

C:\Users\peter\Documents\COMMAND FAILURE\The Book\Chapter 3 When did the terms World War I and World War II start being used.wpd

Chapter 3

How Did World War II Officially Become World War II?

In a 1926 book review of Hemingway's short stories F. Scott Fitzgerald made reference to "the war." The uninitiated might wonder, "Which war?" For Fitzgerald and his generation there was no question. He meant the Great War. The War of 1914-1918. The War to End All Wars. The War. Like every generation's war, which war was understood. For us today it is important to recognize that for people of the 1920s and 1930s there was no first world war or World War I. This is because there had not been a second world war or World War II.

Obsessed as we are with ourselves, and lacking historical perspective older than our parent's generation, we count only two great world wars. And we number them that way. World War I and World War II. It's not as if world wars didn't happen before the 20th century. By loose reckoning there have been six world wars, not two, in modern history. Begin with the Thirty Years War (1618-48) and the War of the Spanish Succession (1702-14). Move on to the Seven Years War (1756-63) and the Napoleonic and European Revolutionary Wars (1791-1814). And who can forget the 100 Years War? All leading up to our own specially titled first and second world wars. The combatants are familiar. Only the alliances have changed.

People are naturally inclined to name, organize, and categorize the world surrounding us. When elevated to a science, this inclination is called "taxonomy." When taken to extremes it might be more like compulsive-obsessive disorder. The manner in which we taxonomize the world in turn influences how we observe, discuss, study, interpret, and relate to our world. Starting from a defined starting or reference point these factors then help us build the knowledge base which influences how we further educate ourselves about our world. Inevitably, bias is introduced because people can't help having opinions about what they see, learn, or observe. These opinions can get in the way of facts and occurrences. Opinion, for example, can lead us to doubt or discount historical fact and replace what is known to be true and accurate with convenient and comfortable explanations that please by being simple, neat and tidy.

A case that points out this convenient, comfortable, pleasingly simple, neat and tidy explanation of history is what to call the European war that occurred between 1914 and 1918. Historical taxonomy today conveniently calls that war, World War I. This is possibly an inconvenience since there could not have been a World

War I without there being a World War II. As it happens, the 1914-1918 war went by many names before the public was happy with calling it World War I. Also inconvenient is what historical taxonomy today now calls World War II because, obviously, there could not have been a II without a I.

This how to assign names for these two world wars introduces a conundrum. What, or better yet, where is the defined starting point? In writing about historical events in the United States in late 1940, what should the 1914-1918 war and the war that had been going on in Europe since 1939 and Asia since 1936 be called? Answering this taxonomic question is not as easy at it first appears because the terms "World War I" and "World War II" were not in common usage until very, very late in the latter and certainly not in existence during the former.

In truth, despite of what is in common usage today, the term "World War II" was not widely used within the United States while that war was being fought. This naming is mostly a political artifact from the war's end. It's the same with "World War I." Terms like World War I and World War II are so ingrained today in how we discuss these two wars that it's easy to overlook that the people who lived through these wars thought of them ahistorically and therefore by other names. For instance, in his 1932 book, *The Flying Carpet*, author Richard Halliburton **references progress made in Sarawak since the "World War."** Of course there is no mention of World War I since there as yet had not been a World War II. More on this later.

The provenance of numbering the 20th century's two world wars "I" and "II" is unquestioned today. Thoughts of how they came to be called world wars and how they came to be numbered as they are aren't considered. They are accepted. The boys growing up in the 1930s would have learned about the first and then fought in the second. What would they have called those wars they studied and then fought in? In newspapers, magazines, literature, and in conversation what we now call "World War I" and "World War II" was usually referred to back then for either of them as, the War. For example, **in several short stories and essays published during the 1920s**, F. Scott Fitzgerald refers simply to "the war" though in his 1926 novel, *The Great Gatsby* he does also once use, "the Great War."

As a start to answering this naming question comes from a letter dated 31 July 1919 from President Woodrow Wilson. He proposed to the Secretary of War that the late war against the Central Powers be named, "The World War." So it was that on 7 October 1919 the War Department directed, "The wars against the Central Powers of Europe, in which the United States has taken part, will hereafter be designated in all official communications and publications as

'The World War.'

