

# Re: Runaway Global Warming Possible!

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-02/9010.html>

---

**From:** Coby Beck ([cbeck\\_at\\_mercury.bc.ca](mailto:cbeck_at_mercury.bc.ca))

**Date:** 02/18/05

Date: Fri, 18 Feb 2005 16:30:56 GMT

"bill" <[ford\\_prefect42@hotmail.com](mailto:ford_prefect42@hotmail.com)> wrote in message  
news:1108678000.071930.5790@141g2000cwc.googlegroups.com...  
> *Yes, it does bother me to be manipulated, but do you think that*  
> *the public will be convinced by a solid logical reason, or an*  
> *emotional, fear based harrangue? I recognize the need for the*  
> *deception,*

Spoken like every other dictator before you.

> *If we have done a*  
> *moral "good" by getting rid of saddam and improved our strategic and*  
> *economic position at the same time, how bad can that really be.*

Well the only way to make a reasonable value judgement like that would be to honestly assess the bad things as well as the good things. I see no moral value in strategic and economic goals without using Bush's "God on our side" thinking.

It takes alot more than "Saddam is gone" to balance out over 100,000 Iraqi dead, infant mortality and poverty way higher, dententions and torture at the hands of the US and British, Fallujah 75% destroyed and completely uninhabitable, use of chemical weapons on civilians, bombing and raiding hospitals and clinics intentionally, 10's of thousands of US military casualties.

With the exception of use of chemical weapons, there is nothing in that list that is even controversial in the mainstream media. It is just very rarely mentioned.

But, now that the latest false justification of "binging democracy" is about to be tested, we will soon see if the US actually does withdraw, as the overwhelming majority of the Iraqi population wishes (democracy, remember?).

> *here's your cite sir.*  
> [http://web1.whs.osd.mil/mmid/casualty/Death\\_Rates1.pdf](http://web1.whs.osd.mil/mmid/casualty/Death_Rates1.pdf)

Thanks for that. It disagrees with your statement that the total US

sci.physics: Re: Runaway Global Warming Possible!

military deaths in Iraq is "fewer soldiers than we lose in training accidents in the same time period."

Total deaths for the last year in that .pdf (2002) is listed as 1007 with a figure of 34.4 accidental deaths per 100,000 people serving which would mean 538 for the 1,564,066 total military personnel. Likewise, the totals are low for the last 10 yrs shown.

The only way to give some kind of support to your minimization of the 1400 lives lost in Iraq is to compare accidental deaths in an army of over 2,000,000 in the 80's to deaths in an army of 100–150 thousand in Iraq. For some reason (different definition?) the accidental deaths/100K rate reached 65–72 in the early 80's.

--

Coby Beck

(remove #\Space "coby 101 @ big pond . com")