

# Los Cerritos Community News – January 12, 2007

## Nothing New

President Bush's new "plan" to send 21,600 additional troops to Iraq shows that he is living in a bubble, cut off from the rest of the world. The American electorate sent an unmistakable signal last November, that they want to pull our forces out of Iraq. The bi-partisan Iraq Study Group lead by James Baker, the person who helped put Bush in office by working in 2000 to prevent a recount in Florida, said that we should begin pulling our forces from Iraq. President Bush, however, seems to not listen, as if he is living in a different universe.

Make no mistake about it. There is nothing new about this "plan". Over the four years that the war in Iraq has

TO ADVERTISE CALL 800-901-7211 THE COMMUNITY NEWS • JANUARY 12, 2007

5

## OPINIONS & LETTERS

lasted (a period of time longer than World War II), the number of troops has fluctuated between 130,000 and 160,000. Therefore, there is nothing new in adding 21,600 troops to bring the total number of troops in Iraq to the higher end of the range.

From a tactical perspective, there is absolutely no way that the additional 21,600 troops, which represent about a 15% increase in the number of troops can make such a big difference. Before the war began, the then Secretary of

the Army General Eric Shinseki told Congress that it would take hundreds of thousands of troops to occupy and stabilize Iraq. Don Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney, and George W. Bush refused to listen to Shinseki's professional opinion, and "let him go". They thought that they could fight the war on the cheap, and finance it with the sale of Iraqi oil. Of course, Shinseki was right, and now Iraq is one huge mess.

Continued on page 6

6 THE COMMUNITY NEWS • JANUARY 12, 2007 TO ADVERTISE CALL 8

## Letters and Opinions

Continued from page 5

These days, to stabilize the situation in Iraq would probably take MILLIONS of troops, so the additional 21,600 troops would simply not make much of a difference. Even if Bush wanted to send millions of troops to Iraq, we do not have that size of a military, unless Bush was to re-institute the draft.

Can the Democrats in Congress do anything about this? The answer is "it depends on the courts". The president, as the commander in chief has the right to execute the war any way he pleases, so long that the Congress approves the war. In 2002, the Congress authorized the war in Iraq, but it was under false pretenses given by the president. This brings up the question "Can the Congress take back its authorization?" That question has no precedence, so

it will be up to the Supreme Court to answer that.

Last week, Nancy Pelosi promised an end to deficit spending. She now needs to show that she was serious about her promise. If the president wants additional troops, which would cost additional money, then the money would have to come from somewhere. It's about time to reverse the irresponsible tax cut on the rich from 2001. Never before in our history have we cut taxes during war time. It is time to put an end to this fiscally irresponsible behavior.

Alon Barlevy, PhD.  
President, Hubert Humphrey  
Democratic Club  
Cerritos,

President Bush's new "plan" to send 21,600 additional troops to Iraq shows that he is living in a bubble, cut off from the rest of the world. The American electorate sent an unmistakable signal last November, that they want to pull our forces out of Iraq. The bi-partisan Iraq Study Group lead by James Baker, the person who helped put Bush in office by working in 2000 to prevent a recount in Florida, said that we should begin pulling our forces from Iraq. President Bush, however, seems to not listen, as if he is living in a different universe.

Make no mistake about it. There is nothing new about this "plan". Over the four years that the war in Iraq has lasted (a period of time longer than World War II), the number of troops has fluctuated between 130,000 and 160,000. Therefore, there is nothing new in adding 21,600 troops to bring the total number of troops in Iraq to the higher end of the range.

From a tactical perspective, there is absolutely no way that the additional 21,600 troops, which represent about a 15% increase in the number of troops can make such a big difference. Before the war began, the then Secretary of the Army General Eric Shinseki told Congress that it would take hundreds of thousands of troops to occupy and stabilize Iraq. Don Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney, and George W. Bush refused to listen to Shinseki's professional opinion, and "let him go". They thought that they could fight the war on the cheap, and finance it with the sale of Iraqi oil. Of course, Shinseki was right, and now Iraq is one huge mess. These days, to stabilize the situation in Iraq would probably take MILLIONS of troops, so the additional 21,600 troops would simply not make much of a difference. Even if Bush wanted to send millions of troops to Iraq, we do not have that size of a military, unless Bush was to re-institute the draft.

Can the Democrats in Congress do anything about this? The answer is "it depends on the courts". The president, as the commander in chief has the right to execute the war any way he pleases, so long that the Congress approves the war. In 2002, the Congress authorized the war in Iraq, but it was under false pretenses given by the president. This brings up the question "Can the Congress take back its authorization?" That question has no precedence, so it will be up to the Supreme Court to answer that.

Last week, Nancy Pelosi promised an end to deficit spending. She now needs to show that she was serious about her promise. If the president wants additional troops, which would cost additional money, then the money would have to come from somewhere. It's about time to reverse the irresponsible tax cut on the rich from 2001. Never before in our history have we cut taxes during war time. It is time to put an end to this fiscally irresponsible behavior.

Alon Barlevy, PhD.  
President, Hubert Humphrey Democratic Club  
Cerritos, CA