

the associates of John Jacobs and Mark Rudd did. Their new-suburbanites' dream-world fantasy-life was administered a nasty taste of reality; they went virtually as mad as Peter Weiss's Marat and de Sade combined.

### Apply the clinical lesson

For the historian's view of the mid-1960s, these "New Leftists" were the rampaging hordes of Flagellants from Fourteenth-Century Europe's "New Dark Age." They were the characters from Bertolt Brecht's *Three-Penny Opera*, but staged with a very generous overcasting for Jennys of all conceivable, and also inconceivable sexes.

There is another historical precedent, a very relevant precedent: the Paris mob created and used as paid and armed hirelings of the Duke of Orléans known as Philippe *Egalité*, and by the Jacobin terrorists such as Robespierre, Saint-Just, Danton, and Marat. The political and moral characteristic of the New Left so described, is extreme lability. They are, in effect, a mob for hire, like the street mobs among the spectators at the Roman arenas, echoes of the hired mobs of the ancient Roman proletariat used to destroy the Republic of Rome. They were the raging children of Satan, the dionysiacs, complete with Phrygian caps. They were the Paris mob voting to decapitate Lavoisier, the mob shouting: "The Revolution has no need of scientists." They would have cried, had they the opportunity, "Crucify Him!" against Jesus Christ.

Especially notable, for understanding the presently continuing social and ideological impact of the 1964-1972 cultural paradigm-shift, is the feverishly anti-labor passion expressed by the majority among the politically-active New Left currents of that period. The way in which McGeorge Bundy's Ford Foundation, and its money, with help from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, orchestrated the Fall 1968 New York Teachers' strike, is illustrative of the anti-labor rage, rampant among the majority of the New Left university campus-strata of that time. That suburbanite New Lefters' gut-hatred of "blue-collar" labor, was an important consideration in the 1972 launching of the "ecology movement," as the replacement "cause" around which to regroup the already organically anti-labor "New Left." This is the root of fervently anti-labor policy of the leadership of the Democratic Leadership Council today, as of Vice-President Al Gore, and of the cousin of the late Senator Joe McCarthy's "Leporello," Roy M. Cohn. I speak, of course, of "Third Way" poll-cat "Dick" Morris.

There is no remedy for such moral and emotional disorders but that implied in what I have summarized here. The general remedy is to restore a sense of participation in physically useful work, that accompanied by a reeducation in those subject-matters which call forth from the student the innate powers of cognition. The victims of that New Left ideological legacy need a sense of participation in reality, and, for that purpose, they require that cognitive sense of reality which they either never had, or lost on the way home from their university campus somewhere back then.

---

## 4.4 Nuclear weapons and the New Age

---

By now, the citizen should have learned the hard lesson, never to elect a President as Commander in Chief of our armed forces, without first looking into his, and his key advisors' military doctrines. The lunacy which grips the minds of the majority of the Executive Branch's Israeli-penetrated, BAC-controlled White House Principals Committee, is presently moving the world close to a state of generalized warfare throughout most of the planet.

In Africa, the conflagration, spread chiefly, and jointly by British, Israeli, and U.S. "Iran-Contra"-type gun-runners, engulfs most of sub-Saharan Africa, with, as I have already reported here, a recent death-toll among black Africans from these wars, now estimated as exceeding the six millions Jews reported victims of the Nazis. Already, Cuba has been drawn, once again, into a recently escalated continuation of African wars which continue to be orchestrated chiefly by joint British and Israeli interests. Weapons from the territory of the former European Warsaw Pact are now also being featured.

A condition now approaching a state of generalized irregular and other warfare, is taking over more and more of South America. There is the not-so-secret alliance of Tony Blair, Israel's Netanyahu, and the Al Gore-directed Principals Committee, which is pushing the world toward the early prospect of a Middle East war, this time with nuclear-weapons implications. Central Asia is already a large target for British orchestration of warfare and terrorism spilling over from Afghanistan. The Balkans is still inflamed from what Thatcher, Mitterrand, and Israel unleashed, under the banner of the Thatcher government's "Fourth Reich" campaign to destroy Germany, and to set a deadly, future Balkans trap for Russia at the same time.

