

---

Subject: Diplomacy

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 02:37:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Does the US have anyone that really excels in diplomacy? Henry Kissinger always seemed to be amazing to me and I'm wondering who now days does effective diplomacy.

Do you believe that countries like Iran, Syria and North Korea are beyond diplomacy? I always look for diplomatic solutions but I think the US government has totally stopped any real diplomacy. Yes, No ? Didn't we wait a good week for Israel to blow up Pakestan last month until we Condi wandered over to the UN and said "hey, you think it's time to reduce the kill rate to show we care?".

John

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 02:41:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Do you believe that countries like Iran, Syria and North Korea are beyond > diplomacy?

North Korea?.....why not ask the Clintons? Iran?.....no problem.....all we have to do is abandon Israel and convert to Islam.  
Syria????.....I'd rather try to herd cats.

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450cb4fb\$1@linux...

>

> Does the US have anyone that really excels in diplomacy? Henry Kissinger > always seemed to be amazing to me and I'm wondering who now days does effective > diplomacy.

>

> Do you believe that countries like Iran, Syria and North Korea are beyond > diplomacy? I always look for diplomatic solutions but I think the US government > has totally stopped any real diplomacy. Yes, No ? Didn't we wait a good > week for Israel to blow up Pakestan last month until we Condi wandered over > to the UN and said "hey, you think it's time to reduce the kill rate to show > we care?".

>

> John

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 03:18:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ok, so diplomacy isn't working. But WHO are the diplomats and do they have any skill like Kissinger?

John

"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:

>Do you believe that countries like Iran, Syria and North Korea are beyond  
>> diplomacy?

>

>North Korea?.....why not ask the Clintons? Iran?.....no problem.....all

>we have to do is abandon Israel and convert to Islam.

>Syria????.....I'd rather try to herd cats.

>

>

>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450cb4fb\$1@linux...

>>

>> Does the US have anyone that really excels in diplomacy? Henry Kissinger

>> always seemed to be amazing to me and I'm wondering who now days does

>effective

>> diplomacy.

>>

>> Do you believe that countries like Iran, Syria and North Korea are beyond

>> diplomacy? I always look for diplomatic solutions but I think the US

>government

>> has totally stopped any real diplomacy. Yes, No ? Didn't we wait a  
good

>> week for Israel to blow up Pakestan last month until we Condi wandered  
>over

>> to the UN and said "hey, you think it's time to reduce the kill rate to

>show

>> we care?".

>>

>> John

>

>

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 04:29:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Why was Kissinger successful? He had an agenda.....get us out of VietNam.  
Everyone agreed on this agenda....even the Russiand and therefore they were  
willing to go the "detente" route. North Vietnam couldn't really pay them

for the billions they were expending to prop up that regime. As far as we were concerned, there was never any real desire to stay there once Kissinger took center stage. Cronkite declared victory for the Viet Cong at the end of Tet (December 1968) and everyone went along with this so Kissinger had to figure out how to go about getting out and getting our prisoners out.

As far as China goes, it was in China's interest to open up relations with the west because their economy was tanking and they were scared as hell of the Soviets.

These were the times we were extremely active in supporting Latin American dictatorships and he was accused of being complicit in war crimes by a few leftist journalists like Christopher Hitchens.

The thing is that international politics isn't pretty. Kissinger may have gotten the Nobel Peace prize, but it was more the time in history than the person, IMO. I mean, Arafat and Annan have gotten the Nobel Peace prize which shows how bogus it really is these days.

Trying to be the passive good guy and pleasing the world gets us the disastrous results of the Carter and Clinton administrations. Just a little correct intelligence at the right time and we'd likely not be in such a mess today. Too bad Clinton screwed the pooch on that one. When Kissinger was Secretary of State, we had an intelligence service that could be depended on. You can't conduct diplomacy without having a few hole cards.

DJ

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450cbe96\$1@linux...

>

> Ok, so diplomacy isn't working. But WHO are the diplomats and do they have

> any skill like Kissinger?

>

> John

>

> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:

> >Do you believe that countries like Iran, Syria and North Korea are beyond

> >> diplomacy?

> >

> >North Korea?.....why not ask the Clintons? Iran?.....no problem.....all

> >we have to do is abandon Israel and convert to Islam.

> >Syria????.....I'd rather try to herd cats.

> >

> >

> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450cb4fb\$1@linux...  
> >>  
> >> Does the US have anyone that really excels in diplomacy? Henry  
Kissinger  
> >> always seemed to be amazing to me and I'm wondering who now days does  
> >effective  
> >> diplomacy.  
> >>  
> >> Do you believe that countries like Iran, Syria and North Korea are  
beyond  
> >> diplomacy? I always look for diplomatic solutions but I think the US  
> >government  
> >> has totally stopped any real diplomacy. Yes, No ? Didn't we wait a  
> >good  
> >> week for Israel to blow up Pakestan last month until we Condi wandered  
> >over  
> >> to the UN and said "hey, you think it's time to reduce the kill rate to  
> >show  
> >> we care?".  
> >>  
> >> John  
> >  
> >  
>

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy  
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 12:01:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and obliterate dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with Kissinger's dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace and knew clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.

There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button and have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.

So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see anyone who clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I don't know anyone who seems to have the cool head that I percieve Kissinger had. Also, I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger but he always struck me as the ultimate diplomat.

John

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 13:04:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

>There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button and  
>have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.

.....and where exactly do you get this info? Seems to me that if your  
assumption was right, North Korea would be a parking lot right about now.  
We have developed \$250,000.00 cannon shells that can be shot out of a  
howitzer from 25 miles away and hit within 10' of a scumbag so that we only  
kill his human shields in the immediate vicinity. I'm finding it harder and  
harder to justify spending this kind of money on people who haven't got the  
common sense to take these people out themselves (and it's very disturbing  
to me that I feel this way.....but I'm beginning to).

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3909\$1@linux...

>  
> Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and obliterate  
> dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with Kissinger's  
> dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace and knew  
> clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.

>  
> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button and  
> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.

>  
> So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see anyone who  
> clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I don't know  
> anyone who seems to have the cool head that I perceive Kissinger had.

Also,

> I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger but he  
> always struck me as the ultimate diplomat.

>  
> John

>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 14:50:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Just to be clear, my question is "Who are the diplomats of today".

"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:

>>There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button and

>>have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.  
>  
>.....and where exactly do you get this info? Seems to me that if your  
>assumption was right, North Korea would be a parking lot right about now.  
>We have developed \$250,000.00 cannon shells that can be shot out of a  
>howitzer from 25 miles away and hit within 10' of a scumbag so that we only  
>kill his human shields in the immediate vicinity. I'm finding it harder  
and  
>harder to justify spending this kind of money on people who haven't got  
the  
>common sense to take these people out themselves (and it's very disturbing  
>to me that I feel this way.....but I'm beginning to).  
>  
>  
>  
>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3909\$1@linux...  
>>  
>> Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and obliterate  
>> dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with Kissinger's  
>> dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace and knew  
>> clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.  
>>  
>> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button and  
>> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.  
>>  
>> So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see anyone  
who  
>> clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I don't know  
>> anyone who seems to have the cool head that I perceive Kissinger had.  
>Also,  
>> I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger but  
he  
>> always struck me as the ultimate diplomat.  
>>  
>> John  
>>  
>>  
>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy  
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 19:31:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

But you stated that there seemed to be far too many people who were ready to  
push a button.....etc. I disagree.

I think we've got plenty of diplomats in this administration.. They have to have something other than an ideological brick wall or a weasel to negotiate with though. What good did \*diplomacy\* with the Koreans or Arafat. To dispatch envoys to discuss international affairs and foreign policy with terrorists and Nazi maniacs like the Iranian prime minister legitimizes them and their tactics.

<http://www.iranfocus.com/modules/news/article.php?storyid=54> 26

Back around 1970 when I was studying political science, one of the the required courses of study was international government and politics. This book was part of the required curriculum:

[http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cup/catalog/data/071030/071030673\\_3.HTM](http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cup/catalog/data/071030/071030673_3.HTM)

It was of particular interest to me because I had a job lined up in the Middle East with a company out of New Orleans named McDermott International to work in Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf. It was a great job.....stay 18 months and bring home an incredible amount of money tax free, but it was considered dangerous duty over there, even then. The 1973 arab/israeli war ended up blowing my whole plan out of the water because the company had to reshuffle their experienced employees.....but anyway.....I read the book and quite a few others dealing with the middle east with great interest. Also I had a friend who was an architecture student who was an Iraqi American and we often talked about middle east affairs.....and still do.

