

**General Topics :: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?****President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit? - posted by rookie (), on: 2006/4/20 15:09**

I post these articles, not for political reasons, but for spiritual. Christianity in many places has become a culture. Many look to men who support their own way of life. What kind of life does the Lord call us to? What kind of life do men call us to?

Here is an article about the ways of President Bush. Is he like the mighty men of David in 2 Samuel 23?

By Robert Parry
Republished from Consortium News

Knowledge and Intent: More of the same old lies...

The White House is taking umbrage over new press reports that George W. Bush misled the American people on a key justification for invading Iraq. But Bush's latest excuse – that he was just an unwitting conveyor of bad information, not a willful purveyor of lies – has been stretched thin by overuse.

Nevertheless, White House spokesman Scott McClellan lashed out at a Washington Post report that in May 2003, Bush described two Iraqi trailers as mobile biological weapons labs although two days earlier a Pentagon field investigation had debunked those suspicions in a report to Washington.

"The lead in the Washington Post left the impression for the reader that the President was saying something he knew at the time not to be true," McClellan said on April 12, 2006. "That is absolutely false and it is irresponsible, and I don't know how the Washington Post can defend something so irresponsible."

But the truth is that Bush has been caught, again and again, relying on lies and distortions to confuse the American people about the Iraq War. Sometimes, he can blame U.S. intelligence agencies for the false information, but other times, he simply lies about facts that he personally knows.

For instance, just weeks after Bush made his false statement about the bio-labs, he also began rewriting the history of the Iraq War to make his invasion seem more reasonable.

On July 14, 2003, Bush claimed that Saddam Hussein had barred United Nations weapons inspectors from Iraq when, in fact, they were admitted in November 2002 and given free rein to search suspected Iraqi weapons sites. It was Bush who forced the U.N. inspectors to leave in March 2003 so the invasion could proceed.

But faced with growing questions about his justifications for war in summer 2003, Bush revised this history, apparently trusting in the weak memories of the American people and the timidity of the U.S. press. At the end of an Oval Office meeting with U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan, Bush told reporters:

"We gave him (Saddam Hussein) a chance to allow the inspectors in, and he wouldn't let them in. And, therefore, after a reasonable request, we decided to remove him from power."

In the following months and years, Bush repeated this claim in slightly varied forms as part of his litany for defending the invasion on the grounds that it was Hussein who "chose war," not Bush.

Meeting no protest from the Washington press corps, Bush continued repeating his lie about Hussein showing "defiance" on the inspections. Bush uttered the lie as recently as March 21, 2006, when he answered a question from veteran White House correspondent Helen Thomas.

"I was hoping to solve this (Iraq) problem diplomatically," Bush said. "The world said, 'Disarm, disclose or face serious consequences.' ... We worked to make sure that Saddam Hussein heard the message of the world. And

when he chose to deny the inspectors, when he chose not to disclose, then I had the difficult decision to make to remove him. And we did. And the world is safer for it.”

The significance of this lie about the inspectors – when judging Bush’s proclivity to lie – rests on the fact that he can’t simply blame his advisers when cornered. Bush was fully aware of the U.N. inspectors and what happened to them.

‘Downing Street Memo’

Indeed, documentary evidence shows that Bush was determined to invade Iraq in 2002 and early 2003 regardless of what U.S. intelligence could prove or what the Iraqis did.

For instance, the so-called “Downing Street Memo” recounted a secret meeting on July 23, 2002, involving British Prime Minister Tony Blair and his top national security aides. At that meeting, Richard Dearlove, chief of the British intelligence agency MI6, described his discussions about Iraq with Bush’s top advisers in Washington.

Dearlove said, “Bush wanted to remove Saddam, through military action, justified by the conjunction of terrorism and WMD. But the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy.”

At an Oval Office meeting on Jan. 31, 2003, Bush and Blair discussed their determination to invade Iraq, though Bush still hoped that he might provoke the Iraqis into some violent act that would serve as political cover, according to minutes written by Blair’s top foreign policy aide David Manning.

So, while Bush was telling the American people that he considered war with Iraq “a last resort,” he actually had decided to invade regardless of Iraq’s cooperation with U.N. weapons inspectors, according to the five-page memo of the Oval Office meeting reviewed by the New York Times.

The memo also reveals Bush conniving to deceive the American people and the world community by trying to engineer a provocation that would portray Hussein as the aggressor. Bush suggested painting a U.S. plane up in U.N. colors and flying it over Iraq with the goal of drawing Iraqi fire, the meeting minutes said.

“The U.S. was thinking of flying U2 reconnaissance aircraft with fighter cover over Iraq, painted in U.N. colours,” the memo said about Bush’s scheme. “If Saddam fired on them, he would be in breach.”

Regardless of whether any casus belli could be provoked, Bush already had “penciled in” March 10, 2003, as the start of the U.S. bombing of Iraq, according to the memo. “Our diplomatic strategy had to be arranged around the military planning,” Manning wrote.

According to the British memo, Bush and Blair acknowledged that no weapons of mass destruction had been found in Iraq, nor were they likely to be found in the coming weeks, but that wouldn’t get in the way of the U.S.-led invasion.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit? - posted by rookie (), on: 2006/4/20 15:14

Here is another article concerning the fruit...

State Department Memo: "16 Words" Were False
By Jason Leopold
Truthout | Report

Monday 17 April 2006

Sixteen days before President Bush's January 28, 2003, State of the Union address in which he said that the US learned from British intelligence that Iraq had attempted to acquire uranium from Africa - an explosive claim that helped pave the way to war - the State Department told the CIA that the intelligence the uranium claims were based upon were forgeries, according to a newly declassified State Department memo.

The revelation of the warning from the closely guarded State Department memo is the first piece of hard evidence and the strongest to date that the Bush administration manipulated and ignored intelligence information in their zeal to win public support for invading Iraq.

The memo says: "On January 12, 2003," the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR) "expressed concerns to the CIA that the documents pertaining to the Iraq-Niger deal were forgeries."

Moreover, the memo says that the State Department's doubts about the veracity of the uranium claims may have been expressed to the intelligence community even earlier.

Those concerns, according to the memo, are the reason that former Secretary of State Colin Powell refused to cite the uranium claims when he appeared before the United Nations in February 5, 2003 - one week after Bush's State of the Union address - to try to win support for a possible strike against Iraq.

"After considerable back and forth between the CIA, the (State) Department, the IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency), and the British, Secretary Powell's briefing to the U.N. Security Council did not mention attempted Iraqi procurement of uranium due to CIA concerns raised during the coordination regarding the veracity of the information on the alleged Iraq-Niger agreement," the memo further states.

Iraq's interest in the yellowcake caught the attention of Mohamed ElBaradei, the head of the International Atomic Energy Association. ElBaradei read a copy of the National Intelligence Estimate and personally contacted the State Department and the National Security Council in hopes of obtaining evidence so his agency could look into it.

ElBaradei sent a letter to the White House and the National Security Council (NSC) in December 2002, warning senior officials he thought the documents were forgeries and should not be cited by the administration as evidence that Iraq was actively trying to obtain WMDs.

ElBaradei said he never received a written response to his letter, despite repeated follow-up calls he made to the White House, the NSC and the State Department.

Vice President Dick Cheney, who made the rounds on the cable news shows that month, tried to discredit ElBaradei's conclusion that the documents were forged.

"I think Mr. ElBaradei frankly is wrong," Cheney said. " has consistently underestimated or missed what it was Saddam Hussein was doing. I don't have any reason to believe they're any more valid this time than they've been in the past."

As it turns out, ElBaradei was correct, the declassified State Department memo now shows.

Monday's declassified State Department memo was obtained over the weekend by the New York Sun under a Freedom of Information Act request the newspaper filed last July. The Sun's story Monday morning, however, did not say anything about the State Department's warnings more than a week before Bush's State of the Union address about the bogus Niger documents.

The memo, dated June 10, 2003, was drafted by Carl Ford Jr., the former head of the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research, in response to questions posed in June 2003 by I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby, Vice President Dick Cheney's former chief of staff, about a February 2002 fact-finding trip to Niger that former ambassador Joseph Wilson undertook to investigate the uranium claims on behalf of the CIA.

^ ^ ^ ^ The memo had originally been drafted in June in response to Libby's questions about Wilson. But after Wilson wrote an op-ed in the New York Times July 6, 2003, in which he disclosed that he had personally investigated the Niger uranium claims and found that they were false, Powell requested further information from his aides. Ford went back and retrieved the June memo, re-dated it July 7, 2003, and sent it to Powell's deputy, Richard Armitage.

^ ^ ^ ^ The Sun reported that the memo contained no direct reference to Plame Wilson's CIA status being marked as "secret" despite the fact that the word "secret" is clearly marked on every page of the INR memo.

^ ^ ^ ^ The memo does not say that the State Department alerted the White House on January 12, 2003, about the bogus uranium claims.

^ ^ ^ ^ But the memo's author, Carl Ford, said in a previous interview that he has no doubt the State Department's reservations about the Niger intelligence made their way to President Bush, Vice President Cheney, and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld.

^ ^ ^ ^ One high-ranking State Department official said that when the department's analysts briefed Colin Powell about the Niger forgeries, Powell met with former Director of the CIA George Tenet and shared that information with him.

^ ^ ^ ^ Tenet then told Vice President Dick Cheney and then-National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice and her former deputy, Stephen Hadley, that the uranium claims were "dubious," according to current and former State Department and CIA officials who have direct knowledge of what Tenet discussed with the White House at the time.

^ ^ ^ ^ The White House has long maintained that they were never briefed about the State Department's or the CIA's concerns related to the Niger uranium claims.

^ ^ ^ ^ "I refuse to believe that the findings of a four-star general and an envoy the CIA sent to Niger to personally investigate the accuracy of the intelligence, as well as our own research at the State Department, never got into the hands of President Bush or Vice President Cheney. I don't buy it," said a high-ranking State Department official. "Saying that Iraq sought uranium from Niger was all it took, as far as I'm concerned, to convince the House to support the war. The American people too. I believe removing Saddam Hussein was right and just. But the intelligence that was used to state the case wasn't."

^ ^ ^ ^ A spokeswoman for Tenet said Monday that the former head of the CIA wouldn't comment on the newly declassified document but promised that Tenet would tell the "full story" about how the infamous 16 words wound up in Bush's State of the Union address, in Tenet's book, "At the Center of the Storm," expected to be published in late October.

^ ^ ^ ^ Many career State Department officials interviewed Monday said they were upset that the so-called "16 words" made their way into the State of the Union address and they are pleased that the INR memo has been declassified, thereby proving that their colleagues sounded early warnings about the dubious Niger intelligence.

^ ^ ^ ^ A State Department official who has direct knowledge of the now declassified INR memo said when the request came from Cheney's office for a report on Wilson's Niger trip it was an opportunity to put in writing a document that would remind the White House that it had been warned about the Niger claims early on.