Recently, the Principals Committee has uncorked what leading strategic experts in Europe and elsewhere already recognize as its hoax of alleged biochemical threats from "weapons of mass-destruction." The hoax is, that the source of the actual danger is typified by the prospect, that perhaps the ever-present cockroach in the pantry factor, otherwise known as "certain Western and Israeli secret services," might utilize some new group of admirers of the Dalai Lama, who might serve as a prospective successor to the Aum cult's Japan rampage, in a provocation, which in that case would provide a "plausible" cover for such attacks against China as its political target.<sup>61</sup>

---

61. There are some people, whose enthusiastic repeated references to a certain new gadget they have picked up, often betrays their temptation to create a pretext for trying the gadget out. E.g., an actual attack, actually run by "relevant secret services," for the purpose of giving credibility to what the Principals Committee avows is the danger from such "weapons of mass destruction." The now-celebrated letter to Prince Hassan, by the King of Jordan, corresponds to a circumstance in which such an operation by "relevant secret services" is being set up. There is much of the shameless sophistry secreted

Given the rapidly worsening global military situation, it is urgent that the issues of warfare be given some prominent attention in this place, at this time. I address this matter, first, in this conclusion of the present section, and, later, in a different context, within the summary of my economic and foreign policy, in the next and closing section.

Look at the change in the definition of warfare, which has been established as policy, first by the combined aftermath of the 1962 missile-crisis negotiations and the murder of President Kennedy. Grasp the enormity of that change in policy for today, and see the way in which right-wing New-Left drop-out Al Gore<sup>62</sup> figures in the present efforts to unleash perverted strategic formulas which could have no effect but to aggravate the already menacing threats of war and terrorism. Particularly dangerous, is Gore's role in promoting that hare-brained "Special Forces" doctrine, which was introduced more than a decade ago, then with the backing of both then-Senator, and presently Secretary of Defense Cohen, in concert, then as now, with the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Henry H. Shelton.

First, summarize the background, the former military doctrine of the U.S.A.

From the beginning, the change from feudal to modern forms of warfare, reflected a fundamental change in the constitutional principles of society. To understand this change with reasonable accuracy, it is sufficient to focus upon the interconnections among three leading points of the initial change.

1. The change began, as I reported here earlier, with an initially subtle, but revolutionary change in the form of government, as in Louis XI's reconstruction of France, and also under the echoing reforms under Henry VII in England. This change introduced into practice an evolutionary principle, aimed at bringing

---

by Cohen et al. from the Principals Committee which mimics the known personality—or lack thereof—of Vice-President Gore. It were useful on this account, to review a tape of the celebrated televised "debate" between Gore and Ross Perot. Perot blew it, by attempting to limit debate to the relevant rational evidence, evidence which Gore refused to debate. Gore conducted a lunatic's raging monologue, allowing Perot virtually no opportunity to speak. If Perot had understood the situation adequately, he would have recognized that there is only one way to debate Gore: call Gore the liar and lunatic Gore is, directly to Gore's face, and be prepared to debate the issue of Gore's lying and lunacy, ready to back *that issue* up with the relevant facts. Perot knew this to be the actual issue which he should have confronted in that debate, but, apparently, Perot simply lacked the guts to say so. So, a Perot who had shaped the 1992 general election, was virtually dumped, by Gore's carnival pitch-man's trick, from a significant future role in U.S. political life. Dumped by a literally raving liar and lunatic, unceremoniously virtually driven from any significant role in politics thereafter. The same lying style peculiar to Gore, is sometimes echoed by Secretary Cohen, as on the biochemical weapons issue.

62. "Right-wing New Left drop-out" equals "Third Way." So, during the celebrated, prolonged Berlin trolley-car strikes, prior to Adolf Hitler's coming to power, the local Communist and Nazi parties were swapping large chunks of memberships back and forth, virtually by the week.

successive reforms of government into convergence on conformity with the Christian definition of human nature, as each person made in the image of the Creator. For this purpose, human nature is defined under natural law, by the nature of the powers of cognition unique to the human species. The humanist form of education of orphans and others by methods of, or consistent with the work of the Brothers of the Common Life, typified this qualitative elevation of the legal and social status of the population as a whole.

2. As I have also reported earlier, there was an accompanying, revolutionary change in the principles of law as such. As Professor von der Heydte has defined this, the effect was to bring all facets of political society into conformity with that Christian notion of individual human nature.
3. There was a correlated change in the notion of economy, away from the zero-technological growth rule which feudalism had inherited from the Code of Diocletian. This change emphasized a form of political-economy premised upon fostering of increases of the productive powers of labor, through aid of scientific and technological progress.

The impact of this change on warfare is demonstrated most sharply by the reforms instituted by France's Louis XI. Louis XI was obliged to fight wars on several fronts, in the effort to ensure the reconstruction of France despite its enemies. His methods were a brilliantly successful, qualitative break with feudal traditions in warfare. This effectively outflanked those adversaries, taking them by surprise by means of reforms which those adversaries would have considered unthinkable by their standards of conduct. For this, France's outwitted foes called him "The Spider King." This achievement of Louis XI was built upon by the ensuing work of Leonardo da Vinci and Niccolò Machiavelli, especially respecting the strategic and related implications of a commitment to scientific and technological progress, and by their understanding of the effects of this upon the emerging political institutions of the modern sovereign state, in addition to the revolutionary impact upon the conduct of warfare as such.

