

## Weapons of Mass Distortion

**The Wall Street Journal** has something to say about the current rash of complaints about the lack of WMDs so far found in Iraq:

For ... opponents of [the] war, it isn't enough that a tyrant and his psychopath sons have been deposed. It doesn't count that mass graves have been uncovered, that torture chambers have been exposed, or that Saddam's victims can speak freely for the first time in 30 years. The critics are now claiming the war was illegitimate because no one has yet found a pile of anthrax in downtown Baghdad.

[...] That Saddam had biological or chemical weapons was a probability that everyone assumed to be true, even those who were against the war. U.N. inspections in the 1990s had proved that Iraq had such weapons, including 30,000 liters of anthrax, and Saddam had used chemical weapons against Iran and Iraq's own Kurds. The French themselves insisted that disarming Saddam of WMD, as opposed to deposing him, had to be the core of U.N. Resolution 1441.

[...] What seems to be going on here is an attempt to damage the credibility of Mr. Blair, President Bush and other war supporters. If their backing for the war is morally vindicated, they will emerge as even larger forces on the world stage, and so they must be tarnished after the fact as dissemblers.

So where are the WMD? We don't know. Check out **Andrew Sullivan**'s take on it though. Also **L.T. Smash** asks:

Saddam was an evil and ambitious man, who cast a shadow of darkness over the lives of millions. He had to go. As we uncover scores of mass graves and further evidence of his atrocities every day, only one burning question remains: How could anyone in good conscience have opposed the liberation of Iraq?

We don't know the answer to that one either.

Nobody's found Saddam either, but that doesn't mean he didn't exist and wasn't a threat.

After 9/11, the US has a right, nay a *responsibility* to take out terrorism-sponsoring regimes. Arresting individual criminals after the event/s isn't good enough. Even if the WMDs didn't exist at all (which I don't believe for a minute), it was still better to take out the Ba'athists than leave them in place murdering their own people and helping out terrorists who threatened freedom.

Alice

[http://libertarian\\_parent\\_in\\_the\\_countryside.blogspot.com/](http://libertarian_parent_in_the_countryside.blogspot.com/)

by a reader on Tue, 06/03/2003 - 17:43 | [reply](#)

### **If WMDs were not the point of...**

If WMDs were not the point of the invasion, why did Blair say they were?

by a reader on Wed, 06/04/2003 - 10:19 | [reply](#)

### **Rationalization**

Isn't this all one big rationalization for war?

by a reader on Wed, 06/04/2003 - 12:32 | [reply](#)

### **Although I was and am for the...**

Although I was and am for the war, I think it is simply inadequate to argue that for each new grave we find "how could you not support the liberation of Iraq?" Because there are plenty of potentially reasonable ways. Suppose you are under the impression that using the same amount of money, ten times more lives could have been saved if it were used in other ways. Or suppose you believe that a few thousand American deaths in the war and the long presence afterward are simply not a fair price to pay for the liberation of a foreign people in a foreign land, alien to American culture and values. These theories are wrong, but pointing in shock at them and crying about the morality of saving Iraqi children doesn't refute them.

I think that at this point, there is a real issue of credibility. Leaders united on apparently incontrovertible intelligence that Saddam had these weapons. Its worth finding out why things didn't go as planned. But this is a political issue, not a moral one.

by [Daniel Strimpel](#) on Wed, 06/04/2003 - 15:06 | [reply](#)

### **Well said. Alisa....**

Well said.

**Alisa.**

by **Alisa** on Thu, 06/05/2003 - 03:00 | [reply](#)

## About WMDs

Can I point out that the reason that people fear WMDs is that some of them are small and easily hidden. 30,000 liters is less than 150 55-gallon drums, and Iraq is 171,599 square miles in area.

Three questions:

What are the odds of finding this stuff in a couple of months?  
What are the odds that some of will never be found because the people that hid it are dead/disappeared?  
What is the likelihood that anything would be found if Saddam were still in power?

by a reader on Thu, 06/05/2003 - 06:01 | [reply](#)

## My Answer

My answer is that you could save 10 times as many people today, but you could lose many thousands or even millions tomorrow. That is what WMDs are designed to do.

