

by Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr.  
Chairman, U.S. Labor Party  
Sept. 2, 1978

## Part II

*The first installment of "A Return to a Federalist-Whig Military Policy" appeared in New Solidarity, Vol. IX, No. 54, Sept. 8, 1978.*

### 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 NATO MC 144 and 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 to converge, asymptotically, on full deployment of maximum strategic ABC capabilities, the "flexible response" and related doctrines obsessively 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 is 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*

# A Return Whig

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

machinery and plan advantage in passive with Soviet geography. Since the military policy he coordinate in exploiting potentials of Soviet key to Soviet coup during World War I subsequently with the

A passive civil-defense to be built into the involving capital-for anything in our nation the target date for acc of a decade ahead measures would provide

The only policy route of the United States ICBMs and related weapons in flight. Such weapons



power dare deviate from that order of warfare. At least, 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 thermonuclear war is the bombardment of the logistical (e.g., population) centers of the adversary's homeland by saturation with ABC (atomic, biological, chemical) weapons bombardment. 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 dedicate any strategic weapons to counterforce 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 endured 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-Warsaw 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'

deployment for occupation of China is indicated for the initial period of warfare. ABC neutralization of key industrial capabilities and military forces' concentrations is indicated as for warfare in the European theater. However, the character and specific vulnerabilities of a relatively backward China dictates emphasis upon suitable ABC weapons, mainly biological and chemical weapons. Striking at key urban-logistical capabilities and introducing chaos and confusion into the Chinese population will neutralize China's capabilities for deploying forces beyond its borders.

Although China has a significant component of modern warfare capabilities, the emphasis on labor-intensive forms of production in most of the population, the low social productivities of the Chinese population and nation as a whole, reduce the economic and military potential of the Chinese nation approximately in proportion to the ratios of social productivity between the Chinese and Soviet economies. A surgically precise approach to exploiting the crucial weaknesses of the Chinese economy and related military capabilities effects a defeat of China with a relatively economical deployment of forces.

The only deviations of Soviet strategic deployment against China would be those based on a Soviet wish to aid an insurrection against the Peking regime. However, Soviet self-interests would be the overriding consideration.

For such a war, the proposal for U.S. "passive" civil defense measures is pathetically incompetent. Passive civil defense means such measures as evacuation programs, shelters, redeployments of populations and logistical resources, and protective measures for existing

The reality of thermonuclear warfare reflected in the Soviets' strategy, backed by a scientific progress as national NATO "flexible response" by James R. Schlesinger. NATO capabilities are a Soviet May Day military Commander Haig discomfited soldier.

caught on the ground must be neutralized may contribute major counter-countermeasures to the attacker. The weapons is the only competent active counter. Such weapons are feared as the most imminent and effective kind of effectiveness.

Why, then, did the U.S. deploy such an international slander? General Keegan and scientists collaborated the beam-weapon capabilities. R. Schlesinger exempts oligarchist agents and other institutions trend toward war combined NATO-USA.

The emerging major winning advantage is emphasis on basic qualitatively greater existed for a decade and from the development according to a co-sources of potential riched from the U.S. "mentalists" movement. IMF and World capital-formation in capitalist sector, and NATO policy think related with the response" doctrines. Soviet in-depth capabilities shaped by a complex trends are relatively an incompetent doctrine.

The trend is lurid volunteer army." An actual thermonuclear the "all-volunteer army" trend toward no in-

It is of no use to the U.S. Army is a problem hidden from the Soviet again means "Useless recruitment program those ghetto and white internal U.S. industry shoved toward the so problem of U.S. forces the public streets of V

The point is not it should not be induced. Apart from the shock U.S. depression, which