The uneven, but otherwise clear trend in changes in the conduct of what we came to call regular warfare, led through the influences of France's Cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin, Jean-Baptiste Colbert and Vauban. This was continued by a well-defined revolution in warfare, introduced by Lazare Carnot, during his victorious command of France's forces during 1792-1794. After the defeat of Prussia at the twin battles of Jena and Auerstadt, the Prussian reformers, such as Gerhard Scharnhorst, were situated to assume leadership of Germany's resistance to Napoleon's tyranny. The Prussian

reforms variously coincided with or complemented the reforms which Carnot had introduced in France.

Athwart those two latter developments, there was the preceding U.S. War of Independence, which served as an influence on both the subsequent military reforms in France and Prussia, followed by the evolution of U.S. military doctrine into new forms, a change in U.S. doctrine greatly influenced by the work of Carnot and Scharnhorst, and subsequently realized under President Abraham Lincoln. The Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71, under the command of Helmuth von Moltke, brought together most of the lessons contributed by the American Revolution, Carnot, Scharnhorst, and of Grant and Sherman under Lincoln. Going into both World Wars I and II, this legacy of development of the military side of statecraft defined broadly the ground rules of modern warfare as known to, and practiced by the best U.S. commanders, such as General Douglas MacArthur.

To sum up the lessons which should have been learned from the experience of Europe's emergence from feudal forms of warfare and other statecraft, it should be an acknowledged principle, that, henceforth, war must never again be an echo of professional sports competition. Nor should wars be fought for revenge, nor for those purposes of so-called "aversive behavioral modification" which utterly immoral, U.S.A. and other scoundrels have recently deployed. Exemplary of the latter folly, is the set of war-crimes which have been perpetrated, as under the Clinton-Gore Administration's participation in British psychological-warfare style, "behavioral modification" bombings of Iraq.

Those practices which I propose must be prohibited, were among the characteristics of feudal warfare, a legacy from a disgusting tradition which spilled over into modern times in the form of what became known as "Eighteenth-Century cabinet warfare." In the tradition of "cabinet warfare," into which U.S. military policy and practice have degenerated over the course of recent decades, the military arm has become merely the murderous thug unleashed or called back at the pleasure of diplomats of Henry Kissinger's depraved type. The kindest thing which could be said of governments which degrade their military arms into such uses, is that those governments are conspicuously uncivilized. Military commanders and other leading responsables who approve of such uncivilized use of military arms should be summarily dismissed for cause, on that account alone, and replaced by officers whose choices of adopted career-benchmarks were more like William Tecumseh Sherman and Douglas MacArthur.

As the Augustinian principle of *justified warfare* implies for today, in the modern era, the only legitimate purpose of war, is to promote the civilized peace, but only for that military purpose, and that only under conditions that those aims could be accomplished only by military means and no other. That means that the manner of conduct of any and all war must be consistent with that principle. It means that the conditions which the victor imposes upon the vanquished must be, from that point on, beneficial to the vanquished, affording the van-

quished the access to as perfect a sovereignty as he commanded before, or better, and as good, or better a prospect for the general welfare of his people than before. It is those benefits, not the Hobbesian's threat of reprisals, which supply those foundations of a civilized and durable peace essential to a consolidated victory.

Nothing of what I have outlined above is idle rhetoric on my part. This has been my policy toward the Soviet Union at the time I first proposed what became the SDI, and it was my policy, at Berlin, on October 12, 1988, when I presented my proposed terms of peaceful cooperation to a Soviet Union which I then knew, as I then stated, to be doomed to an economic collapse during the course of the year or so then immediately ahead.

Consider three key points of my past strategic military policy, as illustrations of the immediately relevant point. Thereafter, I shall return to the issues of modern warfare in general. However, before either of those sub-topics, I shall interpolate a brief, relevant note, on the role of the Christian missionary.

The Christian missionary knows that the world is filled with heathen. The British monarchy of Elizabeth II, for example, is a variety of heathen which not merely borders on outrightly satanic cults, but is an integral, leading part of such cults. Otherwise, there are heathen such as those apostles of hatred, the Reverend Pat Robertson and the Reverend Jerry Falwell, whom a modern Jonah might prefer to abhor, who are exemplary of the odious challenges to be matched sometimes by missionary skills and devotion. Nonetheless, whether the client of the occasion is odious or not, once Jonah is clear on the authority behind his orders, he will carry out his mission.

The order to slaughter heretics never came from the Creator. The mission is not to slaughter the unbelievers, but to save them, if not by the sermon of the word, by the sermon of the deed. Does the missionary ever kill, or approve killing? Only when there is no other alternative, and only when that act itself is not the futile gesture which would thus become a probable goad to useless spreading of the fires of death. However, warrior or not, he never abandons his primary mission, to save the heathen, that in fulfillment of the principle, that each man and women is made in the image of the Creator, and thus a target for redemption.

