

EIR Feature

Dealing with the Russians' decisive cultural inferiority

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Below are excerpts of a policy-memorandum issued on Sept. 11, 1986 under the title, "The design of political counter-operations: medium- to long-term operations in dealing with the Russian empire."

This paper addresses the range of topics which must be considered individually, and together, to define both the shorter-term and long-range implications of the irregular warfare directed against us by the integrated resources of Sino-Soviet intelligence. The paper uses the hypothetical case, that, over the relatively short term ahead, a peace-through-strength posture by the U.S.A. and its collaborators, has halted the Soviet empire's active aggression. This hypothetical circumstance is posed, to define a general approach to winning of irregular warfare against that empire. The point is presented and explained, that exclusive emphasis upon methods of internal subversion of nations falling into the classes of Russia or mainland China, can not lead to a net success. Only by inducing a crisis of felt cultural inferiority within such nations, can the conditions for the needed cultural shift be induced. This can not be accomplished by narrow emphasis upon covert or other factional penetration of the inside of those nations, but only by causing such nations to feel deeply that they are culturally inferior to nations immediately surrounding them. It is shown also, that this same approach defines an effective counteroffensive against Soviet-directed irregular warfare.

A crucial feature of this irregular warfare is the Soviets' most important and masterful deception of the post-1945 period, the credulous Western acceptance of the myth of the Moscow-Beijing split.

1. Doctrine of counter-warfare: principal theses

Strategic policy-planning against Sino-Soviet irregular warfare, must begin with the broad understanding, that we are dealing chiefly with three broad classes of cultures: Russian, Chinese-mainland, and Western European. Although Moscow and Beijing have remained united, throughout the postwar period, to the



Russian ambassadors at the court of Maximilian I in Augsburg (woodcut, 1516). By the early sixteenth century, the Russians had already adopted the ideology of a Muscovite-centered world empire. This is the barbaric culture that must be defeated today.

destruction of their adopted common adversary, us, they represent respectively different, implicitly immiscible cultures. Their continuing irregular warfare is directed against nations of cultures more or less immiscible with either Russian or mainland-Chinese culture. Thus, the most essential feature of their irregular warfare, is of the form of one species of culture engaged in subversion of a different species of culture.

The proper strategic doctrine of the U.S.A. and its allies, divides its objectives into a range of objectives, from the near-term to the long-range:

1) Targeting and eradication of Sino-Soviet irregular warfare capabilities in territories outside China and the Russian Empire.

2) Military and cultural containment of the adversaries' forces.

3) Transformation of those ruling cultural paradigms of the adversaries, which dispose them to adversary posture against us, our allies, and our friends.

In all three of these phases of our strategic operations, we, too, are engaged in irregular warfare. We are thus obliged to undertake ventures broadly analogous to those of our adversaries, but from a reversed cultural standpoint.

It would be a grave, potentially fatal error, to assume that irregular warfare is in any way a game of "tit for tat." It would be a fatal error, to study Sino-Soviet warfare against us, with a view to imitating Sino-Soviet practices as countermeasures against them and their surrogates. The tiger does not combat the crocodile by imitating the habits of the crocodile. Western civilization, Russian culture, and mainland-China culture,

are three respectively distinct species of society, each as distinct from one another as animal species differ, as least as much as the cuckoo differs from the species in whose nests the cuckoo leaves its eggs.

The essence of Sino-Soviet irregular warfare against us, is penetration and subversion. International narco-terrorism, and other less subtle features of their irregular warfare, are merely a specific application of the capabilities achieved by penetration and subversion. Two practical questions lie at the center of our policy-making in these matters:

1) How do their operations of penetration and subversion express their cultures' deployment against our culture?

2) Is counter-penetration of their nations a central feature of our counter-warfare?

Sino-Soviet irregular warfare against us, is not of the form analogous to a military alliance, but rather the analogy of a joint-stock company. This joint-stock-company arrangement is analogous to Soviet intelligence's control of two U.N.O. agencies, the World Health Organization (WHO) and FAO, U.N.O. agencies which are, in practice, joint-stock-company ventures of the U.S.A. and Soviet intelligence establishments. So, Soviet intelligence dominates Sino-Soviet joint-intelligence operations.

There are important conflicts between the Russian Empire and China, essentially conflicts of immiscible cultures, an immiscibility accentuated by the conflict between the Muscovite imperial chauvinism of the one, and the hermetic quality of racialism of the other. This is a source of endemic, and indissoluble conflicts between the two states. These are echoed as discordant notes within the two powers' joint-



"We use the term 'China culture' here as shorthand for that aspect adopted by Mao Tse Tung, rooted in ancient 'legalist philosophy' and Taoism."

stock-style intelligence operations against us. They have never prevented the unbroken continuity of the Sino-Soviet strategic alliance against us. The cultural conflict exists, but it is ignorance expressed as political insanity, to adduce from this conflict any argument in support of the "China Card" delusion.

There are two outstanding instances of important penetration of Russia and China, respectively, by Western European culture. For Russia, the attempts of Peter the Great to civilize that nation. For China, the case of Sun Yat Sen. On the surface, it might appear to some that these are examples of penetration-operations; to the degree there was penetration included, to emphasize such penetrations is to fog the issues. In each case, the Western civilizing influence was the result of deep feelings of national-cultural inferiority within that nation, by an explosion of increase of economic and related power in adjoining nations. In the case of Peter the Great, it was the post-1653 explosion of economic progress in Western Europe, then centered in France, and the impact of the founding of Prussia's power by the reforms of the Great Elector. In the case of China, it was the rise of Japan. "Be ashamed not to be like Japan," was the slogan of the New China movement, based in China's coastal cities, a policy directly opposite to Mao Tse Tung's apotheosis of the countryside of the interior.

The only effective means for inducing a positive cultural shift within either Russia or China, is to humiliate the existing cultural values in the eyes of, respectively, the Russians and the Chinese themselves: not only by awesome economic and related power of the OECD nations, but by high rates of growth of nations at their borders. It is impossible to penetrate successfully either Russian or China-interior culture; one can

only induce it to become ashamed of itself, and therefore to transform itself.

How, and why this disparity between modes of Sino-Soviet and effective U.S. irregular warfare, is the case, is the subject on which we concentrate attention in this chapter of our report.

