

---

Subject: eggmac the pacifist

Posted by [eggmac](#) on Wed, 19 Mar 2003 02:34:35 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

K9Trooper

Egg and all of you Anti-American dreamers your intentions for peace may be sincere, but you're aiming you anger at the wrong country.

No, I am not an Anti-American. Standing up for peace is not anti-americanism. Criticizing Bush's policy is not anti-americanism.

Sure, the regime in Iraq must not be tolerated. The assumption that Hussein possesses weapons of mass destruction must not be tolerated. But whatever threat Hussein might pose to the rest of the world, it is not grand enough to justify a war.

Quote:I feel America is justified in protecting it's citizenry and intrest

True, very true. But is a war on Iraq really a defensive war? Does it serve for the protection of US citizens? In my view, it does the contrary.

There are no troops of Iraq standing at the border of the USA, whereas the opposite is the case. There are no links of Iraq to 9.11. Iraq does not have any military power or any possibility to attack the USA. Iraq is controlled and supervised for 12 years by the UN and there is no evidence that weapons of mass destruction are still possessed by Saddam Hussein. Many things can be assumed, Iraq does not pose an objective threat to the USA. The media try to evoke those feelings, of course, but objectively speaking, Iraq has no possibility to threaten the USA in any way.

The USA is the most powerful nation and has the greatest influence on the world. Even the horrible attacks of september 11th do not pose a real threat to the USA, the terrorists were able to kill 'only' 3000 people (don't get me wrong, that sounds really horrible), which is, in numbers, not much compared to any other collateral damage. So there is no threat against the USA. Your children are relatively safe, your families are. But, on the other hand, the children in Iraq are not. They have to go through the horror of war. The civilians there will have to suffer. I cannot imagine that anybody wants that to happen. I think we all can agree that this is something that should be avoided.

Some of you say that it could not have been avoided but I am convinced of the opposite. If the real goal was to find weapons of mass destruction then the UN inspectors were the right means to do so. If the goal was to disarm Iraq then supervision of the UN would be the only legitimate possibility. If the goal was to get rid of Saddam Hussein then one must have judged him in the international court of war crimes. Or hell, one could have even just assassinated him if it would be really necessary. But none of that happened. This war is not about promoting democracy. It is not about freeing Iraqis from a dictatorship. This war is about power and influence, like any other war is as well.

What really scares me is that the world is more and more divided into black and white. Like Bush

said "Either you're with us or against us". This sentence has a really great impact. How can smaller countries know that they are not next on US war agenda? If they do not comply to US demands, they have to fear a military intervention. Now you may say that these countries then will stop to feed terrorism and that the world will be safer. But terrorism evolves without the help of any countries, it evolves due to extreme hatred. And after the war in Iraq, new hatred against the USA will evolve. It will have a huge impact on new generations of arabs and of the third world countries. Thus, each war will produce much more terrorism than it can erase.

It is not credible that the US government wants a war in order to remove the dictatorial regime of Saddam Hussein. Pakistan is a military dictatorship with no free speech. It is supported by the US. Ukraine is a quasi-dictatorship, Kazakhstan is a dictatorship, Turkey commits crimes against humanity (ethnic cleansing of Kurds), they are close partners to the US. Saudi-Arabia is ruled by a dictator backed up by the USA. Not to mention dozens of governments in Africa. So for me, the assumption that Bush wants a war for humane reasons only is very much not credible.

Quote:Nothing gets done by the weak in this world. They are usually the first to die

The most important democratic principle is that every minority is equal to others and must be protected. The state has the only legitimation to use violence, we are far beyond the idea of the 'survival of the fittest'. Your assumption would fit into the stone-age, but we are hopefully civilised people and not animals after all. On a political level, only the UN has the legitimation to decide on military actions against other countries. Anything else is a violation of international law. If every country would do whatever it likes then we would fall back to pre-WWII-times (which we maybe did already).

P.S.

Quote:Who's going to really understand the destructive power of something unless it is released in an environment where it can prove its worth?

That's the point, that's why we dropped them on their civilian cities.

It is a shame to read something like that. Your argument is 100% identical with the argument of Osama Bin Laden.

---