



- [Home](#)
- [Archive](#)
- [Columnists](#)
- [Video](#)
- [Blogs](#)
- [Discuss](#)
- [About](#)
- [Search](#)
- [Donate](#)

[!\[\]\(666e09182d4cd268646ea700ea60dcdf_img.jpg\) **Get AlterNet in your mailbox!**](#)

Advertisement

[Reserve the Premium Ad Spot!](#)

Advertisement

[Reserve the Silver Ad Spot!](#)

Advertisement



- JOIN US: RECLAIM OUR PRESIDENT

[Visit Draft Gore](#)

[Contribute: We Can't Do It Without You](#)

[Read more...](#)

[Sign Our Petition](#)



- [Read more...](#)



- Sexual Politics With a Twist Always. Something. Interesting. [Read more...](#)



- 10th Annual Freedom to Marry Week 10 years of work. 10 years of change. 10 years closer to equality. Now all we need is you. [Read more...](#)

[Be 1 of up to 4 ads in this strip!](#)

Advertisement



Advertisement

- AlterNetYour turn

Support AlterNet

Do you value the information you're getting from AlterNet? Please show your support with a [tax-deductible donation](#).

Feedback

Tell us [how we're doing](#).

[Search:](#)

Bush Is Badly Screwing Up the War on Terror

By [Robert Parry](#), [Consortium News](#). Posted [February 21, 2007](#).

Al-Qaeda's resurgence in new Pakistani strongholds is the latest sign that George W. Bush is losing the 'Global War on Terror' and has become a dangerous liability to the American people.

Tools

[!\[\]\(cbe2492b119e39e02a1dab2af4a4b296_img.jpg\) EMAIL](#)

[!\[\]\(e474458956c9a37fbf9586ddb60a7fa1_img.jpg\) PRINT](#)

[!\[\]\(3e2231b1ad3ca8da8658228c00dd08e0_img.jpg\) 70 COMMENTS](#)



Share and save this story:



Also in [Top Stories](#)

[Which Babies Are Real Americans?](#)

Priscilla Huang, TomPaine.com

[Maybe We Deserve to Be Ripped Off By Bush's Billionaires](#)

Matt Taibbi, RollingStone.com

[Hair Weaves Tangle Self-Image for Black Women](#)

Malena Amusa, Women's eNews

[The Life and Times of Donald Rumsfeld](#)

Roger Morris, Tomdispatch.com

[Do Sustainable Cities Have a Future?](#)

Neil Peirce, The American Prospect

More stories by [Robert Parry](#)

 [Main AlterNet RSS Feed](#)

**Get AlterNet in
your mailbox!**



Advertisement



LIBERTY
UNIVERSITY.
Distance Learning

*Challenge your mind...
build your faith.*

**Click Here To Request
FREE Information!**

Despite the sacrifices in lives, treasure and liberties, the painful reality is that the United States is losing the "war on terror" -- in large part because too many people in the Middle East and across the globe view George W. Bush as a bully and a hypocrite.

Bush has become the ugly face of America, mouthing pretty words about freedom and democracy while threatening other nations and bludgeoning those who get in his way. Perhaps even worse, Bush has shown himself to be an incompetent commander, especially for a conflict as complicated and nuanced as this one.

Indeed, it is hard to envision how the United States can win the crucial battles for the hearts and minds of key populations if Bush remains President. Arguably, Bush has become a "clear and present danger" to the interests of the American people -- yet he still has almost two years left in his term.

This predicament -- the desperate need for new U.S. leadership and the difficult fact of being stuck with Bush -- was underscored by the Feb. 19 lead article in the New York Times describing the revival of al-Qaeda as a worldwide terror network operating out of new bases in remote sections of Pakistan.

"American officials said there was mounting evidence that Osama bin Laden and his deputy, Ayman al-Zawahiri, had

been steadily building an operations hub in the mountainous Pakistani tribal area of North Waziristan," the Times reported.

"As recently as 2005, American intelligence assessments described senior leaders of al-Qaeda as cut off from their foot soldiers and able only to provide inspiration for future attacks. But more recent intelligence describes the organization's hierarchy as intact and strengthening," the Times wrote.

The *Times* [quoted one American government](#) official as saying "the chain of command has been reestablished" and that al-Qaeda's "leadership command and control is robust."

In the face of this al-Qaeda comeback, the Bush administration is reportedly debating whether to launch military strikes inside Pakistan. But that would risk destabilizing the dictatorship of Gen. Pervez Musharraf and conceivably provoking the nightmare scenario of Islamic fundamentalists gaining control of Pakistan's nuclear arsenal.

In other words, more than five years into the "war on terror," Bush has overseen a strategy that has simultaneously alienated world public opinion -- with scandals over Guantanamo Bay, Abu Ghraib and secret CIA prisons -- while fueling Islamic extremism and giving new life to the 9/11 masterminds.

The bipartisan Iraq Study Group described the situation in Iraq as "grave and deteriorating." But the same description would fit for the broader strategic position of the United States in the Middle East.

The U.S. military is facing a worsening crisis in Iraq; the Taliban is on the rise again in Afghanistan; Hezbollah is gaining strength in Lebanon; Iran is defying international pressure over its nuclear program; and now al-Qaeda -- having resettled in Pakistan -- is rebuilding its capability to strike targets beyond the Middle East.

Bush's mistakes

Much of today's crisis can be traced to Bush's arrogance and impatience. In 2001, even before the 9/11 attacks, Bush insisted on a "unilateralist" approach toward the world, asserting U.S. global hegemony under a strategy laid out by the neoconservative Project for the New American Century.

At the center of this grandiose scheme was the belief that the oil-rich Middle East could be remade through violent "regime change" in hostile countries like Iraq. Bush later broadened his target list to the "axis of evil," tossing in Iran and North Korea and making clear that other lesser enemies included the likes of Syria, Cuba and Venezuela.

While this neoconservative plan wrapped itself in the noble language of "democracy," the concept was always less about respecting the will of indigenous populations than in restructuring their economies along "free market" lines and ensuring compliant leaders.

In all of this, there was little room for compromise or negotiation with the "bad guys." It was as if the macho rhetoric of AM talk radio and Fox News had swallowed U.S. foreign policy. Real men don't negotiate with people who get in the way; you jail or kill them.

Bush also grew enamored with his "gut" instincts about war, especially after U.S.-backed forces ousted Afghanistan's Taliban leaders more quickly than many expected. Even after he let top al-Qaeda leaders slip away from Tora Bora in late 2001, Bush ignored warnings that he needed to finish the job there before turning America's attention elsewhere.

