

## For what it is worth, Iran and Preemptive War

By Keith S. Brown

12 June 2007 © Keith S Brown

Reference:

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/06/10/ftn/main2908476.shtml>

On 10 June 2007, US (Independent Connecticut) Senator Joe Lieberman stated,

***“I think we've got to be prepared to take aggressive military action against the Iranians to stop them from killing Americans in Iraq... And to me, that would include a strike into... over the border into Iran, where we have good evidence that they have a base at which they are training these people coming back into Iraq to kill our soldiers.”***

And those comments were cheered on by postings such as the following:

I think this regime is just as bad as Hitler was. So why wait?

When a person has a cancer, does she wait to get a treatment? Iran has a cancer and USA is able to do the treatment. It might be quite messy, but letting the mad mullahs get nukes would be much much worst.

Posted by: Rémi Houle | 11-Jun-07 8:10:40 PM

Iran is getting away with murder, it's about time they felt the pain. Missile strikes on their Command structure would send an appropriate message to the world and the people of Iran.

Nobody would care if Iran had nukes if they were a real democracy that respected human rights and individual freedoms, they could waste all the money they want on them if that were the case.

Posted by: philanthropist | 11-Jun-07 9:17:18 PM

My response follows:

*We learn from history that we don't study history.*

Thus the following historical hypothetical: *"If a foreign power had done to the US, what we've done to Iran since 1953, how would we've reacted... and continue to react?"*

If the US had suffered decades of brutal police-state imprisonments, beatings, and executions... all aided, abetted and backed by a foreign power, how would we react to that power once the imposed police state was swept aside?

Then also consider the following historical hypothetical: *"In the 70's, the US went from a oil exporter to an oil importer. If a dominant foreign power told the US during the oil crisis, 'Sorry guys, we don't trust you with nuclear energy. Once your oil is depleted, we expect you freeze in the winter, broil in the summer, walk if you want to travel, and return to a poverty-stricken third-world status.'* How would we have reacted?"

I was in the Orient during the early 70's, but as I recall, Americans back home were none too happy with the results of the oil embargo... and by comparison that was merely a temporary inconvenience.

A teacher once stated, *"If you reverse the circumstances and still find yourself happy with the results, then you've discovered the essence of an ethical decision."*

If I assume I'm right simply because I'm stronger than anyone else, I'm arrogant. If I attempt to enforce that arrogance, I'm a bully. If I kill others who have not attacked me to enforce that arrogance, I'm a murderer.

I wholeheartedly believe in self-defense, both on a personal and national level. But preemptive attack is not self-defense... not on a personal level, nor on a national level, it is but naked aggression.

In my home town, a bravado invaded a home and killed the occupants... to teach them and their surviving family members a lesson in humility. I condemned him to death row. If I don't tolerate such nonsense with my neighbors, then why should I tolerate the same kind of behavior from the people who claim to represent me?

We don't like it when we as a nation are bullied, though admittedly it's been a few years since that last happened. So what God given right makes it acceptable for us to bully others?

Regarding Houle's comment: *"When a person has a cancer, does she wait to get a treatment? Iran has a cancer and USA is able to do the treatment. It might be quite messy, but letting the mad mullahs get nukes would be much much worst."*

When did you last submit to involuntary surgery? Not recently? No? Certainly you will have no problem if the CDC decided this or that part of your anatomy needs to be sliced off... for your own good, of course. And while the procedure might be quite messy and painful, I expect you will dutifully submit without protest.

With regard to philanthropist's comment: *"Iran is getting away with murder, it's about time they felt the pain. Missile strikes on their Command structure would send an appropriate message to the world and the people of Iran."*

Are missile strikes on the Command structure the appropriate response for engaging in proxy war? If so, then you'll not protest when any of the recipients of our past proxies target missile strikes on Washington and New York.

Is not turn-about fair play?

No?

Then by which special rule-book do you operate?

