

## What will be the outcome of the Middle East Road Map to Peace?

[view](#)

[results](#)

- It will be just like Oslo.
- It would work if only the Jews would accept it, but the hard-liners won't let them.
- It would work if only the Palestinians would accept it, but they don't want to.
- It will lose its way because it has missed the boat and lost the moral high ground above the roadblocks.
- It's too early to tell; it depends on what Bush knows.
- That region is inherently violent. There will never be peace because the hatreds run too deep.
- It will cause a major catastrophe.
- It will work more or less as planned.

[Vote](#)

Mon, 06/16/2003 - 07:37 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

### Discussing this question

It hasn't got a chance in hell of working. Does anyone in their right mind think it will work??

by a reader on Mon, 06/16/2003 - 08:42 | [reply](#)

### Let's not get too pessimistic!

It hasn't got a chance in hell of working. Does anyone in their right mind think it will work??

Call me out of my mind but I think it's too soon to say for sure it won't work.

by a reader on Mon, 06/16/2003 - 08:48 | [reply](#)

### What possible way could it wo...

What possible way could it work? If anyone would like to say why

this time will be different from all the others, let's hear it.

by **Chris** on Mon, 06/16/2003 - 10:03 | [reply](#)

## Reason For Hope

I am quite optimistic about the future for Israel, not exactly because of the Road Map, but perhaps the Road Map will help. Two reasons for hope are (1) the current more positive stance of the American government towards Israel and (2) the new Israeli government policy of increased force and the threat of force against the terrorists.

The Israeli government's announcement (sort of) that everyone in Hamas is the enemy of the peace process and is therefore going to be killed – and their showing that they mean business – will ratchet up the pressure on everyone in Hamas. Other terrorists will be experiencing increased pressure too: they will be next.

This is also going to increase the pressure on ordinary Hamas-supporting Palestinians. In the past, the Israeli government's policy of avoiding civilian casualties at all costs resulted in terrorists surrounding themselves with human shields. But their new, more forceful policy is such that ordinary Palestinians will now want to avoid having Hamas people in their cars and homes in case they too get killed in Israeli action against the terrorists. They will eventually start to complain when terrorists move next door, not because they have suddenly grown out of their hatred of Jews, but for the simple pragmatic reason of not wanting to get caught in the crossfire. Force and the threat of force is vital here, just as it was vital in Iraq. Reason doesn't work with terrorists and terrorist supporters. Force and the threat of force will concentrate their minds.

The other thing that gives me hope is that the Americans have not come out against this new Israeli policy. The effect of their praising the Palestinian so-called Prime Minister and deeming Hamas the enemy of the peace process provides a way for ordinary Palestinians (with a little push, as above) to jump over to the side of peace.

I just hope that they don't forget the importance of the true **democracy** bit. Natan Sharansky is right about that.

by **Sarah Fitz-Claridge** on Mon, 06/16/2003 - 11:00 | [reply](#)

## Will Israel Attacking Hamas help Abbas?

Eugene Volokh passes along an **opinion** today that argues that the Israeli hard-line against Hamas will strengthen Abbas' position and the chances for peace.

by **Gil** on Mon, 06/16/2003 - 22:59 | [reply](#)

## Question

To the people who voted for:

It will lose its way because it has missed the boat and lost the moral high ground above the roadblocks.

What does this mean?

~Woty

<http://woty.blogspot.com>

by **Woty** on Tue, 06/17/2003 - 20:48 | [reply](#)

## What does this mean?

That they chose randomly?

That they voted accidentally when the cat jumped on their keyboard?

That they read just the first bit ("It will lose its way") and voted before reading the rest of the sentence?

--

Sarah Fitz-Claridge

<http://www.fitz-claridge.com/>

by **Sarah Fitz-Claridge** on Tue, 06/17/2003 - 21:07 | [reply](#)

## mixed metaphors

I count about 4 mixed metaphors in that cryptic choice.

by **Daniel Strimpel** on Fri, 06/20/2003 - 02:13 | [reply](#)

## Has it got "a chance in hell?"

How can you say it doesn't have "a chance in hell" of working?

This IS a chance in hell. A chance in hell is therefore the ONLY chance it has of working.

by a reader on Wed, 06/25/2003 - 14:06 | [reply](#)

## Hell

Could you describe the boundaries of hell please?

My atlas seems to be out of date.

by **Gil** on Thu, 06/26/2003 - 00:06 | [reply](#)

## Atlas

Gil, if you'd like it to be labelled 'Gehenna' your atlas is not *sufficiently* out of date, but it's immediately west/southwest of the walled city, and only a couple hundred yards wide. Apparently the

1949 UN Armistice line followed it, so A Reader's concern is understandable.

by [Kevin](#) on Thu, 06/26/2003 - 15:40 | [reply](#)

## It won't until the Mullas are in power!

Until the Islamic Republic of Iran exists and pays the terrorists in Lebanon and among the Palestinians with the money that actually belongs to the Iranian people ,desprately in need of it I might add, NO peace map has any chance of survival.

-----  
*Editor's Note: We think that this commenter means **while**, not 'until'.*

by a reader on Sat, 07/19/2003 - 15:50 | [reply](#)

## Israelis should defend themselves

Dear Sarah,

I didn't vote on this one. I can't see any option that I really like amongst the list. Voting in online polls is a bit silly, since there is no way to have a representative, random sample. The results may be interesting to some, but are statistically troubled by self-selection error. As well, voting isn't reason. It isn't like counting noses ever solved a problem, nor is it the case that one man standing alone is necessarily wrong while millions voting the other way must know what they are on about.

