

Re: How America Massacred Many Innocent Civilians At Fallujah

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.diseases.lyme/2004-06/0615.html>

From: A_Weisman (a_weisman_at_yahoo.com)

Date: 06/14/04

Date: 14 Jun 2004 12:10:38 -0700

derdrittemann2003@yahoo.com (derdrittemann) wrote in message news:<f2af2263.0406140655.596e4c08@posting.google.com>...
> a_weisman@yahoo.com (A_Weisman) wrote in message news:<e55e6d97.0406131741.1d7b7b86@posting.google.com>...
> > "Martijn" <Kw3Ls@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:<40cc7d71\$0\$771\$3a628fcd@reader10.nntp.hccnet.nl>...
> > > "A_Weisman" <a_weisman@yahoo.com> schreef in bericht
> > > news:e55e6d97.0406121537.54c7643@posting.google.com...
> > >
> > > At last an American on this group who is not looking through his/her
> > > patriotic glasses like most others do.
> >
> > "Martijn there are many (but not enough) who are informed and who
> > aren't simply reactionary and jingoistic here".
>
> There may even be some here who have been deeply troubled and
> frustrated over the anachronistic tribal political structure in some
> middle eastern, oil-rich states, and have great sympathy for the
> people who starve in the face of great wealth...literally flowing from
> the earth. There may have been many in the State Department...former
> and present...who saw the need to "modernize" the gulf states
> political structure and distribute the wealth of these nations more
> appropriately among their people.

Uh der dritte mann, have you ever heard of the concept of SOVEREIGNTY?

It is the first and most fundamental principle of international law.

Basically it means that it ain't none of our business. Or more accurately, it isn't our right to decide their forms of government or how they treat their own people.

Period.

Otherwise other countries would have the same right to decide that they don't like our form of government, our leaders, our distribution

of wealth, how we treat our people.

- > *Some may even have sympathy for the objectives of anyone who would*
- > *aspire to bring down such regimes. Their attempt to drive a wedge by*
- > *attacking the allies of the Saudi regime, however, makes them*
- > *international criminals...and the US has a right to defend itself from*
- > *such attacks...al Qaeda and Osama are outside the boundaries of*
- > *international law, now...regardless of how one may understand the*
- > *motivations...or even sympathize with them.*

Whether or not al Qaeda and Osama are "outside the boundaries of international law" isn't so clear. It depends on whether they are in or have transited through countries that are state's parties or signatories to the international criminal court treaty AND whether the ICC has subject matter jurisdiction over their actions while they were in or transiting through such countries. (note: the rights and obligations of states' parties and signatories to the ICC treaty are different, states' parties and signatories are two different categories).

- > *Unfortunately, the "free-flow-of-oil" from that region is not only of*
- > *paramount importance to the United States...but to the GLOBAL*
- > *economy...particularly, Asia...increasingly China. An ascendancy of*
- > *fundamentalist Moslem regimes...controlling the world's supply of*
- > *oil...threatening the world with that control...is frightening ...from*
- > *a GLOBAL perspective...probably capable of throwing the world economy*
- > *into deep economic depression.*

That may be true. But it doesn't give us any right legally to take action in those countries. Even if you believe that natural resources are the "common heritage of mankind" as defined in the Law of the Sea treaty, there is no treaty or basis in international law to claim ownership or access to the mineral rights and natural resources that exist within the sovereign territory of other nations.

Any more than other nations have the right of ownership or access to minerals or other natural resources in the United States.

Period. End of story.

- > *That's reality.*

That is reality. And some times the truth hurts.

- > *The United States...as the world's largest military power has had the*
- > *unenviable task of securing that flow...which means supporting those*
- > *with their hands on the shutoff valve.*

The US has no such right in any interpretation of international law. It is outrageous to assert that we do.

Nor has the US tried to justify military intervention in Iraq (in 1991 or now) or in Afghanistan or anywhere on that basis.

That MAY be a motivation but the US has consistently denied it.

- > *The collapse of the former USSR left the US as the preeminent*
- > *economic, military and political power...a position unparalleled,*
- > *probably since the UK in the height of the Empire. The challenge is to*
- > *use that power wisely...for the good of the world's people...and not*
- > *just the narrow interests of the west...or the US in particular.*

The challenge is not to fall into the same trap that every "preeminent economic, military and political power" has fallen into throughout history.

The "most fundamental problem of politics ... is not the control of wickedness but the limitation of righteousness." The Nazis, the Jacobins, the ayatollahs, and the others who have made revolutions have all been self-righteous.

So has Osama and George W Bush!