Instead, Bush redirected U.S. military assets to Iraq, a country that wasn't involved in 9/11 and actually had served as an important bulwark against Islamic fundamentalism, both the strains from Shiite-ruled Iran and Sunni-dominated al-Qaeda.

But Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein was something of a Bush family obsession since he defied President George H.W. Bush in the Persian Gulf War of 1990-91. In March 2003, Bush launched an invasion of Iraq and toppled Hussein's government in three weeks.

After basking again in public adulation as the victorious "war president," Bush stubbornly refused to acknowledge the growing seriousness of an Iraqi insurgency that rose up to challenge U.S. forces.

The U.S. occupation of Iraq -- combined with abuse scandals at U.S.-run prisons -- also fed popular anger across the Middle East. Thousands of young jihadists rallied to the cause of ousting the Americans from Muslim lands.

As the body counts grew -- thousands of U.S. soldiers and tens of thousands of Iraqis -- Bush dug in his heels deeper. When Iraq slid into chaos and then civil war, Bush again refused to acknowledge the facts in a timely fashion.

Bush also encouraged Israel to wage an ill-conceived war in southern Lebanon in summer 2006, further alienating the Muslim world. That was followed by the grisly execution of Hussein in December and new military tensions with Iran in early 2007.

In short, Bush appears determined to stampede the United States into a Middle Eastern box canyon -- after offending most Muslim allies and offering little more than military solutions to essentially political and diplomatic problems.

Al-Qaeda's favorite president

Over the past six years, the wily and ruthless leaders of al-Qaeda also came to understand that Bush was their perfect foil. The more he was viewed as the "big crusader," the more they could present themselves as the "defenders of Islam." The al-Qaeda murderers moved from the fringes of Muslim society closer to the mainstream.

After the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq in 2003, al-Qaeda's leaders transformed the conflict into both a rallying cry and a training ground. Bin Laden and Zawahiri believed the longer the Iraq War lasted the better it was for al-Qaeda.

So, in fall 2004, with Bush fighting for his political life against Democrat John Kerry, bin Laden took the risk of breaking nearly a year of silence to release a videotape denouncing Bush on the Friday before the U.S. election.

Bush's supporters immediately spun bin Laden's tirade as an "endorsement" of Kerry and pollsters recorded a jump of several percentage points for Bush, from nearly a dead heat to a five- or six-point lead. Four days later, Bush [hung on to win](#) a second term by an official margin of less than three percentage points.

The intervention by bin Laden -- essentially urging Americans to reject Bush -- had the predictable effect of driving voters to the President. After the videotape appeared, senior CIA analysts concluded that ensuring a second term for Bush was precisely what bin Laden intended.

"Bin Laden certainly did a nice favor today for the President," said deputy CIA director John McLaughlin in opening a meeting to review secret "strategic analysis" after the videotape had dominated the day's news, according to Ron Suskind's *The One Percent Doctrine*, which draws heavily from CIA insiders.

Suskind wrote that CIA analysts had spent years "parsing each expressed word of the al-Qaeda leader and his deputy, Zawahiri. What they'd learned over nearly a decade is that bin Laden speaks only for strategic reasons. ... Today's conclusion: bin Laden's message was clearly designed to assist the President's reelection."

Jami Miscik, CIA deputy associate director for intelligence, expressed the consensus view that bin Laden recognized how Bush's heavy-handed policies were serving al-Qaeda's strategic goals for recruiting a new generation of jihadists.

"Certainly," Miscik said, "he would want Bush to keep doing what he's doing for a few more years."

As their internal assessment sank in, the CIA analysts were troubled by the implications of their own conclusions. "An ocean of hard truths before them -- such as what did it say about U.S. policies that bin Laden would want Bush reelected -- remained untouched," Suskind wrote.

Even Bush recognized that his struggling campaign had been helped by bin Laden. "I thought it was going to help," Bush said in a post-election interview about the videotape. "I thought it would help remind people that if bin Laden doesn't want Bush to be the President, something must be right with Bush."

Bin Laden, a well-educated Saudi and a keen observer of U.S. politics, appears to have recognized the same point in cleverly tipping the election to Bush.

Prolonging the war

Al-Qaeda's leaders understood that a U.S. military withdrawal from Iraq might mean a renewed assault on them as well as the loss of their cause celebre for recruiting new jihadists. With Bush ensconced for a second term, that concern lessened but didn't entirely disappear.

According to a captured July 9, 2005, letter, attributed to Zawahiri, al-Qaeda leaders still fretted over the possibility that a U.S. withdrawal from Iraq could touch off the disintegration of their operations, as jihadists who had flocked to Iraq to battle the Americans might simply give up the fight and go home.

"The mujahaddin must not have their mission end with the expulsion of the Americans from Iraq, and then lay down their weapons, and silence the fighting zeal," said the "Zawahiri letter," according to a text released by the office of the U.S. Director of National Intelligence.

In another [captured letter](#), dated Dec. 11, 2005, a senior al-Qaeda operative known as "Atiyah" wrote that "prolonging the war [in Iraq] is in our interest."

Now, it appears al-Qaeda's "Bush-second-term" strategy is paying big dividends. Bush is stretching U.S. forces even thinner by escalating the American troop commitment in Iraq while also deploying military assets to threaten Shiite Iran, another enemy of the Sunni fundamentalists in al-Qaeda.

Meanwhile, al-Qaeda's Taliban allies are on the offensive against embattled NATO contingents in Afghanistan, and new al-Qaeda units are undergoing training in Pakistan. In Iraq, al-Qaeda still makes up only a small percentage of the armed insurgency -- probably less than five percent -- but it benefits from the arrival of new recruits and the opportunity to test out military tactics against the Americans.

Overall, time and momentum appear to be on al-Qaeda's side. As long as Bush remains America's leader and al-Qaeda's poster boy, there seems little chance for a more effective U.S. counterinsurgency strategy.

Unlike the Iraqi insurgents who are proving to be highly adaptive in the field, Bush can't seem to get beyond his tough-guy rhetoric and his obsession with military force. He remains bin Laden's favorite President.

According to one recent [Newsweek poll](#), 58 percent of Americans wish the Bush administration were over. But there is a long way between wishing for a desperately needed change and the slow process of the electoral calendar.