--Keith

In response to:

[http://westernstandard.blogs.com/shotgun/2007/06/lieberman\\_got\\_t.html#comment-72446226](http://westernstandard.blogs.com/shotgun/2007/06/lieberman_got_t.html#comment-72446226)

Faramir asked:

***Pre-emption is not self defense? That is a pretty idiotic black and white argument. Pre-emption can definately be self-defense. To not considerate it is just following a fool's advice.***

Posted by: Faramir | 12-Jun-07 12:00:26 AM

My response:

If I take your declaration literally, then I am perfectly justified in killing you now because some time in the future you might be a threat.

I believe you would find that unpalatable.

Threat potential is a continuum.

Threats that are far removed in time, distance, or logic require “passive” responses. As threats become imminent my options become constrained. At some point my response may be “aggressive” because I lack the skill, tools, time or space to do otherwise.

For example, if from ten feet away, a man runs toward me with a knife in an out-thrust hand, I need not wait until actually cut before avoiding, disarming or incapacitating the attacker – even if such actions harm the attacker.

However, self-defense does not permit an unprovoked attack.

For example, assume that from ten miles away, I find that a man is running towards me with a knife in out-thrust hand. That action on his part does not justify harmful actions on my part. Due to the time required for a running man to cross that distance I have a vastly larger set of available options: I can leave the area, I can hide, I can misdirect, or I can enter a building and bar it against his entry. Furthermore; from that distance I cannot reasonably infer the man’s intentions. Even if I could correctly determine his intentions at ten miles, he may have a change of heart before he comes close enough to do me injury.

Markalta stated:

***Keith,***

***If someone says that as soon as they get nukes that you and all others will live under their rule, (as Iran has), then a first strike is indeed justified. No matter how much moral relativity you try, Iran does not equal the U.S.A.***

Posted by: Markalta | 12-Jun-07 8:42:18 AM

My response:

We learn from history that we do not study history...

If I take Markalta's statement at face value, then I must logically conclude Markalta favors an immediate first strike against all communist countries that have nukes... to wit China, and North Korea, (and if it had not already "collapsed", the USSR). All have nukes, and communist philosophy cannot forever tolerate the existence of a non-communist enclave...

Carrying Markalta's statement to its logical conclusion, we should have nuked all nuclear-equipped communist nations at the first opportunity. And given that we've missed the first opportunity by a few decades, we should do so, now, immediately, without hesitation or thought of consequence...

In terms of brutality, butchery and murder, the communists make the modern followers of radical Islam well behaved children by comparison. Even Hitler's atrocities pale to the multiple genocides perpetrated by communists.

Why so gung-ho on Islam? Seems like the classical "Strain at a gnat, swallow a camel" (Matt. 23:24)

--Keith

OBC stated:

***I haven't seen any Chinese suicide bombers in the news lately, or the Chinese President say that he wants to destroy Israel and then the US - but I've been busy on this site for a while now - so I might have missed it.***

Posted by: obc | 12-Jun-07 10:10:51 PM

My response:

We learn from history that we do not study history...

OBC, Chinese suicide bombers?

Suicide bombings are desperation tactics. If the Chinese want mass casualties, they've plenty of nukes, as well as conventional and non-conventional delivery systems.

Or for the more subtle, they could simply mislabel diethylene glycol as glycerine, and claim that "... diethylene glycol had been used in toothpaste in China for years, and that producers did not believe it was very harmful."

Who manufactured the food and health products you used today? Don't know? Who manufactured the ingredients? How much are from China?

Or given that China recently had more than a trillion US dollars, suddenly dumping those dollars could trigger a royal economic collapse.

The US is leveraged... in other words, we are in debt past our eye-balls.

Total US debt in 2004 was \$40T or approximately \$136,500 per person. Total US Debt is defined as all US debt, public and private. In other words it is the sum of federal and state & local governments, international, and private debt, including households, business and financial sector debts, and federal debt to trust funds (such as Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, etc).