The warrior's conscience must be informed by the missionary. When war must be fought, it must be fought as General Douglas MacArthur conducted the forces under his command in the Pacific war. MacArthur conducted his part in that war with an excellent sense of the principles of justified warfare, a quality in which he far surpassed other Allied commands in World War II. There were other skilled and honorable, excellent commanders, but MacArthur is outstanding in the fashion he conducted war, with the greatest possible economy of time, and also of the lives of victor and vanquished, in his pursuit of victory.

Above all, he commanded with a sense of justice for the

vanquished. The war was necessary; victory was feasible; and, the outcome, despite President Truman's criminal error of judgment in bombing Hiroshima and Nagasaki, was a durable peace. It was a peace pursued with tender regard for restoring, as rapidly as feasible, the sovereignty of the vanquished, and with durable benefits for the population which had been defeated, and its institutions.

It used to be said only half in jest, when I was a much younger man, that the luckiest fate for any nation, was to be defeated and occupied by the armed forces of the U.S.A. Not recently. Not for more than thirty years. Once, our military and political leaders knew that winning war was winning the peace which came afterward. No more; not recently. There, one might say, is the tragedy.<sup>63</sup>

Now, before resuming the discussion of policies for modern warfare in general, I shall now illustrate the points to be made by reference to the three notable, distinct circumstances in which I found myself either qualified to define, or make decisions respecting war and peace, either as prospective advisor to a President, or as a well-suited candidate for President myself.

- The first occasion came during the second half of the 1960s, when the subject was the war in Indo-China; during this period I summarized my policy in a paper under the title of a "Second Front Against The War in Vietnam."
- The second occasion came at several points during the interval between the 1976 general election-campaign period and 1983, when my policy as that of a well-suited candidate for election as President—in fact, the best-qualified at the time—converged upon a policy enunciated by President Reagan in a March 23, 1983 address on the included subject of a "Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)."
- The third occasion was, as I have indicated, my televised Berlin address of October 12, 1988, in which I outlined the likely circumstances for the prospective early reunification of Germany around its historic capital, Berlin.

Thus, consider, first, my late-1960s policy concerning the implications of the war in Indo-China.

In reviewing my military policy from the late 1960s, it must be taken into account, that the views on the global strategic situation which emerged as my policies of the late 1970s had been outgrowths of what I discovered through my investigations into the shocking changes which occurred during the 1960s. During the early through middle 1960s, my policies toward issues such as the war in Indo-China were shaped,

---

63. You have seen—as Ross Perot and his TV viewers saw—how Al Gore gets, when he does not get his way.

firstly, by views, already adopted at the close of World War II, on the eradication of colonialism and its vestiges from this planet, by my inquiry into the rabidly pro-colonialist overthrow and butchery of President Patrice Lumumba, and also my already expert foresight respecting the direction in which the U.S. and world economy were headed, both prior to, and after the short-lived Kennedy administration. It was on the basis of that limited, but not meager knowledge of the global strategic situation, that my military policy of the late 1960s was premised.

I acknowledged some degree of sincerity in U.S. and other measures toward granting true independence and rights of economic self-development to former colonial entities; but, as I taught and wrote during the 1960s, these reforms, while valuable meliorations of the problem, had accomplished but little toward what President Franklin Roosevelt intended to do, cutting away the rentier-financier root of the British, Dutch, Portuguese, and French colonial systems. If nothing else, the tyranny of international financial loans continued, and from that root, the colonial system always threatened to grow back, perhaps even in a more savage expression than ever before, as it has done since the strategic change of 1989-1992.

I knew, partly from considerations which first came to my attention while I was serving in Asia, during and immediately following World War II, that the war in Indo-China, from its inception at the point the British had ordered the defeated Japan military forces' reoccupation of Indo-China, was the fruit of a pro-British, pro-colonialist policy embedded in our State Department and other relevant institutions. Such was the character of the entire conflict in Indo-China,<sup>64</sup> from late 1945 through the U.S. military operations there during the 1964-1975 interval.

I also knew, that what might be called the "objective impetus" for such war in Indo-China came as a by-product of morally rotten economic, and strategic policies taking hold in the post-Kennedy government and financier circles associated with McGeorge Bundy and Robert Strange McNamara.<sup>65</sup> Thus, I saw political action focussed simply upon the war itself as a futile, probably merely self-gratifying posturing by anti-war activists, with no efficient relevance for addressing the continuing causes of the actual war itself.