The trickier questions are: Can the United States afford 23 more months of Bush in the White House? Does his incompetence in the face of today's fast-moving crises demand extraordinary action to remove him from office through impeachment?

If impeachment is impossible, given the sizable Republican minorities in both the House and Senate, is there at least some hope for legislative remedies that can begin to correct Bush's many errors? Could patriotic Republicans confront the President and Vice President about resignations?

Or must the American people wait two more years as today's "clear and present danger" grows only more acute?

 [Digg This Story](#)

Tagged as: [war on terror](#), [bush](#)

Robert Parry's new book is [Secrecy & Privilege: Rise of the Bush Dynasty from Watergate to Iraq](#).

Story Tools:  [EMAIL](#)  [PRINT](#)  [70 COMMENTS](#)

[AlterNet Home »](#)



STAY IN THE LOOP. GET ON THE LIST.

AlterNet sends email newsletters almost every day to keep you up to date. To sign up, just enter your email address:

Advertisement

Comments

[Give Us Feedback »](#)

Tools: [\[Post a new comment\]](#) [\[Login\]](#) [\[Signup\]](#)

View:

NO MATTER WHAT PARTY YOU ARE IN

Posted by: Thundergod on Feb 21, 2007 12:34 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

WE ALL NEED A FIRST CLASS PRESIDENT THAT CAN REPRESENT AMERICA IN A WAY THAT MAKES AMERICA LOOK LIKE IT IS...

A NATION THAT WANTS THE BEST IN THE WORLD AND WELCOMES ALL THE PEOPLE IN THE WORLD TO JOIN IN ON PEACE AND FAIRNESS TO ALL...

WHEN WE GET THAT AMERICA WILL BE BETTER.

STOP THE BUSHIT!

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

Reality TV for the 21st century

Posted by: edith on Feb 21, 2007 1:22 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

This article only underscores the need for Western nations to negotiate a long-term agreement with Iran to establish full diplomatic and economic ties with that major regional power which in turn would take over together with other local govts the bulk of the duties in fighting Al Queda in SW Asia.

As for Israel's objections, they are as relevant to the US as Al Queda's desire for a US presence in the area to stir things up.

The two major sources of terror in the world are Al Queda and Israel. They both should be dumped by their neighbors who rightly despise them.

Whether Zionist lovers like Rodham-Clinton, McCain, Obama (he'll convert to Judaism before Islam, so don't worry, neocons out there), Romney, Edwards and Gore could do the right thing by cutting Israel off and thus hitting Al Queda where it really hurts is of course highly dubious.

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

Propaganda Slogan "War On Terror" is a FRAUD...

Posted by: Hal on Feb 21, 2007 1:38 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

Oddly enough many if not most don't understand this...

“War on terror” was foisted up from the ashes of an ongoing and **proven criminal 911 cover-up** directly responsible for the shredding of America’s Bill of Rights and the bankrupting of the nation. All on behalf of blood money war for private corporate oligarchs.

Even George Orwell would have been amazed at the lies [palmed off](#) for a completely [phony war](#) pinned on CIA asset [Osama bin Laden](#) (a.k.a. [Tim Osman](#)).

“I saw papers that show the U.S. knew al-Qaeda would attack cities with airplanes... I gave [the 9-11 Commision] details of specific investigation files, the specific dates, specific target information, specific managers in charge of the investigation. This is not hearsay. These are things that are documented.”

MRS. SIBEL EDMONDS (former top-level FBI translator who gave closed session testimony to the 9-11 Commission. The Bush/Cheney administration silenced Edmonds with a court gag order citing the rarely used

“state secrets privilege”. 4/2/04)

“It was a good thing for Israel...We are Israeli. We are not your problem. Your problems are our problems. The Palestinians are the problem.”

SIVAN KURZBERG (Israeli spy caught celebrating with his team on the New Jersey shore when jetliners struck the WTC twin towers. Kurzberg and his team declared knowledge of the “terrorist” act when such information was not known. Kurzberg and his crew were arrested by the FBI and released to Israel due to intense pressure from Israel and Washington 9/11/2001

“The bottom line is by 1995 there were no more weapons in Iraq... And furthermore, the CIA knew this, the British intelligence knew this, Israeli intelligence knew this, German intelligence, the whole world knew this.”

SCOTT RITTER (ex-UNSCOM inspector stating the reality that all major intelligence services knew Saddam had no WMD before invasion and conquest of Iraq. In an interview with Seymour Hersh 10/19/05)

"For bureaucratic reasons we settled on WMD [to invade Iraq] because it was the one reason everyone could agree on".

PAUL WOLFOWITZ (“neo-con” US Deputy Defense Secretary and chief architect of the Iraq War in an interview for Vanity Fair 2004)

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

» [RE: Propaganda Slogan "War On Terror" is a FRAUD...](#) Posted by: Dboy

» [Spot-on, Hal....](#) Posted by: David V

» [Its the WAR >OF< TERROR! WAR OF TERROR!](#) Posted by: JoshuaLudd

» ["War On Terror" is a FRAUD... Project for a New American Century](#) Posted by: BillDouglas

Bush has walked into every trap laid before him by al Qaeda

Posted by: Bobsays on Feb 21, 2007 2:21 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Read Clausewitz's 'On War'. It was the building block for Mao's military writings which in turn have formed the bible for all insurgents and anti-imperialists. It says clearly that an over-whelming force can never win against a people determined to maintain their dignity and sovereignty.

Yet the US has ignored all of this. During the Vietnam war a survey was taken of West Point graduates going to 'Nam to lead troops. They found not a single one had read Mao or any of the guerilla literature out there. They hadn't clue where the Vietcong were coming from or what tactics and strategies they were using. And the same stands today.

The nimrods leading the troops haven't a clue about the cultures and countries they invade. They don't know how they think and can't anticipate their future actions. And thus they will always fall into their traps.

We need totally different people leading the west. We need people who are nuanced, not the idiot boys and girls who were good at sport and smiling for the parents, but live in such a narrow world view they can't even come close to imagining what life is like outside of a world of shopping malls, Monday night football, beer, and hanging out with frat boys.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

» [I mean, really, don't you ever question why they don't teach these critical things to their](#) Posted by: Prophit

» [Ah, more conspiracy-mongering](#) Posted by: brunowe

» [It looks like more and more everyday that a double whammy is coming](#) Posted by: Bobsays

» [RE: Bush has walked into every trap laid before him by al Qaeda](#) Posted by: Lauren

Didn't finish reading it yet and already I have two comments.... LOL

Posted by: Prophit on Feb 21, 2007 3:39 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

1. Bin Laden is dead and so is his commander so WHO is rebuilding Al Qaeda????? Could it be their original sponsors in a country that enjoys the support of their original sponsors??

