

---

Subject: Re: WHAT DO YOU THINK?

Posted by [f100d3d](#) on Wed, 22 Nov 2006 21:47:49 GMT

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

---

Erm, that's considered discrimination here in the U.S. (the whole polish shop thing).

Also, I don't want to argue over who threw which stone first with terrorism. It's wrong. It's extremist. And the United States would never willingly donate money and arms to a cause that was hell bent on "terrorizing" anyone - even the soviets. It was an operation designed to cause instability in the region and hold back aggression using our money (no different than korea or vietnam). But it wasn't about terrorism, it was about funding local groups to do our bidding. I just see it as two completely separate things, but I do see your point as well.

As for the UK being able to hold their own weight, let me clarify something: I never said that no other military in the world was competent. There are plenty of wars going on and many of them do not include the U.S. (hard to believe, eh, lol). But the U.S. does have more people, it does have a larger military force, and it does have a much larger "coverage" than any other nation (thus it being considered the only current superpower remaining). This isn't about egos or who's dick is bigger. I was just illustrating the point that I feel too much time is spent at the UN trying to convince the world to do things that they are not capable of doing alone. For example, you can't possibly say that the UK or any other UN nation could have invaded Iraq alone. It would never happen. But on the flipside, the UK did play a very important role in those operations as they are a close ally of ours and share intelligence.

---