

The following was captured by me (Sherwin M. Levinson) from the Participate™ (Parti) system on The Source™, affectionately known to many of us as "POTS". I know this was not when the discussion was fresh during September of 1983, but more likely in late 1984 or early 1985, when I had this fancy "high speed" printer and was worried about this important conference disappearing.

Some of you may recall that POTS was one of the first public incarnations of Parti. A number of the early members, including Harry Stevens, one of Parti's architects, credited this conference with taking Parti from a quiet backwater of The Source to one of its most active and dynamic components.

A couple important points:

1. You may recall that one could send a message to multiple addressees. If one of those addressees was a conference, the entry in the conference would say "Message yy.nnnn" where yy might first say "Branching off..." depending on how it was sent. Some branches were just the message itself, others the start of an entire new conference.
2. Not all the original messages were still there when I printed this content. Messages could be deleted by the sender or administrator and they could expire and be purged if they hadn't been viewed for a while.
3. These were printed at different times, so the page numbers printed at the bottom of the pages are pretty meaningless. They are, however, in as near to a reasonable order as I can make them.
4. In the USA, until 1989, a published work had to contain a valid copyright notice to receive protection under the copyright laws. All this content was posted prior to that date. I have seen no copyright notices on any of the content. In addition, the authors of all the following content did know (or should have) that it was made available to the general public - anyone who was a member of The Source, which had no entry requirement other than paying the fee, had access to this content. (See [http://fairuse.stanford.edu/Copyright\\_and\\_Fair\\_Use\\_Overview/chapter0/0-b.html](http://fairuse.stanford.edu/Copyright_and_Fair_Use_Overview/chapter0/0-b.html) for more information about copyrights and fair use.) So I think I'm safe in making this available. However, this required significant effort on my part to compile and make available in this format, so I am asserting a copyright on this version of this content as well as a compilation copyright. At the time this was available, anyone was free to copy or print it just as I've done and can make and publish their own compilation just as I have.

This work is Copyright © 1984-2020 Sherwin M. Levinson and may not be reproduced in any form without the prior written permission of the copyright holder.

"KOREAN AIRCRAFT - ?" Conference 83.8249 JIMM, about "IS THERE A BETTER EXPLANATION OF WHAT HAPPENED TO THE AIRCRAFT?" (answers: 14) FRI, 09/02 21:07 (926 characters)

A question, and perhaps another test of this new medium.

The last few days have been full of the downing of the Korean Aircraft. I have yet to see much beyond expressed horror. Does it worry anybody else that no one has said anything about why the Korean aircraft is not reported to have talked with US or Japanese air defense people - who might well have informed it that it was in the wrong place. How come the US folks were able to track the Russians tracking the aircraft and yet were unable (or unwilling?) to warn the flight - for 2.5 hours no less.

Who says that the only kind of intelligence mission is one with cameras. Has anybody ever been concerned about reaction times, resources used etc?

I am, believe it or not, deeply distrustful of the Soviet Union, but the apparent

idioticcies in all of this baffle me. Does anybody have any better answers than we've seen so far?

1) DAVE O.: LET'S REMEMBER THAT THIS IS NOT THE ONLY TIME THIS HAS HAPPENED. IN 1973 ISRAEL SHOT DOWN AN UNARMED LIBYAN AIRCRAFT AND KILLED 108 PEOPLE. I DIDN'T HEAR THE KIND OF LANGUAGE USED THEN THAT I'VE HAVE (APPROPRIATELY) HEARD TODAY. A DOUBLE STANDARD? WHY?

2) MAC:

THE AIRCRAFT WAS APPARENTLY OFF COURSE. WHAT AREN'T WE BEING TOLD? I WONDER IF THE SOVIETS ARE REALLY THAT STUPID?

3) JIMM: My question is. How could a 747 in constant radio contact be so horrendously off course for 2.5 hours. It makes no sense to me.

4) JIMM: If fill Judging from what I have read about intelligence activities in the good old days of WWII, nobody would have thought much about using a passenger liner or aircraft for intelligence purposes (without consulting the passengers) if they thought they had a good chance of getting away with it or denying it if something went wrong. Is anything much different now in USSR, US, Korea, Libya, Israel or any other state?

Message 83.8253 CADY, FRI, 09/02 22:34 (112 characters)

jimm, i'll join in for a while, but this ground is being covered now in "POLITICS". perhaps not enough.

7) MATT: Listening stations are not transmitting stations. These are lower level Japanese who understand Russian only.

We may supply the equipment but the Japanese supply the people.



8) CADY: Indeed, why? And why did they force a plane down in 1978 on the same route? I have heard that it is a long announced policy of Moscow that military installations in that area are to protect their security - including air space - and have orders to force planes to land that they catch. Their claim that they couldn't enlist a response from flight 7 seems to be justification for firing on it. It doesn't make sense - the Soviets will be hard put to come up with an effective propaganda campaign to mollify the rest of the world over this affair.

Does anyone agree with some politicians who are calling for the suspension of Aeroflot's landing privileges in the U.S.?

9) JIMG:

REF. ANSWER #3

JIMM, FROM WHAT I'VE SEEN, THE AIRLINER WAS ABOUT 60 MILES OFF COURSE. IF THE CREW WAS USING THE INERTIAL NAV SYSTEM (INS), THEN AN INPUT ERROR OF 1 MINUTE OF LAT/LONG WOULD PROVIDE THE 60 MILE ERROR. IF NAVIGATION WAS COMING FROM AN OMEGA SYSTEM, A RESTART OF THE SYSTEM COULD HAVE INDUCED THE ERROR.

10) JIMG:

THIS IS A RETRANSMISSION OF ANSWER 6. PLEASE FORGIVE THE BOTCH JOB THE FIRST TIME.

Let's begin by discussing the mechanics of trans-oceanic flight (members of ALPA or other aircrew members please correct me.) Aircraft remain within ground-based air-traffic control radar coverage for only 200 to 300 miles of shore, depending upon altitude. After leaving radar coverage, aircrews maintain contact with ground stations -- primarily by HF radio -- and periodically report their progress along the route of flight. As stated in news reports, Korean Airlines Flight 7 was in contact with Anchorage airways for the first part of its flight and then switched to Tokyo airways. The aircrew made the required position reports, telling the ground sites where they thought they were. Let us assume they intended to fly the airway. They thought they were on course based upon the indications of navigational equipment.

The ground stations receive the reports, but have no way to confirm their accuracy. The aircraft was probably not within range of Japanese air-traffic control radars or equipment which could interrogate the airliner's transponder -- assuming the transponder was turned on. The ground station could only believe what the aircrew was telling them and expect to see the aircraft enter radar coverage based upon its reported speed and position.

It is not normal procedure for aircrews to report flight progress directly into military air defense radar systems. Military radars look for unidentified aircraft entering the areas they are assigned to defend. They attempt to correlate unknowns with flight plans and reports from air-traffic control systems. Japanese air-defense radar may have observed a dot on the radar screen which was KAL Flight 7, but if it was sufficiently off course they may not have been able to correlate it with a known flight plan and, therefore, assumed it was a Soviet aircraft operating in Soviet airspace.

Intelligence services of all nations maintain electronic surveillance of other countries -- both friends and enemies. They intercept radio, telephone, telegraph, and radar emissions. It is likely that US or Japanese

intelligence services monitored Soviet air-defense radio frequencies and heard them scramble fighters to intercept the "unknown" aircraft. Most likely, the intelligence gathering site and the friendly air defense radar were not at the same place and were not sharing information. Therefore, although some Japanese or US assets may have been aware the Soviets were intercepting and attacking an unknown which had entered Soviet airspace, it is unlikely the pieces could have been put together and INFORMATION PASSED THROUGH CHANNELS FAST ENOUGH TO WARN THE KOREAN AIRCREW.

THE REAL QUESTION REMAINS. WHY DID THE SOVIETS FIRE -- WITH OR WITHOUT WARNING -- ON A CIVILIAN AIRLINER IN CONTRAVENTION OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS AND WITH DISREGARD FOR STANDARDS OF CIVILIZED BEHAVIOR.

11)TJ: I AM AN INTEL SPEC. WITH ARMY NAT. GUARDIAN WIS. TO ANSWER THE QUESTION ABOUT OUR RELUCTANCE TO CONTACT THE KAL 747, THE INFORMATION NSA PRODUCED CAME MANY HOURS AFTER THE INCIDENT WAS OVER.

THE INFORMATION WAS OBTAINED THROUGH TWO SATELLITES MONITORING THE AREA UNDER COMPUTER CONTROL. THESE HAVE PROGRAMS TO ALERT NSA IF CERTAIN PHASES, OR DISTINCTIVE FREQUENCIES ARE USED. SINCE THE SOVIET AIR DEFENSE NET WAS USED IN A NORMAL MANNER THIS WAS NOT SET OFF.

ONLY AFTER MANUAL CHECKS OF RECORDINGS FOR THE PERIOD WAS THIS INFORMATION MADE KNOWN TO OTHERS IN US GOVERNMENT.

THE KAL PLANE WAS IN CONTACT WITH JAPANESE AIR CONTROL UP TO 2:23 (EDT) WITH NO TROUBLE REPORTED BY THEM. AT 2:26(EDT) THE SOVIETS REPORTED "TARGET DESTROYED".

STW651 TJ

12)JIMM: The answer explaining how the satellites intercept data makes some unfortunate sense. I'm still surprised that there exists no mechanism to alert ATC of wandering planes when they fly SO CLOSE to hostile airspace. Isn't there an equivalent of

Loran or Satellite-based Navigation available over there. An error of 60 miles in a location known to be so critical seems possible - but quite unforgivable given what I think I know about navigation technology.

I notice no-one has dealt with the issue of whether an intelligence service would use a civilian aircraft for its own purposes if it thought it could get away with it.

13)H. R. SNOW: Unless I am mistaken Aeroflot's landing privileges were cancelled some time ago and therefore cannot be cancelled now.

My understanding is that the 747 has an onboard gyroscopic navigational system with two backups and it cannot be jammed. Although this in now way justifies the Soviet action, someone is gonna have to do some serious explaining on why that plane was off-course. If (and there is no evidence of this yet) the Koreans were using a civilian plane for spying (obviously not the photographic kind but the electronic kind) they should be subjected to the wrath of the whole civilized World, just as the Soviets should if it turns out that the plane was not spying and a reasonable explanation for being off-course can be found (100 Km is a huge error for this navigation system).

H. R. Snow

14)RON TINDIGLIA:

THERE ARE SO MANY UNANSWERED QUESTIONS.

FIRST I CAN'T BELIEVE WE WOULD USE A COMMERCIAL AIRLINER -- A BIG 747 WITH INNOCENT PASSENGERS ON BOARD FOR SURVEILLANCE. I WOULD THINK OUR SYSTEMS OF SURVEILLANCE WOULD BE MORE SOPHISTICATED THAN THAT.

SECONDLY WHY THE DELAY BY THE SOVIET UNION IN ADMITTING HAVING SHOT DOWN THE COMMERCIAL AIRLINERS.

I HEARD SPECULATION ON ONE OF THE NEWS PROGRAMS THAT PERHAPS THE ORDER TO DESTROY THE AIRLINER CAME FROM A LOWER LEVEL DECISION MAKER IN THE SOVIET MILITARY-- NOT FROM THE TOP.

WHILE THE DECISION TO STONEWALL BY THE SOVIETS IS NOT ENTIRELY OUT OF CHARACTER, IT STILL SURPRISES ME.

AS FOR THE SUGGESTION THAT AEROFLOT NO LONGER BE PERMITTED TO FLY OVER U.S. AIRSPACE-- I THINK THAT SHOULD BE A BEGINNING IN TERMS OF WHAT THIS COUNTRY SHOULD DO TO "RETALIATE".

I THINK AN APOLOGY IS ALSO A REASONABLE REQUEST. THERE SHOULD ALSO BE FINANCIAL LIABILITY TO THE KOREAN AIRLINES, BUT MORE IMPORTANTLY TO THE FAMILIES OF THE INNOCENT PEOPLE KILLED BY THE ATTACK.

ALL THIS FOR STARTERS. WHAT DO OTHERS OF YOU THINK?

First, I don't think WE would use civilian passenger craft for spying, mainly because there would be too great a chance of being caught by our own citizens - the public indignation that would follow would be both richly deserved and devastating to those responsible. This was, however, NOT an American airliner, but a Korean one. In discussing the incident roughly 5 years ago with a Korean citizen fairly close to the government, he felt certain that this sort of surveillance is done regularly. IF the pilot was aware he was being buzzed by Russian fighters and IF he was in radio range (both of which seem to be true), then why didn't he convey this information, ask for help, or whatever else would be appropriate - anything but total silence on the matter. UNLESS the pilot WAS on a surveillance mission and would rather take his chances that the Russians would not shoot down a civilian plane. Being forced down and exposed could be a far worse fate. He could have even transmitted whatever information he had gathered before he was shot down. Or, his initiation of transmission could have been what prompted the attack.

Another question I have heard no answer to - WHAT do the Russians have there that is so sensitive. They would certainly be aware of reaction to an incident of this sort. What could be important enough to keep secret that they would rather withstand this sort of reaction?

Message 83.8278 RON TINDIGLIA, SAT, 09/03 11:20 (1004 characters)

I ALSO CANNOT BELIEVE THE PLANE WAS A SURVEILLANCE VEHICLE. SPECULATION IN THAT REGARD SEEMS TO ACCOMPLISH THE SOVIET INTENTION OF DIVERSION FROM THE ISSUE: 269 PEOPLE SHOT DOWN BY THE SOVIET UNION.

I HEARD SPECULATION THE DECISION WAS MADE BY A LOWER LEVEL SOVIET MILITARY OFFICIAL -- AND THE HIGHER-UPS IN THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT WERE SILENT UNTIL THEY COULD INVESTIGATE WHAT HAPPENED.

THE FACT THAT THEY ARE STONEWALLING -- STILL NOT ADMITTING THEY SHOT DOWN THE AIRLINER -- IS, IN MY VIEW, TYPICAL RUSSIAN THOUGHT.

I'D LIKE TO HEAR YOUR THOUGHTS ON APPROPRIATE RETRIBUTION:

1. BANNING AEROFLOT FROM U.S.,  
S. KOREAN, CANADIAN, AUSTRALIAN,  
BRITISH AIRSPACE?

2. A WORLDWIDE APOLOGY FROM THE  
SOVIET UNION.

3. ADMISSION BY THE SOVIET UNION  
THAT THEY WERE IN ERROR.

4. FINANCIAL RETRIBUTION TO THE  
FAMILIES OF THE DEAD AND THE TO  
KAL.

WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS ON THESE AND OTHER IDEAS?

-----  
Answer 17 (of 36) JIMG, on SAT, SEP 03 1983 at 11:38 (936 characters)

I BELIEVE IT TO BE HIGHLY UNLIKELY THE KOREAN JET WAS A SURVEILLANCE PLATFORM. HAD THERE BEEN A HISTORY OF AIRSPACE VIOLATION -- AND BY THAT I MEAN MORE THAN ONCE EVERY SIX YEARS -- THEN PERHAPS SUCH AN IDEA WOULD BE PLAUSIBLE. YOU CAN BET THE SOVIETS WOULD HAVE BEEN SCREAMING THEIR HEADS OFF IN EVERY AVAILABLE MEDIA IF THIS WAS THE CASE.

WHY SHOOT THE PLANE DOWN? WHY NOT FORCE IT TO LAND. HAD THE INTERCEPTORS FLOWN ACROSS THE JET'S NOSE SEVERAL TIMES AND FORCED EVASIVE MANEUVERING, I DON'T THINK THE PILOT WOULD HAVE CONTINUED TO PRESS -- NOT WITH A LOAD OF PASSENGERS.

FROM WHAT I HAVE READ OF SOVIET COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS, THIS WAS A CONSCIOUS DECISION MADE AT A VERY HIGH LEVEL. NO FIELD COMMANDER WOULD HAVE THE SLIGHTEST THOUGHT OF MAKING SUCH A DECISION. MY GUESS WOULD BE THE DECISION CAME FROM WITHIN THE KGB OR GRU (SOVIET MILITARY INTELL). WHY IS STILL A MYSTERY.

-----  
Answer 18 (of 36) MATT, on SAT, SEP 03 1983 at 12:00 (582 characters)

There is nothing unusual about civilian equipment being used for military purposes, e.g. Russian Trawlers, and not being taken out. However, a civilian plane that has been configured for military application usually has something distinctive about it, like AWACS. So whether or not the 747 was used for military purposes is it is unsat to shoot it down. And if you really believe that it is for military purposes then you force it to land so you get the spy gear, the data, and the propaganda. What they did seems to have been just plain stupid.

Answer 19 (of 36) JOHN SAUTER, on SAT, SEP 03 1983 at 12:01 (720 characters)

I understand that Soviet fighter planes cannot communicate on the international distress frequency, to discourage defections. In a similar incident in 1978, in which most of the passengers survived, the pilot stated that he had tried unsuccessfully to communicate with the Soviet fighters who forced him to land in a frozen lake. In this case the pilot may have declined to ditch a Boeing 747 in the sea, knowing that there would be no survivors, and hoped that he would not be shot down. I would hate to have to make a choice like that, knowing that my passengers' lives were forfeit in either case. If that was the situation he was faced with, I applaud his courage.

John Sauter

-----  
Answer 20 (of 36) STEVE DEERING, on SAT, SEP 03 1983 at 12:14 (20 characters)

It was a mistake.

-----  
Answer 22 (of 36) CRAZY EDDIE, on SAT, SEP 03 1983 at 16:10 (70 characters)

And we're supposed to trust these fine fellows in a nuclear freeze?

-----  
Answer 23 (of 36) KEN, on SAT, SEP 03 1983 at 19:15 (406 characters)

AREN'T THERE ANY RECOGNIZED INTERNATIONAL AUTHORITIES OR COURTS (THE WORLD COURT AND THE U.N. -REMEMBER THE U.N.? - COME TO MIND) THAT CAN INVESTIGATE THIS INCIDENT AND PERHAPS PASS JUDGEMENT. THIS IS AN INCIDENT BETWEEN THE USSR, S. KOREA, JAPAN AND THE US, AS WELL AS PROBABLY SEVERAL OTHER COUNTRIES, AND IT STRIKES ME AS STRANGE THAT IT IS UP TO THE U.S. TO DECIDE UPON AN APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

-----  
Answer 24 (of 36) DAVE O., on SAT, SEP 03 1983 at 21:26 (500 characters)

AGAIN I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHY THERE IS SUCH ZEAL FOR RETRIBUTION AGAINST THE USSR BUT NO ONE RAISED THIS WHEN ISRAEL DID THE SAME THING TO A LIBYAN PASSENGER PLANE AND KILLED 108 PEOPLE? THIS IS NOT AN APOLOGY FOR THE USSR BUT A QUESTION ABOUT THE DOUBLE STANDARD. IF THIS IS A HEINOUS ACT OF BARBARIANS, THEN WHY IS NOT ANY GOV'T THAT DOES THIS EQUALLY BARBARIC? INCIDENTALLY, I AM JEWISH, SO DON'T GO ACCUSING ME OF BEING AN ANTI-SEMITES. BUT WHAT'S SAUCE FOR THE GOOSE, ETC.

-----  
Answer 25 (of 36) TJ, on SAT, SEP 03 1983 at 21:38 (1538 characters)

1. THE IDEA THAT THE KAL 747 WAS FITTED OUT WITH AN ELECTRONICS SUITE FOR THE PURPOSE OF ELECTRONIC INTEL (ELINT) USE IS ABSURD. TO BE BRIEF, THERE IS NO WAY TO SECURE THE EQUIPMENT, SO AS TO PREVENT DETECTION BY GROUND-CREWS OR REGULAR INSPECTORS. IN ADDITION TO USE THE KAL FLIGHT IS A WASTE OF EFFORT. REGULAR INTEL GATHERING MEANS CAN OBVIOUSLY WATCH THE AREA. TO EVEN DISCUSS THIS NONSENSE MERELY GIVES CREDIBILITY TO THE SOVIET FAIRY TALE.

