

15 December 2025

The Honorable Congresswoman Houlihan
U.S. Representative PA District 6
709 E. Gay Street, Suite 4
West Chester, PA 19380

Topic: Response to Recent Emailed
Duty and Diplomacy Report

Dear Chrissy Houlihan:

I felt it necessary to ask you the rhetorical question of why did you feel obligated to verbally remind the military soldiers and sailors that they have an obligation to challenge an order which they are worried about if the order could violate the laws of war without clear, conclusive evidence? Are you concerned that our armed forces never received the training that would have taught them that specific avenue of address? Or did you go on stage with 5 other Democrat legislators to attack the Trump administration and its Secretary of War Department. If there was only one Democrat raising a concern over this matter, I would have felt that to offer up a note of caution about the appropriateness of a certain combat action would not be a bad idea. However, when there was a parade of Democrat, Progressive legislators repeating the same message, as has been staged on past occasions, the real purpose of you and your associates became quite clear and is quite unfortunate that you chose the path that you did. Even if I presume that you had the best intentions, remember: the road to Hell is paved with good intentions.

Did you ever have the forethought to think about doing your own risk analysis as to what harm could ultimately occur because of your and your cohort's "war crimes" position? Did you even consider that a future problem could develop from your action that some of the military would hesitate to implement future orders in a timely manner because they now believe their actions could possibly be unlawful, when indeed they are not unlawful? Did you consider that by extending any long hesitation process could jeopardize American lives as well as actions?

It is obvious that your Democrat Party is motivated to remove our Secretary of War, Pete Hegseth. Sure, that makes a lot of sense if you believe a leader like General Austin is a better choice who would lead us in any future conflict. After all, China and Russia would much rather face a General Austin instead of a Hegseth. I get it, the Democrat Party wants to be in power no matter who it places in

leadership positions if they meet DEI objectives and who believes that the "status quo" is fine. What other conclusion can be made?

Additionally, you choose to make accusations of war crimes being committed without providing truly concrete evidence of which one or ones actually occurred. You, like many politicians in both parties are fantastic in uttering bullet-lines with absolutely no details to support your cases. I guess that works with those constituents who are not deep, linear thinkers.

What I would really like to see are politicians such as yourself be able to speak to strategic level concerns and provide supporting details as to how exactly these concerns and problems can definitely be solved. Here are a few examples of strategic level concerns which you could have been addressing as part of a bipartisan effort, which you repeatedly have contended how bipartisan you are:

Example Topics

1. Interdiction of Drugs Transported to America

What strategy do you propose that would stop the flow of narcotic drugs into the country and where would that strategy fall in the priority of importance for America to finally prevent their transport into the country?

2. Wars

Future wars with China and Russia places America in as very difficult situation in having to address an enemy who has been gaining military advances in the Arctic, South America, Cuba, and Africa in to effectively surround our country. Previous Pentagon war game assessments are not demonstrating any favorable results for America.

3. Climate Change

If Climate Change was such a high priority concern for Progressives such as yourself, why did you fail to show any support for nuclear energy as a clean energy source which obviously supports the electrical grid with a more compatible base load frequency control? Where were you in identifying this problem and did you ever think that possibly the Chinese CCP was on to something with its buildup of nuclear power plants and dare I say coal fired power plants The Chinese seemed to understand that you need a lot of

energy for manufacturing, the buildup of arms, and of course artificial intelligence.

4. Naval Ship Construction

Then there is the strategic issue of a U.S. Navy for whom years have gone by without appropriate planning and financial support to meet the tremendous buildup of ships by China which incidentally has positioned itself as a very real existential treat to our national security. What are you doing to convince the Department of War to stop constructing naval ships until the ships' designs are complete and introduce quality assurance programs in order to prevent significant schedule and cost slippage?

5. College Education vs Trade Schools

America has allowed it to become quite misguided in many areas by its overly promoting college education over trade schools where students can gain craftsmen skills, skills which today are solely needed to build up the Armed Forces with ships, planes, drones, artillery, ammunition, etc. Of course the strategy of promoting college over trade schools meant that more students could become indoctrinated in Progressive ideas including the hating of America, which you have not resisted.

6. The Ukraine Stalemate

While you have criticized Trump's chief negotiators in their Ukraine peace initiatives, you and your Democrat associates have had years to come with plans to end the conflict and to identify what Russia's true long-term goals are. Yet, as former president Theodore Roosevelt said, "It is not the critic who counts; not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles, or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs, who comes short again and again." Dare I challenge you to get into the game?

Concluding Remarks

Of course an objective individual would have to conclude that the Democrat political strategy of total resistance to all Republican initiatives has failed to produce any positive results for the country in terms of national security (externally and internally), affordability, electrical grid availability and reliability, peace

agreements between waring countries, a strong NATO organization, or for that matter national pride.

You, Congresswoman Chrissy Houlahan, must be a very intelligent woman and one who has aligned herself with a political party that preaches civility and high morale conduct. However, what one says and what one does is certainly different with Progressives. There have been several of its members encourage violent behavior against their political opponents which have led to assignations as well as rampant crime in the streets, which National Guard groups have had to squelch. Need I bother to bring up other Progressive entities such a Antifa and BLM whom you have chosen not to attack. If you desire to divide the country, this is a fantastic way to accomplish that mission. I know that you are smarter than this, but I really have no belief that you will change.

In the end, there has been zero sympathy by you expressed for victims of crime and assignations, yet there has been a lack of criticism of criminal immigrants and drug runners who are killing American citizens.

Getting strategic initiatives prioritized correctly is the name of the game. I simply request that you step up your game and stop the political assaults and get busy protecting this country and its interests which should be aligning with the securing of Western Civilization and that does not include allowing Sharia Law.

As you well know, there is an old adage which states: "Lead, Follow, or Get Out of the Way." While you most likely convinced yourself that you are "leading", that is a real stretch. You really are "following" your peer herd of politicians who demonstrated precious little ability to protect American interests and its future growth and prosperity. You certainly have the right to express your opinion, but with you being such a high level figure in America, I would have expected that you would have picked up the phone and called Hegseth and discussed your concerns in a way that does not further divide the country, unless dividing this country is a strategy that you find to be appropriate. Our enemies have to love and support that dissention when we rarely demonstrate unity even on common sense issues.

There is no obligation for you to respond,



John Archer

706 Rosemont Ct. Wyomissing, PA 19610-9004
(610) 823-4228; Email: bulldogs67rule@gmail.com