Correct definition of warfare

The principles involved overlap the folly of protracted land-war in Asia. To understand how this overlap applies, one must rid oneself of the popularized notions of the connections between regular warfare and irregular warfare. One must reject the connotations of such terms as "low-intensity warfare," "unconventional warfare," or the *Kleinkrieg* which Professor von der Heydte adopted as title of the original edition of his book. These terms connote the false idea, that irregular warfare is an adjunct, or alternative to regular warfare. In the whole span of human existence, irregular warfare is the natural and original form of warfare; what we call "regular warfare" is a relatively modern innovation, and remains merely an optional aspect of irregular warfare. It were proper to say, that "regular warfare is irregular warfare supplemented by other means." The only alternative term, for "irregular warfare," which might be recommended, is "cultural warfare." We use the two terms more or less interchangeably, according to which aspect of the common phenomenon is being emphasized in that location. When regular warfare in Asia is considered from this corrected standpoint, the perils of such enterprise are more immediately clear.

In the cases of wars within Western Europe and the Americas, the contending powers represent nations of the same species of culture. Thus, no matter what passions are aroused, the invasion of one of these nations by the other involves no fundamental cultural conflict between the invading forces and the invaded populated territory. When the war is conducted between two cultures which are axiomatically immiscible, the invasion turns the entire population of the occupied territory into an implacable foe, who must mount escalating irregular warfare as a result.

The complicating feature of the case of wars among nations of Western European culture, those of Western Europe and the Americas, is that the average of Western European culture is itself a never better than uneasy accommodation between two cultural strains which are ultimately immiscible, but which have been mutually habituated to a certain degree of cohabitation.

In the case of the Nazis, for example, the forces of the German invaders of Western nations and Poland, during World War II, were predominantly German patriots serving under the command of a Nazi state. At one level, mere patriotism dictated resistance to invading and occupying forces, because the invaders were German. The resistance grew as it became clear that the invasion was not by German culture, but on behalf of a Nazi culture implacably hostile to, and alien to Western European culture in general.

The case of the Nazi occupation of the Ukraine is one illustration of this. Originally, the Ukrainians received the Wehrmacht as liberators. Had the Wehrmacht been allowed to continue actions preparatory to establishing an independent Ukraine under Wehrmacht sponsorship, Germany would have conquered Russia in World War II. Soon, the Wehrmacht's political administration of occupied territories was pushed aside by the Nazi administration, whose brutalities turned collaborators of the Wehrmacht occupation into dedicated irregular warfare forces committed to the extermination of Germany. It was this irregular warfare, which drained the resources of the Wehrmacht to the degree Moscow could both recapture the allegiance of captive-nation sectors of its empire, and administer a defeat to the Nazi forces.

It was not Russian "distances" or the logistical difficulties of the Wehrmacht's protracted warfare which caused the Nazi defeat on the Eastern Front. These were factors, of course; but, they became major factors only because of the environment of irregular warfare enveloping the German forces.

In Asia, the rules of cultural warfare always predominate. Although not all among these cultures are as absolutely immiscible, respectively, as Western European and China-interior cultures, the axiomatic commonality generally characteristic among nations of Western European cultural heritage, is lacking, either absolutely, or almost so in degree. For example, the idea of "Chinese empire" is a policy of displacing the population representing the culture of the conquered territory, and repopulation of the seized territory with Chinese; whereas, the Russian idea of empire is based on the models of the Babylonian, Persian, and Roman empires, a system of satrapies, each of a conqueror-prescribed, distinct culture of its own, each and all subject to common overlordship by a Muscovite master-race.

Cultural warfare has two aspects. In one aspect, it is the spreading of the hegemony of one's own choice of culture. In the other aspect, it is the destruction of the opposing nations' culture and cultural-specific institutions from within. The actions taken in one respect, are designed to serve the actions taken in the other respect, but, except as the two overlap in part, they are not of the same form or nature of action.

Warfare occurs in the form of an implicit set of goals, respecting the development of one's own nation, and the shaping of affairs among the nations of this planet. As other nations have implicit goals conflicting with our own, we are in conflict to that degree. When this conflict reaches the intensity, at which the opposing set of implicit goals defines another nation or set of nations as "the face of the adversary" (German: *Feindbild*), then a state of cultural warfare exists between the two sides of the conflict; this cultural warfare is expressed as irregular warfare. We seek to assert our implicit goals, and to destroy not only the adversary's power to pursue conflicting goals, but to destroy his willingness to adhere to such conflicting goals.

Irregular warfare is the original and primary form of

warfare, with respect to which regular warfare is sometimes a subsumed feature. Regular warfare is irregular warfare implemented by aid of other means.

2. Parameters of cultural warfare

By "Soviet culture," we mean the *Raskolniki* type, and identify the relevant, characteristic features of that type as follows. We mean this type as defined by Fyodor Dostoevsky, as typified by the *Raskolniki* revolts against Peter the Great, the Pugachov insurrection, and as congruent with the philosophical outlook of 1440 Muscovy, of Ivan III, Ivan IV, the mystical 1510 prophecy of Philotheos of Pskov, the writings of Maxim Gorky, and the films of Sergei Eisenstein.

We use the term "China culture" here as shorthand for that specific aspect of China's manifold culture adopted by Mao Tse Tung, a cultural tradition rooted predominantly in ancient "legalist philosophy" and Taoism, and associated with the bestialized mode of life traditionally imposed upon the farmers of China.

We identify these two cultural types as belonging commonly to a wide range of particular forms of irrationalist cultures and religions of the same general species. In practice, we include the bestial tyrannies of such African states as Qaddafi's Libya, Idi Amin's former dictatorship in Uganda, and so forth, as regimes of the same cultural species. We include, generally, also those sorts of "nativist" cultures targeted for exploitation by the Soviet ethnology agencies of Evgenii Primakov and Geidar Aliyev, including Shi'ite and some other forms of so-called "Islamic fundamentalism."

We also include as varieties of this general species-classification, the ancient Mesopotamian culture and the Siva current in India's culture, the Egypt-Hellenistic cults of Isis, Osiris, and Horus, and so forth and so on.

As a general classification, all such cultures are usefully viewed, for purposes of strategic policy-shaping, as degenerated, or barbaric cultural types: a locust-plague of enemy forces, differing among themselves, but commonly swarming in lust, dedicated to the destruction of our civilization. These are strategically analogous to pestilences and epidemics, which threaten to destroy any civilization which lowers its cultural resistance sufficiently. Like locust-swarms, the individual member of the species may rarely be conscious of his effective intent to destroy civilization; he may destroy an entire civilization, unwitting of the nature of wrong he has accomplished against humanity generally. Yet, consciously or not, he undertakes just that in effect, as a matter of cultural instinct.

