

## 1: Sun Sentinel - We are currently unavailable in your region

*OUGHT WE TO FIGHT FOR OUR COUNTRY IN THE NEXT WAR? C. D. Broad. The question before us is of the general form: 'What ought such and such people (e.g. males of military age) to do under such and such circumstances (e.g. when their country is involved in a war)?.'*

Vietnam War Quotations You can kill ten of my men for every one I kill of yours, but even at those odds, you will lose and I will win. Eisenhower, Now we have a problem in making our power credible, and Vietnam is the place. Kennedy, This is not a jungle war, but a struggle for freedom on every front of human activity. Curtis LeMay, May We are not about to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves. We could pave the whole country and put parking strips on it, and still be home by Christmas. Rostow, National Security Adviser, Dec. North Vietnam cannot defeat or humiliate the United States. Only Americans can do that. Let them forget their humanitarian promises! Vietnam was lost in the living rooms of America--not on the battlefields of Vietnam. I viewed it as a genuine tragedy. No one had a monopoly on anguish. Then pile on top of that an attitude of social opprobrium, an attitude that made the fighting man feel personally morally responsible for the war, and you get your proverbial walking time bomb. With the Americans had begun the heroin phase. It was misreported then, and it is misremembered now. Nixon, The war was won on both sides: And if the one side won an ideological and political victory, the other made Apocalypse Now and that has gone right around the world. We are the richest people in the world and they are among the poorest. We savaged them, though they had never hurt us, and we cannot find it in our hearts, our honor, to give them help--because the government of Vietnam is Communist. And perhaps because they won. I think all the people who remember it should forget it, and all the people who forgot it should remember it.

## 2: American Revolution Quotes (92 quotes)

*Here are 10 Wars That Could Break Out in the Next Four Years countries between them to avoid fighting at home. 5. Civil War in Iraq happen in a war between North and South Korea. We Are.*

Inevitably, things go awry. Reactions have unintended consequences. Since then, Chinese and Japanese air and naval assets have taken many opportunities to troll each other. The Chinese people see these provocations as violations of their sovereignty and anti-Japanese demonstrations erupted in China. World War II memories die hard. The islands themselves are just an excuse. Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, who is a hardline nationalist, is unlikely to bow to Beijing just because of a military buildup. They sit on trade routes. Oh, and there are oil and natural gas reserves there. China started building artificial islands and military bases in the Spratlys, which is interesting because the U. So the next U. President will also have to be prepared for 2. China under Xi Jinping is much more aggressive in its rise. It now has a second, entirely Chinese one under construction. The Russians wish they had a ship like this. The ballistic missile looks a lot like nuclear missiles and can carry a nuclear payload. Once a Chinese anti-ship ballistic missile sinks its first U. This is why China develops weapons to deny the U. A map from "some things never change. Threats made by Russian President Vladimir Putin are always serious. Putin claims the right of Russia to protect the rights of Russian-speaking minorities abroad and uses military force to do so. The Houthis are still fighting for deposed dictator Ali Abdullah Saleh, whose regime was a victim of the Arab Spring. Iraqi Prime Minister Haidar al-Abadi warned the sudden uptick in sectarian violence may spill over into the greater Middle East. The proxy war is already in Iraq. In the meantime, the two keep battlefields in the countries between them to avoid fighting at home. Speaking of which 6. They also were the workhorse behind turning the tide of the ISIS advance and putting the terror group on the defensive. In Iraq, the Kurdish Autonomous Regions are rich in oil and are unlikely to be given away by the government in Baghdad. The Kurds will have to fight all three governments and will come to the U. Hezbollah For those out of the know, Israel takes its security seriously. When Hezbollah fighters switched their focus to support the Assad regime in Syria, Israel took the opportunity to disrupt any Hezbollah supply line that might be used against the Jewish state. Israeli soldiers return from southern Lebanon. When the fighting in Syria stops, Hezbollah will not forget its age-old enemy and is likely to retaliate. The Israel Defence Force has never hesitated to invade Lebanon with the aim of taking out Hezbollah fighters. The last time was in and Israel is already planning for the next one. Civil War in Turkey The Turkish people are facing an identity crisis. The cost was a turn away from the secular democracy that defined the Turkish government Turkish women protesting the AKP government in Istanbul. Civil War in Afghanistan The U. The Afghan security forces are unlikely to be able to stand up to these battle-hardened jihadists without U. The war lasted all of a month and only resulted in slight boundary changes which have never been fully addressed. The coming war may be nominally over the Himalayan boundaries between the two countries, but in reality, it will be about water. The two countries both want the hydropower and water from the Yarlung Tsangpo "Brahmaputra River. In the event of a war with China, their perpetual enemy, Pakistan would likely join in on the Chinese side. The Chinese are heavily invested in Pakistan, especially in the disputed area of Kashmir. Individually, India can beat Pakistan and make a stand against China, but is unlikely to win against both. Anyone If anyone was going to invade North Korea, they would have done it by now. Seriously, what does this country have to do to get its government ousted? Blake is based in Hollywood, but often found elsewhere.

### 3: The liberators ought to fight another war – Nehanda Radio

*It is safe to say that if our country does indeed descend into revolution, nuclear war will not come into play, for if it did, there would be nothing to rule over in the aftermath. The United States has already witnessed civil war of a conventional nature.*

The Four Freedoms Speech was given on January 6, 1941. In the address, Roosevelt critiqued Isolationism, saying: Such a peace would bring no security for us or for our neighbors. The first is freedom of speech and expression – everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way – everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want – which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants – everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear – which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor – anywhere in the world. That is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation. That kind of world is the very antithesis of the so-called new order of tyranny which the dictators seek to create with the crash of a bomb. With the creation of the Office of War Information, as well as the famous paintings of Norman Rockwell, the Freedoms were advertised as values central to American life and examples of American exceptionalism. However, in the speech received heavy criticism from anti-war elements. Polls and surveys conducted by the United States Office of War Information OWI revealed that "self-defense", and vengeance for the attack on Pearl Harbor were still the most prevalent reasons for war. Indeed, these Four Freedoms were explicitly incorporated into the preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which reads, "Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed the highest aspiration of the common people Every realist knows that the democratic way of life is at this moment being directly assailed in every part of the world The need of the moment is that our actions and our policy should be devoted primarily – almost exclusively – to meeting this foreign peril. I also ask this Congress for authority and for funds sufficient to manufacture additional munitions and war supplies of many kinds, to be turned over to those nations which are now in actual war with aggressor nations. Let us say to the democracies Roosevelt [16] Main article: Four Freedoms Award The Roosevelt Institute [18] honors outstanding individuals who have demonstrated a lifelong commitment to these ideals. Among the laureates have been:

