

Re: GMD Intercept Success

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2006-09/msg00163.html>

- *From:* "Jordan" <JSBassior2001@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 5 Sep 2006 11:27:14 -0700
-

Ed Kyle wrote:

Jake McGuire wrote:

Right. Since killing small numbers of civilians to convince a country that it needs to abandon some military venture has ALWAYS worked in the past.

-jake

Consider who has decided to use such weapons in the past. Hitler (V-1/V-2), Sadaam (Scud), and Nasrallah (short-range rockets), among others. Folks who did not, or have not, necessarily always exhibited sound strategic judgement.

Part of their lack of sound strategic judgement was using their missiles in such a fashion.

But they did manage to kill quite a few people and cause a bit of chaos. London's children and mothers had to leave town again.

Not only did that fail to advance Hitler's war aims, but it resulted in Jadis the White Witch losing control of Narnia.

Sadaam kept CNN busy chasing lost Patriots across Arabia and Tel Aviv.

Um, so? How did this significantly advance his war aims?

Re: GMD Intercept Success

Nasrallah's rockets all but shut down the northern part of Israel for a month. The latter barrage may have shortened the war and may play a role in the downfall of a government.

The latter barrage _was largely responsible for_ the war in the first place, and has probably convinced Israel that she now has to ensure that Hezbollah never again is allowed to base within range of Israel. Israel did not end her own attacks until she had assurances of an international force whose main job would be to keep Hezbollah out.

The mere presence of such weapons could have a powerful impact on U.S. strategy far beyond their limited tactical effect. Today, U.S. citizens don't expect their cities to be attacked when the Pentagon bombs or invades another country. How much would U.S. citizens rein in their Pentagon if they knew that future such attacks would bring missiles with conventional warheads raining down on them?

Until such an attack was launched, American citizens would not take the threat seriously. _When_ such an attack was launched, American citizens would be demanding revenge and destruction of the threat, not the "reining in" of the Pentagon.

And by the way, "the Pentagon" has very little to do with deciding whether or not America goes to war ... do you know how the US system of government actually works? The key decisionmakers are, in order, the President, the Senate (especially the Foreign Policy committee), and the House. The Joint Chiefs of Staff may influence the President's decisions by their advice, but the President makes the decision to launch or end military action, with the Senate and House having the power to sanction or deny sanction to such actions.

– Jordan

.