

 **TODAY'S "SHORT TOPIC"**
TWENTY-TWENTY
HINDSIGHT CUTS
BOTH WAYS
RE: IRAQ WAR!

By Stephen L. Bakke  May 26, 2015



Here's what provoked me:

A well known local attorney wrote a letter to editor that attempted to try and convict George W. Bush without examining the evidence. I thought I should just give a little push back.

Here's my response:

20-20 Hindsight Cuts Both Ways re: Iraq War!

Marshall H. Tanick first shows wisdom by criticizing recent questioning of Republican presidential candidates regarding what they would have done about Iraq, if they knew then what they know now ("It's not what they know now; it's how they responded then," May 25). It's irrelevant, using the facts available today, to judge a person's decision a long time ago. But then he goes on to express his desire that we should use 20-20 hindsight about why they donned blinders after 9/11 resulting in a "suspension of disbelief with regard to the veracity of the Bush administration"

Tanick and I probably agree that we don't like the results of what evolved in Iraq, and find much to be critical of. But Mr. Tanick should know that in the American tradition of justice, we do NOT suspend our BELIEF in old or new evidence as we make judgments. In order to reach Tanick's obvious conclusion about Bush's lack of veracity, one would have to ignore – not even examine and dismiss – several pieces of new and old evidence.

It's always been fairly clear, and Bob Woodward recently agrees, saying: "there was no lie in this that I could find." And the CIA's former Deputy Director and former Acting Director asserts that, regarding accusations that Bush told the CIA to represent that Hussein had WMD – it never happened! Remember also that Hussein HAD actually used WMD on sections of his population.

Mr. Tanick, Bush's veracity is intact – just look at the evidence!