

General Topics :: Barna, Comfort & McLaren?!

Barna, Comfort & McLaren?! - posted by coops (), on: 2006/10/6 22:55

I'm a little amazed. I though Barna was very respected and biblical. Even Ray Comfort quotes him (and we know way of the master crew are pretty conservative). So I just stumbled accross this today:

<http://www.revolutionconference.com/>

Both Barna & Brian McLaren (I thought he was an absolue heretic) are speaking at the same conference? Wow.

Re: Barna, Comfort & McLaren?!, on: 2006/10/10 13:03

Quote:

coops wrote:

I'm a little amazed. I though Barna was very respected and biblical. Even Ray Comfort quotes him (and we know way of the master crew are pretty conservative). So I just stumbled accross this today:

<http://www.revolutionconference.com/>

Both Barna & Brian McLaren (I thought he was an absolue heretic) are speaking at the same conference? Wow.

Don't be surprised. Be alerted. Be disappointed at the deception and with some, it is "purposefully" so. Those of the socio-theological camp will embrace any belief that supports their effort for their cause be it from the secular or religious community. Warren, Hybels, et al sound oh so right. However, one must lift the sheets to discover whats really going on. Consider much of the lit out and see what the main focus is on. Unity for sure, but with God? Only presumptuously so. God has other purposes they are being used for.

:-(

help me out coops..., on: 2006/10/10 14:10

why do you think Brian McLaren is "absolute heretic"?

I'm not asking that to stir the pot, but I constantly hear this one or that one is a heretic, and there aint enough hours in the day for a fellow to go digging thru the info pile to make "absolute" pronouncements, so help me out here....whats the matter with B. McLaren, where is he going off the rails as you see it?

bartle

Re: help me out coops... - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2006/10/10 14:32

i was wondering the same thing... i dont know anything about the man, but absolute heretic is quite a statement.... just curious

Re: help me out coops..., on: 2006/10/10 16:19

Quote:

bartle wrote:

why do you think Brian McLaren is "absolute heretic"?

I'm not asking that to stir the pot, but I constantly hear this one or that one is a heretic, and there aint enough hours in the day for a fellow to go digging thru the info pile to make "absolute" pronouncements, so help me out here....whats the matter with B. McLaren, where is he going off the rails as you see it?

bartle

Have you ever heard him speak?

:-)

Re: Brian McLaren - posted by coops (), on: 2006/10/10 19:48

You can: (<http://podcast.wayofthemasterradio.com/audio/podcasts/0406/WOTMR-042706-2.mp3>) Listen to him on radio (25:45 and onwards).

Way of the master radio played his stuff once to look at what he was saying, and here is a running summary:

- Judgement of only Jewish leaders
- Jewish leaders had a path of violence
- Jesus came to create peace & harmony
- Jewish leaders rejects Jesus' message of peace
- AD.67-70 was THE judgment by God through romans on Jerusalem
- The threat of hell (ghena) by Jesus was FULFILLED when Jerusalem was destroyed
-
- Takes a shot at hermenutics, as taking things out of context
- Jesus came to usher in the kingdom through peace
- We will bring the kingdom to earth through our love
- The doctrine of hell means God would get his way through violence & coercion
- The "coming kingdom" is not "coming", it is here through your kindness & suffering
-
- Your traditional view of the bible is wrong. Let me show you what the whole narrative really means.

Etc. etc.

(<http://podcast.wayofthemasterradio.com/audio/podcasts/0406/WOTMR-042706-2.mp3>) Listen to the whole thing (Intro 23:00, or go from 25:45 onwards for the meaty stuff)

ormly....., on: 2006/10/11 0:09

Quote:

-----Have you ever heard him speak?

noooooo, have you?

coops, on: 2006/10/11 0:57

I listened to the whole program, actually I'm listening right now at the McLaren segment, but that host with the smooth radio voice (who is that?) is going over a tape, where he stops it after tiny brief segments of what McLaren is saying.....le mme listen more....

more: Gotta tell ya, this radio host has a tone in his voice that is just....well, lemme say I'm not drawn to listening this host...I still can't figure out what is being argued.....

he keeps hitting in the "emergents"...ok.

