

Re: OT: why USA is a regime

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.vms/2004-10/1782.html>

From: Bill Todd (billtodd_at_metrocast.net)

Date: 10/25/04

Date: Mon, 25 Oct 2004 00:08:12 -0400

"David Froble" <davef@tsoft-inc.com> wrote in message
news:417BF7B0.50504@tsoft-inc.com...

...

> > *Unfortunately, David seems to be turning out to be a lost cause:*
ignorant,
> > *arrogant, and opinionated, with no inclination whatsoever to get off his*
> > *butt and actually become informed about matters before (or even after)*
> > *mouthng off about them.*
>
>
> *I don't claim to be all knowing. I can easily alter my perception when*
evidence
> *is presented that makes that a correct course.*

No: you just demand that the evidence be substantiated ad infinitum, rather than buckling down and doing some research yourself (at least to the point of becoming somewhere nearly as informed as those whose statements you so cavalierly dismiss).

What's unfortunate is that

> *anyone who sees things a bit different than you is automatically a 'lost cause'.*

Nope: I spent a good deal of time in just this one interchange attempting to open your eyes before deciding that the effort was wasted. And here I am yet again, hoping one last time to crack your complete irrationality on the subject – because I know from experience that you're not the utter moron that you've presented yourself here as being, and if we're ever going to be able to improve the situation we're going to have to reach a lot of people very much like you.

>

>

> > *I had hoped for a lot better from him, but then I had hoped for a lot better*

> > *from my country. We do, in fact, have the kind of government that we*
> > *deserve, and my main regret is that the rest of the world must also pay*
a
> > *major part of the price of our having it.*
>
>
> *Attributed to Bill G, Democracy, three wolves and a sheep voting on what's*
for
> *dinner. But, do you have any better ideas?*

I was not referring to the *type* of government (though whether we still live in anything properly termed a 'democracy' is in some doubt), but to the nature of its implementation. The Constitution is still in my opinion an excellent basis for our government, though it could be a bit more complete (e.g., in specifying the means by which representatives are elected: we do not, technically, enjoy any right to vote in this country save by legal *precedents*, which is rather alarming in itself given the current circumstances).

>
>
> > *I always hope that apparently fruitless discussions like this one might*
at
> > *least cause a bit of neural activity in silent observers whose brain*
cells
> > *haven't yet completely ossified, but lacking visible results it's often*
> > *difficult to sustain the effort solely on faith.*
>
>
> *Well, it's a bit tough when JF is totally irrational.*

Your most recent response to him indicates that if anyone is completely irrational, it's you:

What part of the increased deterrent effect of a trial by one's own people, rather than by a puppet government set up by an occupying invader, manages to escape you?

It's marginally encouraging that, six decades after the fact, some people like you can realize that the use of nuclear weapons against Japan at the end of WWII was wrong. Perhaps six decades from now you'll be able to recognize similar problems with our current behavior, but it's in no way fair to ask the rest of the world to wait that long.– and easy to understand why the world is more than justified in feeling that "the USA has proven it is capable and willing to misuse its WMDs" both on the basis of that history and on the basis of very recent statements by the administration (plus its proposals to develop even better tactical nuclear weapons than those we enjoy today – weapons which cannot possibly be rationalized as a strategic deterrent).

You have no ability whatsoever to step outside your rampant jingoism and see the situation objectively, as in responding "Asshole!" when JF suggested that the same standards that were applied to Iraq after its illegal invasion of Kuwait be applied to us after our illegal invasion of Iraq. Regardless of the *detailed* merits of that suggestion, your response to a proposition that is to a first approximation a completely reasonable (even if, unfortunately, somewhat impractical) one was utterly mindless.

Responding "In your dreams" to a situation in the U.N. which *already exists* to a large extent is even more ape-like.

Suggesting that defying illegal orders is no big deal for a grunt (for that was the implication inherent in your response in that area) is absurd enough. Following that suggestion with the observation that what constitutes an illegal order is usually defined by the winners makes it even more so (at least if you're talking about the winners' grunts, as you were).

Suggesting that accepting aid from foreign nationals (or even foreign governments, for that matter) in the course of attempting to expel invaders from your country somehow invalidates its being self-defense is just silly. But failure to recognize the fact that we're being actively opposed by the people we're supposedly 'freeing' is criminally negligent (at least to the degree that we, living in a putative democracy, can be considered responsible for our government's criminal actions), and the non-response of stating that "The US job is to free the Iraqi people" is both incompetent and, yet again, wholly ignorant of international law (because, of course, that's not our job at all but rather the U.N.'s – if, and only if, they deem it appropriate).

As is your suggestion that in paraphrasing the explicit dictates of international law in regards to the responsibilities of an invading force JF is "(taking) it upon (himself) to assign the 'responsibilities' of the world".

And the above covers only the truly irrational (and/or incompetent) responses you gave: most of the rest of them were questionable at best, but at least possibly worthy of further discussion.

...

> > *If Bush is elected next week, there's at least a chance that a lot of the people who voted for him will actually have the opportunity to realize how lousy a choice he was over the next few years (4, or less if the Democratic party has the balls to make a serious effort at impeachment, which, as I've said before, is the proper response to his activities rather than simply ushering him out the door with his golden parachute intact). If Kerry is*

> > *elected, I fear that the people who voted for him will cling to their
> > illusions for considerably longer (and that those who voted for Bush
will do
> > the same, not having had to live with the consequences of their
support),
> > and therefore that little real change will occur (our race toward the
cliff
> > may slow down a bit, but there's no indication that it will even come
close
> > to stopping, let alone reverse direction).*
>
>
> *I seem to grasp your concept, but cannot imagine 4 more years of Bush.*

The only way I can imagine it (or at least want to) is under conditions where the Congress is willing to stand up and say "NO!" to most of his excesses. Fortunately, that is already to a significant degree occurring: even my fairly conservative NH Senators (New England Republicans may in the aggregate enjoy a reputation for relative moderation, but that reputation is not based on the NH component) opposed his abhorrent Energy Bill (and at least one of them also opposed the Medicare corporate give-away), and if the Democrats manage to preserve (or even strengthen) the spine which the Dean campaign at least temporarily transplanted into them the next four years should be considerably less alarming than the last four. Even the reactionary Supreme Court is balking at some of his civil-rights abuses.

Nor do I

> *see the logic, unless you want a complete meltdown.*

You can only see the logic if you know enough about Kerry and his 'neolib' backers to be truly disgusted and concerned. Most Democrats (and others with a perfectly justifiable hatred of the current administration) aren't willing to look that hard, because it makes the situation even more uncomfortable than it already seems – and when you're scared, whatever illusions you can preserve are at least temporarily comforting.

If it helps at all, you might mull over the possibility that quite a few parallels exist between the reluctance to recognize our country's misbehavior (and/or Kerry's drawbacks) and the head-in-the-sand attitude many here have displayed toward cHumPaq's behavior over the years (just to inject a single crumb of topicality into this discussion).

– bill