That war, like our corrupt President Polk's war against Mexico, like many other wars by different parties in different

---

64. The Japan forces were instructed to reimpose their occupation of Indo-China, until they were relieved by British troops, that in preparation for France's reclaiming and occupation of the former colony. At the point the British set this reoccupation into motion, Ho Chi Minh had been a faithful military and political ally of the United States! The treachery which the U.S.A. exhibited, repeatedly, beginning 1946, to Indo-China, under British instruction, and in British imperial interest, had much to do with the later character of the 1965-1975 phases of the war.

65. As Dr. Edward Teller once pointed out, Secretary McNamara's middle name had been, quite literally, Strange. Some might say of this, that "God sometimes works in mysterious ways."

times and places, was more the symptom of the infection, than the infection as such. Polk's war was *intended* to be what its outcome became, the pre-staging of what became the Civil War. It was, to be specific, a pre-staging of the British puppets' operation, the Confederacy, to destroy, and to reconquer the U.S.A. for the British monarchy, by dividing it among two or more mini-states, some such mini-nations slave-holders' tyrannies, others nominally anti-slavery. The connection between Polk's war and the treasonous preparations conducted under Polk's accomplices, Presidents Pierce and Buchanan, is plain. So is the collaboration among John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, et al., against Polk's war. So, is the connection of these earlier developments to Lincoln's defense of the Union against both the pro-slavery and anti-slavery traitors. The case of Polk's war, thus illustrates the importance of never falling prey to magicians' sleight-of-hand, never underestimating that war may be unleashed by the guile of clever magicians. That the magicians create and orchestrate the war, and its rules of engagement, as the Roman emperor toyed with the gladiators set to kill one another in the arena: as a means to effect the mutual destruction of the contending parties set into that arena of conflict.

Such, in fact, was that magician's trick commonly known as the war in Vietnam. It was the actual infection which needed to be diagnosed, and that infection removed, if one were to succeed in effecting the cure.

My point of attack was therefore the fact, that with the sharp down-turn in U.S. economic trends, which began with the 1966-1967 shift in economic policy within the Johnson Administration, the relevant flank of the strategic situation, was the need for an economic recovery program of rather massive shock-impact, an economic-recovery program based upon U.S.A. and western European capital-exports into accelerated general economic development of what was then called "the Third World."

In respect of the impact of the war on domestic affairs, the U.S. needed to match the promises of the Civil Rights reforms with the substance of expanded economic opportunities for the former victims of "Jim Crow" policies. The entire U.S. labor-force required expanded, and upgraded employment opportunities, to reverse the effects of economic down-trends already setting in. The unleashing of the kind of post-war economic development programs which FDR had envisaged for the former colonial world, prior to his most untimely death, was needed in the late 1960s. The needed form of action, was matching successful war-time economic methods, with the urgent common needs of the U.S.A. and "Third World" populations of the 1960s, and with the benefits of "crash program" methods of expansion of the economy and its per-capita productivity.<sup>66</sup>

66. Instead, the Johnson Administration was induced into the worst possible reaction, directly opposite to the required response. Instead of using the existing stimulus program, the most fruitful in modern history, the space

In that way, I argued, we must shift the agenda of the policy debate, to focus upon the real strategic issues, the issues hidden behind the magicians' bloody tricks of deception; we must address those root-issues, rather than become foolish, doomed gladiators in a rigged arena. Failing to do so, as I sensed we must not fail to do, we ended the war, but only after we had already lost *our war*; we had already been caught in the magicians' trap. The real purpose of the launching and escalation of that war, the self-destruction of the United States, was the continuing aftermath, the terrible penalty to us all, of our allowing our nation to be lured, so foolishly, into that unnecessary, wholly unjustified war.

Thus, the anti-war movement itself became, in the end, a greater affliction to the U.S.A., and to the world in general, than the war itself. And, on the opposing side of the political debate of that time, the U.S. command had apparently learned nothing from the monstrously costly aftermath—the Civil War—of Polk's war with Mexico.

An abrupt reversal of post-1964 Indo-China policy, based upon "peace through capital-intensive development," represented the common interest of the peoples of Southeast Asia and the U.S.A. Thus, by changing the underlying strategic premises for the Indo-China war, the possibility of a just termination of the war could be realistically established. Had the U.S., even the anti-war movement itself, had the sense to adopt that policy, the U.S. would have won the larger war, by the manner of its ending the war in Indo-China. That, unfortunately, did not happen.

Turn, next, to the second case, to the setting of the 1970s strategic developments.