2. Today, February 21st 2007, this author says he "has become a dangerous liability to the American people???? NO, I AM SHOCKED, LOL He is 6 years too late. Many of us saw that years ago. Where was he back then before all this happened when we could have stopped it.

Will add to the list as I finish reading it. Just had to take the time to do this now before I forgot.... LOL I am getting older... LOL

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

» [Bin Laden is dead??? Since when?](#) Posted by: Ellie1

» [RE: Bin Laden is dead - Links to many msm sources:](#) Posted by: rwa

Right on the mark

Posted by: feduphoosier on Feb 21, 2007 4:17 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

*"Bin Laden certainly did a nice favor today for the President," said deputy CIA director John McLaughlin in opening a meeting to review secret "strategic analysis" after the videotape had dominated the day's news, according to Ron Suskind's *The One Percent Doctrine*, which draws heavily from CIA insiders.*

Ah... there is that national media again, playing their part perfectly.

Bin Laden and Bush have a symbiotic relationship: bin Laden needs Bush as a foil to drive new recruits into al Qaeda, and Bush needs bin Laden to remain at large, so he will continue to scare Americans into 'going along.' Oddly, behind the scenes, the bin Laden family and the Bush family are undoubtedly still great business friends. Such tangled webs... but great profit to be had by all (well, except for the American and Iraqi people. But its never about the people, is it?)

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

How can any war be won?

Posted by: mfogler on Feb 21, 2007 4:33 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

You're giving the "War on Terrorism" too much legitimacy. It's not like this war, if done differently would be won

and everything would be great. Wars, let alone completely fabricated wars like the "War on Terrorism, are not won. "You can no more win a war than win an earthquake," said Jeannette Rankin. This whole thing is madness and it's criminal.

[\[<< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >>\]](#)

Human Relationships

Posted by: Dboy on Feb 21, 2007 4:34 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

This author has analyzed the human relationships involved fairly well, but he's completely lost on the motive for these events. He needs to read more Alternet.

Dboy

[\[<< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >>\]](#)

Back on the Table

Posted by: Urstrly on Feb 21, 2007 4:50 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

I agree with Parry: we can't withstand two more years of this, and if we don't have the votes for impeachment, what are the (legal) alternatives? Too many Democrats are absorbed in building their warchests, but I'm hoping someone not running for president will step forward. Since people seem to have written off Kucinich for president, maybe he'll start the ball rolling. Or maybe Ralph Nader and the Greens will rev up. I used to hope Colin Powell would be the guy, but it doesn't seem to be in him.

I remember thinking we'd never get rid of Nixon. Then Agnew was confronted with demanding bribes and the Watergate committee found "the smoking gun," and the whole administration collapsed. This administration is far more corrupt, and somewhere there's a thread that could unravel the whole thing. We just have to find it. If, for example, the US or the Israelis attack Iran, I can see that the Republicans might tip in favor of impeachment. I'm hoping for something less deadly myself.

[\[<< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >>\]](#)

[» RE: Back on the Table](#) Posted by: oregoncharles

Bush is a liability for America

Posted by: sheena2u on Feb 21, 2007 4:59 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

The way Bush has dealt with Al Queda is similar to the way he dealt with the disaster after hurricane Katrina. Bush is a simpleton, and he is a child in the worst sense of the word. Cheney seems to only care about lining his pockets, and is willing to sell the American people down the river to gain his aims. No, America cannot stand 23 more months of Bush/Cheney. If the Republicans can convince Bush and Cheney to step down they would be doing a great thing for America.

[\[<< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >>\]](#)

LetsDance

Posted by: JonPaul on Feb 21, 2007 5:12 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

"The War on Terror", WHAT A CROCK! Anyone who believes that there is such a thing is a complete fool. The U.

S. is conducting a 150 years war of terror against the world, it's resources and it's people. Everyone who repeats the drivel is culpable. WAKE UP!

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

"wily and ruthless" al-Qaeda a SHAM?

Posted by: Hal on Feb 21, 2007 5:27 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

If evil old Al-Qaeda is not some kind of [CIA](#) snake oil sting why does Israel, Britain and the U.S. in the business of either [faking](#) if not [planting themselves](#) and [pretending](#) at being wicked al-Qaeda agents.

And even when these phony "al-Qaeda" actors get caught, they're [whisked away](#) so others can presumably take their place and keep the bloody circus going.

Old [CIA](#) asset Osama bin "[Tim Osman](#)" Laden may have been tickled (if he were alive)...

Like I said, George Orwell would have had a field day.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

[» RE: "wily and ruthless" al-Qaeda a SHAM?](#) Posted by: babs

Buy the Premise Fight the War Support the Troops ...

Posted by: AdamSelene40 on Feb 21, 2007 5:35 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

It's not that there are no 'Terrorists'. There are always some terrorists. What there is not is "The Terrorists" a mysterious, band of supernaturally powerful 'others' who can 'want to kill us and our families' who can 'destroy our way of life' -- the fighting of which is our first, third, and last priority.

So we dispatch an army to a far away place to fight the terrorists. And in the nature of things, soldiers get killed, but when 'morale is good' they also enjoy the killing. Now the Brave Boys and Girls become one of the reasons to fight the war. The troops will feel bad if the people back home don't love and admire them. Not loving and admiring the troops, the mission and the commander puts the brave boys and girls at physical risk. We can't quit now.

And then there is the homeland security: a bottomless pit for tax dollars, and endless cornucopa of profit for security consultants and security contractors alike. It also provides superb cover for generally tightening civilian discipline: instilling useful habits of anxious obedience in people who might otherwise question and criticize.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

[» RE: Buy the Premise Fight the War Support the Troops ... even if you don't believe in the BS.](#) Posted by: symcokid

"The Terrorists are Winning -- Vote Progressive"

Posted by: AdamSelene40 on Feb 21, 2007 5:44 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

As long as 'our' writers keep repeating the tropes: "Al Qaeda threatens us" (like Robert Perry in this article) and "We support the troops" (like Randi Rhodes on Air America ... it really doesn't matter whether we vote Republican or Demikin ... whoever is elected will be required to 'keep us safe' with budget busting, liberty destroying Defense and Homeland Security establishments.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

» [Thank you for that siccinct and pointed commentary..... its sooooo true and it begins to....](#) Posted by: Prophit

» [It stinks of desperation...](#) Posted by: rwa

» [RE: It stinks of desperation...](#) Posted by: pingoo

» [focus on what we have total proof about - 9/11](#) Posted by: rwa

» [What is going on and why????](#) Posted by: pingoo

» [RE: "The Terrorists are Winning -- Vote Progressive"](#) Posted by: picket

Once Upon a Time...

