
IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by utocoman - 2008/03/26 06:26

This thread discusses the Content article: IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Another editorial from the Reich Winger's! newspaper editorial board. How interesting that the writer was able to calculate non combat deaths of other military service persons during Clinton's term but alas none could be determined under Bush's? Perhaps he ran out of fingers and toes?

As for the last paragraphs...If the "Bring 'em on" President says so it must be true just like, WMDs, biological weapons, mobile WMDs, stockpiles of weapons (even if they were dated from the Vietnam era and non-functioning), etc etc.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by The Keeper - 2008/03/26 07:14

It has also raised the hope that Iraq can become a foothold for democracy and a beacon of hope in the Mideast.

Oh, right, democracy!

CIA overthrows the democratically elected Jacob Arbenz in a military coup. Arbenz threatened to nationalize the Rockefeller-owned United Fruit Company

CIA attempts to legitimize a tyrannical puppet regime in South Vietnam, headed by Ngo Dinh Diem.

The CIA trained and supported the brutal Regime of the Shaw of Iran.

The U.S. military helps "Papa Doc" Duvalier become dictator of Haiti.

Dominican Republic - Rafael Trujillo, a murderous dictator Washington has supported since 1930.

Ecuador - CIA-backed military forces the democratically elected President Jose Velasco to resign.

Congo - The CIA assassinates the democratically elected Patrice Lumumba.

The CIA trained and supported the brutal Regime of Saddam Hussein.

Dominican Republic - The CIA overthrows the democratically elected Juan Bosch in a military coup.

Ecuador - A CIA-backed military coup overthrows President Arosemana

Brazil - A CIA-backed military coup overthrows the democratically elected government of Joao Goulart.

Indonesia - The CIA overthrows the democratically elected Sukarno with a military coup.

Congo (Zaire) - A CIA-backed military coup installs Mobutu Sese Seko as dictator.

The CIA trained and supported the brutal Regime of Manuel Antonio Noriega.

If that's Washington's idea of "democracy" then you can keep it!

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by RogerWilco - 2008/03/26 10:20

The entire editorial is based on this false premise:

"If the Iraq war helps to keep terrorists off our soil -- and by unseating Saddam Hussein it has, according to a detailed report by the Institute for Defense Analyses -- then it might be seen as a responsible move."

Who the heck is the "Institute for Defense Analyses?" I've never heard of this group. I wouldn't be surprised if it were

chaired by Donald Rumsfeld and Paul Wolfowitz.

Instead, look at the Pentagon's recently released report that is based upon the past 5 years' research of 600,000 documents recovered in Iraq. The Pentagon says that Saddam Hussein had no ties to Al Qaeda. Period.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/03/26 10:49

RogerWilco wrote:

The entire editorial is based on this false premise:

"If the Iraq war helps to keep terrorists off our soil -- and by unseating Saddam Hussein it has, according to a detailed report by the Institute for Defense Analyses -- then it might be seen as a responsible move."

Who the heck is the "Institute for Defense Analyses?" I've never heard of this group. I wouldn't be surprised if it were chaired by Donald Rumsfeld and Paul Wolfowitz.

Instead, look at the Pentagon's recently released report that is based upon the past 5 years' research of 600,000 documents recovered in Iraq. The Pentagon says that Saddam Hussein had no ties to Al Qaeda. Period.

So what is it you would like to see done now?

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by Leonardo - 2008/03/26 10:50

I am grateful for our young men and women who are keeping me safe here in the homeland. You should be grateful too.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by utocoman - 2008/03/26 11:06

I am saddened for the loss of life from both sides of these wars that did not need to happen.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by RogerWilco - 2008/03/26 11:27

Leonardo wrote:

I am grateful for our young men and women who are keeping me safe here in the homeland. You should be grateful too.

Leonardo,

I am too. Which is why I don't like the fact that President Bush has deployed 150,000 troops to fight a war that has nothing to do with our country's security. It has made us less safe.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by RogerWilco - 2008/03/26 11:31

ThomasK wrote:

So what is it you would like to see done now?

The worst way to deal with a mistake is to perpetuate it. Our treasury can't afford the \$5,000 per second it costs, and more importantly, our sons, daughters, friends and neighbors should be allowed to come home and be delivered a big apology by the President.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by Leonardo - 2008/03/26 11:34

How can you say that you are less safe? Have you been attacked lately? Has our Country been attacked since 9/11? Some of you think freedom is free. Well it isn't. There are bad people out there who would like to kill every last one of us. Those 4000 brave young men and women haven't given their lives in vain. They have helped to preserve our safety. We owe them a debt of gratitude and we should never minimize their contribution and their ultimate sacrifice.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by The Truth Typhoon - 2008/03/26 12:25

Leonardo wrote:

How can you say that you are less safe? Have you been attacked lately? Has our Country been attacked since 9/11? Some of you think freedom is free. Well it isn't. There are bad people out there who would like to kill every last one of us. Those 4000 brave young men and women haven't given their lives in vain. They have helped to preserve our safety. We owe them a debt of gratitude and we should never minimize their contribution and their ultimate sacrifice.

It is very simple to say we're less safe. Both Ridge and Chertoff have said it is not a matter of "if" the U.S. gets hit again, but "when." Sounds to me they know that whatever we've done in Iraq will not stop the next attack.

And answer this. Did not Spain and the UK fight along side us in Iraq? But did they also not get bombed in Madrid and London? So the simple question is: "If Spain and the UK were fighting with us in Iraq, why didn't it make them safer in Madrid and London?"