In the setting of the 1971 collapse of the old Bretton Woods agreements, the crux of the emerging strategic situation then, was defined chiefly by the intersection of two disastrous developments:

1. As I wrote in August-September 1971, the headlong rush toward policies whose results must be future global economic catastrophes, unleashed by the 1971-1972 establishment of virtually cannibalistic austerity trends inherent in a lunatic floating-exchange-rate monetary order;
2. The "doomsday" implications inherent in the SALT I and ABM agreements. My concern, and investigations bearing upon the interrelationship between these two factors, led to my defining, gradually, what became known, briefly, in Spring 1983,

---

program, to stimulate the growth of productive employment opportunities and net economic growth of the tax-revenue base, the Administration used 1966-1967 to pull the bottom out from under the most stimulative aspects of the aerospace technology-driver, and substitute the pathetic "Great Society" folly instead.

as the SDI. By the time of the 1976 general election, the relevant dangers had become clear.

During the period of the Carter Administration, the following were the evident leading factors in the strategic situation.

The reality—the so-called “bottom line”—of the aftermath of the murder of President Kennedy, was the use of the BAC agreements with the Khrushchev government in the setting of the 1962 Missiles Crisis, to proceed toward implementing the doomsday policies proposed by Szilard at the 1978 Quebec meeting of the Pugwash Conference, while using that strategic agreement as a pretext for taking down, step by step, the science-driver element of the strategic policies of the U.S.A. and western Europe.

The first important step to the latter effect, was the British monarchy’s orchestration of a parliamentary sex scandal against a key official of Prime Minister Macmillan’s British government—the “Profumo scandal”—to bring down that government, and thus, with a perfunctory decent interval in between, bringing in the Labour government of Prime Minister Harold Wilson, to conduct Wilson’s Luddite program for smashing much of the United Kingdom’s industrial potential. The British monarchy’s strategy was to destroy much of the national economies of itself and its allies, by setting fire to the neighborhood, setting fire to its own house first.

The attempted assassinations of France’s President Charles de Gaulle, the hastened ouster of West Germany’s Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, the subsequent parliamentary coup d’état which brought down Germany’s Ludwig Erhard government, and similar actions, brought much of the world’s economy into the crippled state associated with the 1967-1968 Sterling-Dollar crises, and the subsequent, August 1971 collapse of the Bretton Woods agreements. The ouster of Macmillan, the murder of President Kennedy, the successive ousters of Adenauer and Erhard, and the increasing strategic isolation of President and British assassination-target Charles de Gaulle, effectively eliminated or neutralized any significant political leadership for continuing the kinds of science-driver-pivoted strategic economic programs which had, with ups and downs, characterized the sweep of the period from the beginning of World War II through the Missile-Crisis negotiations.

Symptomized by savage cut-backs in the brilliantly successful use of the Kennedy aerospace program as a science-driver for the U.S. economy, beginning 1966-1967 there was an accelerating process of taking down crucial elements of the economy essential to any program of continued net physical-economic growth of output, real incomes, and significant gains per-capita, in physical-economic productivity. The Carter Administration’s creation of the permanent national-debt-crisis symptomized an accelerating process of general U.S. economic decay, which has been uninterrupted from the mid-1970s to the present day.

## What must be learned from the SDI

Thus, we were trapped between a deteriorating economy and the combination of SALT I and the ABM treaty. The strategic situation was thus becoming increasingly dangerous. On the one side, by means of arms-control agreements, the superpowers had trapped themselves into the confines of doomsday scenarios; on the other side, we had gutted those elements of the economy which were indispensable to building our way out of that doomsday-scenario trap. For those with the intellectual powers and knowledge to see what is developing, with ominous rapidity now, we are clearly still in that doomsday-scenario trap, still today, a scenario which is currently becoming worse almost by the week. Admittedly, the prospect of massive salvos of missile-exchanges between superpower blocs is a thing of the past, but this has made the situation, and the alternatives all the more desperate.

By the mid-1970s, 1975-1977, this strategic trap had become the center of my concerns. Out of this, I developed a strategic program which became known as that form of the SDI presented by President Ronald Reagan in the relevant portion of his March 23, 1983 televised address. That originally offered SDI package was subsequently soon altered in critical features, producing a design which remains unworkable in conception to the present day. The design aired by the President on March 23rd, would have worked, and in respect to all of its principled features, it would still would work today. What is being publicly offered as ballistic missile defense from the Pentagon today, is essentially a chimera designed to confuse the minds of children, not defeat the real-life kinds of doomsday scenarios coming on line today.

The first crucial feature of the original version of the SDI, is represented by the fact that the President offered to share the relevant technologies with the Soviet Union. The second crucial feature, but not pinned down in the President’s March 23 address, is that the feasibility of such ballistic missile defense depended, and still depends absolutely, upon the development of systems based on what are termed “new physical principles,” not—*absolutely not*—intrinsically incompetent reliance upon high-speed interceptor rockets—so-called “kinematic” systems. The third crucial principle was, and remains today, that each and all of these technologies required for strategic (and tactical) ballistic missile and related defense have a powerful potential for the non-military sector of the economy. Therefore, on this third account, the program which I had previously outlined to the Soviet government, as reflected in the President’s address, demanded a commitment to using this approach to cooperation in developing strategic ballistic missile defense in the same way the U.S.A. had learned to use the Kennedy aerospace program, as a science-driver for the world’s economies.

