strategic principle is the inherently greater in-depth war-fighting potentials of the republic.

The potentials of a republic are chiefly these:

(a) The fostering of scientific and technological progress permits advantages in the technology of warfare paralleling the advantages in increased social productivities gained through higher rates of technologically progressive capital formation per capita.

(b) The citizen of the republic, because of the inherent social and moral benefits flowing from the fostering of progress, has both superior technological potentialities and superior mental powers of innovation and problem-solving.

The potentials are realized as in-depth war-fighting capabilities through the creation of a universal militia which is well-trained, well-equipped, and ably led.

Republics order the conduct of warfare such that this in-depth advantage becomes the determining feature of the outcome of the war.

The object of warfare by a republic is to bring the adversary nation into the republican order.

The political policy of war-fighting aims at crushing the oligarchist component of the adversary nation, through aid of offering the adversary nation the conditions and benefits of a republican order, as the conditions of either terms of peace or the pacification process of military occupation.

The general purpose of the military policy of a republic is the establishment of the effective world hegemony of a community of principle-based alliance among sovereign republics. This general purpose is known as the Great Design.

The aggregate result of the development and deployment of republican military capabilities must be the progressive liquidation of oligarchist and allied governments globally, and the increase of the numbers and aggregate strength of republics.

3. The Development of The Republican Militia

The strategic objective of the existence and development of a republican military force is city-building, the creation and defense of cities as the chief mediators of scientific and technological progress into urban and rural life. Thesesame objectives and capabilities are integral to the logistics of war-fighting and the pacification of occupied territory in war-fighting.

The development of an effective republican military force demands a complementarity between developed capabilities for heavy engineering and military duties as such. A good modern republican military force is a force which can completely construct a modern city; or fulfill the heavy-engineering requirements of a large-scale agricultural development project; or construct the communications, transport, and other key elements of infrastructure for a small or medium-sized nation.

The military forces of the United States represent both a fighting force and a corps of engineers.

The training of the universal militia must provide the member of the militia competence in a range of relevant productive skills as well as proficiency in arms.

The majority of the members of the permanent officer corps and reserve officers corps must be proficient in both arms and professional qualified as science or engineering.

The costs of providing a military force in these days are offset by the value of the works of peace performed by the services, and by the fact that the educational expenditures are a recoverable cost in terms of benefits to the civilian economy. The management of the educational costs is improved by integrating military educational requirements with high education programs for the population generally.

Such a military policy is most singular appropriate for the quarter century immediate before us. Throughout the developing sector of the world, thousands of nuclear fission and, later, nuclear fusion plants must be installed. Hundreds of new cities must be constructed. Irrigation, drainage, advanced agricultural methods, and mechanization must be combined with heavy engineering generally, to create fecundity where marginal agriculture presently prevails.

Ratios of accomplishment in heavy engineering and related work beyond precede must become commonplace.

Whether an U.S. military forces deployed the request of a nation, or trained reservists
progress into urban and rural life. These same objectives and capabilities are integral to the logistics of war-fighting and the pacification of occupied territory in war-fighting.

The development of an effective republican military force demands a complementarity between developed capabilities for heavy engineering and military duties as such. A good, modern republican military force is a force which can completely construct a modern city, or fulfill the heavy-engineering requirements of a large scale agricultural development project, or construct the communications, transport, and other key elements of infrastructure for a small or medium-sized nation.

The military forces of the United States represent both a fighting force and a corps of engineers. The training of the universal militia must provide the member of the militia competence in a range of relevant productive skills as well as proficiency in arms.

The majority of the members of the permanent officer corps and reserve officers corps must be proficient in both arms and professionally qualified in some branch of science and engineering.

The costs of providing a military force of these qualities are offset by the value of the works of peace performed by the services, and by the fact that the educational expenditures are a recoverable cost in terms of benefits to the civilian economy. The management of the educational costs is improved by integrating military educational requirements with higher education programs for the population generally.

Such a military policy is most singularly appropriate for the quarter century immediately before us. Throughout the developing sector, thousands of nuclear fission and, later, nuclear fusion plants must be installed. Hundreds of new cities must be constructed. Irrigation, drainage, advanced agronomical methods, and mechanization must be combined with heavy engineering generally, to create fecundity where marginal agriculture presently prevails.

