

never again should the imperative of public support be ignored," Weinberger said.

In fact, Weinberger is asserting a time-honored conception of republican warfare, which involves use of military force only as a last resort, and then with the full commitment to succeed in achieving a specific objective. This requires, in democracy, public support to work, although gaining that support may not always be easy. But it is also not just a matter of "taking a public opinion poll." The secretary outlines this view in his "six major tests that should be applied by the U.S. in deciding to commit U.S. conventional military forces to combat:

"1) The U.S. should not commit forces to combat unless our vital interests are at stake. Our interests, of course, include the vital interests of our allies.

"2) Should the U.S. decide that it is necessary to commit its forces to combat, we must commit them in sufficient numbers and with sufficient support to win. If we are unwilling to commit the forces or resources necessary to achieve our objectives, or if the objective is not important enough so that we must achieve it, we should not commit our forces.

"3) If we decide to commit forces to combat, we must have clearly defined political and military objectives. Unless we know precisely what we intend to achieve by fighting, and how our forces can accomplish those clearly defined objectives, we cannot formulate or determine the size of forces properly, and therefore we should not commit our forces at all.

"4) The relationship between our objectives and the size, composition and disposition of our forces must be continually reassessed and adjusted as necessary. In the course of a conflict, conditions and objectives inevitably change. When they do, so must our combat requirements.

"5) Before the U.S. commits combat forces abroad, the U.S. government should have some reasonable assurance of the support of the American people and their elected representatives in Congress. Of course, this does not mean we should wait upon a public opinion poll. The public elects a President as a leader, not a follower. He takes an oath to protect and defend the Constitution. The people also expect a Congress sworn to the same principles and duties. To that end, the President and the leadership of the Congress must build the public consensus necessary to protect our vital interests. Sustainability of public support cannot be achieved unless the government is candid in making clear why our vital interests are threatened, and how, by the use, and only by the use of American military forces, we can achieve a clear, worthy goal. U.S. troops cannot be asked to fight a battle with the Congress at home, while attempting to win a war overseas. Nor will the American people sit by and watch U.S. troops committed as expendable pawns on some grand diplomatic chessboard.

"6) Finally, the commitment of U.S. forces to combat should be a last resort—only after diplomatic, political, and economic and other efforts have been made to protect our

vital interests."

While a great deal can be said about these six points, they do explain Weinberger's insistence that the raid against Libya was done "only as a last resort," failing effective economic boycott measures, while Shultz, reflecting the discredited McNamara approach, has always pushed for a tit-for-tat gradually escalating U.S. military response to terrorism.

Weinberger's approach also explains why Lyndon LaRouche's call for bombing the Libyan oil fields now is appropriate and effective militarily.

## EIR releases report on crisis in education

Perhaps the most fundamental crisis confronting the United States of America, is the catastrophic situation in our educational institutions. Despairing parents, and concerned citizens from all walks of life, have long recognized that the effects of America's broken-down educational system on students' capacity to think, are threatening to become as devastating as the effects of the drug plague.

The collapse of the the average American student's educational level—a direct consequence of the National Education Association's policies—is quickly assuming the proportions of a threat to our national security. A future generation among whom illiteracy is so rampant, will no longer be capable of defending itself. But lurking behind the conceptions of the NEA, we can also discern a deliberate design and purpose; and for this, we have a word which describes the destruction of young people's minds: *menticide*.

American society exhibits a shocking number of the same symptoms which marked the fall of the Roman Empire. The brutality and ugliness of the porno films on the video market, the drug-rock counterculture, the films glorified and promoted by Satanic cults—all these are merely aspects of the brutal environment in which children must grow up in America today.

To confront this situation, *EIR* is releasing in May a \$250 Special Report, *The Libertarian Conspiracy to Destroy America's Schools*. It reviews the history of the NEA subversion of our schools, and their opponents—who more often than not, share the same libertarian ideology! The report features, for the first time in English, a major writing by the father of German classical education, Wilhelm von Humboldt, and Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.'s in-depth study, "Saving our children: reintroducing classical education to the secondary classroom."