

Re: Yet Another Roswell Thread

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2007-07/msg00426.html>

- *From:* ainarbb@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Mon, 16 Jul 2007 06:20:09 -0700
-

Ian Parker wrote:

On 16 Jul, 01:23, eina...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

It appears that throughout most of history societies were indeed extremely concervative. Think about it, you may be familiar with the movie "300." But when the Greegs fought the Persians they found out that theyr traditional shields were stronger, theyr traditional spears were longer. That gave Greeg foot soldiers a clear edge over the standard Persian foot soldier of the time. Decates later, that gave Alexander the Great the confidence that a much smaller Greeg army could defeat the Persian empire. In the meantime there had been no change whatsoever in the Persian armoury. Just a litle example.

It appear to me that humanity would indeed have stagnated again for long periods, like during the stoneage, if there hadn't been for the periodic influx/invations of new people's who replased the previous ones. Innovation what happened appears to have often been driven by such events.

In ancient times it appears people were really reluctant, far more than can really be understood by the modern man, to change. They did stay with what they knew, what theyr forfathers had used, and in most cases it took the influx of a fresh group of people to make a change.

That doesn't mean there was no communication, after all trading relations were widespread and regular going right back to the late stone age. Sometimes people did actually innovate but such events usually were hundreds of years apars.

Something genuine has happened in Modern Times. A change as fundamental as the change which ocured between 50 and 60th. years ago. Nowadays people are far, far more responsive to change, to the adaptation of something new, that before and it's such a huge change that it needs to be called a transformation. It didn't happen all at once, one can trace the first seeds perhaps back to the 15th. century Itali. But since the industrial revolution began in 18th. century Britain the pace of change has been gathering steam and gathering some

Re: Yet Another Roswell Thread

more steam right since then and there appears to be no going back.

I think this is to an extent due to increased communication.

I think not. It does not matter how often you communicate if you are not responsive to the foreign idea(s). Something has changed which has made people far more prepared than ever before to try out new things, to give new ideas a chance. It's like you heard nothing I said. Societies have been existing side by side for more than thousand years, yet the whole time maintaining regular contacts, still each persisting with their own thing even though one was clearly gaining on the other.

The big change is people's readiness to adopt a new thing, when prior societies had a deep reluctance to do that.

I really don't see how the difference could simply be more frequent communication. Now, one can see ideas travel and being adopted, but before people heard about them, knew others were operating in different ways, but still it remained to them unthinkable to try out these different ways. That's IMO is the real difference between modernity and the past.

Ian Parker wrote:

On 16 Jul, 01:23, eina...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

When people vote on ethnic or religious lines, that can create a most unfortunate situation. Africa has seen many such cases, often ending in tears. It's a reason behind much of the instability there, i.e. different ethnic or religious groups compete for the control of the state organs, any way they can. When they gain control, they often used that influence to enrich or benefit their own group, usually to the detriment of the other groups. Typical in Africa is that an election results in the rule of the largest single ethnic/religious group, if there is another ethnic/religious group or groups with a sizeable population(s), then what has number of times happened is that members of that group engineer a hostile takeover of the government, i.e. a coupe. What then may follow is a series of coups and counter coups, leading to either of the two: a) highly repressive despotic police state under the control of a single ethnic/religious group or b) civil war. Africa has seen a great number of coups, many repressive despots and many civil wars.

Interesting is how blind the Bush' regime was to the fact that Iraq had a similar history and hence was likely to follow a similar pattern over again. The regime of Saddam was one of the two logical outcomes, now that Bush has ousted him the second logical outcome has

Re: Yet Another Roswell Thread

occured instead. Mind you, African history does also show that such civil wars are not without end, but usually it takes years for them to be resolved in some manner.

There is an addage that a country gets the government it deserves. Only a strongman can rule a united Iraq. What was in fact needed was another Baathist who was more susceptible to international pressure than SH.

That would have been the pragmatic thing to do. Bush was told by the Saudi Arabian ambassador in Washington who also is an old Bush family friend to do just that.

Ian Parker wrote:

On 16 Jul, 01:23, eina...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

To what extent do people follow these norms?

