What candidate is better suited to handle war?

Washington Post columnist Kathleen Parker reports some talk of war in France based on the Nice attack (July 17).

Without blinking, she claims that a big war is inevitable and that we should worry only about the details, for example, which United States presidential candidate would be better suited to lead this war “in the American theatre.”

But her column has a fatal flaw: she fails to make the case for war. The United States has waged various wars in the Mideast since the turn of the millennium and it’s hard to see that either the United States or Europe is any safer. Research, in fact, shows an increase in terrorism since the “War on Terrorism” started in 2001.

Is another war really necessary?

She concludes with this piece of despair: “The slog [war] we were warned against long ago is our reality for now and perhaps for generations.”

Who warned who against what? What is this “reality” she worries about? Do we really need to swallow endless war “for generations.”

Parker’s final sentence challenges the new commander in chief to the “rally the troops starting on Day One.”

The Peace Coalition of Monterey County denounces this kind of propaganda.

— Thomas F. Lee, Monterey