## 4: OUGHT WE TO FIGHT FOR OUR COUNTRY IN THE NEXT WAR?

*It's been a long time since we have had to fight a war at home, and warfare has changed a lot since then. The biggest threat to a modern country is not infantry. The biggest threat to a modern country is not infantry.*

Although few soldiers joined the anti-imperialist cause, their statements did sometimes provide ammunition for the opponents of annexation and war. In , the Anti-Imperialist League published a pamphlet of Soldiers Letters, with the provocative subtitle: Supporters of the war discounted the accounts of atrocities as the boasting of soldiers wanting to impress their friends and families at home or, because the identities of some of the writers were withheld from publication, as outright fabrications. United States Engineers, writes from Manila, February 22d: This is now our rule of procedure for cause. After delivering my message I had not walked a block when I heard shots down the street. Hurrying forward, I found a group of our men taking pot-shots across the river, into a bamboo thicket, at about 1, yards. I longed to join them, but had my reply to take back, and that, of course, was the first thing to attend to I reached the office at 3 P. Vickers, Sergeant in the First Nebraska Regiment: I am not afraid, and am always ready to do my duty, but I would like some one to tell me what we are fighting for. Guy Williams, of the Iowa Regiment: The soldiers made short work of the whole thing. They looted every house, and found almost everything, from a pair of wooden shoes up to a piano, and they carried everything off or destroyed it. Talk of the natives plundering the towns: I deprecate this war, this slaughter of our own boys and of the Filipinos, because it seems to me that we are doing something that is contrary to our principles in the past. Certainly we are doing something that we should have shrunk from not so very long ago. Most of the general officers think it will take years, and a large force of soldiers, to thoroughly subjugate the natives. And the unpleasant feature of this is that unless the conditions change radically there will be few soldiers who will care to stay there. And the thought of its not ending for several years is not an especially pleasant one, either. Charles Bremer, of Minneapolis, Kansas, describing the fight at Caloocan: Company I had taken a few prisoners, and stopped. The colonel ordered them up in to line time after time, and finally sent Captain Bishop back to start them. There occurred the hardest sight I ever saw. They asked Captain Bishop what to do, and he said: Sylvester Walker, of the Twenty-third Regulars, February There has not been a night for the last ten days we have not had fighting. Our force is too weak, and we cannot spare any more men, and will have to wait for more troops. Olson, of the Fourteenth Regulars: We can lick them, but it will take us a long time, because there are about , of the dagos back in the hills, and as soon as one of them gets killed or wounded there is a man to take his place at once; and we have but a few men in the first place, but we are expecting about 8, more soldiers every day, and I hope they will soon get here, or we will all be tired out and sick. This is an awful bad climate and there have been from two to four funerals every day. The boys have chronic diarrhea and dysentery, and it just knocks the poor boys out. Sweet, of the Utah Light Battery: The scene reminded me of the shooting of jack-rabbits in Utah, only the rabbits sometimes got away, but the insurgents did not. Albert Otis, describes his exploits at Santa Ana: I have six horses and three carriages in my yard, and enough small plunder for a family of six. The house I had at Santa Ana had five pianos. You can guess its finish. Everything is pretty quiet about here now. I expect we will not be kept here very long now. Give my love to all. Davis, Company A, 20th Kansas: They will never surrender until their whole race is exterminated. They are fighting for a good cause, and the Americans should be the last of all nations to transgress upon such rights. Their independence is dearer to them than life, as ours was in years gone by, and is today. They should have their independence, and would have had it if those who make the laws in America had not been so slow in deciding the Philippine question Of course, we have to fight now to protect the honor of our country but there is not a man who enlisted to fight these people, and should the United States annex these islands, none but the most bloodthirsty will claim himself a hero. This is not a lack of patriotism, but my honest belief. Fetterly, a Nebraska soldier: Some think the insurgents are disheartened, but I think they will make a desperate struggle for what they consider their rights. I do not approve of the course our government is pursuing with these people. If all men are created equal, they have some rights which ought to be respected. Arthur Minkler, of the Kansas Regiment says: We advanced four miles and we

fought every inch of the way;. It was like hunting rabbits; an insurgent would jump out of a hole or the brush and run; he would not get very far. I suppose you are not interested in the way we do the job. We do not take prisoners. At least the Twentieth Kansas do not. Burr Ellis, of Frazier Valley, California: They did not commence fighting over here Cavite for several days after the war commenced. I ran off from the hospital and went ahead with the scouts. And bet, I did not cross the ocean for the fun there was in it, so the first one I found, he was in a house, down on his knees fanning a fire, trying to burn the house, and I pulled my old Long Tom to my shoulder and left him to burn with the fire, which he did. I got his knife, and another jumped out of the window and ran, and I brought him to the ground like a jack-rabbit. I killed seven that I know of, and one more I am almost sure of: There were five jumped out of the brush and cut one of the Iowa band boys, and we killed every one of them, and I was sent back to quarters in the hurry. Came very near getting a court-martial, but the colonel said he had heard that I had done excellent work and he laughed and said: Well, John, there will always be trouble here with the natives unless they annihilate all of them as fast as they come to them. Tom Crandall, of the Nebraska Regiment: The boys are getting sick of fighting these heathens, and all say we volunteered to fight Spain, not heathens. Their patriotism is wearing off. We all want to come home very bad. If I ever get out of this army I will never get into another. They will be fighting four hundred years, and then never whip these people, for there are not enough of us to follow them up The people of the United States ought to raise a howl and have us sent home. Captain Elliott, of the Kansas Regiment, February 27th: Caloocan was supposed to contain seventeen thousand inhabitants. The Twentieth Kansas swept through it, and now Caloocan contains not one living native. Of the buildings, the battered walls of the great church and dismal prison alone remain. The village of Maypaja, where our first fight occurred on the night of the fourth, had five thousand people in it at that day,â€”now not one stone remains upon top of another. You can only faintly imagine this terrible scene of desolation. War is worse than hell. Adams, of Ozark, in the Washington Regiment: They would not take any prisoners. One company of the Tennessee boys was sent into headquarters with thirty prisoners, and got there with about a hundred chickens and no prisoners. Mickle, Tennessee Regiment, at Iloilo: The building had been taken possession of by a United States officer, and he looted it to a finish. I suspected something and followed one of his men to the place. I expected to be jumped on by the officer as soon as I found him there, as I was away from my post, but it seems he was afraid I would give him away; in fact, we were both afraid of each other. The house was a fine one, and richly furnished, but had been looted to a finish. The contents of every drawer had been emptied on the floor. You have no idea what a mania for destruction the average man has when the fear of the law is removed. It is such a pity. Theodore Conley, of a Kansas Regiment: Talk about dead Indians! Why, they are lying everywhere. The trenches are full of them There is not a feature of the whole miserable business that a patriotic American citizen, one who loves to read of the brave deeds of the American colonists in the splendid struggle for American independence, can look upon with complacency, much less with pride. This war is reversing history. It places the American people and the government of the United States in the position occupied by Great Britain in It is an utterly causeless and defenseless war, and it should be abandoned by this government without delay. The longer it is continued, the greater crime it becomesâ€”a crime against human liberty as well as against Christianity and civilization