Without understanding the "mechanisms" of culture, no competent shaping of strategic policy for irregular warfare can be accomplished. By "culture," we mean the following.

Put aside the positivist concoctions called modern ethnology-anthropology, sociology, and psychology. Define culture from the standpoint of classical Indo-European philology, using this as a yardstick of comparison, for not only

the case of the Indo-European series, but all contrasting currents of culture.

By aid of examining modern European and other languages from the standpoint of functional analysis of the interrelationship of Homer's and Plato's classical Greek to classical Sanskrit, circles associated with Gauss and the Humboldts, established a more advanced appreciation of relevant points featured within Plato's dialogues: that the ancient Vedic peoples of Central Asia had developed very sophisticated, astonishingly accurate solar-astronomical calendars, and that there is a geometrical principle underlying the structure of the Indo-European languages.

The verifiable accuracy of solar-astronomical calendars in Vedic hymns, shows that a very advanced form of literate language was employed to transmit those calendars orally to the time of written documentation, and that such a literate form of language existed in Central Asia during the period 6000-4000 B.C. If we study the internal history of modern mathematical physics from the vantage-point of a synthetic geometry, we realize that a greater net advance in human knowledge was accomplished, over the span from primitive man to the emergence of the Vedic, than has been accomplished since.

Through languages, and through the religious-cosmological axiomatics conveyed through them, the substrate of the personality remains remarkably little altered over as much as hundreds of generations. This transmission occurs not biologically, but through the medium of language. Language is not reducible to a vocabulary and grammar, but rather, as Panini showed about 2,500 years ago, the self-evolving vocabulary and grammar built around axiomatic principles. This set of principles, and their elaboration, determines the way in which an individual is conditioned to define the structure of experience, to choose goals, and to frame decisions.

Culture is thus defined as both axiomatics and development on the premise of those axiomatics: A particular culture is its axiomatics as expressed by the form of development elaborated up to the time of reference.

Thus, in the largest degree, the behavior of the people of a culture, is not the sum of their individual members' decisions, nor of the interaction among individual decisions. Culture is a force in its own right, more powerful than the will of any number of individuals within that culture at any time. Nations behave not as the collective wills of a few or even all their members will it, but as culture delimits and shapes the way they respond to events. This sort of behavioral tendency rarely changes more than marginally over numerous generations, and usually predominates over scores or more of generations.

The individual is not absolutely prevented from acting in ways contrary to the dictates of his culture, but he can do so significantly, only as his actions are efficiently directed to modifying the axiomatic or axiomatically elaborated features of his culture. Fundamental scientific discovery by an individual, is paradigmatic of the manner in which this kind of

change may be accomplished.

This was more or less clearly understood by the authors of the cultural change which has been imposed upon Western Europe and North America during the past 20 years: a key feature of Sino-Soviet irregular warfare against us. The authors of this "New Age" countercultural project, referred to their efforts as a "cultural-paradigm shift." The traditional, family-centered values of our population were radically shifted, axiomatically shifted, by the rock-drug-sex counterculture.

This action has been the foundation of Sino-Soviet irregular warfare against us. Our counter-action must be to reverse this "cultural-paradigm shift" within our nations' population, and to aim to induce a desirable sort of cultural-paradigm shift in the cultures among barbaric peoples, such as the Russians.

We are not obliged to be blind slaves to cultural heritages, but we must begin with comprehension of the overwhelming force of transmitted culture, to become qualified to modify culture. We must not be blind slaves to culture, nor followers of Mandeville's fable of the bees; we must respect the force of transmitted culture, if we are to be truly effective as individuals. In the realm of irregular warfare, this view is the indispensable one.

The characteristic feature of cultures which are axiomatically adversary to our own, is that they are both irrationalist and bestialist:

1) The Augustinian heritage, the characteristic distinction of Western European civilization, is based upon subordination of every other consideration of law and policy to the essential superiority of man over beast: the divine spark of potential for reason inherent in every human individual.

2) The existence of a universal truth, expressed in the lawful composition of the universe as a whole, which mankind's reason enables us to discover.

3) That the function of individual life, and society, is essentially fostering the development of the individual's powers of efficient reason, governing the practice of individuals and society, according to knowledge of universal truth: natural law.

4) That this defines, axiomatically true individual self-interest, and the true self-interest of states.

Barbaric cultures are essentially racialist, "blood and soil" cultures, whose form of belief is consistent with the worship of capricious tribal gods. They reject the existence of an efficient and knowable universal reason.

The greater facility with which Western European culture generates scientific and technological discoveries, and assimilates these into productive and other practice, is a benefit of the association of the notion of superior social identity of individuals, with qualities of reason. In Western European culture, we normatively consent to modify our culture according to standards of reason. Barbaric cultures, which reject this, are "traditionalist," and assimilate technological progress with difficulty.

The barbaric culture willingly modifies itself only when it accepts the painful recognition that its culture is inferior (hence, the formerly revered tribal gods are no longer respected). Irrationalism, by rejecting the principle of knowable universal reason, adopts, instead of reason, the notions of power and the will to use that power, as the only recognized *lingua franca* of relations among peoples. Only the perception that other nations are intrinsically superior on these latter accounts, enables the barbaric culture to be penetrated by superior cultures.

In order to transform the culture of China, the essential thing is to promote high rates of progress among the nations of the Asiatic Rim, including India. For the culture of China, this is a humiliating, as well as confining "geopolitical-cultural" experience. The establishment, and persistence of such a phenomenon, would wear down the barbaric aspect of Chinese culture, with beneficial effects echoing the philosophical posture of Sun Yat Sen.

In dealing with Moscow, long-range irregular-warfare policy must be premised upon something a bit more than simple "peace through (superior) strength": a growing gap between Soviet power and that of the nations it desires to conquer, to the increasing advantage of the United States. This means rates of growth of gross output, and physical productivity per-capita, not only exceeding those of the Warsaw Pact nations, but with such emphasis on technology-intensive investment and production, that the Western margin of advantage on these counts is increasing consistently.

The hysterical Soviet reaction against the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), was motivated not by considerations bearing upon regular warfare, but cultural considerations bearing upon irregular warfare:

1) Over the past 20 years, the Soviets have achieved a margin of strategic superiority for regular warfare, less for reason of Soviet economic success, than because of the West's "post-industrial" self-destruction of its own development. Any major technological drive within the West would reverse this trend.