^ ^ ^ ^ Many other State Department officials believed that the existence of a memo that would, in essence, disagree with the White House's own assessment on Niger would eventually hurt the administration.

^ ^ ^ ^ "This was the very first time there was written evidence - not notes, but a request for a report - from the State Department that documented why the Niger intel was bull*#\$%^ (edited:)," said one retired State Department official.

^ ^ ^ ^ "It was the only thing in writing, and it had a certain value because it didn't come from the IAEA. It came from State. It scared the heck out of a lot of people because it proved that this guy Wilson's story was credible. I don't think anybody wanted the media to know that the State Department disagreed with the intelligence used by the White House. That's why Wilson had to be shut down."

end of article...

General Topics :: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?

A mighty man of David or is it like in Isaiah 3

Is. 3:1 For behold, the Lord, the LORD of hosts,
Takes away from Jerusalem and from Judah
The stock and the store,
The whole supply of bread and the whole supply of water;
2 The mighty man and the man of war,
The judge and the prophet,
And the diviner and the elder;
3 The captain of fifty and the honorable man,
The counselor and the skillful artisan,
And the expert enchanter.
4 "I will give children to be their princes,
And babes shall rule over them.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2006/4/20 15:19

Here is another thought to ponder...

Former President Clinton and Vice President Gore are members of the Southern Baptist denomination. Why did they not receive the same respect from the "Christian Right" as does President Bush?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/20 16:05

I dont feel this is a place for a liberal agenda.

This has done absolutely nothing to uplift christ.

My brother is a member of the Marines and is proud of the fact that they are in Iraq defending against tyrants like Sadaam.

I am not saying Bush really is a christian, I have heard some real weird stuff come out of his mouth about the Koran, uniting faiths etc. but to attack and to give into a already proven false liberal agenda. You need more discernment, and I pray that you will put your focus on christ and him crucified and stop trying to convince people who is right or wrong.

the people who are lying and reporting this to you hate christians, and dont care a lick if we become a communist state.

May god bless you and I pray you will take this into consideration. I love you, but I dont feel we should be subjected to this on a site where we should be uplifting each other.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/4/20 16:22

Hi Jeff,

Quote:
-----Former President Clinton and Vice President Gore are members of the Southern Baptist denomination. Why did they not receive the same respect from the "Christian Right" as does President Bush?

General Topics :: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?

It is a concern that the lines between true and false Christianity are often blurred when folk are bent on seeing certain 'issues' resolved. You ask a good question.

I think for starters the obvious issue would be their particular stand on moral issues such as abortion. I am writing this post from the State Of Kansas, which is one of two places in the world I am aware of that allow partial birth abortion. Devoted Christians in my circles feel obligated to see these practices come to an end. This means fighting the battle in the political arena by voting for candidates that are anti-abortion. This, of course, means possible supreme Court nominations that will bring an end to this.

Other issues include sexual immorality, etc. and particularly positions on homosexuality.

I know this comes off as a contradiction given the fact that He has led our nation into war in Iraq. Increasingly I know there is a feeling that it was a 'mistake' to go in to Iraq. What his motives really were? I have no idea.

There is a saying in mechanics that says that the "wheel that squeaks is the first to get the grease." It means that the most troubling and serious issues have to be dealt with first. The unfortunate thing is that there is a lot of 'collateral damage' or 'side-effects' (if you will) of getting these serious issues dealt with. Sort of like first aid, you have to deal with the problem that is threatening the life at the moment. Sometimes dealing with a life-threatening situation swiftly opens the door for infection and other problems down the road. There simply is no time to think 'down the road' when so much is on the line at the moment. For the 'religious right' that has been abortion for decades. We have seen tens of millions heaped upon millions of babies killed in this nation and have actually exported funds to promote the behavior in other nations. It has to be stopped. That is why the Religious Right respected Bush in my thinking. He has appointed the justices likely to overturn or greatly limit Roe V. Wade. I suppose if that is accomplished all is not lost.

God Bless,

Robert

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/4/21 4:27

bro boomatt

Quote:
-----I dont feel this is a place for a liberal agenda.

did you miss this which bro Jeff posted preceding the information he placed on this thread?

Quote:
-----I post these articles, not for political reasons, but for spiritual. Christianity in many places has become a culture. Many look to men who support their own way of life. What kind of life does the Lord call us to? What kind of life do men call us to

in addition this is the second thread with this title. the first one was locked to make way for this one and that had probably more pages on it than any other discussion on s.i.i've been here for about 2 yrs now and when i came onto the site, days are evil part 1 was already well over 50 pages long. the intent is to cause us to examine what's going on in the context of what the Lord is seeking to accomplish in this world through His Church and get involved.

i would agree with bro Jeff in that we should examine our own actions, the actions of the congregations we're in, those who rule over us in light of what God requires of us as Christians. i've heard much about this liberal and conservative foolishness going back and forth but the thing is we are Christians first and foremost, Americans (or whatever respective nationality) second and so on. somehow ever since this administration has been in office there has been this sense of something fishy going on.the whole case for the war to me seemed so much of a sham it would grieve me to no end that people simply swallowed it and took no time to examine it further. it highlighted a lack of diligence on our part as Christians a

about examining the word and living for God which has spilled over into every area of our life. whatever has been done in the dark by anyone will one day be exposed that uncludes every administration of every nation there ever was.

i have a cousin in the corps also who was in afghanistan and served in iraq also who returned from there pretty much having renounced his faith or at least having a hard time reconciling God with all the things he saw there. i asked him how he felt about the cause and he laughed and said "hey, i'm just a trigger puller bro" how many others return from tours with the same problem? if we have been lied to it will surely be exposed and it seems it's all coming out of the woodwork now .even some generals who were involved in the war at first such as Anthony Zinni are coming out and protesting. i don't know about you but that disturbs me and leads me to have to consider that maybe all this was a sham for something else. the Lord will surely expose it all.

it seems to me from your response you feel that something is amiss. all these things which come up in the media to oppose the iraq war are always brushed aside as liberal foolishness. to question the reasons for this war is deemed unpatriotic, we were told there would be wmds, none were found, we were told there would be nuclear programs, nothing to suggest that, then it was to remove saddam coz he gassed people 20 yrs ago, why all this now?there is more to this than what is seen on fox or cnn. what if it isn't all rubbish? what if there is some truth to it? that would leave you to ask what your brother is really defending from. is it terror? if so why are we so afraid to die if we are of the True Faith? we are shamed by muslims who believe in a demon and are prepared to die for him yet we of the True Faith will not so much as break a nail for Christ who endured all manner of persecution and humiliation for our cause.

ultimately we must ask ourselves, are our hearts set on man, whether it be Bush or not, or on God.

the Lord's judgment is upon us for our laxity but for those who would, REPENT, REPENT REPENT OR DIE!!!

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2006/4/21 11:13

Brother Robert,

You have expressed a somewhat valid point in regard to abortion. Yet I believe that the most recent men selected for the Supreme Court were not pick for their stance on abortion but for their support of the economic interests of the corporation.

In terms of what the Supreme Court can really accomplish in overturning abortion, I think this article brings to light what must really come to bear in this country...

"Lancaster paper, Sunday December 18

Political decisions are driven by America's culture.

By Bill Wichterman

A substantial part of the controversy which brought down Harriet Miers nominations to the Supreme Court centered on whether she would vote to overturn Roe Vs Wade. Although neither she nor the president's replacement nominee, Samuel Alito, would provide the crucial fifth vote to undo this 32-year old decision, the question was whether her confirmation might open the way for the court to become anti-Roe with the next vacancy.

Many Americans believe that if Roe were overturned, abortion would become illegal nationwide. Not so. Meaningfully reducing the abortion rate requires a prior cultural reformation before politicians can act. Culture is "upstream" from politics.

Government is like a giant mirror reflecting the soul of the nation. While the clarity of that reflection will shift from administration to administration, we generally get the government we deserve. Or, as Plato wrote, "The state is the soul writ large."

In the case of abortion, the Supreme Court simply ratified the sexual revolution begun in the 1960s. The sexual revolution said that sex without consequences was possible. The unintended baby put the lie to that notion. Abortion stepped in to take care of the inconvenient and unintended child.

It's widely forgotten that 18 states had legalized abortion before Roe. There were 600,000 legal abortions in 1972. Roe

didn't even accelerate the steady rate of increase that began in 1968, and continued for 25 years, before leveling off and even dropping in the 1990s. The states were ratifying the sexual revolution one by one, and the court short-circuited that ratification by making it the law of the land.

Overturing Roe would begin a serious state-by-state debate about whether and when abortion should be legal from conception to birth. But in many states, and for much of the population, first trimester abortions would continue. And it may be generations before California, New York, and other populous "blue states" significantly roll back abortion rights. The abortion rate would certainly drop, but, initially, only marginally, from the current 1.2 million annual abortions to perhaps 1 million.

"Overturing abortion-rights statutes would first require a change of heart about the sexual revolution, and politics is ill-equipped for the task. Sexual mores are not set by politicians, and politicians challenge those mores at their peril.

What we love, and what we hate are shaped less by laws than by our habits of the heart. And those habits are shaped more powerfully by the songs we sing, the movies we thrill to, and the books we read. Damon of Athens said, "Give me the songs of a nation, and it matters not who writes its laws."

In his farewell address of 1796, George Washington said, "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports." James Madison said, "Corruption of make a people ripe for destruction. A good form of government may hold rotten materials together for some time, but beyond a certain pitch, even the best constitution will be ineffectual." The framers of the U.S. Constitution understood that the genius of the American Experiment lay not in the parchment, but in the unwritten constitution of the American people. Without virtue, they knew we would be unable to sustain this form of government.

Politics is important--very important. I have no doubt that law is a teacher. That's one reason I have spent almost two decades working as a congressional staff member on Capitol Hill. But politics is not up to the task of single-handedly renewing our culture. For that, we need writers, musicians, producers, and playwrights, who will tell stories that lift up the good, the true, and the beautiful. They, more so than politicians, can help us shape what we love, and what we hate.

Whether the challenge is building a culture of life, bolstering individual responsibility, or restoring sound business ethics, politics plays a limited role. Robert Bork wrote that, "Conservative political victories will always be tenuous and fragile, unless conservatives recapture the culture."

The battles over who sits on the Supreme Court are important. But, we will be sadly disappointed if we focus all of our efforts on the political realm, and neglect the more powerful culture-shaping institutions which drive the law. The sooner conservatives send workers into the cultural vineyards of Hollywood, publishing, and academia, the sooner we'll begin to make sustainable long-term gains in building a healthy culture."

end of article...

The battle spoken here can only be won when a majority of this nation has the heart of Jesus and is not in bondage to the Law given on Mount Sinai.

God Bless
In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2006/4/21 11:49

Hi IRONMAN...

Quote:
-----if we have been lied to it will surely be exposed and it seems it's all coming out of the woodwork now.even some generals who were involved in the war at first such as Anthony Zinni are coming out and protesting. i don't know about you but that disturbs me and leads me to have to consider that maybe all this was a sham for something else. the Lord will surely expose it all.

