

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
TIMOTHY GEITHNER

April 5, 2018

Re: Your Letter Dated the 2d of April

Dear General TMANE:

I appreciate your letter's candidness. I do not, however, agree with some of its contents. The premise on which you base your contentions is, at best, tenuous. I have yet to see the military you describe, for one would wonder why, if it exists, we continue to face the problems we experienced over the weekend and weeks leading up to it.

Indeed, it was you who just last week was sounding the alarm over (another) group of need-to-go names, the most emphasized being GhostTacticz's. So, I must admit, I continue to be blind where you continue to see, for I have yet to be shown that my military's state is anything other than woefully unprepared; though, I do not necessarily prescribe such conditions to your actions in whole.

I do not presume, however, to accuse you of misconduct or inadequate general performance. Instead, I merely intend to point out that the picture you continue to paint -- a stable, prepared, and effective military -- is yet to look "art". I fear the cause for this may lie in your inability to work with others, a fault which, if left unfixed, could prove fatal.

It seems to me that you are the type of person who finds it difficult to work in tandem with others in a power-sharing environment; this is seen when, for example, you assert that the military is yours, using possessive articles when referring to it, e.g. "my military." There is nothing, of course, inherently erroneous about this style (many have it), but in a space that demands that power be allocated across multiple sources, it can prove disastrous.

This is why I concurred with your recommendations to fire GhostTacticz and Lacryma but not with your explanations as to why they deserved to leave. From your perspective, they represented nefarious foes with one goal in mind: removing the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. To me, however, there exists a simpler explanation. I would surprise me none to find out that rather than having evil intent, those two individuals merely got caught in a whirlwind of drama that often accompanies our military; unlike you, though, chose actions severe enough to require termination.

I could prove this no further by looking to your description of the Vice President, which portrays him as bipolar and "antagonistic." I find this difficult to square with last week's interpretation of the Vice President, which was nothing other than absolutely positive. Unless the Vice President has in the last week alone incurred a terrible depression or need to procrastinate, I reject your analysis.

I posit instead that what happened is an all-too-often occurrence: the Vice President did not agree with a determination of yours as to this week's existing threat against the military (this week's' seems to be forming into the newest Secretary of Defense), and your subconscious has turned him into an enemy.

Furthermore, neither the Vice President nor the Secretary of Defense have encroached upon your power; respectfully, affirming that you cannot on your own appoint Service Chiefs or Combatant Commanders -- or their equivalents -- is not "micromanaging" the military. It is reaffirming where the power structures start and end.

And if you wish for the Joint Chiefs of Staff to be more than advisory, then you at the same time cannot dissent from the Secretary of Defense hosting meetings with Service Chiefs, for the Secretary of Defense, after me, is the ultimate source of military authority -- both operational and command.

General, I suspect that you have the right intentions; I also know that you are someone whom I can trust. Your inability to work with your colleagues and let others do their jobs, I must confess, continues to bother me. If an attitude shift cannot occur, please let me know and we will take what future steps are appropriate.

Sincerely,



General BigDaddyTMANE  
9999 Joint Staff Pentagon  
Washington, D. C. 20318