

sci.space.policy: Re: [OT] Re: anti-Kerry documentary vs. Moore's antiBush documentary

## Re: [OT] Re: anti-Kerry documentary vs. Moore's antiBush documentary

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2004-10/2278.html>

---

**From:** Peter Skelton (*skeltonp\_at\_cogeco.ca*)

**Date:** 10/19/04

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 10:50:35 -0400

On Tue, 19 Oct 2004 07:37:42 -0700, "Hagnar" <adfggf@frg.net> wrote:

>  
> "Ool" <ulrich.schreglmann@t-online.de> wrote in message  
> news:cl29ub\$soao\$03\$1@news.t-online.com...  
>> "Rand Simberg" <simberg.interglobal@org.trash> wrote in message  
> news:418b9b02.174043671@news.west.earthlink.net...  
>>  
>> > The fact remains that the intelligence services of the west, including  
>> > France, didn't dispute that he had had them, and that inspections were  
>> > necessary. They then used this as an excuse, being bribed, to attempt  
>> > to buy him time.  
>>  
>>  
>> Time for *\*what?!\** Time for his continuing not to have any WMDs?  
>  
> No time to continue cutting coupons from all those sweetheart deals with  
> Sodum that the europeons had.  
> To hell with security, grab the cash and hide under the bed.  
>

Enough of that bullshit. It's just as biased and inane as the oft-repeated claims that it's all about oil or to give Halliburton fat contracts.

The strategy the French have pursued in the area has been achieve their objectives by playing one against another, never letting any get strong enough to be a real threat. Power is used to limit aggression, as in GW1, and enforce agreements like the no-fly zone. The UN is seen as a useful diplomnatic tool. They've been consistent for decades.

Whether that strategy, invasion or some combination was better is arguable but neither France nor the US is black.

Peter Skelton

Re: [OT] Re: anti-Kerry documentary vs. Moore's antiBush documentary