Names are important. Should we be naming our wars? Doesn't that give them a humanity and individuality they don't deserve? Why not call World War I the "1914-1918 War," the "Great War," or the "European War?" They were all terms in use for many years by large numbers of people who lived through those wars. There are less grandiose names for them though the "Great War" hungers for attention, understanding, and meaning. Great as in wonderful? Great as in large? Great as in, what?

Wars *must* be named if, for no other reason, their awfulness will not to be forgiven nor forgotten. Nothing does this better than a descriptive name. For instance, try on for size the "Hundred Year War." Or the "Thirty Year War." Imagine an enlistment poster for either of them. "Reenlist in the Hundred Year War." "Reenlist for the Thirty Year War." Calling something like that as it really is would really make a soldier think!

Or how about reference in the United Kingdom during the 19th Century, or England at the time, to the "First, Second, and Third Anglo-Afghan Wars?" Educated and historically thinking people would question being exhorted to contribute to the second, third, or fourth war of anything. Such as a Crusade. In any case, why wasn't the first enough? Names make a difference.

Naming our wars makes it easier to compartmentalize and explain the conflicts in context to their era, their times, and the soldiers and civilians who lived and died fighting in or from them. After all the blood shed, the families torn asunder, the landscapes ruined, the tragedy of death and destruction, naming our wars gives us a starting point for comprehending what happened. Naming our wars helps fit them into a historical, political, mythical, or national story. Through all this must come understanding.

People intrinsically appreciate the importance of using names and words correctly. As Barbara Kingsolver has written about the proper use of language, "People learn from what they read, they trust in words, and this is not a responsibility to take lightly." For this reason it's important to use the proper name to describe the war happening around the boys who fought in what we now comfortably call, "World War II." Giving the War its proper name is as important as telling the boy's story. And, they were boys. That is what late teen and early twenty year old men were called in the 1930s and 1940s. You read it in their letters home to parents and wives and read it in official documents and see it in movies of the era.

An examination of newspapers and magazines between the 1920s and

mid 1940s gives perspective on how the taxonomy developed to naming our world wars. Philip L. Graham and the editorial board from *The Washington Post* are usually credited from 1948 with originating the phrase, "News is a first rough draft of history." However, Jack Shafer from *Slate*, did some digging and uncovered that journalist Alan Barth used the phrase, "News is only the first rough draft of history," in a 1943 book review for the *New Republic*. Whomever came up with the concept first doesn't matter as much as recognizing the importance of newspapers and magazines as primary sources for answering this question of naming the War. A second primary source are official governmental documents. Secondary sources, which won't be referenced here except in one instance, are memoirs and histories and motion pictures-both documentaries and movies created for entertainment.

This idea that news can be the, "first rough draft of history," is what makes newspapers especially an excellent place to start answering questions about how the two big wars of the 20th century were named. On a day-by-day basis newspapers covered what was going on in our country and overseas. Small town newspapers were important providers of local, national, and international news, even though they relied on news and wire services to do so. In looking over these newspapers from the middle 20th century, it's not uncommon to read the same wire service story of some event over the course of a week in dailies and weeklies from Bangor to Seattle to Los Angeles to Key West and all points in between.

The best affordable place to start looking at historic newspaper coverage is the subscription service offered by www.newspaperarchives.com. Because of limitations to what is available on that website nearly all the results are for newspapers from medium sized cities down to small towns. Here are some examples of how the two wars were referenced in these newspapers. Note: Upper and lower case lettering is consistently inconsistent in these newspapers along with the introduction of "first" and "second" and "I" and "II" and demonstrates how the taxonomy of "world war" evolved.

Referring to the 1914-1918 war, Missouri's *Joplin Globe* Memorial Day edition for Wednesday 30 May 1923 on page 2 pays tribute to, "all heroes who served in the World war." This designation of "World war" has a direct antecedent in President Wilson's 1919 letter to the Secretary of War. So does the 18 November 1936 editorial in the *Oakland Tribune* by Preston Grover in his column, "A Washington Day Book." He references the, "unknown dead of the World War," and the, "tomb of the World War unknown." Like the *Joplin Globe*, Grover has nothing to do with naming it the *first* since it was, at this time, the only.

The 20 October 1938 edition of New York's *Lowville Black River Democrat* contains a book review for Dr. Henry Cushing's, "From a Surgeon's Journal." It's the lengthy published diary detailing the ambulance service and surgery under fire of a, "famous brain surgeon who was prominent in the World War," written for the benefit of, "people who wish to know some facts about the great war." Calling the "World War" the "Great War" was more common in the United Kingdom than the United States.