Anyway.....this part of the world has interested me for a long time so fast forward to right after 911 but before the invasion of Iraq. I ran across this article which pretty much is spot on IMO about the historical situation as has existed for many years

[http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501\\_why.htm](http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501_why.htm)

.....and the most tragic part of it is the last paragraph wherein the author states:

It sounds like a daunting challenge, but there are many good signs. Al Qaeda is not more powerful than the combined force of many determined governments. The world is indeed uniting around American leadership, and perhaps we will see the emergence, for a while, of a new global community and consensus, which could bring progress in many other areas of international life. Perhaps most important, Islamic fundamentalism still does not speak to the majority of the Muslim people. In Pakistan, fundamentalist parties have yet to get more than 10 percent of the vote. In Iran, having experienced the brutal puritanism of the mullahs, people are yearning for normalcy. In Egypt, for all the repression, the fundamentalists are a potent force but so far not dominant. If the West can help Islam enter modernity in dignity and peace, it will have done more than achieved security. It will have changed the world.

I have no reason not to believe (other than the rantings of the autohateBush lunatic fringe community who want to politicize everything) that during this period, had we possessed an intelligence service that could have warned the administration about the duplicity of those in the global community who were rearming Sadaam Hussein at the expense of the Iraqi people using the UN Oil-For-Food program as their cover and the realities of the mountainous stockpiles of munitions that have been converted to IED's and most likely the destinations oin Syria and elsewhere where Sadaam was moving his WMD's (I still think we haven't heard the last of this issue), we would have done things differently. Instead we got a "legacy" intelligence service that was horribly flawed. What we have discovered is that we had far more enemies during the Clinton administration than anyone knew. Y

This is the intelligence service that bush inherited. You may or may not think these sources credeible, but I think that historical reality has proved them top be correct:

<http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040414-124718-2114r.htm>

[http://www.nationalreview.com/nr\\_comment/nr\\_comment042903.as p](http://www.nationalreview.com/nr_comment/nr_comment042903.as p)

[http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-sid e\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-sid e_x.htm)

<http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/535793/posts> (this one is especially disturbing)

Now what does this have to do with diplomacy? You have to have good information in order to conduct diplomatic negotiations. Yeah, Rice could go out there and negotiate with terrorists and the Korean lunatic. Clinton tried it for 8 years. At some point you have to learn from mistakes of the past.

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d60c8\$1@linux...

>

> Just to be clear, my question is "Who are the diplomats of today".

>

> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:

> >>There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button and

> >>have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.

> >

> >.....and where exactly do you get this info? Seems to me that if your  
> >assumption was right, North Korea wopuld be a parking lot right about  
now.

> >We have developed \$250,000.00 cannon shells that can be shot out of a  
> >howitzer from 25 miles away and hit within 10' of a scumbag so that we  
only

> >kill his human shields in the immediate vicinity. I'm finding it harder  
> and  
> >harder to justify spending this kind of money on people who haven't got  
> the  
> >common sense to take these people out themselves (and it's very  
disturbing  
> >to me that I feel this way.....but I'm beginning to).  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3909\$1@linux...  
> >>  
> >> Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and  
obliterate  
> >> dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with  
Kissinger's  
> >> dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace and  
knew  
> >> clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.  
> >>  
> >> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button  
and  
> >> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.  
> >>  
> >> So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see anyone  
> who  
> >> clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I don't  
know  
> >> anyone who seems to have the cool head that I percieve Kissinger had.  
> >Also,  
> >> I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger but  
> he  
> >> always struck me as the ultimate diplomat.  
> >>  
> >> John  
> >>  
> >>  
> >  
> >  
>

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy  
Posted by [justcron](#) on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 19:46:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Interesting Deej and insightful.

There are so many issues involved, but one of the main topics as it applies to the current situation is has Bush's policies and actions increased or decreased that islamic fundamentalist support? It seems to be growing like wildfire whereas it used to be embers.

"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote in message news:450da2d8@linux...

> But you stated that there seemed to be far to many people who were ready  
> to  
> push a button.....etc. I disagree.  
>  
> I think we've got plenty of diplomats in this administration.. They have  
> to  
> have something other than an ideological brick wall or a weasel to  
> negotiate  
> with though. What good did \*diplomacy\* with the Koreans or Arafat. To  
> dispatch envoys to discuss international affiars and foriegn policy with  
> terrorists and Nazi maniacs like the Iranian prime minister legitimizes  
> them  
> and their tactics.  
> <http://www.iranfocus.com/modules/news/article.php?storyid=5426>  
>  
> Back around 1970 when I was studing political science, one of the the  
> required courses of study was international government and politics. This  
> book was part of the required curriculum:  
> <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cup/catalog/data/071030/0710306733.HTM>  
>  
> It was of particular interest to me because I had a job lined up in the  
> Middle East with a company out of New Orleans named McDermott  
> International  
> to work in Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf. It was a great job.....stay  
> 18  
> months and bring home an incredible amount of money tax free, but it was  
> considered dangerous duty over there, even then. The 1973 arab/israeli war  
> ended up blowing my whole plan out of the water because the company had to  
> reshuffle their experienced employees.....but anyway.....I read the  
> book and quite a few others dealing with the middle east with great  
> interest. Also I had a friend who was an architecture student who was an  
> Iraqi American and we often talked about middle east affairs.....and  
> still  
> do.  
>  
> Anyway.....this part of the world has interested me for a long time so  
> fast forward to right after 911 but before the invasion of Iraq. I ran  
> across this article which pretty much is spot on IMO about the historical  
> situation as has existed for many years  
> [http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501\\_why.html](http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501_why.html)  
>

> .....and the most tragic part of it is the last paragraph  
> wherein the author states:  
>  
> It sounds like a daunting challenge, but there are many good signs. Al  
> Qaeda  
> is not more powerful than the combined force of many determined  
> governments.  
> The world is indeed uniting around American leadership, and perhaps we  
> will  
> see the emergence, for a while, of a new global community and consensus,  
> which could bring progress in many other areas of international life.  
> Perhaps most important, Islamic fundamentalism still does not speak to the  
> majority of the Muslim people. In Pakistan, fundamentalist parties have  
> yet  
> to get more than 10 percent of the vote. In Iran, having experienced the  
> brutal puritanism of the mullahs, people are yearning for normalcy. In  
> Egypt, for all the repression, the fundamentalists are a potent force but  
> so  
> far not dominant. If the West can help Islam enter modernity in dignity  
> and  
> peace, it will have done more than achieved security. It will have changed  
> the world.  
>  
> I have no reason not to believe (other than the rantings of the  
> autohateBush  
> lunatic fringe community who want to politicize everything) that during  
> this  
> period, had we possessed an intelligence service that could have warned  
> the  
> administration about the duplicity of those in the global community who  
> were  
> rearming Sadaam Hussein at the expense of the Iraqi people using the UN  
> Oil-For-Food program as their cover and the realities of the mountainous  
> stockpiles of munitions that have been converted to IED's and most likely  
> the destinations in Syria and elsewhere where Sadaam was moving his WMD's  
> (I still think we haven't heard the last of this issue), we would have  
> done  
> things differently. Instead we got a "legacy" intelligence service that  
> was  
> horribly flawed. What we have discovered is that we had far more enemies  
> during the Clinton administration than anyone knew. Y  
>  
> This is the intelligence service that bush inherited. You may or may not  
> think these sources credible, but I think that historical reality has  
> proved them to be correct:  
> <http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040414-124718-2114r.htm>  
> [http://www.nationalreview.com/nr\\_comment/nr\\_comment042903.asp](http://www.nationalreview.com/nr_comment/nr_comment042903.asp)  
> [http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-sid\\_e\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-sid_e_x.htm)

