

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 03:18:58 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiCrimsonFacts: Clinton cut the active military in half:

Total counts of Active Duty Military Personnel (Army + Navy + Marine Corps + Air Force)

1987: 2,174,217

(Bush, Sr. takes office)

1988: 2,138,213

1989: 2,130,229

1990: 2,043,705

1991: 1,985,555

(Clinton takes office)

1992: 1,807,180

1993: 1,705,103

1994: 1,610,490

1995: 1,518,224

1996: 1,471,722

1997: 1,438,562

1998: 1,406,830

1999: 1,385,703

(Clinton leaves office)

These figures show a net loss of 788,514 active military personnel, which is 36% of the military that Reagan had at the end of his term in 1988.

It's not 36% of the military Reagan had, it's 36% of the people. Now, after Reagan left the presidency, a little place I like to refer to as the Soviet Union collapsed, which was pretty much the last big super-power that stood in the way of the U.S. (INTERESTING FACT: If Clinton hadn't seized most of the weapons-grade nuclear fuel in the collapsing Soviet Union, there might have actually been WMDs in Iraq.) It's for this reason that active personnel went down during the Clinton Administration. This does not, however, mean that the strength of the military went down. Under Clinton, new technology came around, and Clinton stopped throwing money to sleazy defense contractors for research for development of special weapons that didn't even come close to working.

And this proved her right. Maybe not the "half" she claimed, but the military's strength was in fact cut down quite considerably. She never said reduced in power, or your definition of military strength, just "cut in half".

---