# turn to Federalist- ig Military Policy

chinery and plant. The Soviet relative  
antage in passive civil defense is coordinate  
1 Soviet geography. However, it is not merely  
graphy. Since the 1920s, Soviet economic and  
itary policy have been substantially  
rdinate in exploiting the passive civil-defense  
entials of Soviet geography. This policy was  
to Soviet counteroffensive capabilities  
ing World War II, and has been pursued  
sequently with thermonuclear war in view.  
passive civil-defense capability would have  
be built into the infrastructure of the U.S.,  
oliving capital-formation ratios exceeding  
thing in our national experience, even were  
target date for accomplishment in the order  
a decade ahead. Available, short-term  
asures would provide only marginal benefits.  
he only policy route for effective civil defense  
the United States 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 oligarchical 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, peppery Harry S. Truman and his anglo-  
phile "Svengali," 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 re-  
ne Soviets' adoption of a war-winning  
acked by a commitment to basic sci-  
ss as national economic policy. U.S.-  
ible response" doctrine, as advocated  
R. Schlesinger (I.), has rendered U.S.-  
ilities a bad joke. Above, the annual  
y Day military parade; right, NATO  
er Haig discusses strategy with a Dutch

the ground prior to deployment; they  
neutralized in flight. Countermissiles  
tribute marginally to this end, but  
countermissile measures are available  
tacker. The development of beam  
s the only reliable centerpiece for a  
active civil-defense policy in sight.  
ions are feasible in terms of existing or  
ly creatable physics, and provide the  
ctiveness required.

hen, did British intelligence (IIS)  
such an immediate, massive  
nal slander-campaign against Major-  
Keegan and the U.S. Labor Party  
collaborating with him in presenting  
-weapon capability? The case of James  
inger exemplifies the way in which pro-  
st agents within the U.S. government  
institutions have created the present  
ward war-losing capabilities of  
NATO-USA forces.

erging margins of potential Soviet war-  
advantage flow, on their side, from an  
is on basic scientific progress  
vely greater than those which had  
or a decade in NATO and allied nations,  
the developing of military capabilities  
g to a competent doctrine. These  
of potential Soviet advantage are en-  
om the U.S.-NATO side by the "environ-  
it" movement, by the effects of sup-  
IMF and World Bank policies' effects on  
ormation and world-trade ratios in the  
st sector, and by a degradation in U.S.-  
policy thinking and capabilities cor-  
with the emergence of "flexible  
e" doctrines. While the relative trend in  
in-depth capabilities is upward, and  
by a competent doctrine, U.S.-NATO  
are relatively downward and shaped by  
mpetent doctrine.

rend is luridly underscored by the "all-  
er army." Against the crucial issue of  
thermonuclear war, in-depth capabilities,  
l-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 Accomodated." The  
ment program depends upon attracting  
ghetto and white poor which a decaying  
U.S. industrial economy has, in effect,  
toward the social-discard heap. The drug  
m of U.S. forces is openly advertised on  
blic streets of West Germany.

point is not that ghetto and white poor  
not be inducted into military service,  
from the shocking effects of the prolonged  
epression, which made so many poor youth



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 1960 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 ac-  
cording to "flexible response" doctrines, the  
more the Soviet commanders are obliged to nul-  
lify 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 (LISS)? What is a Rhodes  
scholarship? What is Rothschild? What is  
Warburg? What is Lehman Brothers? What is  
Barings? What is Rupert Murdoch?

Schlesinger is, like Henry A. Kissinger, a  
protégé of oligarchist Fritz Kraemer. He is  
essentially an oligarchist, an agent of the Black  
Maltese, of the British monarchy — he is an  
agent of the force which has been consistently  
the chief adversary of the United States since the  
American Revolution. He is dedicated not to the

nations become aggregately a hegemonic force  
globally, eradicating the last vestiges of the  
oligarchical power and policies then typified by  
the evil British monarchy. That is the United  
States, and anyone who has sworn an oath to the  
Constitution is obliged either to stick to that  
policy or to resign his commission or other  
office.

