

arability of Brazil changes from 90 percent to about 15 percent. It is the same terrain with the same surface configuration, but it has new meaning because of changes in technology.

The same thing can be applied, of course, to military matters. In World War I the natural defenses of Paris were of the utmost importance. The Germans had to advance toward Paris against a series of outfacing quaestors. These steep slopes pointing away from Paris were, each one of them, the scene of major combats, like the Battle of Verdun, which was the efforts of the Germans to climb onto those slopes. In World War II those slopes didn't mean anything at all. The strong points were not the high ground but the little villages in which all the paved roads came together. When you are running an army on foot and with horses, terrain means one thing. When you are running an army with mechanized vehicles it means something else.

For Heaven's sake, when World War III comes along, don't interpret terrain in World War II terms. In the intelligence business, in which I have been associated for as long as I have been a professor, the intelligence people--I hope I don't step on any toes at this point; I'll step on my own toes--have been interpreting the wrong war. They were interpreting World War I when they let the Battle of the Bulge take place. The Ardennes was supposed to be difficult for anybody to pass through. On paved roads you can pass through the Ardennes without even knowing it is there. That had to be demonstrated.