

A New Strategy for the United States

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

September 4, 1999

[Published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 26, Number 37, September 17, 1999.
View [original PDF](#) and [video](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

The following keynote presentation was given by Lyndon LaRouche to the International Caucus of Labor Committees/Schiller Institute Labor Day Conference on September 4, 1999.

The subject of this conference is strategy. And I would like to make a brief aside to mention Col. Molloy Vaughn, who just recently deceased, an old friend whom many of you may recall from previous conferences; an old soldier who was always ready to do what was useful for the cause of nation-building.

I would also like to welcome General Bedoya of Colombia, another builder of nations and defender of those nations. And that is essentially the theme of this conference, and the theme of what I have to say to you today in opening this conference.

The world is presently in the final phase of disintegration of a global financial system which was set into motion in the middle of August 1971. From that point on, from the decision made by President Nixon in 1971, to the present time, the U.S. economy has undergone a series of degenerative phase-shifts in policy-making and in practice.

This degeneration of the U.S. economy also reflects a broader degeneration, led by the British Commonwealth—the British monarchy—and other nations which have joined with the so-called Anglo-Americans in imposing upon the world the so-called floating exchange-rate monetary system over the period to the present time, since 1971.

That system is presently hopelessly bankrupt. It will not last. It will disintegrate, or it will be shut down. *My alternative, rather than letting it disintegrate, is to shut it down.* That means that someone with authority must step in, put the old system into bankruptcy reorganization, in the same way you would put a bank in the local community into bankruptcy reorganization—more or less the same—and set in a new system to continue the essential operations, the economic operations performed by the old system, but under new rules, and under new management. It is my view, which I've expressed on many occasions, that the only agency which can accomplish this, is the Presidency of the United States. Not that the President of the United States can *dictate* such a system to the world at large, but

rather, without a leading role by the President of the United States, it is most unlikely, perhaps impossible in practice, that other nations would be able to get together with the United States to shut the old system down, put it into bankruptcy, and keep the world economy going, preferably without missing a step, under new management, new rules, and new policies.

I've proposed that for some time as a New Bretton Woods system. And let me explain again, which I've done in various articles and so forth, which some of you are familiar with. But let me put it again in this context.

We had a workable system from the time that Roosevelt was leading the United States during World War II, until approximately 1964; until after the assassination of President John Kennedy. There were many mistakes in the system, but it worked. The system underwent a degenerative transformation from 1964 to 1971, when the old Bretton Woods system was cancelled, and the new Bretton Woods system, the present one, the so-called floating exchange-rate system, was put into effect on the initiative of President Nixon.

That former system, the Roosevelt-led system, worked in general. It gave us a world economic recovery, at least in Western Europe, and in most of the Americas. It also was beneficial for Japan, and beneficial for other parts of the world. This system continued in the form it had operated after Roosevelt's death, until about 1958. Then, the rules began to change. The mud began to slide.

There was an attempt to go back to the Roosevelt policies under President Kennedy. Kennedy's assassination was the end of the effort to revive Roosevelt's economic policies.

We're now in a situation where the old system has failed, and we desperately need an immediate change to build a new system. In the reality of politics, to make such changes under emergency conditions, and to make them suddenly, we must rely, at least to a very large degree, on choosing precedents from past history, preferably periods of history as close to our own as possible, and use those precedents as guides to design the policy changes we must put into effect, to replace the present bankrupt international monetary system with a new one, which we urgently need to keep the world economy going.

It is my view that throughout the world, only the President of the United States, in his position as President, under our Constitution, has the influence, or the potential influence, and the legal position to be the rallying point for other governments which wish to cooperate in this enterprise. So that the United States government, under a leadership of its President, in cooperation with other governments which desire to cooperate, can set up a new international monetary system, whether the rest of the world wants it or not.

We will do it that way, with that kind of arrogance, because we are acting so that we can survive, and so that the majority of the human race can survive. In other words, we will be acting jointly for the general welfare of the world, and those who oppose that must give way.

Given the authority and influence, waning as it may be, of the United States, the President of the United States is the one political figure on this planet who could, as they say, pull that off.

Roosevelt's Policies

Now, the principles involved are much older than Roosevelt. But as I said, we go back to Roosevelt in order to find a precedent for policies which we must recognize were successful, in direct contrast to the policies under which we are presently operating, which have been a disaster for about thirty years, a continuing disaster.