2) The Soviets would never enter into an actual arms-control cooperation with an adversary power, as sharing technology would imply this ("arms-control" is a hoax we have imposed upon our deluded selves; they never actually supply data on their strength).

3) Moscow is equal to or even significantly ahead of us in developing and deploying strategic ballistic missile defense based on new principles, and in passive measures of strategic defense. All Soviet statements to the contrary are simply lies. Their real objection, is that under any "crash program," around projects such as SDI, the U.S. would sustain high rates of technological attrition comfortably, both economically and culturally. For reasons of inferiority of Soviet culture, Moscow could not match the rates of technological attrition which the U.S. would reach during the medium-term.

The Soviet dictatorship of imperial Russia quickly rec-

ognizes that SDI's success is less a military threat to them, than, rather, a direct cultural threat to the Russian empire. It is this cultural-threat aspect which drives them into a frenzy. . . .

3. The 'New Age' aspect

The key to all activities of Sino-Soviet foreign intelligence and irregular warfare against us, is a proper comprehension of the "Trust." The power of Russia or China as such, is only somewhat greater than the capacity for regular warfare, and for support of "Trust" activities. At present, the Soviets are at the verge of overpowering, and perhaps devouring many among the other partners of the joint-stock company which the "Trust" is. Each of these matters is, relatively speaking, one or another of the particular organs of the entire organism, which the "Trust" is.

To define the "Trust" as an organism, overlay every fact which "Trust" connotes, with an another set of facts, those connoted by "New Age." Such an overlay leaves a few important things to be explained, but not many.

This view of the matter has its predominant practical importance, in dealing with Soviet irregular warfare against us; but, there are very significant aspects of Soviet Russian behavior as such, which can not be understood except as effects of the "Trust's" constraining influence. Each of these two leading aspects of the phenomenon has independent importance for our work. It is chiefly with the "Trust" as an integral organism, that we are concerned.

The focus on a "Soviet adversary" signifies aiming our fire against only one aspect of an adversary deployment, and leaving the other components free to do much as they might please. The chief technical flaw in our defensive policies to date, is that our institutions of lawmaking and enforcement have been victims of precisely this sort of fallacy of composition in policy-making.

In counter-terrorism, for example, the only effective modes deployed have concentrated on destroying what is usually named "the infrastructure" of the terrorist operations. It is shown, that in the cases the command and logistical infrastructure is virtually demolished, the terrorists' "infantry" is effectively neutralized by mopping-up operations. In other cases, where leading elements of the political and logistical infrastructure are defined as lying outside the target-area, and efforts are concentrated on the "infantry," the outcome is a failure.

The failure, so far, to control Soviet-directed narco-terrorism in West Germany, is an excellent, well-documented example of this point. The relevant law-enforcement agencies of the Federal Republic of Germany include commands and professionalized ranks which have the knowledge and skills sufficient to eliminate the problem, at least at the level of irregular warfare deployments there up to this time. Political and legal decisions have prevented these resources from

being deployed effectively. Policy and legal decisions have thrown a protective cloak around the infrastructure of narco-terrorism.

A somewhat similar circumstance exists in France, where, in latest developments to date, French government officials and leading "old boys" of the military-intelligence establishments have identified the correct counter-terror policy. These French statements have been echoed by such figures as Lord Chalfont in Britain, and Horst Herold in the Federal Republic. Included, is a concerted effort by relevant French, Italian, and other agencies, to force an exposure of, and crack-down on, the witting conduiting of funds for European terrorist deployments by prominent Swiss banks in Geneva, Lausanne, and Zurich, including the Geneva and Zurich offices of the same *Crédit Suisse* massively implicated in the laundering of monies of narco-traffickers.

The same principle applies to broader aspects of Soviet-directed irregular warfare. Except as prominent and other figures may be deployed as penetration-agents, with sanction of relevant agencies, no person or entity implicated as an agent, agent of influence, or dupe of adversary irregular-warfare operations, is in a class "above suspicion." Even putatively sanctioned "penetration" by our agencies, is used by the adversary as a form of cover for his operations; so, even this area is not entirely in a class "above suspicion."

The first question posed, in the choice of applying or not applying the label "agent of an adversary," is "agent of what?" Of Moscow, or Beijing? Often, in very important cases, conclusive, courtroom-quality proof of a direct Moscow, Beijing, Damascus, Teheran, or Tripoli agency is not available. In these cases, often, conclusive proof does exist showing the suspect is an agent of the modern version of the "Trust." Unfortunately, many among such suspects are either very powerful themselves, or are under the protection of forces which are very powerful; nonetheless, privately, the conclusive proof is available for such purposes as a discreet adjustment of the environment in which the suspect is operating as an agent.

Irregular warfare subsumes three classes of surreptitious activities: 1) Activities which are surreptitious for almost no other reason than the guile of the responsible agency; 2) activities whose covert character lies entirely in the eye of the beholder; 3) mixed types, in which the responsible agency exploits the flaws of the "eye of the beholder," to cause something to be surreptitious which would not be so to an onlooker with unflawed vision.

In defining those aspects of irregular warfare in which the "Trust" channels as such are the predominant immediate factor, it is the latter two types of surreptitious action which concern us.

"X" is an agent of the "Trust," but prevailing opinion or policy asserts that any identification of "X" with the "Trust" will be rejected as "incredible." "Y" is an agent of "X," and can be proven to be an adversary agent only on the basis of the connection to "X." Or, event "Z" injures the U.S. inter-

est, to Sino-Soviet or "Trust" advantage. Event "Z" was assisted to occur through actions of "Y." These are typical of the second class of surreptitious action.

The same person, "X," is given a reputation of being "very respectable." The adversary agency is therefore able to deploy actions through "X," which would be viewed as suspicious if not perpetrated or sponsored by a person wrongly considered "very respectable." Or, event "Z" is of a type which would be considered reprehensible, unless it were endorsed by "very respectable" people, or by misguided prevailing popular opinion. These are typical of the third class of surreptitious action.

For such reasons as those identified in this chapter so far, our defenses against irregular warfare are virtually nil, unless we escape from the "left-hind-leg of the dog" narrowness of focus, to adopt a correct conception of the dog as a whole organism. We must proceed from a narrow focus upon Russia and China, to situate the relevant adversary features of these nations as sub-features of the real dog, the "Trust." A clear conception of the "Trust" must be adopted, so that the class of facts classifiable as "Trust" actions can become visible objects of counterintelligence sense-certainty. The "Trust" can not be defined accurately, without incorporating the overlay of "New Age."

