

# Re: Copper theft

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2006-09/msg05371.html>

---

- *From:* [kensmith@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kensmith@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Ken Smith)
  - *Date:* Sat, 23 Sep 2006 13:19:30 +0000 (UTC)
- 

In article <n7a8h21ndftn1hlfm20tg83fuv9k27n1ct@xxxxxxx>, <gfretwell@xxxxxxx> wrote:

On Fri, 22 Sep 2006 13:28:04 +0000 (UTC), [kensmith@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kensmith@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Ken Smith) wrote:

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 doubt there would have been the "shock and awe" if they just blew up an island somewhere. We purposely "saved" the two cities we bombed from earlier conventional raids so the total effect was apparent.

I think the idea was to make it look like the US had bombs to waste as well as make obvious that they were extremely powerful. They were after more of a logical not emotional reaction.

--  
--

[kensmith@xxxxxxxx](mailto:kensmith@xxxxxxxx) forging knowledge

.