The problem with your post about Americans jumping to conclusions is that you are also jumping to conclusions. Perhaps a little more research into this matter would help. There are only a very few ex-generals (like former Democratic candidate Wesley Clark, along with a few recent additions) that have openly questioned the war. In fact, most of these do not question the justification for war, but the implementation (such as a need for more troops, etc...). The leaders of the De

mocratic Party have done their worst to openly mock and question President Bush for over two years. It began before the election, and has continued ever since. Their hopes are that President Bush will become a "liability" in the mid-term elections, thus resulting in a shift in the Congressional power structure from the Republicans (who have held control of Congress for 10 years) to the Democrats (who held control of Congress for 40+ years prior). With such a shift in control would also come a shift in policy.

Could you imagine what would happen in this country with a socially liberal Congress making the policy and laws? President Clinton was elected in 1992. Thus, the liberal Democrats held control of the Congress for nearly two years. The result? Sweeping legislation to protect abortion, homosexual "rights" (like allowing gays into the military), repeal of almost all Reagan/Bush Sr. Administration anti-abortion decrees (such as the national and international "gag rule"), as well as some very liberal policies for our nations children (abortion for minors without parental consent or knowledge, very liberal sex education in elementary schools without mention of abstinence, teaching of the embracement of religious "culturalism," etc...). Some of these were openly resisted (i.e. integrating homosexuals into the military was resisted by military leaders, resulting in a compromised "don't ask/don't tell" rule). There were even more liberal policies that were proposed, but these were declared "moot" following the Congressional "*Republican Revolution*" in 1994. This forced Clinton to act more as a "moderate" rather than fulfill his liberal campaign promises as he did to the wealthiest and most liberal donors that fund much of the Democratic Party.

Quote:
-----to question the reasons for this war is deemed unpatriotic, we were told there would be wmds, none were found, we were told there would be nuclear programs, nothing to suggest that, then it was to remove saddam coz he gassed people 20 yrs ago, why all this now?there is more to this than what is seen on fox or cnn. what if it isn't all rubbish?

The "reasons" that we went to war were not due to the presence of WMDs in Iraq. That was used to "further justification" for immediate military action. The overall reason for this war was the fact that, during the Clinton Administration, Saddam Hussein had repeatedly violated the terms of surrender following the first Gulf War in 1991. These can be found (<http://www.state.gov/p/nea/rls/01fs/14906.htm>) here. Every single one of these resolutions were violated. Saddam Hussein was also prohibiting the UN Inspectors from fulfilling their duty for years. As a result, even President Bill Clinton ordered (<http://www.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/stories/1998/12/16/transcripts/clinton.html>) military strikes on Bagdad in 1998. But following those strikes, Saddam continued his ways. Remember, Hussein was also responsible for an assassination attempt on former President Bush in 1993, thus resulting in yet another attack on Iraq by President Clinton. (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/inatl/longterm/iraq/timeline/062793.htm>)

It is argued in foreign policy circles that there was a terrible failure by the Clinton Administration in its handling of the situation in the Middle East. We knew that Al Qaeda was a growing threat. They were linked to many terrorist acts in the world, including many against Americans. Bin Laden was linked to the (http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/february/26/newsid_2516000/2516469.stm) first attack on the World Trade Center in 1993, the (http://www.state.gov/www/regions/africa/kenya_tanzania.html) attacks on the US Embassies in Africa in 1998, the " (<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/trail/inside/cron.html>) Millineum Bombing" plot for 1999, the (<http://archives.cnn.com/2000/US/10/23/uss.cole.01/>) bombing of the USS Cole in 2000, among (<http://www.fbi.gov/publications/terror/terroris.htm>) many others. It was clear that Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden was linked to this, but very little was done. The US knew that Osama bin Laden was based in Afghanistan. Members of the media even (<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/binladen/who/interview.html>) interviewed him in 1998. And we knew that he was planning even more terrorist acts against the United States because of our "support for Israel." But outside of a few limited and select strikes (that ultimately accomplished nothing), the Clinton Administration failed to act. Less than 8 months after Clinton left office, the terrible events of September 11th occurred. In this case, a "preventive strike" would have been quite beneficial to our security.

How should Christians react to government and policy? Should Christians be openly involved with politics? There is clearly an attack on President Bush by the most liberal members of this nation. But worse, there is a blatant attempt by certain liberal elements of society (such as Hollywood) to *redefine* the "social values" of this country. If you don't believe in homosexual marriage, the media calls you "*intolerant*," a "*bigot*," or "*closed-minded*." If you oppose abortion, you are passed off as a "*right-wing radical*." If you hold fast to Christianity, you are passed off as a "*member of the religious right*" - even if you do not consider yourself a member as such. If you oppose the in-depth teaching of sex to your elementary children, you are considered a "*neo-con hick*." We have every right to oppose the neo-modern social agenda of the far-left. They are incredibly vocal as they attempt to push their agenda through films, TV shows, magazines, news programs, and other forms of media -- all of which is read, believed and taught by liberal professors.

General Topics :: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?

While President Bush may have "issues" that you do not agree with, we should at least rejoice in some of the things that he has accomplished. He repealed many of the Clinton Administration pro-abortion orders. He has limited the use of stem-cells from aborted babies. He has limited federal funds from being used for pornographic and openly offensive "art." And he has appointed two members for the US Supreme Court that will obviously not be like the liberal activists that President Clinton appointed.

We are all entitled to our opinions about the policies and actions of the President. We also should remember that this does not entitle us to judge him as a "false believer" as some are in the habit. Before another bash-Bush thread is begun, perhaps we should be willing to count our blessings?

:)

*Feel free to click on the links underlined above to check the events described.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2006/4/21 12:08

Hi rookie...

Quote:
-----Former President Clinton and Vice President Gore are members of the Southern Baptist denomination. Why did they not receive the same respect from the "Christian Right" as does President Bush?

While I don't consider myself a member of the "Christian Right" -- nor a "blind supporter" of President Bush, I think I have a pretty good idea about this. I don't believe that it had so much to do with Bill Clinton's sexual escapades and subsequent coverups, but it was primarily due to his ultra-liberal policies.

President Clinton and Al Gore openly supported special rights for homosexuals, sex education to elementary schools (excluding the teaching of abstinence), abortion on demand, abortion for minors as young as 12 years old without their parents ever finding out, tax-payer funding of pornography and offensive material in the name of "art" (remember the crucifix in a bottle of urine or the "gay Jesus-sex" paintings?), support of euthanasia (physician assisted suicide), funding for nations that promote abortion, etc... This list could go on.

While they held my respect for their office (of the Presidency), their policies held my utmost disgust. It just seems that many conservatives support President Bush's stand on such issues -- to the utmost disgust of far-left liberals that wear "moderate" clothing.

:-)

Re: - posted by rookie () , on: 2006/4/21 12:19

Brother Chris,

I brought up the idea of Clinton and Gore being Southern Baptists to raise the point of fruit inspection, just like these posts that I have made to point to the actual lies that do exist in this administration. The deeds men do in darkness will come to the light.

One man's sin is different from another. One man commits adultery another covets, what is the fruit? The fruit of both administrations cause the sea of men to boil don't they?

Rev. 17:1 Then one of the seven angels who had the seven bowls came and talked with me, saying to me, "Come, I will show you the judgment of the great harlot who sits on many waters, 2 with whom the kings of the earth committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth were made drunk with the wine of her fornication."

No matter what wine one drinks from this harlot one is made blind by it...

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/21 13:17

My point in my earlier post was not defending Bush, or to attack everyone.

the point was to be careful not to believe everything the media says. They are so bent to show that Bush was a liar.

He didnt lie about WMD's. This was because of faulty intelligence. So people need to stop blaming him for that.

Also, did anyone hear about the audio tapes that were confirmed by the CIA to be Sadaam, where he actively talked about moving stockpiles of his weaponry to Iran. Even some of Sadaams ex-Generals said he had weapons, even if they were Nukes, they were still used to kill innocent people. But you will never hear that from the media. They just downplayed the story and almost never reported it.

We cannot be deceived by people that just hate christians and want to bring them down.

I am not saying that Bush is a christian, obviously his fruit exposes himself. And I'm sure he could have lied about some things, but we need to be careful in exposing him using corrupt info. Washington Post is corrupt with these kind of people, as well as other major newspapers.

We need to pray for our leaders to repent, and to follow christ.

Peace and safety to you all

god bless

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/4/21 14:29

bro Chris

i hear you and what i said was that all these allegations which are coming out should be cause enough for us to consider that maybe something is indeed amiss and like you said we have to investigate further. there is indeed a lot of mud-slinging from the democrats which really is of no good, it seems they've not figured out a way to question the administration without shrilling at the tops of their lungs or appearing irrational which causes them to be mocked by the republicans also.

you're right bro there are some things i disagree with Bush on but bro i do thank the Lord for the good which has been done under this administration but i hear from heaven also that a lot of shady things have been done and they are going to be exposed. there are some times when in my spirit i know that what is being said is a pack of lies and it grieves me. however i'm also guilty of some shady things as we all are and it shall all be brought to the light. at the end of the day the Lord placed bush there in power in order to see His will done. i don't doubt the president to be saved, however since he is our brother in Christ we should examine the fruit from not only his tree but our own. if we see rotten fruit then we need a pruning...

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2006/4/21 15:56

For what purpose does this serve?

New U.S. Embassy in Iraq cloaked in mystery

Baghdad locale, slated to be completed in 2007, to be largest of its kind

BAGHDAD, Iraq - The fortress-like compound rising beside the Tigris River here will be the largest of its kind in the world, the size of Vatican City, with the population of a small town, its own defense force, self-contained power and water, and a precarious perch at the heart of Iraq's turbulent future.

The new U.S. Embassy also seems as cloaked in secrecy as the ministate in Rome.

"We can't talk about it. Security reasons," Roberta Rossi, a spokeswoman at the current embassy, said when asked for information about the project.

A British tabloid even told readers the location was being kept secret — news that would surprise Baghdadis who for months have watched the forest of construction cranes at work across the winding Tigris, at the very center of their city and within easy mortar range of anti-U.S. forces in the capital, though fewer explode there these days.

The embassy complex — 21 buildings on 104 acres, according to a U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee report — is taking shape on riverside parkland in the fortified “Green Zone,” just east of al-Samoud, a former palace of Saddam Hussein’s, and across the road from the building where the ex-dictator is now on trial.

The Republican Palace, where U.S. Embassy functions are temporarily housed in cubicles among the chandelier-hung rooms, is less than a mile away in the 4-square-mile zone, an enclave of American and Iraqi government offices and lodgings ringed by miles of concrete barriers.

5,500 employees at the embassy

The 5,500 Americans and Iraqis working at the embassy, almost half listed as security, are far more numerous than at any other U.S. mission worldwide. They rarely venture out into the “Red Zone,” that is, violence-torn Iraq.