Posted by: pcushniesr on Feb 21, 2007 6:13 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

George Bush sits at his desk in the Oval Office, squinting and scratching his head as he tries to read reports containing words of more than one syllable. Suddenly the door swings violently open and crashes against the wall. Enter the entire Joint Chiefs of Staff, all in full uniform, medals and ribbons ablaze in a riot of color and shapes. Following behind are military policemen from each branch of the military, all spit and polish. Then come members of the Secret Service, wearing their traditional somber black suits, curly wires dangling from their ears as ethereal voices speak in their heads. They are followed by the entire membership of SCOTUS, each one wearing the official robe of office. In the hallway outside the office are more people, familiar faces from both houses of Congress, both sides of the aisle. No one is smiling. Absolutely no one is smiling. Bush looks around with an idiot's expression on his face (actually grateful for being taken away from the intel report with the big words that he cannot understand). A noise from outside the building momentarily draws his attention to one of the office windows. On the grounds below, he sees hundreds-- no, thousands-- no, make that millions-- oh, hell, people beyond counting-- carrying torches and shouting, "Burn the monster! Burn the Monster!" A general steps forward and brings Bush's attention, such as it is, back to the people in the tightly-packed room. The general says, "George W. Bush, you are hereby placed under arrest, along with you entire criminal cabal, to answer for your crimes against the Nation and its people, crimes against humanity and the English language. You will be publicly hung until you are dead and your body left to rot..."

And then I awake. Oh, damn! I try desperately to regain sleep and pick up the wonderful dream again. I so much want to see the public hanging, but sleep and the dream elude me. Daylight presses against the windows of my room and I get out of bed to make coffee. I burn the toast and the smell is like that of burning torches.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

» [RE: Once Upon a Time...](#) Posted by: Lauren

Pride, Greed, and Stubbornness

Posted by: Rath47 on Feb 21, 2007 6:16 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Looks like all three are in full force with George...

Hey, this also isn't the right article to post this in, but since the latest 9/11 articles no longer accept posts, I'm putting it here anyway. Someone called for a debate in the last article, and I thought that was a great idea. So I

opened up a blog that is just for that purpose, to debate 9/11. And I mean cleanly debate. I want to look at a single issue each week and present as much of both sides as possible. All information must be referenced. Anyway, I won't go on too long here...

If you're interested, check it out:

<http://911debate.wordpress.com/>

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

» [George Monbiot's Sour 9/11 Grapes](#) Posted by: rwa

» [Actually, it's a totally substanceless rant \(NT\)](#) Posted by: brunowe

» [You're Forgetting That Even Mindless Crap Has "Substance"!](#) Posted by: Douglas

» [Retort not intended to address Monbiot's factual innadequacies nm](#) Posted by: rwa

Shouldn't That Be...

Posted by: NoPCZone on Feb 21, 2007 6:28 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Past Tense, as in Bush has screwed up the GWT?

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

The revolution of 2012

Posted by: solrev on Feb 21, 2007 6:34 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

It is sad that Americans do not understand the Muslim revolution in the Middle East. We are so tangled up in terrorist propaganda; Arab versus Persian or Sunni versus Shia propaganda that we fail to understand the people. With a little understanding of the Muslim revolution, everything that has happened in Iraq was predictable. Everything we do in the Middle East ends up supporting the revolutionaries; American foreign policy is designed to have the opposite effect. We need to stop taking sides in the revolution because the nonhumans and their puppets say it is in their best interest. It is in the best interest of we the people of America to get out of the Middle East and let them have their revolution. It is in the best interest of we the people of the Middle East to win that revolution.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

» [RE: The revolution of 2012](#) Posted by: Basenjjs

Huh?

Posted by: Wacre on Feb 21, 2007 7:00 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Help me understand why people buy into the this whole "War On Terror" paradigm? It is as nonsensical as the actions of our president (not saying too much, I know) and goes a long way toward validating his actions.

A true "War On Terror"-- as an aside, notice how we always seem to have to have a 'War' on something. A war on this, a war on that. The only thing any of these 'wars' seem to have in common is that, to varying degrees, they don't work -- would be focusing on things like the disparity of wealth between the rich and the middle classes; focusing on helping the poor, as opposed to scapegoating them; making the corporation subservient to the will of people,

instead of the other way around; making the economy serve a majority of the people, instead of the scions of Wall Street, etc.

There is no "War On Terror". In fact the very idea is nonsense. How do you have a war on an idea? This is just simply another method of transferring wealth from those that have least to those that have more.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

» [RE: Huh? Who's side are you on?](#) Posted by: [solrev](#)

Rule through Chaos

Posted by: [jjz999](#) on Feb 21, 2007 7:07 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Iraq is a screaming success for Bush. He's just applied his 'man of peace' Sharon's 'rule through chaos' of suppressing the population that you are stealing from. More important than immiserating the victims, the occupation aggressively promotes ethnic, sectarian, racial, and confessional violence among the victim population. That was the purpose of green-lighting the Israeli attack, as one Israeli general put it, to bomb Lebanon back 2 decades, in order to encourage other Lebanese to start a civil war with the Hezbollah, which arose 3 years into the Israeli invasion of Lebanon as freedom fighters that eventually forced the Israeli withdrawal. In hopes of turning other southern Lebanese against Hezbollah, in the last couple of days of it's terror campaign, the Israelis plastered the populated areas and the agricultural fields with cluster bombs. Since a good percentage of cluster bombs don't explode on contact, the Israelis were just planting mine fields around the homes of the people and the land they grew their crops to survive.

Bush again applied the 'rule through chaos' when a group brought peace to Somalia by defeating the war lords that drove the US out of Somalia after Blackhawk Down. Through US air strikes and bribing the Ethiopian dictator to invade, chaos was restored and the bickering war lords were restored to power.

