

---

Subject: Renegade vs. Real World

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Sun, 23 Jun 2002 06:06:00 GMT

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

---

Just a couple of points:2. America is not the greatest nation, only the most powerful. And it's not just due to democracy, otherwise other democracies in the world would also be as powerful. It's also due to the number of people and the strict adherence to the principles of capitalism, or the so called "Greater Good".\*\*\* RESPONSE - I disagree. It is also the most free, the most prosperous, the most stable, the most technologically and medically advanced, the most tolerant of differing ideas. No other nation has everything we have. Now I am not saying we are perfect - far from it! But we have done in a little over 200 years what some nations have not accomplished in many more centuries. \*\*\*+++ I don't think there's much point arguing about the greatest country, as you said later almost everyone probably thinks theirs is the greatest. Although, technological and medical advancements could be debated, because as soon as one becomes available, it's pretty much available to everyone, and they come from all nations. And I would definitely not agree with tolerance, the KKK is a prime example.+++3. Freedom can also mean "A right or the power to engage in certain actions without control or interference", which America has shown. So yes, doing whatever you want to get ahead would = Prosperity.\*\*\* RESPONSE - be careful. Doing what you want does not = doing what you have the power to do. Could we conquer any country through military might? Yes, but we don't. Could we dominate any country through economic might? Yes, but we don't. We recognize that other nations are sovereign too. We can use our power to persuade and even coerce. The end game is the spread of democracy, freedom, and knowledge. \*\*\*+++Doesn't using power for persuasion or coercion contradict the basic tenets of democracy and freedom? And the spread of democracy is a noble goal, but what happens if it stifles an even better form of government? The spread of Monarchies and despotism would have attempted to eradicate democracy in its infant stages as well, although I agree with replacing forms of government that are widely recognised as flawed from past experience with Democracy.+++4. The countries that hate America hate it because decisions to protect it's own interests negatively affect their own. When's the last time you saw a trade embargo put on America because of an economic decision? American Farmers are now heavily subsidised by the government, allowing them to provide their goods at discounted prices, causing an unfair advantage over farmers from every other country. If this was done by another country, you can bet that America would be at the WTO before you could think and sanctions would come into effect.\*\*\* RESPONSE - Arab countries are not negatively affected by our policies. When was the last time we put an oil embargo on them? Our embargo against Cuba is really against Castro, not the Cuban people. Once he steps down/dies and the Communists are out of power, the embargo ends. I agree with you about the farm subsidies, though. No business should be subsidized at all. If they cannot compete in the marketplace, they should not be in it. \*\*\*+++ True, Arab countries are not any more negatively impacted than other countries, but they are impacted by many small economic decisions made like higher import duties. And that's not to say that other countries (including arab countries) do not do the same thing, they just don't have the economic muscle to push as far as the USA.+++5. Countries don't want americans to die for them, Vietnam anyone? As for terrorist bombings, here's a question for you: Who is the only country to have used not 1 but 2 weapons of mass destruction against civilians? (hint: Hiroshima, Nagasaki)\*\*\* RESPONSE - Viet Nam was a mistake. In fact, we were trying to clean up the mess caused by the French (another reason to hate them). We won every single engagement in the war, but lost because the liberal bureaucrats tried to run the war from DC instead of letting the generals win the war the right way. Could have been over in 3 years... The A bombs were a horrible necessity. Japan had made

it very clear that they would not surrender at any cost. All Japanese were of a mindset that to surrender is the ultimate disgrace. The loss of lives it would have taken to conquer each Pacific island and finally take Japan conventionally would have far, far outstripped the casualties suffered by the bombs. Dropping those bombs and forcing an unconditional surrender actually saved many millions of lives, both American and Japanese. BTW both cities were also legitimate military targets. Unfortunately, as in every war in history, civilians get killed. The difference is that civilians were not the target in these cases.\*\*\*+++ I completely disagree with you. The bombing of the Japanese was unnecessary and barbaric. The destructive potential of the bombs could have been demonstrated without the need for any casualties and had the same results, but the Americans wanted a field test. Sure, there were justifications as military targets, but the tests performed on their own soldiers showed the Atomic bombs to be completely indiscriminate in the damage dealt.+++7. Yes it's about time something was done, but again it shows up the hipocrisy of Americans. America has been arressting and detaining suspected terrorists without trial, including those of nationalities other than Afghanistan or Middle-East, but it's only when an American citizen is detained that there's an outcry about this.\*\*\* RESPONSE - suspected terrorists are not American citizens, so they do not have contitutional rights, including a 'speedy trial'. Since they do not belong to a country that has declared war, they are also not covered under the Geneva Convention as POWs. We COULD just execute them and be done with it, but we don't. We feed them, clothe them, and go out of our way to respect their religious beliefs at the taxpayer's expense. As for their native countries, only Britain asked for their nationals back. Nobody else wants the rest... \*\*\*+++ Either that or they don't want to be seen as offside. I don't disagree with the treatment, I was just raising that the only time an outcry was made was when one of the prisoners was American.+++On a final note, I'm not saying America is evil or that terrorism is a legitimate tactic, just that no regime is innocent in what has happened. \*\*\* RESPONSE - no one is completely innocent in the history of every nation. Our own nation had slavery and the displacement of the Indians. BUT...as nearly all nations have, we have grown and changed and progressed. No matter the sins of the government, you cannot justify the deliberate targeting of civilians that occurred on 9/11/2002 \*\*\*+++ I agree. And remember, just because a section of a community or country performs the actions, you cannot condemn the entirety. The IRA doesn't represent the Irish, suicide bombers don't represent Palestinians, and people like Timothy McVeigh don't represent Americans.+++

---