This huge American contingent at the center of power has drawn criticism.

“The presence of a massive U.S. embassy — by far the largest in the world — co-located in the Green Zone with the Iraqi government is seen by Iraqis as an indication of who actually exercises power in their country,” the International Crisis Group, a European-based research group, said in one of its periodic reports on Iraq.

State Department spokesman Justin Higgins defended the size of the embassy, old and new, saying it’s indicative of the work facing the United States here.

“It’s somewhat self-evident that there’s going to be a fairly sizable commitment to Iraq by the U.S. government in all forms for several years,” he said in Washington.

Higgins noted that large numbers of non-diplomats work at the mission — hundreds of military personnel and dozens of FBI agents, for example, along with representatives of the Agriculture, Commerce and other U.S. federal departments.

They sleep in hundreds of trailers or “containerized” quarters scattered around the Green Zone. But next year embassy staff will move into six apartment buildings in the new complex, which has been under construction since mid-2005 with a target completion date of June 2007.

Iraq’s interim government transferred the land to U.S. ownership in October 2004, under an agreement whose terms were not disclosed.

“Embassy Baghdad” will dwarf new U.S. embassies elsewhere, projects that typically cover 10 acres. The embassy’s 104 acres is six times larger than the United Nations compound in New York, and two-thirds the acreage of Washington’s National Mall.

Estimated cost of over \$1 billion

Original cost estimates ranged over \$1 billion, but Congress appropriated only \$592 million in the emergency Iraq budget adopted last year. Most has gone to a Kuwait builder, First Kuwaiti Trading & Contracting, with the rest awarded to six contractors working on the project’s “classified” portion — the actual embassy offices.

Higgins declined to identify those builders, citing security reasons, but said five were American companies.

The designs aren’t publicly available, but the Senate report makes clear it will be a self-sufficient and “hardened” domain, to function in the midst of Baghdad power outages, water shortages and continuing turmoil.

It will have its own water wells, electricity plant and wastewater-treatment facility, “systems to allow 100 percent independence from city utilities,” says the report, the most authoritative open source on the embassy plans.

Besides two major diplomatic office buildings, homes for the ambassador and his deputy, and the apartment buildings for staff, the compound will offer a swimming pool, gym, commissary, food court and American Club, all housed in a recre

General Topics :: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?

ation building.

Security, overseen by U.S. Marines, will be extraordinary: setbacks and perimeter no-go areas that will be especially deep, structures reinforced to 2.5-times the standard, and five high-security entrances, plus an emergency entrance-exit, the Senate report says.

Higgins said the work, under way on all parts of the project, is more than one-third complete.

end of article...

What fruit will this bring? It reminds me of Scripture...

Micah 7:

2 The faithful man has perished from the earth,
 And there is no one upright among men.
 They all lie in wait for blood;
 Every man hunts his brother with a net.

3 That they may successfully do evil with both hands—
 The prince asks for gifts,
 The judge seeks a bribe,
 And the great man utters his evil desire;
 So they scheme together.

4 The best of them is like a brier;
 The most upright is sharper than a thorn hedge;
 The day of your watchman and your punishment comes;
 Now shall be their perplexity.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/21 16:04

What fruit have YOU brought by showing this article?

Of course your going to build a big compound where you are under the threat of being bombed!

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2006/4/21 18:01

Brother Matt wrote:

Quote:
 -----Of course your going to build a big compound where you are under the threat of being bombed!

Why do they anticipate being bombed for years to come?

Why are we building a fortress in the nation of Babylon?

In Christ
Jeff

General Topics :: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/21 21:14

The threat of Islam will take years to erase, if not impossible. It takes much needed education in that area, unfortunately, I don't believe they will be taught Christ.

I feel the U.S is taking appropriate steps needed to secure itself, just look at Israel.

I feel this will help us out in the long run.

I also am not saying that I agree that we should be in this for the long haul, but my brother already told me they are building huge Barracks to house the soldiers out there.

Please pray for him, his name is Will. He is actually scheduled to go back out there two weeks after my wedding (early August). Please pray for his salvation and safety.

Thank you for this good dialogue Rookie. May the Lord continue to bless your life brother.

Re: some questions - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/4/21 23:00

Quote:
-----The threat of Islam will take years to erase, if not impossible.

A question for you: What does Scripture teach about national security? How is it acquired? What methods should we employ? Is there anything we can learn from Israel's history regarding this issue?

Quote:
-----It takes much needed education in that area, unfortunately, I don't believe they will be taught Christ.

Is our security dependent on the enemy becoming Christian?

Also, how are we to "educate", or rather evangelize them about Christ? Did Christ teach us how? Can we apply his teaching to this situation?

Quote:
-----I feel the U.S is taking appropriate steps needed to secure itself

By "appropriate", do you mean in line with Scripture?
Diane

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/21 23:41

Of course the only real security we have is in Christ, everything else is vanity. Islam is a deadly threat anybody who doesn't believe in Allah.

If we reach out to Iraqis with the love of Christ, and pray for salvation for their souls, we wouldn't have anymore enemy, called Islam.

When I said that the US is taking appropriate steps to secure itself, I mean for the safety of the Americans Physically. Not spiritually.

This reminds me, I read that after WWII, One of the Generals for the U.S. in the Pacific recommended 45,000 missionaries go to the area. I would definitely say that is needed today, but unfortunately that's not gonna happen.

Leonard Ravenhill said it best when he said that:

"The only thing we learn from history, is that we dont learn from history"

God bless all

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2006/4/22 0:17

Hi rookie...

Quote:
-----I brought up the idea of Clinton and Gore being Southern Baptists to raise the point of fruit inspection, just like these posts that I have made to point to the actual lies that do exist in this administration. The deeds men do in darkness will come to the light.

I'm not trying to act like I understand your motive for this thread. And of course, I am not trying to question whether you are a liberal or yet another vocal critic of the President of the United States. But your post seems to indicate that you actually believe that President Bush lied. That is a rather strong accusation to make. Perhaps this is due to the "sources" that you read, or from the people in which you associate. But there has never been any concrete proof as such. In such an open and free society as this, where even media-beloved ultra-liberal men like Bill Clinton cannot escape the truth, one would imagine that there would be some sort of concrete proof of such deception. In fact, even Administration "outsiders" (like Colin Powell) believed the intelligence as handled by the FBI. It seems like the only individuals that "didn't believe the intelligence" were men that were silent at the time, and only became vocal following a lack of promotion or accolade -- and after the urges of ultra-left Democrats in Congress.

Like I said, I am not a "*blind supporter*" of the President (or the Republican Party). And in fact, I am neither a Democrat nor a Republican. I only cast my vote after much prayer and with great consideration. But there are issues that I believe are of extreme importance. Of course, these include topics about abortion, the homosexual agenda, euthanasia, legalized drugs, religious liberty, pornographic and offensive "art," bigotry toward Christianity by the media, etc... In the past few years, we have seen people that name the Name of Jesus publicly join the choruses of "HATE BUSH" rhetoric offered by liberal organizations. Some of them cite some "sources" from obviously biased articles (including those from liberal newspapers like the Washington Post or New York Times). It hurts to see people make such "*blind accusations*" in the name of Christ.

If you believe that President Bush actually lied, then it is important of you to at least present some sort of real document to substantiate something as such. Otherwise, such statements are *speculation* at best, or possibly, "libel." Over the years, there have been a lot of "urban legends" released onto the internet that is sometimes believed by many individuals. Such inventors of spin realize that if something is repeated long enough, even if it isn't true, many people will believe it. It is important that, as I Thessalonians 5:21 says, we "test everything." But we need to be careful that, by our skepticism, we do not fall into the plans of the individuals spreading it. Once something is tested, and it is found to not fail such a test, then we should remember the second part of this admonition -- "Hold on to that which is good."

Interestingly, my uncle is a contract worker that was injured in Iraq during the first year of the war (but shortly after the remaining Iraqi leadership surrendered). His armored humvee was hit by an RPG in Fallujah, killing the men sitting on both sides of him (including his best friend). What was my uncle's doing in Iraq? He was destroying the illegal Iraqi weapons that were banned following the first Gulf War. Where were these weapons from? They were illegally purchased from France, Germany and Russia. Tons of these powerful weapons were destroyed on a daily basis, while the legal weapons were saved for the future Iraqi army. To this day, they are still destroying tons of these illegal weapons (many of which were used on civilians) everyday. They find such weapons everyday -- mostly hidden in underground bunkers and "civilian" facilities. And interestingly, they are still looking for the WMDs that Saddam boasted as having possessed. If you would like, I have a lot of photos of these weapon stockpiles and daily detonations.

My uncle recently returned to Iraq in order to continue this work. He feels much more confident in the purpose of this mission than he did when the war began. While the media tends to focus on the war in a negative light, my Uncle is impressed with the progress that has already been made. In fact, he insists that there is no longer any "war" (in the sense of daily combat), but simply small groups of terrorist insurgents being hunted by joint US, UK, Iraqi and other coalition forces. Slowly, the new Iraqi forces are handling such insurgents.

General Topics :: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?

Why did I vote for President Bush? Because of the issues that were listed in my previous post below. Do I believe that he is a Christian? That is not my call. In fact, I cannot judge that he is -- or isn't. I am just happy about the stands that he has taken against much of the blatant liberal-extremism that began during the Clinton Administration, and continues in much of the visual and printed media today. We should be careful not to believe everything that we are told except through the greatest of scrutiny and study. Of course, there is propaganda on all sides. So which side should we believe? We can ONLY trust in the Lord! We should take the advice of the angel as reported in Joshua 5:13-15:

Quote:
-----13 And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and, behold, there stood a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand: and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries?

14 And he said, Nay; but as captain of the host of the LORD am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my Lord unto his servant?

15 And the captain of the LORD's host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy. And Joshua did so.

As far as the mention of the large US Embassy currently being constructed, you should really read up on the embassies around the world. During my graduate thesis, I studied the Iran Hostage Crisis. One of the conclusions from that crisis was the need for larger and more secure Embassies in nations that are prone to crisis or violence. This was never more evident than in the two US Embassies in Africa that were attacked by Al Qaeda during the Clinton Administration (resulting in scores of deaths). An old saying that deserves some consideration is as follows, "Hope for the best, but prepare for the worst."

:)

Re: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?, on: 2006/4/22 5:31

WMD aside, Saddam Hussain Provoked the U.S., U.N., and the Entire Arab world with his shenanigans, terror, and wars. Forgotten the Invasion of Kuwait already? How about the Iran/Iraq war(8 years) He planned an invasion on Saudi Arabia, that's why U.S. troops were there in the first place. What about his threats to "Incinerate Israel"? This man and his savage sons RAPED woman, put people in MEAT GRINDERS, and used WMD on a Kurdish uprising KILLING THOUSANDS. He also taunted the world and had to be cooped up in a "No-fly" zone for 11 years costing the US millions of dollars. I know Arabs(Iraqis) in this country who hate Saddam Hussain, and are glad he is gone. Saddam is a thug. Hussain kept the peace in Iraq by CRUSHING DISSENT BRUTALLY! The Iraqis know his crimes better than anybody and he will now get to answer for them. May God receive his soul. "The face of the Lord is against them that do evil, to cut off the remembrance of them from the earth" Ps.34:16

Re: What kingdom do we defend - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/4/22 6:18

Quote:
-----Of course the only real security we have is in Christ, everything else is vanity.