Ratios of accomplishment in heavy-engineering and related work beyond precedent must become commonplace.

Whether U.S. military forces deployed at the request of a nation, or trained reservists employing their skills in civilian employment, the net cost of maintaining such combined capabilities of our active and reserve military potential is relatively small, when the creation of value fostered by such programs is taken into account. (1)

This policy is not only appropriate and sound, but establishes the circumstances for fostering precisely those qualities of morale which a force of city-builders in arms must acquire. The work of peace is the cause served in war.

4. The Technology of Warfare

There is no more pathetic folly concerning warfare than the misguided persuasion that since improved technology enables warfare to become more destructive, that technological progress in warfare is to be either inhibited or abhorred.

Wars are fought because the penalty of not going to war is unendurable. When wars are fought, they are fought with the object of victory. To obtain victory, the sole object of war, in-depth war-fighting capabilities must be realized to the fullest potential which victory requires. Victory must be enhanced by development and employment of the most effective means of warfare, which effectiveness is not essentially separable from destructiveness.

It is a special form of lunacy which desires that wars be made less horrible so that wars might be fought more freely, with less horrifying deterrents to inhibit their initiation. It is not those who propose most effective weapons who are the bloodthirsty ones, but those who oppose use of more effective weapons so that war might be fought with less fear of its penalties, and hence fought more frequently, more recklessly.

The republican commander does not view war as a professional athlete views football. Arms is not a profession which seeks to perpetuate itself: war is not a sport for the gratification of romantics. The object of warfare for republicans is to end war by crushing the oligarchists adversaries to the point where there are no governments able to make war in behalf of the oligarchists cause in any part of the world. The object of republican military policy and warfare is today what it was with the great city-builder, Alexander the Great, and what it has been for those republicans who continued the Platonic dedication of Alexander. The object of republican military policy is total victory of a republican cause over the last bastion oligarchical policy in any nation of the world.

We shall continue to prepare to fight war, a shall increase the effectiveness of our forces a their enemies, until that final battle against an oligarchist is either fought or until the oligarchist government submits peacefully our willingness.

Wherever we fight war against the oligarch enemy, we deploy weapons as destructive as we need to secure victory with minimal injury to our forces. We shall improve the effectiveness of our forces and weapons constantly, with emphasis on the most advanced technological ever fresh advantages, until the last battle total victory over the oligarchists has been won.

The associated concern of the Department of Defense and the officers corps generally is to foster general scientific and technological progress in each of its facets in national life. Although it will be appropriate at some points direct scientific research to specifically militia ends, the notion of a special, compartmentalized body of scientific research dedicated to military objectives is pathetic folly. Military technological capabilities occur as by-products of a general scientific progress.

The Department of Defense must participate as a part of the scientific community in research work as research work, without regard whether the research has or has not a visit to military applications. But integrated within the general work of science, the Department of Defense and officer corps enriches its qualifications for detecting a assimilating the military potentials which fit from a general progress.

The broad strategic principle which we inform the decisions of the Department of Defense with respect to military technology is this: Each range of military technologies defines a corresponding range of rational, effective approaches to military strategy for that period as the German Hauf and emergence of artillery defined the three armies of warfare from its beginning of the 16th century, and as changes in technologies introduced qualitati
In civilian employment, maintaining such combined effective and reserve military small, when the creation of new programs is taken into account. The work of effective weapons which require investment and sound, corresponding for increasing the rates of morale which a force must acquire. The work is an end in itself.

In announcing the effective weapons which a force must acquire, the work is an end in itself.

I. The Nature of War

The object of military policy is total victory of the Republican cause over the last bastion of oligarchical policy in any nation of the world. We shall continue to prepare for the fight war, and shall increase the effectiveness of our forces and their weapons, until that final battle against oligarchism in either fought or until the last oligarchist government submits peacefully to its will.

1. A universal military program of these qualities and dimensions may prove a most effective aid in freeing our youth from the destructive grip of the drug counterculture.