

---

Subject: Cindy's single soon  
Posted by [colinhester](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 02:31:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Geez, Say that subject line three times real fast.....Colin  
<http://www.thesmokinggun.com/archive/0815051sheehan1.html>

---

---

Subject: Re: Cindy's single soon  
Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 03:56:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

An astounding number of people divorce over the death of a child, even an adult one, as I know of one case personally. In the situation I know of the wife just went fruit-loops after their son was killed and the husband packed it in.

---

---

Subject: Re: Cindy's single soon  
Posted by [colinhester](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 04:13:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You're right. I am sorry. That was an insensitive post.....Colin

---

---

Subject: Re: Cindy's single soon  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 05:04:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I am amazed that the people are so eagre to make her an ogre. All these connections and conspiricies to somehow profit from the kids death. Amazing. Just because so many of the other greiving parents have been silenced they just cannot stand one who will not shut down and take her sons death like a true patriot; instead she has an opinion and states it; what a crime..it must be a conspiracy! She is trying to undermine the president. And those nasty people she associates with; she can't possibly give a shit about his death, It's a publicity stunt. She should shut up and go away.I don't mean to single anyone out by this rant but it's really incredible when you can't seek justice for a dead child.

---

---

Subject: Re: Cindy's single soon

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 12:44:51 GMT

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

---

Sorry, John, but I just don't buy it. The associations she has made aren't hard to follow. It isn't as if she were involved with CompassioanteFriends.org, or some other group that supports grieving parents. She's chosen to make her associations with those that are politically inclined. So one might observe that her actions aren't those of a grieving mother, but instead are politically motivated. If this were truly a grass roots effort, I think she could have started her own website, done her own thing. But that's not what happened. Liberally motivated journalists took the ball and ran with it, creating MeetWithCindy.org and probably everything else that's gotten recent attention in the press. You're smart enough to see this for what it is. Regardless of your political leanings, the actions and timeframe of this are pretty obvious. I'm sure she grieved the loss of her son, it's not like I think she's heartless. It's just that this is much more than a grieving parent, this is an organized political media event.

---

Subject: Re: Cindy's single soon

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 14:27:51 GMT

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

---

Well; thats the point and I never denied that. Of course it is a media event and that is how she wanted it. And the sacrifice of her son grants her the legitamicy to persue her opposition to the war in any way she chooses. If she chooses to shine a light on this to maybe help end the war that is an honest approach to fulfilling her responsibilities as a mother. I don't get the concept that there is a proper way to express your anger at the useless death of your child. You express that as forcefully and noticeably as possible. And if the media wants to join in and support her anger so much the better. She has every right to do this any way she chooses because she made the sacrifice that gives her that right. Your contention that somehow she should behave in a special way that doesn't put light on the issue is just unbelievable to me. Allow me an indiscretion; I think if it was my son and people told me how I should act and who I should associate with so as not to violate some phanthom code of ethics they made up, I would explain to them firmly to shut the fuck up and stay out of my business. As apparently she has done. I just don't get people thinking they have some standing that permitts them telling her how she should have treated his death and why she is behaving improperly. And that scares me that anyone would appropriate that right for themselves. I say this forcefully because I am absolutely unable to understand where she loses her rights because cameras follow her and Micheal More takes an interest in her story. What does one have to do with the other?? It's almost the same principal invoked in the Schiavo case; that somehow the way people behave at death should be defined by others who know nothing of the situation and have no standing whatsoever.

---

Subject: Re: Cindy's single soon

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 15:19:06 GMT

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

---

Ok, so but then that makes her a political activist who has exploited her fallen son to make her case. Her son wasn't forced into the service, he joined voluntarily. So there is reason to believe he wanted to be there. She has put her own interests, and those she's speaking for, in front of her son and the rest of her family. And making a political issue out of it gives political opponents reason to challenge her. You mentioned the Schiavo case, and I agree with you. That was a personal matter, best left to the families involved. No one else had intimate knowledge of the situation and probably shouldn't have offered their opinions about it. But the political pundits came in and used it for propoganda. When people bring these kinds of things out into the public, the tone of discussions always gets out of hand. The gossip columns take advantage of the situation to have something to talk about, and political propogandists try to find angles to exploit. The still silent voice is the only one that is reasonable, but it is always completely overwhelmed by the noise.