## 5: Here are 10 Wars That Could Break Out in the Next Four Years | [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com)

*There are two undeniable facts about our recent political trajectory. For now, Zanu-PF is the custodian of our lives, be it prosperity or poverty. Second, whether we like it or not, Zanu-PF rule.*

Traditionalists and Revisionists Contemporary just war theory is dominated by two camps: Traditionalists and Revisionists. Their views on the morality of war are substantially led by international law, especially the law of armed conflict. They aim to provide those laws with morally defensible foundations. Civilians may not be targeted in war, but all combatants, whatever they are fighting for, are morally permitted to target one another, even when doing so foreseeably harms some civilians so long as it does not do so excessively. Most revisionists are moral revisionists only: Some, however, are both morally and legally revisionist. Among its key contributions were its defence of central traditionalist positions on national defence, humanitarian intervention, discrimination, and combatant equality. Revisionist criticism of combatant equality and discrimination followed Holmes ; McMahan ; Norman They have accordingly sought firmer foundations for broadly traditionalist positions on national defence Benbaji ; Moore , humanitarian intervention Coady , discrimination Rodin b; Dill and Shue ; Lazar c , and especially combatant equality Zohar ; Kutz ; Benbaji ; Shue ; Steinhoff ; Emerton and Handfield ; Benbaji We will delve deeper into these debates in what follows. First, though, some methodological groundwork. Traditionalists and revisionists alike often rely on methodological or second-order premises, to the extent that one might think that the first-order questions are really just proxy battles through which they work out their deeper disagreements Lazar and Valentini forthcoming. Readers are directed to the excellent work of philosophers and intellectual historians such as Greg Reichberg, Pablo Kalmanovitz, Daniel Schwartz, and Rory Cox to gain further insights about historical just war theory see, in particular, Cox ; Kalmanovitz ; Reichberg ; Schwartz In particular, we should prescribe morally justified laws of war. We then tell individuals and groups that they ought to follow those laws. On the second approach, we should focus first on the moral reasons that apply directly to individual and group actions, without the mediating factor of institutions. We tell individuals and groups to act as their moral reasons dictate. Indirect consequentialists believe these institutions are justified just in case they will in fact have better long-run results than any feasible alternative institutions see Mavrodes ; Dill and Shue ; Shue ; Waldron Non-contractualist deontologists and direct- or act-consequentialists tend to prefer the interactional approach. Their central question is: This focus on killing might seem myopicâ€”war involves much more violence and destruction than the killing alone. However, typically this is just a heuristic device; since we typically think of killing as the most presumptively wrongful kind of harm, whatever arguments one identifies that justify killing are likely also to justify lesser wrongs. And if the killing that war involves cannot be justified, then we should endorse pacifism. Any normative theory of war should pay attention both to what the laws of war should be, and to what we morally ought to do. These are two distinct but equally important questions. And they entail the importance of a third: Too much recent just war theory has focused on arguing that philosophical attention should be reserved to one of the first two of these questions Buchanan ; Shue , ; Rodin b. Not enough has concentrated on the third though see McMahan ; Lazar a. Although this entry touches on the first question, it focuses on the second. Addressing the first requires detailed empirical research and pragmatic political speculation, both of which are beyond my remit here. Addressing the third takes us too deep into the minutiae of contemporary just war theory for an encyclopaedia entry. Rule-consequentialists need an account of the good bad that they are hoping that the ideal laws of war will maximise minimise in the long run. This means, for example, deciding whether to aim to minimise all harm, or only to minimise wrongful harm. But to follow this course, we need to know which harms are extra-institutionally wrongful. Similarly, contractualists typically acknowledge various constraints on the kinds of rules that could form the basis of a legitimate contract, which, again, we cannot work out without thinking about the extra-institutional morality of war Benbaji We can start by thinking about actual wars and realistic wartime scenarios, paying attention to international affairs and military history. Or, more clinically, we can construct hypothetical cases to isolate variables and test their impact on our intuitions. Some early revisionists relied heavily on highly artificial cases e. They were criticized for this by traditionalists, who

