

---

Subject: Re: WHAT DO YOU THINK?

Posted by [f100d3d](#) on Wed, 22 Nov 2006 05:47:17 GMT

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

---

the17doctor wrote on Mon, 20 November 2006 14:47Quote:-Ignoring the U.N.: We ARE the U.N. - at least the only nation that has the military power to enforce anything.

expand on that point.

from what you said at the moment, that is a bunch of bullshit

It's not a bunch of bullshit. (1) League of Nations failed because the U.S. wouldn't participate. (2) UN was formed to be an equal peace force but only survived its missions and purpose over the last 20+ years because of troop majority provided by the United States. (3) The U.S. pumps the most money AND military forces into "peace keeping" and UN policy enforcement hands down. When was the last time you saw Germany, the UK, Russia, China, etc. say "fuck ya'll I'll just do this alone"? Never, not because of principle - but because they can't. A sad, but true, reality here is that the U.S. has become built for war over the last few decades. They are quite literally the UN enforcers and the only ones capable of achieving objectives alone if needed. The UK is usually close to follow as well. Other nations are too passive to get involved in affairs that they should be involved in.

warranto wrote on Mon, 20 November 2006 15:03f100d3d wrote on Mon, 20 November 2006 12:30So I guess you guys think that the size, objectives, overall mission, etc. of 'Al Queda' and Bin Laden were the same then as they are now? If so, you're sorely mistaken.

What does size, objectives, mission etc. of late have to do with anything?

Everything. My point was that they weren't similar and that the US didn't sponsor terrorism; at least not in the context you made it out to be in. Everything was different then. Some poor decisions? Yes. Sponsoring terrorism as we know it now, no.

---