> <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/535793/posts> (this one is  
> especially disturbing)  
>  
> Now what does this have to do with diplomacy? You have to have good  
> information in order to conduct diplomatic negotiations. Yeah, Rice could  
> go  
> out there and negotiate with terrorists and the Korean lunatic. Clinton  
> tried it for 8 years. At some point you have to learn from mistakes of the  
> past.  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d60c8\$1@linux...  
>>  
>> Just to be clear, my question is "Who are the diplomats of today".  
>>  
>> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
>> >>There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button  
>> >>and  
>> >>have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.  
>> >  
>> >.....and where exactly do you get this info? Seems to me that if  
>> >your  
>> >assumption was right, North Korea would be a parking lot right about  
> now.  
>> >We have developed \$250,000.00 cannon shells that can be shot out of a  
>> >howitzer from 25 miles away and hit within 10' of a scumbag so that we  
> only  
>> >kill his human shields in the immediate vicinity. I'm finding it harder  
>> and  
>> >harder to justify spending this kind of money on people who haven't got  
>> the  
>> >common sense to take these people out themselves (and it's very  
> disturbing  
>> >to me that I feel this way.....but I'm beginning to).  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3909\$1@linux...  
>> >>  
>> >> Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and  
> obliterate  
>> >> dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with  
> Kissinger's

>> >> dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace and  
> knew  
>> >> clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.  
>> >>  
>> >> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button  
> and  
>> >> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.  
>> >>  
>> >> So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see anyone  
>> who  
>> >> clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I don't  
> know  
>> >> anyone who seems to have the cool head that I percieve Kissinger had.  
>> >Also,  
>> >> I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger but  
>> he  
>> >> always struck me as the ultimate diplomat.  
>> >>  
>> >> John  
>> >>  
>> >>  
>> >  
>> >  
>>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy  
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 20:09:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Cron,

I think this has less to do with Bush and Iraq and more to do with finding a time/place/excuse to wage this jihad. Iraq has provided all three, but I think it would be happening elsewhere and if not now.....soon.

;o)

"justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message  
news:450da43b@linux...

> Interesting Deej and insightful.

>

> There are so many issues involved, but one of the main topics as it  
applies

> to the current situation is has Bush's policies and actions increased or

> decreased that islamic fundamentalist support? It seems to be growing like  
> wildfire whereas it used to be embers.  
>  
> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote in message  
> news:450da2d8@linux...  
> > But you stated that there seemed to be far to many people who were ready  
> > to  
> > push a button.....etc. I disagree.  
> >  
> > I think we've got plenty of diplomats in this administration.. They have  
> > to  
> > have something other than an ideological brick wall or a weasel to  
> > negotiate  
> > with though. What good did \*diplomacy\* with the Koreans or Arafat. To  
> > dispatch envoys to discuss international affiars and foriegn policy with  
> > terrorists and Nazi maniacs like the Iranian prime minister legitimizes  
> > them  
> > and their tactics.  
> > <http://www.iranfocus.com/modules/news/article.php?storyid=54> 26  
> >  
> > Back around 1970 when I was studing political science, one of the the  
> > required courses of study was international government and politics.  
This  
> > book was part of the required curriculum:  
> > [http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cup/catalog/data/071030/071030673\\_3.HTM](http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cup/catalog/data/071030/071030673_3.HTM)  
> >  
> > It was of particular interest to me because I had a job lined up in the  
> > Middle East with a company out of New Orleans named McDermott  
> > International  
> > to work in Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf. It was a great  
job.....stay  
> > 18  
> > months and bring home an incredible amount of money tax free, but it was  
> > considered dangerous duty over there, even then. The 1973 arab/israeli  
war  
> > ended up blowing my whole plan out of the water because the company had  
to  
> > reshuffle their experienced employees.....but anyway.....I read  
the  
> > book and quite a few others dealing with the middle east with great  
> > interest. Also I ha'd a frend who was an architecture student who was an  
> > Iraqi American and we often talked about middle east affairs.....and  
> > still  
> > do.  
> >  
> > Anyway.....this part of the world has interested me for a long time so  
> > fast forward to right after 911 but before the invasion of Iraq. I ran

> > across this article which pretty much is spot on IMO about the historical situation as has existed for many years

> > [http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501\\_why.html](http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501_why.html)

> > .....and the most tragic part of it is the last paragraph wherein the author states:

> > It sounds like a daunting challenge, but there are many good signs. Al Qaeda is not more powerful than the combined force of many determined governments. The world is indeed uniting around American leadership, and perhaps we will see the emergence, for a while, of a new global community and consensus, which could bring progress in many other areas of international life. Perhaps most important, Islamic fundamentalism still does not speak to the majority of the Muslim people. In Pakistan, fundamentalist parties have yet to get more than 10 percent of the vote. In Iran, having experienced the brutal puritanism of the mullahs, people are yearning for normalcy. In Egypt, for all the repression, the fundamentalists are a potent force but so far not dominant. If the West can help Islam enter modernity in dignity and peace, it will have done more than achieved security. It will have changed the world.

> > I have no reason not to believe (other than the rantings of the autohateBush lunatic fringe community who want to politicize everything) that during this period, had we possessed an intelligence service that could have warned the administration about the duplicity of those in the global community who were rearming Sadaam Hussein at the expense of the Iraqi people using the UN Oil-For-Food program as their cover and the realities of the mountainous stockpiles of munitions that have been converted to IED's and most likely the destinations in Syria and elsewhere where Sadaam was moving his WMD's (I still think we haven't heard the last of this issue), we would have done things differently. Instead we got a "legacy" intelligence service that

> > was  
> > horribly flawed. What we have discovered is that we had far more enemies  
> > during the Clinton administration than anyone knew. Y  
> >  
> > This is the intelligence service that bush inherited. You may or may not  
> > think these sources credible, but I think that historical reality has  
> > proved them to be correct:  
> > <http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040414-124718-2114r.htm>  
> > [http://www.nationalreview.com/nr\\_comment/nr\\_comment042903.asp](http://www.nationalreview.com/nr_comment/nr_comment042903.asp)  
> > [http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-sid\\_e\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-sid_e_x.htm)  
> > <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/535793/posts> (this one is  
> > especially disturbing)  
> >  
> > Now what does this have to do with diplomacy? You have to have good  
> > information in order to conduct diplomatic negotiations. Yeah, Rice  
could  
> > go  
> > out there and negotiate with terrorists and the Korean lunatic. Clinton  
> > tried it for 8 years. At some point you have to learn from mistakes of  
the  
> > past.  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d60c8\$1@linux...  
> >>  
> >> Just to be clear, my question is "Who are the diplomats of today".  
> >>  
> >> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
> >>> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button  
> >>> and  
> >>> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.  
> >>>  
> >>> .....and where exactly do you get this info? Seems to me that if  
> >>> your  
> >>> assumption was right, North Korea would be a parking lot right about  
> > now.  
> >>> We have developed \$250,000.00 cannon shells that can be shot out of a  
> >>> howitzer from 25 miles away and hit within 10' of a scumbag so that we  
> > only  
> >>> kill his human shields in the immediate vicinity. I'm finding it  
harder  
> >> and  
> >>> harder to justify spending this kind of money on people who haven't

got  
> >> the  
> >> >common sense to take these people out themselves (and it's very  
> > disturbing  
> >> >to me that I feel this way.....but I'm beginning to).  
> >> >  
> >> >  
> >> >  
> >> >  
> >> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3909\$1@linux...  
> >> >>  
> >> >> Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and  
> > obliterate  
> >> >> dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with  
> > Kissinger's  
> >> >> dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace and  
> > knew  
> >> >> clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.  
> >> >>  
> >> >> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button  
> > and  
> >> >> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.  
> >> >>  
> >> >> So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see  
anyone  
> >> who  
> >> >> clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I don't  
> > know  
> >> >> anyone who seems to have the cool head that I percieve Kissinger  
had.  
> >> >Also,  
> >> >> I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger  
but  
> >> he  
> >> >> always struck me as the ultimate diplomat.  
> >> >>  
> >> >> John  
> >> >>  
> >> >>  
> >> >  
> >> >  
> >>  
> >  
> >  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 20:22:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in today's world?