---

---

Subject: Silent voice

Posted by [Damir](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 16:22:10 GMT

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

---

In war, silent voice you can't heard, you must speak so loudly, louder then explosions. IMO - why so many people "stood up" trying to disturb her credibility, `cos she is dangerous. Why? She is not afraid, because she have nothing to lose. And she have credibility for her action.

---

---

Subject: Re: Silent voice

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 16:36:55 GMT

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

---

Both political parties have stood up to voice their opinions. One voice that hasn't been heard is her husband's, who also lost his son.

---

---

Subject: Re: Silent voice

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 16:38:22 GMT

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

---

Holy moses; you got it to a tee. Thats it in a nutshell; say no more.

---

---

Subject: Re: Silent voice

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 16:40:05 GMT

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

---

Bingo! Because that is how he chooses to react. We are not the arbitors of proper response to a childs death. He did what he wants and she did what she wants.

---

Subject: Re: Cindy's single soon

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 16:50:34 GMT

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

---

There's no tone here; it's just us. And I admitt to a selfish motive for prolonging this. I need a personal framework within which to try and understand the thinking that dictates what her response to this tragedy should be. A woman who is an avowed anti-war activist loses her son in the war.How should she behave..what exactly is the protocal here?.She takes to the streets in her anguish to protest the war by asking for an audience with her elected representative.And thats wrong..why?People choose up sides and determine for themselves what her proper rights and behaviours should be.Exploiting her sons death?? Sorry I just don't get how that can be. Unless you feel she wants money or fame more than she wants her son.By that logic; anyone against the war has no standing if a person who loses a son has no standing. Then every one who protests the war is exploiting something. And there is no such thing as personal convictions.

---

Subject: Re: Silent voice

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 16:58:02 GMT

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

---

If your wife used the death of your child to promote a Republican agenda, how would you feel? Not only would you have lost a child, but you would suffer the media frenzy going over and over the matter, with your wife taking a side that you despise.Cindy Sheehan isn't the only one affected by her actions. She and those behind her have exploited her son and discounted the feelings and wishes of the rest of her family.I think it was a selfish move on her part and I think the political parties have jumped in to take advantage of the propoganda.

---

Subject: Re: Cindy's single soon

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 17:00:30 GMT

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

---

The tone I am speaking of is the public tone. I don't normally involve myself in these kinds of discussions. But I do see them on the various media outlets, and that's what I'm talking about.

---

---

Subject: Re: Silent voice  
Posted by [Damir](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 17:02:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hm, who exploited her son? And for what purpose? That is the question.

---

---

Subject: Re: Silent voice  
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 17:03:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

He was exploited to make a political statement.

---

---

Subject: Re: Silent voice  
Posted by [Damir](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 17:11:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I think he is dead. And, I talk about exploiting while he was alive. I know that many don't like it, but his mother has the right to said something about it, alone or through political party, movement, media, whatever. Of course, some people wish her silent...

---

---

Subject: Re: Silent voice  
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 17:14:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I think one of the people that wants her silent is her husband. I don't think either political party really wants her silenced, because I think they're both getting their voices heard. It has become an opportunity to polarize the public and promote political agendas. That's what I mean by exploitation. I think this family is being used for media attention and political gain.

---

---

Subject: Re: Cindy's single soon  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 17:46:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I know what you mean't, thats why between us we can mirror the public tone and see where people and the public differ. After the Schiavo thing it became obvious that someway the public has become an arbitor of personal behaviour instead of just spectators with opinions. That to me is bizzare in a bad way. It is almost like the Pilgrims portrayed in the Scarlett Letter; how they decide in committe how people are allowed to behave in their private lives. That was the whole purpose of the 60's rebellion. To refute that concept. While this discussion may be tireing it is valuable in a positive way. It has allowed us to see into the issue without the clouds of perception filtered through spin and propoganda.To me anyway.Someday we may have to act on these opinions ourselves.

---

---

Subject: Re: Silent voice  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 17:50:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

O'Kay so it isn't Cindy that is exploiting her son it's the media?I have purposefully not followed this event in the news because I want my own perspective. Where does the husband claim he is upset by her actions and what exactly does he complain about?

---