Not only does the Total US debt greatly exceed the US Income, the debt growth rate greatly exceeds the Income Growth Rate. As of 2004, the Total US debt was somewhat more than 425% of the National Income and growing.

I just checked. As of March 2007, the Total US debt is up to \$48T (or ~\$160,000 per man, woman and child in the US). Can you pay your family's fraction of that debt? No?

A grand economic collapse now, could make the Great Depression look like a pleasant stroll through the park. Our exposure is greater and our position is more precarious now than in 1929.

The Chinese have already started dumping dollars. They really have no choice. The Federal Reserve has devalued each dollar to near worthlessness. Its just a matter of whether the Chinese dump dollars quickly or slowly.

To twist a phrase, we bought the rope from the Chinese, tied it around our necks, tossed the free end over the yardarm, handed it to them and asked them "pretty-please" to not let go... and you are worried about a few rabble-rousers in the Middle East?

Please permit me a gentle suggestion... turn off the tube, put down USA-Today, look around, read, and think for yourself...

People, and I'm not talking just about geriatric old fools like me, have long memories. If you've lived or studied in the Orient, maybe you'll remember some reprisals are generations in the making.

Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Mao all had some very interesting things to say, about us, the US, the West, war and Life. If you let yourself be continually distracted by the talking heads on the tube; you won't notice the gun barrel screwed into your ear until way too late...

For example, here are some nice, cozy, sentimental quotes from the late Chairman Mao...

If the U.S. monopoly capitalist groups persist in pushing their policies of aggression and war, the day is bound to come when the people of the whole world will hang them. The same fate awaits the accomplices of the United States.  
Speech at the Supreme State Conference (September 8, 1958).

Every Communist must grasp the truth; "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."  
"Problems of War and Strategy" (November 6, 1938), Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 224.

The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds well universally, for China and for all other countries.  
Ibid. p. 219.

People of the world, unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs!  
People of the world, be courageous, and dare to fight, defy difficulties and advance wave upon wave. Then the whole world will belong to the people. Monsters of all kinds shall be destroyed.  
"Statement Supporting the People of the Congo (L.)  
Against U.S. Aggression" (November 28, 1964),  
People of the World, Unite and Defeat the  
U.S. Aggressors and All Their Lackeys, 2nd ed., p. 14.

Chairman Mao, Stalin, Pol Pot, all put words into action. Death estimates for Mao range over 30,000,000. Stalin's repression combined with the starvation of the Ukraine, killed 10,000,000 to 30,000,000 and Pol Pot murdered 1/3 the Cambodian population.

While fortunately none of those sanguinary figures still breathes, their philosophical brothers still rule.

I'm not denying radical Islam is a problem. It's just not very high on my priority list.

Yanni stated:

***Keith,***

***You are in denial.***

***Know this ... Islamic Jihad!***

***If you understand what that means, then you will shut up and let your betters protect your ass.***

***Ethical decision making doesn't apply to madmen. These phycoreligionists have been up to no good for centuries. It's only since they managed to steal enough of our technology, rip off enough of our money selling us oil. I did say selling didn't I. We don't steal their oil. We set them up in the oil business. The only revenue generator they have.***

***What are they doing with the dough? Are they building infrastructure, diversifying their economies, building universities, hospitals nooooooooooooo they are building nukes and supporting terrorism while they for bid their women to walk freely in the streets.***

***You are a very morally confused person Keith. So again, it would be best if you just shut up and let your betters try to protect you.***

Posted by: Yanni | 12-Jun-07 9:38:14 AM

My response:

Yanni, must I assume from your comments you claim to be my better?

If so, in what way?

Are you a military vet? No? A current serviceman? No? Perhaps you're an expert in martial arts? No? An expert sniper? No? Then son, how do you expect to save my sorry ass?

