

July 15, 2005

Dear Editor,

I am amazed to see the recent claim, by several letter writers, that because our troops weren't "there" in Iraq when we were attacked on September 11th 2004, this somehow provides justification for being "there" now. It's true that our troops weren't "there" in Iraq in the September 2004, but have these letter writers conveniently forgotten that the 9/11 suicide attackers were almost entirely from Saudi Arabia? And that our troops were most assuredly "there" in large military bases throughout Saudi Arabia, supporting the oil monarchy friends of the Bush family? And that the presence of these US troops "there" in Saudi Arabia was (and along with Iraq continues to be) the major factor in recruitment of such suicide attackers?

Many people can now clearly see a distinction between the invasion of Afghanistan to go after the terrorist camps tolerated by the Taliban, and the invasion of Iraq, which was never about going after non-existent weapons of mass destruction. The latter was a lie of impeachable proportions by Bush and his neo-con armchair generals to publicly justify gaining geo-political influence for oil resources by military force. Unfortunately Bush's impeachment will not provide a solution to the problems he has created.

John Donovan

Eugene, OR