There is one current in the leadership of the  
Soviet Union which is committed to defining  
economic and political agreement with us  
according to those U.S. principles, of fostering  
global scientific and technological progress at

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  
leading strata, currents which define "socialist"  
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  
his 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  
Japanese are not great enthusiasts of the Soviet  
Union, they had also contributed crucially in  
more ways than in negotiations concerning  
Siberian 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



Continued from Page 4

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 actively 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-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 protégé, 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 of 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 formation of the League of Armed Neutrality in 1780, the British monarchy's principal, continuing fear has been that an alliance of economic cooperation, based on fostering

household and semiautonomous state of Bavaria were and had been British clients.

It was Prince Rupprecht and Haushofer who initiated the Hitler project in concert with British intelligence. It was the Warburgs and inside circles of British intelligence, including the Churchill circles, who ordered Hitler placed in the Chancellory, and S.G. Warburg, Schacht's patron, which dictated Hitler's 1933-1936 policies, the policies which led to the rest.

It was British circles which blocked the French from moving into the Rhineland in 1936, which saved Hitler from being overthrown in a 1938 Generals' Plot on the eve of the Czechoslovak occupation, and which ran the Western Front as a "phony war" until it became clear that Hitler could not, or would not, restrain his generals from moving westward before considering moving eastward.

It was Hitler's Chancellory which halted Guderian's tanks, permitting the Dunkirk evacuation. It was Hitler who saved England from German conquest by ordering Goering's "terror bombing" of London, and Hitler who went east without eliminating the British base in his western rear. It was Nazi Germany which declined to occupy the island of Malta, an inexplicable act strategically, but not astonishing if one knows the pedigree of Hitler and his inner circle. There was nothing absurd, excepting a matter of timing, in Rudolf Hess's flight to Scotland. This was undoubtedly ordered by Hitler. Nor is it surprising that the British should have brainwashed Hess, nor that Hess was not executed, but rather condemned to become the lone last prisoner in his prison.

Nor is it astonishing that Stalin refused to believe British warnings of an impending Wehrmacht assault. The assault was initially effective because Stalin correctly considered it strategically lunatic of Hitler to move eastward before eliminating Britain. Stalin also assumed wrongly, but for eminently sound reasons, that Churchill was disposed to attempt to provoke a premature war between the Soviet Union and Germany as a desperate gamble to save England. Stalin's error was in failing to understand what Hitler actually was, and consequently failing to understand the imminence of an assault that would have been utter Wehrmacht lunacy had Soviet forces been deployed according to the preestablished order of warfare for such a contingency.

It is a matter of record that President Franklin Roosevelt moved against Churchill from the

interests in respect to realization of interests. London has predominated U.S. Soviet policy. We are in that a "dumb giant" serving the British as Lord Milner prescribed at the century.

There have been important exceptions. The Eisenhower Atoms-for-Peace Administration's Rogers Plan is an important thrust in corresponding vital interests. The 1972 Nixon-Brezhnev is potentially a addition to that list. Until we face matters as the Bronfman-bank entity, and its links to assassination, we must leave off the question whether Kennedys moved into a direction parallel to and Nixon's.

The realities of history, between nations which should one another at that time, warm cheerful presumption that a proper Great Design policy, would give U.S. war with the Soviet "Bukharinites" in the Soviet nation's deadly enemies, degraded in a Jacobin guise. If that force power in the Soviet Union, relations would become most difficult.

However, if we adopt a policy the Great Design, and develop capabilities in accordance with flowing from dirigist policies technological progress, we have provides us with the most effective action in any eventuality.

#### The Tasks of The President

George Washington was a John Quincy Adams did that beyond the knowledge of no service, as Secretary of State, as the de facto President of from behind the scenes, after Delano Roosevelt was a power some great moments, including described Lord Mountbatten "that bastard." However, President to match Abraham flanked by such great figures and William D. Kelley, approximation of Plato's "philosopher king" ever presidency.