John

"DJ" <[animix\\_spam-this-ahole\\_@animas.net](mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net)> wrote:

>Cron,

>

>I think this has less to do with Bush and Iraq and more to do with finding a

>time/place/excuse to wage this jihad. Iraq has provided all three, but I

>think it would be happening elsewhere and if not now.....soon.

>

>;o)

>

>

>"justcron" <[parisnews@hydrorecords.com](mailto:parisnews@hydrorecords.com)> wrote in message

>news:450da43b@linux...

>> Interesting DeeJ and insightful.

>>

>> There are so many issues involved, but one of the main topics as it >applies

>> to the current situation is has Bush's policies and actions increased or

>> decreased that islamic fundamentalist support? It seems to be growing

>like

>> wildfire whereas it used to be embers.

>>

>> "DJ" <[animix\\_spam-this-ahole\\_@animas.net](mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net)> wrote in message

>> news:450da2d8@linux...

>> > But you stated that there seemed to be far to many people who were ready

>> > to

>> > push a button.....etc. I disagree.

>> >

>> > I think we've got plenty of diplomats in this administration.. They have

>> > to

>> > have something other than an ideological brick wall or a weasel to

>> > negotiate

>> > with though. What good did \*diplomacy\* with the Koreans or Arafat. To

>> > dispatch envoys to discuss international affiars and foriegn policy with

>> > terrorists and Nazi maniacs like the Iranian prime minister legitimizes

>> > them

>> > and their tactics.

>> > <http://www.iranfocus.com/modules/news/article.php?storyid=54> 26  
>> >  
>> > Back around 1970 when I was studing political science, one of the the  
>> > required courses of study was international government and politics.  
>This  
>> > book was part of the required curriculum:  
>> > <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cup/catalog/data/071030/071030673> 3.HTM  
>> >  
>> > It was of particular interest to me because I had a job lined up in  
the  
>> > Middle East with a company out of New Orleans named McDermott  
>> > International  
>> > to work in Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf. It was a great  
>job.....stay  
>> > 18  
>> > months and bring home an incredible amount of money tax free, but it  
was  
>> > considered dangerous duty over there, even then. The 1973 arab/israeli  
>war  
>> > ended up blowing my whole plan out of the water because the company  
had  
>to  
>> > reshuffle their experienced employees.....but anyway.....I read  
>the  
>> > book and quite a few others dealing with the middle east with great  
>> > interest. Also I ha'd a frend who was an architecture student who was  
an  
>> > Iraqi American and we often talked about middle east affairs.....and  
>> > still  
>> > do.  
>> >  
>> > Anyway.....this part of the world has interested me for a long time  
so  
>> > fast forward to right after 911 but before the invasion of Iraq. I ran  
>> > across this article which pretty much is spot on IMO about the  
>historical  
>> > situation as has existed for many years  
>> > [http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501\\_why](http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501_why).ht ml  
>> >  
>> > .....and the most tragic part of it is the last paragraph  
>> > wherein the author states:  
>> >  
>> > It sounds like a daunting challenge, but there are many good signs.  
Al  
>> > Qaeda  
>> > is not more powerful than the combined force of many determined  
>> > governments.  
>> > The world is indeed uniting around American leadership, and perhaps

we

>> > will

>> > see the emergence, for a while, of a new global community and consensus,

>> > which could bring progress in many other areas of international life.

>> > Perhaps most important, Islamic fundamentalism still does not speak to

>the

>> > majority of the Muslim people. In Pakistan, fundamentalist parties have

>> > yet

>> > to get more than 10 percent of the vote. In Iran, having experienced the

>> > brutal puritanism of the mullahs, people are yearning for normalcy.

In

>> > Egypt, for all the repression, the fundamentalists are a potent force

>but

>> > so

>> > far not dominant. If the West can help Islam enter modernity in dignity

>> > and

>> > peace, it will have done more than achieved security. It will have

>changed

>> > the world.

>> >

>> > I have no reason not to believe (other than the rantings of the

>> > autohateBush

>> > lunatic fringe community who want to politicize everything) that during

>> > this

>> > period, had we possessed an intelligence service that could have warned

>> > the

>> > administration about the duplicity of those in the global community

who

>> > were

>> > rearming Sadaam Hussein at the expense of the Iraqi people using the

UN

>> > Oil-For-Food program as their cover and the realities of the mountainous

>> > stockpiles of munitions that have been converted to IED's and most

>likely

>> > the destinations oin Syria and elsewhere where Sadaam was moving his

>WMD's

>> > (I still think we haven't heard the last of this issue), we would have

>> > done

>> > things differently. Instead we got a "legacy" intelligence service

that

>> > was

>> > horribly flawed. What we have discovered is that we had far more enemies

>> > during the Clinton administration than anyone knew. Y

>> >

>> > This is the intelligence service that bush inherited. You may or may

not

>> > think these sources credible, but I think that historical reality has  
>> > proved them to be correct:  
>> > <http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040414-124718-2114r.htm>  
>> > [http://www.nationalreview.com/nr\\_comment/nr\\_comment042903.asp](http://www.nationalreview.com/nr_comment/nr_comment042903.asp)  
>> > [http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-sid\\_e\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-sid_e_x.htm)  
>> > <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/535793/posts> (this one is  
>> > especially disturbing)  
>> >  
>> > Now what does this have to do with diplomacy? You have to have good  
>> > information in order to conduct diplomatic negotiations. Yeah, Rice  
>could  
>> > go  
>> > out there and negotiate with terrorists and the Korean lunatic. Clinton  
>> > tried it for 8 years. At some point you have to learn from mistakes  
of  
>the  
>> > past.  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >  
>> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d60c8\$1@linux...  
>> >>  
>> >> Just to be clear, my question is "Who are the diplomats of today".  
>> >>  
>> >> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
>> >> >> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button  
>> >> >> and  
>> >> >> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.  
>> >> >  
>> >> >.....and where exactly do you get this info? Seems to me that  
if  
>> >> > your  
>> >> > assumption was right, North Korea would be a parking lot right about  
>> > now.  
>> >> > We have developed \$250,000.00 cannon shells that can be shot out of  
a  
>> >> > howitzer from 25 miles away and hit within 10' of a scumbag so that  
we  
>> > only  
>> >> > kill his human shields in the immediate vicinity. I'm finding it  
>harder  
>> >> and  
>> >> > harder to justify spending this kind of money on people who haven't  
>got

>> >> the  
>> >> >common sense to take these people out themselves (and it's very  
>> > disturbing  
>> >> >to me that I feel this way.....but I'm beginning to).  
>> >> >  
>> >> >  
>> >> >  
>> >> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3909\$1@linux...  
>> >> >>  
>> >> >> Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and  
>> > obliterate  
>> >> >> dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with  
>> > Kissinger's  
>> >> >> dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace  
>> > and  
>> > knew  
>> >> >> clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.  
>> >> >>  
>> >> >> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button  
>> > and  
>> >> >> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.  
>> >> >>  
>> >> >> So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see  
>> > anyone  
>> >> who  
>> >> >> clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I don't  
>> > know  
>> >> >> anyone who seems to have the cool head that I percieve Kissinger  
>> > had.  
>> >> >Also,  
>> >> >> I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger  
>> > but  
>> >> he  
>> >> >> always struck me as the ultimate diplomat.  
>> >> >>  
>> >> >> John  
>> >> >>  
>> >> >>  
>> >> >  
>> >> >  
>> >>  
>> >  
>> >  
>>  
>>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 21:14:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I would love a web site or tv show that listed who our diplomats meet with and what they report back and if any meetings with the "enemies" are public.

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>

>So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in today's  
>world?

>

>John

>

>"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:

>>Cron,

>>

>>I think this has less to do with Bush and Iraq and more to do with finding  
>a

>>time/place/excuse to wage this jihad. Iraq has provided all three, but

I

>>think it would be happening elsewhere and if not now.....soon.

>>

>>;o)

>>

>>

>>"justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message

>>news:450da43b@linux...

>>> Interesting Deej and insightful.

>>>

>>> There are so many issues involved, but one of the main topics as it

>>applies

>>> to the current situation is has Bush's policies and actions increased

>or

>>> decreased that islamic fundamentalist support? It seems to be growing

>>like

>>> wildfire whereas it used to be embers.

>>>

>>> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote in message

>>> news:450da2d8@linux...

