

Allusions to Illusions Shia vs. Sunni vs. Everyone Else

June 15, 2014

Hello from Your on the Street Reporter. Before jumping into the present Middle East melting pot, one in which a sizable Middle East population has already been melted down, a short review of the past:

- Prior to Iraqi War II, the Middle East was relatively stable. Iraqi's Saddam Hussein (Sunni) kept Iran (Shia) in check and vice-versa
- Hussein killed a lot of people. However, many more people have been killed since he 'left office.' Defenders of removing Hussein say fewer people are being killed now in contrast to those he was killing. Saddam's numbers do not come close to the numbers associated with the current mayhem.
- Beyond this equation of win-loss deaths: Removing Hussein resulted in the Shias' (Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki) taking power.
- Maliki disenfranchised the Sunnis.
- But then, Hussein's Sunnis had disenfranchised the Shias. Turn-about is fair play.
- During this time, America was training the Shia military to actually be a military.
- Reacting to mostly non-violent Sunni demonstrations in the Sunni Iraq heartland (northwest Iraq), Maliki "detained thousands of Sunni men without charges, touching off a spasm of violence that left hundreds of civilians dead."¹

A pause that depresses:

- The Sunni's demonstrations cited above masked the fact that no amount of inclusive-government assuaging on the part of the Shias was going to placate the Sunnis. They had lost power. To the Sunnis, the Shias were as evil as Jews or Christians. The Sunnis have never changed their goal to get rid of Jews, Christians, and Shias.
- No number of military training sessions and no number of tutorials in Nation Building 101 will change this reality. Yet America's prominent Middle East neocons (they are still grinding out their views of nation building and bringing in loot from their lectures) say the reason for the current problems is because America abandoned its nation building efforts in Iraq prematurely.
- How many years does it take to "build a nation?" One that is, according to Wolfowitz, Bush, Jr., Cheney, and other neocons, aligned with America? One that would be required to reject Sharia Law...in that Sharia Law contradicts the separation of church and state philosophy of the United States Constitution.
- Would America renounce the Bill of Rights for Sharia law?
- Yet, prominent media pundits have this line, "The [possible fall of Baghdad] "...would further traumatize the tumultuous region, and raise questions about whether the U.S. squandered the progress it made there."²

¹ Dexter Filkins, "What We Left Behind," *The New Yorker*, April 28, 2014, 50.

² Jim Michaels, "Iraq Heads for Civil War," *USA Today*, June 12, 2014, A1.

- Progress? This week, thousands of American trained Iraqi troops (not tens, not hundreds, thousands) abandoned their posts as Sunni radicals overran North West Iraq. Why should this Sunni-dominated army fight other Sunnis to support a Shia regime that had repressed Sunnis? So much for progress.

The detractors of this essay will say, “We prematurely walked away.”³ I believe the opposite. At the risk of having the Chicken Hawks question my loyalty to America, we should have never “walked-in.”⁴

Currently, the administration, Congress, and the parts of the media inform American citizens that America has no choice other than to prevent Iraq from falling to a religious/military faction (ISIS) that even al-Queda will not support. Furthermore, America must support Iraq’s current government. The alternative is an anti-American Iraq...similar to the one dislodged through Iraqi War No. II, but more radicalized.

Surreal? Here’s more. Assuming the ISIS and its supporting factions are Cold War sensitive, the United States has deployed an aircraft carrier (with supporting destroyers and cruisers, to fend off advanced warfare ISIS submarines) to the area. U.S. intelligence has noted that the insane, to-the-right-of-al Queda killers will be kowtowed by fighter jets possibly shooting them and the civilian population into which they have integrated.

Sunni vs. Shia. Shia vs. Sunni. The *same* religion has its adherents torturing and killing one another. The current affairs with how these people practice Islam can be likened to a Baptist beheading a Methodist because the two branches of Christianity have different interpretations of Christianity.

No amount of apologia, no degree of “it’s all relative” can explain or countenance these depravities. You rescue one, he will slaughter the other. You rescue the other, he will do the same. What to do? Send in an aircraft carrier to the area.

I’ve a better idea: turn the debacle over to the Saudis and Iranians. The Saudis should be afraid of ISIS, even though both are Sunni.⁵ Iran is Shia. It’s in their interests to contain the problem. They have the arsenals to do it. Yet, everyone expects America to come to the rescue.

Maybe that is only logical. After all, Cheney, Bush, Wolfowitz, *et al* started the cycle. Perhaps these men should be in uniform. It would be interesting to see how hawkish these Chicken Hawks actually are. But no, they do not populate the wards of Walter Reed. They send in troops and collect speaking fees explaining why nothing can be fixed---including our warriors’ post traumatic stress disorders.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Into Iraqi II. I have documented my views (against all policy makers; nonetheless, they were my views) that the possibility of Hussein having nuclear weapons capable of wreaking havoc was *very* remote. And if he did, he had no delivery systems.

⁵ Yet, according to recent sources, the ISIS is receiving funding from Saudi Arabia. For other surreal events, see: <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/iraq-crisis-sunni-caliphate-has-been-bankrolled-by-saudi-arabia-9533396.html>.