

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 21 Feb 2004 01:57:36 GMT

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

---

Nukelt151.) Bombing of USS Cole (an attack on a US warship is an act of war, and el presidente did jack shit about it).

2.) Oklahoma City bombing- not organized terror, but nevertheless a very serious attack that was not prevented.

3.) A military DEBACLE in Mogadishu, Somalia- when US troops were pinned down in the city, Clinton actually refused to provide them with tank support- the local commander ended up having to beg Pakistani troops to BORROW armor support. His decision resulted in more US casualties, and when he pulled US troops out, he didn't even bother to recover the bodies of the dead, which were left to be desecrated. Real great job he did there.

Duh-Duh-Didn't-Read-My-Post Unit.

1) You didn't read my post: Here: I said that Clinton got super pissed and appointed Richard Clarke to make a plan to kill al Qaeda once and for all. Why isn't al Qaeda gone yet? Because Bush didn't follow up on Clinton's plan.

2) After this, Clinton proposed to expand wiretap capabilities for intelligence agencies, which was fought against by the Republican congress on stupid issues which I won't put here because it's kind of long so go and READ MY POST!

3) This didn't have anything to do about terrorists. It was a UN peacekeeping mission to settle Somalia down. Clinton didn't go after the dead? You know what would have happened if that task force did? A lot more of them would have died. But I guess it's all in a day's work. Why didn't Clinton send more armor in? Maybe because there was already armor there that the task force could use? It would have taken probably longer to ship in armor and get it all set up then to borrow some from other allied military factions. Did you ever read the book, Black Hawk Down? It's a really good book. I haven't seen the movie, but I don't think it would measure up to the book. That whole Somalia situation was pretty ugly, because the U.S. sent in a task force [composed of people from Ranger and Delta forces] hoping to help these people, and then everyone turned on them and then they got in to a huge firefight in the city. That's why there were so many casualties.

CrimsonLook, I posted just the first part of a large poster. LESS THAN 10% of it. And the point of the poster is NOT to nitpick at the details. As I already stated, the poster is entitled "A course of conduct". It's really only through reading the entire poster and the 90%+ I haven't typed out that you get the true perspective of why Clinton was a bad guy to have in that office.

Well, lets see the whole poster, so I can have a nice laugh. Then show you why it's wrong.

CrimsonI also like how Clinton spent more money going after Bill Gates than he did going after Osama Bin Laden. Guess he couldn't handle Bill not giving large donations to him.

If Clinton had one more term, he probably would have rolled up Osama and most of al Qaeda. Like I said before, he had an expert make a detailed plan, but didn't have time to implement it before Bush jr. became president, and then Bush never bothered to use it. [Yes, Clinton did give it

to Bush jr.]

CrimsonAnd yes, they are different things. I am NOT a loyal listener who relies on Rush for all my political news and views. I had never visited his website until a couple of days ago. Therefore, YOU CAN'T TRY AND LUMP ME WITH THE PEOPLE YOU ARE QUOTING. I simply do NOT fit the demographic. Therefore, pulling up the supposed, ALLEGED stupidity of Rush listeners is a huge waste of time and completely irrelevant. Just because I happen to agree with some of his research does not make me a "rushhead", and also, just because Rush isn't 100% right 100% of the time doesn't mean that everything he says is a lie or total bullshit.

OK, lets just drop the whole Rush thing. I don't like him, and I gave my reasons.

---