>>> > But you stated that there seemed to be far to many people who were  
ready

>>> > to

>>> > push a button.....etc. I disagree.

>>> >

>>> > I think we've got plenty of diplomats in this administration.. They

>have

>>> > to  
>>> > have something other than an ideological brick wall or a weasel to  
>>> > negotiate  
>>> > with though. What good did \*diplomacy\* with the Koreans or Arafat.  
To  
>>> > dispatch envoys to discuss international affairs and foreign policy  
>with  
>>> > terrorists and Nazi maniacs like the Iranian prime minister legitimizes  
>>> > them  
>>> > and their tactics.  
>>> > <http://www.iranfocus.com/modules/news/article.php?storyid=54> 26  
>>> >  
>>> > Back around 1970 when I was studying political science, one of the the  
>>> > required courses of study was international government and politics.  
>>This  
>>> > book was part of the required curriculum:  
>>> > <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cup/catalog/data/071030/071030673> 3.HTM  
>>> >  
>>> > It was of particular interest to me because I had a job lined up in  
>the  
>>> > Middle East with a company out of New Orleans named McDermott  
>>> > International  
>>> > to work in Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf. It was a great  
>>job.....stay  
>>> > 18  
>>> > months and bring home an incredible amount of money tax free, but it  
>was  
>>> > considered dangerous duty over there, even then. The 1973 arab/israeli  
>>war  
>>> > ended up blowing my whole plan out of the water because the company  
>had  
>>to  
>>> > reshuffle their experienced employees.....but anyway.....I read  
>>the  
>>> > book and quite a few others dealing with the middle east with great  
>>> > interest. Also I had a friend who was an architecture student who was  
>an  
>>> > Iraqi American and we often talked about middle east affairs.....and  
>>> > still  
>>> > do.  
>>> >  
>>> > Anyway.....this part of the world has interested me for a long time  
>so  
>>> > fast forward to right after 911 but before the invasion of Iraq. I  
ran  
>>> > across this article which pretty much is spot on IMO about the  
>>historical  
>>> > situation as has existed for many years

>>> > [http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501\\_why.htm](http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501_why.htm)  
>>> >  
>>> > .....and the most tragic part of it is the last paragraph  
>>> > wherein the author states:  
>>> >  
>>> > It sounds like a daunting challenge, but there are many good signs.  
>Al  
>>> > Qaeda  
>>> > is not more powerful than the combined force of many determined  
>>> > governments.  
>>> > The world is indeed uniting around American leadership, and perhaps  
>we  
>>> > will  
>>> > see the emergence, for a while, of a new global community and consensus,  
>>> > which could bring progress in many other areas of international life.  
>>> > Perhaps most important, Islamic fundamentalism still does not speak  
>to  
>>the  
>>> > majority of the Muslim people. In Pakistan, fundamentalist parties  
have  
>>> > yet  
>>> > to get more than 10 percent of the vote. In Iran, having experienced  
>the  
>>> > brutal puritanism of the mullahs, people are yearning for normalcy.  
>In  
>>> > Egypt, for all the repression, the fundamentalists are a potent force  
>>but  
>>> > so  
>>> > far not dominant. If the West can help Islam enter modernity in dignity  
>>> > and  
>>> > peace, it will have done more than achieved security. It will have  
>>changed  
>>> > the world.  
>>> >  
>>> > I have no reason not to believe (other than the rantings of the  
>>> > autohateBush  
>>> > lunatic fringe community who want to politicize everything) that during  
>>> > this  
>>> > period, had we possessed an intelligence service that could have warned  
>>> > the  
>>> > administration about the duplicity of those in the global community  
>who  
>>> > were  
>>> > rearming Sadaam Hussein at the expense of the Iraqi people using the  
>UN  
>>> > Oil-For-Food program as their cover and the realities of the mountainous  
>>> > stockpiles of munitions that have been converted to IED's and most  
>>likely

>>> > the destinations oin Syria and elsewhere where Sadaam was moving his  
>>WMD's  
>>> > (I still think we haven't heard the last of this issue), we would have  
>>> > done  
>>> > things differently. Instead we got a "legacy" intelligence service  
>that  
>>> > was  
>>> > horribly flawed. What we have discovered is that we had far more enemies  
>>> > during the Clinton administration than anyone knew. Y  
>>> >  
>>> > This is the intelligence service that bush inherited. You may or may  
>not  
>>> > think these sources credeible, but I think that historical reality  
has  
>>> > proved them top be correct:  
>>> > <http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040414-124718-2114r.htm>  
>>> > [http://www.nationalreview.com/nr\\_comment/nr\\_comment042903.as\\_p](http://www.nationalreview.com/nr_comment/nr_comment042903.as_p)  
>>> > [http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-sid\\_e\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-sid_e_x.htm)  
>>> > <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/535793/posts> (this one is  
>>> > especially disturbing)  
>>> >  
>>> > Now what does this have to do with diplomacy? You have to have good  
>>> > information in order to conduct diplomatic negotiations. Yeah, Rice  
>>could  
>>> > go  
>>> > out there and negotiate with terrorists and the Korean lunatic. Clinton  
>>> > tried it for 8 years. At some point you have to learn from mistakes  
>of  
>>the  
>>> > past.  
>>> >  
>>> >  
>>> >  
>>> >  
>>> >  
>>> >  
>>> >  
>>> >  
>>> >  
>>> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d60c8\$1@linux...  
>>> >>  
>>> >> Just to be clear, my question is "Who are the diplomats of today".  
>>> >>  
>>> >> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
>>> >> >>There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button  
>>> >> >>and  
>>> >> >>have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.  
>>> >> >  
>>> >> >.....and where exactly do you get this info? Seems to me that  
>if

>>> >> >your  
>>> >> >assumption was right, North Korea would be a parking lot right about  
>>> > now.  
>>> >> >We have developed \$250,000.00 cannon shells that can be shot out  
>of  
>a  
>>> >> >howitzer from 25 miles away and hit within 10' of a scumbag so that  
>we  
>>> > only  
>>> >> >kill his human shields in the immediate vicinity. I'm finding it  
>>harder  
>>> >> and  
>>> >> >harder to justify spending this kind of money on people who haven't  
>>got  
>>> >> the  
>>> >> >common sense to take these people out themselves (and it's very  
>>> > disturbing  
>>> >> >to me that I feel this way.....but I'm beginning to).  
>>> >> >  
>>> >> >  
>>> >> >  
>>> >> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3909\$1@linux...  
>>> >> >>  
>>> >> >> Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and  
>>> > obliterate  
>>> >> >> dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with  
>>> > Kissinger's  
>>> >> >> dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace  
>and  
>>> > knew  
>>> >> >> clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.  
>>> >> >>  
>>> >> >> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button  
>>> > and  
>>> >> >> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.  
>>> >> >>  
>>> >> >> So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see  
>>anyone  
>>> >> who  
>>> >> >> clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I  
don't  
>>> > know  
>>> >> >> anyone who seems to have the cool head that I perceive Kissinger  
>>had.  
>>> >> >Also,  
>>> >> >> I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger  
>>but  
>>> >> he



"justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote:  
>Dunno, but jump into your next point cuz he's had a lot to say lately.  
>  
>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f2399\$1@linux...  
>>  
>> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?  
>>  
>> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in  
>> today's  
>> world?  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy  
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 23:54:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Wow, I never knew I could inflate my scrotum. Kewl !!!

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:  
>  
>What? It's a simple question. Who is a real diplomat in today's world?  
  
>  
>  
>"justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote:  
>>Dunno, but jump into your next point cuz he's had a lot to say lately.  
>>  
>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f2399\$1@linux...  
>>>  
>>> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?  
>>>  
>>> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in  
  
>>> today's  
>>> world?  
>>  
>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy  
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 00:20:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I think I answered your question as much as I can by stating that a diplomat cannot do anything unless there is willingness to participate in a meaningful and sincere dialog.....so keeping in mind that a negotiator must have credibility and those for whom he is negotiating must have some sort of track record of credibility, I ask you.....who do you think would be a credible negotiator for Iran, North Korea, Syria?

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f310e\$1@linux...

