

The Dignity Of The Army Is At Stake

To: Retired, and Active Duty,
U.S. GOs, ADMs, COLs, CAPTNs, LTCs, and CMDRs

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Please allow me to suggest that, within your own professional circle, and *gratis*, without asking or waiting for support, or handing off to a civilian agency or think tank, you undertake an engineering project:

- (1) conceive and design a U.S. General Staff with Chief of Staff, under SecDef, to oversee, plan, equip, train, provision, and command all U.S. Military and Intelligence Operations,
- (2) mission the U.S. General Staff for homeland defense and the very rare intra-continental punitive expedition – Americas only – and
- (3) assist the U.S. Congress to update, rewrite, or repeal, as needed, U.S. Code: Title 10, the National Defense Authorization Act, the National Security Act of 1947, and other Acts and portions of U.S. Code, to establish the U.S. General Staff and Chief of Staff you design.

Lastly, if I may, a concluding suggestion: that, in pursuit of the foregoing, you treat of the U.S. General Staff – i.e., the U.S. Armed Forces – as comprising five mutually-beneficial force vectors: Space Army, Air Army, Cyber Army, Sea Army, Ground Army. As fully net-centric, these forces comprise the U.S. Joint Force, The United States Army writ large.

The Rev. David R. Graham
nobody.108.11529@gmail.com
09 August 2023

PS: Be sure to shutter or fold into the U.S. General Staff [these guys](#) (CAPE), a SecDef McNamara legacy, and [these guys](#) (USDP), a redundancy in context of a U.S. General Staff.

PPS: Provide for the US defense industry to become self-sufficient USA state property under DOD. Weapons are for killing, not sales. American taxpayers as a whole do not benefit from financial speculation, affecting their safety, by monied persons in pursuit of more monies.

The U.S. General Staff, indeed DOD *in toto*, along with Congress, serves Americans as a whole, for national level, Federal public responsibility. They do not and must not serve entrepreneurial speculators, whose goals and responsibilities are parochial.

National defense TOEs can be kept current with the need only where their design, engineering, and fabrication industries are national property under DOD.

PPPS: The cynosure of this project is the Russian General Staff, who win their wars, rather than the German General Staff, who lose theirs.

Clausewitz is wrong in this regard: that war is a *mere continuation of policy by other means*. That's a pugilist's attitude. Russians are right in this regard: that policy is a material continuation of war by other means. That's an engineer's attitude.

A constant of life is war, not policy. Clausewitz rightly identifies three constants of war -- Violence, Chance, Reason -- but War itself is a constant whereas policy is not.

Russians are right to have an engineering approach to war -- you're always at it, doing it -- rather than a pugilistic approach to war -- now you do it, now you don't. Americans will be happy to appreciate and emulate the Russian cynosure.