generally use more empirically-informed examples. Walzer. Revisionists can pay close attention to actual conflicts. e. Traditionalists can use artificial hypotheticals. e. Abstraction forestalls unhelpful disputes over historical details. It also reduces bias—we are inclined to view actual conflicts through the lens of our own political allegiances. But it also has costs. We should be proportionately less confident of our intuitions the more removed the test case is from our lived experience. How can we trust our judgements about such cases more than we trust our views on actual, realistic scenarios? Artificial hypotheticals have their place, but any conclusions they support must be tested against the messy reality of war. The second divide is related to the first. Reductivists think that killing in war must be justified by the same properties that justify killing outside of war. Non-reductivists, sometimes called exceptionalists, think that some properties justify killing in war that do not justify killing outside of war. A paradigm reductivist, by contrast, might argue that justified wars are mere aggregates of justified acts of individual self- and other-defence (see Rodin ; McMahan a. Reductivists are much more likely to use far-fetched hypothetical cases, since they think there is nothing special about warfare. The opposite is true for exceptionalists. Many traditionalists replied by rejecting reductivism, arguing that there is something special about war that justifies a divergence from the kinds of judgements that are appropriate to other kinds of conflict (Zohar ; Kutz ; Benbaji ; Dill and Shue). Again, some philosophers buck these overarching trends for reductivist traditionalist arguments, see e. But this masks a deeper methodological disagreement: Should we model justified killing in war on justified killing outside of war? Or, in focusing on the justification of killing in war, might we then discover that there are some non-canonical cases of permissible killing outside of war? My own view is that thinking about justified killing outside of war has its place, but must be complemented by thinking about war directly. Next, we can distinguish between individualists and collectivists; and we can subdivide them further into evaluative and descriptive categories. Evaluative collectivists think that collectives can matter independently of how they contribute to individual well-being. Descriptive individualists think that any act that might appear to be collective is reducible to component acts by individuals. Descriptive collectivists deny this, thinking that some acts are irreducibly collective. And again there are outliers—individualist traditionalists. e. War is a useful test case for theories of collective action and the value of collectives, but no more than that. Intuitions about war are no substitute for a theory of collective action. Perhaps some collectives have value beyond their contribution to the well-being of their members. For example, they might instantiate justice, or solidarity, which can be impersonally valuable (Temkin). It is doubtful, however, that groups have interests independent from the well-being of their members. On the descriptive side, even if we can reduce collective actions to the actions of individual members, this probably involves such complicated contortions that we should seriously question whether it is worth doing (Lazar b. More recently, they have added an account of permissible action post-war, or *jus post bellum*. Others suggest an independent focus on war exit, which they have variously called *jus ex bello* and *jus terminatio* (Moellendorf ; Rodin a. These Latin labels, though unfortunately obscure, serve as a useful shorthand. When we refer to *ad bellum* justice, we mean to evaluate the permissibility of the war as a whole. This is particularly salient when deciding to launch the war. But it is also crucial for the decision to continue fighting. *Jus ex bello*, then, fits within *jus ad bellum*. The *jus in bello* denotes the permissibility of particular actions that compose the war, short of the war as a whole. *Jus ad bellum* typically comprises the following six principles: Reasonable Prospects of Success: Typically the *jus in bello* list comprises: These all matter to the ethics of war, and will be addressed below. However, it is unhelpful to view them as a checklist of necessary and sufficient conditions. To get an intuitive grasp on necessity and proportionality, note that if someone threatens my life, then killing her would be proportionate; but if I could stop her by knocking her out, then killing her would be unnecessary, and so impermissible. The necessity and proportionality constraints have the same root: Harms and indeed all bads that we cause must therefore be justified by some positive reason that counts in their favour—such as good achieved or evil averted (Lazar a. Both the necessity and proportionality constraints involve comparing the bads caused by an action with the goods that it achieves. They differ only in the kinds of options they compare. The use of force is proportionate when the harm done is counterbalanced by the good achieved in averting a threat. To determine this, we typically compare the candidate course of action with what would happen if we allowed the

threat to eventuate. Of course, in most cases we will have more than one means of averting or mitigating the threat. And a harmful option can be permissible only if all the harm that it involves is justified by a corresponding good achieved. If some alternative would as successfully avert the threat, but cause less harm, then the more harmful option is impermissible, because it involves unnecessary harm. We determine its proportionality by comparing it with the harm suffered if T should come about. In my view, we should simply expand this so that the necessity constraint compares all your available options bar none. Then proportionality would essentially involve comparing each option with the alternative of doing nothing, while necessity would involve comparing all options including doing nothing in terms of their respective balances of goods and bads. On this approach, necessity would subsume proportionality. But this is a technical point with little substantive payoff. More substantively, necessity and proportionality judgements concern consequences, and yet they are typically made *ex ante*, before we know what the results of our actions will be.

### 6: NPR Choice page

*America's Next Civil War Will Be Worse Than Our Last. H. W. Crocker III; "You ought to be in our army." it seems to me that we can at least be as understanding of our own history.*

A quarter of the population resides abroad in search of a better life. These questions question the notion of our liberation and the future of its proponents? Throughout history, relevance of political ideas over generations is critical. Nazism was outlawed in Germany as its ideas were deemed not safe and ideal for a progressive society. Socialism was fought with guns culminating in the fall of the Berlin wall and the opening of the famous Brandenburg gate. At present, in the heart of Berlin, the famous Brandenburg gate that used to separate not only Germany, Europe but also socialism and capitalism is a centre of world tourism. These examples advance the thesis that political ideas and ideologies if not propagated over generations, extinction is imminent. Today, it seems that the values and ideas of Zanu-PF stand for ever. Nevertheless, gazing into the future, it is tempting to argue that the ideas and values Zanu-PF stood and stand for will be considered a social outcast warranting outlawing. Yes it is but under what circumstances? Already, our revolutionary party is a political party that is more feared than loved by the many Zimbabweans. Its name has been used to commit very inhuman crimes. There are no more threats of pure colonialism and liberation movements should evolve to make sense to present and future generations. Not with guns but with policies and ideas that make positive progress in modern day society. As the young generation our needs are clear – socio-economic and political institutions that offer incentives and opportunities for progress. For someone who has never lived outside Zimbabwe for just a month, it is very difficult to appreciate how countries should be run. It is no secret that, everything is wrong between the Limpopo and Zambezi rivers. Public health, education, infrastructure, water and sanitation, the list is endless, the liberators have failed to understand and manage the drivers of a modern nation state. When life becomes miserable as what we endure day and night, you are forced to think deeply about the past, present and future. When a country cannot sustain its own currency? When political parties win an election through hook and crook? When few ruling elites are showing signs of obesity due to overeating and corruption whilst children are dying of malnutrition on the way to clinics? When primitive accumulation replaces wealth creation and hard work? When a government fails to perform its very basic functions? It means that our very own liberation party is on the verge of extinction. Those that want to save the liberation party from extinction must fight day and night so that, Zimbabweans see the necessity of keeping this party. This is however, a very fierce fight as it entails bringing alien terms to the fore. The party must understand transparency, accountability, creativity and hard work – ingredients that are essential in the success of modern governments. History suggests that liberation parties became irrelevant after failing to address bread and butter issues. Why should we keep a political party that brings misery, suffering and poverty in our lives? Why the cosmetics of a snake that even bites its own offsprings? New research indicates that the liberators inherited systems and institutions that benefit them and their hold on power. In concluding their fifteen years of research on states and governments in the book *Why Nations Fail*: After all, for progress and development, this is a political party that one day must be outlawed. For now, the liberators have a chance to fight for the survival of their party and its ideas.