Harassed by a rump Democratic the control of outright traitors: traitors, especially the New crews, within his Republican fight wisely for each degree of he required. The loss of the war was a blow. Secretary of War the prosecution of the war in was largely a saboteur. Based on the Midwestern Whigs, and Whig generals such as Grant Lincoln saved the nation's dirigist mobilization of its in a republican military police Whig fiscal and monetary measures.

Lincoln's accomplishment from without and massive support are but the predicates of his writings exhibit, Lincoln humanist, of an intellectual U.S. President since has

outset of World War II on this same issue. Sabotage from within the U.S. government and powerful policy institutions blocked Roosevelt to a significant degree. The Byrnes nomination of his protégé, 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 dupe in the White House. Churchill's "Cold War"

Most of the academic arguments about the doctrine of world war II on this same issue. 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 formation of the League of Armed Neutrality in 1780, the British monarchy's principal, continuing fear has been that an alliance of economic cooperation, based on fostering scientific and technological progress, would develop among France, Germany, and Russia. There is no other true reason for all the gobbledygook offered in the pretext of arriving "objectively" at the discovery of the significance of the Eurasian "heartland's" allegedly magical properties.

The British designers of "geopolitics" had the potential success of Hanotaux's and Witte's efforts directly in view, as Milner, the Webbs, et al. first formulated the geopolitical doctrine at the onset of this century. Also, they recalled not only 1780-1783, 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 amiably around Russian heads of state!) The British had suffered their most disastrous defeat of the 19th century in 1863, 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 Maltese 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 nicely 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 signator 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 Dresdner Bank's Jürgen Ponto and Mercedes Benz's Hans-Martin Schleyer in 1977. (Please, dear reader, do not make an ass of yourself by pretending that you doubt that the British — which is to say Black Maltese-Zionist forces — did not murder Ponto and Schleyer!)

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 Bremen agreements and the May 1978 Schmidt-Brezhnev 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 Haushofer 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 protégé, 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 dupe 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 Maltese 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, peppery 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

a republican military Whig fiscal and monetary

Lincoln's accomplishments from without and mass are but the predicates of writings exhibit, Lincoln humanist, of an intellectual U.S. President since the approximate without the of his intellectual powers succeeded, and our nation survived.

Now, we have entered a



in which those same special qualifications of a "philosopher king" indispensable in the office if reasonably assured of general through the difficult period dare not risk another mediocrity or Carter in that office at this semi-mediocrity like a Nixon, times, such as Eisenhower above all, tolerate immoral sort who flitter hither and yon points of agreement with constituent of a mutually consensus, "a candidate for all of the time."

This is a period of grave or officials are no longer selected but in an increasing number of frauds which range in the or percent or more of the vote record 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 the courts to oversee elections — too many officials fear that their election, or are depended upon vote fraud.

This is no longer in fact a democracy. The controllers of vote fraud oligarchy which selects the winners despite the voters.

Our youth are being destroyed, Dionysiac counterculture such as New York City are insurrection of drug users or drug pushers in public streets, or before our public eyes.

At this moment, despite the numerous outright fraudulent officials

ists in respect to realization of such U.S. lists, London has predominantly determined Soviet policy. We are in that respect merely "giant" serving the British monarchy — and Milner prescribed at the opening of this century.

There have been important exceptions to this. Eisenhower's Atoms-for-Peace and the Nixon administration's Rogers Plan are examples of important thrusts in correspondence with U.S. interests. The 1972 Nixon treaty with the Soviet Union is potentially a very important addition to that list. Until we fully explore such exceptions as the Bronfman-backed Permindex and its links to the Kennedy administration, we must leave our minds open on the question whether Kennedy might have turned into a direction paralleling Eisenhower's policies.

Realities of history, including wars between nations which should not have fought either 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 "primitives" in the Soviet Union are our deadly enemies, degraded oligarchists in guise. If that force should come to the Soviet Union, relations between the two would become most difficult.

