

Re: Copper theft

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2006-09/msg04988.html>

- *From:* kensmith@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Ken Smith)
 - *Date:* Fri, 22 Sep 2006 13:28:04 +0000 (UTC)
-

In article <qlu2h2h12bldpdqip59faaf12kckhq392l@xxxxxxx>, <gfretwell@xxxxxxx> wrote:

On Wed, 20 Sep 2006 13:00:41 +0000 (UTC), kensmith@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Ken Smith) wrote:

You can't really hurt these people much by bombing them, they don't have much to lose and you end up killing more innocent people than those you can prove were terrorists.

There are cities in Afghanistan. There are bridges and roads and at least one airport. They also have livestock you could take out with strafing etc. There may be less targets in Afghanistan than Iraq, but you can't say there are none.

Yes and that is why they call Karzai the mayor of Kabul. We can control the cities but Osama is not in the city. He is out in the mountains and nobody really can control that ground. Bombing the mountain his cave is in doesn't accomplish much.

That depends a lot on how accurately and intensely you do the bombing.

Also, he was very likely eating the livestock produced in the area.

[...]

Most historians agree Japan was starving and isolated by 1945 and the bombs were probably unnecessary.

Most historians agree that the people of Japan did not even consider the possibility that they were losing the war. The US would have had to fight there way in.

Re: Copper theft

The first one may have nudged them over the line toward surrender but the second one was just to push the Russians back.

I disagree with that theory. The second one was to prove that the US could do it more than once. Many people wanted there to be a demonstration before the first one was used on a population center. The idea was to blow up some small island somewhere and tell them to go take a look at the results. This may have been a better way to go.

I dispute the notion that "Isla