

## Poor Arguments For and Against the War, and Why They're Poor

Poor Pro-War Arguments	Reason(s) Why the Argument is Poor:
1. If anyone criticizes the war, that person is not a patriot.	1. Obviously, a person can question the war without being unpatriotic. It's a fallacy (called the False Alternatives fallacy) to assume that one must either love America or leave it - there is a third possibility where one can criticize America and still "love it."
2. If anyone criticizes the war, that person supports or loves Hussein.	2.(a) If this is a good argument, then no one can ever question any foreign policy that criticizes another country without supporting its leader, which is obviously a silly argument. (b) Obviously, one can hold the position that Hussein is evil on the one hand, and hold on the other hand that the proper response to his evilness and schenanigans is NOT to go to war. Again, this argument commits the fallacy of false alternatives.
3. Celebrities should have no say in politics and in the war, especially.	3. Celebrities are citizens and have the right to free speech just as we all do. What are Rush Limbaugh's political science credentials? He had three semesters at college, and he's ranted on the radio for many years. Are these sufficient qualifications? What about Michael Savage? Savage has a Ph.D. in epidemiology and nutrition science, which hardly qualifies him to speak on political affairs. In sum, if the celebrities have no right to give us their opinions because they're only trained to be actors, then Limbaugh and Savage (just for starters) should not be allowed to give us their opinions, since they are only trained as entertainers in the media. In fact, if this is a good argument, then almost no one in America is qualified to comment about the war.
4. If you are anti-war, then you don't support the troops.	4. (a) The protestors have the right to question the leader of this war, whether or not they question the troops. (The anti-war protestor may or may not think that the troops are morally responsible for following orders, but he or she may question the leaders and commanders, regardless.) (b) Actually, it is arguable that one who opposes the war might support the troops more than those who favor the war, since if those opposed to war had their way, the troops who are now dead would be alive, since they wouldn't have been in harm's way.

I would like to thank Kerry Leibowitz, who made some very helpful suggestions.

## Poor Arguments For and Against the War, and Why They're Poor

<b>Poor Anti-War Arguments</b>	<b>Reason(s) Why the Argument is Poor:</b>
1. "We will support our troops when they start shooting Bush." (This was shown on a banner at a protest.)	1. This is evading the issue, really, since it does not give a reason why we should not go to war.
2. Bush is an imperialist who just wants to take over the world.	2. There is no evidence that Bush really wants to take over that area - he may want to have a government that "plays nice," but that doesn't mean that he wants to rule the world.
3. This is a war against Islam.	3. While the American government rightly condemns fundamentalist Muslims who want Americans dead, and are even looking for these people, the war in Iraq cannot be seen as a direct threat to Islam (though the people who think that this is a good argument seem to be the Arabs in the region).

I would like to thank Kerry Leibowitz, who made some very helpful suggestions.