2. THE SEA OF OKHOTSK, KAMCHATKA PEN., SAKHALIN ISLE AREA IS A PRIME BASING & OPERATIONAL AREA FOR THE SOVIET BALLISTIC MISSILE SUBMARINES IN THE PACIFIC FLEET OF THE SOV. NAVY. ALSO THE AREA PROVIDES ELINT POSITIONS FOR ACTIVITY DIRECTED AGAINST JAPAN, CHINA, AND NORTHERN PACIFIC NAVAL ACTIVITY.

3. TO THE SOVIETS ESPECIALLY TO THE PVO (THEIR NORAD EQUIVILENT) ANY

BREACH OF AIRSPACE IS AN INTOLERABLE ITEM. AFTER THE EXECUTIONS, DISMISALS, AND REORGANIZATIONS FOLLOWING THE INCIDENT IN 1978 OVER THE KOLA PEN. (IN NORTH EUROPEAN SOVIET UNION) WHERE A PLANE PENETRATED DEEP INTO SOV AIRSPACE (500-1000 MILES) THEY WERE KEYED UP FOR THIS.

4. GIVEN THE COMMAND STRUCTURE OF THE PVO, THE FIRE ORDER HAD TO COME FROM THE CENTRAL HQ. FAR EAST REGION WOULD NOT TAKE THIS KIND OF ACT ON ITS OWN. WETHER OR NOT THE POLITICAL END OF THE SOVIET APIRATE WAS ENGAGED MAY BE OPEN TO QUESTION. BUT THE DECISION TO FIRE HAD TO COME FROM VERY NEAR THE TOP, DEF. MIN USTINOV COMES TO MIND IN THIS CONTEXT.

TOM JOHNSON

-----  
Answer 26 (of 37) MES, on SAT, SEP 03 1983 at 22:18 (726 characters)

Tom Johnson has answered all my questions. He knows everything there is to know about the Soviets' military and political apparatus that it is clear that the U.S. and South Koreans would simply ask him rather than send a spy plane. Still, I find the arguments that the Soviets are just so paranoid and trigger happy that they shot this bird down after tracking it for 2.5 hours unconvincing. Common folks, either they are trigger happy, paranoid, devil-possessed, atheistic, subhuman psycho- paths or they are cold, calculating, emotionless, atheistic, superhuman psychopaths. They can't be both -- can they? Maybe they can. Tom Johnson would know for sure. What do you say Tom? What's the real story?

-----  
Answer 27 (of 37) TJ, on SAT, SEP 03 1983 at 23:25 (560 characters)

TJ) TO ANSWER, I AM NOT CALLING ANYONE NAMES, OR SUPERHUMAN. THIS INFO IS MY SPECIALTY AND I AM SHARING AS MUCH OF IT AS I CAN TO INFORM FELLOW CONFRANCE MEMBERS ON THIS MATTER.

THE REAL STORY MAY NEVER BE PUBLICLY REVEALED, SINCE TO DO SO ON OUR PART MAY COMPRIMISE INTEL GATHERING MEANS NOW IN USE, OR BY THE SOVIETS. THE SOVIETS HAVE NOW ISSUED TWO UNCOORDINATED STATEMENTS THAT TAKE THEM FROM NOWHERE NEAR THE CRASH TO FIRING WARNING SHOTS. I BELIVE THAT THEY WILL STICK TO THIS AND RIDE OUT THE STORM.

TOM JOHNSON STW651

-----  
Answer 28 (of 37) TJ, on SAT, SEP 03 1983 at 23:48 (728 characters)

TJ) ACCORDING TO JAPANESE GOV. (UNATRIBUTED) SOVIETS THOUGHT KAL WAS A USAF RC-135 RECCE VERSION OF THE BOEING 707. IF TRUE THE TRAINING OF BOTH PILOTS, AND RADAR OPERATORS IN THE FAR EAST REGION IS VERY MUCH IN NEED OF WORK. THE 747 IS ABOUT 3 TIMES THE SIZE OF AN RC-135 AND HAS A VERY DIFFERENT SHAPE. ALSO THE RADAR TRACK OF THE AIRCRAFT WOULD BE AN INDICATION OF ITS PURPOSE. AN RC-135 WOULD NOT, NOT, FLY AT 33,000 AND MAINTAIN THE COURSE KAL 7 DID. THE RC-135 IS AN ELINT ACFT. AND WOULD FLY HIGHER AND OUTSIDE USSR AIRSPACE. THIS TO AVOID INTERCEPT AND FORCED LANDING ON SOVIET FIELD. SOVIET LONGRANGE ARICRAFT FLY SIMILAR MISSION PROFILES OFF THE EAST COAST OF US.

TOM JOHNSON

-----  
Answer 29 (of 37) EUGENE, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 00:49 (638 characters)

I THINK THE PLANE WAS WARNED TO FORCE LAND. I ALSO BELIEVE THAT THE PLANE RADIOED THE GROUND AND ADMITTED TO HAVING A US CONGRESSMAN ABOARD. THIS WAS

TRANSMITTED TO THE RUSSIANS,WHOM FINALLY DECIDED TO FIRE ON THE PLANE. WHY ELSE DID IT TAKE TWO AND ONE HALF HOURS? ALSO,DID YOU KNOW THE PLANE FLEW DIRECTLY OVER A SECRET SOVIET NAVY BASE? IF YOU LOOK AT THE MAP THE PLANE WAS FLYING FROM JAPAN TO THE NORTH AND WOULD HAVE TO TURN SOUTH 180 DEGREES TO HEAD BACK TO SEOUL. WHY WAS THE PLANE SO FAR OFF COURSE. DID THE KOREAN CIA KNOW THE WHEREABOUTS OF THE PLANE? RAISES SOME INTERESTING QUESTIONS DOESN'T IT?

-----

Answer 30 (of 37) JIMG, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 00:56 (102 characters)

REF ANS 29. WORK ON YOUR GEOGRAPHY FOR AWHILE. THE PLANE WAS TRAVELING FROM ALASKA TO KOREA!

-----

Answer 31 (of 37) EUGENE, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 01:21 (262 characters)

LET ME TRY AGAIN FOOL! THE PLANE FLEW OVER SOUTH JAPAN AND HEADED NORTH FROM THERE.THIS IS NOT A NORMAL ROUTE FOR ANY PLANE. I DON'T KNOW WHERE THE PLANE STOPPED TO REFUEL. IF IT DID,NORMAL REFUELLING IS IN TOKYO. IF I'M STILL WAY OFF BASE LET ME KNOW.

-----

Answer 32 (of 37) TJ, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 02:15 (1970 characters)

TJ) THE AIRCRAFT WAS ENROUTE FROM ALASKA TO SEOUL FLYING SOUTH. FROM ALASKA ACFT. HAD TO FLY TOWARDS JAPAN TO FOLLOW REGULAR ROUTE. THE ACFT DID NOT OVERFLY THE JAPANESE HOME ISLANDS AT ANY TIME.

AT APROX. 2:12EST THE ACFT MADE ITS INITIAL REPORT TO JAPANESE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, ALL IN ORDER ON COURSE. AT APPROX. 2:23 THE ACFT WAS AGAIN IN CONTACT WITH JAPANESE AIR CONTROL, REPORTING FUEL STATUS, OUTSIDE TEMP, AND ETA TO NEXT REPORTING POINT. NO MENTION OF ANY FIGHTER AIRCRAFT IN VICINITY, THIS SUPPOSEDLY AFTER OVER 2 HOURS OF SOVIET ATTEMPTS TO MAKE CONTACT. THE ATTEMPTS ARE SAID TO HAVE INCLUDED TRACER ROUNDS FIRED NEAR THE PLANE. AT APPROX. 2:26 SOVIET FIGHTER REPORTED HAVING FIRED ON AND DESTROYED THE ACFT. KAL FLT 7 LAST TRANSMISSION OF 2:23 WAS CUT OFF.

SAKHALIN ISLAND IS 24 MILES NORTH OF JAPAN. TO SAY THE LEAST, ELINT ON SAKHALIN CAN BE GAINED FROM POSITIONS ON HOKKAIDO WITH OUT ANY NEED FOR FANTASTIC PLOTS INVOLVING NATIONALS OF 7-8 NATIONS, SECRET SPY GEAR, AND OVERFLIGHTS BY LARGE SLOW, EASILY INTERCEPTED 747 TYPE ACFT.

PHOTO RECCE CAN BE ACQUIRED FROM THE BIG BIRD SAT. COVERING THE AREA WITH FAR GREATER SECURITY AND ACCURACY THAN BORROWING AND PASSING KOREAN AIRLINER. THE BIG BIRD MAY ALSO HAVE INFRA-RED CAPABILITY WHICH WOULD MAKE IT CAPABLE OF TAKING PHOTOS IN DARKNESS.

THE PRIME CONSIDERATION IN INTELLIGENCE IS TO GATHER THE DATA REQUIRED IN THE LEAST OBTRUSIVE MANNER POSSIBLE. IF YOU LEAVE TELLTALE SIGNS AROUND, THE DATA IS COMPRAMISED AND QUICKLY USELESS, AS WELL AS THE SOURCE.

I AM SORRY TO READ THAT THERE IS STILL CONFUSION AS TO THE ROUTE OF THE PLANE, BUT, I ALSO CAN RECALL BEING ASKED IN 1970/71 WHERE VIETNAM WAS.

THIS TYPE OF COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK IS POSSIBLY THE TRUE ANSWER TO THESE TYPES OF PROBLEMS. IT IS UNFORTUNATE THAT INFO CANNOT TRAVEL BETWEEN THE NATIONS AS FAST AS WE CAN EXCHANGE IT HERE.

TOM JOHNSON

-----

Answer 34 (of 37) SDC, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 17:16 (1182 characters)

It now develops (see UPI story 104, 4:45 PM Sun. 9/4) that White House spokesman Speakes acknowledges that the Soviets \*DID\* initially mistake the



Korean airliner for a U.S. spyplane, and that in fact we \*DID\* have such a spyplane in the area at the same time as the airliner was there!! However, he says, the Soviets had ample time to identify KAL 007 as a civilian 747, and they \*SHOULD\* have known they were shooting down an unarmed airliner. While the Soviets have at the least been guilty of murderously criminal negligence, and probably of intentional mass murder, it sounds to me like our intelligence people have some heavy responsibility and perhaps critically serious negligence here as well. If we knew : (1) a civilian airliner was being mistaken by the Russians for one of our spyplanes and tracked as such for more than 2 hours, and (2) that spyplane of ours (for which the Soviets mistaken the KAL plane) was in fact in the same area at the same time, then why in the world did we not get on the hotline and say to the Russians "Don't shoot down that plane - we do have a spyplane there and that's not it"?? There seems to be much more here than meets the eye.

-----

Answer 35 (of 37) H. R. SNOW, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 20:07 (360 characters)

QUESTION: Actually the 747 was not over Soviet territory for 2 1/2 hours: it entered Soviet territory over the Kamchatka Peninsula, left it over the Sea of Okhotsk, and reentered at Sakhalin Island. A critical factor to understand what happened is the TOTAL amount of time spent over each segment of Soviet territory. Anyone have the answer? H. R. Snow

-----

Answer 36 (of 37) TJ, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 21:03 (838 characters)

THE AREA OF THE SEA OF OKHOTSK IS WITHIN THE SOVIET AIR DEFENCE ZONE, AND IS, I BELIEVE, SO MARKED ON CHARTS OF THE AIR WAYS.

MES, I THINK I HAVE THE PICTURE YOU SEEM TO SEND. THE CIA OR KCIA HAD ONE OF THEIR FANATICS SEIZE CONTROL OF THE ACFT, AND FLY IT INTO THE SOVIET AIRSPACE. THIS WAS DONE TO PROVIDE COVER FOR THE RC-135 TO SWOOP IN AND PICK UP COPIES OF STOLEN SECRET PAPERS (YES ANOTHER FANATIC) OFF THE ISLES SLE OF SAKHALIN. THAT THE 268 PEOPLE WOULD (OR AT LEAST COULD) BE KILLED FIGURED NOT IN THIS FIENDISHLY CLEVER PLOT. OF COURSE PERHAPS THEY WERE ALL AGENTS, ONE PER WINDOW, TO TAKE PHOTOS OF SENSITIVE SOVIET WATER, ROCKS, ETC.

THERE IS OF COUSE NO EXCUSE FOR THE SOVIET ACTION, EVEN IF THE AIR WAS JAMMED WITH USAF PLANES, THEY SHOULD HAVE NAILED ONE OF THOSE NOT THE AIRLINER.



Answer 37 (of 40) RLHOWARD, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 21:55 (1956 characters)

For a far more considered, although vitriolic, discussion about this incident, you really must go over to the "POLITICS" Conference (83.7860) and read answers # 49-53.

I am astounded by some of the comments in this conference!

People refuse to accept what is plainly historical fact. Russia, whether Czarist or Soviet, is an expansionist, ruthless, arrogant and irresponsible country which will do exactly what they need to do to get what they want.

One only has to consider the overthrow of a fledgling democracy in 1918, the purges of the 20's and 30's, the pact with the Nazis before the invasion of Poland in 1939, the invasion of Poland from the east when the Germans invaded from the west, Korea, China in the late 40's, Vietnam (and I am not a supporter of our involvement there), Afghanistan, and Kampuchea (Cambodia), to realize that this is a country that will do WHATEVER IT HAS TO DO to impose its will on a weaker people.

I am far from a right-winger or war-monger, and do not even consider that the US is always right in what it does, but to EVEN DOUBT that the USSR was 100% wrong in shooting down an unarmed aircraft carrying civilians, to EVEN THINK that the US is to blame in this shameless display of international banditry, is absolute stupidity carried to the farthest extreme.

Read what Sourcevoid and Irving at NYU say in ans. 49-53 of the Politics conference and believe that their comments are the merest tip of the iceberg in our relationship with the USSR.

What do we do? Let the experts sort it out and resolve it. All this breast beating will only make things worse. The Soviets must know, certainly, of our disgust. But remember -- WHEN A DECISION IS MADE ABOUT WHAT TO DO REGARDING THIS WE WILL KNOW WHAT IT WAS. Can we say the same about the common people in the USSR. YOU KNOW THE ANSWER TO THAT!!!!

Rob Howard  
STV414

---

Answer 38 (of 40) MATT, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 22:09 (106 characters)

Ken -- the UN has been investigating the chemical warfare in Afghansistan for years now. Comprende?

----

Answer 39 (of 40) MES, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 22:43 (484 characters)

TJ - Thank goodness I've made myself clear. Now the only question that remains is how to reveal this fiendish plot to the world. I think that you should be the one to do it. As you were obviously on the plane, the world can hardly ignore your testimony. By the way, how did you escape? Oh oh -- now I get it. You must have been on one of the other planes!! Holy Moley!! Amazing how clear everything becomes if only one has access to a reliable source of information.

---

Answer 40 (of 40) JIMG, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 22:58 (302 characters)

PLEASE, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, LET'S NOT LET THIS CONFERENCE DEGENERATE INTO A NAME CALLING SESSION. IF YOU MUST FIGHT IT OUT, TRY USING PRIVATE MESSAGES.

TRY TO KEEP YOUR FEELING ABOUT THE NEXT PERSONS OPINIONS IN CHECK. PERHAPS WE'LL ALL LEARN SOMETHING IN THE PROCESS.

THANKS.

"KOREAN AIRCRAFT - ?" Conference 83.8249 JIMM, about "IS THERE A BETTER EXPLANATION OF WHAT HAPPENED TO THE AIRCRAFT?" (answers: 45)

Answer 41 (of 45) TJ, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 00:52 (546 characters)

JIMM YOU ARE QUITE CORRECT, I APOLOGIZE TO ALL AND TO MES IN PARTICULAR. I ONLY PLEAD THE LATE HOURS IN MY DEFENSE.

MES HOWEVER MUST UNDERSTAND THAT TO HAVE KNOWLEDGE ON INTEL METHODS IS NOT TO CLAIM TO HAVE BEEN PRESENT. I HAVE TRIED TO AVOID SPECULATION ON THE MOTIVES FOR THE SOVIET ACTIONS, EXCEPT IN CONTEXT OF THE PAST. US METHODS ARE KNOWN, AND IF COMPARED TO THE STORY THE DIFFERENCES SHOW QUICKLY.

I ALSO SUPPORT THE PREVIOUS MSG ON THE POLITICS CONFERENCE, IT HAS SOME VERY INTERESTING MSGS.

TOM JOHNSON

-----  
Message 83.8363 JW, MON, 09/05 02:13 (708 characters)

THE US SPYPLANE WAS IN THE AREA AS ADMITTED BY OUR GOVERNMENT BUT THE RUSSIANS COULD TELL THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CIVILIAN AND MILITARY CRAFT JUST AS WELL AS WE CAN. IT IS OVIOUS TAT THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE RUSSIANS WAS DELIBERATE. WHY I DON'T KNOW. I'M NOT A RUSSIAN EXPERT. MAYBE THEY WANTED TO SHOW THE WORLD HOW TOUGH THEY WERE AND IT BACK FIRED IN THEIR FACES. IF THE PLANRE THEY SHOT DOWN TWAS THAT US SPYPLANE IT WOPULD PROVE A THING TO ANYONE BUT AN UNARMED CIVILIAN PLANE THAT'S A TOUGHIE.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT ACTION OUR GOVERNMENT AND OTHER GOVERNMENT WILL DO IN RETALIATION BUT HTHAY NEED SOME SORT OF COORDIATED FRTONT TO SHOW THEIR DISGUST AND ANGER OVER THIS BARBARIC ACT.

-----  
Take Carlo's points on Soviet technology, presence of US "spy" plane in vicinity, thoughts of numerous others on this and Politics conference, and perhaps the best conclusion is that the whole thing was a terrible and tragic mistake where communications on the US plane were confused with info on the KAL liner. Add to confusion a fear of questioning orders and it is possible there was no direct intention to down a passengar flight. There is no way the Russians would ever admit that the tragedy was a result of an inoperable defense system coupled with flawed technology - the inference regarding their total defense capability would be just too damaging and embarrassing.

"KOREAN AIRCRAFT - ?" Conference 83.8249 JIMM, about "IS THERE A BETTER EXPLANATION OF WHAT HAPPENED TO THE AIRCRAFT?" (answers: 64)

Answer 48 JIMG, on MON, SEP 05 1983

IT WOULD BE COMFORTING TO KID OURSELVES THAT SOVIET TECHNOLOGY DOES NOT WORK. WE CAN TALK ABOUT HOW THEIR COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS MUST BE INADEQUATE BECAUSE THEY DON'T USE INTEGRATED CIRCUITS, BUT CONSIDER THIS. THE TECHNOLOGY WORKED WELL ENOUGH TO ACQUIRE AND TRACK AN "UNKNOWN AIRCRAFT" ENTERING SOVIET AIRSPACE. IT WORKED WELL ENOUGH TO INTERCEPT THAT AIRCRAFT. IT WORKED WELL ENOUGH (I BELIEVE) FOR INFORMATION TO PASS BACK AND FORTH ALONG THE CHAIN OF COMMAND, PERMITTING THE DECISION TO SHOOT TO REACH THE INTERCEPTOR PILOT. IT WORKED WELL ENOUGH TO ACCOMPLISH ITS PURPOSE. HOW MUCH BETTER DOES IT NEED TO WORK?

AS AN ASIDE, THE SOVIETS HAVE BEEN TAKING POT-SHOTS AT US AIR FORCE RECCE AIRCRAFT FOR A LONG TIME. THEY KNOW THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A USAF RC-135 AND A 747. THERE WAS NO MISTAKE ABOUT WHAT THE IDENTITY THE IDENTITY OF THE TARGET. THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT MADE THE CONSCIOUS DECISION TO COMMIT MURDER, BUT COUCHED IN IN TERMS OF "SENDING A MESSAGE TO FRIENDS AND ADVERSARIES ALIKE." THE MESSAGE TO ENEMIES, "THIS IS OUR SPHERE OF INFLUENCE -- STAY OUT OR SUFFER THE CONSEQUENCES." THE MESSAGE TO FRIENDS, "YOU'VE SEEN WHAT WE'RE WILLING TO DO TO DETER OUR ENEMIES, IMAGINE WHAT WE'LL DO TO KEEP YOU IN LINE!"