Look at Roosevelt's policies, and let's look at them from the standpoint of their historical background, and general principles.

During World War II, the period of a terrible alliance between a Roosevelt-led United States and a Churchill-led Great Britain, Roosevelt set forth to Winston Churchill, and to others, very clearly, three precise policies or policy guidelines for the postwar world, that the United States would introduce to the world, *whether the British monarchy liked it or not.*

The first thing that Roosevelt specified, was that the world was no longer going to tolerate what Roosevelt described as "the British Eighteenth-Century methods," that is, the methods of the British East India Company and Adam Smith, the so-called "free trade" method.

Rather, Roosevelt insisted that because of U.S. power to create this change, the postwar world would be dominated by American methods, the methods which were introduced into the United States officially under the first President, George Washington, as typified by the policy papers of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton. We were going to make American methods available to the world as a whole. And we were going to scrap the ability of the British to continue to impose their free trade system, their gold standard system, and similar kinds of systems, on the world any longer.

The second thing that Roosevelt was committed to doing, as he stated explicitly to an irate Churchill, was that with the end of the war, the United States' power and the support it would have from around the world, would act immediately to eliminate all continuation of Portuguese, Dutch, British, and French imperialism and colonialist methods. That this would be the occasion for freeing these nations, which had been subject to these empires or these types of influences, to become sovereign nation-states, enjoying access to the kinds of technology and technological progress which the United States enjoyed and desired to continue to enjoy. And the British would simply have to give up their old system.

Thirdly, Roosevelt pointed to the map of Africa and other parts of the world, and emphasized that with the postwar world, the United States would take the leadership, using American methods, proven American methods of basic economic infrastructure development, and so forth, in order to build up these parts of the world which had been looted, ruined, and kept depressed under British and similar kinds of methods.

Parts of Roosevelt's policy were adopted after his death. But with his death, the policy as a whole died. President Roosevelt had envisaged the United Nations Organization as a way of bringing together nations as a *community of principle* around the idea of the sovereign nation-state, the *perfectly sovereign nation-state*. That such a community of states must be the dominant force and authority on this planet, and the United Nations would be a vehicle to facilitate the bringing into being that kind of community of principle of which, for example, Secretary of State and later President John Quincy Adams had written, in advising President Monroe to institute: the so-called Monroe Doctrine of 1823.

That was American policy.

But, with the President's death, President Truman, under the influence of the British, ordered Japanese troops, of a defeated Japan, which were sitting in camps in Indochina, waiting to be shipped back to Japan, to come out of the camps, pick up their weapons, and *impose French colonial rule on Indochina*.

The arrangement was that the British would return first to take over and replace the Japanese, and then French troops would come in to replace the British. The same thing was done with the Dutch colonies, as present-day Indonesia. The same thing was done with the French colonial empire. The same thing was done with the relics of the Portuguese empire, a relic which we see in the so-called East Timor issue today.

So that part of the policy—Roosevelt's community of principle—was not established. Truman then adopted from Britain a policy, a nuclear weapons policy, designed by a group of people in Britain around Bertrand Russell, perhaps the most evil man of the Twentieth Century. Russell's policy was the policy of the British monarchy. This policy was imposed upon Truman, who, on British directives, through New York people, such as the Harrimans, who were essentially agents of influence of the British, decided to drop the only two remaining bombs—nuclear bombs—in the U.S. arsenal on the civilian population of an already-defeated Japan. Japan had been defeated. MacArthur, aided by the U.S. naval blockade of Japan, had brought Japan to the point that it had no choice but to surrender. *It had no possibility of getting the imports on which its economy depended to survive.*

At the same time, the Emperor of Japan had already agreed, through the Vatican to the United States, on terms of surrender, which happened to be, exactly, more or less, the terms of surrender which Japan accepted after the signing of the surrender agreement.

The problem was, that a certain section of the Japan military, who had been opponents of the Emperor of Japan, Emperor Hirohito, were determined to continue the war. This was the military section of Japan which had launched the second Sino-Japanese war in China. These were the hard-ball guys. And the MacArthur policy was, sit back, wait until maybe October, until the crunch of the naval blockade brings the Japan military to submit to the will of the Emperor, who has ordered the surrender of Japan.

The British were determined that that should not happen. Therefore, they induced the President of the United States, President Truman, a fool, to drop the only two fission nuclear weapons the United States had, on this helpless, civilian population of Japan.