## 7: What, if Anything, Have We Learned from the Vietnam War?

*We're in a fight Mass censorship of conservatives and libertarians is exploding. You've already seen this with the demonetization and ultimate purge of Infowars and other alternative media outlets by mega-corporations working in tangent to stifle competition.*

Immediately upon the capture of Newbern General Burnside started an expedition to Beaufort. The expedition left Newbern on Thursday, 20th, in steamers, and went partially down the river, and on landing struck the railroad, and took up the march for Beaufort, with hand-cars front Newbern loaded with ammunition and baggage. A few days before the gun-boat Stars and Stripes went outside and assisted the blockade, lest the Nashville might try to escape to sea when the troops come inland. Upon the arrival of the expedition the first report stated that they found the city evacuated by the rebels, Fort Macon Mown up by the retreating enemy, and the rebel steamer Nashville burning to prevent her falling into our hands. Later accounts, direct from the blockading squadron, however, say that the Nashville ran the blockade successfully. General Burnside then sent a force with several gun-boats to Washington. No opposition was made to landing. Our troops occupied the town, and the Union flag is flying on the Court-house. Our pickets extend about eight miles from Newbern toward Goldsborough. The inhabitants of Newbern are gradually returning to the town and taking the oath of allegiance. Forster, and the Solicitor-General of England on the subject of the blockade of the Southern ports. The tone of the leading British presses has been so uniformly unjust to the United States, and so notoriously under the control of secessionist emissaries, that there were many here who feared that Great Britain would be as false to her traditions and her laws on the subject of blockades as her people had been on the subject of slavery. These apprehensions have not been fulfilled. Members of the British Government have declared in the most positive termsâ€”what we all knew here long agoâ€”that the blockade of the Southern ports is as perfect as any blockade ever was, and that no foreign power can disturb it without flying in the face of the fundamental principles of international law. The pleasure with which we record these evidences of official candor in England would have been greater if they had not been followed, in almost every instance, by the expression of opinions unfavorable to the success of the North. It is natural that British statesmen should cling to their cherished hope of seeing this country divided and weakened. But is it wise, is it friendly, to proclaim the wish so constantly to the world? What would be said of a tradesman who was constantly predicting aloud the bankruptcy of his rival over the way? Would he not be set down as a dirty, mean fellow? Would it not have been better for Lord Russell to have left this sort of thing to Gregory and Ferguson, and other blacklegs and boobies? With the exception of the crazy people down South who are being whipped into reason by the armies of the Union, every body now agrees that, sooner or later, in one way or another, slavery ought to be abolished on American soil. The main question thus decided, it is high time that the people began to think of and discuss the questions yet undetermined of the how and the when. We have two historical precedentsâ€”that of Great Britain and that of France. In the revolutionary Government of France with a stroke of the pen freed all the slaves in the French West Indies: These two plans of emancipation were carried under the most diametrically opposite circumstances. Emancipation in the British colonies had been brought before Parliament every year for twenty years, and only succeeded at last through the support of London bankers, creditors of the slave-owners in Jamaica and Barbados, who saw in a parliamentary grant their only chance of collecting the debts due them. The measure was adopted after full deliberation, and five years were granted the slaves and their owners to prepare for the change. In France emancipation was decreed from the impulse of the moment, without outside pressure from any quarter, and without preliminary notice of any kind to the parties immediately concerned. So far as practical results show, the French scheme succeeded better than the English. The British colonies began to decay after emancipation, relapsed almost into a desert condition, and have only begun to recover very recently. The French colonies have undergone but little change. It would, however, be rash hence to infer, that immediate and unconditional emancipation works better than the gradual and conditioned abolition of slavery. Emancipation worked badly in the British colonies mainly in consequence of the besotted and imbecile nature of the white slave-owners. With stolid pigheadedness, they refused to

accommodate themselves to the new condition of things; haughtily declined to pay wages to the colored laborers who had once been slaves, and sank into ruin with their estates for want of common sense. Slavery had rotted their hearts and minds out, as it has done with the whites of several of our Southern States; and the failure of emancipation, for nearly a quarter of a century, was due to their stupidity. The slave-holders of the French islands, on the contrary, with their national versatility, adapted themselves at once to the new order of things, paid wages cheerfully to the emancipated slaves, and went on growing tropical products as before. In neither case was it proposed to expatriate the slaves after emancipation, and both British and French colonies, since the abolition of slavery, so far from seeking to get rid of the negroes, have complained loudly of the want of labor. The Jamaica government has even tried to import free negroes from the United States. In studying these precedents it must be remembered that the slaves in our Southern States are at least ten times as numerous as the slaves in either the British or the French colonies. They now exceed four millions in number, and men now living will, in all probability, see the colored race on this continent more numerous than the entire population of the country at the present time. It is pretty well understood that President Lincoln agrees with Senator Doolittle in advocating colonization of the blacks. This is the Western plan. Illinois has always refused citizenship to free persons of color, and Western men generally object as much to free negroes as to slavery. In Jamaica and Barbados the mulattoes are steadily gaining power and influence, and the end can not be mistaken. The white race must eventually go to the wall. To avoid this result, Mr. Blair, and those who agree with them, propose to colonize the negroes of our Southern States to send them to Hayti, or Central America, or somewhere else. To be effectual this remedy must be thorough. The entire four millions must be exported. Let us assume that the National Legislature adopts the colonization scheme, and decides to carry it into effect. To carry the 4,000,000 slaves now in the Slave States to a foreign port would require at least vessels of 4,000 tons each—in other words, all the large sailing vessels in the world for a couple of years. It would likewise be necessary to support the 4,000,000 slaves so exiled for at least one year in. The moment they were sent away our Southern States would raise the cry which has been raised by the British West Indies ever since emancipation—for more labor. Cotton, sugar, and rice plantations would go to ruin for want of labor. Prosperous regions would relapse into wilderness, and we should be driven, as the maritime nations of Europe have been driven, into adopting systems of coolie and negro immigration. In the mean while, under the fostering influence of a tropical sun, a negro empire would be rearing its head menacingly somewhere on our Southern border. This empire would number 10,000,000 souls in 10 years, and 30,000,000 in 30 years. Would not such a neighbor be more dangerous than any of the perils which we have tried to ward off by adopting the Monroe doctrine? We have said nothing of the probability that the negroes would object to be exiled, and of the monstrous difficulty of exporting 4,000,000 human beings against their will. This is an obstacle which could be surmounted, though to overcome it would involve much expenditure of money, time, and energy. We offer no theories on this vital question, and are content to throw out a few facts by the wayside for the consideration of the people. Soon enough it will devolve upon us to decide upon a policy in regard to these negroes. Let us be prepared to act with a full knowledge of past history, present circumstances, and future prospects. It will not do to be led by passion or prejudice in the matter. Our action will determine the weal or woe of many generations of white people on this continent. On the face of it, the problem appears to be one of unparalleled difficulty—none the less because its true bearings are so constantly obscured by the fanatic teachings of partisans of naked material interest on the one side, and of abstract moral principle on the other. But we shall have to solve it some day. IT is certainly tiresome to keep on exposing absurdities and errors; but if we were to be satisfied with a simple denial and exposure of untruth, then not to put too fine a point upon it—the devil would have his own way easily. All that falsehood wants is to be let alone. It is all that treason wants—all that any crime wants. The present error that cries aloud for reiterated correction is the querulous complaint—“What is the use? On the shores of the Potomac—in the Virginia Valley—at Newbern—they all go off with the army, except the old people and the slaves. Come, now, you may beat, but you can not conquer. They may hold out, but they can not secure their independence. It is as broad as it is long. What is there to compromise? Here are a crowd of rebels, organized, drilled, intrenched, resolute, who defy the Government of the nation. Either they must succeed in bringing the Government to terms, or the Government must reduce them. If they can compel the