I'M AFRAID THE STRATEGY WILL PROBABLY SUCCEED.

-----

"KOREAN AIRCRAFT - ?" Conference 83.8249 JIMM, about "IS THERE A BETTER EXPLANATION OF WHAT HAPPENED TO THE AIRCRAFT?" (answers: 68)

Answer 66 (of 68) C.W., on TUE, SEP 06 1983 at 19:08 (494 characters)

TJ & MES --

Please. Enough is enough. This conference is exceedingly interesting but if you have to argue credibility, please use private messages. With the massive number of joiners to this conference, I am sure you have wasted 100's of dollars in other people's connect time. Please--it is accepted that these are only OPINIONS, Professional or otherwise that show up in PARTI. What you two are arguing belongs in one of the recently degraded conferences such as politics.

-----  
Message 83.8465 RON TINDIGLIA, about "HOW ABOUT THESE QUESTIONS?" TUE, 09/06 22:32 (968 characters)

LET ME TRY THIS--

WHAT IS YOUR REACTION TO THE RUSSIAN "CONFESSION" ?  
IS REAGAN PLAYING IT SMART -- A "MEASURED" RESPONSE LIMITED  
TO THE ISSUE OF CIVIL AVIATION FOR THE MOST PART ?  
WHAT ABOUT SECRET UNDIVULGED COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE SOVIET  
UNION AND THE UNITED STATES ? ANY SPECULATION ABOUT WHETHER THE  
"HOTLINE" HAS BEEN USED ? I HAVEN'T READ ALL THE UPI  
DISPATCHES, AND AM STILL UNCERTAIN ABOUT THE KOREAN GOVERNMENT'S  
DEMANDS TO THIS INCIDENT -- CAN ANYBODY FILL ME IN ON THAT ?  
IS THE RUSSIAN MILITARY PERHAPS TRYING TO COVER UP ITS MISTAKE  
TO ITS OWN GOVERNMENT ? IS IT POSSIBLE THE RUSSIAN LEADERSHIP  
IS NOT GETTING THE REAL STORY FROM IT'S OWN MILITARY BECAUSE THE  
GENERALS FEAR STERN ACTION ? WILL THERE BE A STATEMENT ON THE  
AIRLINER KILLINGS FROM ANDROPOV HIMSELF ?

-----  
Message 83.8473 SIMON SEZ, TUE, 09/06 23:17 (198 characters)

You actually trust their promise? How about the promise not to use biological weapons? How about the promise not to develop ABM systems? How about the promises on human rights? come on!!!

"KOREAN AIRCRAFT - ?" Conference 83.8249 JIMM, about "IS THERE A BETTER EXPLANATION OF WHAT HAPPENED TO THE AIRCRAFT?" (answers: 73)

Answer 70 (of 73) RANDY MAZEN, on WED, SEP 07 1983 at 22:24 (1440 characters)

The act of the Soviet Union of shooting down a commercial airliner cannot be justified by any rational means. However, there are questions that must be raised regarding the actions of the Koreans and/or any involvement of the United States.

The Korean 747 was undeniably in Soviet airspace, and while this should not be a terminal error, it was in fact a grievous, negligent, inexcusable blunder on the part of the Korean pilots. The airline must accept responsibility for, at the least, provoking this tragedy.

Whether the United States was involved, and to what degree, may never be known, either. Were we using the commercial aircraft as a decoy, or did the Russians inadvertently mistake it for our reconnaissance aircraft, which was operating in the area at approximately the same time?

The only plausible explanation is that the Russians thought the aircraft was in fact, the U. S. reconnaissance aircraft that they had been tracking, and that it was flagrantly violating their airspace in the vicinity of their sensitive installations. The downing of a U.S. intelligence aircraft 200 miles inside their border would undoubtedly be a propaganda coup for the Russians, much as the U-2 incident was.

It would seem then, that two unforgivable errors, one by the Koreans, one by the Russians, resulted in the tragic loss of so many innocent lives.

----

\* \* \* \*Branching off of "KOREAN AIRCRAFT - ?" 83.8249 as Answer 72 (of 73)

Message 83.8523 RON TINDIGLIA, about "REPEATING #67" WED, 09/07 22:48 (854 characters)

FOLKS, SORRY FOR THE DIFFICULTY YOU'VE HAD IN READING ANSWER #67--

HERE IT IS AGAIN--

WHAT IS YOUR REACTION TO THE RUSSIAN "CONFESSION"?

IS REAGAN PLAYING IT SMART -- A "MEASURED" RESPONSE LIMITED TO THE ISSUE OF CIVIL AVIATION FOR THE MOST PART?

WHAT ABOUT SECRET UNDIVULGED COMMUNICATION POSSIBLY BETWEEN THE SOVIET UNION AND THE UNITED STATES? DO YOU SPECULATE THERE HAS BEEN ANY?

AND WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS ON WHETHER THE HOTLINE HAS BEEN OR SHOULD HAVE BEEN USED?

IS THE RUSSIAN MILITARY PERHAPS TRYING TO COVER UP ITS MISTAKE TO ITS OWN GOVERNMENT?

IS IT POSSIBLE THE RUSSIAN LEADERSHIP IS NOT GETTING THE REAL STORY FROM ITS OWN MILITARY BECAUSE THE GENERALS FEAR STERN ACTION FROM THEIR OWN GOVERNMENT FOR THE MISTAKE?

WILL THERE BE A STATEMENT ON THE AIRLINER KILLINGS FROM ANDROPOV HIMSELF?

-----

Answer 73 (of 73) MES, on WED, SEP 07 1983 at 22:55 (378 characters)

There seems small possibility that a trained Russian pilot could get as close to the 747 as he did and not recognize it for what it was. A light reveals the KAL insignia on the tail and the shape of the plane is distinctive, not at all like the spy plane in question. It would be nice to think of this as mistaken identity, but unfortunately that just doesn't wash.

"KOREAN AIRCRAFT - ?" Conference 83.8249 JIMM, about "IS THERE A BETTER EXPLANATION OF WHAT HAPPENED TO THE AIRCRAFT?" (answers: 75)

Answer 74 (of 75) MATT, on THU, SEP 08 1983 at 20:28 (108 characters)

So why should the Russians treat anyone else better than thier own citizens? They murder them also.

----

Answer 75 (of 75) MATT, on THU, SEP 08 1983 at 22:01 (1112 characters)

Retaliation -- The existance of civil aviation depends upon over flight agreements and perhaps explicitly but at least by presumption that straying planes will not be shot down. Therefore, terminate all agreements that permit the international flights of Aeroflot. Aeroflot becomes a puddle jumper witin the USSR until such time as the SU abjures the policy of shooting down civilian planes. Next, based upon recent experience, request that all Soviet block countries abjure such a polity. If they will not then terminate all international flights by them outside of the SU.

Additionally, all straying SU flights will be given the oppurtunity to make a forced landing or be shot down. Planes that make the forced landing will then be evacuated and sold as compensation for the families of the victims.

Next pursue this matter in the courts of any country where Aeroflot does business currently. Name Aeroflot and the SU as defendents. After winning sieze all property. Freeze all existing property pending the outcome of the court case.

"IDEAS FOR REVENGE" Conference 83.8286 NICK DANGER, about "WHAT CAN YOU DO TO A NUCLEAR BANDIT" (answers: 10) SAT, 09/03 15:26 (1144 characters)

The shooting of an unarmed passenger plane with 260 people on board is not unlike the sinking of the Lusitania by a German U-Boat, an event which plunged the U.S. into WW I. In the "old days" (pre-nuclear) this sort of behavior would have been dealt with by a forceable attempt to remove the Russian government from power. With nuclear arsenals in place on both sides however, the problem is: what do you do to this gang of barbarian murderers that won't result in the end of the world? Do we really have to sit by and take this sort of behavior? These goons are imprisoning dissenters, forcing martial law on the Poles, dropping chemical weapons on Afghans, and now they are shooting airliners out of the sky. Aside from "stern protest" and calling them names, what do you DO? Does their possession of nuclear arms render them invulnerable to retribution? Are we doomed to making noises in the U.N. and sending ballet dancers home every time these assassins show off their might?

Does anybody have a practical suggestion for an action we can take which won't get us all blown up?

-----  
1)NICK DANGER: Our usual methods for dealing with Russian actions which infuriate us tend to resemble shooting ourselves in the foot: grain embargoes, boycotting the Olympics, etc. I'm hoping that someone out there in Sourceland has an idea for a NEW thing we could do, something that hurts THEM more than it hurts US, and yet something that will not ineluctably lead to nuclear holocaust. Here's something that will scare the willies out of some people: Suppose you were the U.S. President. Suppose you become convinced that we could, silently and with little obvious preparation, make that airbase on Sakhalin "go away". It could be done in such a way that the Russians would know who did it, but that no one else would even know it had been done. Does this event trigger the big bang? Might be risky, eh? If you don't think a discussion something like this is going on right now in Washington, you're kidding yourself. What would YOU do?

2)TJ: IN RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION "NOW WHAT DO WE DO?", THE PRIME AREA IN WHICH WE CAN INFLUENCE THE SOVIETS IS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER. MEASURES SHOULD BE STARTED TO CUT OFF THE OPEN TRANSFER OF HIGH TEC INFO. TO RETARD THE COVERT TRANSFER OF INFO THE LAWS REGARDING ILLEGAL SALES SHOULD BE TIGHTENED AND THE DATA ON THIS ACTIVITY SHOULD BE EXCHANGED BETWEEN THE AGENCIES FREELY. IT IS NOW HELD UP BY ARCHAIC REGULATIONS AND MISSION ASSIGNMENTS.

TOM JOHNSON

3)JIMM: How about hitting the Russians in the pocketbook. Why not agree that landing fees at all major airports will be doubled for Russian Aircraft for a period long enough to do the following:

1. Pay indemnity (right word?) to relatives of all passengers on the flight.
2. Pay KAL for the loss of its plane
3. Pay Japan for search time for Aircraft
4. Build up a fund for research to prevent reoccurrence of this type of incident.

4)GEORGE: Having worked for awhile at Natl. Technical Information Svc in Commerce Dept., where the subject of tech transfer to USSR is a touchy one, I can say that there ISN'T any way we can clamp down specifically on transfer of high-tech information specifically to Soviet block. Problem is that they can

easily deal thru middlemen in other countries; we would have to embargo ALL such technology transfer, or put it under tight security control (which amounts to same thing), and that would end up just being another case of cutting our own throats. Main reason that Western technology generally moves much faster than Communist bloc is that interchange is freer; when they take in the technology, their development of it slows down considerably.

5) TEXAS SHRINK: I can't believe that so many people are trying to explain or apologize for the barbarous acts of the Russians. There can be no excuse...period for such behavior and all we do by looking for excuses is play into their hands. The only sensible response is economic. Our grain fed the pilot who pulled the trigger, our technology was probably copied for the plane that was used.

In order to make a buck we have sold ourselves down the river! We must stop all trade with the Soviet block! Even non-military trade allows the Russians to get high tech material by smuggling it out in food crates, etc. Our aid to Poland and other communist block nations makes it easier for Russia to maintain its strangle-hold on those countries. There are no easy solutions, we have to bite the bullet and that we are dealing with a group of people who do not value life or property.

Must make the same mistake we made with Hitler? If we do, can we survive it this time around?

6) KEN: HEY COME ON NOW - HOW ABOUT SLOWING DOWN AND WAITING FOR THE FACTS. NOBODY KNOWS (OR IS TELLING) WHAT HAPPENED.

7) JOHN SAUTER: This conference has been about what the government can do in response to the incident. Let's talk about what we can do. I agree that the response should be economic. Boycotting products isn't workable for the same reason as technology--it is too easy to use middlemen. How about this: don't vacation in any Soviet block country. Instead, vacation in some Western country. I don't know how much foreign exchange the Soviets make from vacationers, but it must be a lot or they wouldn't have all the Intrurist bureaucracy. Even if it isn't much there is symbolic value to it, and we can be sure that only the Soviet block governments will be hurt.

John Sauter

8) BJ:

FROM 'THIS WEEK WITH DAVID BRINKLEY' (ABC)

Speaking on This Week with David Brinkley on ABC, George Wills made some very strong points concerning our relationship with the eastern bloc countries. His major point is that American banks are making 6% money available to the Polish government while most Americans are paying at least 12% for the money they borrow. If the US government were to buy up all of the outstanding loans to the Eastern Bloc Countries held by American, the strategic weapon of "credit" would then be in the hands of our foreign policy decision makers and no longer controlled by private bankers.

Once the US government owns the loans, we can force an Eastern Bloc country into default by calling its loans. Poland was the example used in the broadcast, with the expected outcry and concern for the Polish people.

DISCUSSION:



Separating a people from its government is a well worn Eastern ploy, and as much as I feel for the Polish people, they do allow their government to be Communist. The Afghans, for example, do not.

I would add to Mr. Wills scenerio, that no future loans should be allowed by American banks to any foreign government, particularly a Communist one. The avowed purpose of Communism is the destruction of Western banks and governments. Why do these institutions persist in the short-sighted support of their own destroyers?

After the US government owns the E. Bloc loans, the default step must be taken with extreme caution. If calling the loans on Poland makes the Russians think their own economic demise is finally at hand, they will react with violence.

Bill Jones

9)TJ: I AGREE WITH BILL, THE IDEA OF ECONOMIC WARFARE IS ONE AREA WHERE WE DO HAVE A MASSIVE SUPERIORITY OVER THE SOVIETS. THE ACTIONS SUGGESTED BY G. WILL THIS AM ARE BASICALLY SOUND, BUT REQUIRE GREAT CARE IN THIER DEVELOPMENT TO ACTION.

ANOTHER VITAL POINT, DO WE MAKE THIS A UNILATERAL ACTION? THE COSTS MAY BE BEARABLE, BUT TO SHOOT ONESELF IN THE FOOT HARDLY SHOWS AN ABILITY TO HANDLE THE WEAPON.

TOM JOHNSON

10)NICK DANGER: 1. It seems to me that imposing stiff landing fees on Aeroflot flights which land in Western countries will be quickly answered by high landing fees on Western flights to the USSR. Such a step may perversely lead to a monopoly for Aeroflot on routes to and from the USSR. Wrong step.

2. After reading this conference's parent, I am convinced that the fellow who says we should "wait for the facts" really means "we should do nothing." He and his ilk won't be personally satisfied until they are flown to Korea and shown a missile marked "CCCP" clearly sticking out of some pitiful 3-year old's abdomen. And then they will say the Korean CIA put it there. Wake up, jerk! There are 269 innocent people dead!! You EXCUSE this!!!

3. Cutting off their money...Hmmm. Sounds reasonable. How do we begin?

"POLITICS" Conference 83.7860 KEN AT PSI, organizer, about "A FORUM FOR POLITICAL DISCUSSION" (answers: 70) TUE, 08/23 20:49 (668 characters)

Answer 47 (of 70) MES, on SAT, SEP 03 1983 at 21:54 (1322 characters)

One doesn't have to approve of the Soviet Union to be willing to apply to their alleged acts the same criteria we apply to those accused of crimes within our own borders. So far, there is nothing but allegations to support the idea that the Soviets shot down the Korean flight. Planes go down for a variety of reasons, and the story coming out of both sides with regard to the loss of this aircraft stinks. The U.S.-Korean story has as many holes in it as the Soviet tale. In any event, it seems extremely likely to me that the plane was indeed involved in some espionage activity -- and that the U.S. was aware of it. Spy satellites and electronic eaves-dropping notwithstanding, there is still a use for direct overflights. Perhaps, knowing how volatile the Soviets are about intrusions into their airspace, we should not have exposed civilians to this peril. Before we drown in our own self-righteousness, perhaps it should be recalled that the Soviets have no monopoly on brutality. Should we list a few reminders: My Lai, Kent State, Dresden, Hiroshima, Chicago, El Salvador, Atlanta. Of course, we're nicer folks than they. But let's not pretend that we're John Wayne and they're Jack Palance. And let's at least see some real EVIDENCE before we draw conclusions and pass sentences.

----

Answer 49 (of 70) SOURCEVOID, on SAT, SEP 03 1983 at 23:14 (2550 characters)

Oh Horsehockey, MES! The JAPANESE (now go ahead and make them part of the conspiracy too - and the Australians, and the Canadians, and of course Congress had to know too and really wanted to get rid of McDonald, so they also arranged to have him miss his flight by 4 minutes) are the ones who monitored the pilot/ground conversation. And who was flying the jet, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or maybe the slant eyed pilot was really from the CIA. Couldn't possibly be just what it in fact was - a Korean civilian airliner whose (often) sloppy navigation send them over Soviet territory.

As for fascism, I have found the extreme left in the United States more willing to use the power of government to jam their own notions down the throats of all Americans than the extreme right.

And the self-righteous liberals who, as you are so quick to say that the US is no better than its adversaries, are also so damn blind they couldn't tell a blatant international crime (which the shoot - down was) if it hit them in the face like a wet fish.

And who is the "we" who exposed "civilians" to "their" airspace? Where is your evidence MES. Your tortured reasoning makes Sec Shultz sound like Sir Galahad.

Did it occur to you that the most likely explanation is that the sloppy Korean airlines met the incompetant (politically) western Soviet military mind and, in their paranoia over possible pictures (stupid too when our satellites can do a better job) coupled with a delegation of shoot-down authority after their Air Force looked like asses when in 1978 they couldn't even make contact with a strayed Korean liner until it had penetrated enough to have done in half a dozen cities if it were armed to do so - shot the damn thing down (after, incidentally it had passed over all their installations). I'll bet you Andropov has already fired a dozen generals, has sent some unattributable private communication to Reagan saying (It was one of my stupid Generals. Sorry. It wont happen again). But BOTH nations will act according to their doctrines and play out an inconclusive war of words and postures and punitive

acts.

Which, of course, is the really frightening thing. That WWII will start as a series of accidents. The trouble with you MES, is that you really think governments know what the hell they are doing most of the time! Not only don't they, but the supposed omnipotent media couldn't even get the story straight. And now you add your ancient 60's paranoia!

-----  
Answer 50 (of 70) KEN, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 01:23 (102 characters)

THANK GOD FOR SOURCEVOID. THIS SOUNDS LIKE ANOTHER CASE OF INCOMPETENCE, NOT SOME WILD CONSPIRACY.

-----  
Answer 52 (of 70) SOURCEVOID, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 12:51 (2488 characters)

Well, well, well. My little speculation thrust at self (U.S.) flagellating MES last night from 30 years watching clumsy nations reported by crap-shooting press, swallowed by headline (but not fine print) confused citizenry got some scary confirmation in this Sunday's London Times. Seems like U.S. intelligence "sources" believe it likely that Gen. Vladimir Govorov, Commander of the Soviet Far East Forces gave the order to shoot down the KAL liner. He in turn got the green light from Marshal Alexander Koldunov, commander-in-chief of Soviet air defense forces WHILE YURI ANDROPOV WAS ON A HOLIDAY AT THE TIME!

Now the plot thickens! Frighteningly so. THE DECISION MAY HAVE BEEN A DELIBERATE ATTEMPT BY SOVIET MILITARY LEADERSHIP TO UNDERMINE ANDROPOV'S EFFORTS AT DE-ESCALATING ARMS SPENDING!

What would you advise the President to do now, Political Experts of Parti?

We don't know that scenario to be true. But we now know it to be a plausible reason. So we can't ignore it, since it is based upon the Soviet calculated reading of OUR probable reaction - anger, cutting off arms control talks, retaliation etc.

Let me give you a little History Lesson. We faced this before - maybe before some of you were born. Cuban Missile Crises 1961. When Pres Kennedy blocked the approaching Soviet ships heading for Cuba after we had conclusive proofs of the new missiles in place, Khrushchev (sp?) send an angry cable to the Prez BUT WHICH LEFT A LITTLE ROOM FOR COMPROMISE. So while our worried inner circle pondered the U.S. response (we had to be firm, flexible, satisfy the public, the Congress, our Allies, our military) A SECOND TOUCH CABLE CAME THAT LEFT NO ROOM FOR COMPROMISE. As our depressed inner circle pondered these fateful steps toward global nuclear war, Bobby Kennedy had a stroke of genius. ANSWER THE FIRST CABLE AS IF THE SECOND ONE HADN'T ARRIVED. For they saw clearly that the Soviet Hawks had prevailed in the parallel debates in the Soviet inner circle. BY ANSWERING THE FIRST, COMPROMISE, CABLE THEY STRENGTHENED SOLUTION-SEEKING LEADERS, NOT WAR-HOPING GENERALS.