The function of that, was to establish a reign of postwar nuclear terror, the Bertrand Russell nuclear weapons policy, which has dominated the United States increasingly since that time, to the present time. Most of our military strategy has been a by-product of that lunatic, terrorist policy of nuclear weapons as a way of attempting to bludgeon the world into giving up sovereign nation-states, and instead accepting some form of world government—something we call today “globalization.” Give up your sovereign nation-state, give up the independence of nations, as Tony Blair demands; let a rampaging enforcement crowd run around the world on one pretext or another, bomb this nation, bomb that nation, just the same way that Truman bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Bombing helpless populations, destroying economies, in order to *terrorize* nations, and the world generally, into submitting to this kind of tyrannical will, the will of world government, the will of globalization.

So, those parts of Roosevelt’s policy were destroyed. There was no elimination of the imperial and colonial system. The United States supported Britain in restoring, in maintaining, and building up the imperial system, dominated and led from the City of London by the British financial interests. The United States accepted a military policy—a nuclear weapons policy—a policy whose sole and stated purpose was to bring about world government and the extinction of all sovereign nation-states, *including the extinction of the sovereignty of the United States itself.*

That was the change.

The Postwar Policy Retreat

Now, at the same time, a compromise was made on the issue of free trade. The United States was the only really functioning economy of that period, at the end of the war. Europe was a

mess. Britain was a junk heap economically. And the only way in which the world could be rebuilt to some degree, was through United States cooperation in setting up a highly regulated system of monetary and financial and trade relations, under which Western Europe, parts of the Americas, and other parts of the world, could enjoy an economic recovery.

This economic recovery was not truly generalized, but it involved several features, which were successful, which we called the old Bretton Woods system, the pre-1959 Bretton Woods system. This involved the replacement of the British gold standard system, which Roosevelt had overthrown in the 1930s for the United States, by a gold *reserve* system, based on a fixed price of gold.

This system was backed up by capital controls and exchange controls, financial controls, regulated trade—protectionist methods of trade, tariffs and trade—in order to foster growth and trade among nations. Not the lowest price, not the Adam Smith lowest price.

The best example of success of this policy was the case of Germany. After the United States had decided it was going to support Britain in a nuclear conflict, or a potential nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union, it was decided that Germany had to be rebuilt as a bastion, a logistical bastion, for any credible opposition to the Soviet Union. Therefore, the intent to crush the German economy entirely, which had been British and U.S. policy at the end of the war, was abandoned.

Under these circumstances, a leading German banker, Hermann Abs, went to the Americans, the remnants of the Roosevelt administration, and secured agreement to a method for financing reconstruction of Germany. This became known as the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau, as proposed by Abs, under which the most efficient use of Marshall Plan credit was made for the growth of the economy.

That is, the use of Marshall Plan funds in Britain and France was much larger than in Germany, a country whose population was smaller. And yet, in Britain and France, the performance with Marshall Plan funds, was relatively ridiculous, compared with the high degree of success achieved in Germany, centered on Deutsche Bank and the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau.

This was a successful system. Obviously, there were many features of it which could have been better, but it was a successful system.

While this was happening, and as the economies of the world began to recover during the late 1950s; there was an effort to go back to the free-trade system, step by step: to reduce controls, to lessen capital controls, to lessen exchange controls, and to lessen protectionist

methods, and to shift toward free trade—your good old British Eighteenth-Century methods of free trade.

The failure of the Eisenhower administration in its second term, the economic failure, created the circumstances under which a President Kennedy, who had modelled himself largely on the image of Franklin Roosevelt, could become successfully elected as President. While Kennedy may be judged to have floundered to some degree in getting his feet on the ground in his administration, by the time he was assassinated, he was becoming a fairly serious and capable proposition, as typified by his manned Moon-landing policy, which is typical of traditional American thinking, which Kennedy showed.

The assassination of Kennedy brought that to an end. Effectively, there were remnants of—many of us still believed, as I did, in the legacy of the experience of the 1930s, the war, and the postwar reconstruction. But the policy was going down.

From about 1966 on, the policy was to march toward the kind of world which Winston Churchill, not American patriots, desired. Henry Kissinger, of course, himself cited this a number of times. In an address he gave in London on May 10 of 1982, he made reference to this. He said, essentially—he pointed to the fact that the American intellectual tradition and the British intellectual tradition, as typified by Churchill, were at odds. And, he emphasized the conflict between Churchill and Roosevelt on the postwar world, during the World War II alliance.

