

PRESIDENT'S IN A TOUGH SPOT REGARDING A WAR WITH IRAQ

October 22, 2002

A reader recently asked me for my thoughts on the ongoing controversy over Iraq. By the time you read this my guess is the President will have been granted authority to act unilaterally by both the House and Senate. Reelection considerations will undoubtedly play a large part in some of the members' decisions.

The left has urged delaying action until after the coming elections. Why? Could it be wait until after the elections (when my neck will not be on the line) before voting on a resolution concerning national security? I would hate to let the correctness, quotas, bowing to unreasonable union demands and opposing strong support and needed increases in defense spending are more important than taking steps to protect the nation.

They had no aversion to military action around the world when it served to divert attention from Bomber Bill's sexual indiscretions and campaign finance law violations. Why now, after over 3,000 people are killed and our economy has lost trillions, are they left with doubts?

I would remind those erstwhile national elected officials that their number one priority is and was spelled out when our nation was formed to provide for national defense. It was few of the myriad, vote-buying pork barrel spending programs they are enamored with.

After looking at all sides of this issue, I can only say I do not envy the President or any of the other key players who will make the final decisions.

Several things have combined to form my perceptions and opinions on the subject. First and foremost are past events under similar circumstances and facts, as we know them to date.

Members of both parties have expressed pro and con opinions. The left has been much more critical of the President's expressed need and motives for asking for these powers.

All those reluctant to acquiesce to his requests have couched their objections in the form of questions that elicit questions of my own.

A few of them are: Do we know how close Saddam is to acquiring nuclear weapons? How much would a preemptive strike cost? How long would troops have to be stationed there?

My answers are: What difference does it make as to how long it will be before they have nuclear weapons? We know he is desperately trying to obtain them. We can thank the Israelis for destroying a known nuclear facility years ago. A preemptive strike would certainly be a lot cheaper than a direct attack on us with nuclear weapons. What are our lives and freedoms worth? What did World War II cost and was it worth it? How long would we have to station troops there? Who knows? How long have they been stationed in Japan, Germany, South Korea, and how many other places?

Winston Churchill stands out as the one person wise and courageous enough to address and assess the events leading up to World War II. He was proven right in his total assessment of the situation in the face of adverse public opinion.

One of his telling pronouncements was: "To urge preparation of defense is not to assert imminence of war. On the contrary, if war were imminent, preparations for defense would be too late."

Douglas MacArthur lends credence to his words with an opinion that all military disasters can be summed up with two words – too late.

The League of Nations and the United Nations were and are two innocuous counterproductive organizations. The first did nothing to prevent World War I and the second has done little to alleviate the horrible transgressions and suffering of most of the third world nations.

UN actions in this matter would only serve to prolong a dangerous situation, which would only serve to benefit the many regimes bent on destroying our western way of life.

Sean Hannity sums up what is inherently wrong with liberal philosophy in this regard. I quote from his book *Let Freedom Ring*: “Far too many liberals see no connection between values, education, and moral health of our nation and America’s security and prosperity.”

Further: “Whether the issues are social, cultural, economic, or international, every significant policy debate and every election of consequence from this point forward will be weighed against the events of 9/11.

Please reflect on that and vote accordingly.

I leave you with words of Cal Thomas in a recent article on the subject, “We’re already at war: Let’s win.