It worked.

Now Parti Children. For your homework, write me a series of answers to this question - AS ONE OPTION, ASSUMING THE ABOVE SCENARIO TO BE TRUE, WHAT SHOULD THE US RESPONSE BE????

That's 'real' politics, gents. Not airy fairy declamations about guilt over Kent State.

-----  
Answer 53 (of 70) NYUMEDCENTER, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 13:24 (2330 characters)

It is sad that many reactions to world events are steeped in the puerile

nihilism that became so fashionable in the 60's. It then becomes possible to equate the social insensitivity of an American administration to the murderous intent of rampant Nazism. It becomes chic to reserve judgment on the destruction of 269 men, women, and children on the off chance that an airliner was serving as an electronic Trojan horse. In all of this, uncomfortable ignorance is masked by a juvenile veneer of assumed moral superiority--strange, disgusting, mad.

For many years I have been involved in the international scientific arena, attempting to bring fruit to the promise of science and technology transfer and interchange among the industrialized and emerging nations. Time and again I was astonished by the strange and brutish behavior of the Soviet Bureaucracy when the promise of Soviet involvement was peremptorily shoved aside by the disappearance of their scientists and their replacement by "bureaucrats" who had neither expertise nor interest, who would in turn drop from sight, only to show up in time to catch the return flight home.

It is well known among those of us who have participated in international programs that the Soviets view these activities as extensions of their foreign policy interests. Thus they have always felt justified in subverting the programs of the International Atomic Energy Agency and World Health Organization by assigning KGB agents to staff positions. At the same time, they have hindered--to the point of destroying the careers and freedom of their own scientists--the conduct of technical assistance programs in the less developed countries as well as international conferences.

Social justice in the United States is an imperative. But it cannot be recognized here if it is blithely ignored in the rest of the world. I despise the excesses of the martinets in El Salvador and Nicaragua, of the murderous Pol Pot regime and the bloody-minded Soviet air-defense commanders.

I also despise the sanctimonious stupidity that bars rational analysis and assigns all events to a particular bin in an ideological pigeon-hole. If it doesn't fit, then change the shape of the hole.

Irving

-----

Answer 54 (of 70) NICK DANGER, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 19:33 (224 characters)

My favorite thing about Sourcevoid Dave is how often he expresses my own feelings much more eloquently than I could have. MES's theory is indeed horseplop, and Dave was at his stinging best. Wonderful conference!

-----

Answer 55 (of 70) NICK DANGER, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 19:39 (206 characters)

The response to the scenario given is the same one we want anyway: help Andropov get rid of his warmongering generals by demanding that those responsible for this horrendous act be courtmartialed.

-----

Answer 56 (of 70) KEN, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 20:16 (194 characters)

PUERILE NIHILISM, AIRY FAIRY DECLAMATIONS, SANCTIMONIOUS STUPIDITY - YOU'RE RIGHT MR. DANGER THIS IS A WONDERFUL CONFERENCE. AND I WAS AFRAID IT WOULD DEGENERATE INTO A DISCUSSION OF AT&T.

-----

Answer 57 (of 70) RLHOWARD, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 21:46 (2314 characters)

Right on Sourcevoid [ans 49 and 51] (what would we do without you, Dave?) and Irving at NYU. If you look over in the "Korean Aircraft - ?" conference, you will find even more mindless ravings about this disgusting incident than there are here. I am going to refer the people over there to this conference to let them read some realistic assessments of the situation.

There is even one guy there who had the plane flying from Tokyo north. The self doubt, the vindictiveness against THE USA in this matter, is incredible, especially in people presumably well enough educated to sign on to the Source.

People refuse to accept what is plainly historical fact. Russia, whether Czarist or Soviet, is an expansionist, ruthless, arrogant and irresponsible country which will do exactly what they need to do to get what they want.

One only has to consider the overthrow of a fledgling democracy in 1918, the purges of the 20's and 30's, the pact with the Nazis before the invasion of Poland in 1939, the invasion of Poland from the east when the Germans invaded from the west, Korea, China in the late 40's, Vietnam (and I am not a supporter of our involvement there), Afghanistan, and Kampuchea (Cambodia), to realize that this is a country that will do WHATEVER IT HAS TO DO to impose its will on a weaker people.

I am far from a right-winger or war-monger, and do not even consider that the US is always right in what it does, but to EVEN DOUBT that the USSR was 100% wrong in shooting down an unarmed aircraft carrying civilians, to EVEN THINK that the US is to blame in this shameless display of international banditry, is absolute stupidity carried to the farthest extreme.

Reread what Sourcevoid and Irving at NYU say in ans. 49-53 and believe that their comments are the merest tip of the iceberg in our relationship with the USSR.

What do we do? Let the experts sort it out and resolve it. All this breast beating will only make things worse. The Soviets must know, certainly, of our disgust. But remember -- WHEN A DECISION IS MADE ABOUT WHAT TO DO REGARDING THIS WE WILL KNOW WHAT IT WAS. Can we say the same about the common people in the USSR. YOU KNOW THE ANSWER TO THAT!!!!

Rob Howard  
STV414

-----  
Answer 58 (of 70) MES, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 22:04 (2126 characters)

Boy, you sure are upset, aren't you? Actually, the MOST PROBABLE ANSWER is most likely what you suggest. All I've been saying is that you and your cohorts have taken that probability and translated it into a certainty, which to me is sloppy thinking and worse justice. We can't pretend to be wearing the white hats in all this if we're so quick to abandon our much self-touted western standards of evidence and justice. What the Soviets (and the Israelis and Bulgarians) have done in the past may add to the PROBABILITY that they have done so again, but it certainly would not be admissible in one of our own courts of law as proof that they committed this particular crime. The idea that the "slanty-eyed" pilot might have been engaged in espionage is not so far-fetched, as the South Korean and U.S. CIA's are in that business, and are not above involving commercial enterprises in their activities. The plane in question was in radio contact with Tokyo, had an American spy plane aware of its presence less than 300 miles away, and had at least 3 redundant navigation devices, both inertial and radar. Yet, somehow, it found itself over

territory that is marked on the maps with a warning that aircraft may be shot down without warning. Although you seem to imply that oriental pilots and Korean air services are genetically inferior to their western counterparts, I find that explanation smacks of "horsehockey" itself. Your predictions of American and Soviet behavior over this incident may well be accurate. We'll know soon enough. I'm afraid, however, that those of us who did not reach our final conclusions upon hearing the first reports of this incident will never achieve your enviable certainty about what actually did occur. As to WWII, it will probably occur because enough Americans and Soviets will be conditioned to regard each other as somehow "subhuman" and different or inferior enough to justify their nuclear annihilation. That's how we've been talked into most wars. Hell, where are the Jerries, Japs and Dagos now that we really need them?

-----

Answer 59 (of 70) SOURCEVOID, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 22:10 (334 characters)

Oh, Nick! Ya gotta understand the Government Mind. You don't COURTMARTIAL the Soviet Generals, you PROMOTE THEM right up to where they are (only) advisers to the Supreme Soviet, while you keep the trigger finger under your control. No you then, the rest of the world FIRE THE GROUND CONTROLLERS FOR MISQUOTING THEIR ORDERS.

-----

Answer 60 (of 70) MES, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 22:16 (1350 characters)

I for one find it frightening that all our lives may be terminated by game-playing jackasses in Washington and Moscow trying to guess each other's motivations. After a lot of lip service about the U.N. and the hotline, we're still spitting into the wind and hoping that we can duck in time. It's too simple to dismiss self-criticism and honest self-examination as "airy-fairy" or "self-flagellation" and assume the Saturday matinee serial "me good, you bad" theory of international relations. Unfortunately, we can no longer just send the kids off to die for our wild-west shoot-em-up school of international morality and U.S. jingoism. We have to assume that we, ourselves, are sitting at ground zero. Since we have no reasonable chance of dislodging the Soviet leadership, no matter how heinous their behavior, by military adventures, economic boycotts, or refusing to send our athletes to Los Angeles, the only practical response is to leave it to the South Koreans, whose plane it was that was downed, and to go about our business, pretending that we are fallible mixtures of good and evil, just like everyone else. Maybe a little better than some, a lot better than others, but pretty much the same as most. Or, as an 18 year old student in my office suggested, we could shoot down one of their planes.

-----

Answer 61 (of 70) MES, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 22:21 (344 characters)

NICK D - If we demand the generals be courtmartialled, you can be sure they will be given medals and promoted. The last thing that will be done by Andropov is whatever the U.S. demands. On the other hand, if we keep our mouths shut and let the other "outraged nations" carry this ball, we may just see the result for which you wish.

-----

Answer 62 (of 70) MES, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 22:28 (1020 characters)

Rob - what you say about the USSR is undoubtedly true. However, it can be said with equal accuracy about the USA at certain parts of its history (which

after all is not that long). The fact of the matter is, I do not disagree with your perceptions of the USSR, only with the speed with which Sourcevoid et al leaped from inadequate evidence to iron-tight conclusion with respect to this incident. He may be right -- it could be just a tragedy of errors. On the other hand, there MAY be much more here than meets the TV camera and microphone.

As all you fellows seem to agree -- I think you should pay my bill this month. After all, what would you be doing without me. Who would elicit those eloquent epithets from your fingertips? Why you'd all be sitting back, yawning, patting each other on your respective electronic backs for how perceptive, patriotic and ABSOLUTELY RIGHT you all are. My second suggestion to answer the problem. Resurrect John Wayne and let him take care of it.

-----

Answer 63 (of 70) SOURCEVOID, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 23:20 (3686 characters)

Now you are getting sensible, MES. The whole damn thing is far more complex than any self-righteous position of the left or right can account for. But I am not the knee-jerk conservative you would [like] me to be. I happen to think the endless arms buildup is self-defeating but more seriously REFLECTS A POVERTY OF IMAGINATION IN THE WEST ON HOW TO GET OUT OF THIS DANCE OF DEATH. And I resented - and still do - those who would ONLY bitch and complain about our actions but refused to run for, accept, or take responsibility for doing something about it EXCEPT self-flagellate. Well to paraphrase and old saying, if Wars are too important to be left to Generals, then Government is [today] too important to be left to the merely elected. The American public not only resisted the Vietnam war, and many avoided it, then got rid of the draft AND THEN BITCHED ABOUT THE ACTIONS OF THOSE IN UNIFORM. You get the Government, and Military you deserve, MES. And if you don't get in the kitchen and cook, then don't complain about food poisoning. The wholesale abdication of making our system work in Washington as well as it is (beginning) to work at the grass roots again is very, very dangerous. I swore I wouldn't do it, but I have found myself rereading McNamara's Speech to the American Newspaper Editors at Montreal May 18th, 1966 SEVENTEEN YEARS AGO which predicted exactly what is going on in El Salvador, Lebanon, Thailand today AND WHY THE US SHOULD TURN AWAY FROM THINKING MILITARY FORCE IS THE ONLY TRUE ROUTE TO SECURITY, WHEN IN FACT SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT IS SECURITY. I, and a very small handful of professional associates in Washington provided that speech, and all the hard facts and global view it represented. (Three years studying with all the information resources of the U.S. at our disposal every armed conflict in the world for over 100 years, their causes, their occurrences, their costs, their resolution, their results). It was McNamara's swan song in the Administration. He left Defense to run the World Bank, where more of the solutions were. (We showed an incredible correlation between conflict and the economic status within and between nations, far greater than any other factor, including communism). But did the American Public heed his advice? Hell no, not even when the press spread the text of his speech all over the world. Instead it STILL demanded less foreign aid (notice how nobody on Source is interested in the Parti Conference on technical assistance to LDCs (less developed nations)).

Yet we have been in World War III for past 25 years (starting with the 1958 Marine Landing in Lebanon - DE JA VU!). In the 8 years between 1958 and 1966 there had ALREADY been 162 resorts to force in the political process within and between nations, not one nuc fired, the vast majority guerilla, internal, civil war, coup d' tat, AND NOT ONE DECLARED WAR IN THE WORLD!

And still, in 1983 we act like the destruction of global civilization is



not already well progressed.

And so we leave it to "them."

Its all here in my desk, MES, the scenario for the end of the world as we know it. We are on page 8 of 12. Ive already peeked at the end. And unless some very, very, original approaches are made I don't see anything but that grim denouement. Thats why I am here, connecting, with the only new way for people, organizations, and ideas to move in the world.

But its a race against time. Whether you like his methods or not, Horatio is still at the bridge. And until I find a better way, I'm gonna support him.

-----  
Answer 64 (of 70) SIR BRUCE STEWART, on SUN, SEP 04 1983 at 23:51 (868 characters)

Dear MES:

In re answer 47 ... OH COME ON NOW!!!!!!

How anyone can so lightly pass off the deaths of some 100,000,000 citizens of the Russian Empire SINCE the October Revolution at the hands of the Peoples' Government is beyond me.

How you can also equate a few incidents (not to excuse them: they were inexcusable, but not equivalent!) WITH SUCH A BUTCHERY ALSO SHOWS HOW EASILY SUCH AS YOU IS SUCKED IN.

I am furious.

There are some who would call you a fellow-traveller. I won't: but dupe, I will call you.

---bas

P.S. Please remember that I am \*not\* an American and have good cause to try and find another option to most American policy...but inhuman, uncivilised behaviour deserves nothing less than the disgust of all those who would uphold the ideals of Man. Or would you rather bring back certain (unhealthy) regimes?

-----  
Answer 66 (of 70) SIR BRUCE STEWART, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 00:02 (1012 characters)

Sourcevoid: Am reading at answer 52 (it's been a rough weekend.)

Don't know yet what others have said: answer seems obvious, though.

For our part, displeasure must be shown. Chop off Aeroflot landing rights in West (be slow about returning them, too.) Quit flying any Western airline to any POE, USSR.

Consider recalling ambassadorial staffs, Western Embassies & Consulates, Moskva &c. Certainly throw out on their ear any Soviet diplomat who attempts to dance to a Western government.

UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES use linkage to grain, pipeline, etc. This only causes Russians to (as Fr. Hal would say) hunker down and since he is one I will buy the statement.

In short, we treat civilised men as civilised men: we treat barbarians as barbarians.

And since we have onely dealt in kind with Soviets, we still have room for hot-line negotiation to Andropov which will allow him to manoeuvre in Soviet Union itself if he is in fact faced with a military problem.

---bas

-----



Answer 68 (of 70) SIR BRUCE STEWART, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 00:09 (410 characters)

Rob Howard: Only problem with your otherwise fine repost is that the experts often have sold us down the river. We must recognise that in every age there is a place to draw the line and say "NO MORE".

007 is the place is not what is important: it is important that we remember that we must choose a place if the adversary is not to choose both the place and the time of our demise.

---bas

-----  
Answer 69 (of 70) SOURCEVOID, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 00:11 (150 characters)

But ain't it a shame, Sir Bruce, that a few dozen Russians 'at a small party', Japanese, Chinese, Koreans, Canadians, Poles weren't here too....

-----  
Answer 70 (of 70) SIR BRUCE STEWART, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 00:14 (496 characters)

MES: shooting down an Aeroflot plane makes us as heinous as they are in our eyes today.

But, I ask you, when we are faced with a 'drop your guns, pardner, we've got ya covered' from these same Soviets that you still want to justify, how are you going to live after that?

Of course, I need not have your answer: I know that they will come after my ass. When they take yours...well, those who cried "wolf" today will be long gone to the Gulag, the Lubyanka, or worse.

---bas

-----  
Answer 71 (of 70) SIR BRUCE STEWART, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 00:24 (1578 characters)

At answer 63 now and still...well done!

Let me add a few cold facts to this mix:

1. Russian units are now occupying islands in the Canadian Arctic (for our protection, no doubt, and without permission, much less declaration of war.)

2. Overflights by Soviet aircraft occur over Canada regularly by this 'peace-loving socialist state.'

3. Soviet fishing fleet regularly violated Canadian waters with spy apparatus (and overfishes in convtravention of treaty, to boot.)

These are hardly the actions of a nation which should be considered as 'like us.'

I won't mention the pressure the USSR placed on Canada for getting the 6 Americans out of our embassy in Teheran: that has evidently been long forgotten around this sorry globe.

I believe that children should be disciplined: I believe that gansterism should be brought to justice: I believe that outlaws should be eschewed.

I also believe that our best weapon against the Soviets is to bring the rest of the world to an understanding of where their interests lie.

Politeness is wasted on barbarians, and aid and assistance only strengthens them: the same can be made to work on the third parties we need to help

isolate these bastards in their own country, thence to slowly starve to death.

Or have you forgotten that they have such a good command of economics that they can feed not only themselves, but most of the world besides?

(oh yes, that's us that does that. Maybe we can do something about that in the interests of world peace, eh?)

---bas

\* \* \* \*Branching off of "POLITICS" 83.7860 as Answer 73 (of 76)

Message 83.8365 CARLO HOLLYWOOD, about "IS "INEFFICIENCY" AN EXPLANATION? CAN ANYONE DO ANYTHING RIGHT?" MON, 09/05 03:44 (2200 characters)

AN OBSERVATION COUPLED WITH AN INQUIRY RE: COMPARATIVE TECHNOLOGIES:  
I DIDN'T SEE ANYONE MENTION A POINT THAT HAS INTRIGUED ME, WITH RESPECT TO SOVIET VS. U.S MISSILE SYSTEMS...

EVERYONE (\*REPEAT\* >>EVERYONE(<<) I KNOW WHO HAS EVER DONE BUSINESS OR WORKED WITH SOVIET TECHNOLOGY FIRST HAND (I TRUST THERE ARE SUCH FOLKS INVOLVED IN THIS CONFERENCE) HAS COMMENTED: "IT DOESN'T WORK WELL."

RUSSIAN CARS DON'T RUN, RUSSIAN TOASTERS DON'T TOAST, RUSSIAN TV LOOKS LIKE HELL, THE TRAINS \*DON'T\* RUN ON TIME, AND THE MASSIVE INEFFICIENCIES OF A CENTRALLY-PLANNED ECONOMY WREAK HAVOC WITH EVERYDAY MACHINERY. SIMPLY PUT, NOTHING WORKS. RURAL MEXICO HAS BETTER PHONE SERVICE, INDIA HAS BETTER TRAINS, AND EVERYONE HAS BETTER TV.

MUCH OF THE WEAPONS SYSTEMS THAT CONCERN US INVOLVE ALLIED TECHNOLOGY: TRANSISTOR CIRCUITRY, LOGIC SYSTEMS, SWITCHING NETWORKS, ETC. AS WAS POINTED OUT BY ANDREW COCKBURN IN HARPERS (MARCH '83), IN AN ARTICLE TITLED "IVAN THE TERRIBLE SOLDIER, [Inside the Bumbling Red Army]", THE RUSSIANS DO NOT HAVE IT TOGETHER.

WE ARE TALKING ABOUT UNTRIED, INFREQUENTLY AND INCOMPLETELY TESTED WEAPONS SYSTEMS THAT INVOLVE THE CUTTING EDGE OF 20TH CENTURY TECHNOLOGY.

THEY CAN'T MAKE IT WORK.

CHANCES ARE IT WON'T WORK, IF IT EVER HAS TO... (A COLD COMFORT IN THE LIGHT OF EVEN A PARTIAL, BUMBLED, INACCURATE STRIKE BY MEGATON NUCLEAR WEAPONS OF THE "DIRTY" SORT.)

I KNOW WE ASSUME THEY ARE PERFECT; IT'S THE REASONING BEHIND EVERY PENTAGON APPROPRIATIONS BILL-- WE KEEP BUILDING IMPRACTICAL, COSTLY, INEFFICIENT COUNTER-WEAPONS TO WEAPONS THAT DON'T WORK WELL (IF AT ALL) IN THE FIRST PLACE!

