



**News and Current Events :: Do you believe him?**

**Do you believe him?, on: 2007/7/24 21:05**

[Image: <http://graphics8.nytimes.com/images/2007/07/24/us/24bush-600.jpg>]

**President Bush spoke before an audience of American military personnel at Charleston Air Force Base in South Carolina**

July 24, 2007

Bush Insists Al Qaeda in Iraq Threatens U.S.

By BRIAN KNOWLTON

WASHINGTON, July 24 — President George W. Bush argued forcefully today that an Al Qaeda-affiliated group in Iraq is linked tightly to the central Al Qaeda leadership, and that for American forces to leave Iraq without defeating the terror group would be “dangerous for the world and disastrous for America.”

He made the remarks at Charleston Air Force Base in South Carolina, at a time of fierce debate in Washington over Iraq policy. Last week, a major intelligence report concluded that the international Al Qaeda organization of Osama bin Laden had successfully regrouped, probably in rugged northwest Pakistan, and that it is as strong as it has been in years.

In a half-hour speech clearly aimed at his Democratic critics, Mr. Bush said that those who argued that the affiliated group, called Al Qaeda in Iraq or AQI, was a local group with local objectives, and not a serious threat to Americans at home, were seriously misinformed.

“It’s hard to argue that Al Qaeda in Iraq is separate from bin Laden’s Al Qaeda when the leader of Al Qaeda in Iraq took an oath of allegiance to Osama bin Laden,” Mr. Bush said, referring to Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, a leader of the affiliated group in Iraq who was killed last year.

Mr. Bush called the two similarly named groups “an alliance of killers,” and said, “No enemy is more ruthless in Iraq than Al Qaeda.”

The president’s remarks focused almost entirely on links between the two groups and on threats they pose. His tone was particularly tough. Mr. Bush’s message did not vary much in substance from what he has long said about the group, though he added some details, apparently based in part on newly declassified information.

Critics of the administration’s policy in Iraq, including some Democratic politicians, have said that Mr. Bush’s portrayal of the links between the Qaeda groups is overblown, and that the group in Iraq did not exist before the American-led invasion. The international group, they say, is the one that poses the much greater threat to the United States, while in Iraq, sectarian violence is a far greater concern than are foreign-led terrorist groups like Al Qaeda in Iraq.

Democrats reacted swiftly and dismissively to the president’s remarks. Senator John Kerry of Massachusetts, accusing Mr. Bush of “flawed logic,” said, “The president is putting forth a false rationale for continuing the war.”

Holding up a copy of the latest National Intelligence Estimate on terrorism, released by the administration last week, Mr. Kerry said, “Our own intelligence community tells us today unequivocally that our presence in Iraq has created more terrorists, attracted more terrorists.”

Senator Harry Reid of Nevada, the majority leader, said that “the president’s claim that the war in Iraq is protecting us from Al Qaeda is as misguided and dangerous as the conclusions that drove us to Iraq in the first place.”

“Despite what the president would like us to believe,” he added, “it has been established that Al Qaeda had no active cells in Iraq when we invaded, and we have long known that we were not attacked from Iraq on 9/11. Saying otherwise does not make it so.”

Still, judging by recent opinion polls, the president has had some recent success in making a case to voters for continuing the war in Iraq. He has insisted both that success is possible and that failure would be catastrophic, in part because Al

Qaeda in Iraq might then turn its attentions elsewhere.

Earlier today, the White House spokesman, Tony Snow, was asked why Mr. Bush felt the need at this point to insist that the two Al Qaeda groups were closely connected.

“I think, when somebody tries to argue that Al Qaeda in Iraq is not a key part of the problem, it creates a basis of saying, well, you need to go someplace else,” he said.

Mr. Bush emphasized in his remarks that Al Qaeda in Iraq’s top leaders include people from Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia and Turkey, and said that American forces had recently unmasked an effort by the group to pass off an Iraqi actor, using the surname al-Baghdadi, as its leader to give it a more Iraqi image.

Mr. Bush said that after the United States-led invasion of Iraq in 2003, Mr. Zarqawi “was able to expand dramatically the size, scope and lethality of his operation,” and that he swore formal allegiance to Mr. bin Laden the following year.

Mr. Bush said Al Qaeda in Iraq was now the only known extremist group in Iraq with ambitions of attacking American targets outside Iraq.

