

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 26 Mar 2004 18:27:51 GMT

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

---

Fox news did NOT violate the rules. The reporter ASKED the White House if he could reveal the tape and the White House said that he could (I mean, why wouldn't they?) Clarke as a former employee had no say in the release of his own words spoken in a professional context.

I love you libs. I really do. Instead of focusing on the fact that Clarke is a BIG FAT LIAR, you'd rather talk about how you THINK Fox news wasn't allowed to reveal that it was Clarke on that tape.

And the meaning of Cheney saying Clarke wasn't "in the loop" is because he moved to Cyber defense very shortly after Bush took over.

Interview with Dick Cheney on March 22Q All right, let's get straight to what the news is all about now, before we branch out to things. Why did the administration keep Richard Clarke on the counterterrorism team when you all assumed office in January of 2001?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, I wasn't directly involved in that decision. He was moved out of the counterterrorism business over to the cyber security side of things, that is he was given a new assignment at some point here. I don't recall the exact time frame.

Q Cyber security, meaning Internet security?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Yes, worried about attacks on the computer systems and the sophisticated information technology systems we have these days that an adversary would use or try to the system against us.

Q Well, now that explains a lot, that answer right there explains -- (Laughter.)

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, he wasn't -- he wasn't in the loop, frankly, on a lot of this stuff. And I saw part of his interview last night, and he wasn't --

Q He was demoted.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: It was as though he clearly missed a lot of what was going on. For example, just three weeks after the -- after we got here, there was communication, for example, with the President of Pakistan, laying out our concerns about Afghanistan and al Qaeda, and the importance of going after the Taliban and getting them to end their support for the al Qaeda. This was, say, within three weeks of our arrival here.

So I guess, the other thing I would say about Dick Clarke is that he was here throughout those eight years, going back to 1993, and the first attack on the World Trade Center; and '98, when the embassies were hit in East Africa; in 2000, when the USS Cole was hit. And the question that ought to be asked is, what were they doing in those days when he was in charge of counterterrorism efforts?

Q Well, the media finally has what it wants -- I'm talking about the partisan media has what it wants. It's got an independent contractor, a man whose worked for both administrations, now launching full barrels at the President. And one of the claims that Clarke is making is that -- and you just countered it -- he said the President didn't treat al Qaeda as a serious threat before September 11th. He keeps harping on the fact that even before your administration assumed office, you guys wanted to go in and level Iraq.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Yes, that's -- again, that's just not the case. The fact is, what the President did not want to do is to have an ineffective response with respect to al Qaeda. And we felt that up until that point that much of what had been done vis-a-vis al Qaeda had been totally ineffective: some cruise missiles fired at some training camps in Afghanistan that basically didn't hit anything. And it made the U.S. look weak and ineffective. And he wanted a far more effective policy for trying to deal with that. And that process was in motion throughout the spring.

And yes, that analogy DOES work. Intelligence exists mostly in informants who take a bribe to tell secrets. Informants don't always tell the truth. Overall, you're still looking at a huge open desert the size of California, and it hasn't all been searched yet.

I think you're the one who's refusing to learn. Why don't you take a page out of Zell Miller's book? He's a Democrat and he sees firsthand how desperate the Left is getting in order to try and gain back their seat in the Oval Office. He sees firsthand that the Democratic party in general is no longer embracing the values they used to.

Your arguments are weak and easily countered. If you honestly think that Clinton did anything against terrorism, then you are even more misguided than I thought. Even the Democrats are letting Clinton take some hits and admitting he didn't do the best job in the hopes that Bush will take some hits too. They have stopped attacking his weaknesses and are now going after his strengths. They'll fail there, too.

There's no shame in being wrong from time to time. Why can't you admit that?

---