After, if we adopt a policy consistent with the Design, and develop our military policies in accordance with the potentialities of dirigist policies of scientific and technical progress, we have a policy which gives us the most effective means for any eventuality.

### The Tasks of The President

Washington was a great President. John Adams did this nation service to the knowledge of most, in our foreign policy. As Secretary of State, as President, and in fact as President of the Whig forces, and the scenes, after 1828, Franklin D. Roosevelt was a powerful President, with moments, including the moment he Lord Mountbatten to Churchill, as "dard." However, we have had no one to match Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln, such great figures as Henry C. Carey and D. Kelley, was the nearest to Plato's model of the "king" ever to occupy the

by a rump Democratic Party under of outright traitors, and hampered by especially 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 the war in many ways. Seward a saboteur. Basing himself largely on Western Whigs, and the emergence of such as Grant and Sherman, saved the nation through a utilization of its industrial potentials, military policy, and Federalist and monetary measures.

accomplishments, in the face of war and massive treason from within, predicates of his character. As his bit, Lincoln was a Neoplatonic intellectual stature which no one since has even threatened to Without that special development



President Harry S. Truman's (l.) tutelage under Winston Churchill (r.) shifted postwar U.S. policy determination from Washington to London.

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 capabilities are a direct reflection of our British-designed military policy. There is a direct and necessary connection between Schlesinger's zero-growth energy and antispace policy and his "China option" and "flexible response" babblings.

In one term, beginning January 1981, 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.

continuation of the same conflict which has persisted to date during 3,000 years of history.

The essential policy of those forces around Benjamin Franklin was a commitment to scientific and technological progress, mediated through urban centers and improvements in means of communication and commerce, to promote rising social productivities and improvements in conditions of life in both urban occupations and in the progress of agriculture. This commitment was seen in part as an indispensable course for meeting the needs and improving the welfare of the citizens and their posterity. It was also seen as essential to fostering the development and employment of those creative-mental powers which distinguish man from the lower beasts.

The British monarchy and its associated oligarchist forces sought to keep the colonists in a relatively fixed form of rural-centered technology, thus suppressing the development of those creative-mental potentialities, and so tending to degrade those persons into a beast-like condition.

These oppressions Franklin and his collaborators would not tolerate. They turned to influential persons in various nations, persons who shared their Neoplatonic dedication to the fostering of scientific and technological progress. Such persons were already known to them, since the Commonwealth Party in England and in America had maintained its connections to the followers of Descartes, Leibniz, and Jean-Baptiste Colbert, chiefly under the cover of scientific collaborations. They centered their efforts in France, entering into close collaboration with such French successors of Colbert as Turgot and Vergennes. With those co-conspirators, Franklin and his American associates plotted an alliance against the English monarchy which would enable an American Revolution to establish the United States as a sovereign nation, a republic whose constitution would be based on natural law.



monetary... accomplishments. In the face of war and massive treason from within, rediculous of his character. As his bit, Lincoln was a Neoplatonic intellectual stature which no one since has even threatened to without that special development of powers, he could not have and our nation could not have

entered a period of U.S. history



philosopher king" to guarantee U.S. the met in only one presidential can-

those same special qualities, the of a "philosopher king" are in the office if the nation is to be assured of getting successfully difficult period now before us. We another mediocrity such as a Ford of that office at this juncture, nor a city like a Nixon, nor a man for the as Eisenhower was. We cannot, operate immoral candidates of the ter hither and yon in efforts to find agreement with each important of a mutually contradictory a candidate for all of the factions all

period of grave crisis. Our elected no longer selected by the electorate, greasing number of cases by vote a range in the order of up to 15 ore of the vote recorded. The courts al, not act to halt these fraudulent spensing with the evidence of such mere irregularities." Legislatures, U.S. Congress, have so far refused r legislation which efficiently the courts to overturn corrupt too many officials either know or air election, or an ally's election on vote fraud.

longer in fact a democratic republic. ers of vote fraud represent an ich selects the winning candidates, pers.

are being destroyed by a drug- ysiac counterculture. Police in cities York City are instructed to avoid s users or drug pushers, even on the s, or before our public schools. ment, despite the misconstrued and, audulent official figures, we are

In one term, beginning January 1981, 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 with 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 1981 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.