With particular respect to Israel, I do like the fact that the Israelis, or at least their government, are going about taking deliberate and forceful actions in self-defense. Defensive and retaliatory force are justified. I think it is a very bad idea to tolerate terrorists bombing cafes, malls, or flying aircraft into buildings.

Having said as much, I do think there are obligations on those who engage in defensive or retaliatory force. Doing so should obligate the force user to select their targets accurately.

I'm quite sure that al Qaeda hated Saddam Hussein's policies and politics just as much as they hated the USA. The inaccuracy of reports claiming that Saddam was behind the attacks on the World Trade Center remains an important issue. While I completely agree with Dana Carvey's choice quip, "If Saddam didn't have weapons of mass destruction, he was an idiot for not letting every inspector see every site they wanted," I'm not convinced that those weapons presented a clear and present danger to the USA. There was no evidence of uranium purchases from Africa, for example.

I use these items as sort of comparative literature. On the whole,

from what I've seen, Israel has done an adequate job of targeting terrorists and their direct accomplices and supporters. I think it is to the Israeli's credit that they have not invaded and occupied Syria or Egypt or Lebanon in this latest round of actions, and much to their credit that when they did agree that they were occupying a part of Egypt (the Sinai) they came to a peace conference at Camp David and returned that property to Egypt.

Unfortunately, I don't see much prospect for the USA leaving Afghanistan to be run by Afghans or leaving Iraq to be run by Iraqis, any more than I was able to see the USA leave Vietnam to be run by the Vietnamese except at the last instant, in the worst possible way. Talk about betrayals.

Regards,

Jim

davidson@net1.net

<http://www.ezez.com/free/freejim.html>

by [planetaryjim](#) on Fri, 11/07/2003 - 04:54 | [reply](#)

## Sustainability through FMSL

FMSL is about a child-centric, self-sustainable approach to solving the problems of the world.

If we first ensure that there is enough for every child, we can then be sure that there will be enough for every adult. A child's future right to food, shelter and education is more important than its parents' immediate right to reproduce. A certain degree of financial security must be mandatory for marriage so that the children to be born are not denied their basic rights. Compulsory financial security of some kind, if required at marriage, by law, would significantly prevent birth into poverty and consequent evils. FMSL is a law that requires a predetermined level of financial security before a legal marriage can take place. Such a law would make it more likely that children live in sanitary conditions, are less likely to go hungry and shelter less and have access to quality education and information. Those children will be more likely to attain success in life and develop into useful citizens.

When the poor decrease in number, the government will not have to provide cheap transport, subsidized goods, free education and free healthcare. Money saved in this manner could be used instead to improve infrastructure and enforce law and order.

More prosperous people would mean that more people will be able to afford environmentally friendly resources and technologies. We can then continue our progress without causing a threat to our own survival or to the survival of other species.

I believe that the child centric approach is our best shot against overpopulation, poverty, environmental hazards and all other associated evils. All that is required is that proof of financial security

in any form - property, cash, income proof etc. be required in all

nations for legal marriage. Human life will flourish to only as much as can be sustained. A UN directive to implement the FMSL law would aid greatly in accomplishing this.

by [cooloften123](#) on Fri, 11/26/2004 - 13:19 | [reply](#)

## Yeah, Right.

I'm not sure what the comment above has to do with the Middle East roadmap, but I'll respond anyway...

If you add restrictions to legal marriage, all you'll achieve is fewer legal marriages.

You won't inhibit many people from living together or having children. In fact, you'll probably cause more children to be born out of wedlock, perhaps reducing the percentage of fathers who feel a real obligation to support their children once their relationship sours.

I agree that it's good to promote the idea that people should have good economic prospects before taking on the awesome responsibility of having children. But, I don't think that laws will accomplish this. You have to change people's minds.

## Gil

by [Gil](#) on Fri, 11/26/2004 - 22:24 | [reply](#)

## words like terrorists

Terrorist is a word, not a person. It is used for people we want to fight and not help. Some of those people called terrorists believe they fight for justice, and more certainly many are people who's friends and children are killed by bombs. I have two children. I hate it when they cry. I have the pictures of children in body bags, and their mums, and young men in casual clothes. They have no medals and they have no planes. They fight in their own land, not abroad, and they are called insurgents.

He people we want to fight have been seen as dirty, sub-human, worthless, ugly, stupid etc., while we create puppet governments to lead them into poverty, steal their land= and giving gas to Sadaam to gas them.

Are you aware as we debate the 'road map' - which incidentally is not a road not a map, but a face-saving exercise for the harsh cruel Jewish State - that Palestinian farmers are having their wheat crops sprayed in the desert so they can be forcibly moved into 'conurbations', and the land appropriated. This is achievable, because their leaders, their rites are unrecognised, because they are 'worthless' - tradition is worthless. Instead gain, and pride can be made, as politicians we step in and out of the limelight. It is best left to them, and to their fighters. Israel should be prosecuted for war crimes, and their nuclear bombs confiscated (they should be invaded).

The modern army man is a spoilt, pampered civil servant in fancy-

dress uniform, who gets mad and complains when shot at by a rifle:  
"Where was the support - the planes and bombs?"

by [a reader](#) on Fri, 05/06/2005 - 23:50 | [reply](#)

---

[home](#) | [archives](#) | [polls](#) | [search](#)

Copyright © 2008 Setting The World To Rights