>  
> What? It's a simple question. Who is a real diplomat in today's world?  
>  
>  
> "justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote:  
> >Dunno, but jump into your next point cuz he's had a lot to say lately.  
> >  
> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f2399\$1@linux...  
> >>  
> >> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?  
> >>  
> >> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in  
> >> today's  
> >> world?  
> >  
> >  
>

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 00:27:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I wasn't that impressed with Kissinger. However I heard our former Colorado Senator and current head of the UN Foundation talk this spring, and was impressed with what he had to say. Tim Wirth. Actively involved.

Or perhaps another former Colorado Senator, former president of the University of Northern Colorado, now president of the University of Colorado, Hank Brown. He has done some local diplomacy in this state and seems to know how to calm people down.

Cheers,

-Jamie

<http://www.JamieKruz.com>

John wrote:

> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?

>  
> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in today's  
> world?

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy  
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 10:54:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That's a pathetic answer. Yeah we don't need no stinking diplomats! Everyone else is nuts, crazy and a lunatic. DJ, I thought you had better answers than that.

"DJ" <[animix\\_spam-this-ahole\\_@animas.net](mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net)> wrote:

>I think I answered yur question as much as I can by stat8ing that a diplomat  
>cannot do anything unless there is willingness to participate in a  
>meaningful and sincere dialog.....so keeping in mind that a negotiator  
must  
>have credibility and those for whom he is negotiating must have some sort  
of  
>track record of credibility, I ask you.....who do you think would be a  
>credible negotiator for Iran, North Korea, Syria?

>

>

>"John" <[no@no.com](mailto:no@no.com)> wrote in message [news:450f310e\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:450f310e$1@linux...)

>>

>> What? It's a simple question. Who is a real diplomat in today's world?

>>

>>

>> "justcron" <[parisnews@hydrorecords.com](mailto:parisnews@hydrorecords.com)> wrote:

>> >Dunno, but jump into your next point cuz he's had a lot to say lately.

>> >

>> >"John" <[no@no.com](mailto:no@no.com)> wrote in message [news:450f2399\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:450f2399$1@linux...)

>> >>

>> >> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?

>> >>

>> >> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in

>> >> today's

>> >> world?

>> >

>> >

>>

>

>

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [TCB](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 13:45:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Kissinger?!? A great diplomat? A great diplomat can create a strategic victory from a position of weakness. Kissinger wrought strategic disasters out of positions of incomparable strength. Extending the Vietnam war into Cambodia and Laos, running operation Condor to destabilize a moderately leftist regime in Chile, blanket support for Suharto in Indonesia in the 70's. These just come off the top of my head as places that destroyed US credibility in places where it was unnecessary to be involved at all.

TCB

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>

>Anyone, anyone? Beuller?

>

>So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in today's  
>world?

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 14:26:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 14:56:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

OK John.....are you going to send a diplomat to talk to himself? I agree it's pathetic but in irder for diplomacy to happen, there has to be more than one diplomat. You want me to name a few.....I can't. I think Bolton and Rice could do a great job if given someone rational to work with.

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450fcc57\$1@linux...

>

> That's a pathetic answer. Yeah we don't need no stinking diplomats!  
Everyone

> else is nuts, crazy and a lunatic. DJ, I thought you had better answers  
> than that.

>

> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:

> >I think I answered yur question as much as I can by stat8ing that a  
diplomat

---

> >cannot do anything unless there is willingness to participate in a  
> >meaningful and sincere dialog.....so keeping in mind that a negotiator  
> must  
> >have credibility and those for whom he is negotiating must have some sort  
> of  
> >track record of credibility, I ask you.....who do you think would be a  
> >credible negotiator for Iran, North Korea, Syria?  
> >  
> >  
> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f310e\$1@linux...  
> >>  
> >> What? It's a simple question. Who is a real diplomat in today's  
world?  
> >>  
> >>  
> >> "justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote:  
> >> >Dunno, but jump into your next point cuz he's had a lot to say lately.  
> >> >  
> >> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f2399\$1@linux...  
> >> >>  
> >> >> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?  
> >> >>  
> >> >> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in  
> >> >> today's  
> >> >> world?  
> >> >  
> >> >  
> >>  
> >  
> >  
>

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy  
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 14:58:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'd give Winston Churchill a thumbs up. He was an unpleasant guy to be sure,  
but he was a diplomat.

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450ffe32\$1@linux...  
>  
> Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy  
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 15:04:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Correct me if I'm wrong but isn't he DEAD? Sorry, I meant living today, active and not with a foot in the grave. Thanks ! hehe

"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:

>I'd give Winston Churchill a thumbs up. He was an unpleasant guy to be sure,  
>but he was a diplomat.

>

>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450ffe32\$1@linux...

>>

>> Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?

>

>

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 15:42:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hey now: [http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2006-09-19-chirac-intervi\\_ew\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2006-09-19-chirac-intervi_ew_x.htm)

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>

>Correct me if I'm wrong but isn't he DEAD? Sorry, I meant living today,  
active

>and not with a foot in the grave. Thanks ! hehe

>

>"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:

>>I'd give Winston Churchill a thumbs up. He was an unpleasant guy to be  
sure,

>>but he was a diplomat.

>>

>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450ffe32\$1@linux...

>>>

>>> Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?

>>

>>

>

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [TCB](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 15:46:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>

>Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?

---

It depends on the definition of diplomacy, of course, so I'd say probably the best diplomat we've had as a president in a while was Bush Sr. When you compare the quality, quantity, and staying power of his coalition in Gulf I to the phony coalition of the bullied and bought for Gulf II it says a lot. I'm no Bush Sr. fan at all, he was a warmongering bastard like every president since at least McKinley, but he was shrewd and rational. I think Colin Powell had a real chance until he got neo-conned. I think he had the temperament and the fact he was non-white gave him a different sort of credibility than, say, James Baker when he would talk to non-European countries. I think Saudi ambassador prince Bandar was given enviable cards to play (best oil fields in the world) but has managed them impressively considering his country leads the world in beheadings and funding Islamists.

Historically, in the west, I'd say Metternich has to take the cake even though he believed everything I despise. Austria by rights was a bit player on the European stage but their chief diplomat remade most of Europe.

For the US, I'd say nobody has come close to Benjamin Franklin, with John Adams as a second. Adams was able to convince both finance and political bigshots to believe in a country that didn't exist, and to lend us lots of money and a Navy. Franklin did much the same with the French, exquisitely managing a relationship with Talleyrand, another stunningly nimblefooted (or treacherous depending on your opinion) diplomat. And Franklin managed this while being adored by the French and banging lots of hot French aristobabes on the side. So that goes along ways with me.

Just my ideas off the top of my head. The US has been starved for true diplomats and strategic thinkers for some time. That's part of the reason we're in the mess we're in now.

TCB

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy  
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 15:58:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The biggest weasel on earth I'd say.

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:45100fe1\$1@linux...

>

> Hey now:

[http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2006-09-19-chirac-interview\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2006-09-19-chirac-interview_x.htm)

>

> "John" <no@no.com> wrote:

> >

> >Correct me if I'm wrong but isn't he DEAD? Sorry, I meant living today,

> active  
> >and not with a foot in the grave. Thanks ! hehe  
> >  
> >"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
> >>I'd give Winston Churchill a thumbs up. He was an unpleasant guy to be  
> sure,  
> >>but he was a diplomat.  
> >>  
> >>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450ffe32\$1@linux...  
> >>>  
> >>> Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?  
> >>  
> >>  
> >  
> >  
>

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy  
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 16:04:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Historically, in the west, I'd say Metternich has to take the cake even though he believed everything I despise. Austria by rights was a bit player on the European stage but their chief diplomat remade most of Europe.

I agree that he was absolutely brilliant.

>Just my ideas off the top of my head. The US has been starved for true diplomats and strategic thinkers for some time. That's part of the reason we're in the mess we're in now. <

Well, IMHO, we are faced with what we've got now (and could be improved) or with the return to the Talleyrands of the left and the wet finger in the wind.