Amen to that! The nation of Israel found that to be true - over and over again. As long as they trusted God he kept them safe from enemies. However, whenever they strayed, God himself brought enemies against him, as well as pestilence and famine. However, the good news about God's judgments is that he always extended mercy - and that is the same good news for today - God's salvation!

I find it interesting that no where in the Bible is there a case of enemies arising except that permitted by God. Do you think that is still true today?

Quote:
----- Islam is a deadly threat anybody who doesn't believe in Allah.

I don't want to "put words in your mouth", but are you meaning to say: "Islam is a deadly threat to anyone who doesn't trust in God" ?

General Topics :: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?

"For in all things we are more than conquerors through him who loved us. For I am convinced that neither death nor life.. .. nor any powers.... will be able to separate us from the love of God..." Romans 8:37

It is a great comfort to know that God is still the ruler of the universe, though it often doesn't seem like it. He relentlessly continues to build his eternal kingdom - amidst all the earthly turmoils.

And that is the only kingdom that really matters in the long run. Because that is the kingdom his children belong to - forever.

Quote:
-----When I said that the US is taking appropriate steps to secure itself, I mean for the safety of the Americans Physically. Not spiritually.

I appreciate your clarification. Jesus said, "What good is it to gain the whole world and forfeit your soul". I can't help but wonder (I speak generally), Does the pursuit of temporal security come with a price-tag - we forfeit our very souls? Do we forfeit God's eternal promises?

Just something to think about....

This is serious stuff.

Diane

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/22 9:04

Thanks Diane for your post. Sorry I dont make myself clear sometimes.

It has been great getting everyones input, and you all have a blessed day in the lord.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/4/22 11:16

bro Chris

Quote:
-----Why did I vote for President Bush? Because of the issues that were listed in my previous post below. Do I believe that he is a Christian? That is not my call. In fact, I cannot judge that he is -- or isn't.

this is the topic of the whole discussion: what sort of fruit grow on ths Bush :-P ok i had to throw that in there, but seriously what sort of fruit is he producing? When one makes the claim to be a Christian those of us who are have to check the fruit to see if it is true. As Christians we have to judge ourselves and eachother so that if the fruit are bad, those branche s can be cut off or even uproot the whole tree.

this whole situation and the one brewing with iran is going to leave us in a lot of trouble. a judgement from heaven will come through this mess so we need to get our houses in order before the Lord because our nation as we know it will cease to exist when the Lord is done with it. When this happens our true or false Christianity will be exposed because Christianity is proved in the fire of adversity and that fire is coming. so mnay saints i talk to think it's going to be peace and safety but i hear from heaven a sudden and utter destruction coming and i see and feel the urgency for repentance, yet the saints are just coasting along for the most part :-?

for those that would REPENT, REPENT, REPENT OR DIE!!!

General Topics :: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/4/22 11:20

Bro Boomatt said

Quote:
-----Of course the only real security we have is in christ, everything else is vanity. Islam is a deadly threat anybody who doesnt believe in Allah.

amen bro! brethren what's so scary about death though?

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/4/22 11:31

sis diane
you're off into some deep waters here...

Quote:
-----I find it interesting that no where in the Bible is there a case of enemies arising except that permitted by God. Do you think that is still true today?

amen, the enemy can only do what he is allowed by heaven and no enemy may be raised up against anyone lest heaven allows it first, ie nothing happens outside the will of God, He is not taken by surprise.

Quote:
-----I appreciate your clarification. Jesus said, "What good is it to gain the whole world and forfeit your soul". I can't help but wonder (I speak generally), Does the pursuit of temporal security come with a price-tag - we forfeit our very souls? Do we forfeit God's eternal promises?

this is a sobering question. it makes you think about all the times we retaliate to attack reflexively without giving thought to the fact that it may be a judgment and there is something to be repented from. Sometimes we need to call a solemn assembly and fall on our faces before God. i wonder sometimes how it would have been had such an assembly been called by the president after 9/11. when we do pursue our own preservation or security by our own means without trusting God we show lack of Faith in Him and without faith it is impossible to please Him. it seems that this opens a can of worms...

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2006/4/22 11:47

Brother Matt wrote:

Quote:
-----The threat of Islam will take years to erase, if not impossible. It takes much needed education in that area, unfortunately, I dont believe they will be taught christ.

Brother Rahman suggested that I read this book:

All the Shah's Men, An American Coup and the Roots of Middle East Terror
By Stephen Kinzer

In Chapter two, this author covers the roots of the religion of Shiite Islam. I just read this this morning and it will take 4 or 5 posts to develop the whole thought for the statement you made above.

After reading this chapter you will know why the Shiite Muslim poses such a threat to the nations seeking oil. You will see why the current administration might even use nuclear weapons to bring about their will on this nation...

Page 18

Many countries in the Middle East are artificial creations. European colonialists drew their national borders in the nineteenth or twentieth century, often with little regard for local history and tradition, and their leaders have had to concoct outlandish myths in order to give citizens a sense of nationhood. Just the opposite is true of Iran. This is one of the world's oldest nations, heir to a tradition that reaches back thousands of years, to periods when great conquerors extended their rule across continents, poets and artists created works of exquisite beauty, and one of the world's most extraordinary religious traditions took root and flowered. Even in modern times, which have been marked by long periods of anarchy, repression, and suffering, Iranians are passionately inspired by their heritage.

Great themes run through Iranian history and shape it to this day. One is the continuing and often frustrating effort to find a synthesis between Islam, which was imposed on the country by Arab conquerors, and the rich heritage of pre-Islamic times. Another, fueled by the Shiite Muslim tradition to which most Iranians now belong, is the thirst for just leadership, of which they have enjoyed precious little. A third, also sharpened by Shiite beliefs, is a tragic view of life rooted in a sense of martyrdom and communal pain. Finally, Iran has since time immemorial been a target of foreign invaders, victim of a geography that places it astride some of the world's most important trading routes and atop an ocean of oil, and it has struggled to find a way to live with powerful outsiders. All these strains combined in the middle of the twentieth century to produce and then destroy the towering figure of Mohammad Mossadegh.

Migrants from Central Asia and the Indian subcontinent began arriving in what is now Iran nearly four thousand years ago, pushed out by a combination of resource depletion and marauding tribes from the north and east. Among them were the Aryans, from whose name the word Iran is taken. The emperor who united these gifted visionaries and the figure who first conceived the idea of an empire based in the region known as Pars (later Fars).

After rising to power in 559 BC., Cyrus, launched a brilliant campaign that brought other leaders on the vast Iranian plateau under his sway. Some he conquered, but many he won to his side by persuasion and compromise. Today he is remembered for his conquests but also for the relative gentleness with which he treated his subjects. He understood that this was an even surer way to build a durable empire than the more common means of oppression, terror, and slaughter.

In 547 Cyrus marched into Asia Minor and captured the majestic Lydian capital of Sardis. Seven years later he subdued the other great regional power, Babylon. Over the decades that followed, he and his successors went on to more great victories, including one by Xerxes in which Macedon, Thermopylae, and Athens were taken by an army of 180,000 men, by far the largest seen in Europe up to that time. This dynasty, known as the Achaemenians, built the greatest empire of its era. By 500 B.C., it embraced the eastern Mediterranean from Greece through modern-day Turkey, Lebanon, Israel, Egypt, and Libya and stretched eastward across the Caucasus to the banks of the Indus. Cyrus called it Persia because it sprang from his own base in Pars.

The tolerant and all-embracing approach to life and politics for which Achaemenian emperors were known sprang in part from their connection to the Zoroastrian faith, which holds that the sacred responsibility of every human being is to work toward establishing social justice on earth. Zoroastrians believe that humanity is locked in an eternal struggle between good and evil. Theirs is said to have been the first revealed religion to preach that people must face judgment after death, and that each soul will spend eternity in either paradise or perdition. According to its precepts, God makes his judgment according to how virtuous one has been in life, measured by one's thoughts, words, and deeds. The prophet Zoroaster, later known to Europeans as Zarathustra, lived sometime between the tenth and seventh centuries B.C. in what is now northeastern Iran, and preached this creed after a series of divine visions. Zoroastrianism has had a profound effect on Persian history not simply because Cyrus used it in his audaciously successful campaign of empire-building, but because it has captured the hearts of so many believers over the course of so many centuries

to be continued...

As you read this snapshot of Iranian history, meditate on the Scriptures which speak of this time...

Sister Diane has established the biblical view that Christians should realize...

In Christ
Jeff

General Topics :: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/22 12:12

Hi rookie,

What are your current views on Iran?

If they still persue a nuclear program, and continue to threaten Israel, would you advocate disarming them?

Here is a little something I found:

Iran, Israel, Russia, United States This Week Have Lept Toward Ezekiel 38

By Bill Wilson, KIN Senior Analyst - www.watch.org

Wash—Apr 19—KIN— So far this week, Iran, Russia, the United States, Syria, the Palestinian Authority and Israel have taken monumental steps toward prophetic fulfillment of the Ezekiel 38 prophecy where Gog, Magog, Persia, Libya, Ethopia and other nations of the world come, as it says in verse 16, "against my people of Israel, as a cloud to cover the land."

Iran's President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad gave a clue to his so-called peaceful nuclear program by saying that Iran's army will "serve peace and security for mankind especially the region and its neighbors." And he said that Iran stands ready to employ its technology and manpower to "cut the hand of any aggressor" who threatens it. In the past, Ahmadinejad has said that he would use nuclear power to bring about peace. The type of peace Ahmadinejad has in mind is the peace that comes after all the world submits to the Iranian Islamic authority.

Israel's Ambassador to the United Nations, Dan Gillerman, told the international body that the actions of Iran, Syria and the Palestinian Authority amount to "clear declarations of war." Gillerman said, "A dark cloud is looming above our region, and it is metastasizing as a result of the statements and actions by leaders of Iran, Syria, and the newly elected government of the Palestinian Authority." And President George W. Bush, in response to a question whether he is considering a nuclear strike in response to Iran, replied, "All options are on the table. We want to solve this issue diplomatically and we're working hard to do so."

The rhetoric from all sources has amplified since Monday's Hamas-supported terrorist attack in Tel Aviv. Russian Foreign Ministry Spokesman Mikhail Kamynin said "We resolutely and unconditionally condemn this bloody attack by extremists who again are raising their hands against innocent people." But the Russian response called those involved in the terror attack "extremists," ignoring the fact that the Hamas leadership unconditionally supported the Tel Aviv attack. Palestinian terrorists later demanded an apology from the Palestinian Authority's President Mahmoud Abbas, who condemned the attacks.