“We’ll stay on the hunt, we’ll deny them safe haven, and we will defeat them where they have made their stand,” he said. “However difficult the fight is in Iraq, we must win it. And we can win it.”

The intelligence assessment released last week concluded that the United States was losing ground against the international Al Qaeda terrorist organization, saying it had regrouped and had become significantly stronger in the past two years.

American officials have ascribed the Al Qaeda resurgence to a decision made last September by Gen. Pervez Musharraf, the president of Pakistan, to take a hands-off approach toward the tribal areas in the mountainous northwestern region of his country, along the border with Afghanistan, where Al Qaeda and Taliban militants are thought to be based.

Frances Fragos Townsend, the White House homeland security adviser, has urged General Musharraf to take a sharply tougher approach. She warned on Sunday that American military forces might conduct their own strikes in the border areas if necessary an idea Pakistan has rejected.

**Re: Do you believe him?, on: 2007/7/25 12:52**

worm-

I am a white middle class republican (or 'christian' as we call it in this country)... of course I believe him.

In Christ - Jim

**Re:, on: 2007/7/25 14:09**

Since I've been to Kuwait, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Israel & Turkey (in my Marine days) during Desert Storm... yes, I absolutely believe what he says. I've seen the hatred. If you haven't been there you ought not to be implying this is all a lie... because you're acting out of ignorance.

If you're not implying that, then please don't take what I just said personally. I just couldn't help but figure that's what you were meaning, judging by the title of your thread.

This is not a political issue with Al Quida. This is a fundamental belief issue with them. They aim to kill everyone who does not believe as they do, and they have world domination fantasies that make Hitler look like a cherub. Only a fool or a seriously uninformed person would believe otherwise. This is a much more serious threat than 90% of the people think it is.

So keep eating those McD fries and reading Harry Potter, America... everything is hunky dorey.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by MSeaman (), on: 2007/7/25 14:28**

So keep eating those McD fries and reading Harry Potter, America... everything is hunky dorey.

Krispy, you crack me up.

This is definitely a real threat. You can find legitimate information on it if you know where to look.

**Re:, on: 2007/7/25 16:53**

“The Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised.”

No WMDs were found.

“ has aided, trained and harbored terrorists, including operatives of Al Qaeda.”

Hussein was a modernist, Bin Laden a fundamentalist. The Bush Administration never found a link.

“America tried to work with the United Nations to address this threat because we wanted to resolve the issue peacefully.”

The United States formed the "coalition of the willing" and unilaterally decided to invade Iraq without the consent of the vast majority of the world's nations.

“If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you.”

650,000 Iraqis have died in this war, many of them innocent women and children. And during the nineties an estimated one million children starved to death because of U.S. led sanctions.

“We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free.”

He should have said, "we'll hire Halliburton to reconstruct everything for you". No work for the Iraqis, but lots of money for Americans in the way of weapons and reconstruction industry.

“Should Saddam Hussein choose confrontation, the American people can know that every measure has been taken to avoid war and every measure will be taken to win it.”

Saddam posed no threat to America. America posed a threat to Iraq's oil.

“The terrorist threat to America and the world will be diminished the moment that Saddam Hussein is disarmed.”

For every Iraqi kid killed by an American depleted uranium shell, ten more pop up. They're learning guerrilla tactics. And they want revenge.

The toppling of Hussein increased the threat of terrorism.

“Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty... The United States with other countries will work to advance liberty and peace in that region.”

The single biggest thing Iraqis miss about Saddam is "at least there was order". Rape, theft, kidnapping, murder, and terrorism are rampant under the U.S. puppet government (divide and conquer... makes it easy to git' their oil )

**Jim, on: 2007/7/25 17:05**

Quote:

-----I am a white middle class republican (or 'christian' as we call it in this country)... of course I believe him.  
-----

good.

as a former member of the intelligence community, when you have the Executive Branch of Govt, breathing down your neck, strong pressure to write a report on what they WANT to hear, I don't believe him.....and what has been happening is that both POTUS and VPOTUS have so alienated the CIA, that there is a wedge between the CIA, and the Executive branch that has never existed in this country before, that is the most disturbing element of all.

face it, the GOP is done in 08, unless of course "something bad" happens before then. Get your seatbelts on, and stay a way from crowds.

I could tell you stories of lies, that have been told to the public in the past, that would blow your mind. Not conspiracy theories, but facts I've seen.

