

**News and Current Events :: Torture****Torture, on: 2005/11/18 20:00**

LONDON, England (CNN) -- Former CIA chief Stansfield Turner lashed out at Dick Cheney on Thursday, calling him a "vice president for torture" that is out of touch with the American people.

Turner's condemnation, delivered during an interview with Britain's ITV network, comes amid an effort by Sen. John McCain, R-Arizona, to pass legislation forbidding any U.S. authority from torturing a prisoner. McCain was tortured as a Vietnam prisoner of war.

Cheney has lobbied against the legislation, prompting Turner to say he's "embarrassed that the United State has a vice president for torture. I think it is just reprehensible."

Turner, a retired Navy admiral who headed the intelligence agency from 1977 to 1981 under President Jimmy Carter, stood firm on his earlier remarks Friday and, in a CNN interview, scoffed at assertions that challenging the administration's strategy aided the terrorists' propaganda efforts.

"It's the vice president who is out there advocating torture. He's the one who has made himself the vice president in favor of torture," said Turner, who from 1972 to 1974 was president of the Naval War College, a think tank for strategic and national security policy.

Cheney has fought McCain's legislation, pushing for an exception for the CIA in cases that involve a prisoner who may have knowledge of an imminent attack. (Read about McCain's anti-torture campaign)

Torture diminishes the country's image and moral stature, forcing other nations to look at the United States "in a very different light," Turner said, adding that such tactics also open the door to retribution.

"We military people don't want future military people who are taken prisoner by other countries to be subjected to torture in the name of doing just what the United States does," he said.

Turner, who supported Sen. John Kerry in the 2004 presidential election, went on to say that "the vice president is out of tune with the American people, who don't want our country tarred with the label of being one that tortures."

A statement from the vice president's office said that the United States "does not torture." It also stated that Cheney's views are "reflected in the administration's policy."

"Our country is at war, and our government has an obligation to protect the American people from a brutal enemy that has declared war upon us." (Watch special on Cheney's remarks over the years)

The United States has enacted several intrusive procedures since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks to protect the country from terrorists, but torture, Turner said, is an unacceptable method.

"Torture is beyond the pale. It is going too far," he said.

Re: Torture - posted by martymill (), on: 2005/11/18 21:36

An interesting moral problem. If you captured a terrorist and he knew where a nuclear bomb was hidden, would you as a Christian be willing to have him tortured? Wouldn't it save thousands of lives?

I have no idea how to answer that one.

Martin :-)

Re:, on: 2005/11/18 23:28

I'd show him Jesus. as Brother Andrew is doing now ;-)

Re: - posted by groh_frog, on: 2005/11/18 23:42

Unfortunately, even "pushing your religion" on that prisoner is prohibited- you're allowed to give them their own "holy book" and access to a chaplain, and that's it. Heaven forbid that we "offend" a prisoner of war. Gotta love the Left in their never-ending knowledge...

This is a hard one, but I think we've come too far in wanting to be so "nice" that we've lost our guts as a country in the U.S., when it comes to some things. Like this. In Abu Ghraib, if a soldier "mishandles a Koran" and offends a prisoner, the media goes crazy. So, the military works harder to make the prisoner happy.

In this war, does the enemy care? Are they more empathetic towards those they take hostage because we were more tolerant? If you follow the war, you'll have to say no. To them it's about their ideals, their religion, and they hate the U.S. because of who we are. Will they ever treat their prisoners better because we have? No. They'll continue to chop heads off on camera, and mail them to the families of the victims.

I'm not necessarily for torture- their inhumanity isn't an excuse for ours, but it's gone too far when we have to put our prisoners in a hotel so that they're comfortable.

Going back to the point, though, unfortunately, we can't even share the Gospel without the American People having a cow about it. The U.S. demands "tolerance", and with that comes mediocrity in hopes of this unification of beliefs. It's corrupting the minds of many in our churches, and hardening many outside of our churches. All the military will let us do for them is pray.

Grace and Peace...

groh frog, on: 2005/11/20 20:31

in all due respect sir, its not about what the islamists do, or what their values are....its about us, as Americans, who we are.

If they make us become like them, if they make us become like nazi's, like fascists, then all the blood shed to beat the hitlerite empire back, was shed in vain.

if they compel us to become something we don't want to be, then the Constitution is a dead letter, and this great experiment called the United States of America is no longer a shining beacon to the world.

Thats the problem I have with this current administration, I love this nation too much to have a bunch of cheapjack oilmen take us down the highway to hell, without raising my voice.....

