

Sunday, July 8, 2007

## **Death toll**

3603 dead U.S. soldiers for the disorted perception of reality of some politicians I hope, some people in Washington can't sleep anymore ...

Posted by Joerg Moellenkamp in English, lost and found at 22:19

"I hope some people in Washington can't sleep anymore ..."

You'd think so, but that would be assuming an ordinary human conscience. And if that the assumption were true, we wouldn't have the 3603 dead in the first place (not to mention hundreds of thousands of Iraqis).

Here's what the main reality-adverse conscience-free person in Washington had to say about that in December:

"I must tell you, I'm sleeping a lot better than people would assume."

From: [http://blogs.abcnews.com/politicalradar/2006/12/bushs\\_first\\_com.html](http://blogs.abcnews.com/politicalradar/2006/12/bushs_first_com.html)  
Anonymous on Jul 9 2007, 13:37

It's not that easy folks. War is not a choice we all make -- sometimes it's made for us. Now, you can argue that the war in Iraq was not a choice foisted on the U.S., but that is not enough -- besides having to "win" the argument there's the argument that choosing one war can prevent a worse one, and while you might argue that the Iraq war didn't go well enough to justify it, you can't easily dismiss the fact that preventative war against Nazi Germany in 1934/6 could have prevented WWII and its horrors, at least in Europe, you'd have to persuasively argue that it should have been obvious in 2002/3 that war in Iraq wouldn't prevent a bigger war, and this you cannot do. Now that the war happened, even if you think it's going horribly, if pulling out now could make things worse, then pulling out now is not a good idea.

Anonymous on Jul 9 2007, 19:35

"War is not a choice we all make -- sometimes it's made for us."

Even on the most charitable interpretation of the rationale for the Iraq War, it was indisputably a war of choice, not a choice that was "made for us". The entire theory was "preventive war", specifically chosen not because of any imminent threat.

"... you'd have to persuasively argue that it should have been obvious in 2002/3 that war in Iraq wouldn't prevent a bigger war, and this you cannot do."

Excuse me, but the proper word for that in American vernacular is \*bullshit\*. It was obvious to me and very many other people in 2002 and 2003, and it should have been obvious to you too. After being fully vindicated by history, I really don't see the point of an argument about this any more.

Moreover, if you're going to cast an argument like that, then you're obliged to consider the other side of the coin -- if the decision to go to war causes an even greater catastrophe than otherwise would have been the case, possibly including more and worse war, then the decision shouldn't have been made. The full-scale disaster we have right now has decisively answered this question.

"Now that the war happened, even if you think it's going horribly, if pulling out now could make things worse, then pulling out now is not a good idea."

First of all, why the conditional on "if you think it's going horribly"? Who in their right mind could possibly conclude otherwise?

And again, your own argument confronts you with the other side of the coin -- if staying there makes things worse, then we have to pull out, as soon as possible. And it just keeps getting worse, year after year after year.

Anonymous on Jul 10 2007, 00:05