Last week, Iran's Ahmadinejad called Israel a "rotten, dried tree" that will be annihilated by "one storm." And he previously said Israel should be "wiped off the map." Each of these nations this week have advanced into the end times as if they had no choice and no indicator that they were moving in that direction. As the Lord says in Ezekiel 38:4, "I will turn you back and put hooks into your jaws, and I will bring you forth, and all your army." These current events are moving with amazing speed toward prophetic fulfillment. And the things prophesied may well happen "before your eyes" as the Lord says in Ezekiel 38:16, "that the heathen may know me." You might wake up one day and see it. Are you prepared?

Peace be with you all!
Boomatt

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/4/22 12:49

bro Boomatt

Iran is going to be a big issue, or should i say it already is. i was listening to Art Katz speaking about Ezekiel, the prophet of resurrection and in this he speaks of the need for the death of the nation of israel as we know it. The current state is jews in name only for the most part, practising the jewish faith and yet like their ancestors having no true reverence for God but just going through the motions, kinda like how we are as the Church. now i'm not sure if iran will be the tool the Lord uses to bring this death about such that the result will be a people who return with contrition to God and repent. Most call themselves israeli as opposed to israelites and the capital right now is tel-aviv as opposed to Jerusalem, when Chris

t returns He'll be coming back to Jerusalem.

this is all very interesting, the times we're living in and all these goings on. the persians have a role to play in all this and it will be interesting to see how it all plays out.

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/22 13:18

This truly is a scary time

I think I have a pretty good signature. We need to be in constant prayer for Israel.

I find Joel 3:2 to be a pretty scary prophecy for the future. Notice how it says He will Gather ALL NATIONS.

god bless

Pruners of the Vine...? - posted by ccchhrrriiss (), on: 2006/4/22 14:49

Hi IRONMAN...

Quote:
-----this is the topic of the whole discussion: what sort of fruit grow on ths Bush ok i had to throw that in there, but seriously what sort of fruit is he producing? When one makes the claim to be a Christian those of us who are have to check the fruit to see if it is true. As Christians we have to judge ourselves and eachother so that if the fruit are bad, those branches can be cut off or even uproot the whole tree.

With all due respect, I don't think that it is possible for you to make such a "determination of fruit" by viewing the "fruit" as presented by a worldwide media that is obviously biased. Unless you really know this man (President Bush), do you feel comfortable enough to go around basing such judgment (or "fruit inspection") on the speculations or assumptions that are based primarily upon such a skewed reputation as presented by the media? This is the entire problem with most spiritual "fruit inspectors." Either they feel too determined to inspect fruit based upon their *own understanding or perception* of what "good fruit" and "bad fruit" is, or they are relying too much on "supernatural discernment" that is often anything but that!

Even though we are commended to "*know them by their fruit*," is it really our job to do the actual pruning? Would you feel safe enough to be the one holding the pruning tool? From what I understand from the Word, we are to do our best to determine the sheep from the goats, but it is the responsibility of the Son of Man to do the separating (Matthew 25:31-33). I would not feel comfortable enough to do that. Yes, we are to separate ourselves from this world -- but in a *spiritual* sense.

As far as a "fear" of the end of America: Why should we worry? If we are walking with the Lord, it shouldn't matter what the outcome will be, because "*...to live is Christ, and to die is gain...*" Jesus did not come to "take us out of this world" but to "protect" us from this world as we walk with Him (John 17:15). There are individuals that sometimes write troubling posts about believers "being deceived" by the anti-Christ before the Lord's return. But in reality, such warnings often come from believers that are upset that someone else doesn't buy into their particular beliefs about doctrine, views of physically-manifest holiness, or end-time prophecy. But if I am truly fellowshiping with the Lord, if I know His Word, and if I truly know and love His heart, and if the highlight of my life is to spend time with Him -- will I be so easily deceived?

As far the situation in Iran and Iraq is concerned, I believe that we are not to act us unwise in making assumptions about such issues. There are certainly many "armchair generals" that do not truly understand many of the deep and perplexing issues in this situation. Their research is confined to the internet and a certain selection of biased books. When I began my thesis research on the Iran Hostage Crisis, it was easy to distinguish *real* sources from sources of obvious *bias*. Unfortunately, it seems that many individuals have a difficult time with this concept. A biased work will often make a determination before the work is even begun. This is true with everything -- not just issues of faith, doctrine or even foreign policy.

Is President Bush a Christian? Like I said before, that is not my call to make. He openly claims to be one. Even though some question his policy decisions, the President seems quite sincere. He has acted upon certain issues (like abortion, stem cell research, etc...), that haven't made him very popular. Yes, there are certain things that can be determined by his actions. But his salvation? Besides, most of what we "know" is from skewed reports. And aren't you glad that people don't "inspect" our fruit by what others say about us? And more importantly, aren't you glad that people are not trying to prune us from the vine due to our apparent faults?

General Topics :: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?

:-)

Re: Pruners of the Vine...? - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/4/22 18:38

bro Chris

Quote:
-----With all due respect, I don't think that it is possible for you to make such a "determination of fruit" by viewing the "fruit" as presented by a worldwide media that is obviously biased. Unless you really know this man (President Bush), do you feel comfortable enough to go around basing such judgment (or "fruit inspection") on the speculations or assumptions that are based primarily upon such a skewed reputation as presented by the media? This is the entire problem with most spiritual "fruit inspectors." Either they feel too determined to inspect fruit based upon their own understanding or perception of what "good fruit" and "bad fruit" is, or they are relying too much on "supernatural discernment" that is often anything but that!

i agree bro which is why we have to be dilligent in our research and go beyond what the media says because the media as i see it for example is thus

fox news paints a more favourable picture of bush than does cnn. the truth is probably somewhere in the middle though so we have to dig through the mire and muck to see what the truth is. so the determination of what sort of fruit is on this tree is not dependant on what the media says. however what is the fruit of a person other than what he or she does in public and an private?

Quote:
-----Even though we are commended to "know them by their fruit," is it really our job to do the actual pruning? Would you feel safe enough to be the one holding the pruning tool? From what I understand from the Word, we are to do our best to determine the sheep from the goats, but it is the responsibility of the Son of Man to do the seperating (Matthew 25:31-33). I would not feel comfortable enough to do that. Yes, we are to separate ourselves from this world -- but in a spiritual sense.

i didn't say anything about us doing the pruning but i see how you could have extrapolated that from what i said though. the Lord is the one who prunes, now he may use any one of us to do it or whatever other means. if the Lord were to say to me "I am going to use you to prune so and so or such and such" then i'll say "ok Lord, go ahead and do what you must , here am i"

Quote:
-----As far as a "fear" of the end of America: Why should we worry? If we are walking with the Lord, it shouldn't matter what the outcome will be, because "...to live is Christ, and to die is gain..." Jesus did not come to "take us out of this world" but to "protect" us from this world as we walk with Him (John 17:15). There are individuals that sometimes write troubling posts about believers "being deceived" by the anti-Christ before the Lord's return. But in reality, such warnings often come from believers that are upset that someone else doesn't buy into their particular beliefs about doctrine, views of physically-manifest holiness, or end-time prophecy. But if I am truly fellowshiping with the Lord, if I know His Word, and if I truly know and love His heart, and if the highlight of my life is to spend time with Him -- will I be so easily deceived?

and that is a big if, are we walking in His will as we should? if we were, judgment would not come. i agree some people do lash out when people disagree with their eschatological point of view but there are some who are speaking what they hear from heaven and people lump those ones in with the ones who lash out and as a result the message is missed and people are left wondering what happened after the fact. consider all the prophesies against israel, the warnings and calls to repentance, the prophesies of doom, how many people listened to those? very few. there was no repentance and when the judgement came people who though they were walking in the Lord's will but were not were left shocked and disillusioned.the prophets were seen as crackpots saying all kinds of foolish things. the truth is most people think they're walking in the Lord's will but really are not so when these things happen they will be completely lost and and at a loss as to what happened.bro here's where the Lord has me at, He's showing me all these things concerning what is to come, then charging me with the task to spit it out as He leads. ok Lord, i'm doing it and yet very few saints i've run across seem to be getting. i not only see but i feel the urgency for the need for repentance and there are few i've encountered who can identify with that. this says to me a lot of people are deceived into a false sense of security. When the Lord has me post such messages, it is indeed Him speaking to His saints, or whosoever will listen. now when people thought me a nutcase before it would throw me into a fit coz i ego was bruised (that's self rising up) but not so any more. The Lord has brok

General Topics :: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?

en me down such that i realize that it is by His grace i can see these things coming and understand or else i'd be as lost
ir not more lost than the ones He sends me to concerning what's coming. i feel now a sense of anguish which is his own
anguish over the fact that people don't listen to what the Lord's prophets come out and say. when it comes to things suc
h as these bro, i speak only what i hear from heaven and what i hear is what i spit out.

Quote:
-----As far the situation in Iran and Iraq is concerned, I believe that we are not to act us unwise in making assumptions about such issue
s. There are certainly many "armchair generals" that do not truly understand many of the deep and perplexing issues in this situation. Their research is
confined to the internet and a certain selection of biased books. When I began my thesis research on the Iran Hostage Crisis, it was easy to distinguis
h real sources from sources of obvious bias. Unfortunately, it seems that many individuals have a difficult time with this concept. A biased work will oft
en make a determination before the work is even begun. This is true with everything -- not just issues of faith, doctrine or even foreign policy.

i agree we shouldn't be making unwise assumptions and decisions. the thing is the Lord has shown this to me about the
upcoming war with iran and the looming economic collapse here for the sake of those who will listen to the warnings. i k
now i'm not the only one who sees this train coming... bro, i don't give a rip about economics, foreign policy etc, i'm a sci
entist. you evidently know a whole lot more about foreign policy than i do, you have a degree in the stuff. all this which th
e Lord has shown me is simple enough for me to grasp by His own grace, as to why He's showing this to me (of all peop
le) and others who're not on the evening news (or who really care about or are learned concerning this kinda stuff) seem
s to me like the Lord using the foolish things to confound the wise...