In short, the mission which I assigned the development of what became briefly known as the SDI package, was to break the deadly deadlock of the 1970s, the deadlock defined by a

self-aggravating collapse of the economy by means of which strategic ballistic missile defense could be developed, and the doomsday scenarios which probably loomed if we failed to do so.

The crucial rejection of the SDI came from four leading sources, in the following order of appearance. A pair of Armand Hammer protégés, Soviet General Secretary Yuri Andropov and his protégé, M. Gorbachev (implicitly, at least, also Armand Hammer protégé Al Gore); circles associated with Vice-President George Bush inside the Administration; Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher; and—not President Reagan, but—both the Republican and Democratic parties' campaign-committees for the 1984 general election. Otherwise, it would have worked, technically and economically; there are many who, if they understood the implications, would go down on their knees today, to pray that it had been adopted as originally proposed. The number who might be induced by worsening crises, to get down on their knees so, will now likely increase by the week, as the Sun rises, each day, to reveal what the night had freshly wrought.

There was an underlying, deeper, but most crucial implication for what I had developed as a program of U.S.-Soviet cooperation in strategic ballistic missile defense. For all civilized nations and their governments, the primary concern provoked by any perceived strategic threat, especially a military threat, is how to eliminate, or at least significantly lessen the adversarial relationship. Today, looking at the hindside of the developments of the 1970s and 1980s, seeing how easily the Soviet system crumbled at the close of the 1980s, any thoughtful observer must ask: "That being the case, why were we thermonuclear-adversary powers? How deep had the issues been, during the immediately preceding decades? If the adversarial posture could crack open so quickly at the end of the 1980s, does this not indicate that it cracked then because it had been ripe for such a change even years earlier? Could it not have been cracked earlier, if the right approach had been discovered and adopted?" Was not my design for strategic ballistic missile defense precisely the approach to have been taken?

Look at this aspect of the matter as I spoke publicly on exactly this matter, yet once again, in my October 12, 1988 address.

In February 1982, the last time I met personally, in Washington, with the relevant Soviet representative, he indicated to me that his government would reject what I had outlined as economic and scientific cooperation in developing a strategic ballistic missile defense as an alternative to the doomsday scenarios of McCloy's, Bundy's, and Kissinger's "Mutual and Assured Destruction (MAD)" doctrine. In light of events which followed throughout the later weeks, and throughout the 1983-1989 interval as a whole, the following elements of my response to that advice are of strategic importance still today.

I replied, if President Reagan were to offer your govern-

ment, publicly, what I have outlined to you, and if your government rejected that offer, and continued to reject it, as a result of that rejection the Soviet economy would collapse within about five years. The President did make that offer, publicly. The Soviet government rejected it, and continued to reject it, even with the most extraordinary violent language, against President Reagan, and much more violent, against me.

This reaction continued through the Reykjavik meeting of October 1986, a latter meeting which occurred just several days after one faction in the U.S. government had planned to use an operation conducted by the U.S. Justice Department's William Weld, as a cover for eliminating me and others in a military-style cross-fire. The Warsaw Pact proceeded to disintegrate, for economic reasons, not within exactly five years, but, beginning with Poland and East Germany, over the Summer and Autumn of 1989.

Subsequently, I incorporated the same forecast, "about five years," within rather widely circulated public materials.

How did I know this would be the outcome? Essentially, as much other evidence shows, I am a very good economist, perhaps the most successful living long-range economic forecaster today.

The Soviet system's civilian economy stunk, whereas the so-called scientific-military-industrial complex contained one of the largest concentrations of scientific competence in the world. The crucial problem was, those obstacles which prevented the kind of efficient spill-over into the civilian sector which we in the U.S.A. had demonstrated repeatedly, under President Franklin Roosevelt, and, most notably, the aerospace program's spill-overs into our civilian industrial sector. Under the conditions of sharing civilian applications of products of a crash program such as I have proposed for ballistic missile defense, cooperation among the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., western Europe, and Japan, could engender a global economic boom, which would, as a by-product, provide a natural way of rebuilding the sick agro-industrial sectors of the U.S.S.R. as a whole.

If that option were not taken, then the capital factors of rot in the U.S.S.R.'s sick economic sectors, would produce combined economic and social effects which must tend to reach a crisis-point within about five years.

