

Re: OT: Scott Ridder on Fallujah

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2004-11/3688.html>

From: Bill Sloman (bill.sloman_at_ieee.org)

Date: 11/13/04

Date: 13 Nov 2004 02:15:35 -0800

John Fields <jfields@austininstruments.com> wrote in message
news:<0a97p0lcfahof4p79bjls30923618h2jlt@4ax.com>...

> On 11 Nov 2004 02:54:16 -0800, bill.sloman@ieee.org (Bill Sloman)

> wrote:

>

> > John Fields <jfields@austininstruments.com> wrote in message
news:<3lq4p0pseiql90kovpph3ne5bvq2vi8ji@4ax.com>...

>

> >>

> >> *What drives them is the love they have for their leaders, but what
> >> drives their leaders is just plain old greed and lust for power and
> >> hatred for anyone who opposes their getting what they want.*

> >

> > *We are talking about your relationship with Dubbya here, aren't we*

>

> ---

> *Hardly, and you're either getting senile in your old age or just being
> disingenuous. I'll vote for disingenuous, since you must remember
> that in the very recent past we voted for the lesser of two weevils
> and there was very little love lost in the process, very little being
> there to start with.*

> ---

>

> >> *Kind of like liberals; spoiled children run amuck. What they really want > >> is the utter destruction of
everything that doesn't fit into their narrow
> >> viewpoint of who's OK in their book,*

> >

> > *Dubbya, as his father's son, really wanted to stick it to Saddam
> > Hussein, and has exploited his high position to waste a large number
> > of American lives (and a much larger number of Iraki lives) and a
> > great deal of money to satisfy this childish ambition.*

>

> ---

> *So say you, but what you tout as truth is just another opinion, which
> with a dollar or so will get you a cup of coffee somewhere.*

> ---

I'm not touting it as truth, but it is rather less incredible than your rubbish about liberal motivations.

> *>It hasn't done*
> *>a thing to improve U.S. security*
>
> ----
> *I disagree. It's now, AIUI, _much_ harder to get into this country for*
> *the purpose of doing mischief than it used to be, and visitors are*
> *subject to greater scrutiny while they're here. In addition, things*
> *which once weren't being watched very closely, like our borders and*
> *our airports, are now also under greater scrutiny.*
> ----

It is certainly much harder to get into the US than it used to be. Whether the new, even higher levels of bureaucratic obstruction, stop any more of the people who are planning mischief is quite another question. You've stepped up from Regan's utterly cheap-skate and sloppy privatised security to a slightly higher level, but the fact that you are wasting so much time and energy making life difficult for blameless academics (amongst others) suggests that you haven't exactly got your eye on the ball, even now.

And what has surliness in the immigration department got to do with invading Irak?

> *>in fact, by encouraging disgruntled*
> *>Arabs to sign on with Al Qaeda, it has probably increased the risk of*
> *>second 11/9.*
>
> ----
> *If we'd merely absorbed the first one do you think that would have*
> *decreased the risk of a second one?*
>
> *Surely you can't be idiotic enough to believe that appeasement works.*
> *Even though we've been subjected to ever-increasing violence from the*
> *"disgruntled" and taken the bombing of a marine barracks in stride,*
> *and the bombing of a couple of embassies, and an attempt to blow up a*
> *ship, and the WTC the first time, and the list goes on, we can't, and*
> *won't, take it forever.*

I'm sure it doesn't, but invading Irak neutralised a non-threat, and – as it turned out – encouraged lots of Arabs to join Al Qaeda, which could be a real threat.

> *Regardless of what you and the rest of our detractors think, we're not*
> *an infinite sink and the only reason we let that crap go on for so*
> *long is because we _always_ try for a diplomatic solution to*
> *difficulties. But there are limits, and once the line is drawn in the*
> *sand, as far as I'm concerned, that's it.*
> ----

Idiotic posturing. Your Dubbya drew his line in the wrong bit of sand

...

> >> *and that's you, Frank, and it's*
> >> *me, and it's everyone else who has what they resent, a life.*
> >> *Basically, they have nothing except their pitiful lives, so what can*
> >> *be taken away from them to make them stop? You figure it out.*
> >> ---
> >
> > *In Dubbya's case, the high office. You just blew it.*
>
> ---
> *I blew nothing. What you're saying is that if W was out of there*
> *they would magically stop fighting, and if you mean it you're a bigger*
> *idiot than you appear to be. Do you think Kerry could have wound the*
> *war down?*

He could have elected to prosecute it properly, so that Irak becomes secure enough for there to be some effective reconstruction, or to cut your losses and got out, which would at least leave the Arabs to sort out their own problems.

> *Hardly. That namby-pamby loser riddled with guilt from his*
> *escapades in Viet Nam would only make it seem like we had lost our*
> *resolve and put us all in a more precarious position by giving the*
> *enemy hope.*
> ---

As opposed to the present situation, where concentrating on putting out the fire in Fallujah has let it flare up everywhere else.

> >> *>The US is driving them up the wall. The US only increases*
> >> *>terrorism and extremist muslim behaviour.*
> >>
> >> ---
> >> *No, it's always been there, like a nasty boil that's been festering*
> >> *for years, waiting to come to the surface. All we're doing is*
> >> *bringing it to a head so we can get rid of it.*
> >> ---
> >
> > *That's your theory. To the rest of us it is just a routine case of*
> > *fools rushing in where angels fear to tread.*
>
> ---
> *"The rest of us?" LOL! You certainly seem to have an overinflated*
> *sense of self-importance, unilaterally declaring yourself to be the*
> *spokesman for millions and millions who, as a matter of fact, disagree*
> *with your stance. Or, perhaps more properly phrased, "your repose".*
> ---

So what did you make of the international response to the original US proposal to invade Irak, as put to the UN? You got told that you'd better think it out again – which looks like good advice, in retrospect.

> >> ---
> >> *What's happened is that the virus is now wise to the fact that it's
> >> been found out and it's trying to kill its host before we can figure
> >> out how to get rid of it.*
> >> ---
> >
> > *Neglecting the fact that the "virus" in Irak was only killing Irakís,*
>
> ---
> *"only killing Irakís"? Interesting choice of words...*
> ---
>
> > *and nowhere near as many of them as you have done for, and your
> > pointless invasion has now dispersed it around the world where it
> > threatens to become an epidemic which you don't seem to have clue how
> > to control – talk about opening Pandora's box*
>
> ---
> *The box was already opened, then closed for a long time. What we've
> done is open it for the second time.*
> ---
>
> >> >> *"Sorry, Uncle Sam, we can't help you right now but call us when the
> >> >> bread is baked and we'll help you to eat it"...*
> >
> > *Theo van Gogh got to eat some of the bread you baked, as did a bunch
> > of Spanish commuters earlier this year, and some Australian tourists
> > on Bali in 2002 (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2002_Bali_terrorist_bombing).*
>
> ---
> *So, everybody in the world should kow-tow to al-Qaeda's demands for
> the destruction of the US in order to gain themselves a little
> temporary safety? Until al-Qaeda later decrees that some other
> infidel country is on their hit list? And then...???*
> ---

And how did invading Irak do anything against al-Qaeda? The invasion – as I've already said – did nothing to harm al-Qaeda – and the Arab reaction to the invasion seems to have done lots to help al-Qaeda.

> > *We'd much prefer not to be sharing the results of your rash adventure.*
>
> ---
> *You don't want to share the risk, but you won't mind sharing the the
> reward, huh?*

What reward?

Bill Sloman, Nijmegen