If I'm wrong and you are a vet, or a current serviceman, my apologies for assuming otherwise. I'm ex-USARMY... enlisted, not drafted back during the tail end of that little fiasco in the Orient.

You say I am "a very morally confused person." My question, have you looked in a mirror recently? Given your rant and tone, sounds like you've confused me and thee.

Ethical decisions are not a shield for my opponent -- they are a shield for me. Ethics keep me from killing those who just annoy.

OBC replied:

"Suicide bombings are desperation tactics."

Baloney. The 9/11 murderers were all middle class folks. None were starving. If they were desperate, it's because their religion brainwashed them into that state.

Ann Colter was right. Mass conversion or, for those refusing, mass annihilation. Civilization cannot live with these creatures any longer.

Posted by: obc | 13-Jun-07 8:08:28 AM

My response:

OBC:

“desperation” (n) 1. The condition of being desperate. 2. Recklessness arising from despair.

“despair” v.i. To be overcome by a sense of futility or defeat –n 1. Utter lack of hope. 2. Something that destroys all hope.

“tactics” (n) The technique or science of securing the objectives designated by strategy, esp. the art of deploying and directing troops, ships, and aircraft in coefficient maneuvers against the enemy.

Given the right circumstances, desperation tactics are engaged in by all sides. Numerous examples are available if you care to read military history.

And while starvation can bring on desperation, it's not a requirement.

Damn few of the military I've met, worked with, and lived with believe in mass annihilation... such nasty brutality seems to be the dominant purview of deranged politicians, insane philosophers, and armchair civilians.

Once you've exterminated 23% of the human race, who will be next on your list of undesirables? At what point will your claimed appetite for blood be sated?

OBC, pray tell what are your ethics? What prevents you from killing all who annoy? What separates you from Stalin or Mao... other than the apparent ambition to make their sanguinary atrocities dim by multiple-magnitudes-of-order in comparison to yours?

Or is your proclaimed machismo all bluff and bluster?

Are you willing to bash out the brains of babies? Disembowel the pregnant? Slit the throats of toddlers? And do it again and again by the hundreds of millions? Or do you expect others to do that bloody work for you – so you don't have to scrape the blood from under your fingernails?

Are you as big a problem as that you declaim?

***Why are Robin, Keith and Gallagher consistently ridiculed or branded as "leftoids" on this site? Identifying common sense and thoughtful discourse as left wing characteristics unjustly flatters the left and, inferebtially, denigrates the right. When psychos like OBC get away with that sort of nonsense, it certainly doesn't help the conservative cause.***

Posted by: Zog | 13-Jun-07 2:20:38 PM

Leftoid? Me? In what universe?

Please indulge me by answering a short quiz:

>How do you stand on Personal issues?

- a) Government should not censor speech, press, or internet.
- b) Military service should be voluntary. There should be no draft.
- c) There should be no laws regarding sex between consenting adults.
- d) Repeal laws prohibiting adult possession and use of drugs.
- e) There should be no National ID card.

Add 20 points if you agree, 10 for maybe and 0 for disagree on each of the above Personal Issues.

>How do you stand on Economic issues?

- a) End "corporate welfare." No government handouts to business.
- b) End government barriers to international free trade.
- c) Let people control their retirement: privatize Social Security.
- d) Replace government welfare with private charity.
- e) Cut taxes and government spending by 50% or more.

Add 20 points if you agree, 10 for maybe and 0 for disagree on each of the above Economic Issues.

Definitions follow:

<b>Group</b>	<b>Personal</b>	<b>Economic</b>
Left (Liberal)	100	0
Right (Conservative)	0	100

Statist	0	0
Centrist	50	50
Libertarian	100	100

See: <http://www.theadvocates.org/quiz-ad-colors.pdf>

By the above definitions, I am not a member of the Left, or the Right. Neither am I a Centrist or Statist.

Anyone who honestly believes I'm a Leftoid (which I'm interpreting as a disparaging term for members of the Left) has serious issues with reality.