

A Thought on President Trump's Attack on Syria

Thomas R. Cuba

2017 0411

Let's get a few things straight. I am not opposed to going to war with Syria. I am not opposed to eliminating ISIS. I am opposed to doing so as we have done.

By going to war upon the orders of the President, others (i.e. Congress) can sit back and offer opinions to reporters on whether or not it was the right thing to do. The President is seen as the sole owner of the intent, the act, and the outcome. If you don't want to call the recent actions a war, and prefer to use terms like "committing forces in a limited strike" that's fine. It's still a rose, if you know what I mean.

Congressmen, in the position of bystander, have been heard offering their steadfast opinions that Assad must be removed as the leader of Syria, completely forgetting that Mr. Trump has absolutely NO authority to do so. Those espousing such a one-sided removal at the hands of one man, our President, ought to consider the ramifications of another state, say Russia, for example, deciding that Mr. Poroshenko doesn't deserve to be president of the Ukraine, and acting with military force to do so.

The Constitutional process stands in stark contrast to the autonomy of the Commander in Chief. Consider it well! If the choice to go to war with Syria were placed before Congress, there would be open discussion about the use of chemical weapons, the death of children, and the need to terminate these acts.

There would be open discussion about whether or not Assad needs to be removed. Each vote would be recorded for all time.

The discussion, and a subsequent affirmative vote, would let Assad and the rest of the world (i.e. Russia) know that the decision to take aggressive action against Assad is not the decision of the President, but it is the decision of America. The Constitutional process sends a much stronger message.

~ Thomas R. Cuba, April 11th, 2017.