**Re:, on: 2007/7/25 17:25**

Is the purpose of this thread to spark more controversy and division among the brethren? What does this have to do with discussion of theology or encouragement for the brethren?

Krispy

**Krispy, on: 2007/7/25 17:31**

I'm saying this in love, real gentlemanly-like.

You were lied to, circa 1990-91.

We gave that idiot Saddam Hussein a wink and nod, a tacit "go-ahead" to light up Kuwait, it's true. Know why?

Ever since the Iranian Revolution, our NCA and NCS had been dreaming of ways to "project force" into the Persian Gulf, so that we could maintain boots on the ground, so as to never be at the mercy of those who would withhold the most strategic resource from the US, and that's petroleum.

You weren't fighting for the freedom of Kuwait, you were fighting to preserve the "American way of life", which is accessible, reasonably priced petroleum, and all the men and women who served in Gulf 1, performed beyond expectation, bravely and honorably. Duty is duty, but truth is truth.

I no longer trust the President, certainly not the Vice President, as I said to Jim, they have so alienated the CIA, as well as other intel agencies, that this gulf will take years to heal.

Did you know the only ones, who had 'on the shelf' plans, 12 Sep 2001, to take down the Taliban, was the CIA?

The DoD had nothing, it was CIA paramilitary using oodles of cash to buy Northern Alliance troops that brought down the Taliban. The CIA commander on the ground cornered Osama in the Tora Bora region, they were intercepted his radio comms, the CIA commander begged DoD to send him one battalion of Army Rangers to seal off both ends of this valley and either take or kill Bin Laden.....700 men he asked for, he was rebuffed and Bin Laden escaped.

That said, are radical Islamic jihadists a clear and present danger to America? oh yes they are, but it's the old story of "lie to me once, shame on you, lie to me twice, shame on me".

He lied, plain and simple, no WMD's, no previous linkage between the Ba'athists (marginal Sunnis) and Al-Qaeda (Salafis) and no, repeat NO plan of the conditions of victory.

He has destroyed the fortunes of the Republican party in 2008, and they all know it, everyone at Dod, in the Pentagon, in the CIA, and the other intel communities, and most importantly the American people.

but who knows, there might another "October surprise".

I pray we don't repeat the mistakes of a war weary Britain circa 1918-1939.....they turned inward and ignored a growing threat, because they had been led by idiots during WW1, and let their military go to pot.

Which is why I intend to vote for Senator Clinton, I have watched her at Armed Services Committee hearings, she is no dove, she knows the military, and the generals have actually come to like and respect her, as I do. I didn't before, but I have watched these hearings.

You are right, jihadism is akin to nazism, but who will go to fight?

**I'm confused, on: 2007/7/25 17:34**

Quote:  
-----Is the purpose of this thread to spark more controversy and division among the brethren? What does this have to do with discussion of theology or encouragement for the brethren?  
-----

I see political threads going up all the time, without a word said. am I to be denied?

I don't intend to engender division, I'm speaking from my heart and from what I know. Maybe you don't agree, fair enough, but what price freedom?

**Re: Krispy, on: 2007/7/25 17:36**

Worm...

Nothing you have to say to me at the moment means a hill of beans to me. You've made it quite obvious that you're not here to edify or encourage the brethren, or to discuss doctrine or theology, or to discuss the sermons available to download on this site.

You seem to have an agenda that doesn't line up with the purpose of this forum.

I haven't read your post, and I don't plan on reading your post. In the future please do not respond to what I write and do not address any posts to me.... I will simply ignore them.

Krispy

**Re: Krispy, on: 2007/7/25 17:42**

worm4christ said

Quote:  
-----"lie to me once, shame on you, lie to me twice, shame on me".  
-----

Didn't you mean...

"There's an old...saying in Tennessee...I know it's in Texas, probably in Tennessee that says Fool me once...(3 second pause)... Shame on...(4 second pause)...Shame on you....(6 second pause)...Fool me...Can't get fooled again."

--George W. Bush to Nashville, Tennessee audience, Sept. 17, 2002, MSNBC-TV --Politex, Sept. 17, 2002, 10 PM

**Krispy, on: 2007/7/25 18:36**

you wrote:

Quote:  
-----Nothing you have to say to me at the moment means a hill of beans to me. You've made it quite obvious that you're not here to edify or encourage the brethren, or to discuss doctrine or theology, or to discuss the sermons available to download on this site.