We do this now, as concisely as the nature of the subject permits, with respect to prevailing patterns of errors and ignorance of this subject among policy-shaping circles generally.

How Bolshevism was created

Both Bolshevism and fascism were creations of the "New Age" movement in which Dostoevsky, Nietzsche, and Crowley were prominent figures. The connection between the "New Age" and fascism is more widely understood, because the wild mysticism of the Nazis and other fascists is rather well known, and because the defeat of German fascism brought many of the direct connections to light. This view of Communism is not widely accepted, largely because popular opinion views Communism as the psychotic phase of the social-democratic neurosis, and has selected and arranged only those facts and legends which appear to coincide with such a popular prejudice.

In the last analysis, there is a much more weighty reason that Communism is not recognized as a "New Age" spin-off. This particular error is key to the bungling which permeates even the most weightily documented publications and papers on the subject of the "Trust."

The "New Age" was immediately a production of a large and growing degeneracy among the European aristocracy and financier families. The relatively plebian intellectual figures of the "New Age" movement, as Dostoevsky and Nietzsche, were under the patronage of such wealthy degenerates. It was impossible to conceal these "class" connections of the fascist movements. The popular notion of "class" affiliations and enmities of the Communists, views fellows such as Corliss

Lamont as “defectors from their social class,” and rejects out of hand the notion that any large component of the “wealthy upper classes” could have sponsored Communist insurrections. The very idea of such “class” connections puts the popular delusion into jeopardy: that politics is arranged, “from right, to center, to left.” People will tolerate refutation of those ideas they have reached by processes of reason; they will more rarely tolerate “any further discussion” of evidence contrary to their delusions.

That is the only honest reason the phenomena of the “Trust” are either ignored or fundamentally misinterpreted strategically.

The case of the French Jacobins’ leadership and Paris mobs is rather exhaustively documented. If we trace the history of European radicalism, from the Jacobins, through Mazzini’s “Young Europe” and “Young America” conspiracies, into the formation of the socialist and Communist movements of the present century, and the functional coincidence of the “New Age” and “Trust,” as institutions, the popular prejudices are supplied devastating refutation. At that point, real comprehension of the “Trust” begins.

Robespierre and the Jacobins’ rise to power in France, was a joint enterprise of French-speaking Swiss bankers, the Duke of Orleans organization, and the British East India Company of William Pitt the Younger. The pivotal Swiss figures involved directly, were the French finance minister who bankrupted France and brought on the revolution, Jacques Necker, and his notorious daughter, the Madame de Staël. The siege of the Bastille, is the best-known instance of such direct connections. The mob was organized and armed by the Duke of Orleans. As the mob left the Bastille, bearing the heads of the murdered on their pikes, at the head of the procession was borne the bust of Jacques Necker, whom the mob demanded be appointed immediately the prime minister of France. The storming of the Bastille was an election-rally for a Swiss banker, organized by the French King’s cousin, the Duke of Orleans. One wonders what the French imagine they celebrate annually, on July 14!

Robespierre’s career was molded in the salon of Madame de Staël. Danton was appointed to power, after being deployed from London by British intelligence for this purpose. Marat was a Swiss mental-case, trained in London by British intelligence, and deployed to France, to replace Danton, by the same agencies which had deployed Danton. All leftist radicalism, and fascism, have been creations of this same sort of patronage. In each nation, there are local wealthy patrons, usually working in cooperation with some police or intelligence agency, which run several “extremist” and otherwise kookish groups as “controlled assets.” This has been the history of every nation of Europe, and the Americas. Yet, the most important local varieties of radical organizations have always been part of an internationally coordinated operation, to the effect that the ownership of the radical movement has always had the form of a joint-stock-company operation among the wealthy patrons and governmental agen-

cies using these as controlled assets.

We must be more specific. Radicalism of the right and left varieties has been controlled predominantly, not by wealthy people in general, but by a well-defined faction among the wealthy. The required definition is the international mobilization for and against our War of Independence. For a clearer empirical distinction, draw a line defining the opponents of the American Revolution and the winning faction at the 1815 Congress of Vienna. Since 1653, there has been

All leftist radicalism, and fascism, have been creations of wealthy patronage. In each nation, there are local wealthy patrons, usually working in cooperation with some police or intelligence agency, which run several “extremist” groups as “controlled assets.” This has been the history of every nation of Europe, and the Americas.

only one kind of revolution in the history of Europe and the Americas, the American Revolution. Every other event classed as a revolution was either an echo of the principles of the American Revolution, or was a counter-revolution against those principles. The Russian Revolutions of 1905 and 1917 were such counter-revolutions. Those are the only two consistent sides in the sweep of historical events in Europe and the Americas over the past four centuries.

If we include on the American side, monarchs and aristocrats who espoused the principles of natural and constitutional law associated with the American Revolution, we are clearly understood when we class this faction as the “republican.” The opposite side, aristocrats and financier families, are of a type sometimes clumsily identified as the “feudal reaction” against the American Revolution, as Metternich and Castlereagh so classed themselves. A better term, a term more consistent with a science of history, would be “oligarchical faction.”

Despite the oligarch’s partial victory at the 1815 Congress of Vienna, the principles of the American Revolution had shown stubborn powers of recovery during most of the 19th century. So, during the 1870s and 1880s, the same oligarchic interests who had prevailed in establishing the Holy Alliance, moved to plunge civilization into a “New Dark Age,” to thus eradicate those Augustinian traditions from which the principles of the American Revolution derived their stubborn cultural strength.

Dostoevsky, Nietzsche, and Crowley typify the doctrine of the "New Dark Age." They were not only prophets of that calamity, but each was the intellectual center of an organized effort to make the prophecy reality. Of these more celebrated figures, although movements were built around the writings of Dostoevsky and Nietzsche, the organizations which Crowley built around himself are outstanding in their direct influence, and continuing counterintelligence importance, to the present day.

Crowley's organization is the major, "Trust"-linked counterintelligence adversary inside Britain, the Commonwealth, and the U.S.A. today, as we have already indicated some of the extent of that. This is the organization which produced the "recreational drugs" movement in the U.S.A. It was Crowley's organization which invented and which still controls "the rock industry." Without this organization and its powerful protectors and promoters, Sino-Soviet narco-terrorist warfare against the United States would have been impossible. The "rock-drug-sex counterculture," the principal irregular warfare weapon exploited against us by Sino-Soviet intelligence capabilities, is of the form of event "Z."