HAS ANYONE CONSIDERED THE RAMIFICATIONS OF THAT? I'D APPRECIATE COMMENT... DOES ANYONE HAVE EXPERIENCE THAT COUNTERS MINE? HAS ANYONE HERE ACTUALLY WORKED WITH SOVIET RUSSIANS ON ANYTHING WHERE THEY WERE AS EFFICIENT AS THE FRENCH OR ITALIANS? AS US? TJ-- YOUR IMPLIED EXPERTISE MAKES YOU A LIKELY RESPONDENT.

FINALLY: DOES THIS MAKE ANY MORE PLAUSIBLE THE CONTENTIONS THAT \*\*SOMEONE\*\* (NOT US, NOT THE KOREANS, A RUSSIAN) GOOFED. BADLY?

-----

Answer 75 (of 76) JIMM, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 10:40 (1612 characters)

Gentle(wo)men:

What perhaps escapes some of this discussion is the fact that this country claims to operate by a different set of standards than the totalitarian countries. If such were not the case then there would be no occasion for the delightful epithets I have seen on these fleeting electrons. I, for one, still believe that striving for such standards makes my life worthwhile.

Assuming this desire, the questions asked about our behavior first in the sixties and then again in these conferences are not in conflict with a condemnation of USSR or Chilean or South African actions. I for one, am not going to forget the actions of the USA in Vietnam. The deliberate lies (Tonkin Gulf, Cambodia bombings etc.) were not challenged (at the least) by the press and the Congress. With G.E. Reagan at the helm now I see every reason to question actions which smell of potential deceit.

Again, I will publicly decry the loss of 269 lives, but am concerned that we may be doing ourselves a long-term disservice by:

- Making arms-control negotiations more difficult
- Bringing economic disaster by ill-considered boycotts etc.
- Stiffening Soviet militarists who will argue that there's no point in compromise since we won't listen anyway.
- Lessening our ultimate credibility if it does turn out that we were indeed mixed up with the whole business.

We must indeed stand up to the current Hitlers, but let us not condone blindly all actions whether or not they accord with our principals.

-----

Answer 76 (of 76) JIMM, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 10:42 (1234 characters)

Several comments on the meanderings of two conferences.

- Sourvoid's rereading of the MacNamara speech is grand. I'm reminded of Mark Antony's supposed words, "the evil that men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones." I'll emphatically agree with the good contained in what I'm told of that speech, but the problem for many of my generation is that MacNamara is defined by his role in the Vietnam war, his apparent refusal to recognize human as opposed to technological reality. His good name was GONE. One pays little attention to a man wearing a badge of shame. (I'll also agree that one who has seen "the light" may well deserve attention - and that it was our loss that we didn't listen.)

- The difference between "Politics" and the "Korean Aircraft -?" conference has turned out to a strategy/tactics difference. What I hoped would happen in starting the Aircraft conference would be an elucidation of the actual facts. We've not done a bad job at that, though naturally we've strayed off into the reasons behind them. Politics, on the other hand, has stayed at the lofty level of GeoPolitical right and wrong. It seems to me there is a place for both.

"POLITICS" Conference 83.7860 KEN AT PSI, organizer, about "A FORUM FOR POLITICAL DISCUSSION" (answers: 110)

Answer 77 THE HERMIT, on MON, SEP 05 1983

I realize this is going to win me a lot of abuse from people I usually agree with, but what I mostly find in this conference, reading it straight through from the top, is good old-fashioned war hysteria. True, there's a lot of sophisticated talk about global politics and strategies, etc., but there's far more passion than reason here, and the very strong message that comes through (to someone like myself who is constitutionally rather uninterested in the whole business [yes, I know. shock. outrage. how can you not be interested in global destruction? sorry, guys. I prefer basketball]) the overall message, I feel, is that the real objective of most people here is not to find a strategy to avoid war, but rather to have the satisfaction of spitting in the evil emperor's face. Let's face it: If you're really dealing with the kind of realistic, bedrock, geopolitical issues that Sourcevoid talks about, unimpeded by the sort of softheaded emotionalism everyone is decrying, how important is this airliner incident, really? What terrible things happen if we just pretty much ignore it, assuming it was a mistake all around (even if it wasn't), maybe even giving the Russians some help in backing out of it with as little humiliation as possible. How does that advance their Satanic goals? The funny thing is, I seem to hear people on both sides of the debate urging this approach (which is comparable to the Kennedy response on Cuba), but a lot of those in the majority don't really seem very happy with it because it's just not emotionally satisfying, now that we've been given a smoking gun, so to speak, and an opportunity to point the finger of blame without reservation.

This probably accounts for the vituperation and vilification heaped upon MES, who, as near as I can tell, has simply pointed out that, if it were a domestic incident -- let's say I shotgunned a delivery truck, thinking it contained a band of robbers pulling onto my property -- one of the issues that would be addressed in any court would be the degree to which the victim contributed to the unfortunate outcome. Awards in damage suits are routinely assigned as percentages of blame, in such fashion. More importantly, I think, MES was simply pointing out that few things are unambiguous, and that there are probably more dimensions to this incident than we now know about, some of which may not reflect favorably upon us and our friends. That doesn't mean the Russians are absolved of blame, or even the overwhelming portion of it. One of the things I disliked about the '60s radicals was their insistence on seeing everything in terms of black and white. I find it amusing now to see MES's suggestion that it probably ISN'T that simple dismissed as '60s liberalism. You would think from the general reaction to his remarks that MES had suggested that we surrender to the Soviets. His real offense, I think, is that he has dared to suggest that the "smoking gun" so many of us are so pleased to have at last, may not be the unadulterated evidence we would like to believe it to be.

In any event, I side with JIMM on this: the reason we in this society insist on the principles underlying our legal system, even in application to the Soviets (or the Devil, as Mark Twain argued) is not because we want to be fair to the Soviets, but because the survival of our own system depends on our remaining true to those principles. It is only enlightened self-interest. Similarly, the reason one supports equal rights for minorities and women is not because of any particular quality or value possessed by minorities and women (something liberals often seem to lose sight of) but because we protect our own rights by insisting on the equal application of the law. It is

precisely because of the tendency of so many to abandon democratic principles in times of stress (national security demands it, don't you know) that Jefferson noted that the tree of liberty needs to be watered from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants.

As to Sourcevoid's comment that you can't complain about the food unless you did the cooking, while I have some problems with this on logical grounds (for one thing, it seems to me a kind of thinking that leads ultimately to lynch mobs), the chief difficulty here is that the only way to enforce such a rule is to establish the sort of government we see in Moscow. Only a few get to enter the kitchen at all, and the rest eat what they're given and keep quiet. Unfortunately, one of the burdens of a democratic society is the tendency of the citizenry to act like normal, inconsistent human beings. They gripe about the quality of education and then turn out in large numbers to vote down a teacher salary increase; they complain about crime and then show up at the polls to defeat a salary hike for police officers. This is also my comment on how well local government is now working in contrast to federal. My impression is that it's still just as responsive as it ever was -- to the country club set. And I'd guess that most of the people affluent enough to be debating these topics on the Source probably belong to that set. Judging from what I see on all the conferences, if the Source tomorrow were to become the powerful political instrument that Sourcevoid foresees, it would function essentially as merely another voice for business, property and privilege. Of course, everyone feels disenfranchised in a democracy, simply because there is rarely a consensus on anything. But those of us on the Source are a privileged minority, frankly, and we ought to have the grace to admit it instead of whining about the public not going along with our view of things. The Hermit

-----

Answer 78 RLHOWARD, on MON, SEP 05 1983

Now JIMM (ans 75) has REALLY got my dander up with his allusions to MacNamara, and his quote from Shakespeare, "the evil that men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones." I'm not even going to try to be erudite, because I am just plain darned MAD!

We in America are always ready to roundly condemn our leaders for minor infractions, misdeeds, and yes, even association with an unpopular, and perhaps needless war. As I said before, I was not a supporter of that war. I am not saying that MacNamara was a paragon of virtue.

The difference between us and most of the rest of the world, is that if we don't agree with our leaders we have a chance at least every two years to change them, or at least to scare them into changing their direction. We have the right to take to the streets and demonstrate for a redress of our grievances without having to make a revolution. We have the right to sue our leaders and our government to insure they comply with the law.

We have done just that throughout our history, including recently from LBJ to Nixon, from Carter to Reagan, from Hoover to FDR, etc, etc.

Using JIMM's test of political purity, we have elected a Nixon instead of a Vietnam tarred Hubert Humphrey. Look at what THAT did for our country! We drove LBJ into early retirement, even though his domestic programs were the most forward looking since FDR's. Of course Nixon left in disgrace, but can anyone deny that he was perhaps ONE OF THE GREATEST FOREIGN POLICY LEADERS OF OUR TIME?

This Shakespearean bullroar insures that we will have a cynical, defeatist attitude toward our leadership, and toward our system of government. Our government draws its power from the consent of the governed. Every two bit dictatorship in the world draws its power from force and terror. Try to

change their direction at the ballot box or by demonstrating, or by merely typing words such as this on a typewriter or CRT, and its off to Siberia, or Auschwitz, or the Amazon jungle you go -- if you aren't dead.

Is it human nature to be this way? I think it depends on the direction we are nudged by those in the public limelight, politicians, writers, media representatives. We go for the exciting news, ignore the good that is done because it isn't exciting. GOOD IS WHAT OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT IS SUPPOSED TO BE DOING so how can that be news.

Yes I know (thank you Sir Bruce) that leaving it to the experts is not always the right course. But in our system of government (and in yours, Sir Bruce) the experts are going to listen to what is being said. You can jolly well bet that there is at least one micro-computer in the White House tuned to Parti. They read the newspapers. They are influenced by popular opinion. Sometimes too much. They do not operate in a public opinion vacuum.

Don't misunderstand me, folks. I am NOT saying we should ignore it when our leaders or our government do something wrong. I agree with you JIMM, we should aim for those standards. But we must remember that our leaders are human beings and therefore fallible. An error doesn't mean we should toss the rascal out on his ear, and ignore his other talents.

I might add as an afterthought that I have found those on the radical left to be far more likely to suppress my right to speak by undemocratic methods. The radical right WANTS to, but usually tries to do it (in this country) by the accepted form -- organize, politicize, vote, and win! Both radical wings of the political spectrum disturb me. I guess it is incumbent on the people in the center to take a page from their books, and organize, politicize, vote, and win!

Know this is long, and apologize for it, but it only costs about 24 cents to read.

Rob Howard  
STV414

-----  
Answer 79 H. R. SNOW, on MON, SEP 05 1983

WOW! WHAT A CONFERENCE! Even normally temperate people like Ron Howard have gone through the roof! What surprises me is that moderate statements elicit the most violent diatribes from so many people. Hold on MES! (A man more right than his neighbors is a majority of one). As for Sir Bruce, I think the extremists on this

conference deserve to have him on their side. Hey, Sir Bruce, the Americans as well as the Russians have continually violated Canadian fishing waters; does that mean that they are also ruthless, lawless bastards? And what is wrong with reserving judgment until ALL the facts are in? (Is that playing into Soviet hands?).

I thought OUR side was the one that encouraged an open attitude! H. R. Snow

-----  
Answer 80 NICK DANGER, on MON, SEP 05 1983

Re promoting the generals to sinecures and then courtmartialing the lieutenants: My suggestion to courtmartial the generals was intended as a way that Andropov could use this event as an excuse to rid himself of some hawks, if in fact that is what he wanted to do (and if he is powerful enough-- he may not be.) Whoever said that public pressure from the US would make it more difficult for Andropov to do this is right; if our intelligence picks up such

a power struggle in the USSR, we should shut up and give Andropov time to work.

MES thinks that since this was a Korean jetliner we can ignore the 60-odd U.S. citizens aboard and treat this as the Korean's problem. I wonder if MES would change his response if it were a Pan Am or TWA flight-- which it just as well could have been. I think the real impact of this event will be fairly far down in the psyche of the average U.S. citizen. I think a bunch of people who had somehow rationalized the events in Poland and denied the reports from Afghanistan are being faced with an event they can't push aside as easily. These guys are creeps-- real creeps. Maybe the "freeze" isn't such a good idea; maybe we really CAN'T trust the Russians. If these guys would stoop to THIS, what else might they do-- and shouldn't we get ready?

-----

Answer 81 JIMM, on MON, SEP 05 1983

Here's a curve ball of a rather traditional nature. I have sitting on the shelf by my toilet last weeks Philadelphia Inquirer. In it is a super job of documenting the extermination of a village in Guatemala. How come something so much less ambiguous (I maintain) than this KAL incident receives nothing like the outcry. I offer the following possibilities:

1. The KAL incident brings us a bit closer to WW3, whereas the Guatemala extermination is merely one more of the old routines.
2. The KAL incident involves high technology (intelint, radar, inertial guidance, etc. which are clearly more fascinating than straightforward murder)
3. The KAL incident involves people who generally speak English (all pilots have to) whereas people south of the Rio Grande don't.
4. The KAL incident is a one of a kind situation and therefore interesting, whereas the Guatemala incident is routine and thus not very remarkable.
5. All of the above.

-----

Answer 82 SOURCEVOID, on MON, SEP 05 1983

Why not emotion, and strong language H.R. Snow? - these matters have involved life and death for many of us and the assault on our most cherished values, whether of the left or right. Was our Constitutional Convention only a polite debate among gentlemen? I doubt it. And America is debating with itself again, thank God, for its very future is at stake and there is NO GREAT CONSENSUS anymore, the absolute prerequisite - in the long run - for the survival of our Republic. We have drifted for 25 years as a nation, with the pendulum swinging ever more dangerously from the extreme left to the extreme right while the moderate, the intelligent, the creative are either numb with exhaustion, withdrawn from the arena, or savaged by the mob. Patrick Henry would probably be in the Glen Cove Jail this morning had he been at the Soviet Resort yesterday.

I am a passionate man, Mr. Snow, having been privileged in my lifetime to have crawled as an infantryman through the muck of Vietnam while my countrymen rioted and wished me dead, clasped as a white the thumb of revolutionary black brothers in intensity of mutual respect that



transcended all politics or race, had paragraphs in Presidential Speeches, and succeeded in making America work again in small places here in the West with the old old ideals and the new society using the newest (this system) tools. I give a damn, Mr. Snow, I give a damn. And I can't help it if I show it. And raise my voice.

As one of Welsh heritage I rather subscribe to the lines of Dylan Thomas when he wrote:

"Do not go gentle into that goodnight.

Rage, Rage,

Against the dying of the Light!" I wouldn't BE here if MES didn't believe what he said, I think him wrong, and want either to convince him or learn from him why I am wrong. For if we cannot find a common area of agreement at THIS level - with none of the pressures for having to ACT - then how can the nation function in Washington? Thus I rather resent spending my money on purile conferences here with large pretensions in which I detect nothing more than electronic dilettantism. Life's too short, and I haven't got the time to be brief, or overly civil.

Don't be too quick or concerned with the force and candor you find here and confuse it with disintegration of debate. Aristotle understood it - he called it "katharsis" and I can assure you, as a practitioner of theories of social change, its uncomfortable Heat is a prerequisite to Light. You just have to keep your eyes open amidst the earsplitting sounds - something I learned from rural Korean soldiers with whom I shared rice in the paddies on the Yalu River when the paranoic Chinese swarmed all around us. Those Koreans and their children now fly KAL jetliners in a highly successful economy as a consequence of the modern skills they learned from us while defending their country, and our Congressmen are willing to entrust their personal safety to them. So why didn't they also learn the democratic values as well as they did the technical and economic? Maybe because there was nobody there to teach them that too. Ironical.

-----

Answer 83 JIMM, on MON, SEP 05 1983

I'm apparently responsible for opening the Vietnam wound. As one who wasn't in the fields I feel humble before those who were - particularly those who were conscious of the dilemma of their presence there. Let me refute only one statement by Sourcevoid. Those of us who remained here did NOT wish you dead.

We were bewildered, frightened, dismayed, angered - in short we were all of the things I have read our Soldiers were. We were not in physical danger. It is for that reason I am humble - but I am not ashamed of what I did any more than most of those who went to Vietnam should be individually ashamed of what they did.

As I see it, the issue becomes the complicated one of what is "the good" beyond one's personal circle. That issue hovers at the campfire edge of this conference. My eyes are not strong, but I believe I see its shade.

-----

Answer 84 NYUMEDCENTER, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 18:50 (4214 characters)

David, you beat me to it, but I will upload my remarks anyway (electronic dilettante that I am!).

No, Hermit, the expletives were deserved. Passion has a place; an essential role in politics. If anything is softheaded, it's the presumption that our affairs must be governed by "...enlightened self-interest."

All events have a core reality, a factual centerpiece around which we react, argue, respond, and meld with our experience and history. And our response to events is of necessity governed by passion. The principals to which we adhere--the fabric of our beliefs--trigger passions. If we believe in the sanctity of life, it's brutal extinction must provoke abhorrence and horror but not vengeance. Vengeance and jealousy are responses which fly against our most gracious and civil beliefs.

No person who attempts in over 5800 characters to invoke a deliberate veneer of cool reason can convince me that she or he is more interested in baseball than a discourse on life and death. It is a conceit that we need not dally with.

How can you confuse the victims of this debacle? Since when have 269 airline passengers contributed to their victimization? Or are the Korean authorities or the Reagan Administration the victims? How did those people contribute to the violence inflicted against them? Oh, you mean that they were sacrificed by others--the American administration, the Korean authorities, the Japanese, and key members of the rabid anti-communist congress! Your legal analogy is nonsense.

Most cynicism obliges the cynic to treat the Soviet Union as a force of nature rather than the creation of humans. After all, the beast's violence is a product of natural law rather than human appetite and the victim--presumably rational and knowing--tempts nature's retribution by passing through the jaws of the beast. All fault then falls on the victim. There is Reagan, taunting the poor dumb beast with a sacrificial rabbit, villifying it for its lack of prescience, and then holding the mauled and bloodied carcass aloft in mock horror. Is that what happened at My Lai, Tonkin, Havana Harbor?

Well, now, there was this 136 foot RC-135 flying a routine reconnaissance mission, varying its altitude from 35,000 to 17,000 feet, adjacent to the Kamchatka peninsula. There were at least 2 of 8 interceptors which sighted all 231 feet of the 747, claimed it was dark (the evidence from the Japanese communication intercepts says otherwise), and then proceeded to shoot it down. Obviously, the Korean airliner was flying a spy mission for the NSA and the CIA. Just as clearly, the victims were cruelly sacrificed to the well-understood need of the Soviet's to obliterate any entity with the temerity to enter its domain.

Now you say that Mes was simply suggesting a scenario with some credibility and that it should be taken as having a merit or probability comparable to the proposition that we emotional softies hold: namely that the Soviet air defense commanders acted with peremptory cruelty and brutishness. Really, Hermit? Having been a soldier (as has David and a few others in this conference) I remember being crushed (with unseemly emotion) when I learned of Cally amock at My Lai, torn with the hatred of black pajama'd Charly, his wife, his kids, and revolted by my own descent from humanity. It wasn't "...enlightened self-interest" that got us out of Viet Nam, but that revulsion, Hermit. If anything, "...enlightened self-interest" got us into the quagmire.

By all means, the rule of law! I have many friends in the Eastern Block countries. They all lament their condition--privileged bourgeoisie that they are...even the one who remembers scratching the land for potatoes under the

prewar order. True the regime gave him his education and scientific standing, then proceeded to deny him the fulfilment that the unchained intellect demands.

Oh, I will live with the beast, all right, but I will scream with hysteria over the bodies of his victims until he learns to respect my conscience.

Irving

-----  
Answer 85 KEN, on MON, SEP 05 1983

A beautiful piece of writing, Irv, and I agree with every word you said. The subject we are discussing is life and death, cruelty and barbarism, and we should not conceal our passion or it's effect on our emotions.

But we should probe our own minds to understand where our passions are justified and where they become barbaric and vengeful. If we are not cool, dispassionate creatures we can at least understand our own emotions. And JIMM's question still stands: why does this act anger us more than atrocities that are much less ambiguous and affect many more people? Mass murder in Guatemala, nerve gas in Afganistan, slave labor in Siberia, the list is almost endless. And what got the american people angry over the years? American hostages in Iran, American involvement in Vietnam, and now the destruction of a jet that had Americans on board and left from an American city. Are we really that self-centered?