Quote:
-----Is President Bush a Christian? Like I said before, that is not my call to make. He openly claims to be one. Even though some questi
on his policy decisions, the President seems quite sincere. He has acted upon certain issues (like abortion, stem cell research, etc...), that haven't mad
e him very popular. Yes, there are certain things that can be determined by his actions. But his salvation? Besides, most of what we Â"knowÂ" is from
skewed reports. And aren't you glad that people don't Â"inspectÂ" our fruit by what others say about us? And more importantly, aren't you glad tha
t people are not trying to prune us from the vine due to our apparent faults?

yo bro, i don't doubt the man's sincerity on some things yet on others my spirit percieves lying. is there some lying going
on, sure there is, i lie sometimes, so do you so do we all. at the end of the day though the Lord has things which can onl
y be done through this administration so i wholeheartedly agreed with bush when he said he felt the Lord wanted him to
be in power because if God didn't, it would not be so. as it pertains to me being pruned, if i need it, and God knows i do,
prune me. if it appears the fruit on this tree look bad and the Lord needs for you Chris to be a tool for that pruning, hey m
an prune me!

if i seem over the top or you're wondering, yeah i am, but such is the nature of the jealousy i feel for the Lord's Church a
nd the urgency of the situation we're in.

help us Lord!!!AMEN.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2006/4/22 21:15

Hi IRONMAN...

Quote:
-----i didn't say anything about us doing the pruning but i see how you could have extrapolated that from what i said though. the Lord is t
he one who prunes, now he may use any one of us to do it or whatever other means. if the Lord were to say to me "I am going to use you to prune so
and so or such and such" then i'll say "ok Lord, go ahead and do what you must, here am i"

yo bro, i don't doubt the man's sincerity on some things yet on others my spirit percieves lying. is there some lying going on, sure there is, i lie sometim
es, so do you so do we all. at the end of the day though the Lord has things which can only be done through this administration so i wholeheartedly agr
eed with bush when he said he felt the Lord wanted him to be in power because if God didn't, it would not be so. as it pertains to me being pruned, if i
need it, and God knows i do, prune me. if it appears the fruit on this tree look bad and the Lord needs for you Chris to be a tool for that pruning, hey ma
n prune me!

But don't you think that it is possible to "prune" with our hearts and words? I personally feel that the Church is often too
willing to personally prune as they "feel led" by the Lord. This would be wonderful if people were truly led by the Lord. U
nfortunately, even in a room filled with wonderful and sincere believers, it is difficult to get two people to agree on certain

matters. All it takes is for one believer to state their belief about a matter, and suddenly another believer is willing to "prune."

Did President Bush lie? This is a very strong allegation to state as fact -- when the statement itself might not be true in this case. This is often reported by Democrats, although they typically don't use the word "lie" (instead, they are told to say "misled" -- which, by constant spin, alludes to "mishandled leadership"). But as human beings, we seem prone to state our educated speculation (or even spiritual speculation) as fact. Someone may even feel like God felt a need to personally tell them such information. But by stating this sort of speculation or belief as a "fact," it might possibly amount to a lie itself -- or even slander.

Remember, President Bush received the same reports that were given to Congress by the Pentagon. These reports included not only the intelligence from the US, but also from the UK, Russia, France, Germany and a few other nations. Even if this intelligence was not conclusive, it was indeed very frightening. But again, I must point out that the justification for military action was not based on WMDs. This notion is based mostly on the spin issued by the most anti-war liberals of the Democratic Party. The real justification for war was due to the immense violations by Saddam's government of the restrictions set forth following the first Gulf War. As far as the WMDs are concerned, the intelligence was almost certainly flawed. But should we say that President Bush lied about this?

The opinion of most experts in executive and foreign policy (even those of liberal and idealist persuasions) is that the intelligence itself was flawed, or at worst, misinterpreted. Saddam indeed claimed that he possessed these weapons. In the recent past, he threatened to use these "weapons" on both "Israel and the support of Israel" (obviously, the US and UK). Over the course of a decade, he performed terrible acts of evil upon people in his own country (including both "unregistered" Christians and believers unwilling or unable to pay "religious taxes"). Saddam also ordered and funded an attempt on a former President -- itself an act of war. And of course, Saddam provided incredible funds to the families of suicide bombers (he called 'martyrs') in Israel.

The United States began a preemptive war against Saddam after he repeatedly laughed off a belief that the US and other nations would take military action. The concept of a preemptive strike is not new. Israel felt an immediate threat in 1967, and struck quickly at the nations surrounding it, and thus began the Six Day War. The Administration claims that the danger of WMDs in the hands of a madman was too much to ignore. And while the WMDs have not yet been found (although information and science pertaining to it has been found), there were several benefits for going into war. Saddam was a ruthless dictator amassing incredible amounts of dangerous conventional weapons, which were illegal following his terms of surrender following the first Gulf War. I have photos of the daily demolition of these weapons, most of which were illegally sold by France, Russia and Germany (including land mines, missiles, and other very large explosive devices). The UN's "Oil-for-Food" program was corrupt, providing Saddam with great amounts of money, while his own people starved. And while his army was relatively weak, his rhetoric was quite dangerous -- still provoking terrorist acts today.

As an undergraduate engineering major, I interned thrice with NASA Langley Research Center in Virginia. We were able to view some satellite photos that were remarkably clear. Yet while the clarity was remarkable, the photos are prone to errors of interpretation. The brightest minds in the Pentagon -- most of whom were there long before Bush became the President, interpreted this data as indicative of a dictator trying to jumpstart his WMD programs (which he had used many times in the past).

All that I am saying is that we should be very careful about saying someone lied about something we are not completely certain as such. In the thread about "fruit inspection," I stated a quote from a pastor, "*I believe in inspecting fruit. The only problem is that most 'fruit inspectors' have bad eyesight. And the biggest problem is that the people with the worst eyesight are usually the quickest to 'lay the axe at the root' of those that simply disagree with them.*" Often, our "skill" for such inspection of fruit can be clouded by our biases, lack of information, or by what we believe to be "discernment" (but later find out was suspicion).

Personally, I am not interested in whether or not President Bush possesses "good" or "bad" fruit. I am going to pray for him regardless, and of course, hope for the best. I will rejoice at the President's attempt to create new limits in abortion, as well as his stands against euthanasia, stem-cell research using the cells of aborted babies, explicit sex education for elementary children, abortion for children as young as 12 without parental consent, homosexual "marriage," etc... And I will also be careful not to mention slanderous things as fact that are certainly assumption or speculation in the clothing of "discernment." I'm not saying that is what this amounted to. In fact, I am pretty certain that your passion for the Lord's honor is just as great as mine and the other believers that fellowship on this site. But sometimes, our words can be easily misunderstood by those that read them.

Quote:

-----as it pertains to me being pruned, if i need it,and God knows i do, prune me. if it appears the fruit on this tree look bad and the Lord needs for you Chris to be a tool for that pruning, hey man prune me!

I definitely will try not to "prune" you. I really feel that this is the job of the Lord -- and the Lord alone. He is the Master Gardener. Instead, I hope that we can encourage one another, with both gentleness and truth in perfect love. If we see something that concerns us, as the family of God, we can point out our concerns privately in the manner as prescribed in the Word. Hopefully, we won't have to resort to any sort of verbal pruning in a public forum. If this is how you feel about the President, why not write him a heartfelt note? Perhaps that note will make it to his desk. You might be surprised!

:-)

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/4/22 23:07

bro Chris

Quote:
-----But don't you think that it is possible to "prune" with our hearts and words? I personally feel that the Church is often too willing to personally prune as they "feel led" by the Lord. This would be wonderful if people were truly led by the Lord. Unfortunately, even in a room filled with wonderful and sincere believers, it is difficult to get two people to agree on certain matters. All it takes is for one believer to state their belief about a matter, and suddenly another believer is willing to "prune."

i think that your assertion is correct, we can prune with our heart and minds and so on and we should be wary of that. this is something to pray much on.

Quote:
-----Did President Bush lie? This is a very strong allegation to state as fact -- when the statement itself might not be true in this case. This is often reported by Democrats, although they typically don't use the word "lie" (instead, they are told to say "misled" -- which, by constant spin, alludes to "mishandled leadership"). But as human beings, we seem prone to state our educated speculation (or even spiritual speculation) as fact. Someone may even feel like God felt a need to personally tell them such information. But by stating this sort of speculation or belief as a "fact," it might possibly amount to a lie itself -- or even slander.

did the president lie, maybe so, in the end it will all be exposed. the point i was trying to get across is that invariably there is some lying going on which we are all guilty of and we need to repent of that. not only that but all our shady deeds and words will be exposed one day. i had gotten past the whole wmd/iraq issue and was addressing something a bit more general but your statements are noted.

Quote:
-----I definitely will try not to "prune" you. I really feel that this is the job of the Lord -- and the Lord alone. He is the Master Gardener. Instead, I hope that we can encourage one another, with both gentleness and truth in perfect love. If we see something that concerns us, as the family of God, we can point out our concerns privately in the manner as prescribed in the Word. Hopefully, we won't have to resort to any sort of verbal pruning in a public forum. If this is how you feel about the President, why not write him a heartfelt note? Perhaps that note will make it to his desk. You might be surprised!

like i said bro, if the Lord calls on you and says He needs for you to be a tool to the pruning (or whatever other work) concerning myself or anyone else, do whatever the Lord says. we should indeed pray for our leadership and so i do like you pray for the pres. i don't have any beef with the pres although i don't agree with all he does (i actually agree with him on more things than i thought which is rather refreshing and humbling at the same time) i suppose that a lot of my concerns were fleshly but over time i realized that the Lord has it all in hand. incidentally i did write him a letter after 9/11. i'm unsure if he got it though. as for our words oft being misunderstood or the talking past each other as it's called, that happens a whole lot...i think we had some of that going on here. nonetheless we should always be able to encourage each other and correct each other when we veer off course by whatever means the Lord prescribes.

God bless you bro

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2006/4/23 9:50

All the Shah's Men, An American Coup and the Roots of Middle East Terror

By Stephen Kinzer

The Zoroastrian religion taught Iranians that citizens have an inalienable right to enlightened leadership and that the duty of subjects is not simply to obey wise kings but also to rise up against those who are wicked. Leaders are seen as representatives of God on earth, but they deserve allegiance only as long as they have farr, a kind divine blessing that they must earn by moral behavior. To pray for it, generations of Persian leaders visited Zoroastrian temples where holy flames burned perpetually, symbolizing the importance of constant vigilance against iniquity.

Cyrus and the other kings of his line bound their vast empire together with roads, bridges, uniform coinage, and efficient system of taxation, and the world's first long-range postal service. But eventually and inevitably, the tide of history turned against them. Their empire began to shake after Darius, Persia's last great leader, lost the decisive Battle of Maratton in 490 B.C. The death blow came from no less a conqueror than Alexander, who marched into Persia in 334 B.C. and, in a rampage of destruction, sacked and burned Persepolis.

For the next ten centuries, through periods of rule by three dynasties, Persians nurtured and deepened their strong feelings of pride and nobility. They flourished by assimilating influences from the lands around them, especially Greece, Egypt, and India, reshaping them to fit within the framework of their Zoroastrian faith. In the third century A.D. they began returning to the peak of world power on a scale that recalled the glory of the early emperors, capturing Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria and pushing to the walls of Constantinople. Persian armies suffered a reverse at the hands of the Byzantines in 626, but the great defeat was yet to come. A few years later, an army arose on the barren Arabian peninsula and turned toward Persia. These Arabs came armed not only with the traditional weapons of war, but with a new religion, Islam.

