

Trust

Gordon Brown has said that if Robin Cook had not died he would have **made him his deputy** when he became party leader (and presumably Prime Minister). His reason would have been to restore "trust."

Whose trust does he want to cultivate? Robin Cook was a socialist who felt he had **"sold his soul"** by joining up to New Labour. Presumably New Labour's superficial prattle about a Third Way between capitalism and socialism put off Cook who preferred more overtly socialist nonsense.

Cook also famously opposed the liberation of Iraq. So Brown wants to cultivate the trust of socialists who oppose deposing evil dictators who fund terrorism. The leader of a nation should argue for the policies he thinks are right and to pursue them as successfully as he can. After France fell in 1940, some members of Churchill's Cabinet wanted to accept a "peace offer" from Hitler. If Churchill had tried to win his colleagues' "trust" by pandering to this nonsense, he would have been guilty of a shameful abrogation of his responsibilities. Instead he gave them a speech that persuaded them not to surrender. Mr Brown has shamefully pandered to the worst elements in the Labour Party, hard core socialists and antiwar noisemakers.

Another potential leader has also shown that he can't be trusted. Potential Conservative Party leader Malcom Rifkind **said**:

"I believe it [the Iraq war] was a **wrong war**, at the wrong time, for the wrong reasons. The war was an extremely foolish and unnecessary one. The consequence has been to create a political vacuum in Iraq itself.

"Terrorists are operating within Iraq in a way we didn't have in the past, so the war has certainly assisted international terrorism in Iraq. If you destroy an existing regime - however evil it may be - you create a political vacuum..."

That is **nonsense**.

"If a prime minister has led his country to war on a false basis then he should bear the full responsibility. He should have resigned. If I had led the party at the time

that would be the policy I would have pursued.”

That too is a bizarre remark. When a Prime Minister makes decisions about war and peace he must do so on the basis of the best information available. If that information turns out to be wrong he should only resign if this problem is a result of wrongdoing or incompetence on his part. There is no reason to think that was true in regard to the information on Iraqi weapons stockpiles, and all the other reasons for deposing Saddam turned out to have been underestimated.

Nor has Mr Rifkind explained how we can prevent terrorists from attacking Britain without removing tyrants who sponsor terrorism, like **Saddam**. Sometimes we may be able to do this without a war by sponsoring a resistance movement or through economic sanctions. But Saddam's Iraq was a Stalinist police state and economic sanctions did not harm Saddam's regime and had proved ineffective. Mr Rifkind and Mr Brown are opportunists who cannot be trusted to lead Britain in a time of war.

Wed, 08/17/2005 - 17:24 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

France fell in 1940

Henry Sturman

by [Henry Sturman](#) on Thu, 08/18/2005 - 12:47 | [reply](#)

Re: France fell in 1940

Indeed it did. How that typo got through is a deep mystery! But it's corrected now. Thanks.

by [Editor](#) on Thu, 08/18/2005 - 12:53 | [reply](#)

"who sponsor terrorism, like

"who sponsor terrorism, like Saddam". Modern islamic terrorism is a complex problem. Removing Saddam doesn't help at all.

Al-Qaeda and other terrorist organisations are sponsored by many people through "havala" system. People in islamic states are not happy with their governments and they sponsor terrorism against West in order to deprive their governments of foreign support. Many people in Saudi Arabia believe that Saudi regime is sponsored by America and they feel moral necessity to fight against America.

Where is Saddam Hussein in this system?

On the other hand, helping Iraqis to set up government by Americans is considered by many arabs as installing a western government and therefore contributes to terrorism support quite a lot.

So, it turns out that "liberation of Iraq" has an opposite effect to

what you described in your heroic pro-war slogans.

by a reader on Thu, 08/18/2005 - 14:24 | [reply](#)

First of all, I hope it doesn't

First of all, I hope it doesn't need pointing out that the fact (which I'll not dispute) that the "havala" system is used by "many people" to support terrorism does not, in and of itself, refute the fact that Saddam Hussein was an evil dictator who supported terrorism, as **The World** stated. The two facts are not mutually exclusive. (Unless the claim is that 100% of all terrorism is supported by non-dictator laypeople through the "havala" system, a claim which would be absurd on its face.)