There are plentiful newspaper accounts during the 1930s referring to, "World War," which means the concept was well established and accepted by people in the United States. For instance, on the cusp of Germany's invasion of Poland when all European nations were mobilizing for war, the *Oakland Tribune's* editorial page for 27 August 1939 has a column by Raymond Lawrence entitled, "Propaganda and Politics." He writes about the, "period of comparative peace until the outbreak of World War I."

The *Arizona Independent Republic* from Phoenix for 12 September 1939 covers their front page with war news and refers to *the* World War I and *the* World War II (italics added) as if undecided how to exactly term what is going on over there. "War Starts Abroad," calls out one headline addressing how, "Nothing in connection with the present war in Europe, referred to by some as the World War II, has aroused American citizens so much as the sudden and apparently unnecessary increase in the price of foodstuffs."

Taking a neutrality position with, "What War Means," columnist Willis Thornton on that same front page bemoans the thoughtlessness expressed in such comments as, "Oh, yes. I suppose we'll be in it sooner or later." Ignoring the war naming issue Thornton worries that, "Scarcely one of these persons has given so much as a thought to what war would really mean to every man, woman, and child in America, even to those not called to military service."

Elsewhere on the *Arizona Independent Republic's* front page that day is an article, "This War Starts like the Late One." Discussing events in Europe and still undecided on what terms to use the anonymous author refers to the, "current war," as well as "the late one."

Recognizing their singularity and numbering, the two massive wars of the 20th Century came quickly to Illinois's *Earlville Leader*. Two weeks after the Nazi invasion of Poland, the *Leader's* 14 September 1939 writes, "After but a little more than a week of World War II, it is increasingly apparent that the path of the neutral nation is going to be a difficult one." This, from an unsigned editorialist. "Already the war is taking a course that

is too familiar to World War I to bode well for non-combatants," the anonymous author continues.

Another small paper, Iowa's *Algona Upper Des Moines*, followed the *Earlville Leader's* lead. On 14 September 1939 it reported that World War II began, "when Germany invaded Poland." And quoting from *Time Magazine's* "March of Time" on 21 September, 1939, on page 5, New York's *East Hampton Star* refers extensively to, "World War I." As a *non de guerre* for the current conflict, "World War I" and "World War II" for the time stays with these smaller papers.

At least in small town newspapers there has been an acceptance of describing the current conflict, "World War II," by late 1939 and this continues through 1940 and into 1941. Columnist Charles G. Sampas writing for the *Lowell Sun* in Massachusetts for 19 May 1941 opines, "In the 21 years between World war I and World war II there has never been a year when all the nations of the globe were actually at peace." The same story, with no by-line but with the header, "Cranium Crackers," appears in the Texas, *Laredo Times*, on 2 April 1941.

Months before the United States is involved in the war, the *Chester Times* in Pennsylvania on 20 August 1941 reports that the National Resources Planning Board predicts, "World War II will end not later than November, 1944 and perhaps several months sooner." If only. The Ogden, Utah, *Standard-Examiner*, for 1 January 1942 has a syndicated article by Roger W. Babson expounding on his forecast for a decline in non-defense related industries where, "World war II," is referenced many times. A nationally syndicated writer, Babson's forecast appeared in a number of papers that day.

It's neither strange nor odd that a search for "World War II" in United Kingdom newspapers at www.newspaperarchives.com brought no positive results from 1939, 1940, and 1941. Likely this is due to a lack of coverage within the website's archive than a lack of coverage in UK newspapers. However, late 1942 search results come up with the phrase in, *London Stars and Stripes*, a daily newspaper of the U.S. Armed Forces in the European Theater of Operations. One example of many appears 6 November 1942 when Charles W. White reports on the battles occurring in the North Africa desert with General Erwin Rommel by writing, "Certainly no Nazi wolf has been hunted with more determination in World War II." It's unknown how many Londoners were reading this American serviceman's newspaper.

On the movie scene, in one 1943 motion picture produced in the United Kingdom, *The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp*, the current war is referred to as, "the four year war."

The start of using the term "World War II" is equally vague in literature. For instance, in Ilya Ehrenburg's memoir, *The War: 1941-1945*, the Russian writer refers multiple times to "World War I" but to the subject of his book he always refers to "the war." And this from a book first published in translation in 1964. Clearly, World War II as a descriptive term was still uncertain in use a generation following the war.