Everyone of these dictators who kills his own people or his neighbors *\*is\** a weapon of mass destruction.

by a reader on Thu, 06/05/2003 - 06:09 | [reply](#)

## Oiiiiiiiiiii

Everyone of these dictators who kills his own people or his neighbors *\*is\** a weapon of mass destruction.

And the ones who have oil and therefore lots of money can get much more effective weapons than their poorer counterparts. So oil actually matters in legitimate ways.

~Woty  
<http://woty.blogspot.com>

by **Woty** on Thu, 06/05/2003 - 13:42 | [reply](#)

## Re: Oil

Sure oil matters, having Iraq sell oil on the open market means Saudi Arabia has less leverage. Having a free and prosperous Iraq in the middle of a bunch of medieval theocracies/kleptocratic dictatorships is going to be worth a lot strategically.

by a reader on Thu, 06/05/2003 - 16:29 | [reply](#)

**Check out the dissident frog...**

Check out the dissident frogman's comment here:  
<http://www.thedissidentfrogman.com/dacha/000168.html>

by **Chris** on Tue, 06/10/2003 - 16:44 | [reply](#)

## Weapons of Mass destruction

Oh my God - People people people...are you all for real? You don't find Bush evil? Who are the terrorist? is it bin Laden? or al Qaeda? maybe the Taliban? And where are these mass graves your talking about? I have heard and why are we worried about them when we're busy making more. And speaking of Iraqi oil we won't see a drop of it for a long time, if ever, because Iraqi's have plenty of old explosives to keep them shut down for a long, long time.

Weapons of Mass destruction was all they could talk about. Don't you find placing the blame squarely were if belongs a good thing? And if you're willing to write that off then shame on you. You should never have children or raise them because you wouldn't know the difference between the truth and a lie.

by Burnie123 on Sun, 01/16/2005 - 00:47 | [reply](#)

## Re: Weapons of Mass destruction

Burnie123 wrote:

Oh my God - People people people...are you all for real?

No, we're just playing a really, really elaborate joke on you.

You don't find Bush evil?

He's not evil. He's wrong about some things, but not evil.

Who are the terrorist? is it bin Laden? or al Qaeda?  
maybe the Taliban?

Those are examples of evil terrorist organisations, but not the only ones.

And where are these mass graves your talking about?

Iraq, I done saw it the **news**.

I have heard and why are we worried about them when we're busy making more.

Um, no we're not. Even the terrorists who the Coalition sends to the big Virginarium in the sky will get buried in a nice little plot. It'll have flowers on it and everything, honest.

And speaking of Iraqi oil we won't see a drop of it for a long time, if ever, because Iraqi's have plenty of old explosives to keep them shut down for a long, long time.

I see. And they're keeping the oil wells shut down for what reason?

Oh, I see, so the US doesn't steal the oil despite the fact that they could easily have bought it. Okay they would have had to pay ~~Saddam Hussein's pimp~~ Kofi Annan a cut but it's still a lot less expensive than a war.

Weapons of Mass destruction was all they could talk about.

Apart from Saddam Hussein being a tyrant and a terror sponsor and their desire to spread democracy in the Middle East...

Don't you find placing the blame squarely where it belongs a good thing?

Yes. We blame Saddam Hussein and his fellow tyrants and terrorists for their evil crimes and we blame the UN for being stuffed to the gills with apologists for these terrible people.

And if you're willing to write that off then shame on you. You should never have children or raise them because you wouldn't know the difference between the truth and a lie.

A statement is true if and only if it corresponds to the fact it purports to describe. The truth is the set of statements that is true. A lie would be where a person intentionally makes an untrue statement. A mistake would be where a person unintentionally makes an untrue statement. A mistake and a lie are not equivalent. I hope this helps.

by **Alan Forrester** on Mon, 01/17/2005 - 02:48 | [reply](#)