## THE CHARTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### 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, to 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 others that the American people 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 incomes and productivities 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 exclude 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 the financial interests of the City of London.

The conflict between England and the American colonies was an historical echo of the conflict between the Commonwealth Party and the Stuart oligarchy during the 17th century. It was at the same time a reflection of the age-long conflict between humanism and oligarchism, a

of Colbert as turgot and vergennes. With those co-conspirators, Franklin and his American associates plotted an alliance against the English monarchy which would enable an American Revolution to establish the United States as a sovereign nation, a republic whose constitution would be based on natural law, essentially as "natural law" was associated with Leibniz.

The intent of the Constitution was implemented under the Administration of President George Washington. The credit, national banking, and economic doctrines of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton represented a solution to the critical problem of United States 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 continued emphasis on universal public education and the promotion of cultural progress.

Under the leadership of President Washington, President John Adams and Inspector-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 ruined under President Adams's immediate successors in office, to our nation's great peril during 1812-1815. The experience of the second war with England was reflected in the great advances in West Point programs from 1818 through the close of the Administration of President John Quincy Adams and under the leadership of Commandant Thayer.

Although the work of 1818-1828 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 was not coincidental. Jackson and Van Buren halted the U.S. policy of fostering scientific and technological progress, dissolved the Second National Bank, and ruined U.S. credit 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, like the policies of their key French collaborator and ally, the Marquis de Lafayette, was based on the principles of Machiavelli and his successors: that 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 war-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

Continued on Page 6, col. 1

Continued from Page 5

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 intellectual 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 deployment of a republican military force is *city-building*, the creation and defense of cities as the chief mediators of scientific and technological



The U.S. Army has the potential to serve as a builders. Above, Army engineers construct a power plant for a research and development center near the Greenland polar ice cap; right, Army engineers are building a bridge in Korea.

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 professional, qualified in some branch of science and engineering.

The costs of providing a military force with 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 high education programs for the population generally.

Such a military policy is most singularly appropriate for the quarter century immediate before us. Throughout the developing sectors 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 as U.S. military forces deployed at the request of a nation, or trained reservists



The U.S. Army has the potential to serve as an army of city-builders. Above, Army engineers construct a portable nuclear power plant for a research and development center underneath the Greenland polar ice cap; right, Army engineers building a bridge in Korea.



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 as 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 objective 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 oligarchist adversaries to the point where there are no governments able to make war in behalf of the oligarchist 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 the republican cause over the last bastion of oligarchical policy in any nation of the world.

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

Wherever we fight war against the oligarch enemy, we deploy weapons as destructive as are needed 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 technologies of ever fresh advantages, until the last battle of 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 to direct scientific research to specifically military ends, the notion of a special, compartmentalized body of scientific research dedicated to military objectives is pathetic folly. Military technological capabilities occur as by-product 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 to whether the research has or has not a visible military application. By integrating its scientific work within the general work of science, the Department of Defense and officer corps enriches its qualifications for detecting and assimilating the military potentials which flow from a generality of progress.

The broad strategic principle which must 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 Haufe and emergence of artillery defined the three arms of warfare from the beginning of the 16th century, and as changes in technologies introduced qualitative





in civilian employment, maintaining such combined active and reserve military small, when the creation of programs is taken into fully appropriate and sound, circumstances for fostering of morale which a force must acquire. The work served in war.