It appears that in older times they really were adered to pretty much in general. In older times people lived the way theyr grandfathers had done. People didn't expect anything ellse.

The generational difference in ideas and life experiences that has exchisted in the modern period is generally unique to that period.

Modern times are really, really very different...more like a transformation of the human experience at quite a fundamental level.

Brought about by communications.

Try not to fixate on a single idea as an explanation for everything.

For some reason communication more often results in an adaptation of a new idea in modern times. In past times, people learned about a thing but did not adopt that thing. Clearly communication can't be explanation for that difference, i.e. people's reluctance to change, theyr choise to stay with what was familiar instead of adopting the new thing they were hearing about, the inherent reluctance to change which used to be the norm.

In the absence of this readiness to change, it may not make much difference though communication becomes more frequent and easyer at the same time.

Re: Yet Another Roswell Thread

Ian Parker wrote:

On 16 Jul, 01:23, eina...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Putin is running on empty. Defense spending is 2.7% of a rather small GDP.

Theyr GNP is a bit over trillion dollars. Smaller than it used to be, but not small. Big enough to make Russia about the 10th. largest economy.

Still, Russia could be a house of Kards. It depends very narrowly on the tremendously large energy sector which now is in the hands of Putin's cronies. Those appear to be underinvesting in oil and gasfields, and overinvesting in headquarters and other nonproductive stuff like that. Apparently the largest growing sector of the economy is the state, with thousands of people joining its ranks every year. I have heard it said that the number of state officials has doubled under Putin. You literally can't get anything done unless you bribe some official. Which means that the leaches on the economy have been getting more numerous. But a small business man can experience his business being literally taken away from him with forged documents, if someone ellse say a competitor has given higher bribes. This kills naturally small business. This is a vicious circles.

The alternative worry is a second collapse of Russia in a few years time.

Ian Parker wrote:

On 16 Jul, 01:23, eina...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Hmm, in this light it's perhaps not surprising how difficult it has been to decrease Palestinian extremism. After all, Israelis have clearly been going at it the wrong way. Think about it, they have since the so called second Palestinian 'Intifada' began punished Palestinian in ways which has been detrimental to Palestinian economy, which has made the jobs situation ever more hopeless seeming.

As a result, it's really not at all strange that instability and extremism has been growing among Palestinians. As far as I can see Israelis have been shooting themselves in the foot. The more they punish the Palestinians, the more they destroy theyr lifellyhood, the more extremist factions gain power. Yet, Israelis appear completely blind to that quite obvious thing, despite the parallel with Germany of the 30s they ought not have forgotten.

This I think also illustrates something else. Israel is behaving in the way she is because there is no answer to insurgency other than the

Re: Yet Another Roswell Thread

imposition of a lock down on society. Society cannot be protected in any other way. This illustrates the analogy of cavalry in WW1. What is needed is urgent work on an answer. If no answer is found it calls into question the utility of conventional forces.

An insurgency can only be defeated by a hearts and minds approach and economic progress. How do you reconcile this with the security of Israel. I feel though it is also true to say that a lot of security is imposed punitively, is really for show and in the end is counter productive. The Israelis for example could perfectly well take down their Arab-Arab checkpoints in the West Bank. They seem to me to be purely punitive.

– Ian Parker

The only way for peace is the acceptance by both parties they have a right to be where they are at the present time. That means Palestinians have to give up the hope of pushing Jews into the ocean, and also at the same time Jews have to stop pushing Palestinians off their land with their settlement policy.

Along with the peace plan the economic situation has to be dealt with, as far as I can see the only other way to reduce the power of the extremist factions is to make the overall situation of the Palestinian people less bleak.

With current policies Israel is constantly deepening the hole in which the overall situation appears stuck. With most Palestinians being out of work, extremists have got an almost limitless recruitment pool. That has resulted in a growing instability among the Palestinians. That recruitment pool of out of work young people needs to be shrunk rapidly as possible as a part of the overall peace settlement strategy so may have any hope whatsoever of success.

Cheers, Einar

.