You seem to have an agenda that doesn't line up with the purpose of this forum.

I haven't read your post, and I don't plan on reading your post. In the future please do not respond to what I write and do not address any posts to me.... I will simply ignore them.

-----  
the depth of your malice towards me, and the bad things you testify about me, just takes my breath away.

but it's okay.....your request, suits me right down to the ground. No problem, water off a duck's back, you're the one with the brewing simmering hatred, not me. I'm just sitting here, slightly stunned at the hate-filled spew. Give it a few minutes, and Lord willing, I'll be okay.

God bless you brother, may He soothe your tortured soul.

**Re: Krispy, on: 2007/7/25 18:40**

Krispy, worm, if you can't play nicely you'll have to play outside...

**Thank you Corey, on: 2007/7/25 18:42**

for the attempt at light-hearted humor.

at least it's better than malice, and may God bless you for your intent.

**Re: Thank you Corey, on: 2007/7/25 19:51**

I seem to remember hearing someone far more wiser than I saying something to the effect of, "you don't need to like your neighbor to love him".

**Re: better things - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/7/25 20:56**

Quote:  
-----What does this have to do with discussion of theology or encouragement for the brethren?  
-----

Quote:  
-----I see political threads going up all the time, without a word said. am I to be denied?  
-----

Two fair questions...

To be frank I think SI has been squatted in the last couple of weeks, with a volley of conspiracist and political cannonballs firing back and forth. And it isn't even 2008 yet!

If we were critiquing the United States with a kingdom of God perspective, this might be understandable. But we know that these recent partisan threads are indifferent to the Holy Spirit's agenda....in fact these threads rise no higher than good old earthly partisan politics. Perhaps at one point you aspired, and even ached, to see these things with heavenly eyes...but it is not happening now.

This is not to say that there is something inherently wrong with political opinions...but their concern is little help to the primary concern of this website, which is namely to see the Church arise and live in the power of Godliness once again as

of old.

If the brethren here want to talk about Haliburton and President Bush, why not start a blog? A blog dedicated to these interests would work better than altering the atmosphere of Sermon Index. If you cannot start a blog, then at least confine all the opened pieces to a single thread.

Now if you brethren were truly interested in being a prophetic voice to "Babylon", you would lay down your part in her fornications as well. Yet, because you rail not as prophets, but as political rivals, you are being little more than divisive, and irrelevant to the deeper spiritual needs of the Church and our nation. I trust we all admit this problem in our hearts...when one of us succumbs to temptation, our failure only taunts the others to fall as well.

It's not my nature to be offensive...the Lord knows I hate to risk friendships...but I do not believe we can pretend to be seeking God for revival when our passions are so invested in these carnal discussions. Divest yourselves of these political intrigues! Let's ask the Lord to remove the anger and unforgiveness we have towards those Christians in the body who do not share our politics. (Which should be more of a former nature if we are really looking towards heaven.)

October is coming, and if the only fire we have burning inside of us is over President Bush then God help us for our earthbound affections. I certainly know the draw of these Earthly powers...but I also know the draw of the Holy Spirit. These two powers are not pulling in the same direction...as Christians we must pick a kingdom and live in it. (Vote if you feel led, but not against one another!)

I am confident I am not alone in my sentiment here...although I imagine most people are trying to avoid getting dirty and as a result are not saying anything. So start a separate blog and chase the Donkeys and Elephants, filthy beasts that they are, out of this sanctuary set apart for repentance and Godliness. Let's not always need Greg and Mike to lower the boom on our conduct as if we are children needing the law. Let's walk freely in love and respect for the holy purpose God has placed in their hearts, through which God is honored in a way that we are all wonderfully invited to participate.

Blessings my dear brothers in Christ,

MC

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/7/25 23:45**

Hi Compton...

I pray to God that the amount of opinionated political rhetoric will end here at SI. It is not part of the website's purpose, and it typically serves to divide rather than unite. While I don't see a problem of introducing political issues into the forums, it shouldn't be for the purpose of invoking opinion. Often, these sort of threads unleash all sort of questions and accusations -- which is a characteristic of our Enemy.

While we are commended to "test everything" (1 Thessalonians 5:21), such topics seem to miss the "heart of God." They often begin with wild allegations, accusations or predetermined questions. They often end just the same -- but with more division between the brethren. They often reek of pride and opinions based upon limited knowledge and surface wisdom.