The Crowley organization is "X," and those deployed in "X's" actions to produce event "Z," are "Y." The Crowley organization, "X," is the majority of the Anglo-American-Canadian membership of today's revived version of the "Trust."

The demonstrable practical connections of sundry aspects of the "New Age" to both the "Trust," and to Moscow and Beijing directly, are abundant. By statistical correlation alone, the "New Age" and the "Trust" overlap to such a degree they are virtually one and the same. However, we require proof of principle more precise, than inductive statistical reasoning. We wish to be able to aim precisely at the head of the snake, if we find it necessary to do so, rather than wishfully throwing random pattern-fire into the snake's general vicinity. We must know the beast and its habits so precisely that we can adduce his most vulnerable flanks from his organization and nature. Our object must be to destroy the infrastructure of this organized criminality.

We shall not succeed all at once. Massive hard investigative work and evaluations must be done in the course of improving war-plans for our conduct of irregular warfare. A correct scientific definition of the problem's nature, is an indispensable guide to investigations and estimates, but is not a substitute for the hard work to follow. We need a veritable army of professionals dedicated to planning and winning this war; but the army must be unified around a correct definition of both the face of the enemy and of the creature's species-determined habits and vital interests.

The key to understanding fascism and Bolshevism, is to start from the "New Age." It would be a mistake to proceed in the reverse order. Once the "New Age" program is understood, one is able to understand both fascism and Bolshevism correctly and, relatively speaking, immediately.

To define this approach, recognize that all three specific

targets, the "New Age," fascism, and Bolshevism, are creations of the wealthy oligarchic faction. This faction is defined with reasonable approximation, most readily, from the standpoint we have indicated: the issue of the principled features of the American Revolution, as those principles are seen, hatefully, through the eyes of a feudal-minded aristocrat and medieval "Lombard" usurer. The social composition of the oligarchic families emulates the legendary daily life of the pagan gods of Olympus, and the imperial courts of Caligula, Tiberius, and Nero. Today's "jet-set" degenerates exemplify the type.

To understand those who do the thinking for these wealthy degenerates, take St. Augustine, Charlemagne, Otto I, Frederick Barbarossa, France's Louis XI, as republican types. Locate as their principal immediate enemies, such Byzantine rulers as Justinian and Photius, plus Mount Athos, Venice, and the old Roman imperial families of Rome. Put special emphasis on the Byzantine control over the Vikings, through both the "Nordic" version of the Olympus pantheon imported to these barbarians earlier, and the Arian heresy imported later.

See the Byzantine and Venetian deployment of such barbarians against the order established by Charlemagne and Otto, including Venice's role in creating the "Mongol hordes," and steering them southward and westward: to adduce thus a very specific feature of the adversary's habits, relevant for today.

The "New Age" is not the first time the adversary has consciously fostered a "New Dark Age," such as that of the 14th century, in an effort to eradicate the Augustinian cultural heritage. Barbarians overrunning Western Europe from the East, is part of the enemy's stock-in-trade in ancient and medieval times, as well as in the instance of the Holy Alliance's adoption of Russian hordes as the "policeman of Europe." Moreover, remember, that unlike modern-day, pragmatic Americans, who study the pabulum of textbook history essentially to pass the course, our adversary's brains-trust really studies history in great depth, and very seriously, in order to discover scenarios and principles by which to shape the present and future. In respect to that brains-trust, you are not dealing with a stupid enemy, but a very satanically clever one.

"New Age" is short-hand for Nietzsche's and Crowley's defining the twentieth century as "The Dawning of the Age of Aquarius." Both defined this as an end to "The Age of Pisces," which, for them, was the age of Jesus Christ and the Socrates of Plato's dialogues. As their new god, which they defined as the "anti-Christ," Nietzsche proclaimed Dionysos, the Phrygian name for Satan. Crowley proclaimed Lucifer, the Mithraic-cult form of Satan, known in Greek as Apollo.

The "New Age" adopted a specific current within Russian culture, as the leading instrument for their destruction of Western civilization during the course of the twentieth century. They rejected the Westernizing culture current sponsored by Peter the Great, and embraced the Romanovs' dead-

ly and implacable enemies, the *Raskolniki*. Dostoevsky expresses this culture and its implicit goals most precisely, in the terms the "New Age" admired and promoted the *Raskolnik* current. Out of this came the image of a century of great, protracted wars, social revolutions, and titanic cultural-paradigm shifts, echoing the cult-proliferation of 14-century Europe. Out of this upheaval, at a later phase in the process, the armed *Raskolniki* of Russia would obliterate the cultural institutions of Western European civilization.

That, Ladies and Gentlemen, is the true face of our enemy.

So, to destroy German culture, Russian *Raskolniki* culture was imported to foster a mystical variety of German racism which was the mirror-image of Dostoevsky's *Raskolniki*. This was Nazism. The credulous myth-spinners attributed Hitler's "Third Reich" to the succession of Bismarck's, Weimar, and Nazi Germany. The Nazis took the name directly out of Dostoevsky's prophesying the coming of the "Third Rome," an eternal world-empire whose appointed capital was "Holy Moscow." Dostoevsky's German translator, Möller van den Bruck, was the one who contributed the "Third Reich" myth directly to the Nazis.

The problem posed to the "New Agers" by Dostoevsky's program for establishment of a "Third Rome," was how to industrialize Siberia without Westernizing the *Raskolnik* out of the Russian? How to industrialize the *Raskolnik*, so that he might conquer the world like the Mongols before him, without Westernizing him. This required a form of society so totalitarian, so brutishly so, that the industrial and cultural objectives could be reached simultaneously. "Communism" was the chosen solution: grafting the idea of industrial communism upon the *Raskolnik*'s deeply embedded commitment to rural communism.

Too much emphasis is placed usually upon the economic features of Bolshevism. The popular idea of "godless materialism," is a dangerously absurd misestimation in practice. The Bolshevik is deeply mystical, and has very pronounced agreement with the priestless faction of Old Believers during the 18th century. Essentially, he is very religious. The problem lies not in the wrongly supposed fact, that he is "godless," or, more accurately, "priestless." The problem is that his god is the "anti-Christ," Cybele, the mother of Satan (Dionysos) in her Russian costume, as the pagan earth-goddess Matushka Rus.