Re: groh frog - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/11/20 21:06

Could do without the rhetoric

Quote:
-----"It's the vice president who is out there advocating torture. He's the one who has made himself the vice president in favor of torture," said Turner, who from 1972 to 1974 was president of the Naval War College, a think tank for strategic and national security policy.

Thats ridiculous

Re: groh frog - posted by groh_frog, on: 2005/11/21 7:34

Hey, Neil.

I was just commenting mostly on YeshualsMyGd's comment about leading them to Jesus.

Actually, I was just today reading an article about religion in the military. It was talking about the possibility of passing a bill that make it illegal for any military person to talk about religion while on duty- essentially it would be the same as sexual harrasment, etc.

I'm not, however, saying he's wrong. Just that I don't know for how long that will be feasible in this country. Whether we realize it or not, some of our rights are being parted to make way for things like tolerance, security, etc.

Grace and Peace...

Re: Torture, on: 2005/11/21 8:40

21st November: Start The Week (45 mins) - presented by Andrew Marr, BBC Chief Political Correspondent.

Panel interview order:

Englishman Clive Stafford-Smith (Reprieve) (Lives in the US) - Article in this week's New Statesman about Guantanamo Bay (from the inside).

American author John Battelle - new book on Google - concerns about Patriot Act.

(<http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/atoz/index.shtml#s>) <http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/atoz/index.shtml#s>
Link to 'listen' or 'website' from alphabetical listing.

Re: Mike Baalog, on: 2005/11/21 19:24

you might not like the rhetoric, but when a guy like Brent Scowfort saying he doesn't "know" Dick Cheney anymore, something's wrong.

We are in deep deep trouble as a nation with this conflict in Iraq, when a nation is in an armed conflict with no real discernible parameters of victory explainable, or visible...something's wrong.

When a leading Reagan conservative, Bruce Bartlett says this about the President:

Quote:
-----"Just in the past few months," Bartlett said, "I think a light has gone off for people who've spent time up close to Bush: that this instinct he's always talking about is this sort of weird, Messianic idea of what he thinks God has told him to do." Bartlett, a 53-year-old columnist and self-described libertarian Republican who has lately been a champion for traditional Republicans concerned about Bush's governance, went on to say: "This is why George W. Bush is so clear-eyed about Al Qaeda and the Islamic fundamentalist enemy. He believes you have to kill them all. They can't be persuaded, that they're extremists, driven by a dark vision. He understands them, because he's just like them. . . ."

"This is why he dispenses with people who confront him with inconvenient facts," Bartlett went on to say. "He truly believes he's on a mission from God. Absolute faith like that overwhelms a need for analysis. The whole thing about faith is to believe things for which there is no empirical evidence." Bartlett paused, then said, "But you can't run the world on faith."

something's wrong. This is no blue state liberal with an agenda, this is a republican talking.

"he believes you have to kill them all".

terrorists or muslims?

and when would that line start to blur when you do the berserker thing, like we did in the last days of WW2?

"kill them all"?

Do you see why Jesus Himself told us to love our enemies?

Do you know in WW2 Germany a SIGNIFICANT portion of the Lutheran church gave spiritual cover to Hitler?...and that most Germans were just doing what they thought was their patriotic duty.

If the American church starts to ally itself with a national apparatus that tortures, than its a long slippery slope to maintaining secret prisons where due process and legal rights are a thing of the past.

watch out what you term ridiculous and what you exalt.

respectfully and lovingly, neil

later edit: URL for Scowcroft article:

http://www.newyorker.com/fact/content/articles/051031fa_fact2

Re: - posted by habakkuk3 (), on: 2005/11/21 19:55

Neilgin,

I would suggest we pray. If you want to get a deeper understanding of what is going on in the Nations Capitol go to www.markswatson.com.

This administration is not what it seems as I say that as someone who works in the "beltway" meaning in the DC area. I'm very conservative myself but believe this administration will prove to be one if not the most corrupt ever.

This is the first time in our history in which we attacked a country and were not directly provoked. I pray for God's mercy and pray that you will as well.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/11/21 22:15

Quote:

-----watch out what you term ridiculous and what you exalt.

Neil, we have been down this road before. Why the penchant to crowd things into camps? The point was why put words or thought not expressed into someones mouth? It's unnecessary and dishonest, much like the test of this rhetoric that you want to keep toting out here.

Quote:

-----"he believes you have to kill them all".

A quote of a quote of a quote. Do you buy into everything you read or just the ones that fit your particular bent and see no problem with the unhelpful rhetoric because it fits this particular area of concern for you?