- > *To the extent that the intervention in Iraq makes any sense, it's real*
- > *primary objectives were probably to intervene in the region, where*
- > *there was an opportunity...before the Islamic revolution spirals out*
- > *of control...establishing a positive western presence...and securing a*
- > *foothold against total oil shutoff. We see the future...we will need*
- > *new oil buddies, basically.*

Well this is a hard argument to make since, under Sadaam, there was NO "Islamic revolution" that threatened to spiral out of control. Sadaam was a baathist, a SECULAR leader. He was NOT an islamic fundamentalist and in fact acted to suppress the islamic fundamentalists in Iraq. He fought a long battle against Iran an theocratic state.

For this fundamental reason Al Qaeda was NOT linked to Sadaam. He would NOT have given them WMDs even if he had them since they would have been likely to use them against him.

One of the frightening possibilities in post war Iraq is that a theocratic state dominated by islamic fundamentalists could emerge. Along with a Kurdish state on the border of our (ally???) Turkey, both phenomena having the potential to seriously destabilize the entire region.

- > *Secondly...by taking out Saddam...one of Israel's most fervent, vocal*
- > *and dangerous enemies is off the board, in theory, making the*
- > *possibility of progress there possible.*

The US has lost any pretense of acting as an "honest broker" in the peace process.

Also it has long been clear that Bush has no real plan or inclination to deal with the israel–palestinian problem. Belatedly a lame effort that predictably fell far short was made on the eve of the invasion of afghanistan and later iraq.

When was the last time that even a high level envoy made a trip that showed an effort to deal with the ongoing problems?

What ever happened to the road map? There were so many detours that no one could find their way from step 1 to step 2.

What a joke.

> *The reality here, for our European friends, also, is that the fairly
> substantial Jewish population in certain key states in the US means
> that American presidents or presidential candidates are reluctant to
> oppose Israeli policy...and are eager to convince Jewish voters of
> their support of Israel. While the raw numbers are not high...in the
> last election, this issue could easily have cost either side the
> election.*

Jewish voters are overwhelmingly liberal on most issues and have consistently voted 2/3 democratic. Polls show the same is likely this time. Each election year the republicans claim they're going to make inroads.

They never have done so.

The Jewish vote isn't going to swing the election this time.

In fact, it isn't even going to be close barring two things:

One we invade some new country and the people rally to the president;

Two, there actually is a major terrorist attack on US soil;

What you have to wonder is whether Bush will honor the election results this time OR whether he will declare a national emergency and refuse to turn over the white house.

The question to ask yourself is not whether this is likely to happen.

But who would stop it if it did.

> *Domestic electoral politics sometimes have critical roles in American
> foreign policy actions.*

Sometimes. Typically "big" foreign policy initiatives are second term projects.

And with this guy it is going to be "like father, like son, one term and done."

I pray. This country can't take four more years of this.

- > *The other objective, apparently, was to build a "model democracy" in*
- > *the middle east...and thus, provide an example of how a pro-western*
- > *government would work for the benefit of other arab states with*
- > *similar tensions.*

Delusional neocon nonsense. Someone should drug test Wolfowitz, Perle, Feith, Cheney, Rice, Armitage, Scooter Libby etcetera

- > *Naive, at best.*

Freaking delusional is what it is.

- > *But the overall objective may have...may have...been*
- > *more benign than many critics, particularly in Europe, have*
- > *insinuated. Perhaps a good objective. Brilliant military execution. No*
- > *follow-through on the most important objective. Too few resources*
- > *devoted. Ridiculous assumptions concerning "planting the seeds" of a*
- > *democracy in a desert and expecting them to grow.*

What was benign?

- > *Some of the European criticism is a bit difficult to hear at*
- > *times...as some of it is an outgrowth of the very colonial,*
- > *imperialistic policies which created the very exploitive divisions in*
- > *the first place. The French and Russians, for instance, had their*
- > *hands deep into Iraq.*

It would be nice to learn the lessons of history. The same problems, logistically, politically, morally that haunted imperialistic policies are germane today. Along with new issues in light of the "globalization" of the economy and to a lesser extent, politics. One of the problems is the absence of working political globalization mechanisms.

- > *Very moralistic now...liberals, neo-Socialists and "Green" parties*
- > *objections should be, perhaps viewed in the historic context of the*
- > *roles of European intervention in the area.*

I don't follow what you mean. DO you mean that we are saddled with an irrelevant legacy of imperialism?

Do you realize that what bush has proposed is democratic imperialism, which is truly a contradiction in terms? The bush doctrine amounts to an age old idea. Might makes right. And the bush policies have amounted to, do as I say NOT as I do.

Arrogance, short sightedness, ideological crusades which are fundamentally religious. History offers many lessons. Bush has learned none.

And thus is doomed to repeat the mistakes of history.

Unless we stop him.

> *In other words...thanks for the mess. Thanks for blaming us for trying
> to straighten it out. And, if and when Islamic fundamentalists shut
> down the world's oil supply...and economic chaos ensues...please
> remember to donate your help. Talk to us then.*

This isn't a legal OR moral justification.

