

Our First Convert From Idiotarianism?

In a *sensitively*-written piece in the **Globe and Mail** (via **Abode of Amritas**),

Roy MacGregor brought to life the terrible plight of Ms Dianne Burnham, who does not speak with "a loud voice, but ... quietly and cautiously". This poor peace activist has, it seems, been so traumatised by finding herself in "the minority anti-war side" in that most abominable of regimes, America, that she is looking for a "safe haven". Anxious to help her in her search for a new home, we'd like to recommend that she try **North Korea**, **Syria**, or perhaps **Cuba**, **France** or **Zimbabwe** might appeal to her too.

But wait! Could it be that Ms Burnham has experienced a last-minute access of sanity? Look at her bumper sticker ad for **The World!**:

"God Bless **The World**", she insists.

Though we are atheists, we gratefully accept the support of what may be our very first idiotarian convert.

Tue, 04/29/2003 - 01:58 | [permlink](#)

Unbelievable

This paragraph reached out and kicked me:

It is hardly an even split, the pro-war side vastly outnumbering the antiwar, and because **the media, particularly television, have been vastly pro-war**, little attention has been paid to the minority side apart from quick dismissals and even charges of unpatriotic activity.

I haven't read the Globe and Mail before, so I'm not clear on what its place is on the political scale, but I find that ridiculous. It seemed to me that 9 out of 10 news outlets here were anti-war (at least until the fighting was over, then it seemed to abate somewhat). It's like they made that up to somehow justify this woman's insecurity.

Oh, and does she realize how un-American it is to run when things aren't just how you like it? If she were in the old Iraq, after fleeing, her remaining family members would certainly be tortured after she

left for suspicion of disloyalty.

by a reader on Tue, 04/29/2003 - 06:09 | [reply](#)

The Globe and Mail

The Globe and Mail is the main traditional left-centre Canadian newspaper. They generally believe that the state is man's best friend.

by a reader on Wed, 04/30/2003 - 21:32 | [reply](#)

Was the writer entirely serious?

I thought I detected a hint of sarcasm in the *Globe and Mail* article. Anyone else?

by a reader on Wed, 04/30/2003 - 21:34 | [reply](#)

Ms. Burnham's hysterics

The Globe and Mail should reinterview Ms. Burnham next year to discover whether she had the courage of her convictions to disrupt her life by actually moving to Canada or Costa Rica. Or whether - after quivering delicately in the spotlight - she simply stayed put. As a former journalist I didn't detect so much as sarcasm in the tone of the report (as noted by a previous reader) as a sense of boredom with Ms. Burnham's creepy solipsism.

by a reader on Thu, 05/01/2003 - 17:41 | [reply](#)

As Anti-American As Anti-TV?

Is there a connection between anti-Americanism and being anti-TV apart from the obvious 'commercialism' aspect?

by a reader on Fri, 05/02/2003 - 01:52 | [reply](#)

Yeah, I'd lay money on her st...

Yeah, I'd lay money on her staying right where she is.

by a reader on Fri, 05/02/2003 - 01:53 | [reply](#)

Anti-American, Anti-TV

Yes there is a connection.

They both come from a preference for the "natural" (ie primitive).

America is seen as favoring using technology to control nature to "improve" (their scare quotes, not mine) our lives. This includes using TV to communicate and entertain.

Fundamentally, I think this preference is anti-human, because they

seem to view "natural" as "excluding human action", so they seem to think the world would be perfect if only there were no people in it.

by **Gil** on Fri, 05/02/2003 - 17:15 | [reply](#)

Copyright © 2005 Setting The World To Rights