

Hi Julian:

Read your post.

When Pearl Harbor happened, we declared war on Japan. Why? Because they attacked us. Japan had already declared war in fact, but then it did so formally. By treaty, Germany and then Italy declared war on us. Suddenly we were in a two-front war with limited resources. The "War to End All Wars" had been fought decades before and American isolationism and pacifism had taken hold. The armed forces had been reduced to a shadow of what it had been in that intervening time, so, when war was declared, we had to scramble for resources. Realize, too, that we were still in the Great Depression with greater than 10% unemployment, so tax revenue was low. But scramble we did.

Given that we had two fronts, which one held the most danger? Japan was still battling China and, I believe, Australia was doing its part. Our Pacific fleet was essentially blown to hell in the December 7th attack, so we were in no position to wage a counterattack. In fact, there were troops massing on the shores of Washington and Oregon in case there was to be a Japanese invasion of our homeland. Our industries were not geared for a war footing. Our military was understrength. And Germany had conquered France, Poland, parts of Africa. Italy was in the hands of Mussolini and his fascists. And England was about to undergo the "Battle of Britain" with massive bombings of its cities. The Soviet Union had a treaty with Germany....

Rosy picture, huh? I take it from your post that you felt the government had betrayed the military in the Pacific theater. Realistically, we didn't have the manpower, the equipment, or the materials to wage a large effort in both theaters the first three years of the war. Choices had to be made. War bonds had to be sold. If we had concentrated on Japan, the Germans would have consolidated their foothold in the Eurasian theater. So we bolstered Great Britain and began a military campaign in Africa. Thank God for Hitler's stupidity in betraying Stalin! We suddenly had an "ally" where we once had, at best, a neutral party.

We also had Germany in a two front war. But all that was to come about later. Our efforts were design to win the war, because defeat meant our destruction. And Hitler was the greater threat. There was no talk of negotiating a "peace" with Hirohito or with Hitler. There was no hand-wringing introspection on the reasons "why" the Japanese and the Germans wanted war. Peace was to be achieved through winning the war. There was no alternative. Peace through strength. Peace through standing up and defeating the bully.

The newspapers and radio were supporters of the war effort in those days. There was no talk of body counts and peace marches and mistreatment of prisoners and mismanagement of the war. We did learn of defeats such as the Phillipines and Rommel's victories in North Africa. But we also learned of the victories in both theaters. The Battle of Midway was a turning point in the Pacific theater. Our victories in North Africa, then Italy, then the Normandy invasion were all broadcast as beacons of hope to a scared and war-weary populace. We also had the island-hopping victories at great price in the Pacific: Iwo Jima, Guadalcanal. Millions of men died in the six years of the war, more millions wounded. Yet we celebrate on Memorial Day the sacrifice of those men to preserve our freedom, our liberty. And men and women of that stripe are again risking their lives in Iraq and we would betray them by surrender, by retreat?

My dad and his brothers enlisted before Pearl Harbor when my grandfather saw what Hitler was doing in Europe. He predicted a war would come and he did not want any son of his to be a common foot soldier. They got their GEDs (they had been home schooled before that had become popular) and went to OTS. Dad became a second lieutenant in the Army, helped with the boot camps at Fort Leonardwood and in Texas, was sent on a courier mission to Europe and became a member of the intelligence H2 division in England and later in France. He had a Bigot clearance the weeks before D-day and knew everything about the invasion except where and when.

My Uncle Henry, after whom I was later named, rose to become a Captain in the Pacific theater. He was

killed by a Japanese sniper in the Phillipines in 1945 scant months before the war's end. He believed that what he was doing was the right thing to do, that his country was deserving of his all. He had a job to do and he died doing it. And we are free because of his sacrifice and those of many of his comrades.

Now back to Iraq. We call it "the war" in Iraq. But it really isn't "the war" we are engaged in. Rather it is a skirmish, a front in the real war. The war, as I tried to convey in my last letter, is against an enemy that attacked us, just as Japan did those many years ago. Unlike Japan, the Islamofascists attacked us in 1991 in the first WTC bombing, and later in the Khobar Tower bombings, and then again with the USS Cole. There were others as well that I can't recall. Our response was to look for "reasons" why they would attack us, that somehow it was "our fault" that they did what they did. (The fact that they felt they could attack us, did attack us, and promised to attack us again in pursuit of a caliphate just wasn't considered.) Our response was weak. (Remember the cruise missile on an aspirin factory, or was it baby formula?) It emboldened them to try again. Remember 9/11? Osama bin Laden stated that the weak responses to the earlier attacks and our "withdrawal" from Mogodishu showed him that we are paper tigers. Our betrayal of our ally in Viet Nam showed him, he said, that the American public had no stomach to defend itself. Wage war long enough and the American public will become Osama's ally because they could not stand the sight of their own blood.

And he was right. The American public, when faced with reports from the media of body counts and bombings, with emphasis on American military faux pas and a noted deemphasis concerning enemy atrocities, cannot be blamed for wanting to flinch from the pain of battle. WMDs, or the lack of them, is repeated by our media and the Democrats as showing that Bush either lied or led us into battle for no good reason. But we didn't really know they didn't exist until we got there!!! Even both Clintons, Gore, and Kerry thought at one time that Hussein had WMDs and would use them. But that fact is conveniently forgotten in the rush to judgement. Why do you think the majority

of Democrats voted for authorizing military action? Kind of disingenuous that they now rue that decision because even THEY could not foresee that the WMDs weren't there! But Bush is conveniently easy to blame, and so they do.

When a military hero dies to protect an embedded Newsweek reporter, there is no mention of it in Newsweek. When Cindy Sheehan protests the war, it garners front page headlines. The VA hospital scandal is seen as solely a problem of the Bush administration, but those same conditions existed during Clinton's administration as well. (It also is not a good example of government-run health care, but I digress.)

The difference between the Islamofascists and those who advocate "peace", is that death is martyrdom to the former and to be avoided at all costs by the latter. Hence Murtha, Sheehan, Michael Moore, MoveOn.org, and their ilk don't want more brave soldiers to die. Osama and his ilk don't care if their brave fighters die as long as the cause progresses to a total world-wide caliphate. Those who die, die willingly as martyrs.

We may "redeploy" (read retreat) from Iraq, again betraying an ally, but that will not end the war, just the war in the Iraq theater. I predict that a defeat in Iraq, and that is what it will be interpreted by the Islamofascists, will encourage Iran to deliver a nuclear weapon onto Israel within five years of our withdrawal. I predict that Osama and his crowd will be emboldened to terrorize Europe where there are already large populations of Muslims that have never integrated well into European society.

Use your imagination and take it from there. By the year 2100, the caliphate may have been established throughout the world. I will not live to see that time, but my great grandchildren may.

And there will be "peace " in the world.