It's plain that local press quickly accepted and adopted the term, "World War II," as early as 1939 but *The New York Times* never really jumps on the phrase in a big way. Between 1939-1945 the *Times* refers to the war as "the European war" or "European conflict" or "this war" and to the 1914-1918 war as the "last war" or the "World War." In 1939 there is mention in the *Times* of "the last war," and, "the early years of the World War." In 1941 is a movie review of an Australian motion picture, *Forty Thousand Horsemen*, where "World War I" is mentioned. There is a 21 October 1941 obituary for Captain John F. Hines who served "during the World War." But they are referring to what we now call, World War I.

As for the current war there is the headline for the 10 December 1941 *New York Times* where President Roosevelt predicts, "a long, world-wide war." In 1942 there are some pages of captioned artwork comparing, "Posters of World War I and World War II." Also an essay in the *New York Times Magazine* in April, 1942 that states, "It is now common usage to speak of the First World War and the Second World War," though the *Times* has not yet adopted that common usage in its own pages. An unsigned article in August that year, Special to *The New York Times*, declares, "The second World War is 'intimately bound up with the future of the church,'" according to Archbishop Edward Mooney of Detroit.

In 1943 there is an increase in *The New York Times* calling attention to "World War II" but these articles lean towards special features not written by *Times* staff. One such Special announces, "March, 1918, State Is Reached In World War II," comparing the German defeat in the Tunisian campaign to a similar time in the past while predicting Germany will launch, "perhaps their final, major offensive." In late 1943 Lincoln Barnett contributes to *The New York Times Book Review* with a banner headline proclaiming, "A Hundred Amateur Writers Report on World War II."

Thereafter, references to World War II become more common in *The New York Times* but even on V-E Day (Victory in Europe) and V-J Day (Victory in Japan) the *Times* would still rather refer to one as the "War in Europe" and the other as "the war."

Identifying and naming world wars was different at *The Washington Post* than *The New York Times*. Several weeks after the invasion of Poland in 1939 the *Post* was headlining articles about, "the last World War," and revealing the death of a soldier from that war. A 19 September 1940 letter to the editor laments, "World War II, grave and awful as it is, is merely a temporary phase," to be endured because, "during the past decade no attempt has been made to destroy Naziism." In September of 1941 the *Post* was writing about how substantially lower the stock market was performing currently versus, "when world War II got under way two years ago," and how the current war compared to the similar time frame during, "World War I," when "popular enthusiasm for war babies resulted in skyrocketing stock prices." Given extreme Russian losses on the eastern front, an article from 10 October 1941 says it is time to, "discard the theory that casualties in World War II would be minor," comparing blitzkrieg warfare to the trench warfare of World War I.

Six days following the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor, *The Washington Post* reports, "America's roll of honor in World War II began emerging today from the smoke and flame over the Pacific," as it chronicles the death of United States Army Air Forces B-17 pilot Captain Colin Kelly, Jr. On the 29th of that month they report, "Senator Joseph F. Guffey (Democrat), of Pennsylvania, said last night that World War II would have been avoided if the United States had not junked Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations peace plan."

By late 1942 the *Post* is fully committed to the name, "World War II," proclaiming in headlines such as these: "Hull Blames Japan For World War II," and, "Baptist Church Honors First Member to Die in World War II." On 5 May 1945, V-E Day, the *Post* simply reports that, "the war is over." A person would have to have spent the previous six years living in a hole in the ground to not know what war the *Post* was talking about. Which might explain why people referred to the war simply as, "the War." See, for instance, the Ken Burns PBS documentary of that name. Adding a literary bent to how people referred to the war is French writer and novelist, Marguerite Duras, who simply titled her World War II memoir, *The War*.

Before hostilities in Europe began American magazines were running regular features from Great Britain and the continent from their correspondents based there. Reportage from *The New Yorker* is indicative of articles being filed for readers in the United States. The magazine's evolution on what to call the war is interesting because it doesn't follow newspaper war taxonomy at all.

At the beginning of the European War, A. J. Liebling wrote in 28

October 1939, "Theoretically, there is as much danger from the air this week as on the first day of War '39, as Frenchmen call this one to distinguish it from the other." The name, "War '39," has a hopeful quality to it. As if this current war won't last as long or be as greivous as the previous one.