-----  
Answer 87 SIR BRUCE STEWART, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 19:52 (296 characters)

The point made about remembering our standards is well placed. If I appeared to stand for some other position than this, I accept the blame for poorly phrased and chosen words. We MUST remember what is it that we will defend: without that, our defence is not worth the costs.

---bas

-----  
Answer 88 SIR BRUCE STEWART, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 20:03 (1646 characters)

Hermit: have just read your 5800+ character message. Well spoken, sir, and well argued, and I suspect that underneath all the snarky remarks of another night we really are on the same footing.

I couldn't agree more that it is ESSENTIAL that we offer the same protections (for our own protection) to our adversaries as we do to ourselves: to do otherwise is both to challenge the legitimacy of our system at its heart, and to demean ourselves as human beings in the process.

Yet I find that too many people are willing to set aside that same rule of law in the interests of international "peace". We must ensure that adversaries of the system (internal and external) receive their day in court, with no impedance placed upon their defence. Yet we must also ensure that they COME to court in the first place. To ignore a violation of the law (or worse, custom) of civilised men is to make a mockery of the law in the same sense as the rule of Judge Lynch does.

My remarks were designed to shock and to express my outrage. I admit freely that I spent minutes venting frustration with many many years of ignoring reality composing those comments; smashing keys in the process. All those looking over my shoulder were in the same frame of mind. I take back no

word of the argument: the rhetorical form I today, in the harsher light of a new day, would have used to better advantage than to dump yet another load of emotion into a society that desperately needs rational argument at its core.

And I, as a member of that aristocracy of pull, do have a certain noblesse oblige to fulfil.

---bas

-----  
Answer 89 SIR BRUCE STEWART, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 20:08 (646 characters)

Rob Howard: You sound like a man of the radical centre. You are quite right: we have left our world to the lunatic fringe far too long.

Don't let ANY of us talk you out of long answers: the whole value to be found in this damndable incident is that it DOES have us talking out these issues---the PROPER prelude to acting upon it.

We can only hope that more of the citizenry will (probably for the wrong reasons) rise up in righteous anger to reclaim their proper place not as the governed, not as the governors, but AS those who ARE vitally committed to their society, their values and the future of their world.

---bas

-----  
Answer 90 SIR BRUCE STEWART, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 20:18 (2322 characters)

H.R.Snow:

No, I do not forgive similar American violations of Canadian Law and Sovereignty. And for the same reasons. But I do at least try to remember that there IS a difference between the actions of an elephant next to a mouse which is basically interested in co-existence and preservation of our mutual differences, and one which would cheerfully and gladly take over my nation and exchange "the life of one aristocrat" for "the preservation of the socialist revolution."

Worse still, Canada has the same treaty (word for word, other than dates and country names) that Afghanistan had with the USSR. We know what happened in the name of "mutual assistance" there. Dare we cancel it? Would they honour our termination, or would they consider it as a "need for mutual assistance"? And what do \*I\* do, a man who loves his country passionately, does not UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES want

to leave her no matter what her follies, and who must recognise the limited opportunities we have to materially change our current circumstances.

America's actions, and the problems she causes, are not to be excused. But they are to be left until later, as a dispute between friends, and not lumped in with the actions of both a country which espouses a religion/ideology of world conquest and the enshrinement of the destruction of the individual in the face of the mass and a civilisation with a millennial hatred of the values of the West and which, should the Soviet-cum-Western aberration which is laid upon be removed, would still be paranoid towards all outsiders, supremely convinced of their role as the New Rome, and passionately and desperately opposed to all that we hold dear.

Russians DO NOT share our values. Remove the Soviet layer, and the hatred of the world, and the expansionist quest for "security" would still be there. Where we reach for the stars (in the West, where our outlook is vertical, upwards bound, each individual questing for a better life) they

crawl outwards across the ground (in the Orthodox civilisation the outlook is horizontal, tightly bound and the individual is merely a cog in the state machinery.)

They never have shared our world-view: why, then, should I pretend that they are entitled to equality of opinion?

---bas

-----  
Answer 91 SIR BRUCE STEWART, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 20:21 (316 characters)

Jimm: re answer 81, the answer IS, unfortunately ALL OF THE ABOVE.

I wish it were not so. Perhaps all the vitriol aside, the conference will help us all to focus on what is happening out there in our world: that, and where our loyalties must lie if we are to be true to our stated convictions.

---bas

-----  
Answer 92 SIR BRUCE STEWART, on MON, SEP 05 1983 at 20:32 (1926 characters)

Sourcevoid: You do yourself proud, lad. Heah, heah, and hear again!

I am so goddam sick and tired of taking shit (pardon my language, those of delicate sensibilities, but the muck we stand in demands no less at this time) from those who arrogate to themselves the so-called right to determine my level of overt emotional involvement in any issue that I cannot help but applaud a message such as yours.

When they riot to have the government give out additional handouts it is redress of social inequities (regardless of the violence and damages), when I write about my disagreement I am labelled "bigot", "radical rightist" or "damned Tory". When they knock off innocent civilians around the world it is called "a popular uprising" (or "restoring order", depending on the alliance status involved); when I express my outrage against any of man's continuing lack of consistency in his values, I am labelled as either "damned reactionary" or "leftist swine", as appropriate.

When they shoot down an airliner, giving the impression of circumstances that has been given, and I express my outrage, I am called "overly emotional" and "not waiting to have all the facts". And how, pray tell, do I verify the honesty and truthfulness and completeness of the reporting of these facts (either by our media, or theirs...it matters little which.)? I suspect I will have doubts regardless.

That shouldn't paralyse my actions, though. And it will not. We may have taken far too much already (that remains to be seen) but we must, if we are to be true to the values of our respective nations, and of our civilisation, draw a line and say "this I will support, and that I will oppose, regardless of how expedient it is to do the opposite."

Anything less is to be less than that which man was meant to be ... and, ultimately, painfully dead as opposed to honourably departed.

---bas

-----  
Answer 93 THE HERMIT, on MON, SEP 05 1983

Come on, Irving, who's being ingenuous now? I didn't say anything about

feeling passion -- only about acting out of passion when reason is called for. And in fact, I didn't even counsel that. I simply pointed out that some of you seem to want to have it both ways -- to portray yourselves as hardheaded realists dealing with the true facts (in opposition to mushheads like MES and I), while calling for the rope.

Also, I haven't the slightest idea what happened in the incident under discussion. I have not read the conference which dealt with that, nor have I paid much attention to the news accounts. I was reacting strictly to what I read here, in this conference, and I don't see any need to take back anything I said.

And, for what it's worth, 5800 words isn't a lot for me. I could have written five times that about basketball without breaking a sweat. The Hermit

-----  
"STOP" Conference 83.8409 JOHN PATRICK, (answers: 0) MON, 09/05 22:23 (1078 characters)

Sourcevoid: No one seems to be speaking about Reagan, and his non-surprise to this occurrence. He is not surprised, because he believes (and has believed) this to be the mentality of the Soviet leadership (which should be somewhat divorced from the Soviet Citizenship). Their history does not help them. There is also the point (Sourcevoid) about Reagans speech about what has been called "High-Frontier". If that is not a radical departure from our standard nuclear policy, you did not read it. His perceptions are right, and the way to remove ourselves from this madness is to make it OBSOLETE. When we don't have to have nuclear weapons to keep the Soviets from their worldwide terrorism, we will very quickly dismantle (most) of ours. Our creativity and freedom WILL get us through this one too. (If all our energies and money are not first spent complaining about things and giving the poor telephone stamps). We simply need a few more Jeffersonian LIBERALS (ha!!!). Those that speak for equality of OPPORTUNITY...not equality. John Patrick.

-----  
Answer 95 SOURCEVOID, on MON, SEP 05 1983

JIMM: Let me - at length I am afraid - develop a thesis long in the making, that had to do with "perceptions" of Vietnam, that, when generalized, may have a lot to do with our future.

One of the most significant things I came to realize after studying all the internationally significant conflicts for 100 years was the extraordinary importance of the modes of public communications to the course of these events. The Medium was not only the MESSAGE, as McLuhan put it but starting in Vietnam, the Medium was the POLITICS of that war. And to an even greater degree GIVEN THE PROTRACTED NATURE OF THE GLOBAL, MULTIFACETED STRUGGLE WE ARE IN AGAINST THE BREAKDOWN OF SOCIAL, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC ORDER (in which the threat of anarchy, accident, error of interpretation, is greater than all ideologies) THE MEDIA IS THE CENTRAL POLITICAL ARENA.

Another finding, relevant to what I am about to point out, was that nations tend to perceive wars and conflict in accordance with their national character. The Chinese way in war is Intellectual, the British way in war is Legal. The Russian perception is National. The American way in war is Moral.

First, Communications. It is hard to realize that in the entire course of World War II, with 3 million men under arms in the U.S. with very, very few exceptions there were never photographs of dead American soldiers in the news!

In Vietnam, by contrast, the speed and sophistication of communications including television brought images of that war into every living room every night EVEN BEFORE THOSE SAME IMAGES HAD REACHED THROUGH CHANNELS OF AUTHORITY THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CONDUCT OF THE WAR. As a result it was often that Reporters were demanding to know what government DECISIONS were going to be on one crisis after another even before those who had to make them KNEW THERE WAS A PROBLEM TO BE SOLVED! Even with equal technical communications means it was always far easier for CBS to directly, one on one, inform 20-30 million Americans than it was for Government to receive the same information through channels of authority and delegated responsibility. Thus many decisions were made in an intense communications-pressure cooker, and more and more at the top, rather than by those delegated authority.

Communications channels became the real Paths of Power. They still are. And that has screwed up the way the nation is supposed to conduct, through its Constitutionally created apparatus, the Affairs of State.

But there was a greater, and more profound problem, that afflicts us even now, in this conference. Americans, simply because they saw images of that war, were certain they KNEW that war. They would see clouds of American helicopters descend on a paddy (power, as the American public perceives it), they would NOT see the Viet Cong or their power, growing out of the barrel of their guns too (part of their doctrine for waging war in which the manipulation of all 'images' are vital, such as in the attack on the Embassy, militarily trivial, but politically decisive - made so by the mere ACT of media coverage) they would see women and children, shooting, and confusion, with no 'coonskin on the wall.'

In a nation brought up on win-lose domestically every sports game, in every business, in every election what do you expect them to expect, but evidence of win-lose?

Then they would listen to Walter Cronkite's two minute interpretation of that action, himself a victim of 'reports', that any statistician could show - regardless of the competence and motives of the reporters - was a pretty random sampling of all the hundreds of thousands of daily conflict events that were really going on.

In fact, in the absence of visible symbols of win-lose, occupy-not occupy, we had to fall back on INTERPRETATION of the images we saw. There was a Washington Interpretation, a Westmoreland Interpretation, and a Hanoi Interpretation. And the one that dominated them all, a Press Interpretation.

Over time, in a war designed by the Communists to be protracted in accordance with their doctrine which also perfectly was suited to nag at the American character of impatience, the public concluded: AMERICA HAS POWER IN VIETNAM, THE ENEMY DOES NOT SEEM POWERFUL, AND WE ARE NOT WINNING, I SEE REPORTS OF LOSS, OF ATROCITIES, SO WE MUST BE EVIL! For deep in the American Character is the conviction that Power and Rightousness are one! (Didn't President Reagan invoke that American Principal tonight?) It is our Glory and our Achilles Heel in a complex world, frustrating, fibillrating world - the one MES describes.

We made more moral judgements about every image of that war than any major war in history. And, like Hamlet, it paralyzed our will. THAT, ADDED TO OUR TECHNICAL INCOMPETANCE AS A NATION IN COUNTERING A TECHNICAL FORM OF WAR INVOLVING GRASS ROOTS POLITICAL ORGANIZING ACTION BACKED BY GUNS OUR ADVERSARIES HAD PERFECTED OVER DECADES HASTENED OUR FAILURE. (and that incompetence was far more, in those agencies of the US government - State, AID - where the only strategic victory could be won, while the very most the military could do is win the strategic defensive



and buy time.) Compared with the ability of the British in Kenya to apply ameliorative actions to the problems of the Africans as a counter to the Mau Mau, we were, and remain, incredibly clumsy amateurs.

Funny, most here think we should never have gotten into that war in the first place. I think the strategic reasons were right, the motives were right, and that we had the means to do it right. \*I\* had no pangs of conscience while I was there - and learned in Korea, as a professional soldier, not to depend on the support of my countrymen in an ambiguous conflict. Fortunately, unlike Lt. Calley, I had had a chance to study carefully the new nature of international conflict, and, when faced by ambiguity, relate what I was doing to American first principles and what we were legitimately trying to accomplish in that war. And I reserved to myself the decision whether to obey, or resign, in the face of orders that betrayed either.

Talk about the subtleties, complexities, nuances, facts, "evidence", for conflict! Vietnam had them. El Salvador has them. The "Massacre of KAL" has them. The world has them. Yet we must either act now, or act later. Nonaction is NOT a viable alternative in our shrinking, interdependent world.

But though everyone who lived through that era is convinced they were well informed (by the press) about that war, I came to conclude that TV coverage was little better than Plato's Shadow on the Cave. Not reality itself. But flickering deceptive, exaggerated intimations of Reality, where THE MOST IMPORTANT UNPHOTOGRAPHABLE REALITY WAS WHAT WAS IN THE MINDS OF THE VIETNAMESE THEMSELVES WHERE THE CENTRAL CAMPAIGN OF THAT WAR WAS BEING FOUGHT. But who reported that in a sustained, comprehensive, measurable-over-time way? We used, and still use, the images of Clauswitzian War and its symbols to represent the Reality of Modern Conflict, when, at the General Nuclear War end of the spectrum the decisive reality is in what is in the Minds of those who control the Weapons. And in El Salvador, at the Subversive Internal War end of the spectrum the reality is, once again in the Minds of Men, far more than in their uniforms.

Even the reaction to McNamara is interesting here. He was as liberal as anyone in this discussion. He would not have been in Kennedy's cabinet if he hadn't been. But since he CONTROLLED the apparatus of war, great gobs of the public identified him WITH the implements of war. Images.

Why don't we revolt at the Guatemalan deaths, the Afghanistan gassing? No pictures. But shooting an airplane out of the air? A crisp, credible, event with vivid images (invoked easily by pictures of 747s and SU class aircraft and taped voices, and our simple logic that, since they haven't showed up, and since what goes up must come down, they have to be dead).

We are a simple people in a complex world. The decisive American Polity only reacts to Clear Images. Pearl Harbor. The sinking of the Maine. Custers Last Stand. Hiroshima. (oh how twisted has become our logic in retrospect that considers Hiroshima a crime when the alternative, in a war we didn't start was up to a million more American casualties and how many Japanese civilian?)

It is our national character. And it is ill suited to the world war of the present. And those who oppose us understand it so well, they bend over backward NOT to present clear threat images. That's why I think the KAL shootdown was a gross blunder and not calculated murder. But in their insecurity they can never admit they made a mistake, for the mistake deals with the very heart of their nuclear command control apparatus. Their own images.

It is then Images, Concepts and Interpretations of Images that dominate the politics of conflict and potential conflict, not Facts as Reality.



Thus it is why I think THIS medium is the forebearer of one of the few options we have to escape the Riddle of Conflict Images we have built for ourselves in the Age of Publishing and Broadcast (which is NOT the Age of Information.)

I am afraid I have not said it well, in the above piece, but down at the bottom I mean this: that is we could reduce most of the major differences in the world to the true matters of substance, while, through intense multilayered direct lateral as well as top-to-top or grab bag journalism, communication reduce the areas of disagreement based upon misperceptions, we might have a chance at progress. But as long as we have to paddle furiously to just stay afloat in a sea of images, we can't seem to make progress towards land.

And the only way I can see to get such a self-correcting mode of communications going is to multiply this technology a million fold.

This little conference that nobody but us will remember, proves the point - we ALL have had access to the media and government(s) presented facts and opinions. But my reaching a consensus with you on what to do about it has been more powerfully molded by the conversations here than all the panoply of Press or Presidency.

The new modes of political discussion will have to start at the bottom or they will never start at all, for the Press has, by its very scope and power moved over to that questionable, discredited arena we long ago reserved for government, big business, and big labor.

-----

Answer 97 MES, on MON, SEP 05 1983

Sourcevoid - I find little to disagree with in your answer. Perhaps the one great ray of hope is that (other than in 1945) no nukes have been used. Still the drift toward chaos and away from constructive solutions is apparent and frightening. I had little disagreement with "Horatio's" speech tonight, either. But he seems to be a man devoted to confrontation, and I fear that we can ill afford that today. Without ignoring Soviet crimes, it seems to me that he is in his way every bit as paranoid as the Russians who shot down Flight 007. By seeing the Soviets behind every trouble spot in the world, he conveniently ignores the genuine human misery and political and economic exploitation that fertilized the fields they seek to harvest. Like us, the Soviets seek to exploit the troubles of their enemy where the opportunity presents itself. If we focus on them alone, we fail to deal with the injustice (often of American origin) that gives them their opening. Central America is a case in point. There would have been no Castro without Battista. But how does a nation that is trying to restore its own gasping economy and deal with the growing disparity between its own rich and poor begin to solve the economic and social problems of the rest of the world. Perhaps the time has come to call in the IOUs of the Germans and the Japanese and ask them to reach into the overflowing coffers of their healthy economies to fight the battles that have been almost exclusively fought by us since WWII.

-----

Answer 98 MES, on MON, SEP 05 1983

bas - call me a dupe if you like. I just find that arguments such as yours invariably lead to war. My feeling is that although the Soviets may have (or better definitely have) been guilty of enormous crimes, the culture that produced the Gulag, the non-aggression pact with Hitler and the atrocities in Hungary, Czechoslovakia (not to mention Flight 007) also produced Tolstoy, Tchaikovsky, Sakharov, Scharansky, the Bolshoi, etc. etc. To paint a people

black is to make them ready to kill. I have few illusions about the nature of the Soviet system. At the same time, I believe that it behooves us to be better than them. Those who assumed from the start that the Russians were guilty of this deed reached their conclusion a few days before I did. Perhaps they are like the Russian military commanders who, confronted with Flight 007, put two and two together, mixed it with what they KNEW about the perfidious west, and shot the plane down. I wanted more evidence before I started shooting. The President's speech coupled with the Canadian action and the conflicting Soviet statements of today have persuaded me that the Soviets are indeed guilty of shooting down the KAL plane. I still have plenty of questions that will probably never be answered. I may be a dupe of the Russians -- but I refuse to be a dupe of the media and the CIA as well. I will continue to try, in my own dupish way, to sort out the facts from what is presented to me and reach my conclusions when I feel I have enough evidence to support them. I am an American citizen, and as such I have the RESPONSIBILITY to swallow no one's pronouncements whole.

-----

Answer 99 MES, on MON, SEP 05 1983

bas - calling the Russians barbarians and using that epithet to justify increasing international hostilities is neither likely to enhance our security nor modify their behavior. A cursory overview of Russian history shows that only the most naive would expect them to respond as we do to events in the international arena. Whether or not thier history excuses their behavior, it certainly helps to explain it. Surely if we hope to survive this century it behooves us to forget about who is the barbarian and who is civilized and simply remember that we all have much in common. It is only by finding the common ground that we can learn, as we must, to live together on the uncomfortably small planet. Isolating and starving them is a pretty silly notion to my mind. We have no international support for such a policy. The Canadians and Argentines will help feed them, or they will bully the food out of other nations. Besides, the word is that they are having a good harvest this year. Your plan makes as much sense as taunting a wounded bear. We'll all be blown to hell long before we're in danger of being conquered.

-----

Answer 101 TJ, on MON, SEP 05 1983

HAVING READ THE LAST TWO MESSAGES, I FIND MYSELF IN GENERAL AGREEMENT WITH BOTH MES AND SOURCEVOID. (I HOPE THAT DOES NOT SHAKE ALL UP) THE FLOW OF INFORMATION IS RAPIDLY BECOMING THE DETERMINING FACTOR IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, MILITARY DECISION MAKING, AND IN PUBLIC OPINION.