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:451010bb\$1@linux...  
>  
> "John" <no@no.com> wrote:  
> >  
> >Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?  
>  
> It depends on the definition of diplomacy, of course, so I'd say probably  
> the best diplomat we've had as a president in a while was Bush Sr. When  
you

> compare the quality, quantity, and staying power of his coalition in Gulf  
> I to the phony coalition of the bullied and bought for Gulf II it says a  
> lot. I'm no Bush Sr. fan at all, he was a warmongering bastard like every  
> president since at least McKinley, but he was shrewd and rational. I think  
> Colin Powell had a real chance until he got neo-conned. I think he had the  
> temperament and the fact he was non-white gave him a different sort of  
credibility  
> than, say, James Baker when he would talk to non-European countries. I  
think  
> Saudi ambassador prince Bandar was given enviable cards to play (best oil  
> fields in the world) but has managed them impressively considering his  
country  
> leads the world in beheadings and funding Islamists.  
>  
> Historically, in the west, I'd say Metternich has to take the cake even  
though  
> he believed everything I despise. Austria by rights was a bit player on  
the  
> European stage but their chief diplomat remade most of Europe.  
>  
> For the US, I'd say nobody has come close to Benjamin Franklin, with John  
> Adams as a second. Adams was able to convince both finance and political  
> bigshots to believe in a country that didn't exist, and to lend us lots of  
> money and a Navy. Franklin did much the same with the French, exquisitely  
> managing a relationship with Talleyrand, another stunningly nimblefooted  
> (or treacherous depending on your opinion) diplomat. And Franklin managed  
> this while being adored by the French and banging lots of hot French  
aristobabes  
> on the side. So that goes along ways with me.  
>  
> Just my ideas off the top of my head. The US has been starved for true  
diplomats  
> and strategic thinkers for some time. That's part of the reason we're in  
> the mess we're in now.  
>  
> TCB

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy  
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 17:01:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

and you're pick is?

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy  
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 17:17:48 GMT

---

Ted Kennedy

"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote in message  
news:45101602@linux...

> Historically, in the west, I'd say Metternich has to take the cake even  
> though

> he believed everything I despise. Austria by rights was a bit player on  
the

> European stage but their chief diplomat remade most of Europe.

>

> I agree that he was absolutely brilliant.

>

> >Just my ideas off the top of my head. The US has been starved for true

> diplomats

> and strategic thinkers for some time. That's part of the reason we're in

> the mess we're in now. <

>

> Well, IMHO, we are faced with what we've got now (and could be improved)

or

> with the return to the Talleyrands of the left and the wet finger in the

> wind.

>

>

>

> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:451010bb\$1@linux...

> >

> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote:

> > >

> > >Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?

> >

> > It depends on the definition of diplomacy, of course, so I'd say  
probably

> > the best diplomat we've had as a president in a while was Bush Sr. When  
> you

> > compare the quality, quantity, and staying power of his coalition in Gulf

> > I to the phony coalition of the bullied and bought for Gulf II it says a

> > lot. I'm no Bush Sr. fan at all, he was a warmongering bastard like  
every

> > president since at least McKinley, but he was shrewd and rational. I  
think

> > Colin Powell had a real chance until he got neo-conned. I think he had  
the

> > temperament and the fact he was non-white gave him a different sort of  
> credibility

> > than, say, James Baker when he would talk to non-European countries. I

> think

> > Saudi ambassador prince Bandar was given enviable cards to play (best

oil  
> > fields in the world) but has managed them impressively considering his  
> country  
> > leads the world in beheadings and funding Islamists.  
> >  
> > Historically, in the west, I'd say Metternich has to take the cake even  
> though  
> > he believed everything I despise. Austria by rights was a bit player on  
> the  
> > European stage but their chief diplomat remade most of Europe.  
> >  
> > For the US, I'd say nobody has come close to Benjamin Franklin, with  
John  
> > Adams as a second. Adams was able to convince both finance and political  
> > bigshots to believe in a country that didn't exist, and to lend us lots  
of  
> > money and a Navy. Franklin did much the same with the French,  
exquisitely  
> > managing a relationship with Talleyrand, another stunningly nimblefooted  
> > (or treacherous depending on your opinion) diplomat. And Franklin  
managed  
> > this while being adored by the French and banging lots of hot French  
> aristobabes  
> > on the side. So that goes along ways with me.  
> >  
> > Just my ideas off the top of my head. The US has been starved for true  
> diplomats  
> > and strategic thinkers for some time. That's part of the reason we're in  
> > the mess we're in now.  
> >  
> > TCB  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 17:31:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ok, fair enough. I'm just looking for some diplomacy success stories of recent.

"DJ" <[animix\\_spam-this-ahole\\_@animas.net](mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net)> wrote:

>OK John.....are you going to send a diplomat to talk to himself? I agree  
>it's pathetic but in irder for diplomacy to happen, there has to be more  
>than one diplomat. You want me to name a few.....I can't. I think Bolton  
>and Rice could do a great job if given someone rational to work with.  
>  
>

>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450fcc57\$1@linux...  
>>  
>> That's a pathetic answer. Yeah we don't need no stinking diplomats!  
>Everyone  
>> else is nuts, crazy and a lunatic. DJ, I thought you had better answers  
>> than that.  
>>  
>> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
>> >I think I answered yur question as much as I can by stat8ing that a  
>diplomat  
>> >cannot do anything unless there is willingness to participate in a  
>> >meaningful and sincere dialog.....so keeping in mind that a negotiator  
>> must  
>> >have credibility and those for whom he is negotiating must have some  
sort  
>> of  
>> >track record of credibility, I ask you.....who do you think would be  
a  
>> >credible negotiator for Iran, North Korea, Syria?  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f310e\$1@linux...  
>> >>  
>> >> What? It's a simple question. Who is a real diplomat in today's  
>world?  
>> >>  
>> >>  
>> >> "justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote:  
>> >> >Dunno, but jump into your next point cuz he's had a lot to say lately.  
>> >> >  
>> >> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f2399\$1@linux...  
>> >> >>  
>> >> >> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?  
>> >> >>  
>> >> >> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger  
in  
>> >> >> today's  
>> >> >> world?  
>> >> >  
>> >> >  
>> >>  
>> >  
>> >  
>>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 18:28:07 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Deej. You forgot Jimmy Carter! ;>)

Tony

"DJ" <[animix\\_spam-this-ahole\\_@animas.net](mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net)> wrote in message  
news:4510061e@linux...

> OK John.....are you going to send a diplomat to talk to himself? I agree  
> it's pathetic but in irder for diplomacy to happen, there has to be more  
> than one diplomat. You want me to name a few.....I can't. I think Bolton  
> and Rice could do a great job if given someone rational to work with.

>  
>

> "John" <[no@no.com](mailto:no@no.com)> wrote in message news:450fcc57\$1@linux...

>>

>> That's a pathetic answer. Yeah we don't need no stinking diplomats!

> Everyone

>> else is nuts, crazy and a lunatic. DJ, I thought you had better answers  
>> than that.

>>

>> "DJ" <[animix\\_spam-this-ahole\\_@animas.net](mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net)> wrote:

>> >I think I answered yur question as much as I can by stat8ing that a  
> diplomat

>> >cannot do anything unless there is willingness to participate in a

>> >meaningful and sincere dialog.....so keeping in mind that a negotiator

>> must

>> >have credibility and those for whom he is negotiating must have some

>> >sort

>> of

>> >track record of credibility, I ask you.....who do you think would be a

>> >credible negotiator for Iran, North Korea, Syria?

>> >

>> >

>> >"John" <[no@no.com](mailto:no@no.com)> wrote in message news:450f310e\$1@linux...

>> >>

>> >> What? It's a simple question. Who is a real diplomat in today's  
> world?

>> >>

>> >>

>> >> "justcron" <[parisnews@hydrorecords.com](mailto:parisnews@hydrorecords.com)> wrote:

>> >> >Dunno, but jump into your next point cuz he's had a lot to say

>> >> >lately.

>> >> >

>> >> >"John" <[no@no.com](mailto:no@no.com)> wrote in message news:450f2399\$1@linux...

>> >> >>

>> >> >> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?  
>> >> >>  
>> >> >> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger  
>> >> >> in  
>> >> >> today's  
>> >> >> world?  
>> >> >  
>> >> >  
>> >>  
>> >  
>> >  
>>  
>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy  
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 21:56:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

So John,  
Why don't you tell us who your pick would be...