Beyond that, what is all this doing here in the first place? You want to bring the warring news factions biased opinions here? When the great majority of these people are not trustworthy to give a reasoned opinion from all the rhetoric that casts doubt upon their commentaries in the first place....

You can think what you like brother, but again, making a note is not the same as agreement nor disagreement... It's politics and find it difficult to see just what purpose in this fashion of tossing mud pies is to accomplish.

Re: - posted by Christisking (), on: 2005/11/22 0:17

Quote:

"Actually, I was just today reading an article about religion in the military. It was talking about the possibility of passing a bill that make it illegal for any military person to talk about religion while on duty- essentially it would be the same as sexual harassment, etc."

Now that's scary!!! If this bill became law it would end all debate about Christians in the military. Every "true" Christian would have to resign immediately. No "true" Christian would ever concede to a law which made it illegal to talk about Jesus, right?

Mike Baalog, on: 2005/11/22 14:42

Quote:

-----It's unnecessary and dishonest, much like the test of this rhetoric that you want to keep toting out here.

what's unnecessary and dishonest?

are you saying I am? or is it just the "rhetoric" that I "tote"?

Quote:

-----Do you buy into everything you read

no Mike, I don't.

Quote:

-----or just the ones that fit your particular bent

I thought you knew my "bent", my bent is Jesus and serving him, in Spirit and in Truth.

Quote:

-----Beyond that, what is all this doing here in the first place?

Because it's worthy of prayer, its worthy of discussion. Torture is sinful, war is sinful and a sin issue is worthy of prayer and worthy of discussion.

I feel a very hateful hate-filled spirit coming from you towards me, and I don't know why.

my rhetoric, on: 2005/11/22 14:58

What has been moving forward in this discussion about torture is an interest in American abolitionist's circa 1820-1860 AND the church's role in the outcry over slavery. Please allow me to quote snippets from a nice writing on this.

Quote:

-----Frederick Augustus Ross, who was a pastor of the Presbyterian church of Huntsville, Alabama, used a quotation from the Bible in showing his support for slavery: "The powers that be are ordained of God." (Romans 13:1, 1965, p. 137). Ross then concluded that "slavery is of God, and to continue for the good of the slave, the good of the master, the good of the whole American family, until another and better destiny may be unfold

ed." (Ross, 1969, p. 5). It was !
common practice for the preachers to quote from the Bible in showing their support for slavery.

Quote:
-----The abolitionist movement rose up through the churches of the North. Unfortunately, by the mid-1830's, the church had distanced it self from the abolitionists. The church branded the abolitionists as "infidels," or nonbelievers, and they called them radicals. Many abolitionists remaine d faithful to their belief in God, though they were no longer accepted by the church. The abolitionists believed themselves to be the "righteous remnant " of the evangelical tradition; abolitionism became a surrogate religion. (Mathews, 1980, p. 209). Two radical abolitionists, William Lloyd Garrison and Theodore Dwight Weld, considered slavery a sin. Garrison and Weld felt that slavery was a rebellion against God, and all men were accountable to God. Both men thought that man was competing wit h God for control if he were to own another man.

just a glimpse to help you discern my "bent"

Re: Mike Baalog, on: 2005/11/22 15:06

Habakkuk3 said

'I would suggest we pray.'

Quote:
-----This is the first time in our history in which we attacked a country and were not directly provoked. I pray for God's mercy and pray th at you will as well.

Brothers, I don't get what's going on here but I sense that if one lives in a huge country like America, it is possible to feel it is too much of a supertanker to be moved by prayer. And yet, we all know the *only* thing which can make a difference i n the invisible battle against evil, is prayer. I get the same feelings over here, in a place with a quarter of your population
....

Quote:
-----I thought you knew my "bent", my bent is Jesus and serving him, in Spirit and in Truth.

Because it's worthy of prayer, its worthy of discussion. Torture is sinful, war is sinful and a sin issue is worthy of prayer and worthy of discussion.

Amen. Let's try to get a hold of God for all those who are being tortured - whether it's for politics, or for Christ - that they may be comforted by His presence.

my rhetoric 2, on: 2005/11/22 15:10

The passage I outline is so chilling to the parralles it bears today

Quote:
-----The attacks on slavery mounted by the Abolitionists stung Southern evangelicals deeply. They responded to these attacks by rejecti ng the abolitionists' characterization of them as evil. Denominational authorities from both North and South were also quick to react strongly to the abol itionist campaign. One example of this reactivity was the effort undertaken by Methodists to gag abolitionists in the church who were deemed to be a threat to unity and order of the church. The Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church ordered their preachers "to abstain from all abolition movements and associations, and refrain from patronizing any of their publications." They were willing to take this step because they feared that such advocacy mi ght severely damage the patronage of the church in the South

here's the part that illustrates how one can twist Scripture:

Quote:

-----One response to the Abolitionists was the genesis of a pro-slavery argument. It had its origins in South Carolina in the 1820's. Thomas Cooper, the President of South Carolina College and a Deist, and Richard Furman, President of the State Baptist Convention in 1823 were both instrumental in this effort. Furman, for instance, developed a Biblical defense of slavery that had strong appeal in the evangelical culture that existed in the wake of the Second Great Awakening. Among the major talking points of this Biblical defense were: (1) Ham, it was said, was the father of all Blacks; (2) Abraham held slaves; (3) Leviticus enjoins the children of Israel to take slaves from the heathens; (4) Philemon is told to return to master by Paul; (5) Jesus never attacked the institution of slavery.)

Quote:
----- What happened within the South that led to the launch of this kind of crusade? Why did they feel this pressing need to defend slavery?

In the heat of the Second Great Awakening, there had been a widespread recognition of an implicit equality within evangelical Christianity. The ground was level at the foot of cross, or at least at the altar of a camp meeting. And yet, there were countervailing economic forces at work as well. It should also be noted that not every Southerner owned slaves during this period. In fact, only 1 in 11 did. But the major molders of public opinion were often holders of slaves. This was true of educators, doctors, politicians, and preachers. Indeed, Richard Furman--the originator of the Biblical defense of slavery was one such pastor. In South Carolina, for instance, 40% of Baptist preachers owned slaves. It is axiomatic that the beneficiaries of power are generally opposed to measures that would destroy their vested interests.

This is not to say that Southerners weren't guilty over the shift that was taking place, as James Oakes makes clear in the Ruling Race. In the chapter entitled "The Convenient Sin," Oakes examines the diaries and other personal writings of Southerners and discovers that many were deeply troubled by their involvement in slavery, and attempted in various ways to rationalize or justify their participation in this terrible evil. Many became convinced that they were going to hell. And yet, there was a great deal of money to be made by using slaves. As a result, many Southern evangelicals could not bring themselves to give up such a lucrative system. So they tried to ease their guilt by telling themselves that slavery was a political and cultural institution that belonged to the secular world which was beyond their ability to control. One's faith could only be applied to areas of personal morality such as drinking, card-playing, and sex.

The South, for instance, came to disdain social activism out of the fear that it could lead to an unwanted intrusiveness into slavery. At the same time, Northern revivalism came to view social activism in a very different light. Social reform was seen as being fundamental to the task of a Christian, along with the political means to achieve it. In the South, preaching tended to focus on sin and guilt, whereas in the North there was a growing emphasis on the doctrines of sanctification and perfection.

Re: my rhetoric 2 - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/11/22 16:07

Hey Neil,

Just to clarify again;

Quote:
-----"It's the vice president who is out there advocating torture. He's the one who has made himself the vice president in favor of torture," said Turner, who from 1972 to 1974 was president of the Naval War College, a think tank for strategic and national security policy.

Quote:
-----"he believes you have to kill them all".

Quote:
-----"kill them all"?

Are any of these truths? Or just slanderous comments? Before you rush off to the 'issue' and ignore them, isn't this just as much the problem that it's O.K. to make spurious statements that are absurd to prove a point? You missed the first part there; *The point was why put words or thought not expressed into someones mouth?*

And why bring this kind of unnecessary verbal garbage out here? It is one thing to discuss an issue and quite another to

back it up with such ridiculous commentary.

Quote:

-----watch out what you term ridiculous and what you exalt.

Exalt what? There is no exalting of anything, this doesn't touch on anything but the aforementioned dishonesty. Is this not the very heart of the problem with politics? Pragmatism? Keeping to party lines and agendas.. and it's a wonder they are so divided? They are both equally wrong and find it difficult to listen to much of any of it nor believe what is being said, it is all doubtful because there is no integrity anymore. As soon as someone wants to start using slanderous comments, unexpressed statements never even entertained, this whole idea of "I know what they are doing, saying, thinking." Their credibility goes out the window. Beyond all that, what is it precisely you might expect from mere men anyway?

Quote:

-----what's unnecessary and dishonest?

are you saying I am? or is it just the "rhetoric" that I "tote"?

The rhetoric brother.

Quote:

-----I thought you knew my "bent", my bent is Jesus and serving him, in Spirit and in Truth.

Well I do know your passion brother and to be totally honest with you, what I fear is what all this stuff might do to your spirit. It might be difficult to see it but what comes through a lot of these things is a being caught up in it, caught in the tug of war of rhetoric... The war of words...