Kissinger *bragged* about his contribution to this effort, saying that, fortunately, after the death of Roosevelt, British policies had prevailed, and Roosevelt's policies had been gradually eliminated. That's what happened.

Nineteen seventy-one was the ending of the old Bretton Woods system, was the point at which Hell began to break loose.

So, if we compare the two systems today, we have, especially as Americans, especially as those who are proud of the American Revolution, proud of the Constitution; Americans who are typified by Col. Molloy Vaughn, a distinguished officer who in retirement continued to serve his country with the same vigilance and vigor as a nation-builder, *a builder of other nations, as well as the United States*. A man who recognized that building up other nations as sovereign nation-states, as healthy nation-states, is, in the last analysis, the greatest source of security for the United States as a nation in the world.

Creating a New Financial System

Those of us who recognize the qualified—well, we make criticisms, you know, of Roosevelt—you could make a lot of criticisms. He was a compromiser, like most Presidents,

like most American politicians. He made compromises during the war, which could be criticized. *But he did the job, compromises or not.* His system, to the extent that it was continued after the war, for as long as it was continued, worked. You could criticize it. I *did* criticize it, then. I would criticize it today. *But it worked!*

My problem is twofold: Number one, since the crisis that's going to disintegrate this world financial system is going to occur on the watch of the present, incumbent President of the United States, that is, Bill Clinton, then Bill Clinton must adopt certain policies, and sometime very soon, which bring a new Bretton Woods system into agreement.

Now, Bill can't do it all. Because even if he wanted to do it all, he's got a pretty bad Congress. Therefore, we have to have a new Congress. But we can't get that until January 2001. I think we can do it, especially if President Clinton leads in taking the necessary first steps.

The first step has to be to bring a group of nations together to agree to put the old system into bankruptcy reorganization, that is, the world system. That doesn't mean we go into other countries which may not subscribe to this meeting, this conference, and tell them they're going to do that internally. No, we don't tell them that. We say, "*We're going to do it. The United States and its partners are going to do it, in terms of their relationship.*"

Now, the nations I've listed as the candidates for this kind of cooperation are led by China, Russia, India, some part of Europe—and hopefully, we'll get a government in Germany which can pull itself together and play a key role as the keystone nation of western continental Europe, as a partner with the U.S., in cooperation for the development of Asian countries, and the rebuilding of Russia—Asian countries such as China, India, Pakistan, Iran, Malaysia, and so forth. Countries that have indicated they would like such a system of cooperation, particularly if it's backed by a group of nations which represents the *majority of the human race!*; which represents the predominant power on this planet.

If you take the United States, with our friends in South America, our friends in Africa, our friends in continental Europe, our friends in Russia, our friends in China, our friends in other parts of Asia, our friends presumably in Japan, who will come along with us on this one, *that is power. There is no greater power on this planet than such a combination.* If we decide that our relationship with one another, and the relationships we offer jointly and individually to other countries are going to be based on the new system, *I guarantee you, the old system is finished at that moment, and a new system will start immediately.*

That is the job that President Clinton must do, as the man who convenes the conference, and the man who sets forth the initiating proposal which results in these emergency decisions.

The key to it, is to bring forth what I just summarily described to you earlier.

Look at the record. Look at the record of the American System in its best periods, but look more immediately at the record of what Roosevelt did, and what he proposed, and what should have been done, that was not done. And look at how the rejection of Roosevelt's direction of policy-making led to this global disaster, which has gripped this world for thirty years, and now brings us to the virtual edge of an apocalypse. Both a financial apocalypse, and every other kind of an apocalypse!

Malaysia, for Example

That evidence on the table—take the case, for example, of Malaysia—the case of Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad, the Prime Minister of Malaysia. Remember what *that bum*, Al Gore, did, when on a trip as a guest of APEC, speaking as a guest of APEC, under hospitality of the Prime Minister of Malaysia, made the most aggressive, insulting speech imaginable. He makes Ribbentrop look like a sophisticated diplomat, by comparison—the Nazi representative earlier.

What Mahathir did—which was denounced by Al Gore, who is pretty much anti-Franklin Roosevelt up and down the line, on every issue—has been successful, in contrast with every other country which followed a policy contrary to what Mahathir did.

