

## Re: Bye-bye INF treaty?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2007-02/msg01327.html>

---

- *From:* "Jordan" <[JSBassior2001@xxxxxxxx](mailto:JSBassior2001@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 24 Feb 2007 23:11:34 -0800
- 

On Feb 23, 9:06 pm, Alan Jones <[ala...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ala...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Thu, 22 Feb 2007 19:17:56 GMT, h...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Henry Spencer) wrote:

(Actually, lest we forget how this discussion started, the *\*safe\** thing to do is to equip yourself with the means to *\*intercept\** small attacks, so you don't *\*have\** to make such a choice based on inadequate evidence under intense time pressure. Avoiding the problem is better than solving it.)

Intercepting a missile solves nothing.

It stops it from hitting whatever it was aimed at. Surely this is better than having it strike its target?

A full nuclear retaliation solves "it" quite effectively.

What prevents one from intercepting an enemy strike, in part or in full, and then retaliating?

– Jordan

.