I DO SEE A DANGER HERE, THAT WHICH WAS FORESEEN BY THIS COUNTRIES FOUNDING FATHERS, THE RULE OF THE 'MOB'. AS WE HAVE SEEN, THE FLOW OF INFORMATION GETS SPEEDED UP, DECISIONS ARE MADE, STATEMENTS ISSUED, AND ACTIONS COMMENCED OFTEN BEFORE THE WHOLE STORY IS KNOWN.

MY MILITARY JOB IS A REFLECTION OF THIS INCREASE IN FLOW. THERE ARE NOW FOUR MEN WHERE THERE USED TO BE TWO. THE FLOW IS TOO MUCH FOR THE ORIGINAL CREW TO HANDLE DUE TO ITS 24HR NATURE. THUS THE DECISION MAKER WE SUPPORT IS BARRAGED 24HRS A DAY, AND NOW GETS ANOTHER LAYER OF INTERRITATION (COMPETENT I HOPE).

THE POINT- WE ARE HEADING TOWARDS INSTANT GOVERNMENT WHERE THERE IS SO MUCH PREASSURE TO DO OR SAY SOMETHING THAT WHAT IS SAID MAY NOT MATTER ANY MORE. IF THE PRESIDENT STAYS IN CALIFORNIA HIS INACTION IS INTERPRETTED AS A FORM OF ACTION ( I HOPE THAT IS CLEAR).

I AM LISTENING TO CNN TV AS I TYPE THIS, AND THE DEBATE HAS LOST ANY

POINT. THEY ARE ALL SENDING THEIR IMAGE, AND NOT SEEING EACH OTHERS IMAGE.

WE ARE (FOR BETTER OR WORSE) THE LEADING EDGE OF MUST CONSIDER THIS IMPACT BEFORE TAKING ACTION (OR DEMANDING IT OF OTHERS).

THERE USED TO BE AN OLD RULE OF THUMB IN THE NAVY "NO CHANGE FOR THE FIRST BELL OF THE WATCH" IN OTHER WORDS, THINK THEN DO.

AS TO VIETNAM, I BELIEVE WE WERE RIGHT TO GO, BUT DID NOT FOLLOW THROUGH IN THE CORRECT WAY. CLAUSSWITZ WOULD NOT HAVE APPROVED OF OUR ACTIONS BUT WOULD HAVE UNDERSTOOD THE INTENT.

TOM JOHNSON

-----  
Answer 103 MES, on TUE, SEP 06 1983

Goodness. I certainly seem to have brought a lot of "dupes" out of the woodwork. Thank you, Mr. Snow, for actually reading what I wrote and not accusing me of treason. Facts are indeed what I seek, and they seem to be arriving as the days go by. Granted, they seem to support the original contentions of Fast-Gun Sourcevoid and Hot-Shot Stewart. Still, as neither of these esteemed, civilized, gentlemen has his finger on the nuclear trigger, there is little harm done. I just hope that they, and those in power who share their assumptions, are always able to be right without the facts.

-----  
Answer 104 TJ, on TUE, SEP 06 1983

MES-- I WOULD NOT SAY THAT THE PRESS AND THE CIA ARE NECK IN NECK TO DUPE US, UNLESS YOU CONCEDE THE KGB AND GRU.

THERE IS IN PROGRESS NOW AND FOR THE LAST 30 YEARS A STRUGGLE (NOT A WAR) BETWEEN TWO DIAMETRICALLY OPPOSED SYSTEMS. THAT THIS LATEST SKIRMISH IS GETTING A BIGGER WRITE UP IS INDEED TRAGIC COMPARED TO THE USE OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS, SLAVE LABOUR CAMPS, AND THE FENCING IN OF ENTIRE POPULATIONS.

BUT THE STRUGGLE GOES ON, IT IS A STRUGGLE BETWEEN THESE TWO SYSTEMS AND IS WAGED TO GAIN CONTROL OF THE 'HEARTS AND MINDS' OF THE WORLD. THE TRUE TRAGEDY IS THAT THE SOVIETS HAVE OFFICIALLY ADDED THE OLD CUPLLET 'GET THEM BY THE B---S AND THE HEART AND MIND WILL FOLLOW'. WHEN ONE SIDE IS PREPARED TO USE FORCE, FOR ANY REASON, THEN THE OTHER SIDE IS AT A SHORT TERM DISADVANTAGE. THE PEN MAY BE MIGHTIER THAN THE SWORD, BUT NOT IF THE SWORD CUTS OFF THE HAND WITH THE PEN.

THIS IS A STRUGGLE OF IMAGES, AND POSTURING. THAT THE WORLD MIGHT BE BLOWN UP IS A BACKGROUND TO HAUNT ALL THE PLAYERS, BUT THE PLAY WILL CONTINUE UNTILL ONE OR THE OTHER SAYS ENOUGH, AND PUSHES THE BUTTON OR SURRENDERS.

TJ

-----  
Answer 105 KEN, on TUE, SEP 06 1983

SOURCEVOID - ah yes it is the media that determines the response of the American people. Control the input that they receive, and you control the output. But then, who controls the media? Do they people get what they want to see, or do they get what somebody else (who?) wants them to see?

MES - thanks for not jumping on the 'russians are subhuman' bandwagon. They are, after all, just victims of their own government.

-----  
Answer 106 MES, on TUE, SEP 06 1983

NICK \_ yes, I think that a more direct response would be appropriate had this

been an American airliner. I do not dismiss the deaths of 60 Americans. I simply do not see it as a reason to become hysterical. These are not the first (although I hope they will be the last) Americans to die at the hands of foreigners. We simply cannot protect our citizens abroad. We never could. When Teddy Roosevelt was president, we could send troops here and there and never risk much more than the lives of those troops. Nuclear weapons have changed that. Now we must be more responsible. As there is a sovereign country whose involvement is MORE DIRECT than ours (i.e. South Korea), I believe that we should allow them to take the lead on this. Frankly, the more we squeal about it, the more it seems (to the rest of the world) to be just another ploy in the US - USSR rivalry. I think this time we should be one of the followers. Let us press our case, but let's let someone else lead the charge.

-----  
Answer 108 MES, on TUE, SEP 06 1983

Irving, if you honestly believe that your screaming will cause the beast to respect your conscience, please scream on. Frankly, I think the beast will consider your conscience irrelevant. If you think otherwise, you must feel that the beast, too, has a conscience. If he does, then we must stop calling him a beast and see him as a man. If he is, indeed, a man, then he must be, fundamentally, like us, no matter how outrageous his behavior. I believe that the path of war (although successful against Hitler and Tojo) is no longer open to us. It is not a viable option in dealing with the Soviet "beast," for obvious reasons. If we do not agree on this, there is little point in further discussion. If we accept that war is not a reasonable alternative, then we must try to understand, to build bridges, to encourage the Soviets to free themselves of their paranoia and brutality and become a "civilized" member of the international community. Confrontation will only lead to more death. I do not advocate weakness, just the setting aside of your understandable passion in favor of compassion for those who are slaves even as they makes slaves of their neighbors and fellow countrymen. The Russians are as they are. We must live with them or die with them.

-----  
Answer 114 SHERWIN, on TUE, SEP 06 1983

HO! Do I hear MES saying war was successful against Hitler and Tojo when, in the same conference, it is suggested that the strong, healthy economies of Germany and Japan shoulder a greater share of the world burden which the weakened US can no longer handle? Who really gained the most?

-----  
Message 83.8425 MES, about "NOBLESSE OBLIGE" TUE, 09/06

bas - it will probably surprise you to learn that most Americans are not impressed with aristocracies. The requirements for membership are usually not related to merit, and the members themselves have good reason to avoid sharp objects. I'm sure you are very proud of being a SIR. No disrespect intended, but to my mind your aristocracy of pull, is probably an aristocracy of BULL. Frankly, I think your remarks would have more impact without the continual reference to your breeding, a term which, in this country, is most often applied to livestock. As far as I'm concerned, you can take your noblesse oblige and try to sell it to the "darkies" in Africa or India or wherever it last had some meaning.

-----  
Message 83.8426 MES, about "APOLOGY" TUE, 09/06

BAS - please accept my apology. Your answer #89 is so unambiguously democratic that I simply cannot believe you are the same BAS who was noblesse obliging just a few notes ago. When will they work out a way to allow us to use inflection in these notes.

"POLITICS" Conference 83.7860 KEN AT PSI, organizer, about "A FORUM FOR POLITICAL DISCUSSION" (answers: 124)

Answer 116 KEN, on TUE, SEP 06 1983 at 07:49 (1176 characters)

So we have the hypocritical policies against the Russians - on the one hand we want to punish them in economic, military, technological, public relations and international influence terms, while on the other hand we don't want to push them too far. We don't want to back their government into a corner militarily, or risk its demise in an internal revolution. For that's where the real danger of nuclear war occurs - factionalism within the government of a superpower. Besides, the russians are excellent competition for us - they impel us to keep our military sharp and, by comparison always make us look like the good guys.

So the hurt-Russia/help-Russia game must continue, its goal not being the maintenance of the status quo but the \*gradual\* change in the soviet system to create greater international stability, more freedom within the soviet union and its client states, changing the competition for allies to be based upon moral rather than military reasons, and hopefully eventual cooperation between the 2 superpowers. So when dealing with russia, we should try to influence the behavior of their government using both sticks and carrots.

-----  
Answer 118 NICK DANGER, on TUE, SEP 06 1983

While reading Sourcevoid's piece on the influence of the media and the fact that wars are now fought with imagery, I was reminded of how I so quickly came to the conclusion that the Russians were guilty of shooting down the plane. When in fact, as MES protested, few real pieces of evidence were public.

I came to this conclusion when Reagan and Shultz started using words like "heinous" and "brutal". The message I got from that was NOT that the Russians were those things, but that Reagan and Shultz had a "smoking gun". In those first few days, they couldn't admit what they knew because it would compromise HOW they knew. (Now we have a "Japanese" source for the tapes, so we can play them on TV; wanna bet there are infrared movies of the whole thing somewhere in the Pentagon?)

One gets used to the "normal" characterizations, the usual images Reagan employs. This time he was just enjoying himself too much-- the medium WAS the message. I knew the minute he started using the harsh words that he had tapes, pictures, or both.

-----  
Answer 119 H. R. SNOW, on TUE, SEP 06 1983 at 19:41 (226 characters)

MES, it is not out of compassion that the "food" option is not being considered. It is because the "food weapon" used against Soviet actions in Poland are generally considered to have been a dismal failure. H. R. Snow

-----  
Answer 120 JIMM, on TUE, SEP 06 1983 at 20:21 (470 characters)

re: 118 - If ever Sourcevoid needed a response to prove his point we have it here. I do believe the president has advertising advisers. In future all he'll have to do to make a point is pick the right word and 93.24% of the country will be convinced that he must know what he's up to because he used the word (e.g. Commie). Maybe he wouldn't be so sure if he didn't have evidence, but that's not what I would bet on when it came to button-pushing time.

-----

Answer 121 CADY, on TUE, SEP 06 1983 at 21:01 (120 characters)

I'm talking about SERIOUSLY large purchases of world grain reserves - and a guns/butter tradeoff as a symbolic irony.

-----

Answer 122 ALAN, on TUE, SEP 06 1983 at 21:40 (788 characters)

I am surprised that nobody has mentioned that an important factor in Soviet analysis of the KAL commercial airliner threat had to be the fact that in the Soviets 1968 reinvasion of Czechoslovakia the Soviets used the following ploy to take over the Prague Airport: They loaded a commercial jet with soldiers and radioed to the Airport control tower that they had to make an emergency landing. They got permission and after landing they took over the lightly defended Airport and proceeded with getting further mass military landings. Lt. Gen. Ivan Yershov received much credit in the SU for thinking up this ploy.

So why shouldn't they suspect "turnabout is fair play". This episode is described in Cockburn "The Threat: Inside the Soviet Military Machine" p.62.

-----

Answer 123 NYUMEDCENTER

No, no, no, MES, you missed my point. I ridicule the idea of USSR as beast, therefore that nation must be treated as the creation of sentient beings. If David's vision of this medium is to be realized, we will all have to pay better attention.

You are being too precious for words, HERMIT. But, as I said before, I won't dally on that.

I find your analysis interesting, David, but I wonder... The images that dominate the channels in and out of our society are modulated by other things. The myths, values, and downright deceptions of our culture ordain turmoil (and I hope that none of us are naive enough to dump culture and politics into the same admixture--except to acknowledge that culture gives the spice to political reaction). That is to say, the things we bring to the images confronting us ordain our response.

Vietnam was a good indicator of this. When I doffed my fatigues and emerged on the campus of the University of Chicago in the mid-60's, I was stunned to learn that my status as veteran was not appreciated (I had heard rumors, mind you). After attending a few meetings, defended friends and policy, I was tolerated (no vituperation, no hatred--"...never thought you militarists had minds..."). Then a friend...classmate...who had abandoned tanks for a medical degree at Johns Hopkins and had returned to Vietnam as brigade surgeon for the son of a famous blood-'n-guts general, created a flap by passing out antiwar leaflets at the brigade commander's change-of-command ceremony. He called: would I join the veterans against the war? No, I said. Didn't understand what it was all about.

And for most people that was it. What's the ruckus? Where's the flap. "Hey, Irv, things are getting out of hand." Naw, I said, no, no, it's not like they're sending conscripts, you know, only professional bastards like me.

I know the Russians. No, they're saying...of course the state TV breathes shit, but...



Funny thing, I was against the war in 1958, ever since my first and last meeting with MacArthur (I was singing in a glee club for his god-knows-what birthday). "The line stops at the Philippines," he said. His most famous line: "Never again shall American boys die on the land-mass of Asia." That was it! Geopolitics!

So the meat of David's thesis is there. Give Americans' a moral bone and they'll chew. Geopolitics for a red-blooded American? How do you give geopolitics an emotional reality when the color graphics on the evening news are so good?

But that wasn't what cost the faith. Everybody agreed that you couldn't win. Everyone said so. It was then that a lot of people on the line in middle America came to the conclusion that if you're not gonna win why die? Very sensible. That was what Walter was saying.

Today, in the Times, there was an ad. It said in part that the writer hoped that people would remember and honor the dead--before the event was washed away in the flush of history.

So let me say this again. All events have a central reality and--gun shy as we are--we are obliged to pass judgment. We are not the children of gentry caught up in the romantic furors of the Napoleonic wars, sharpening our sabres on the steps of the French Embassy in Vienna before the battle of Genna. We aren't even the surprised citizens of Thebes marching out to meet the Spartans with Epiminondas. We are people luxuriating in something most of our Soviet counterparts will never know: the anguish of people reacting to tragedy.

Irving

-----

Message 83.8474 FR. HAL (-TCD139-), about "ANOTHER SMALL VOICE" TUE, 09/06 23:18 (2912 characters)

Perhaps what miffs the others about the message MES posted (it did me) was his apparent vigorous willingness (perhaps apparent in the lack of much to the contrary) to \*excuse\* Soviet behaviour which had solid and substantial proof of its existence while vigorously condemning \*as accepted fact\* a complicity or a contri- butory negligence to the U.S., Japan and Korea which had as yet no proof, no support, nothing but suspicion to support the condemnation. In effect, he made excuses for Soviet behaviour (quite a different matter than probing the motives the Soviets may have had) while refusing to recognize that nothing but assertion (his own, at that) stood behind his anger at surmised U.S. behaviour.

Now, if you insist on outrage at suspicions, fine... use the same standards for all those suspected. If you are outraged at FACT, fine... use the same standards for all facts. But to evince outrage at a self-asserted guilt of the U.S., Japan and Korea with no evidence whatever to support it besides suspicion, and with quite remarkable aplomb to \*EXCUSE\* (sorry, MES, to me your message did nothing short of that) the barbaric behaviour which was by the time already demonstrated FACT, not mere suspicion, is no less than applying double standards. You cannot squeal for 'justice' in the face of such inequitable principles applied by no one but yourself.

I, too, have more than a nodding acquaintance with the terror of combat, and carry far too much metal in my body for my own comfort in my old age.



And, I, too, recall the years of the '60s and the rage. I would hasten to point out that it was not only the young who protested that war, and few I know of MY age would have considered those who served 'monsters'. But I remember well how young men, angry, did in the streets of America what they condemned in Viet-Nam, AND EXCUSED IT! They did in our schools and streets what they condemned with the terms 'murderer' and 'baby-killer' those who risked their lives for their right to do so. I find abhorrent, most especially in 'democracies' the arrogation of the right to apply standards doubly. 'Democracies' can only succeed, and Liberty can only flourish when the citizenry itself imposes discipline and restraint on itself, rather than on others. Else one merely trades the tyranny of either majority or minority for the tyranny of the Autocrat or the Dictator. And tyranny will remain tyranny. It is no less tyranny to have mobs coercing others of their fellow citizens in the name of the free exercise of their 'rights' than it is tyranny to shoot them down at gunpoint.

MES, I will, perhaps, agree with your point, if and when you can make it clear to this thick old head that you are, in fact, applying identical standards to both parties in the same case.

Fr. Hal

-----  
Answer 125 MES, on TUE, SEP 06 1983 at 23:39 (416 characters)

Well, Sherwin, I guess you could say we won the war and lost the peace. I think we can consider ourselves successful in that war by virtue of the fact that my unmistakably semitic family has not been sent to the death camp at Palm Springs. On the other hand, we seem to have lost the battle of the Toyota and the war of the Volkswagen. Just one of those little ironies that make life so interesting, no?

-----  
Answer 126 MES, on TUE, SEP 06 1983 at 23:47 (1350 characters)

Question 1: Is the idea to starve 250,000,000 in order to avenge 269?

Question 2: As our own farmers have, through the miracle of American know-how, overproduced themselves into bankruptcy since mid-century, and will probably go under without the expected sale of grain to the Soviets, whose nose are we cutting off to spite whose face? The Soviets shoot down a Korean plane so the natural response is to drive the American farmer out of business. No president would survive the political consequences of such an act.

I still feel that there is a chance for genuine world-wide revulsion as a result of the Soviet crime, miscalculation, mistake or whatever. They are handling the whole matter very clumsily, and it is revealing the worst side of their basically unattractive nature. Their only stated defense of any possible substance in the eyes of the world is that this is merely an American anti-Soviet action. Therefore, the more prominent we are in this affair, the more plausible their argument seems. Let us be their antithesis and pursue our claims quietly, through legal actions and international forums, allowing other aggrieved nations to take the lead. This, I feel, will maximize whatever good may come out of this tragedy, and make their inadequate defense of their crime more and more transparent.

-----  
Answer 127 MES, on TUE, SEP 06 1983 at 23:55 (580 characters)

Cady - in your opinion, would such an attempt to starve the Russians move the world farther from or closer to nuclear war? If you were Andropov, what would

be your response to such a move. If you were a leader of a non-aligned country, how would you interpret such an act. Do you believe the American public would willingly participate in such a policy? Do you think it would bring about the collapse of repressive government in the USSR? The idea seems to me impractical, immoral, unworthy of the USA, bad strategy, bad politics, bad karma, bad breath, BAD!!!

-----

Answer 128 MES, on TUE, SEP 06 1983 at 23:57 (188 characters)

ALAN - You figure the Soviets thought the South Koreans were going to land troops in Vladivostok off a 747 and take over the airport? I think I know why nobody else has mentioned it.

-----

Message 83.8480 MES, about "REAL GOOD STUFF" WED, 09/07 00:04 (428 characters)

Irving, you silver-tongued (fingered?) devil, you sure as hell can write! Are you published anywhere? From now on, I'm going to try to have my printer on when I come upon your messages. There just isn't enough time watching them scroll up my screen, to really pick off the meat off the bones. I'm sure a lot of what you say goes right over my head, but it sure is pretty. Thanks for mixing "POLITICS" with poetry.

"POLITICS" Conference 83.7860 KEN AT PSI, organizer, about "A FORUM FOR POLITICAL DISCUSSION" (answers: 140)

Answer 134 (of 140) CADY, on WED, SEP 07 1983 at 17:39 (476 characters)

How the hell can I be accused of bad breath by wanting to feed the owrld's hungry with US defense \$s? Everytime an American wants more productive use of redistributed (tax) \$, someone in the public sector or private, is ready to dump on them.