Thanks for trying to explain to me why McLaren is a "heretic".

In the end brother, I believe we must investigate on our own, and work out our salvations with fear and trembling, and so me guys are drawn to one radio show, and other guys to others.

bartle

Re: - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2006/10/11 1:41

If anyone doubts that McLaren is unorthodox in his Christianity, look no further than this revealing research:

http://www.apprising.org/archives/2006/01/brian_mclaren_a_1.html

http://www.apprising.org/archives/2006/01/brian_mclaren_a_2.html

http://www.apprising.org/archives/2006/01/brian_mclaren_a_3.html

http://www.apprising.org/archives/2006/01/brian_mclaren_a_4.html

http://www.apprising.org/archives/2006/01/brian_mclaren_a_5.html

http://www.apprising.org/archives/2006/01/brian_mclaren_a_6.html

http://www.apprising.org/archives/2006/01/brian_mclaren_a_7.html

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2006/10/11 4:23

i havent checked everything here, but i know when ever someone comes whit a new thing, a new sort of christianity...the n its something wrong, there is only one sort of christianity.... all else is false.. there is only one jesus, and if it is mclaren or anyone else who proclaims "new kind of christianty" or new kind of church, if one meen that in the sense to bring back to the original then its good, but when its new ideas and so on it gets dangerous, and we should be careful, me for one i stick whit the old classics...but the one book we all should read most is the bible, every other book is foolishnes compare d to that book, no matter who wrote it,

Re: ormly....., on: 2006/10/11 6:19

Quote:

bartle wrote:

Quote:

-----Have you ever heard him speak?

noooooo, have you?

Indeed, I have and there is a plethora of sites and information concerning him and his post-modern-ism thinking concern ing the church. I don't believe the man is a Christian, period. Here's a link to what all this is about, if you are interested:

<http://www.professionalservice.com/doublespeak/index96IAR.html>

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2006/10/11 8:11

well after listening and reading some, i agree... he is not christian....

Orm2, on: 2006/10/11 12:43

you wrote:

Quote:

-----I don't believe the man is a Christian, period.

okay, I don't know hardly anything about him, but if say so....okay, he's not a christian.

Just think, in the good ole days, we could get a holy and righteous mob together and burn him at the stake.

True, it would an ugly but neccesary job, after all, we must defend the faith...right?

Re: hmmhmm, on: 2006/10/11 12:51

Quote:

-----he is not christian

there's a second witness!

Boys, we got the makings of a mob, now we just need some good oak wood, some cured, some green, so you get some smoke going, and then we can grab up this apostate.

But remember lads, its our godly duty to give this hellbound apostate a chance to recant and repent of his ways. Its only right.

I nominate Ormly to be the chief inquistor, Orm, whadaya think? Should we "encourage" him to take all his books and to ss them into the fire, and then we make him say the Apostles Creed, or is it the Nicene Creed, I get so confused.

But we have to make him say something that shows his true repentance, some kind of profession of orthodoxy...and if h e refuses, we gotta do what we gotta do, after all we HAVE to defend the faith.

But I got a small heart tug though, I really don't know hardly anything about him at all, but Orm knows, so I'll trust him and go along with the mob, its the safe thing to do.

true witness, on: 2006/10/11 13:04

thanks for posting those articles, I'm reading the first one, trying very hard to understand what they are saying.

I like Mark Driscoll and understood what he said.....and I know "pantheism"...means "many gods", which to this Jewish f ollower of Jesus is an anathema.....but lemme read on.

I hope the other lads knew I was ribbing about the "burning at the stake" thingy.

thanks for the post.

bartle

Re:, on: 2006/10/11 14:56

Quote:

bartle wrote:
But I got a small heart tug though, I really don't know hardly anything about him at all, but Orm knows, so I'll trust him and go along with the mob, its t
he safe thing to do.