Government to agree that they shall obey upon certain conditions, then they are successful, and the Government is overthrown. Suppose that South Carolina agrees to cease active hostility upon condition that she shall have the forts in her harbor, and that the United States will allow her to disregard the tariff? Or suppose that Jeff Davis says that he still do what he can to disband the rebel armies, on condition that the Administration will agree that a slaveholder may take and hold his slaves any where in the country? In that case Jeff Davis merely dictates terms to a conquered enemy. He may make his own terms; but how can he bind any other rebel? And the Administration of our Government may accept terms which the next Administration may repudiate. So that the war is only suspended; and only suspended because neither side has conquered. There can be no compromise, because there are no grounds for a compromise. A compromise belongs to peaceful legislation. Equal legislators say to each other, If you will favor me in this, I will favor you in that. That is a compromise. But if two commanders meet at the head of armies, and one says to the other, "If you will give me your arms and go home I will not fire," and the other assents, that is not a compromise, it is a surrender, a bloodless victory. Or suppose, in the midst of the fight in Hampton Roads, the Merrimac had said to the Monitor, "Let us each turn about and go home;" that would be a compromise. But what would be settled by it? Each would only have waited for the other to come out again. In our war we have to beat absolutely, or to be absolutely beaten. It was no more than I expected. Thank God, the day is ours! It is just about a year since the election in Rhode Island made William Sprague for the second time Governor of that State. He was a young man—the son of a great cotton manufacturer, from whom he had inherited a large fortune, and from his father and uncle the control of a large business. He had returned a year or two before from Europe, when the John Brown enterprise was still exciting the country, and had been selected as a moderate and uncommitted candidate for Governor by a coalition of the moderate but committed political leaders of the State.

## 8: The Sides Are Being Drawn for the 2nd American Civil War

*We ought to possess them in the manner we inherited them from our ancestors, as their manumission is incompatible with the felicity of our country. But we ought to soften, as much as possible, the rigor of their unhappy fate.*

Email It was not a pleasant memory when April 30 dawned and, with it, the realization that it marked the 40th anniversary of "the fall of Saigon. But chances are some of the unanswered questions and unresolved debates over that ill-fated conflict may linger for another 40 years or more, long after those who fought in the war and, those who fought over it, are all dead and gone. Was it, in fact, too late for victory when Nixon came to the White House in , four years after Lyndon Johnson had committed combat troops and a continuing air war to Vietnam? Many long years after Lyndon Johnson had gone to his reward, tape recordings of some of his White House conversations were released. Among them was a phone conversation between Johnson and McGeorge Bundy, one of the Kennedy and Johnson aides often credited with having been a major architect of the American war in Vietnam. Consider just some of what the president had to say: What is Laos worth to me? What is it worth to this country? Vietnamese deaths from the war have been estimated at two to three million. In his campaign for election that fall, Johnson promised the nation: When Johnson had left the room for a moment, Ridgway turned to Humphrey and asked what exactly the mission was that had been given to General William Westmoreland, the commander of U. Nor did he, or the nation, ever get an answer. The John Birch Society was virtually alone in asking why we were fighting to prevent South Vietnam from falling to the communists at the same time we were favoring communist countries elsewhere with trade and aid. Trade with the Soviet Union continued throughout the war, even though the Soviets were the biggest suppliers of arms and equipment to North Vietnam. Sales to Russia included parts for trucks that moved North Vietnamese troops and supplies down the Ho Chi Minh Trail into South Vietnam, and parts used in anti-aircraft weapons to shoot down American planes and pilots. To be sure, then as now, a growing number of inter-related industries in the network that had come to be known as the military-industrial complex was profiting from the war, despite the burden it placed on the economy as a whole. Back in , as the United States was just beginning its combat mission, Robert Welch, founder of The John Birch Society, was publicly raising the questions few others were asking: What are we fighting for? What are we trying to accomplish? What are our goals? What is our real purpose? Nobody knows " or at least nobody in the administration is willing to say. And it is only when that question is answered honestly that the whole business makes sense and, paradoxically, becomes crazier than ever. The answer Welch offered no doubt struck many people as too simple to be true. War is the parent of armies; from these proceed debts and taxes; and armies, and debts, and taxes are the known instruments for bringing the many under the domination of the few. No nation could preserve its freedom in the midst of continual warfare. For the objective is not simply to distract the attention of gullible minds from the steady advance of state socialism and government regimentation at home, although this it certainly does, but the more sinister but parallel purpose is to use the very fact of our being at war as an excuse and a means of speeding up that advance, of gradually completing the transition into state socialism and of converting the increasing and tightening regimentation into the framework of a totalitarian police state. But it is even worse than that. Police in our cities and towns are being equipped with military weapons and vehicles as though at war with their own populace. People seeking personal freedom come under suspicion of being subversives or terrorists. The president of the United States uses drone strikes to kill Americans overseas, far from any battlefield. And it took a filibuster by a United States senator to get the attorney general of the United States to acknowledge that the president does not have the authority to use drone strikes against Americans here in the United States. Our politicians seldom speak any more of liberty, preferring promises of jobs and security. Slaves have jobs and security. We value our readers and encourage their participation, but in order to ensure a positive experience for our readership, we have a few guidelines for commenting on articles. If your post does not follow our policy, it will be deleted. No profanity, racial slurs, direct threats, or threatening language. Please post comments in English. Please keep your comments on topic with the article. If you wish to comment on another subject, you may search for a relevant article and join or start a discussion there.