All these countries of Southeast Asia, countries in Asia, countries in Africa, all the patriots and serious people in these countries want that. They want that! They want national sovereignty, they want the chance for real economic growth, they want to be able to protect their economies—they do not want to be a garbage pail in which more powerful nations rummage.

If the United States, with China, with Russia, with India, with perhaps Germany, and with other countries joining them, agree that we must do this immediately, and agree, *“Let's use the Roosevelt model, of what Roosevelt intended to do at the end of the war—let's do it that way. Because that contains successful elements, in contrast to what we've seen is the incompetence of the anti-Roosevelt methods.”*

If Clinton can do that, he will have saved civilization from consequences perhaps beyond our imagination.

Let Us Create a Qualified Citizenry

Now, then the next questions: What happens in January 2001? Where does the world go from there? Well, we have to have a new President, according to the present Constitution—I'm not against a third term for Bill Clinton entirely, but that's the way things are.

And at present, I'm the only person who is qualified to be that President—the successor to Bill Clinton. No one else on the horizon is qualified. I wish they were. *The most dangerous thing for humanity is to find only one person, particularly an old grandfather like me—one person, the only qualified President of the United States, in this situation.* That's not good. I'm too vulnerable. And maybe the Queen has some people in England who would threaten to get rid of me, shut my mouth, kill me. That's not good.

We've seen what happened to the United States when Lincoln was assassinated, again by a British assassin. We saw what happened in the United States when Garfield was assassinated, again by the same kind of operation. We see what happened to the United States when McKinley was assassinated, this time, again, openly by a British-directed assassination.

We are too vulnerable. We depend so much upon so few in times of great crisis, when great leadership is needed, that those leaders who can do the job, who are so few, so almost irreplaceable. The enemy always recognizes: “knock those off, kill them, eliminate them, jail them, discredit them, defame them.” The enemy recognizes that's a very effective method, and then it might be able to come in and do as it wants to do.

Which is exactly what happened with the death of Roosevelt. You had poor Truman, who was certainly not up to the job. He had many shortcomings, shall we say. He was a patsy for the Churchill crowd. He was a fool, compared to Roosevelt. The loss of Roosevelt by his untimely death in the Spring of 1945, has been a disaster for global civilization.

So therefore, I'm not *pleased* to be the only qualified candidate to be President of the United States in the year 2001. There should be others who are qualified. Well, if there should be others, and I would not like to be alone and vulnerable in that position, under such circumstances, *why don't we produce them?*

Why don't we say to our fellow Americans: You don't have a right to be stupid! You don't have a right to say, “I follow the news,” when you know that most of our news media lie to you most of the time about everything, and doesn't mention most of the things that are important! And you rely upon “interpreting the issues,” as defined by these crooked, monstrously corrupt news media people?

What's wrong with you? Why don't you start *thinking for yourself?* Why don't you take up the so-called “heavy issues,” think them through? Why don't you learn a little bit of history? Why don't you learn some science? Why don't you demand that the people who can teach it to you, *teach* it to you? Not to make you a professional of this or that, but simply to qualify you as a citizen, to know what's going on and what has to be done, and how to judge the great questions that face the nation. How to rally your forces as citizens, behind the kind of

leadership we should be getting out of, especially, the President, and from within the Congress.

That's what we must worry about. And that's what we must worry about *now*.

I've laid out what must be done, what Clinton must do. I will lay it out in more detail. But, looking forward to the year 2001, even presuming that Clinton does what he must do in the coming months; looking ahead, we must not have merely a change of President. *We must have a change in the temper of government, in the temper and outlook of the American people.* We have to organize our people. We have to get them to think, not to say, "Well, I have my opinion."

The Question of Strategy

Now, let's go back to this question of strategy. I've dealt with this in a recent article on the subject of Congress's revisiting the ABM treaty. I've dealt with this at some length there. I've also dealt with relevant questions in the matter of how to tell the future, a subsequent article.

But what is this business of strategy in politics? Why do I say, don't go running around quoting Clausewitz saying, "war is politics continued by other means"? It's not true.

Take the case of our dear friend Molloy Vaughn. Take the case of General Bedoya of Colombia. What's the issue here? What's the issue that faces military people who are patriots, who have some understanding of the world about them, as well as of the needs of their own nation? What is the military man of *that quality*—what does he think?