One impression of how the last war bears upon the current one comes in December, 1939 from Princess Paul Sapieha in an essay published on the second of that month. Making those comparisons, the American-born Princess naively reflects upon the, "parades on Fifth Avenue, a plethora of flags, much advertising of Liberty Bonds," and atrocity stories focused on the Germans following the war's end and being told that the armies back then, "had been composed of simple men who hated to kill one another and suffered mostly from cold hands and wet feet."

By his 12 May 1940 *New Yorker* article, A.J. Liebling writes, "The new phase of the second World War was announced to Parisians at daybreak Friday."

Later, Mollie Panter-Downes is writing in a 1 June 1940 published piece about atrocity stories still remembered by those, "over thirty from the last war," turning up again. To Panter-Downes this war is still unnamed other than referring to the last one.

A. J. Liebling also refers to "the last war" in an article published on 14 February 1942. And uses the term, "The first World War," in an article published 29 July 1944.

The next month, as Brendan Gill shows in his 12 August article, the term "world war" is being used in a matter-of-fact way as if in practice for years. He writes, "Being on the air when the flash announcing the second World War came through, I can remember the time exactly: it was 2:17 A.M., on September third, 1939." There wasn't any, "second World War," then; only the German invasion of Poland and subsequent declaration several days later of war by France and Great Britain. But nobody was calling it the "second" of anything.

Much later in the War when taxonomy is ready to be set in stone, in his "Letter From Rome," published 19 May 1945, Philip Hamburger concludes an article about the effect of Allied bombing on the stored and sequestered artwork of Milan by wondering if any has, "survived the second World War."

Vanity Fair was an important magazine for style and trends during the early 20th century until the Depression forced it to cease publication in 1936. But it was also an important magazine for covering politics, current national and international events, and the national mood. In its February 1919 issue is a book

advertisement for Frank H. Simonds five volume, *History of the World War*. The August 1932 issue has an extended essay about the European War reflecting on, "the heavy expense is not the initial cost of fighting the War, but the upkeep of veterans afterward." In December of that year is an essay by Walter Lippmann where he refers many times to, "the World War." In the June 1935 issue of *Vanity Fair* is a penetrating and thoughtful analysis and appraisal of air power and how it will affect, "the next war," much differently than "the last war."

Elizabeth Nix in an article for the on-line magazine www.History.com writes with clarity on the matter that, "It's hard to pinpoint precisely when the World War I and World War II-or First World War and Second World War-monikers arose." This is because, "During World War I, of course, nobody knew that a second global conflict would follow closely on the heels of the first, so there was no need to distinguish it as the first of its kind." Nix says people in the United States began using, "World War," once America entered the conflict in 1917, preferring at first to refer to it as, "The European War." Meanwhile, Britons preferred calling it the, "Great War," or more simply, "the War," and this usage continued until the late 1940s. On the other hand, Nix says that Winston Churchill in his 1927 memoir, "The World Crisis," preferred calling it the, "World War."

Nix goes on to say that, "World War II," first appeared in print, "all the way back in February 1919, when a *Manchester Guardian* article used the term much in the way people today predict a hypothetical "World War III." But it was Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1941 who, "would publicly label the conflict the, 'Second World War,' and his fellow Americans quickly followed suit."

Nix writes that in 1942 a contest was run to come up with another name for the war. Though there were 15,000 submissions none garnered acceptance. Some of the names were the, "Do-or-Die War," the "Freedom-or-Slavery War," the "Liberty-Eclipse War," and the "Christianity-Against-Paganism" War. This contest may be the source of complaint from a 10 April 1942 letter to the editor in *The Washington Post* that rails about these, "silly names," the public has come up with to rename "World War II." The letter writer says, "This war is not called by that appellation because someone named it that, but because that is exactly what it is-the Second World War."

Unfortunately, Nix doesn't cite her sources, and the editors at www.History.com don't allow contact between readers and writers so it's difficult to substantiate her claims. Because of this, though her conclusions sound satisfying it's difficult to know if there is historical perspective behind it or an *ex post facto* modern historical interpretation.

In the introduction to *American Air Navigator* published by the Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corporation in 1944, Chairman of the Board, Tom M. Girdler comments that aviation has been, "Forced by the second World War to regard the entire globe as a flying field." Though "second" is in lower case and the term, "World War II," is not specifically used it is indicative that in official publications there was taxonomic awareness of how to call this current war. By calling it the "second World War" Girdler is making specific reference to temporal history.