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by Leonardo - 2008/03/26 12:30

Spain and England got hit because they are closer to the terrorists and they weren't being as safe as we are.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by The Truth Typhoon - 2008/03/26 12:36

Leonardo wrote:

Spain and England got hit because they are closer to the terrorists and they weren't being as safe as we are.

Wrong.

The vast majority of the folks that bombed London and Madrid were citizens of the UK and Spain. It wasn't that they were closer to Iraq.

And how can you determine they "weren't being as safe as we are.?" They fought in Iraq, just like us, "so they wouldn't have to fight them at home." They did just as we did. Yet it didn't work.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by RogerWilco - 2008/03/26 12:45

Leonardo wrote:

How can you say that you are less safe? Have you been attacked lately? Has our Country been attacked since 9/11?

On 9/10/2001 you could have asked "Has our country been attacked since 1993?"

What is the difference between 2008 and 9/10/2001? Well, first of all we DID attack Al Qaeda--in Afghanistan. But we didn't finish the job. We got distracted--by Iraq.

Remember Osama Bin Laden? Maybe not, because it has been an awful long time since President Bush has uttered that name. Osama is alive and well and still making videos.

Osama Bin Laden stated his goal in a video he made before 9/11: That the attack was not meant to break the U.S., but meant to draw the U.S. into a conflict that would bleed us dry. He accomplished that goal of miring us in a quicksand war, but he is laughing because we aren't going after him! We're fighting in... IRAQ. And we are spending \$5,000 every second of every day to do it.

You don't think that in this country of 300 million people with tens of thousands of foreign visitors flying in daily, that there isn't somebody right now, waiting for the word to go buy some drums of diesel fuel and bags of fertilizer?

Some of you think freedom is free. Well it isn't. There are bad people out there who would like to kill every last one of us.

But can they? I highly doubt it. You will NEVER live a risk-free life. The question is: How much are you willing to pay? We are paying a lot in liberty, and a lot of dough, to just get a tiny bit closer to a goal that we will never reach. And that isn't a price I am willing to pay.

Those 4000 brave young men and women haven't given their lives in vain. They have helped to preserve our safety. We owe them a debt of gratitude and we should never minimize their contribution and their ultimate sacrifice.

Who has done that?

By the way, in the minute it took for you to read this post, President Bush just spent \$300,000 on his war in Iraq.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by Leonardo - 2008/03/26 12:48

The reason it was done from the inside is because they are so close to the terrorists and so many of them move into those countries. That is one of the reasons they were not being safe.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by The Truth Typhoon - 2008/03/26 13:04

Leonardo wrote:

The reason it was done from the inside is because they are so close to the terrorists and so many of them move into those countries. That is one of the reasons they were not being safe.

Man, oh man. Your lack of the command of the facts is so typical for a Republican.

Of the four bombers in the London attack, three were born in Leeds and one was born in Jamaica. Again, how does that square with your assertion that "they are so close to the terrorists." And those born in Leeds had Pakistani parents, which if you recall from listening to the Great Leader Bush, Pakistan is a fantastic partner in our "war against terror."

Again, you simply do not know what you are talking about. Iraqis are NOT traveling to London, Madrid or Omaha to do us harm. It is people in our own backyards, or in the case of 9/11 the Saudis. Wake up. Learn the facts before you waste your time here.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by RogerWilco - 2008/03/27 17:10

The escalating warfare in Basra underscores that the conflict is a civil war between political and ethnic factions in Iraq, not attacks by "Al Qaeda." Republicans keep their head buried in the sand, wanting to forget that 140,000 soldiers who have been trained to kill with deadly efficiency are instead being asked by the President to do the impossible: Police a civil war. Every Iraqi that a U.S. bullet or bomb kills just creates more enemies.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by RogerWilco - 2008/03/30 11:17

Another measurement of losses in Iraq:

In 2007 alone, the U.S. military in Iraq burned more than 1.1 billion gallons of fuel. (American Armed Forces generally use a blend of jet fuel known as JP-8 to propel both aircraft and automobiles.) About 5,500 tanker trucks are involved in the Iraqi fuel-hauling effort. That fleet of trucks is enormously costly. In November 2006, a study produced by the U.S. Military Academy estimated that delivering one gallon of fuel to U.S. soldiers in Iraq cost American taxpayers \$42â€"and that didnâ€™t include the cost of the fuel itself. At that rate, each U.S. soldier in Iraq is costing \$840 per day in fuel delivery costs, and the U.S. is spending \$923 million per week on fuel-related logistics in order to keep 157,000 G.I.s in Iraq. Given that the Iraq War is now costing about \$2.5 billion per week, petroleum costs alone currently account for about one-third of all U.S. military expenditure in Iraq.

http://www.amconmag.com/2008/2008_03_10/images/fueluse.jpg

From The American Conservative magazine.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Measuring losses in Iraq

Posted by utocoman - 2008/03/30 11:28

Roger,

It is sad to say that at least here in Happy Valley facts are not looked at in making decisions.

It is what the "Decider" says that keep the flock in line.

Heaven forbid free thinking or factual information entering in the equation. If the flock really wants to support the troops they would be supporting a draft. The "volunteers" have more than carried the weight now it is time for the war supporters to stand up and help this country out!

Getting out there and spending \$\$\$ or putting those "I support the troops" magnets on the car just hasn't made the case for the war yet. The "terrorists" have won!

=====