The same occurred in Afghanistan, when, according to Woodward's book, Bush was overjoyed when it only cost the US \$70 million to bribe the drug lords that the Taliban had closed down to fight the Taliban. Now the jostling warlords are back and have restored Afghanistan as the supplier of 90% of the world's heroin supply. Bush also paid them bounties that the US flyers dropped throughout Afghanistan said would make them rich to fill-up Bush's PR stunt at 'law-free' Gitmo. Bush has done everything he could to avoid public trials for the Gitmo victims because the only evidence Bush has against them are confessions obtained through torture.

In Iran, Bush has sent in special op troops to carry out joint terrorist operations with a group that the US has designated a terrorist organization inside Iran and pinpoint targets for air strikes like power, water and sewage treatment plants, hospitals and other civilian infrastructure targets. Pacifica has reported that the bunker buster nukes don't work because they are only capable of penetrating 100-200 feet of dirt.

The real goal is to control the oil of the Mideast. As for Iraq, since Bremer's rule, the US is pushing it's puppet government to legally privatize Iraq oil to the vast benefit of private oil companies. Almost all other developing countries own their own natural resources. The current iteration puts oil company representatives on the board to run Iraqi oil. Former iterations that explicitly gave oil companies 40 year contracts at twice as favorable terms as what the oil companies were able to get elsewhere. A fragmented Iraq would only add to the leverage of the oil companies.

Oil is the only thing that matters to Bush in Iraq. The US troops will be in Iraq and the rest of the Middle East will be there forever to protect US corporate interests. It's blood for oil. It's the Raygun/Bush squared program of the upward redistribution of wealth and income to the top 1% richest Americans.

But this has always been the role of the US military. To paraphrase what Marine Gen. Smedley Butler said of the first half of the 20th century, war is a racket of the US corporations and the military are just the enforcers for the Al Capones.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

Bush Doctrine a Total Disaster

Posted by: Peacemaker on Feb 21, 2007 7:27 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

The Bush Doctrine of preemption is a total disaster. President Bush keeps saying we've got to fight the terrorists overseas, so we don't have to face them here at home again. And he goes on to say that if we were to leave Iraq before the job is done, the enemy would follow us home. Those assertions, along with the terrorists are out to get us because they hate freedom, are overly simplistic.

Terrorism can exist in every country in the world. Is it realistic to believe we can hunt down and kill every single terrorist on their turf so we won't have to fight them on our homeland? Is it really possible to keep all terrorists out of our country and to prevent acts of terrorism from occurring here? How will we know we got the job done in Iraq so the enemy won't follow us home?

The Iraq debacle has created many more anti-U.S. terrorists. They can continue to wreak havoc on our country without ever setting foot on the homeland. It was unwise and very foolish to invade and occupy Iraq and get America entangled in the seemingly everlasting "eye for an eye" cycle of violence that prevails in the Middle East. We are paying big-time in human lives and money for our colossal blunder. We were wrong in thinking our mighty "shock and awe" military machine would make our country and the rest of the world more secure.

The terrorism scourge did not evolve overnight or rise out of a vacuum. There are reasons why terrorism exists. I don't know what all of them are, but I do not believe terrorism exists simply because terrorists hate freedom. We need to learn the causes of terrorism and find ways to remedy its effects, or make things right. The future of the world is at stake in the land where civilization began--between Iraq's Tigris and Euphrates Rivers.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

Certifibably Pathological

Posted by: kgs1947 on Feb 21, 2007 7:40 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Impeach the idiot! Bush is certifiably pathological. The only way we are going to have peace, regain our ethical reputation, and create a path toward justice is by impeaching the Bush Administration, starting with Little George. Not only is he a alcoholic who is NOT in recovery, he is pathologically ill. Check your DSM IV.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

Opening statement a false premise

Posted by: rwa on Feb 21, 2007 7:45 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Al-Qaeda's resurgence in new Pakistani strongholds is the latest sign

This is simply propaganda based on anonymous "U.S. official sources. How foolish are we? Does the writer even present the fact that this is a contested allegation?

ISLAMABAD (AFP) - Pakistan has dismissed "absurd" US claims that Al-Qaeda has established compounds in a remote tribal area to train small groups of operatives for possible attacks on the West.

A US official who spoke on condition of anonymity said Monday that compounds training 10 or 20 people at a time had been detected over the past year in a semi-autonomous tribal area along the mountainous border with Afghanistan.

But Pakistan foreign ministry spokeswoman Tasnim Aslam angrily rejected the allegations, the latest in a series to trouble Washington's relations with its key ally in the "war on terror."

"This is an absurd report and we dismiss it," Aslam told AFP on Tuesday...

Pakistan military spokesman Major General Shaukat Sultan said that the report deserved no response, as the government had answered similar questions during a media trip to the North Waziristan tribal area at the weekend.

"You are bombarding us with the same question again and again and we have given our point of view," Sultan said...

yahoo.com

[\[<< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >>\]](#)

The war on terror is bogus.

Posted by: sonex on Feb 21, 2007 7:52 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

More disinformation from AlterNet, the war on terror is a farce, so we are to debate who is best qualified to wage this make believe war on terror, give us a break...

[\[<< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >>\]](#)

Bush is a bungler, because he does not care.

Posted by: monkeywrench on Feb 21, 2007 7:53 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

Bush, the hood ornament, and Cheney, the real driver of the Limo of State, have screwed up the war on terror because they do not care about the war on terror. They used the terrorist act of 9/11 (I won't comment here about their involvement in it) as an excuse to secure Middle East oil and to replace a Taliban/Argentina contract to build pipelines from the Caspian Sea oil and gas fields to a western Pacific Ocean port (read Greg Palast for more on this). In short, the "war on terror" by the Bush crime cabal is a coverup for stealing resources. As usual, it is about OIL and empire, and nothing more.

Don't get me wrong; there is a war on terror, because a great deal of the terror is based as much upon our imperialistic reach into muslim territory as it is upon clashing ideologies (example: Osama Bin Laden was infuriated that we had built a permanent, ENORMOUS, military base in Ryadh and were flaunting our western ways in one of Islam's holiest cities).

As usual, consistant with one of the sadder aspects of human history, the "war" is about treasure, empire, and greed. There are better ways to fight terrorism – such as cutting its roots by improving people's economic future while respecting their beliefs – than simply killing them in head-to-head battle, and then collecting our plunder. Sure,

there are a small number of terrorists out there to whom reason and cooperation mean nothing; but by acting like pirates, we are merely adding fuel to their fire.

