Itâ€™s Lexâ€™s Fault â€“ The War in Iraq and My Analysis

Description

Lex has composed a fine piece, â€œChatter,â€• putting some thoughts he has to the â€˜net regarding the current state of our foreign affairs.

I began commenting and the stored thoughts I have had in the last few weeks began crawling to the forefront, so Iâ€™m bringing it over here. The beginning:

> For my lowly opinion, I think it would do the bad guys well, looking at it from a purely strategic view point, to hunker down, at the minimum until after Jan 20 something in 2009. At best, put the chocks and chains in place for a few more years.
>
> If â€œtheyâ€• get it, the best tactics right now are to crawl into their spiderholes in the sand, and, if â€œcaught in the openâ€• be unarmed and politely disarming. Make all the violence go away.
>
> Just what does that do? It gives a way out now, to both â€œsidesâ€• of the equation. One says â€œMission Accomplished, we donâ€™t need no moâ€™ money!â€• and the other says â€œMission Accomplished, weâ€™re cutting off all funds!â€•
>
> Dang! Iâ€™m moving this to the blogâ€¦I havenâ€™t written anything today!

default watermark

If it gets all quiet on the Middle Eastern Front, President Bush, or any other supporter of the combat operations in Iraq, would be hard pressed to justify spending even a single penny more. Both side could claim they had the winning ideas. Both sides, as they ramp up for a Presidential election cycle, might even extend hands across the isle and smile for the cameras, for a brief moment displaying some sort of unity that the electorate might accept and thereby help the poll numbers on the popularity climb out of the basement.

The same thing happened when the Soviet Empire cried â€œUncle!â€• President Bush was left to tell the Pentagon that a 600 ship Navy was no longer needed, along with the many air wings, and Army divisions. He actually began the downsizing of the military, and when President Clinton came into the Oval Office, he accelerated the plan dramatically.

So, if the Jihadis could just manage a degree of patience and fake smiles and handshakes all around, just take a guess at what measures weâ€™d let go ofâ€¦

- Intelligence gatheringâ€¦why now the bad guys are good guys (they said they were), so Congress skims money to use for more pet projects
- Funds for stockpiling military related supplies could be cut back/off. No bad guys, what do you need all those millions of pairs of Desert Boots for?
- Overseas headquarters funds for all the leases in host countries could be dispensed with and CENTCOM personnel and equipment could retire to sunny SW Florida, helping boost the tourist

economy
- Keep thinking on your ownâ€¦there are all sorts of things that we could â€œdo withoutâ€• (translates that the voters are used to givning us that much money, so, since weâ€™re collecting it, weâ€™ll find some feel good program to spend it on)

You get the idea. The troops in Iraq come home. The troops in Afghanistan do, too. The â€œbig decksâ€• return to throngs of family members and well wishing females in small craft racing by, the â€œsmall boys,â€• in the shadow of the aircraft carriers get a warm welcome, too. Spouses get happy and quit writing to their Congresspersons. Vets by the returnees lots of beer and other beverages as â€œthank yous!â€• What is sweeter than reuniting the country?

Oh, and yes. Why pay more to have the TSA stand around to inspect your 3 oz bottle of liquid? What about the cost to maintain those fancy bomb detecting devices, lat alone the electricity bills? With the â€œterroristsâ€• happy in their new land, busy constructing a working government, who would want to bomb us? You know, some contend the reason for the terrorism is the presence of America military forces in Iraq. Since they are home now, we no longer have to worry about such trivial issues. The Jihadis, keeping their composure and being able to control their â€œbomb lustâ€• would be able to see us roll back the many security measures we have come to accept in public transportation venues and large gatherings, as the last of the US troops departs for a reunion with family. â€œStaying the courseâ€• for a few years would provide us, internally, greater demand for and rationalize impetus to get rid of all those things that got in the way of instant gratification.

default watermark

Holding the violence to essentially nothing around the world would de-fang us. We could add another level of shame and guilt onto the heap, to go with slavery (never mind the Arabs enslaved more than we did and also were the ones capturing many of the Africans and selling them to us and Europe). If we left and the terrorists â€œquit,â€• then it had to be us who caused it all.

In the political realm, I would venture to guess that the Democrats would take just about every seat in the Congress, specifically if the holder of the seat had been in support of the war, and take the Presidency, too. The fallout would be an unstoppable legislative machine, with enough votes to soundly trump any minority remaining.
At this point, is there any doubt in your mind that an isolationist president would then take an even more appeasing standpoint for our foreign policy? What about then testing all our ideas for anything we do outside our borders (and even some things inside, such as immigration policy) in the Court of World Opinion ala jfkâ€™s 2004 presidential campaign demanded?

Not only would we de-construct the tools of the trade to be alert for terror attacks, weâ€™d ask other nations to give their views on how we should do it.

At some point, we will be lulled back to just being ourselves, happily pretending the world around us isnâ€™t an issue and we can focus on going to Dixie Chick concerts and NFL games without â€œpat downs.â€• Then will be the time to strike, when we have successfully poked out our â€œI&Wâ€• eyes completely.

What that would look like would either be something â€œOUTCONUSâ€• or, if within the 48 states, it better follow the old bar saying â€œIf youâ€™re gonna hit me, you better make sure I donâ€™t get up, because if I doâ€¦.â€•

So, the point I hope I have made is the best strategy would be for the Islamic leaders, who are looking for the Caliphate to reform, and expand to include the entire world, resign themselves to understand it is most likely not possible in the near term, but they may be able to make the appropriate moves to allow their children or grandchildren to be that â€œprivileged.â€• We would do the work for them, we would turn inward and feed on ourselves, minimizing any â€œfrictionâ€• they are currently trying to overcome.

If they do get this smart, I only hope the Democrats wake up in time to enter reality, or, as some now believe, we are outta here.

Of course, there are some who know the reality shouldnâ€™t be like this, but I think they will admit I may not be far off the mark in todayâ€™s political climate.

One last thought I have on the topic for now: The chances of the Jihadis stopping the violence altogether are remote. Why? Simple. The very nature of the manner in which their waging an asymmetrical war, on many fronts, all around the world simultaneously is due to a dispersed, loosely connected network of terrorists. There is no structured chain of command, much less a trained force with a distinctly common vision of substance. So the very strength of their attacks on us also mitigates their ability to effectively manage such a grand, yet central strategy, to their cause right now, and for years to come.

default watermark

Category

1. Geo-Political
2. History
3. Political

Date Created
May 15, 2007
Author
admin