He says, what's his objective? The objective, as General Bedoya has expressed it in his own way, in travelling throughout South America recently; the way that Molloy Vaughn was concerned about nation-building in all kinds of small countries and regions around the world, not just as a U.S. officer concerned about the U.S., and building up the U.S. as a nation-state. *Molloy always understood the security of the United States depended upon building other nations up, as our friends, as nations whose instincts would jibe with ours, in terms of the kind of world, the kind of world neighborhood—the community of principle—in which we wish to live.*

General Bedoya's raised the same question for the Americas—the Americas in general, South America most emphatically. The security of Colombia depends upon the security of the Americas, and the security of the Americas depends upon the security of Colombia, its freedom from this terrible monstrosity which this terrible woman, Madeleine Albright, is fostering in Colombia, against the vital interests of the United States as well as against the Colombian people.

The starting point of politics, in relationship to military strategy, is political strategy. On this planet, there are two important currents, political currents. One, typified by the Venetian tradition, which is the British monarchy's tradition, is called the oligarchical tradition: that a few, controlling money and influence, must rule the world, and the rest of them must be treated as cattle. *You* must be treated as cattle. And you must be herded, made to seem happy, perhaps, but you exist for the pleasure of the cattle-owners—the British monarchy, the financial interests who talk about the sanctity of money, the sanctity of finance, the sanctity of financial systems, which are independent of interference from governments.

What are governments? *Governments are instruments of representation of a nation.* So, a nation, it says, must not have any instrument to impose its will upon this thing from Mars, this financial oligarchy, which comes in like a bloodsucker, like Dracula by night, to suck the blood of our people.

Then, on the other hand, you have the other policy, which has been called modern European culture since the Fifteenth Century: the development of the modern nation-state, whose function is to serve the general welfare, not only of ourselves, that is, our present generation, but also *our posterity*, for hundreds and thousands of years to come. *The government must be governed by nothing but its commitment to serve that general welfare.* That's our Constitution. That's our law; only understand it. That's what the President of the United States must represent, is that point of view. He must take care of the people and *their posterity*.

We also have to take care of a system of nations in which the nations are self-ruled, are sovereign, under this principle of general welfare.

We desire two things: that every government be a sovereign government of a sovereign nation; that it be committed to the general welfare. We also desire that this nation be intelligent enough to recognize that its enemy is any system which threatens systems of government which are committed to sovereignty in service of the general welfare.

Therefore, since we must have nation-states as the only way in which people can be represented in their government, we must have a *system* of nation-states. And the system will work *only to the degree that each nation-state is governed by a commitment to the principle of the general welfare, and that all nation-states each recognize that their well-being as independent nation-states, and their security, depends upon applying the same notion of general welfare to the world as a whole, to all nation-states.*

That is the direction, the American direction, as Kissinger identified and denounced it. That is what Roosevelt represented at his best. Forget all the criticisms, forget all the qualifications. *Roosevelt, as distinct from Churchill, represents what we want! Churchill, as distinct from Roosevelt, represents what we do not want. What we want in the world, what we don't want in*

the world. It's not a matter of "do's" and "don'ts," and "what's this," and so forth, all this kind of thing that people talk about. It's very simple. The principle of the general welfare, the principle of the nature of man, as a thing above the beasts; man as a creature of cognition; the individual as a person of creative cognitive powers, cognitive powers which must be educated and developed in the young, to bring the benefits and security to the present generations and to the future.

That is the source of strategy. That *political commitment* is the source of our strategy against the strategy of people in the Churchill tradition, for example. Therefore, we must develop the military means and methods which are consistent with our nation-building policy and strategy.

That's what strategy is. Use science, use knowledge, use cognition. For example, take the case of another friend of mine who died some time ago, Col. Tom McCrary, a West Point specialist who served as the point colonel for General Patton in the Third Army's march.

And, he described the way he functioned going into Germany and into Austria. These soldiers, who were typical of the West Point tradition from former times; *these commanders and these non-commissioned cadres, acted to rebuild the economy, to rebuild the nations which their forces had invaded.* Because people in that tradition understood that you don't fight wars to defeat enemies. You fight wars when necessary and when justified, for only one purpose: to shape the outcome of history, in favor of what? I say, in favor of a system of sovereign nation-states, each governed by a fundamental constitutional principle of the general welfare, and all sharing and understanding that the survival and security of one, depends upon the general welfare provided by all to each.

And that's the theme I propose to you today.