Further points:

If people in "Islamic states" are "not happy with their governments" perhaps they ought take it up with their governments. The chain of reasoning which asserts that plotting to murder randomly chosen Westerners will somehow improve their own governments is tenuous at best; in any event, the effort is immoral and must be resisted.

Based on a reader's comment re:Iraq it is worth pondering just what he thinks makes people in Islamic states unhappy with their governments. For example, one might think that an evil dictator government (such as Saddam Hussein's) would have made people in that Islamic state unhappy, yet according to a reader when we ended that government (we are not, by the way, "helping Iraqis to set up government by Americans", but *by Iraqis*), we just contributed to terrorist support. Is a reader saying that people in Islamic states like and want evil dictators to govern them, and get mad when they are ousted? Seems like it. Now don't get me wrong; there are certainly people who fit the description "prefers evil dictators". But their preferences are immoral, they should not be heeded, and it is particularly insulting for a reader to insinuate that they necessarily speak for all Muslims (or Arabs - it's not clear which set of people a reader thinks he is talking about BTW; he switches freely).

Finally, a reader contradicts himself. In paragraph 2 we are led to believe that the cause of terrorism is people in various Islamic states not being happy with their respective governments. By paragraph 4, the ouster of Hussein in Iraq has made "many arabs" mad, thus contributing to terrorist support. "Many Arabs"? Why would "Arabs" as such care what happens in Iraq unless they are Iraqi themselves? Remember, the reason (supposedly) terrorists become terrorists is because they are unhappy with "their" government. Why would "Arabs", not from Iraq, become terrorists (as is currently happening) on account of whatever is or isn't going on in Iraq? What's it to them? This phenomenon is inexplicable if a reader's theory of "good-government-wanting terrorists" is correct.

Could it be because improvement of "their" government, as such, is

not quite at the top of their agenda, and something else is?

by blixia on Thu, 08/18/2005 - 22:48 | [reply](#)

your hope is all you have

You are definitely right, that existence of havala system is not 100% mutually-exclusive. On the other hand, getting of tyrans doesn't help with getting rid of terrorists. And the reason for that believe is the existence of such systems as havala and world-wide muslim support of terrorism against western civilization whatever irrational reasons stand behind the terrorism.

So, instead of finding a contradiction in my reasoning you are trying to find contradictions in terrorist ideology. You are not even wrong - there are plenty. In fact, every reason to kill one person for the sake of others is a contradiction. And obviously, I don't hold this contradiction as my personal view. Neither do I support terrorists or tyrans like Saddam. You are fighting with a shadow, don't you?

"The chain of reasoning which asserts that plotting to murder randomly chosen Westerners will somehow improve their own governments is tenuous at best". Who argues about that? Me - not. Extremists-muslims - yes, they vote for that view with their both hands, however tenuous it is. Large number of arab peoples in Saudi Arabia - yes. They vote for that view with their money (sent through "havala" system to Al-Qaeda).

The same irrational view is used by many to recruit suicide bombers, to resist new Iraqi government initiatives, to reject any constitution rendering it as "imposed on us by americans" etc.

The fact that such extremists don't speak for all muslims is irrelevant. It is absolutely pointless to do logical reasoning about what all arabs want or don't want since there is no system in existence to reveal their wishes. There are no elections and therefore, no exit-polls and no such thing as "public opinion". If there is no way to express a wish, there will be no wish. If question is never asked, people don't bother to know the answer.

Later in the text you say that arabs in other countries shouldn't bother what is happening in Iraq. Or have I misunderstood you? These are your words:

"Why would "Arabs" as such care what happens in Iraq unless they are Iraqi themselves?"

Are you really serious about it?

This is the main generating power of global terrorism. British-bred muslims go to a bus in Tavistok Square and blow themselves up for the sake of Iraqi people (or as they think so). But somehow, you make a conclusion that they shouldn't do it. But they DO IT!

Your 100% correct logical construction is based on the assumption that all people are reasonable and rational. You are not even wrong.

You are simply billions of light years away from this planet.