## 9: The Uses Of Military Force - 'the Uses Of Military Power' | Give War A Chance | FRONTLINE | PBS

*Both the events surrounding the treaty and its violation would influence several countries' decisions about entering the war, just as the war's developments in later years would influence those countries' decisions to switch their allegiance to the Allies.*

Reprinted in *Ethics and the History of Philosophy*, Broad The question before us is of the general form: I shall first point out the general conditions which govern all attempts to answer such questions. Any argument on the subject will have to use premises of two utterly different kinds, viz. An ethical proposition is one which involves the notion of good or bad, right or wrong, ought or ought not. A purely factual proposition is one which involves no such notions. That deliberate homicide is wrong is an ethical proposition, true or false. It is a purely factual proposition that, if a man is shot through the heart, he will almost certainly be dead very soon afterwards. Now the purely factual premises are of two kinds, viz. These may be called instancial premises. And ii statements of alleged general laws or tendencies. These may be called nomic premises. An example of the first kind is the proposition that Japan has spent such and such a proportion of her revenue on her navy for the past ten years. An example of the second is the proposition, true or false, that an increase of armaments tends to produce a war. Now everyone admits that what a person ought or ought not to do at a given moment depends either on his present state and circumstances and his past history or on the probable consequences of the various alternative actions open to him at the time; and most people believe that it depends to some extent on both. In order to conjecture the probable consequences of various alternative actions which might be done in a given situation it is always necessary to use both kinds of factual premise. Therefore everyone would admit that factual premises of the instancial kind are needed, and the vast majority of people would admit that factual premises of the nomic kind are also needed, if we are to have any rational argument about such questions as we are asking. But it is equally certain that ethical premises are also needed in any argument about an ethical question. Now ethical propositions are of two kinds, which I will call pure and mixed. It is always difficult to be sure that a given ethical proposition is pure, but it is easy to give examples of ethical propositions which are certainly mixed. Suppose I assert that a classical education is a good thing. I mean a that it is likely to produce in those subjected to it certain experiences and dispositions, which could be described in purely psychological and non-ethical terms; and b that such experiences and dispositions are good. The first of these two constituents of the original proposition is a purely factual statement of the nomic kind. The second is an ethical proposition. Whether it is purely ethical is another question. But, at any rate, the original proposition is certainly a mixed ethical One, and its ethical component is certainly a nearer approximation to a purely ethical one. When mixed ethical propositions are used as premises in ethical arguments they are always liable to lead to mistakes and misunderstandings. If we are to avoid these, it is essential that we should split up such propositions, so far as we can, into their purely ethical and their purely factual components. For two disputants who agree about one of the components may differ about the other; and, if they fail to recognize and distinguish the two, they are bound to be at cross-purposes and to produce crooked answers. There is another important division of ethical propositions which cuts across the division into pure and mixed. Ethical propositions are of three kinds, which may be expressed respectively by sentences of the three forms: For the present purpose I shall group the first two together under the name of judgments of obligation. I shall call the third kind judgments of value. Now this brings us to a fundamental difference of opinion which it is essential to notice if we are to have any intelligent discussion on such questions as we have before us. Some people hold that there is one and only one ultimate obligation, and that this involves an essential reference to value. According to them the one ultimate obligation is to secure the increase and to prevent the decrease of the present amount of good, and to secure the diminution and check the increase of the present amount of evil. They are obligations if and only if they are, in the actual circumstances, the most efficient way of fulfilling the one ultimate obligation to conserve and increase good and to check or diminish evil. Otherwise they are wrong. I shall call this the teleological theory of obligation. This theory can, of course, take many different forms. I shall not attempt to distinguish more than two of them, which I will