A correct collection and arrangement of the facts about Bolshevism, adopts the cultural side of Bolshevism as its primary feature. If the attempt is, to explain the Soviet mind-set from the starting-point of economics, we have the popular misconception of Bolshevism as a result. One must begin with Bolshevik culture, the Soviet mind-set, and discover how this mind-set governs Soviet economic policy.

This is key to understanding the significance of the recent statement, against President Reagan's July 25 letter to General Secretary Gorbachov, by Soviet military spokesman Col. Vasily Morozov:

"... the SDI is aimed at a triple goal. . . . Last, but not least . . . the Americans would like us to try to create our own SDI, because, in their view, this would put such a strain on the Soviet economy that it would collapse under the strain."

Morozov is restating an estimate reached by the Soviet leadership some time prior to February 1983, presented as official Soviet response to the LaRouche design for strategic ballistic missile defense based on "new physical principles." Morozov is speaking for a Soviet military establishment which projects LaRouche's design for SDI policy upon President Reagan, and which bases that projection on an interpretation of the President's July 25 letter and statements and actions of the President and other leading SDI spokesmen since that time. This is the leading reason the Soviets refuse to accept the proposal for cooperation in SDI; nearly all others are propagandistic subterfuges. Their thinking on this subject, is one of the simplest and most conclusive demonstrations of the way in which Soviet culture determines Soviet economic policy, rather than the reverse.

If SDI were limited to some systems-analysts' conception of a perfectly pre-tested, fixed type of SDI, the Soviets would have little difficulty in matching us, along lines they have been working for years. If, however, SDI is not a fixed system, but is, rather, a continuing process of technological attrition, the Soviets would be unable to match this after a span of 5 to 10 years of cooperative progress among the U.S. and its allies.

The problem is analogous to the disagreements between Japan and China, on the subject of development of China's basic economic infrastructure. China has a "two legs" cultural policy, a "Western leg" and a "China leg." China desires a relatively superficial use of Western technological culture, in compartmentalized sections of its topmost governmental functions, and within the confinement of coastal urban centers as industrial-development zones. However, China is also determined to prevent so deep a Westernization as to threaten the continuity of what is viewed as the traditional China-culture of the interior. Japan rightly argues: Without progressive development of basic economic infrastructure in depth, general economic development is not feasible. China responds: Since such a policy would undermine our cultural policy, basic economic infrastructure in depth is clearly not necessary.

The inability of Moscow to match us in technological attrition modes, is not an economic problem, but a cultural one. *Raskolnik* is a cultural "traditionalist," passionately so. Technological change is contrary to his deep, mystical feelings. The Soviet hierarchy refers to this phenomenon of the Soviet economy as "the peasant problem." On the one side, from the standpoint of economic imperatives, they know that the peasant (*Raskolnik*) must be taken out of the industrial operative and local industrial management. On the other side, like China's bureaucracy, the traditional, *Raskolnik* character of the population, is an inviolable leg of their national policy.

This "peasant problem" is one aspect of Soviet motives

for backing the "environmentalist" and "post-industrial" movements in the West. Russian cultural policy will not permit Russian economic policy to adapt to high rates of generalized technological attrition in basic industry and agriculture. Therefore, a self-imposed "post-industrial" practice among the Western nations, is indispensable to Soviet strategic objectives.

Only in a fully rational form of culture, do rational forms of economic considerations induce nations to adapt their cultural policy to economic-science principles. Even then, it is the culture which determines a choice of rational form of economic-science principles. Thus, even in the case of the periods of highest rates of realized scientific progress in Western economies, there is no case in which "economic determinism," of the sort often attributed to Communism, prevails. Economic policy is always an expression of the cultural impulses of a nation; "economic motives" influence cultural policy only in the manner culture itself determines.

The foregoing points of illustration illuminate the fact, that to understand Bolshevism, we must understand how the process of evolving a design for Bolshevism was addressed to the indicated paradoxical feature of Dostoevsky's program. What, in short, is the difference between Peter the Great's program of Westernization and the Bolsheviks' industrialization policy?

The "secret" is to be found in the Grotto of Alex Münthe's Isle of Capri, where "New Ager" Maxim Gorky molded the cultural policy of the future Soviet state.

The mind-set of the "New Age's" authors and leaders, is a deeply mystical one. What is called often "symbolic philosophy," is their alternative to reason. Astrology, witchcraft, paganist varieties of cult-rituals, and a magician's trickery, are the hallmarks of such mystics' mental life. At the center of the unleashing of the program for "The Dawning of the Age of Aquarius," was the adoption of the figure of the Emperor Tiberius as the model incarnation of the anti-Christ, and the resurrection of Tiberius's Mithra-cult center, the Isle of Capri, as the spiritual center of the movement. The chief priest of the cult on Capri, was the notorious Alex Münthe. To this center, leaders of fascism, such as Hitler's emissary, Hermann Goering, were drawn on pilgrimages. Here, Maxim Gorky gathered the Bolshevik leaders for instruction in what he was fashioning as the future Bolshevik culture.

Bolshevik culture is a dichotomized one: the sword of iron, subordinated to the sword of the spirit. Jeane Dixon, using computers to churn out marketable horoscopes, is in keeping with Bolshevik culture. Soviet industrialization must be seen in this light. Russian science and industry are, for the Bolshevik soul, a necessary evil: the sword of iron. Bolshevism proper, is the mystical sword of the spirit. The spirit belongs to the mother of Satan, Matushka Rus.

Thus, in technical matters, the Bolshevik is rational, but only up to a point. On matters which touch the essence of Bolshevism, he is a raving Russian mystic, a *Raskolnik*.

Art and religion, are where men and women are them-

selves.

In Augustinian civilization, art, religion, and the spirit of scientific inquiry, are one and the same: the experience and celebration of the unity of truth, beauty, and *agape*, are the essence of Western classical fine art. In these things we are at peace with ourselves; we are at home, come in from the hurly-burly of daily conflict, to renew ourselves spiritually for the struggles of the coming day.

See the Russian professional musician attempting to perform the classical repertoire. He is typified by an extraordinary degree of physical proficiency, but he makes everything sound like an echo of drunkenly sentimental Red Army soldiers singing "Kalinka." With few exceptions, his mind can not capture the essence of classical composition; he simply does not know what it is all about. He is a Romantic, like Richard Wagner's circle, like Schopenhauer, like Rilke, and so forth; for him the rigorous rationalism of the classical repertoire, in which creativity is of the form of mental activity associated with scientific discovery, is an alien thing, in which he finds no pleasure. In art, he mistakes rigor for the mechanistic, as the Russian neo-classicals attempt to do. He prefers unbridled, irrationalist, sentimentality.