A web posting at the US National Archives in 2014 probes how "World War II" became the official name of the war. Dr. Greg Bradsher begins answering the question of when World War II officially became World War II in the eyes of the United States government by first addressing the 1914-1918 conflict.

President Woodrow Wilson, in a letter delivered to the War Department on 31 July 1919 wrote, "It is hard to find a satisfactory 'official' name for the war, but the best, I think, that has been suggested is 'The World War,' and I hope that your judgement will concur." The War Department concurred and on 7 October 1919, General Orders No. 115 directed, "The war against the Central Powers of Europe, in which the United States has taken part, will hereafter be designated in all official communications and publications as 'The World War.'"

Writing for the War Department in a 1 August 1945 letter to the commanding generals of the United States Army Service Forces, Ground Forces, and Air Forces, Brigadier General Thomas North posed the question of what the official designation of the present war should be. "He mentioned that in official documents, Acts of Congress, publications and in current usage various names and designations had been applied to hostilities which began December 7, 1941," and various committees of the Congress had made reference to, "the wars (*italics added*) in which the United States is presently engaged."

Bringing up General Orders No. 115 from 1919 and how the 1914-1918 war had been officially designated, "The World War," North suggested that for reasons of simplicity and uniform terminology that, "World War II be the officially designated name for the present war covering all theaters and the entire period of hostilities." He pointed out that, "The term 'World War II' has been used in at least seven public laws," and, "analysis of publications and radio programs indicates that this term has been accepted by common usage."

Approval of the naming convention was also sought of, and granted by, of the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, and other major decision makers. On 10 September 1945, Secretary of War

Henry L. Stimson and Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal wrote to President Harry Truman with the proposal. The president signed his approval on 11 September 1945. The letter of approval was published in the Volume 10 Federal Register 11881 as, "Paragraph No. 1 of War Department General Orders No. 80, dated September 19, 1945." It provided that, "The war in which the United States has been engaged since 8 December 1941 will hereafter be designated in all official communicates and publications as 'World War II.'" The bureaucrats had made their major contribution to the war effort.

Common usage in modern times of the term, "World War II," for the conflict waged between 1939-1945 in the west is so well accepted that the name origin is never questioned. It's plain the name had its origins in the 1914-1918 "World War" because, as has been pointed out, there would not have been a "World War II" unless there had been a "World War I." The naming of World War II in the United States was an evolutionary process played out in newspapers and magazines, public spaces, the military, and in government, and it's impossible to locate any one, specific, or particular starting date or first usage. And, funnily enough, the naming convention confusion has never gone away. In his 2019 novel, *Agent Running in the Field*, John Le Carre has his 47 year old protagonist during contemporary times refer to the "'39-'45 war."

Since Adam in the Garden of Eden, naming of things has been a convenience of communication between parties, be they individuals, groups, or countries. Given the wealth of evidence, answering the question of when the terms World War I and World War II came into being is plainly geopolitical and cultural. And that begs the question: Would World War II have been a term if there had been no conflict with Japan? Or if Germany had not declared war on the United States? If so, what would World War II have been referred to in England or in France or Germany itself? The Second Great War? What would Japan have called it? Would it have still been "The Great Patriotic War" in the USSR?

Between the beginning and ending of hostilities between 1939-1945 the War of our concern was known by many names. Such names include "the current war," "this war," "the four year war," "the European War," the European conflict," "war '39," "the Second World War," "the wars." Finally. Officially. Once the bureaucrats became involved. As "World War II." And who knows? There were probably many other possible names. Likely, for the men and women living through, surviving, and fighting it, it was better known and bettered accepted as, simply, the War.

Like Fitzgerald and his fictional character Jay Gatsby? Like all that was great in those times? Like all of the rest of us? **"So we**

beat on, boats against the current." As with so many, we are
"borne back ceaselessly into the past."

End

My appreciation goes to Dr. Adrian Hunt, director of the Flying Heritage and Combat Armor Museum in Everett, Washington who was an integral contributor in thought, philosophy, and review to this article. Sgt/Maj. Joseph R. Menard Jr. served as a sounding board for the military aspect of this question. Also, thanks to Diane Sepanski for her editorial corrections and contributions.