I wouldn't trust the mob, Blind Bart. :-o

The way things are looking, the mob will soon be coming after us. :-?

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2006/10/11 19:13

I don't know if I am the mob or the outcast half the time...

For what it's worth Bartle, awhile back I left a post with my own honest thoughts on the subject. What I shared then was not a hasty reaction against anyone...I was sincerely attracted to the Emergent church for several valid reasons but in the end I could not fully 'buy-in.' Although I have some empathy for their critique of modern evangelicals, the emergent theological and philosophical solutions to the problems in the modern church are simply too indifferent to scripture for me to swallow.

The Emergent Christians like McClaren accuse traditional evangelicals of being too fixated on doctrine. He casts evangelicals as as being too suppositional or merely parroting empty 'positionalism' and not being honest and contemplative enough for real people searching for God in the 21st century.

Vital spiritual experience is said to be more important then correct theology. Yet, inspite of the arguments and divisions sparked from denominational differences over theology, theology does ultimately matter. The Good News is in fact theological...God himself is certainly beyond the boxes of any one culture, but still His condescending revelation to man is faithfully contained in the primitive confines of our written language...as such the post-modern emphasis on subjective experience with God over an objective and rational knowledge of scripture can lead a person away from a biblical understanding of God.

This doesn't mean that I fear or despise Brian McClaren. In fact I'm confident he is a well meaning guy. In spite of my disagreements with his conclusions, I think he has raised some excellent concerns about some modern trends in the church, and I certainly don't want to burn him at the stake ;-)

Anyways here is my older post on
(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id7695&forum36#58509) my own look at the emergent church

Blessings brother,

MC

Orm, on: 2006/10/11 20:25

Quote:
-----The way things are looking, the mob will soon be coming after us

well Praise God then!!

we'll be in pain and torture for anywhere from 2 to 16 hours, that won't be too much fun, but after that crucible, I call "first I" to go and pray with Paul, and the others.

aw c'mon Compy, on: 2006/10/11 20:31

Quote:

-----I certainly don't want to burn him at the stake

you aint no fun, I thought thats what s'posed to done with them hereticks, isnt that what they did in the old days?

oh man, your taking all the fun out of religion!!

Re: aw c'mon Compy - posted by Compton (), on: 2006/10/12 2:19

Quote:

----- I thought thats what s'posed to done with them hereticks, isnt that what they did in the old days

It is true that in the 17th and 18th century many heretics were burned alive, or at least had their tongues pierced with a hot nail. Today we are much more sensible with heretics....we give them lucrative publishing deals. :knockedout:

(I'm just kidding.)

(Well, no I'm not.):~P

By the way, I'm not sure that the label 'heretic' is even politically-correct these days. I think modern heretics prefer to be called "metro-spiritual" persons.:~D

MC

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2006/10/12 4:19

i just thought we could say that, i dont know, i belive the bible to be true in that sense it meens what it says when it says something, or maybe we can twist it around and make it meen whatever we feel like and still be christians, like jehovas witnesses, they are often more bible beliving then most "christians" they just have a little problem whit jesus being god, and hell, but besides that they just as any christians, cant we say that that is wrong or heretic? if someone says well i belive in god but not really as the bible says, is that person still a christian? what is the definition of a heretic? how can we know? shouldent we compare what someone says whit the bible? and if they say something other what the bible says are nt they heretics then? or im i wrong? as for mclaren....as i understand and read the bible he twists and make the verses meen something else then what the context of the bible says... and therefore by the bibleverses i see clarifies what a christian belives then hes not

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2006/10/12 9:54

Quote:

-----maybe we can twist it (the bible) around and make it mean whatever we feel like and still be christians...what is the definition of a heretic?

The post-modern Christian like McClaren, would claim that the modern evangelical has a lack of love for their fellow man ... as they believe love be modeled by Jesus. This might even be a fine notion, but then McClaren's 'love' for fellow humanity, (as well as a rather transparent contempt for the entire evangelical tradition)leads him to do away with the substitutory atonement, or any penal concept when it comes to sin. (As a matter of fact, I think he's done away with that too.)