[[« Reply to this comment »](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

[» RE: Bush is a bungler, because he does not care.](#) Posted by: oregoncharles

This article is part of the propaganda effort to make the "war on terror" seem real

Posted by: rwa on Feb 21, 2007 7:56 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

But Americans are catching on as the article below shows:

Audit: Anti-terror case data flawed

By LARA JAKES JORDAN, Associated Press Writer

Federal prosecutors counted immigration violations, marriage fraud and drug trafficking among anti-terror cases in the four years after 9/11 even though no evidence linked them to terror activity, a Justice Department audit said Tuesday.

Overall, nearly all of the terrorism-related statistics on investigations, referrals and cases examined by department Inspector General Glenn A. Fine were either diminished or inflated. Only two of 26 sets of department data reported between 2001 and 2005 were accurate, the audit found.

Responding, a Justice spokesman pointed to figures showing that prosecutors in the department's headquarters for the most part either accurately or underreported their data — underscoring what he called efforts to avoid pumping up federal terror statistics.

The numbers, used to monitor the department's progress in battling terrorists, are reported to Congress and the public and help, in part, shape the department's budget.

"For these and other reasons, it is essential that the department report accurate terrorism-related statistics," the audit concluded.

Fine's office took care to say the flawed data appear to be the result of "decentralized and haphazard" methods of collection or disagreement over how the numbers are reported, and do not appear to be intentional.

Still, the errors led Sen. Charles E. Schumer, D-N.Y., to question whether the department had exaggerated the number of terror cases.

"If the Department of Justice can't even get their own books in order, how are we supposed to have any confidence they are doing the job they should be?" said Schumer, who sits on the Senate Judiciary Committee, which oversees the department. "Whether this is just an accounting error or an attempt to pad terror prosecution statistics for some other reason, the Department of Justice of all places should be classifying cases for what they are, not what they want us to think them to be."

...Much of the problem stemmed from how that office defines anti-terrorism cases.

A November 2001 federal crackdown on security breaches at airports, for example, yielded arrests on immigration

and false document charges, but no evidence of terrorist activity. Nonetheless, the attorneys' office lumped them in with other anti-terror cases since they were investigated by federal Joint Terrorism Task Forces or with other counterterror measures.

Other examples, according to the audit, included:

_Charges against a marriage-broker for being paid to arrange six fraudulent marriages between Tunisians and U.S. citizens.

_Prosecution of a Mexican citizen who falsely identified himself as another person in a passport application.

_Charges against a suspect for dealing firearms without a license. The prosecutor handling the case told auditors it should not have been labeled as anti-terrorism.

"We do not agree that law enforcement efforts such as these should be counted as anti-terrorism," the audit concluded. Even if those cases were not taken into account, the audit said, the U.S. attorneys' office had overstated statistics in all other categories it reported.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

retired military

Posted by: theonopolis on Feb 21, 2007 8:11 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

WAIT-AND-SEE, is the way many are viewing this thing about GWB regarding the remainder of his term. With the problems that he has caused our country thus far, I have a simple, but rather straight-forward approach which requires a gutsy Congress to enact. Without a long outdrawn rehash of the things we already know about the man and his administration, on the grounds of international law .. and the laws he has caused to be broken due to his lies and invasion of a sovereign land. With that alone being the starting point, strip that man and his VEEP of all further powers to govern any affairs of our nation, and then turn the two of them over to the Hague to be sentenced accordingly under international law, never mind the outcry that they are Americans --- so were the ones whose lives were wasted based on their phony reasons for war in Iraq. A needless and senseless war which has become a living nightmare of violence which extends back to the intervention based on his decision to invade on premature grounds, which has placed that country since then in a perilous position split by sectarian violence, genocide, national strife of every known kind which has reached a state of instability that can no longer be contained. A governing body which cannot venture too far outside for fear of their personal safety, nor are they overly anxious to be puppets for the WH, a country in chaos lapsed into limbo. A country that GWB and his administrators have ruined... and thousands of innocent Iraqis that have been exposed to death or injury because this president chose to ignore the sanctions of the UN and other members of the international community and falsely chose to play god in an instance where so many lives were at stake ... inexcuseable for a world leader.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

a sure-fire way to get Cheney/Bush out

Posted by: kellysgarden on Feb 21, 2007 8:36 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

of office would be to re-open the 9/11 Commission to expose their complicity in those attacks. 9/11 was nothing more than a false-flag op to enable Cheney/Bush to justify the oil wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and now soon to include Iran.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

[» RE: a sure-fire way to get Cheney/Bush out](#) Posted by: sonex

Another Fake Lefty Column on Bush's War on Terror.

Posted by: BillDouglas on Feb 21, 2007 9:17 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

The so called "left" in America is duped or worse regarding the war on terror. Carl Bernstein (All the Presidents Men) in an article for Rolling Stone wrote that about 500 mainstream US media were on the CIA payroll.

It would be utterly naive to believe that they don't have lackies in "lefty" media. The pathetic hit pieces on 9/11 truth seekers by so called "lefty" media . . . shows a disturbing likely infiltration.

Articles like this one, that pretend that 9/11 was not an inside job by people within our own government, bend your mind exactly in the way 9/11 was intended to. To prep you for a permanent war economy, where our treasure is squandered to defend oil companies profits, rather than to create a clean energy economy.

Without 9/11, America would be focusing on educating our children, creating a green economy, lessening global poverty, etc. If you believe those who are running America want those things to happen, you need therapy. In months leading up to the Iraq war 96% of the talking heads on network news were pro-war. Only 4% were skeptical or opposed (Fair Media). So, we now know corporate media is infiltrated and cowed.

Now it is time to look at our precious "lefty" media, which I have read and supported for years. But, after their participation in the attack on those seeking 9/11 truth, I will never trust the so called progressive media again.

[\[« Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment »\]](#)

[» RE: Another Fake Lefty Column on Bush's War on Terror.](#) Posted by: dover23

[» RE: Another Fake Lefty Column on Bush's "War on Terror".](#) Posted by: rwa

the republicans don't give a flying f

Posted by: diamondvajra on Feb 21, 2007 11:06 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

it's obvious that all they care about is their party and their power. bush needs to go, so do cheney and the whole gang. i don't think there is any way they can be reigned in. and they are backed into the wall, which is obviously where bin laden would like them to be.

i feel very sorry for the afghan and iraqi women. this beknighted understanding of the deen will ensure their suffering for years to come.

and our beknighted president and his supporters are going to take us down a road without redemption no matter how many of us march or call or email them. so what do we do?

in the old sufi stories of times like this there are a few responses

- 1.leave the country
- 2.fein insanity
- 3.stay home

of course in those days there were no "nuclear" weapons, bio agents. instead there was hassan bani saba and the hashhashins and the skillful manipulation of minds. as well of course as the christian crusader who brought back

with him the spices and ideas of a very different world.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

[» RE: the republicans don't give a flying f](#) Posted by: Lauren

Wrong Verb Tense

Posted by: LeaderofMen on Feb 21, 2007 11:21 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Bush hasn't become a liability.