call the universalistic form and the restricted form. According to the universalistic form of the theory a person has no special obligation to produce good and diminish evil in one person or community rather than in another. Suppose you have two alternative courses of action open to you. By one of them you will improve the condition of your own countrymen, and by the other you will improve the conditions in another country instead. Then it is your duty, on this view, to avoid the former action and to do the latter, provided that the improvement which you will effect in the foreign country is in the least degree greater than that which you would effect in your own country. According to the restricted form of the teleological theory your ultimate obligation still is to conserve and increase good and to check and diminish evil. But you have a stronger obligation to increase the good and diminish the evil in certain persons and communities, to which you stand in certain special relations, than you have towards other persons and communities to which you do not stand in these relations. On either form of the theory the one and only ultimate obligation is that of beneficence. On the universalistic form of it there is only the general obligation to be as beneficent as you can in the circumstances in which you are placed. On the restricted form of it the appropriate strength and direction of the obligation of beneficence is in part determined by the special regulations in which the agent stands to certain individuals, institutions, and communities. Now many people would reject the teleological theory of obligation. They would hold that there are many ultimate obligations, and that they do not all involve an essential reference to value. They admit that I am under a general obligation to be beneficent to human beings as such; and they assert that I am also under more special and stringent obligations to be beneficent to my parents, my benefactors, my fellow-countrymen, and so on. But they say that there are many other obligations which are not reducible to beneficence at all, whether general or special. And there may be other obligations, e. I propose to call this theory the pluralistic theory of obligation. On the pluralistic theory a person who is called upon to act in one way or another, or to abstain from action, in a given situation may be subject to many different and conflicting claims or obligations of varying strength, arising out of various factors in his past history and various relations in which he stands to various persons, institutions, and communities. Whichever alternative he chooses he will fulfill some of these component obligations, and in doing so he will necessarily break others which conflict with the former. In such cases the right action is the one which makes the best compromise between several conflicting claims, when due weight is given to their number and their relative urgency. But no general principles can be suggested for deciding what is the best compromise. Now I cannot attempt here to decide between the universalistic form of the teleological theory, the restricted form of it, and the pluralist theory. I will content myself with two remarks about them. And, if we reject the universalistic form of the teleological theory, it seems doubtful whether we can consistently rest in the restricted form of it. It looks as if the restricted form were an unstable compromise between the pluralistic theory and the universalistic form of the teleological theory. Facts which might prove conclusively, on the universalistic form of the teleological theory, that a man ought not to fight for his country might lead to no such consequence if one held that a citizen is under a special obligation of beneficence to his own nation. And their force would be still further diminished if one held that a man is under a strong direct obligation to obey the laws of his country, good or bad, simply because he is a citizen of it. It remains to say something about the other kind of ethical propositions, viz. Here again there is a profound difference of opinion on a fundamental question. And they hold further that there is one and only one characteristic of experiences which makes them good or evil. I will call this the monistic theory of value. It might conceivably take many different forms, according to what characteristic of experiences was held to be the one and only good-making or bad-making characteristic. But in practice, I think, nearly everyone who holds the monistic theory of value assumes that the one and only good-making or bad-making characteristic of experiences is their hedonic quality in its two opposed forms of pleasantness and unpleasantness. So, for the present purpose, we may identify the monistic theory of value with the hedonistic theory of value. We mean simply and solely to assert the two following propositions, a That his nature is such that he tends in most circumstances to have, or to produce in others, experiences which are predominantly pleasant. And b that such experiences are, for that reason and to that extent, good. Now many people would unhesitatingly reject the hedonistic theory of value in whole or part. Some would hold that persons can be good or evil in the same ultimate sense in which experiences can be. Some would go further,

and would hold that this is true also of certain collective wholes, composed of intimately interrelated persons, e. Again, even those who hold that nothing but experiences can be intrinsically good or evil may hold that there are other good-making and bad-making characteristics of experiences beside their pleasantness and their unpleasantness. Anyone who holds any of these views may be said to accept the pluralistic theory of value. Once again I shall not attempt to decide between the rival theories. I will content myself with the following remarks, i Prima facie the hedonistic theory is flagrantly at variance with common sense. The common sense view is prima facie that persons, at any rate, can be intrinsically good or evil as well as experiences, and that there are many characteristics beside pleasantness and unpleasantness which make experiences intrinsically good or bad. He will not, indeed, have to try to find the best compromise between a number of ultimate and conflicting obligations of various degrees of urgency. But he will have to aim at producing the best compromise between a number of ultimate kinds of value and disvalue. And no general principle can be offered for conducting the comparison. The only person who can avoid such difficulties is one who combines the universalistic form of the teleological theory of obligation with the hedonistic theory of value. And both the elements in this combination seem prima facie far too simple to be true, iii Whatever may be the truth about these rival theories of value, this at least is certain. Facts which might prove conclusively, on the hedonistic theory of value, that a man ought not to fight for his country might lead to no such consequence if it were held that heroic self-sacrifice gives value to the persons who practise it just as pleasantness gives value to pleasant experiences. And their force might be still further diminished if it were held that a nation is a persistent collective entity of a peculiar kind, with a characteristic value or disvalue of its own which is determined by the actions and dispositions of its citizens. This completes what I have to say about the general conditions which govern all rational discussion about such questions as we have before us. I will summarize them as follows, i The factual and the ethical premises must be clearly distinguished; any mixed ethical premises must be analysed into their purely factual and their purely ethical components; and the instantial and the nomic factual premises must be separately stated, ii The theory of obligation which is being assumed by any disputant must be explicitly stated. We must know whether he assumes the pluralistic theory or the teleological theory. And, if he assumes the latter, we must know whether he assumes the universalistic or the restricted form of it. We must know whether he assumes the hedonistic theory or the pluralist theory. And, if he assumes the latter, we must know whether he holds that only experiences can have intrinsic value or disvalue, or that only experiences and persons can have it, or that experiences and persons and societies can have it. Unless these conditions are fulfilled, there can be no rational argument; there can only be emotional hot air emitted in argumentative form. When these conditions have been fulfilled I do not believe that there is much room for argument on such questions except on the purely factual side. But there are no arguments by which we can alter his opinions as to what circumstances do and what do not impose obligations on him, or as to the kinds of thing which can have intrinsic value or disvalue, or as to the characteristics which do and those which do not confer intrinsic value or disvalue on the things which possess them.

Drugs in anaesthesia and intensive care Tahereh mafi unite me Career Opportunities in the Armed Forces (Career Opportunities) Critical care medicine, which involves diagnosing, treating, and supporting female patients with multiple Sean Manning Ishmael Reed David Ritz Ron Carlson Lynne Tillman Rebecca Brown Gary Giddins David Gates Gen Mental and moral philosophy Ministering to family Java Servlets by Example The Houghton Mifflin anthology of short fiction The teachers mission. Handbook of engineering electromagnetics Mechanics of machines advanced theory and examples M\*A\*S\*H goes to Vienna Atul gawande books Tiger and the shark Social Anthropology in Perspective Being kind to neighbours Ultimate guide to choosing a medical specialty Closer relationships lead to superior planning partidas Construction of novel vaccines on the basis of virus-like particles 1999, Corn-husking bees and other occasions The small investors handbook for long-term security or quick profit Children and number The Song of My Life Far from the Madding Crowd (Penguin Classics) Bmw 3 series service manual Alexander, Whos Not Do You Hear Me ? I Meam it! Going to Move The Little Book of Great Dates Jm keynes general theory Pt. 1. Elementary bookkeeping. Mitchells structure and fabric part 1 Entrenching an uneven playing field: the multilateral regulation of agriculture The heart of the valley Life and public services of James Buchanan Franklin and me, and Sara makes three Ignace Paderewski Sight-reading Andreas C. Lehmann and Victoria McArthur The relationship of a mother to her baby at the beginning Fall of night rachel caine Fast gourmet from Hawaii