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I ask, how

let me try to

the errors of fact compounded by

First, mobilization itself is implicitly

opportunities for mobilization, for example. First,

she is not on the

Next states that, "nuclear
defense requires the maintenance

of huge and dangerous forces."

Nonsense. Nuclear war requires

no army, no surface fleet, no con-
scription. It is not the advent of

nuclear weapons that has caused

us to maintain a standing army,

but a recognition that we are the

leading nation of the West and

that we have global responsi-

bilities. The presence of inter-

continental delivery systems (mis-

iles and long-range bombers) keeps us from the temptation of

slipping back into splendid isola-
tion, as does our dependence on

the rest of the world for trade and

raw materials; it is not just the

presence of nuclear weapons.

She makes numerous references to

small government and national

security, claiming that the defense

establishment is eroding

American rights away. But she
doesn't distinguish between

necessary security and the exces-
sive portion which can be justifi-
ably criticized. I ask, how

significant is this erosion?

How many people ever run into

problems with those protecting

our national security? And how

significant is this erosion? How

does our dependence on

foreign policy (Article

1, Section 8). For the purposes of this description,

vises and consents, the President

makes foreign policy (Article

1, Section 3).
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