Is it that nobody else out there pays taxes? Or is it a National Weakness to spend uncontrollably with no "incentive" oriented spending approach.

Is MES the only Politicer who has ANY feelings about the food weapon?

-----

Answer 135 (of 140) FR. HAL (-TCD139-), on WED, SEP 07 1983 at 19:30 (7144 characters)

They're human beings -- 'just like us'...

I've been hearing that from citizens of the U.S. for so long, so often, I doubt I could count the times. It's so widespread it's axiomatic, it's taken for granted without objection and accepted without criticism and without note.

I suggest that the record of history is against the observation, whatever the source, whatever the national origin of those who make it. It is a classic example of the 'intuitive leap into error'. It is dangerously misleading, and unsupportable as fact, which is indeed the very thing that makes it so dangerous and so misleading.

By this time there will be those who have leaped to the conclusion that I'm referring to the previous statement in this conference that 'after all, the Russians are humans just like us'. Not at all. I have a much wider target. I reject the idea in its entirety, not simply in its application to a single nationality.

It is fuzzy, undefined in its terms and unfocussed in its applications. One might as well say that thieves are people just like us. If by that you mean they share a common human nature, agreed. If by that you mean that they desire the same things...not conceded. That will require demonstration in each and every individual point. I will, for the sake of argument, stipulate that thieves desire, as I do, to be left alone to my own affairs. I desire to be left safely in my own home to pursue my own interests, none of which include theft. The thief desires to be left alone in the interests of his own pursuits as well, one of which \*includes\* theft. I deny he and I are 'just alike' or thereby 'want the same things'. Not at all. I want mine. And \*He\* wants mine.

The same is true of nations, cultures, civilizations. I doubt you could get the substantial support of the citizenry of Canada, for example, to admit that just because they are 'human, just like us' that they \*therefore\* want the same things, or intend to acquire them in the same way or for the same purpose. I will leave it to the Canadians to affirm or deny the accuracy of \*that\* Dobbservation.

However, (I now WILL apply the question to the Soviets. My qualifications are fairly unique in the matter. I am of Russian ancestry, speak the language as a mother tongue, and am first-generation American with the memories of my family and my family's friends to draw upon, not to mention many of my own.) Russians are \*not\* 'just like us'. Neither are the Japanese, the Koreans, the Chinese, the Zimbabweans, the South Africans, the Mexicans or anybody else. A simple look at a third-grade history book ought to be ample demonstration of that. How else does one explain the diversity of government,

the diversity of art, the diversity of language, the diversity of attitude, the diversity of values, the diversity of culture itself? Those who insist that because we each share a common humanity we therefore share any of these other things in common bear the burden of proof.

I have understood by the statement that 'the Russians are human, just like us' and by Mes's statement that the Russians are 'trapped by their own government' that he actually believes Russians agree. Some few will. The vast majority will not. It is not a perception of the Soviet public that they are 'trapped' by their own government. For the vast bulk of them, this government has brought them more good than any government in Soviet history...as, indeed, it has. Things have never BEEN this good in Russia. Those Americans who believe that the average Soviet citizen is displeased with his government understands nothing either of the Soviet Union or of the Russian psyche.

Underlying the statement is a further leap into enormity, a conclusion that therefore the Russians want freedom, just like we do. Not at all true. The Russians do not even share the same concept of 'freedom' as we intend when WE use the same term. The terms are NOT interchangeable. What a Russian means by 'freedom' is fundamentally different from what a citizen of this nation would mean when he used it, and different again from what a Canadian or an Englishman would mean, so too from what a Frenchman, Spaniard, Scot or Irishman would mean.

Yet we persist in making public judgments based on such feeble assumptions. Irving would be among the first to assert from experience, not from hypothesis, that the Vietnamese with and for whom and against whom he fought most assuredly did not share agreement with the statement that Americans and Vietnamese are, after all, commonly human and therefore want the same things. I can assure you from my time in Korea it was amply evident then (as it seems to be now) that neither North Koreans, South Koreans, nor the Peoples' Republic of China indicated any desire to go home because we were, after all, fighting for the same things.

If you're going to insist that Russians are 'just like us' and that therefore must want the same things, you'll have to apply that as well to the Nazis in World War II, and include in that the Death Camps, where far more than 6 millions died. The figure totalled rather more than 15 million. And, the converse must then be true as well...i.e., if Germans are human, just like us, and we therefore want the same things, then we must want Death Camps and must hate Jews and Slavs, too. I don't think I'm going to sit still for that one.

Just such fuzzy "proof by assertion" instead of "proof by demonstration" is root and branch at the bottom of much of what has paralyzed the international policy of this country and of the West in general, though this country seems to have been singularly prone to its worst effects. The rest of the world is not burdened by such a mis-assumption, and consequently sets its policies to deal with the facts of a real world, rather than the idyllic view that purports so often to be 'information' here.

I fear greatly that unless more of us in the U.S. begin to recognize that NOT all others want the same things simply because we share a common human nature we will be unable to cope with either our domestic problems nor our international ones. It is precisely because people do NOT want the same things as their neighbours that the problem of nationalism persists. It is precisely for that reason that international terrorism exists. It is precisely for that reason that war exists. It is for that reason that crime exists. And domestic discord. And bigotry. And prejudice. And discrimination. And ignorance. And poverty.

We do ourselves no favour, nor anyone else, to assert quite so blandly

things which are quite so blatantly untrue. We do ourselves and others even worse disservice when we begin to base policy -- public or private -- upon such unsupported and unsupportable assumptions. \*\*\* WHEN \*\*\*. Oh, When, will Americans ever bother to learn some history?

-----

Answer 136 (of 140) NYUMEDCENTER, on WED, SEP 07 1983 at 22:37 (1168 characters)

Today I saw, in my mind's eye, what the Russian pilot saw as he reached out. What so many pilots have seen... too many. The missile probably exploded a few meters from one of the big fan engines. It probably tore at the hangers and ribs that held the wing against the thrust of the engine. And then the remainder of wing would have folded away. The sudden loss of lift on one side would have caused the plane to lever up and into the truncated wing, probably...

The acute change of direction would then have pinned the passengers in their seats and they undoubtedly wondered at the force of it. And their sounds would have died away in the dapples and plumes of water that reached up from the sea to receive the duraluminum shards and flesh.

Far away the puzzled air controllers and pilots were preparing for their return home after a day's work.

And thinking about it today...

I suddenly began to cry. I was thankful that there was no one to see it. It was a belly cry--full of bathos and tears. It tore the gut from me and hurt.

And I wondered...

At how easy it is to die.

And how hard to cry.

-----

Answer 137 (of 140) NYUMEDCENTER, on WED, SEP 07 1983 at 22:38 (74 characters)

Thank you, Hal. I deeply appreciate your commentary.

Irving

-----

Answer 138 (of 140) MES, on WED, SEP 07 1983 at 22:46 (1278 characters)

I wish I wish I knew what Fr. Hal was so excited about. I have no recollection of anyone saying that the Russians, let alone the Vietnamese or Koreans, wanted the same things we did or had a similar definition of freedom. All I recall saying is that they are people and not monsters and that dehumanizing them by dismissing them as barbarians or whatever is the first step towards war. I also commented, I believe legitimately (although I am not a first generation American of Russian background) that the Russians do not participate directly in the foreign policy decisions of their government and, whether they perceive it or not, are the prisoners of their own system. Those

who do dissent aloud are exiled, enslaved, or treated for mental aberration. I feel that starving the Russians will not starve their leaders. That rather than rebel against the revealed incompetency of their economic/political system, they will rise in anger against their revealed persecutor, the U.S.A., who will be (accurately for once) portrayed as the leader of an international plot against them. If you want to stifle dissent in the USSR permanently and put the most extreme militarists in complete control, go ahead and try to starve them. But count me out.

-----

Answer 139 (of 140) THE HERMIT, on WED, SEP 07 1983 at 23:08 (1612 characters)

Sourcevoid:

You're nearly right. I try very hard to ignore as much news as I can because, in fact, I'm one of THEM (the media). I get paid to care 40 hours a week about a newspaper getting out, and the rest of the time I prefer to think about virtually anything else. From many years of observation, my impression is that the media try to publish what they think people either want to know or OUGHT to know. Perhaps they're deluded. The funny thing is, it's axiomatic in the news biz that the typical front-page story is two things: important and dull -- a story that everyone ought to read but relatively few actually will. The fact is, hardly anyone reads the stories that tell people significant things about their world -- the movement of social forces, even the process by which their local taxes are determined. When they get the tax bill in the mail, they want to know why the press never told them this was happening. Put a word like "assessment" in a headline and no-one will read it. Put a word like "rape" in a headline and everyone will read it -- and remember it, and complain later that all the newspaper prints is sensationalism and "bad news."

Well, I'm no news fan, as I said, nor an apologist for the press. When I'm not working for a newspaper, I'm just an average reader: sports and comics and Ann Landers. But the image people seem to have of media people scrambling for headlines and trying to cram as much sensationalism as they can in the paper at the expense of all the more serious, important stuff is mostly a pipedream. The Hermit

---

Answer 140 (of 140) RECLUSE, on WED, SEP 07 1983 at 23:49 (2448 characters)

This is The Hermit in an alter-ego. I got knocked off on my usual host system.

Something to keep in mind, I think, is that everyone thinks of himself as the "good guy." Hardly anyone sees himself as the villain, not even people like Charles Manson or Ted Bundy. Not even Andropov and his generals.

Please note (you too, Irving): I am not saying that such people ARE good guys, or that they aren't villains, or even that their actions are in any way excused by their perceptions -- only that it's nearly always a mistake to assume that people are proceeding from a wish to do evil.

The fact is that, from their point of view, the Soviets have good reason to be pretty paranoid. Their arch-enemy (us) has them surrounded by missile installations and wants to add more (look how upset we got about missiles in Cuba; how do you think the Soviets feel about missiles in Europe?). Also, their main capitalist enemy (us again) has gotten friendly with their main communist enemy (China), an enemy which directly threatens a good deal of their border. Of course, we know we're the good guys and we wouldn't start anything, so there's no reason for the Soviets to be paranoid about all this. On the other hand, if we had Soviet missiles planted all over South America,

say, and if we had a long history of hostility with Canada, and if the Soviets were suddenly getting very cozy with the Canadians, and if we knew that the Soviets were routinely flying spy planes over our territory (virtually daring us to do something about it, from our vantage point as the good guys), I think we might be a little more jumpy than we are about any kind of alien aircraft entering our air space.

That's not to say we'd shoot down an unarmed passenger plane, even if we really thought it was spying. There are substantial differences between the way the Soviets operate and the way we operate, and that's one of them. But the point is that it's a mistake to think of the Soviets in cartoon terms, as thugs who simply get their jollies shooting down innocent people. Because if the Soviets did in fact act out of what seem to them, in their paranoia, to be good reasons, there is no reason to believe that increasing their paranoia will result in more responsible behavior on their part. You have to be tough with mere thugs; you have to be careful with paranoiacs. The Hermit



"POLITICS" Conference 83.7860 KEN AT PSI, organizer, about "A FORUM FOR POLITICAL DISCUSSION" (answers: 149)

Answer 142 (of 149) H. R. SNOW, on THU, SEP 08 1983 at 19:49 (1142 characters)

It now seems probable to me that the Russians knowingly shot the plane down because that was the "standard" procedure (assuming it is true that the plane did not respond to signals). In this logic, the plane HAD to be a spy plane and it was therefore correct to shoot it down. This could explain the continued "shoot-yourself-in-the-foot" explanations of the Russians over the last week. This may go down in history as a classic case of Parkinson's theory, that states that all organizations tend to reorganize themselves to function independently of their original aim as soon as they are created. A corollary of this theorem is that ANY organization that 'can do no wrong' is CERTAIN to end up a Frankenstein monster (proponents of the 'we the white hats school' take note). As a matter of fact the recognition of this fact by the writers of the American Constitution led them to the idea of checks and balances in the political system, which is the real source of the superiority of the American political system to the Russian. H. R. Snow P.S. HERMIT, I just read your last message and I couldn't agree more.

----

Answer 144 (of 149) NYUMEDCENTER, on THU, SEP 08 1983 at 21:09 (2738 characters)

It's unlikely that an American grain embargo would lead to mass starvation in the USSR. It might cut meat production, but most of the loss is easily made up. The "food weapon" really isn't much of a weapon.

I know it's been fashionable to explain Soviet paranoia by US "encirclement" strategy--more a hodge-podge of ad hoc alliances and hedge-hopping, really. We also have to ask ourselves about their paranoia of Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Moldavians, Kazakhstanians, Mongolians, Romanians, Albanians, Yugoslavians, Hungarians, Czechoslovakians, Poles, (I'll leave out the Bulgarians since they have never forgotten their debt to the Russians for chasing out the Ottoman Turks) and Afghanies (note that I have left out the Armenians, Ukranians, Turkestanis, and Soviet Manchurians since there is no record that these peoples actively sought to dissuade the Russians from incorporating them into the great socialist state).

My point is an historical one: the postwar containment policy was a response to the alarming expansion of the USSR by occupation, annexation, and intervention. Of course you can argue that that was brought about by the WWI Allies' post revolution intervention, and so forth, invoking ever widening circles of cause and effect.

Strategically, there is a major difference between positioning American missiles in limited positions around the perimeter of the Soviet Union (a posture from which the US has steadily withdrawn since the deployment of the submarine missile force) and the Soviet attempt to put land-based missiles in the Carribean. The military strategists refer to this as "interior lines"--the advantage gained by clumping your forces and resources in a central arena. This permits the husbanding of forces and confers on the Soviet a strategic advantage since they are apposed (the spelling is correct) to fragmented and disparate NATO forces strung along tenuous avenues of supply. This has forced American reliance on strategic nuclear weapons and



has permitted the Russians to build massive conventional forces capable of exploiting their advantage of interior lines (note their deployments in Afghanistan as opposed to our intervention in Indochina (we'll let slide the possibility of equivalent outcomes)).

There can be no question that the Soviets attempted to increase their advantage and interpose new weaponry in Europe designed to strategically separate the US from their NATO allies. I don't happen to believe that the American response is correct--to deploy new weapons to counter the Soviet deployment. But we can discuss that one later.

Irving.

---

Answer 146 (of 149) TJ, on THU, SEP 08 1983 at 21:24 (968 characters)

I HAVE JUST READ IRVINGS FINE MESSAGE.

I AGREE THAT THE MERE POSITIONING OF NEW WEAPONS MERELY O BALANCE OFF THE POSITIONING OF SOVIET WEAPONS IS NOT A GOOD ONE.

HOWEVER, THE POSITIONING OF SUFFICIENT FORCES TO DETER AGGRESSION, OR THREAT THEREOF IS A SOUND STRATEGY.

OUR FORCES IN EUROPE MUST BE CAPABLE OF FIGHTING THE TYPE OF ACTIONS EXPECTED OF THEM. LIKE IT OR NOT THE NATO ALLIANCE IS COMMITED TO A BASTARD DEFENSE WHERE THEY MUST STOP THE ATTACK WITHOUT NUKES, OR IF ALL ELSE FAILS, WITH THEM. THIS IS A PROBLEM I WILL DISCUSS IN ANOTHER MESSAGE (TO SAVE TIME).

SUFFICE IT TO SAY, WE (THE NATO COUNTIES) HAVE HANDED THE MILITARY A VERY FULL SHEDULE AND ARE NOW TRYING TO POT AT THEM FOR TELLING THE POLITICAL SIDE WHAT IS REQUIRED TO ACCOMPLISH THE ASSIGNED MISSIONS.

THE SOVIETS HAVE A VERY GREAT CAPABILITY FOR CONVENTIONAL ATTACK IN EUROPE, WITH OR WITHOUT THE USE OF THIER NUKES & BUGS/GAS.

TOM JOHNSON

----

Answer 147 (of 149) TJ, on THU, SEP 08 1983 at 21:33 (1010 characters)

TO CONTINUE ON THE MILITARY PROBLEM. THE SITUATION IS THIS, THE MILITARY FORCES IN EUROPE HAVE BEEN TOLD THIER PRIME JOB IS TO PREVENT A SUCCESSFUL ASSAULT INTO NATO TERRITORY. THE HAVE BEEN TOLD THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1 NO CONSTRUCTION OF FORWARD DEFENSIVE POSITIONS, OR OBSTACLES.
2. NO RSION HAS BEEN ANALYZED (IS IT REALLY AN INVASION OR A MISTAKE?).
3. NO CONTROL OVER MOVEMENT, AND PRIOR STATIONING OF SOVIET INTELLIGENCE GATHERING UNITS/AGENTS WITHIN THIER OWN AREA.
4. THE ORDER TO RESIST WITH ONLY CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS, UNTIL RELEASE OF OTHERS.
5. THE REQUIREMENT TO DEFEND ALL OF THE BOARDER, WHERE THE ATTACKER CAN PICK HIS SPOT.
6. A VERY SHALLOW AREA FOR DEFENSE (THE FRENCH MAY NOT COME IN RIGHT AWAY.

7. A VERY POOR INITIAL STARTING POSITION WITH REGARD TO THE SOURCES OF SUPPLY.

I CAN LIST MANY MORE, BUT THESE SHOULD DRIVE HOME THE POINT THAT THERE ARE GREAT PROBLEMS INVOLVED, NOT JUST THE IDEA OF "IF THEY HAVE THEM I WANT THEM."

----

Answer 148 (of 149) HARRY, on THU, SEP 08 1983 at 22:22 (984 characters)

Wow! To go from the passionate disagreements starting about 100 notes ago to the mutual understanding being expressed here starting about 50 notes ago is impressive to this reader who was offline for the few days when all of those notes were authored.

Who said "maybe" someone at the White House is tuned in here? Why not make sure by contacting any influential politicians you know in D.C.!

And who said this is just a "little conference that nobody but we [actually Sourcevoid said "us"] will remember"! Why not send a transcript to some enterprising reporter you know!!

Obviously, you all are really THINKING THIS THROUGH TOGETHER -- which ought to be worthy of the attention of both the news media and the thinking politicians (come on, now, there are those who both think and care), because I agree with David that this may be the only means to reverse the global chaos trend to one of global peace.

P E A C E      through      D I A L O G U E

Chimo

----

Answer 149 (of 149) THE HERMIT, on THU, SEP 08 1983 at 23:11 (2568 characters)

Look, Irving, I'm not trying to make a CASE that the Russians are more entitled to their paranoia than the Latvians, Lithuanians, etc., or that fied. I'm suggesting that we try to imagine how the Russians think not because they deserve our sympathy, but because it's in OUR BEST INTEREST to understand as clearly as possible why they act and react the way they do. I'm sorry some of you seem to react so passionately to the suggestion that the Russians are members of the same species as us, but it's a fact, and a useful one because it gives us some basis for thinking and planning about how to deal with them. Or you can take Father Hal's position, which, as near as I can make it out, is "We haven't got anything in common with these gooks, so there's no point in talking about it. Just pass out the ammunition."

On the other hand, MES, I don't think there's any way to wage war on a government -- economic or otherwise -- without simultaneously waging war on the people. Oddly, the Russians used to have that idea. "Peaceful coexistence" was based on the notion that "peoples" could get along swell with each other even though their governments were trying their level best to wipe each other out. I think even they have given that up.

From what I can tell by reading the various wires (I'm back at work now), the official CIA position is -- get this -- that it was probably all the fault of a computer, or rather a computer operator. The spooks believe that there was a significant error in the plane's coordinates, as programmed before takeoff, and that the pilot probably believed he was on course and in international airspace. Since it is not unusual for Soviet fighters to come out and pace private aircraft near their borders, or even make practise runs at them, it wouldn't be unusual for a Korean pilot to simply ignore them if he

believed he was in a legal area -- and there's apparently no evidence that the pilot ever did respond to the Soviet attempts at getting him to land. Beyond that, they believe the Soviet pilots and other surveillance personnel were conditioned by their humiliation in the 1978 incident to shoot down any plane that entered their territory and failed to respond to orders to land. They are equally convinced, however, that the Kremlin was kept informed of the whole thing as it was happening, and that those in charge are to be blamed for failing to countermand the standing order. Why they failed to do so appears to be the question of interest. The Hermit