So, in the Summer and Fall of 1988, the evidence confirming my 1983 forecast within the "ball park" previously indicated, showed me clearly that an impending chain-reaction collapse of the Warsaw Pact system as a whole was already in progress, with the ensuing cracking of the U.S.S.R. itself. Thus, I delivered the public address of October 12, 1988, warning of the developments to erupt within approximately twelve months. I proposed that the crisis of food-supply be used as the premise for opening up with the former Warsaw Pact nations, the same kind of global cooperation I had envisaged for what President Reagan had named the SDI.

Unfortunately, my adversary, George Bush was elected President. He was inaugurated; I went to prison. It happened as I had forecast it would; George made a terrible mess of everything, and now Vice-President Al Gore passionately wishes to make everything worse.

Finally on the subject of the SDI itself. During the interval 1977-1986, I generated a large amount of evidence showing that only a strategic ballistic missile defense based essentially upon so-called "new physical principles" could work. The "cute" aspect of all this, was that to escape the sundry certain and other likely problems which the SDI addressed, the U.S. and others would have to unleash a scientific-technological revolution, a massive science-driver program which would overwhelm all of the accumulation of sundry sillinesses which had become U.S. policy of strategic and other practice since the murder of President Kennedy. The lesson to be learned from all this and connected matters, is that the competent design of a nation's strategy starts not from a plan to make war, but, rather, a plan to make history.

### **Make history, not war**

The strategic military policy of a modern sovereign nation-state republic is not a craft; it is not a distinct set of principles respecting military practice. It is an integral function of the strategy for conduct of statecraft in general, and it is always fully subject to that strategy. The strategy of statecraft is located within the challenge of making history, in the sense that the struggle to free the institutions of the modern sovereign nation-state republic from the grip of oligarchical vestiges of previous, morally inferior forms of society and law, is exemplary of that task.

In other words, there can be no competent military strategy which is based simply on the matter of conflicts among states; the conflict with which competent execution of military strategy must be primarily concerned, is whether civilization is being defended effectively, and whether that attempted defense moves the condition of mankind as a whole morally upscale, or not. This was the governing consideration in my policy toward the war in Indo-China, my development of what became the originally proffered version of the SDI, and my strategic doctrine enunciated on October 12, 1988. It is the foundation of my strategic policy for today.

The yardstick by which those strategic scales are defined, is the notion of natural law inhering in the nature of man, as I have restated that underlying root of all proper law, here. The very existence of the modern sovereign nation-state republic has its lawful basis in that functional standard of measurement.

Thus, in a suitable approximation for today, the purpose of all strategic planning, including military action, is subsumed by the requirement of establishing, and defending a just, and therefore equitable community of perfectly sovereign nation-state republics, as the best form of organization of all humanity presently possible on this planet as a whole.

In contrast to that, the idea of world government, in any form, is an abomination invoking the Biblical image of a fallen Tower of Babel.

Contrary to the positions repeatedly asserted, explicitly and implicitly, by Vice-President Al Gore, war is not a license to turn one's own inner sow loose upon some selected victim, either individual or nation. To use the power of the state, especially the power of a most powerful state or concert of states, against any person, government, or nation, to such a purpose as that, is among the greatest of all capital crimes against humanity, a crime which must be so judged in practice as much as in expressed opinion. Always, that moral law which Al Gore despises, the natural law embedded in the distinction between mankind and all inferior species, is the only rightful law of and among nations.

If we do not adopt and enforce that moral law, the present, increasingly chaos-wracked civilization of this planet will not long outlive the passing century, if at all.

To ensure such principles of natural law, the statesman must find his or her personal identity within the simultaneity of eternity, otherwise he or she is not qualified, in capabilities of judgment, to govern under the perilous conditions confronting the world today. Similarly, the qualified military commander, by nature of his enterprise in the domain of rule over life and death, must be no one who does not partake of some of the qualities of conscience otherwise suited to a saint. I strongly believe that the late General Douglas MacArthur would essentially concur with that. It is sometimes difficult to measure up to such high standards, but as long as we do not accept less, our daily struggles for self-improvement within ourselves, as leaders, will hopefully close the gap, at least in effect.

The conscience of the statesman and military commander, must be situated with respect to moral obligations to both the past and future. The statesman and commander must adduce a principle of progress in history as a whole, a principle rooted in, governed by the principle of natural law as I have described that here. This sense of obligation can not be a notion of some bare principle of such progress; it must reflect a highly cultivated conscience, a conscience deeply informed of the essential elements of history as the history of those ideas which pertain to matters of validatable discoveries of physical and other forms of universal principle. It must be the quality of cultivated conscience which recent trends in opinion have abandoned, and which our schools and universities no longer teach.

If you imagine that the fact that such strict standards are required does not worry me, you have not understood me at all. My worry is great, beyond the comprehension of most among you. Therefore, I am justly impatient in commitment, and ruthless in demanding the required bold spirit of innovation from myself.

To the degree I am given the means to do so, I will never make war for the sake of war, but only history.