

BLURRED LINE? REALLY? WHAT A PERFECT ANALOGY

As Barack Obama's relentless pursuit of a violent intervention in Syria continues, cliches have been tossed out freely in each new segment of the corporate news cycle. We had "[credibility](#)" for quite some time, and then yesterday there was "[go it alone](#)" (see the capsule summary for this article on left of page for "go it alone" phrase) when David Cameron lost a parliamentary vote authorizing British cooperation in military action yesterday afternoon. But an [article](#) published last night by the New York Times provided, whether intentionally or not, the perfect analogy for Obama's drive for war in Syria. When I [tweeted it last night](#), the title for their article was "Military Analysis: Aim of a U.S. Attack on Syria: Sharpening a Blurred 'Red Line'". That phrasing immediately calls to mind the latest pop misogynistic hit "Blurred Lines". [The "unrated" version of the video is definitely NSFW.] The Times has now changed its phrasing somewhat, with the latter part of the headline reading "Restore a 'Red Line' That Became Blurred".

Okay, so by changing their phrasing, the Times appears to be signalling that they didn't mean to draw a parallel with the song, but I still feel it is a perfect fit for the situation. The [lyrics](#) are a disgusting collection of violent sexual suggestions for what the artist wants to do to a "good girl". And that seems to fit so well for what Obama wants to do to Syria (while Assad certainly doesn't fit as "good", the innocent civilians who will die do fit): "I'll give you something big enough to tear your ass in two". And if that isn't enough, we even get this in the [music video](#):



Doesn't this strike, when all is said and done, amount to nothing more than Obama proving he has a big d? When even large numbers of [military officers are now openly questioning the wisdom of an attack](#), and insisting that it will spiral inevitably into a larger regional war, Obama's determination to proceed is all about the size of his d.

Granted, in the [LA Times yesterday](#), there was an anonymous suggestion that Obama only wanted an attack "just muscular enough not to get mocked", but from where we simple taxpayers sit, mocking seems the only tool we have left for trying to prevent one atrocity leading to many more under the guise of good intentions.