He was a liability before 9/11. He's simply proven it over and over and over and over and over again.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

BUSH IS BADLY SCREWING UP THE WAR ON TERROR

Posted by: larrykueneman on Feb 21, 2007 11:59 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

For most of my 75 years I have viewed world events through the lens of my belief that civilization was not a blip in the history of man, but is in fact the process of becoming human.

The key to ending terrorism by Islamists or members of any other religion is education away from fear-and-faith-based beliefs. As difficult as it is to even think about, we need to draw the radical muslims (and all violent people) into discussions about the areas in which we are the same rather than focusing on how we are different.

I learned long ago that the raising of a child can be likened to the taming of a wild animal. Punishment of these childish people for their very extensive transgressions must not even be an issue. If we are to ever achieve civilization, we must begin by forgiving, but with an unrelenting leaning toward education of us all.

With this view, it is clear that our current President is simply nowhere near equipped mentally to even stagger toward that goal. That education cannot begin until dubya is history following the 2008 election.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

[» RE: BUSH IS BADLY SCREWING UP THE WAR ON TERROR](#) Posted by: Lauren

What "war on terror"?

Posted by: willymack on Feb 21, 2007 12:13 PM

[[Report this comment](#)]

The war on terror is a fiction, just like the illegitimate claim of bush that he's President of the United States. I'll say one thing for this evil gang; they're consistent, and haven't done a single thing in the past 6 years that has had a positive effect or been good for the American people. That's quite an "accomplishment" in itself, and unique in our history. At the rate we're going, we'll be lucky if our country isn't a pile of radioactive rubble in a decade or so.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

"Screwing up"!?!?!? You're kidding, right?

Posted by: xbj on Feb 21, 2007 1:07 PM

[[Report this comment](#)]

With the amount of (borrowed from China and Japan) money gone from the American Treasury forever into the pockets of Cheney, the rest of the elite, War Pigs like Tony Blankley and any stockholder immoral enough to hold offense contractor stock?

"Screwing up" my ass... why the "War" "Against" "Terror" has been the biggest bonanza for the immoral rich of all time. It's party time for the War Pigs, dancing a jig all the way to their investment houses.

What the heck are a couple of hundred thousand dead innocent babies and women and children and throwaway American troops dying from DU and sniper fire and IE's made, not in Iran, but in SAUDI and Pakistan with American dates and English writing on them, when there's a billion or two to be made, eh?

Just the price of doing business... long as it's YOUR kids and not theirs'.

Happy days are here again... endless war, depopulation of "useless eaters" and endlessly high oil prices, it's what's for dinner.

Nazi Amerika's LAST SUPPER. Because the dancing War Pigs are about to have their house of straw built on sand huffed, and puffed, and blown right down to black glass.

[[« Reply to this comment »](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

I dont agree...I agree

Posted by: pauline.chantal on Feb 21, 2007 1:30 PM

[[Report this comment](#)]

I dont agree if it comes to all the AlQaida threat crap with OBL as the head of the snake...

As Bush once said: "I don't really spend so much time on him"
maybe at least that's a truth...

the Situation in Iraq, on the other hand, is quite a desaster - esp. on the back of the iraqi people and hundredthousands of troops.

here I agree: Mr.Bush is a bad leader. GWB and his Admin. have proven to be unbelievable incompetent of handling the Plan "Iraqi Freedom". The Post War Management was and remains disastrous to present day. The War on Terror is a desaster! The Securitylevel for the average Iraqi person is utterly devastating - unacceptable for our standards, measurement and esp. goals!

So far, the "War on Terror", which is funded with >500billion\$/pa, by US Public Budget alone, has achieved - 6 Times MORE Terror Attacks within 5-6 years.

And it costs US Society a needlessly endangered young Soldiergeneration.

my hopes, as a european :-)) would be, that people in the US - realise - that their VOTE is really worth alot!
Your political system decides over war and peace on earth the most - so please don't vote for a similar incompetent and even criminal Administration again - Please ;-)

Greetings from the Top of the Alps - Snow at last :-)

[[« Reply to this comment »](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

"Mission Accomplished"

Posted by: Philip Newton on Feb 21, 2007 1:58 PM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Bush will eventually secure Iraqi oil for multinational oil interests.

That was his mission.

Accomplished, soon.

Makes me feel globally warm all over to have a guy in the Oval Office who knows what he's doing -- and for what, and to whom.

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

[» Oil infrastructure is impossible to secure, your post makes no sense](#) Posted by: rwa

The War on Terror is a purposeful deception

Posted by: SevenStarHand on Feb 21, 2007 3:00 PM

[[Report this comment](#)]

The evidence is overwhelming that the entire war on terror is a well-planned and long-term deception. When you follow the money and analyze both recent history and current results, it is obvious the NeoCons and other key players set the stage for this situation, armed the so-called terrorists, gave them their marching orders, and cultivated the conditions for the Neo-Crusades.

The 9/11 attacks simply could not have succeeded without a combination of direct assistance and a series of apparent "mistakes" that were perfectly timed to permit those planes to reach their targets unhindered. Without 9/11, there also would not have been another war with Iraq. When you treat this situation as a crime scene to determine who had the motive and profited the most from it, the leadership of pivotal western nations (USA, Britain, Italy, Vatican, etc.)and of course Israel, stand out as red flags.

The time is long overdue for truth and justice to finally prevail in this world...

[Here is Wisdom !!](#)

[<< [Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) >>]

- [Home](#)
- [Top Stories](#)
- [Columnists](#)
- [Video](#)
- [Blogs](#)
- [Discuss](#)
- [RSS/XML](#)
- [About](#)
- [Search](#)
- [Donate](#)
- [Contact Us](#)
- [Advertise](#)

Reproduction of material from any AlterNet pages without written permission is strictly prohibited.
© 2007 Independent Media Institute. All rights reserved.