#### ology of Warfare

pathetic folly concerning misguided persuasion that technology enables warfare to be active, that technological is to be either inhibited or because the penalty of not durable. When wars are fought with the objective of victory, the sole object of war, capabilities must be potential which victory must be enhanced by employment of the most warfare, which effectiveness is separable from

lunacy which desires that able so that wars might be with less horrifying their initiation. It is not effective weapons who, but those who oppose weapons so that war might fear of its penalties, and gently, more recklessly. mander does not view war as views football. Arms is seeks to perpetuate itself; for the gratification of of warfare for republicans trashing the oligarchist point where there are no make war in behalf of the by part of the world. The military policy and warfare with the great city-builder,

Alexander the Great, and what it has been for all those republicans who continued the Platonic dedication of Alexander. The object of republican 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 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.

Wherever we fight war against the oligarchist enemy, we deploy weapons as destructive as are needed 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 technologies for ever fresh advantages, until the last battle of 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 to direct scientific research to specifically military 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 to whether the research has or has not a visible military application. By integrating its scientific work within the general work of science, the Department of Defense and officer corps enriches its qualifications for detecting and assimilating the military potentials which flow from a generality of progress.

The broad strategic principle which must 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 Haufe and emergence of artillery defined the three arms of warfare from the beginning of the 16th century, and as changes in technologies introduced qualitative

modifications in appropriate strategies and tactics hereafter. Any range of qualitative advances in military technology frees military capabilities from the limitations of the preceding technology.

In correspondence with this, insoluble problems arising in the elaboration of a given range of technologies of warfare always have a solution within the realm of qualitative advances in that technology.

The work of military science in this connection follows the principle of scientific advances in general. In any existing body of scientific knowledge and related practice, one discovers the key to the next range of advances in knowledge and practice by isolating and defining a crucial flaw in the existing body of assumptions and developing effective hypotheses and experiments which satisfy the requirements of a comprehensive solution to the flawed character of existing knowledge. In warfare, the difficult problems of existing strategic "geometries" have an analogous character.

It is notable that republican scientist Leibniz specified the importance of development of a cartridge-loaded, breech-loaded infantry weapon during the 1670s.

No single set of discoveries represents a permanent margin of advantage. The advantage lies in maintaining a higher rate of new advances than the adversaries. The argument that "Now we must develop one because a potential adversary is suspected of developing one" is not the viewpoint of military science. We must continue to develop faster than potential adversaries might dream of new developments. We advance, not because the potential adversary has, but because he has not.

The potential of a republic is its effective dedication to achieving the highest rates of technological and scientific progress. On condition that the republican military potentials of this are being developed, the more rapidly technology of warfare advances, the greater the margin of inherent advantage of the republic.

#### 5. The U.S. Military Philosophical Association

The most conspicuous of the formal obstacles to knowledge of Federalist-Whig West Point accomplishments among the officer corps during recent years has been the slanderous misrepresentation of Whig intelligence operative Edgar Allan Poe. All of the generally accredited evaluations of Poe, and accounts of his life, are frauds.

The leading Federalist-Whig strata of the United States were collectively Neoplatonic philosophers and scientists better educated in crucial aspects of historical and philosophical knowledge than leading academic specialists of today. The degradation of U.S. liberal arts culture, especially since the massive British corruption of our educational institutions during the present century, has been a general loss of the mental capabilities even to read intelligently what were the lucid and profound writings of Whig thinkers contemporary to and allied with Poe in the U.S. Whig intelligence service.

The ability of leading Americans and their European associates to create the United States, and to develop the new military doctrines which shattered the old military system over the 1776-1807 period, was based on a method and knowledge generally beyond the comprehension of most modern scholars.

It was because of a recognition of the connection between this body of Neoplatonic method and effective military doctrine and practice that West Point was associated with a Whig-dominated military philosophical association. That quality of association must be revived today, integrated with the life of the military academics, and must revive the quality of knowledge, albeit with modern ingredients, adopted as necessary by the associates of John Quincy Adams.

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