This is the state of mind with which he undertakes the painful duty of technological progress.

Thus, all of the most gifted Soviet scientists walk the perilous edge of heresy to Bolshevism. Outwardly, the heresy is to Friedrich Engels's lunatic concoction of "dialectical materialism," the formal source of that radical nominalist's jiggery-pokery called Bolshevik "diamat" and "histomat": the mechanistic view of Descartes, but with a magical element added in. The truth is, that science as such is itself already heresy to Bolshevism. It is something which Matushka Rus eyes as evil to her, something she is obliged to tolerate for sake of establishing Moscow as capital of the "Third Rome." She permits some Russians to occupy themselves with this sinful practice, a practice of which she hopes to purge herself once the empire is consolidated.

The leading "New Agers," such as Bertrand Russell, always viewed the Bolsheviks as so many characters from a Dostoevsky novel. On this, they were never deceived. The Bolsheviks were, for them, the new berserker Vikings sent against Charlemagne's order, the new Mongol hordes. Was it not satanic of Russell and others, to favor the looting of Western civilization by such a pestilence? Of course; they are as satanic as the London "Hell Fire Clubs" of the 18th century, as satanic as Crowley professed himself to be, and proud of it. Of course, many features of Bolshevism disgusted them, but they viewed it as a necessary evil, a lesser evil than the Augustinian principles expressed by the American Revolution. They saw the Taoist traditions of China and the Russian *Raskolnik*, as the leading candidates to serve as an armed cultural force for destruction of Augustinian civilization, with a bit of Sufism thrown in. For the twentieth century, they saw the Russian empire as the most credible selection, and Taoist China culture perhaps a future successor.

This view by the "New Agers," has produced two World Wars, fascism, and Bolshevism during this century, with outright satanism coming up as the new form of this pestilence. The course of events, so unfolded, transformed the sponsorship of the Russian Revolution into an uneasy, but otherwise efficient partnership with the entity created. That partnership, so defined, is the organism to which we must correlate all of the relevant facts of irregular warfare.

4. The 'New Renaissance' strategy

Modern European history begins out of the 14th century's "New Dark Age." The program of Dante Alighieri, continued by Petrarca from his spider-web's center at Avignon, was developed as the Golden Renaissance of the 15th century. The period from the Hapsburg sack of Rome, in A.D. 1527, until Mazarin's defeat of the Hapsburgs, in 1653, is sometimes described as a "Little Dark Age," less disastrous than that of the 14th century, but severe. Centered around Mazarin's successor, Jean-Baptiste Colbert in France, and the reforms of the Great Elector of 17th-century Prussia, the methods of the Renaissance were used to rebuild Europe. The creation of the United States was a major accomplishment of that latter renaissance.

Over the known history of Europe, the history of particular nations, and sometimes Europe more generally, has been an alternation of new "Dark Ages" and new renaissances. For this reason, Friedrich Schiller, in his capacity as Jena University professor of history, proposed that European history must be studied as essentially a fight between two opposing types of forces: the one typified by the slave-society of Lycurgus's Sparta, the other by Solon's constitutional reforms at Athens. The republican tradition, typified by Solon and St. Augustine, builds society by means we associate with new renaissances; the oligarchic tradition of Sparta, seeks to destroy the institutions of such renaissances, using methods which are either intended to introduce a new dark age, or which tend to cause that result, whatever the intent in the matter might be.

In this aspect of the matter, we are close to the essence of Europe's experience with irregular warfare. Those of us who are educated to become conscious of the thousands of years of republican history, draw upon that historical knowledge for guidance in our crisis of today. Our enemies, the oligarchic faction, draw upon knowledge of their faction's long experience, to shape their policies for today. Those, on both sides, who do not know this history, flounder in their own confusion and blunders.

We republicans have one essential thing in our favor. Thousands of years of experience show this to be true. We are able to show what this potential advantage must necessarily exist for us today. This factor is the secret of winning irregular warfare against present-day forms of our ancient enemy.

This special knowledge is the true secret of Dante Alighieri's famous *Commedia*, sometimes recognized by the name *Divine Comedy*. Before Dante, Plato and Christianity taught us, that the nature of man is twofold. On the one side, there is the aspect of the newborn child which has moral resemblance to the condition of the beasts, irrational hedonism, the mere seeking of pleasure and avoidance of pain. On the higher side, there is that which distinguishes us absolutely from the beasts, the "divine spark" of our potential for developing reason. This, according to Plato, St. Augustine, and Dante, delimits the variety of personalities which humans can assume to three broad classifications: 1) the pure irrational hedonist, the man of Dante's *Inferno*; 2) the purely reasonable type, the man of Dante's *Paradise*; and, 3) the mixed type, the person whose conscience is governed by the desire to be a person of reason, but who is nonetheless gripped strongly by irrational forms of hedonistic impulses.

The immediate source of potential strategic advantage of the republican cause, is that our support within the populations is derived from the quality of reason, whereas the source of political support for our enemy, is man's capacity for bestiality.

The simplest kind of illustration for the intrinsic strategic superiority of our cause, is the fact that technological progress is the only source of increase of the productive powers of labor. That aspect of our nature, which enables us to effect valid scientific discoveries, on the one side, and also to assimilate new discoveries efficiently in the form of technological progress, depends upon mankind's potential for reason. Thus, given two societies starting from a level of equal development, the one which is loyal to the principle of scientific and technological progress, will become more powerful, per capita, than the society which is not.

This advantage is not limited to the work of science and technology. It pertains to every facet of our personality. The immediate source of strategic strength of our cause, is that, provided we adhere to our own right principle, we foster the superior development of people. Our society produces a better, more capable individual personality.

The secret of successful republican strategy in irregular warfare, is that we must promote that kind of development of our people, and apply that superiority of our culture to attack the characteristic weaknesses of the opposing culture. We must foster our strengths, and use those strengths in such a way that we effectively exploit the inherent weaknesses of our adversary.

The example we have used twice earlier, the role of technological attrition in connection with implementation of the SDI, is a good illustration of this principle of irregular warfare strategy. We use the fact that our culture makes us superior in technological attrition, to play upon the fact that the adversary's culture makes him inferior. We serve our culture best, by using its inherent superiority as a weapon; we defeat the adversary's culture, by treating his culture's inferiority as its weak flank.