> > *"There needs to be some kind of balance. For all the danger, the era of
> > the cold war did provide a certain inherent check".*
>
> *Honestly, I think this "balance of power" theory hasn't been heard
> since the treaty of Versailles. I don't think we think along the lines
> of these concepts any longer. You cannot "create" a balance to the
> United States(unless it is China, perhaps)...nor can you "dismantle"
> the US.*

Wrong. Kissinger talked about it and was a devotee of metternich.

Here's an interesting two part article:

Kissinger, Metternich, and Realism – 99.06
<http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/99jun/9906kissinger.htm>

Kissinger, Metternich, and Realism – 99.06 (Part Two)
<http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/99jun/9906kissinger2.htm>

In fact the last fifty years were dominated by a balance of powers approach. It was called the Cold War.

Nixon's foreign policy recognized the importance of the balance of power. Between the USSR, the US AND CHINA which was emerging and growing in importance.

> > *"Throughout history there has been a need for a balance of power to
> > check the unfettered power of any one nation".*
>
> *Metternich? Is that you?*

No. And I'm NOT Henry Kissinger either. But I have read Kissinger and studied metternich and history.

And I think you're quite wrong about it der dritte mann.

> >>>

> > *"But just like Germany didn't need to be "dismantled" (it is united
> > again and not a threat) I think the bigger problem is similar to that
> > of Germany prior to WW II".*

>

> *Personally, I think if there is an appropriate analogy to German
> history, it may well be to the failed attempt to create a democracy in
> Germany following WWI...the "Weimar Republic"...and the role the
> weakness of that government played in allowing the fascists to come to
> power. This, apparently, is what we intend to do in Iraq.*

There are other scarier parallels to Germany. Bush and Hitler. Some scary parallels.

The more apt historical parallel to what we're really trying to do in Iraq is the banana republics in south and central America in the 1950s. And Viet Nam. And our puppet governments and military forces in South Viet Nam. Our recent efforts in Iraq amount to an attempt to Iraqize the war, just like our policies of Vietnamization in the earlier war. The parallels grow between Viet Nam and Iraq. And the Soviet attempt to dominate Afghanistan too in the 1980s.

> > *"It wasn't that ALL the people of Germany were united in their desire
> > for Lebensraum or Aryan purity or world domination. Or that all
> > Germans of the era were "evil."*

>

> *Okay...at the risk of appearing to be an anal smartass...you mean
> "Lebensraum", or "living space"...you are confusing the word for
> "Liebestraum"...or, "sweet dreams", the famous Liszt melody. It's sort
> of unintentionally funny...but a common error.*

Whoops. Embarrassing to me. It isn't that I don't know what Lebensraum was. Or the Liszt melody. Just an error in spelling. Thanks for correcting that.

> *What I find most personally disturbing about our direction here was
> the initiation of action by the United States...*

The POLICY of initiation of preemptive action. The POLICY of might makes right. The POLICY of do as I say and not as I do.

> *...without a convincing showing for need of action or provocation.*

At all. Period. It isn't right. Nor is it effective.

In fact the whole "war" paradigm makes no sense when dealing with non-state combatants who aren't vulnerable to "war."

And if we're going to take action against those who harbor terrorists, we should probably start with our "allies" the Pakistanis, the Saudis, and other truly terrorist nations.

And alienating our allies and frightening our enemies makes the world more dangerous. We have supported repressive regimes in Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Egypt and other "moderate" Arab states. Their leaders remain in power only by suppressing their own people. And their people hate them and us for that.

We support brutal repressive regimes. And it gives birth to many many future Osamas.

And we alienate our allies and squander the good will of the peoples of the world in the wake of 9/11.

And that makes any effort against "terrorists" likely to fail, and makes it more likely that the "terrorist" problem will grow in the future. For generations to come. Our conduct in Abu Ghareib only feeds into the view of the US as immoral and evil. And poisons our relationships with the people and nations of the world for generations to come.

> *It has been along standing policy of the US to NOT initiate*
> *aggressive action.(Okay...Laos, Cambodia, Grenada excepted).*

Until the Bush doctrine of might makes right.

And now there is no other superpower or counterbalancing alliance to stop us or make us hesitate. We have eschewed the need to seek approval of the UN in order for us to act and through a series of actions undermined multilateralism in the face of our unilateral foreign policy. We have acted like bullies and undercut the institutions of multilateralism consistently in this administration.

None of this has made us safer or the world a safer place. And is only going to make things worse for the foreseeable future.

What we need here is REGIME CHANGE.

> *I doubt that the relative ease with which this was done should be*
> *overlooked, and it well may be time to review the "War Powers Act" as*
> *it applies to similar actions.*
> >
> >

I don't follow your last statement. Do you mean that we need to give congress MORE power to check the president's actions???