--  
Martin Harrington  
[www.lendaneer-sound.com](http://www.lendaneer-sound.com)

"DJ" <[animix\\_spam-this-ahole\\_@animas.net](mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net)> wrote in message  
[news:45101602@linux...](mailto:news:45101602@linux...)  
> Historically, in the west, I'd say Metternich has to take the cake even  
> though  
> he believed everything I despise. Austria by rights was a bit player on  
> the  
> European stage but their chief diplomat remade most of Europe.  
>  
> I agree that he was absolutely brilliant.  
>  
>>Just my ideas off the top of my head. The US has been starved for true  
> diplomats  
> and strategic thinkers for some time. That's part of the reason we're in  
> the mess we're in now. <  
>  
> Well, IMHO, we are faced with what we've got now (and could be improved)  
> or  
> with the return to the Talleyrands of the left and the wet finger in the  
> wind.  
>  
>  
>

> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:451010bb\$1@linux...  
>>  
>> "John" <no@no.com> wrote:  
>> >  
>> >Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?  
>>  
>> It depends on the definition of diplomacy, of course, so I'd say probably  
>> the best diplomat we've had as a president in a while was Bush Sr. When  
> you  
>> compare the quality, quantity, and staying power of his coalition in Gulf  
>> I to the phony coalition of the bullied and bought for Gulf II it says a  
>> lot. I'm no Bush Sr. fan at all, he was a warmongering bastard like every  
>> president since at least McKinley, but he was shrewd and rational. I  
>> think  
>> Colin Powell had a real chance until he got neo-conned. I think he had  
>> the  
>> temperment and the fact he was non-white gave him a different sort of  
> credibility  
>> than, say, James Baker when he would talk to non-European countries. I  
> think  
>> Saudi ambassador prince Bandar was given enviable cards to play (best oil  
>> fields in the world) but has managed them impressively considering his  
> country  
>> leads the world in beheadings and funding Islamists.  
>>  
>> Historically, in the west, I'd say Metternich has to take the cake even  
> though  
>> he believed everything I despise. Austria by rights was a bit player on  
> the  
>> European stage but their chief diplomat remade most of Europe.  
>>  
>> For the US, I'd say nobody has come close to Benjamin Franklin, with John  
>> Adams as a second. Adams was able to convince both finance and political  
>> bigshots to believe in a country that didn't exist, and to lend us lots  
>> of  
>> money and a Navy. Franklin did much the same with the French, exquisitely  
>> managing a relationship with Talleyrand, another stunningly nimblefooted  
>> (or treacherous depending on your opinion) diplomat. And Franklin managed  
>> this while being adored by the French and banging lots of hot French  
> aristobabes  
>> on the side. So that goes along ways with me.  
>>  
>> Just my ideas off the top of my head. The US has been starved for true  
> diplomats  
>> and strategic thinkers for some time. That's part of the reason we're in  
>> the mess we're in now.  
>>  
>> TCB

>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Diplomacy

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 22:09:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Martin, I don't think I know enough to make a good pick. I'm just very interested in the diplomacy side of things and I remember as a kid it seemed to be a part of the news that I don't seem to see today. So I'm just wondering aloud who is a real diplomat of today.

I like this story a lot:

There was once a very famous Aikido player in Japan who spent his whole life studying Usheba's legendary art. Although he had dedicated his whole existence to this beautiful art he had never actually had occasion to test it in a real life situation against a determined attacker, someone intent on hurting him. Being a moralistic kind of person he realised that it would be very bad karma to actually go out and pick a fight just to test his art so he was forced to wait until a suitable occasion presented itself. Naively, he longed for the day when he was attacked so that he could prove to himself that Aikido was powerful outside of the controlled walls of the dojo.

The more he trained, the more his obsession for validation grew until one day, travelling home from work on a local commuter train, a potential situation did present itself -an overtly drunk and aggressive man boarded his train and almost immediately started verbally abusing the other passengers.

'This is it,' the Aikido man thought to himself, 'this is my chance to test my art.'

He sat waiting for the abusive passenger to reach him. It was inevitable that he would: he was making his way down the carriage abusing everyone in his path. The drunk got closer and closer to the Aikido man, and the closer he got the louder and more aggressive he became. Most of the other passengers recoiled in fear of being attacked by the drunk. However, the Aikido man couldn't wait for his turn, so that he could prove to himself and everyone else, the effectiveness of his art. The drunk got closer and louder. The Aikido man made ready for the seemingly inevitable assault -he readied himself for a bloody encounter.

As the drunk was almost upon him he prepared to demonstrate

his art in the ultimate arena, but before he could rise from his seat the passenger in front of him stood up and engaged the drunk jovially. 'Hey man, what's up with you? I bet you've been drinking in the bar all day, haven't you? You look like a man with problems. Here, come and sit down with me, there's no need to be abusive. No one on this train wants to fight with you.'

The Aikido man watched in awe as the passenger skillfully talked the drunken man down from his rage. Within minutes the drunk was pouring his heart out to the passenger about how his life had taken a downward turn and how he had fallen on hard times. It wasn't long before the drunk had tears streaming down his face. The Aikido man, somewhat ashamed thought to himself 'That's Aikido!'. He realised in that instant that the passenger with a comforting arm around the sobbing drunk was demonstrating Aikido, and all martial art, in it highest form.

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:

>So John,

>Why don't you tell us who your pick would be...

>--

>Martin Harrington

>www.lendanear-sound.com

>

>"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote in message

>news:45101602@linux...

>> Historically, in the west, I'd say Metternich has to take the cake even

>> though

>> he believed everything I despise. Austria by rights was a bit player on

>> the

>> European stage but their chief diplomat remade most of Europe.

>>

>> I agree that he was aboslutely brilliant.

>>

>>>Just my ideas off the top of my head. The US has been starved for true

>> diplomats

>> and strategic thinkers for some time. That's part of the reason we're

in

>> the mess we're in now. <

>>

>> Well, IMHO, we are faced with what we've got now (and could be improved)

>> or

>> with the return to the Talleyrands of the left and the wet finger in the

>> wind.

>>

>>  
>>  
>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:451010bb\$1@linux...  
>>>  
>>> "John" <no@no.com> wrote:  
>>> >  
>>> >Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?  
>>>  
>>> It depends on the definition of diplomacy, of course, so I'd say probably  
>>> the best diplomat we've had as a president in a while was Bush Sr. When  
>> you  
>>> compare the quality, quantity, and staying power of his coalition in Gulf  
>>> I to the phony coalition of the bullied and bought for Gulf II it says  
a  
>>> lot. I'm no Bush Sr. fan at all, he was a warmongering bastard like every  
>>> president since at least McKinley, but he was shrewd and rational. I  
  
>>> think  
>>> Colin Powell had a real chance until he got neo-conned. I think he had  
  
>>> the  
>>> temperment and the fact he was non-white gave him a different sort of  
>> credibility  
>>> than, say, James Baker when he would talk to non-European countries.  
I  
>> think  
>>> Saudi ambassador prince Bandar was given enviable cards to play (best  
oil  
>>> fields in the world) but has managed them impressively considering his  
>> country  
>>> leads the world in beheadings and funding Islamists.  
>>>  
>>> Historically, in the west, I'd say Metternich has to take the cake even  
>> though  
>>> he believed everything I despise. Austria by rights was a bit player  
on  
>> the  
>>> European stage but their chief diplomat remade most of Europe.  
>>>  
>>> For the US, I'd say nobody has come close to Benjamin Franklin, with  
John  
>>> Adams as a second. Adams was able to convince both finance and political  
>>> bigshots to believe in a country that didn't exist, and to lend us lots  
  
>>> of  
>>> money and a Navy. Franklin did much the same with the French, exquisitely  
>>> managing a relationship with Talleyrand, another stunningly nimblefooted  
>>> (or treacherous depending on your opinion) diplomat. And Franklin managed

>>> this while being adored by the French and banging lots of hot French  
>> aristobabes  
>>> on the side. So that goes along ways with me.  
>>>  
>>> Just my ideas off the top of my head. The US has been starved for true  
>> diplomats  
>>> and strategic thinkers for some time. That's part of the reason we're  
in  
>>> the mess we're in now.  
>>>  
>>> TCB  
>>  
>>  
>  
>

---