By removing the need for atonement for sin, McClaren believes he can show more 'Christ-like love' to humanity...who he does not see as sinful, but suffering. I admit I can empathize with his sentimental narrative of mankind as a tragic and pitiful victim of God's cosmos...but in the end I must conclude, this is ultimately an insufficient biblical depiction of how God

views mankind.

Now trying to unwind McClaren's 'loving' twist on scripture would seem to only reinforce his claim that most evangelical Christians are religious hateful sour pharisees...not to mention big meanies.

I am an artistic person with a natural empathy for other people. Yet as a Christian, I find I need to bring my deeply felt empathy...which is rooted in my own deeply fallen nature, into submission to scripture. To acquire an 'emphathy' for God's perspective I need to let scripture transform my mind! This is because my brand of love, which is darkened, and corrupt apart from God's word, would invariably cause me to question God's love for mankind.

Likewise I think McClaren is a creative, sensitive, and thoughtful person who is sincerely hurting over the pain experienced by mankind. In this context, and perhaps as a critique against the apparent indifference from evangelicals, I believe he decided to place his own feelings and thoughts above the wisdom of God as revealed in scripture. He achieved this by simply demoting recorded scripture into the status of 'ancient religious text'.

Now because McClaren is trying to bring a sense of simple human compassion back into American Christianity (Which he sees as a modern claustrophobic self-absorbed religious superstructure), and because he's not using scripture to acquire houses and luxury cars... it's admittedly harder to decry him as a "heretic"...although I don't think he is preaching the Gospel anymore.

MC

Re:, on: 2006/10/12 10:06

Quote:

Compton wrote:

Quote:
-----maybe we can twist it (the bible) around and make it mean whatever we feel like and still be Christians...what is the definition of a heretic?

The post-modern Christian like McClaren, would claim that the modern evangelical has a lack of love for their fellow man... as they believe love be modeled by Jesus. This might even be a fine notion, but then McClaren's 'love' for fellow humanity, (as well as a rather transparent contempt for the entire evangelical tradition) leads him to do away with the substitutionary atonement, or any penal concept when it comes to sin. (As a matter of fact, I think he's done away with that too.)

By removing the need for atonement for sin, McClaren believes he can show more 'Christ-like love' to humanity...who he does not see as sinful, but suffering. I admit I can empathize with his sentimental narrative of mankind as a tragic and pitiful victim of God's cosmos...but in the end I must conclude, this is ultimately an insufficient biblical depiction of how God views mankind.

Now trying to unwind McClaren's 'loving' twist on scripture would seem to only reinforce his claim that most evangelical Christians are religious hateful sour pharisees...not to mention big meanies.

I am an artistic person with a natural empathy for other people. Yet as a Christian, I find I need to bring my deeply felt empathy...which is rooted in my own deeply fallen nature, into submission to scripture. To acquire an 'emphathy' for God's perspective I need to let scripture transform my mind! This is because my brand of love, which is darkened, and corrupt apart from God's word, would invariably cause me to question God's love for mankind.

Likewise I think McClaren is a creative, sensitive, and thoughtful person who is sincerely hurting over the pain experienced by mankind. In this context, and perhaps as a critique against the apparent indifference from evangelicals, I believe he decided to place his own feelings and thoughts above the wisdom of God as revealed in scripture. He achieved this by simply demoting recorded scripture into the status of 'ancient religious text'.

Now because McClaren is trying to bring a sense of simple human compassion back into American Christianity (Which he sees as a modern claustrophobic self-absorbed religious superstructure), and because he's not using scripture to acquire houses and luxury cars... it's admittedly harder to decry him as a "heretic"...although I don't think he is preaching the Gospel anymore.

MC

Yeah, seems a shame he's a heretic. I mean with his dedication and all. ;-)