Yes, it does seem illogical that people start with fury about their government and end up with fury about western civilization. But it only seems so. In reality it is a matter of radicalisation on whatever issue is available at the moment. Today they are not happy with saudi prince, tomorrow they are unhappy with american administration in Iraq and it seems perfectly reasonable to them.

by a reader on Mon, 08/22/2005 - 17:11 | [reply](#)

Then What Should Be Done with Illogical People?

If destroying a murderous dictator like Saddam and trying to give the Iraqi people a say in their own political affairs helps terrorists, and hurts Iraqi's: What should have been done to hurt terrorists and help Iraqi's? What should be done now?

Attack Israel?

by another reader on Mon, 08/22/2005 - 18:45 | [reply](#)

shhh

I wouldn't recommend suggesting attacking Israel to illogical people.... ;-)

I wouldn't even mention Israel, if you want to continue talking about anything else.

-- Elliot Temple

<http://www.curi.us/>

by [Elliot Temple](#) on Mon, 08/22/2005 - 22:55 | [reply](#)

deal with reality, not with your logical constructions

The trouble with libertarians is always about their idealistic view of the world. Instead of dealing with whatever happens in reality, you just assume that all "logical" people would understand your word and therefore, the problem is solved. When someone points out that there are not-quite logical people all over the place (and in fact, every person is illogical about at least one thing), libertarians just say - or, in that case it doesn't matter, we'll just do ... whatever .

Simple example, an evil person is jailed or executed, but his son loved his father and should be expected to act absolutely illogically in future. But we still have to deal with such cases reasonably.

And we should also expect that many iraqi people while being oppressed by Saddam would prefer to stay under his rule just to be spared of war. And whoever brings the war against Saddam would be considered as trully evil. Is it so difficult to understand? Do these people have to be condemned forever as "illogical creatures"?

And is it so tremendously difficult to realise that many young arabs

are going butts about it? That many older people would sponsor and support these youngsters?

Saddam Hussein regime is toppled, 100 000 iraqis are dead, thousands of new radical youngsters have joined jihad against West.

If hundreds of thousands iraqis have been killed while Saddam was in power are these 100 000 humans deaths of any help now?

Does irrationally motivated global terrorism suffer from any losses here? Hardly.

by a reader on Tue, 08/23/2005 - 10:49 | [reply](#)

"On the other hand, getting o

"On the other hand, getting of tyrans doesn't help with getting rid of terrorists."

If the tyrant is supporting and/or sheltering terrorists, then it does help.

"The fact that such extremists don't speak for all muslims is irrelevant. It is absolutely pointless to do logical reasoning about what all arabs want or don't want since there is no system in existence to reveal their wishes. There are no elections and therefore, no exit-polls and no such thing as "public opinion"."

That is what we are attempting to change, in Iraq. An effort which you (I think it was you) called counterproductive. So, what, then?

"["Why would "Arabs" as such care what happens in Iraq unless they are Iraqi themselves?"] Are you really serious about it?"

Not exactly. I was extrapolating from your characterization of the motive for terrorism: "People in islamic states are not happy with their governments and they sponsor terrorism against West in order to deprive their governments of foreign support." I was trying to illustrate that this doesn't work as a motive for non-Iraqi Arabs who support terrorism in Iraq. If "not happy with their governments" is the motive for terrorism then no outsider Arabs should be bothering with sponsoring terrorism in Iraq, because after all, what does that have to do with *their* government?

Yet (as you say, correctly) outsiders DO sponsor terrorism in Iraq. Why? Your characterization fails to explain. Some key component must be missing.

"This is the main generating power of global terrorism."

Indeed. Which is why your earlier characterization ("they are unhappy with their governments and want to deprive them on Western support") made no sense to me. It failed to take into account the pan-Arab-nationalist sentiment which is, in fact, the (or at least, a) main generating power, as you say.

"Your 100% correct logical construction is based on the assumtpion

that all people are reasonable and rational. You are not even wrong. You are simply billions of light years away from this planet."

Wrong. I do not "assume", or believe, that "all people are reasonable and rational". I was simply being rhetorical so as to show the absurdity of your earlier claim. Get it now? Thanks for the response,

by blixax on Wed, 08/24/2005 - 04:24 | [reply](#)

Copyright © 2007 Setting The World To Rights