

Reality Check: U.S. Turns Blind Eye to Afghan Allies Abusing Children - Freedom Outpost

Obama's Social Engineering Military

It is a story that is literally jaw dropping. Soldiers who served in Afghanistan stripped of their command for standing up against Afghan men who were sexually abusing young boys.

Why? Because the abusers, our government said, were the good guys.

Asad Muslim

If those are the good guys who are the bad ones?

Obama agrees,

This is a Reality Check you won't see anywhere else.

with them Chuck Nis

Background with Frank Marshall Davis!

It is a blockbuster story released by the New York Times. The accusation? That American soldiers and Marines have been instructed not to intervene—in some cases, not even when their Afghan allies have abused young boys and children on U.S. military bases.

One of the focuses of this article is how the U.S. Army stripped U.S. Special Forces Captain Dan Quinn—who has since quit the military—of his command after a 2011 incident in which he allegedly assaulted an Afghan police commander who had admitted to keeping a local boy chained to his bed as a sex slave.

Since the release of the Times article, there have been dozens of stories coming to light of so called "dancing boys" who are coveted by Afghan commanders, and "pretty" boys who were abused and held because they are considered a prize.

In fact, there are a number of threads on reddit which include the stories of soldiers from the Afghanistan war who recount how prevalent this issue was.

To be clear, reports from the military insist that this is just a part of Afghan culture. Because access to women is rare, many men turn to each other. But the abuse of children is certainly different.

Colonel Quinn, who is a Green Beret, said to the Times, "The reason we were here is because we heard the terrible things the Taliban were doing to people, how they were taking away human rights, but we were putting people into power who would do things that were worse than the Taliban did—that was something village elders voiced to me."

Remember, that was the reason the American people were told that we were in Afghanistan even when we knew that Osama bin Laden wasn't.

"Thanks to our military and our allies and the great fighters of Afghanistan, the Taliban regime is coming to an end," former President George W. Bush said in a speech on the war in Afghanistan.

"The agreement we signed sends a clear message to the Afghan people, as you stand up you will not stand alone," President Barack Obama said in Afghanistan. "...it supports afghan efforts for development and dignity for their people."

But in taking down the Taliban, who have re-emerged, did the U.S. make things better? ?

Not according to Quinn who told the Times, "But the American policy of treating child sexual abuse as a cultural issue has often alienated the villages whose children are being preyed upon."

Of would alienate Americans too!
And that is what you need to know. Look, the U.S. commander over Afghanistan has stated that there is no official policy to not report child sex abuse and yet dozens of soldiers have responded to that claim stating that nothing stops you from reporting it. It's just that commanders look the other way and say its none of our business. *and you get discharged!*

Here are the facts: \$685 billion spent on Afghanistan, trillions more with veteran costs. 20,051 soldiers returned wounded, and 2,361 soldiers were killed.

The Taliban is on the rise. And even if they weren't, can anyone even tell the difference between the Taliban and the U.S.-backed commanders who replaced them?

As Vice News asks, is this what winning looks like?

We can't.

Theme Swift by SwiftThemes.Com Copyright © 2015 Freedom Outpost | Entries (RSS) and Comments (RSS) powered by WordPress

*We need a Commander in Chief.
According to Constitution Obama is not! President only Commander in Chief during declared war, we haven't had since WWII!!*

Obama is destroying the Best Military on Earth - Already gutted at!

This is the type of people
your husband has to put up
with in Obama's Social Engineered
military!

Federal Militarization of Police Blocked by Montana Law - Freedom Outpost

Thursday is the day that a Montana law went into effect and will greatly diminish federal programs that seek to militarize local police of the state.

HB330, introduced by Rep. Nicholas Schwaderer (R-Superior), bans receiving of significant classes of military equipment (weaponized drones, combat aircraft, grenades, grenade launchers, silencers and militarized armored vehicles) from the Pentagon's "1033 Program" by state and local law enforcement.

The bill, which passed 46-1 in the state Senate and 79-20 in the state House, was signed into law by Governor Steve Bullock in April.

"I'm incredibly pleased. In the latter part of the session you see so much partisanship so it's heartening to see that both Democrats and Republicans could get behind it," Schwaderer had previously stated. "It's no lightweight bill. It substantially changes policy in a way that strengthens the civil liberties of Montanans."

"This foundation sets a massive precedent in Montana and the country as to what kind of society we want to have," Schwaderer added. "If you get to the point where you need a grenade launcher, we've got the National Guard."

The Tenth Amendment Center also points out that the bill, "closes this loophole by banning law enforcement agencies from purchasing such military equipment with federal grants. They could continue to purchase them, but would have to use state or local funds, and the agencies would have to give public notice within 14 days of a request for any such local purchase."

The growing ties of federal ties to militarization of local police without any real need to do so is alarming. Last year, in the wake of the Ferguson riots, The Guardian reported:

Billions of federal dollars have been spent since September 11 on purchasing modern and often military-grade equipment for state and local police. But there is little that limits the use of that hardware to counter-terrorism purposes, and oversight of the spending is difficult, according to federal sources and documents reviewed by the Guardian.

In the wake of the Ferguson protests, much attention has gone to the Department of Defense's program to supply surplus military equipment to police. But that program is eclipsed in size and scope by grant money from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), which enables purchases of similar "tactical" equipment.

Under existing federal requirements, police departments and state law enforcement agencies do not need to spend much of that money on preventing

terrorism or preparing for disaster relief.

The Guardian then added, "During the current fiscal year, DHS plans to award \$1.6bn in grant money for state, local and tribal agencies, mostly to aid them with counterterrorism, border security and disaster preparedness, it announced last month. By contrast, the Defense Department's "1033" program to transfer surplus military gear gave out less than \$500m worth of equipment in fiscal 2013."

While some will claim that this is necessary for police to "do their jobs" and that it would normally cost the states to buy this equipment, people must begin to think for themselves and ask, does our local police force actually need a military vehicle on American streets? Are we really at war and need MRAPs or Bearcats? I think not. In fact, one Washington Sheriff's deputy has claimed that they need such vehicles to deal with "constitutionalists." And a school district in San Diego even has an MRAP! What on earth are they preparing for from students?

None of this is necessary. As the feds attempt to militarize the local police, they are doing everything they can to disarm the American people in clear violation of the Second Amendment.

As retired Marine Col. Peter Matino told his city council back in 2013, "Is everybody blind? (The US) is building a domestic army!"

I agree, and I'm glad to see that Montana is leading the way against the tyranny. Now, perhaps other states will take the same measures.

Theme Swift by SwiftThemes.Com Copyright © 2015 Freedom Outpost | Entries (RSS) and Comments (RSS) powered by WordPress

Obama and Jemal Holder Att Gen
 out to announce "global police" on
 American streets! Don't want global
 police or nationalized police, just
 need good Constitutional government
 and sheriffs. Obama trying to disarm
 Citizens like all dictators do!

Gifts from Jeds always
have strings attached, worse than
with a Marxist "President"