

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 19:09:28 GMT

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

---

Just to clarify, I'm not blaming the president for 9/11, nor saying it could have in any way been expected. As well, I'm not using past events to say "this is how it should have gone". Point in context, the Oliver North testimony. I know this is stating it as hindsight, but something should have been done then, rather than sitting and waiting for what seemed to be the inevitable to happen. The form of attack may not have been preventable, but an attack itself may have been.

Is Bush to blame for this? Not solely. Everyone involved from that testimony (if not up to the initial funding of Osama) on should receive some blame. It's sort of the "I told you so" argument on a larger scale.

American leaders were warned something like this might happen, yet -as it didn't affect them at that point in time- nothing was done. The same thing happened in World War one, AND two. America did nothing until they were directly threatened, in WWII that time was almost too late.

Am I suggesting that Countries go out of their way to stop the terrorists of another country? No. Am I suggesting that more could of been done to prevent an attack that had been cautioned about? Yes. In relation to the initial arguement, if you know something is going to happen, act on it rather than waiting for it to happen. I'm not suggesting this was the motive behind waiting, but it's an observation based on peoples reaction. Bush seems to become an American hero because of the new aggressive anti-terrorist stance, yet refused to act on it when he had the Oliver North testimony cautioning that Osama was a threat. I don't know about you, but if I knew that someone was a threat, yet how, when, why, if, etc. was unknown, I'd go to them to stop it before it they came to me.

---