



## Letters to the Editor

### Uneasy Feeling About Paul-Frank Teaming Up on Military Cuts

It makes me feel very uneasy when Rep. Ron Paul teams up with someone like Rep. Barney Frank to suggest cuts in U.S. military weapons systems and personnel. ("Can We Cut 'Defense' Spending?" March 21 issue) What fellowship hath light with darkness?

Please consider:

To even think of cutting U.S. troop strength, Navy ships, and aircraft carriers; eliminating the F-35 Fighter; canceling the Trident II's; "retiring" 1,000 nuclear warheads and 160 Minuteman missiles; etc., in the face of a nuclear armed Russia and Communist China, is both unwise and foolhardy!

One of the *few* legitimate functions of the Federal Government, authorized by the U.S. Constitution, is to raise and provide for an army to defend the USA. That's Article I, Section 8.

We may need a few forward bases in the future to *defend ourselves* from enemies like Russia and Red China or to help a friend in need like England, Taiwan, Australia or South Korea. Did not South Korea fight with us in Vietnam? Did not Taiwan offer her sons to fight beside America too? Did not Britain go with us after 9/11 to Afghanistan? If we were attacked again, as we were in Pearl Harbor, would we not want help?

Has Congressman Paul not read State Department Publication 7277, entitled "Freedom From War"? [This publication proposed disarming the United States and other nations while building up the United Nations' "peacekeeping" force. — Editor]

Is not a strong offensive capability a strong defense? If we go back to sticks and stones and bows and arrows, while our enemies (and we do have enemies) possess large standing armies and plenteous nuclear weapons — how long will it take for them to attack a self-inflicted, weakened America?

Robert L. Simpson  
Burlington, N.C.

*In his article, Thomas R. Eddlem commented regarding the Paul-Frank proposal to cut more than \$100 billion from the defense budget over each of the next 10 years: "One might criticize the Paul-Frank commission because it appears to be heavily based on cutting weapons programs, and one can reasonably argue about which weapons programs should or should not be cut. What's not debatable is that if the United States closes its bases abroad and follows George Washington's advice 'to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world,' both equipment costs and costs related to the number of personnel would automatically be greatly reduced."* — Editor

### Tired of Foreign Wars

Regarding your article by Thomas R. Eddlem in your March 21 issue, some two to three years ago an article was published in my Air Force Association magazine, as follows: A hearing was held in Congress to cut U.S. bases in foreign countries. At the time of the hearing, the United States had, and no doubt still has, troops stationed in over 140 countries, and that has been true for many years.

In addition, Air Force personnel, unlike me in World War II as a B-25 crew chief, now have to have



Written by [Staff](#) on April 18, 2011

Published in the issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 27, No. 08

---

training as infantry, artillery, communications, and other skills on the ground as “war fighters.” Witness the number of Air Force personnel killed on ground patrol missions with frontline troops — I read about this in my newspapers every week.

We have been sucked into foreign wars for 100 years. Thank God I didn't have to jump to enlist as I did years ago. I don't care to dominate anyone, anywhere. General Eisenhower was so right in warning about the military/industrial complex.

Thanks for a great magazine.

Frederick H. Lawrence  
Wofford Heights, Calif.



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.