I ask, in the name of Jesus, that such threads might end. Greg (SermonIndex) and Mike (ccrsk) have often gently warned such politically motivated threads to cease -- regardless of political opinion. It would be nice if this could end without their personal rebukes.

What do you think?

:)



**Re:, on: 2007/7/26 13:53**

I believe it is a the known fact is we don't know all matters or the confidential facts in which to agree or disagree with the President. We have not briefed on any matters. I am encouraged by a sitting President or any President who will stand for the God, the Word of God and be dependant upon HIM. We have had many Presidents since the birth of the USA who have did just that. In a Presidential debate in 2000 when the President was asked, " what person has had the most influence on your life", and His answer was " Christ". The follow up question was would you explain how? He said if you have never experience it, it would hard for me would be hard to explain and then he said, " he changed my life". They thought they had just killed his chances to win. But what the devil meant for harm God turned into good.

Our first allegiance as a citizen of heaven is to the Lamb. Our second is to our brother and sisters on earth. They will be done on earth as it is in heaven. I have heard many negative and positive comments about the President. Our system of government gives each citizen the right to either negative or positive. I won't try to justify or defend his actions and that is not my purpose but whether as a citizen I agree or disagree, he has been given the authority to execute the office as he sees fit. God's Word says I am to pray for those in authority and I must admit I find it easier to pray for him than some of the Presidents in the past and possible in the future. Some of the past Presidents I thought were right on target at the time, but since I was saved I disagree with them. However, whether they have the, "what's God got to do with it" attitude or not, we are to pray for those who God has put in authority. My prayer is we will always have a person that it is a joy to pray for and that you have heard from his mouth and seen from his vetos, and from his speeches he is dependant upon who we all are dependant upon and stand for righteousness. Stands for The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the ONE that sent HIS SON Jesus, to die on a cross for you and I. He has overcome death, hell and the grave, paid for our sins, so we can live too. This post is not meant to be political. God Bless the USA and God Bless the President and may both the President and the USA always bless God. When we no longer consider ourselves one nation under God, we will be a nation gone under.

**Re:, on: 2007/7/28 2:41**

The only thing that scares me with these discussions is everything.

I guess because of eschatology only.

If someone is mid or post trib or even pre trib than they know that going too far with defending any earthly ruler is a dangerous ticket.

That's my only fear on this. And everyone is entitled to their opinion on all of these candidates, the bill of rights gives that option and once upon a time, you could give your opinion without fear.

Christians had no problem blasting Mr. Clinton, but now just because someone says they're a Christian, now the way we talk to each other has changed and we turn against one another over this.

I'm not speaking with malice. Everyone should just calm down some when this topic comes up.

Mr. Clinton now says he's a Christian too.  
Why shouldn't we believe him ?

If the anti-Christ comes saying he's a Christian, will we still hold these unapproachable stances of loyalty ?

That's 'all' I worry about. Not anyone's opinion on any candidate, but where we each draw the line with Rom. 13. That's what makes me shutter, that's it.

If the Apostles didn't get entangled in the affairs of this world, yet the Lord gave us heed to be wise and watch, and the early Church Fathers told us what and who to watch for too ... then where's the watching and when do we know who we are really dealing with when it comes to rulers of this present evil world ?

The Word says, Put not your trust in Princes.

We're to obey the laws of the land ... but where do we draw the line, if we feel personally that we're being set up for that



one world government that the Bible and every single prophecy watcher is watching, whether pre-trib or post.

Shouldn't we just be staying spiritually other worldly in our allegiances ?

I don't worry about who backs what, except that I stand for life. Being pro-life, if I don't keep that stand in my heart, I'll start to lose the mind of Christ.

I stand with the folks like Pastor Frin on the issue of Peace and pacifism. I'll go out the way our Lord did ... like a lamb to the slaughter and I have no allegiance to anyone but Christ.

He said to obey the laws of the land, until they come from anti-christ and we're just being tested at present, by where our allegiances really lay.

Whatever upsets us, shows where our allegiances are.

That's plain enough.

When and where do you draw the line in the sand with Romans 13 ?

**Re: Enough! - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/7/28 10:18**

Let this serve as warning.

This thread will also be locked, it is apparent that the disclaimer will need to be updated and spelled out more clearly just what is tolerated here.

Edit: For the time being take Comptons advice to heart. It is time for some changes to be made.