Quote:

-----I feel a very hateful hate-filled spirit coming from you towards me, and I don't know why.

I don't either, because it's not there. What I find disheartening is to see these kinds of hate-filled spirit commentaries being put out here as if they were indeed fact and especially coming from the world's point of view.

Neil, there was a time when I was very much caught up in this whole thing, from the liberal to the ultra conservative and everything in between. I think often your well pointed out thoughts about what is a curious 'evangelical' mindset about buying into whatever conservative point of view is the one that "Christians" ought to be supporting is just as filled with rhetoric as the opposite liberal mindedness that says everything is relevant, neither of them are worth paying any attention to and it seems many are too lazy to do anything other than to believe what they "should". Who are you to believe anyway, this coming from fallen men?... It's never ending, why be caught up in it so much?

That's my concern brother.

Mike, on: 2005/11/22 16:40

Cheney has been pushing hard to have the CIA exempted from the no-torture bill....that's what this thread was all about.. ..what does it say to YOU when a sitting vice-president presses to have a government intelligence agency exempted from a no torture clause that was crafted by a Republican senator who WAS tortured during his captivity..

Before YOU rush off and ignore that....what does THAT say to you?

that's not my opinion, it's been what's happening in OUR govt.

and the other comment was what Bruce Bartlet, A REPUBLICAN strategist said about the President, and guess what?... ..when I listen to the man speak, and watch him...watch his eyes, hear his voice....there is something that doesn'tcompute....I don't see the light of the Lord in this President, my spirit doesn't testify to this.....I see hatred, I see wardeath in this man...and when his vice president tries double hard to make it so a govt intel agency can torture prisoners, something

g is very wrong in this country, and you know it.....don't you lecture me on dishonesty and verbal garbage.....there is so mething wrong out there, and when a Christian just stands by, said Christian is a coward.

Re: Torture?, on: 2005/11/23 14:31

(<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4461470.stm>) <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4461470.stm>

EU to query US 'secret prisons'

"The European Union is to formally ask the US to clarify reports that it ran secret CIA prisons in eastern Europe.

The US has refused to confirm or deny the reports, which surfaced in the US earlier this month...

The Washington Post newspaper first reported on 2 November that the CIA had been using Soviet-era camps in eastern Europe to detain and interrogate terror suspects....

The CIA's controversial "extraordinary rendition" programme involves removing suspects without court approval to third party countries for interrogation."

The bbc webpage displays a map of the alleged distribution of flights.

Re: Torture, on: 2005/11/30 7:40

Liberty challenges UK government.

(<http://www.liberty-human-rights.org.uk/press/2005/torture-flights.shtml>) <http://www.liberty-human-rights.org.uk/press/2005/torture-flights.shtml>

Today human rights group Liberty called on Foreign Secretary Jack Straw to seek assurances in the next 14 days from the USA that it is not using UK airports to transport suspects to countries that torture. Liberty fears that the UK is in breach of domestic and international law by allowing CIA "extraordinary rendition" flights to land and re-fuel in Britain...

Liberty's call to action against extraordinary rendition marks the launch of its "No torture, no compromise" campaign which seeks to make the UK government honour its positive obligation to stop torture and ill-treatment.

A Guardian article published on 12 September 2005 revealed that airports in Biggin Hill, Birmingham, Bournemouth, Brize Norton, Farnborough, Gatwick, Heathrow, Luton, Mildenhall, Northolt, and Stansted have allowed CIA or CIA-chartered jets to land temporarily. The article also says that these aircraft had flown into the UK approximately 210 times since September 2001.

A letter to the Police in whose areas these airports fall, has also been sent - link from Liberty homepage.

Police have been asked to probe claims that the CIA has used UK airports to move terrorist suspects to secret jails in other countries to be tortured.

(<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4483640.stm>) <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4483640.stm>

Re:, on: 2005/11/30 7:59

US PROBES CIA JAIL CLAIM (big sigh)

The US says it will investigate reports that the CIA is running secret jails in eastern Europe and that planes carrying detainees used European airports....

Ms Rice's spokesman, Sean McCormack, said that the US would do its best to respond to the allegations.

He did not comment on whether or not the prisons existed, but said that the US abided by its international obligations, adding: "The United States in its actions does not break US law."

(<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/4482458.stm>) <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/4482458.stm>

EU WARNED ON 'SECRET CIA JAILS'

Reports claim al-Qaeda members are being held in clandestine jails

The European Union's top justice official has warned that any EU state found to have hosted a secret CIA jail could have its voting rights suspended.

(<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4478766.stm>) <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4478766.stm>