The invasion by the Arabs, who to the cultivated Persians seemed no more than barbarians, was a decisive turning point in the nation's history. Persia's fate paralleled that of many empires. Its army had been worn down by long campaigns, its leaders had slipped from what Zoroastrian priests would call the realm of light into that of darkness, and the priests themselves had become divorced from the masses. People fell into poverty as the greedy court imposed ever-increasing taxes. Tyranny tore apart the social contract between ruler and ruled that Zoroastrian doctrine holds to be the basis of organized life. By both political and religious standards, the last of the pre-Islamic dynasties in Persia, the Sassanians, lost the right to rule. The merciless logic of history dictated that it be overrun by an ascendant people fired by passionate belief in its leaders, its cause, and its faith.

Sassanian power was centered in Ctesiphon, the luxurious capital of Mesopotamia. This was not a city of stately columns like Persepolis but one bathed in excess. Its royal palace housed fabulous collections of jewels and was guarded by statuary of solid gold and silver. The centerpiece was the king's cavernous audience hall, which featured a ninety-foot-square silk carpet depicting a flowering garden and, metaphorically, the empire's wealth and power. Rubies, pearls, and diamonds were sewn into it with golden threads. When Arab conquerors reached Ctesiphon in 638, they looted the palace and sent the magnificent carpet to Mecca, where Muslim leaders ordered it cut to pieces to show their contempt for worldly wealth. They destroyed countless treasures, including the entire royal library. In an account of this conquest written by the tenth-century Persian poet Ferdowsi, a general laments; "Curse this world, curse this time, curse this fate / That uncivilized Arabs have come to force me to be Muslim."

to be continued...

In Christ

Jeff

General Topics :: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2006/4/23 10:02

Brother Boomatt wrote:

Quote:

-----What are your current views on Iran?

If they still persue a nuclear program,and continue to threaten Israel, would you advocate disarming them?

If it is approaching end times what can this nation do based on this Sceipture?

Rev. 6:4 Another horse, fiery red, went out. And it was granted to the one who sat on it to take peace from the earth, and that people should kill one another; and there was given to him a great sword.

I live as a pilgram looking to a heavenly country. My weapons are not carnal but...

2 Corinthians 10:

5 casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought i nto captivity to the obedience of Christ, 6 and being ready to punish all disobedience when your obedience is fulfilled.

What does this mean to a believer? (to bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ)

God Bless
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2006/4/24 15:14

All the Shah's Men, An American Coup and the Roots of Middle East Terror
By Stephen Kinzer

continued from previous post...

Â...page 22

By the time of the Arab conquest, Persians already had long experience in assimilating foreign cultures, and whenever t hey did so, they shaped those cultures to their liking or took certain parts while resisting others. So it was when they we re forced to adopt Islam. They had no choice but to accept Mohammad as God's prophet and the Koran as God's wo rd, but over

A period of centuries they fashioned an interpretation of Islam quite different from that of their Arab conquerors. This int erpretation, called Shiism, is based on a particular reading of Islamic history, and it has the ingenious effect of using Isla m to reinforce long-standing Iranian beliefs.

About 90% of the one billion Muslims in the world today identify with the Sunni tradition. Of the remainder, most are Shii tes, the largest number of whom are in Iran. The split between these two groups springs from differing interpretations of who deserved to succeed the prophet Mohammad as caliph, or leader of the Islamic world, after his death in 632. Shiite s believe that his legitimate successor was Ali, a cousin whom he raised from childhood and who married one of his dau ghters. Ali was one of those to whom Mohammad dictated his revelations, which became known as the Koran, and he o nce slept in Mohammad's bed as a decoy to foil a murder plot. But another man was chosen as caliph, and soon Ali fo und himself in the position of a dissident. He criticized the religious establishment for seeking worldly power and diluting the purity of its spiritual inheritance. Economic discontent brought many to his side, and ultimately the conflict turned vio lent.

Ali was passed over twice more when caliphs died, and he devoted himself to preaching a doctrine of piety and social ju stice that won him many followers, especially among the lower classes. He finally won the supreme post in 656, but the conflict only intensified, and less than five years later he was assassinated while praying inside the mosque at Kufa, a M esopotamian garrison town that was a cauldron of religious conflict. According to tradition, he knew he was to be murde

red that day but refused to flee because "one cannot stop death." After being stabbed, he cried out, "O God, most fortunate I am!"

The mantle of resistance passed to Ali's son, Hussein, who was himself killed while leading seventy-two followers against an army of thousands in a suicidal revolt at Karbala in 680. Determined to suppress Hussein's legacy, the authorities ordered most of his family slain afterward. His body was trampled in the mud and his severed head taken to Damascus, where Shiites believe that it continued to chant the Koran even as the caliph beat it with a stick. Retelling these stories and others about Hussein, "the lord among martyrs," is what provokes the paroxysm that spread through Qom and other sacred Iranian cities every year on the anniversary of his death.

Hussein's embrace of death in a sacred cause has shaped the collective psyche of Iranians. To visit Qom during the mourning that commemorates his martyrdom is to be caught up in a wave of emotion so intense that it is hard for an outsider to comprehend. Processions of men and boys dressed in black move slowly, as if in a trance, toward the gate of the main shrine. All the while, they chant funeral verses lamenting Hussein's fate and flog themselves with metal-studded whips until their shoulders and backs are streaked with blood. In storefront mosques, holy men recount the sad tale with such passion that soon after they begin, worshipers fall prostrate with grief, weeping uncontrollably as if the most intimate personal tragedy had just crushed them. The breathtaking authenticity of this scene testifies to the success Iran's Shiites have had in formulating a set of religious beliefs that is within the Islamic tradition but still distinctly native.

to be continued...

Strive to get a hold on this material...you will then begin to understand why these Shiite Muslims do the thing they do...

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/24 15:32

2 Corinthians 10:3-4

3: For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh.

4: For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2006/4/24 15:41

continued from preceding post...

Page 23

Sunnis do not attribute great importance to the violent deaths of Ali or Hussein, but for Shiites, whose name comes from the phrase Shi'at-Ali, or "followers of Ali," they were cataclysmic events. To them, Ali and Hussein represent both the mystic spirituality of pure Islam and the self-sacrificing life that true Muslims must live. In this view, shaped by Zoroastrian tradition, the two heroes rebelled against an establishment that had become corrupt and thereby lost its way. They are believed to have sacrificed themselves, as the truly pious must, on the altar of evil. By doing so they embraced a pattern that still shapes Iran's consciousness. They bequeathed to Shiites a legacy of religious zeal and a willingness, even an eagerness, to embrace martyrdom at the hands of God's enemies. Ali remains the most perfect soul and the most enlightened leader who ever lived, excepting only the Prophet himself; Shiites still pore over his speeches and memorize thousands of proverbs and aphorisms. Hussein epitomizes the self-sacrifice that is the inevitable fate of all who truly love Islam and humanity. His martyrdom is considered even more universally significant than that of Ali because it was inflicted by government soldiers rather than by a lone fanatic. Grasping the depth of this passion is essential to any understanding of modern Iran.

Iranian Shiites consider Ali to have been the first of twelve legitimate imams, or successors to Mohammad. The twelfth was still a youth when he passed into an occult state, apart from the world but aware of its suffering. For Iranian believers he is still vividly alive. They revere him as the Twelfth Imam, often called the Hidden Imam or the Imam of the Age, and many pray each day for his return to earth. When he does return, he will be the Mahdi, or messiah, who will right all wrongs and usher in an age of perfect justice. Until that time, it is the duty of temporal rulers to emulate his wisdom and righteousness. When they fail to do so, they trample not only on human rights but on the very will of God.

“The Imam watches over men inwardly and is in communion with the soul and spirit of men even if he be hidden from their physical eyes,” the twentieth-century Shiite scholar Allamah Tabatabai has written. “His existence is always necessary, even if the time has not yet arrived for his outward appearance and the universal reconstruction that he is to bring about.”

The profound hold that this tradition has on the souls of Iranian Shiites raises their beliefs above the level of traditional doctrine to what the anthropologist Michael M. J. Fisher has called “a drama of faith.” They revere Mohammad but focus far more viscerally on Ali and Hussein, embracing what Fisher calls “a story expandable to be all-inclusive of history, cosmology and life’s problems” and reinforcing it with “ritual or physical drama to embody the story and maintain high levels of emotional investment.” Ali and Hussein gave them a paradigm that tells them not only how the moral believer should live, but also how he should die.

to be continued...

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2006/4/25 16:30

This is a side note...

I read Brother Gregg's and Mike's request about conduct on this site. In particular, the idea of politics and pushing agendas. I thought about it for some time and searched my own motivations if you will...

I do have an agenda which might be described as a pursuit to tear down the ways we allow ourselves to search for hope in the world of politics. From time to time I am guilty of baiting a hook to see if anyone might run with a divisive issue concerning politics. This method, I find now wrong. I will no longer bait people in this way. Please forgive me.

There is much in Scripture which teaches us of man's ways and how he rules over others to their injury. I will not try to point to current day leaders as those who may be representative of the examples that are given to us in Scripture. I will endeavor to point out the examples in Scripture and let Scripture convict or confirm what is in each individual's heart. This is a path that I myself must learn.

Authentic fellowship does bring the ugliness of our corrupt flesh into the light. For the ugliness that I have baited you in this thread please forgive me.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by boomatt (), on: 2006/4/25 16:35

Jeff,

I think that is a very humble thing to do. You don't see many Christians that are like that these days anymore.

God bless you brother,

boomatt

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2006/4/26 0:09

Rookie,

Thanks much for your last thoughtful post brother. It is appreciated.

Quote:
-----This is a path that I myself must learn.

General Topics :: President Bush, Good or Bad Fruit?

It seems one of the hardest paths for me to learn is how not to place additional earthly burdens on others that the Lord never intended them to carry...political conspiracies produce so many anxious questions but rarely any conclusions.

Yet inspite of political controversies, I appreciate your spiritual perspectives and the challenge to my own perceptions. Having grown up in Lynchburg during the heyday of Jerry Falwells' Moral Majority it has unwittingly taken me twenty years to untangle Hal Lindsey and Cal Thomas from the Gospel.

And now, with the help of brothers like you, I am seeing Paul and the early apostolic message in a new light these days..and perhaps understanding a little more why this Gospel of Jesus unraveled mighty Rome and its imperial theology of state...achieving what all of the world's militaries had failed to do.

This theme of being "called out" has been on my heart much this past year, and I think you have played a role in that.

Blessings,

MC

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2006/4/26 14:47

Thankyou for your fellowship Brothers.

I will stop using this thread and repost the historic background of the Shiite Muslim on a separate thread.

God Bless
In Christ
Jeff

Re: EVERY KNEE WILL BOW, on: 2006/4/27 7:03

FOR GOD SO LOVED THE WORLD,i pray that a christian can preach to saddam in jesus name.