

**News and Current Events :: UK evangelicals considers violence to defend faith****UK evangelicals considers violence to defend faith - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2006/11/5 12:26**

[Image: [https://www.sermonindex.net/images/forum/2004/may/featured\\_news.gif](https://www.sermonindex.net/images/forum/2004/may/featured_news.gif)]

A leading church group which represents more than a million Christians has raised the prospect of civil unrest and even "violent revolution" to protect religious freedoms.

In a startling warning to the Government, senior church and political figures have backed a report advocating force to protest against policies that are "unbiblical" and "inimical to the Christian faith".

The report from the Evangelical Alliance says "violent revolution" should be regarded as a viable response if government legislation encroaches further on basic religious rights. The church is urged to come to a consensus that "at some point there is not only the right but the duty to disobey the state". ...

read more: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2006/11/05/nrelig05.xml>

**Re: UK evangelicals considers violence to defend faith - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2006/11/5 12:31**

The church needs to fall to its knees in prayer, it is sad that there is always a inclination to pick up a sword and cut a ear off! We must enter into warfare on "our knees."

Watch this powerful video by Keith Daniel:

**The Power of Prayer (video)**

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=4224>

*Description: This is a powerful video preached at brother Bill Gothard's church. This is part of Keith Daniel's 13th visit to America and he gives a solemn warning to the Church of Jesus Christ we must pray before its too late. There is a digression in the sermon on the topic of music but its application finds itself in that the church should not use wordly methods to win the world it will not work! The main thrust of the sermon is preached from ephesians 6 and the emphasis is that the church needs to get into warfare on their knees.*

**Re: UK evangelicals considers violence to defend faith, on: 2006/11/5 13:56**

oh boy. strange days.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/11/5 14:30**

The comments apparently come as a consequence of a News Release issued by the Evangelical Alliance called (<http://www.eauk.org/faithandnation/upload/faith%20and%20nation%20finalrevised.pdf>) Faith and Nation. Knowing the propensity of the media to exaggerate almost everything it might be prudent to read what they said in the first place.

I think the piece which has caused the interest is this one

Quote:  
-----The weight of history confirms that Christians have generally been supporters of the status quo. However, if, as most Christians accept, they should be politically involved in democratic processes, many believe this may, where necessary, take the form of active resistance to the state. This can take different forms and may encompass disobedience to law, civil disobedience, involving selective, non-violent resistance or protest, or ultimately violent revolution. By way of historical Christian precedents, figures such as Tyndale, Knox, Milton, Cromwell, Bunyan are often cited, and more recently Barth, Bonhoeffer, Martin Luther King and Desmond Tutu. These were devout Christians, some of whom were willing, though not lightly, to justify force or even armed rebellion in certain circumstances and non-violent resistance in others. They wrestled with the same theological questions we face today.

Christians hold differing views relating to the various degrees of opposition to the state which for the sake of simplicity we have classified as 'civil disobedience'. Fundamental theological questions relating to the validity for Christians of breaking the law, violence and war inevitably come into what is a complex and highly controversial debate. Christians simply disagree on these matters. (page 122ff)

"Christians simply disagree..." surely not?

Meanwhile, I'll go and find my tin hat... ;-)

One thing that does interest me here is the little list of 'devout Christians' that the Evangelical Alliance seems ready to affirm... "Barth, Bonhoeffer, Martin Luther King and Desmond Tutu." Personally, I don't recognise any of these as 'evangelicals'. This may be a genuine sign of the times of 'evangelicalism' in the UK.

**really?, on: 2006/11/5 14:53**

Ron, now you have Martin Luther King on your list?

Quote:  
-----One thing that does interest me here is the little list of 'devout Christians' that the Evangelical Alliance seems ready to affirm... "Barth, Bonhoeffer, Martin Luther King  
-----

oh boy Ronnie..tell ya what... if a fellow like Ted Haggard, or Pat Robertson, James Dobson, Jerry Falwell, et al, etc etc are what is to be called or considered "an evangelical".....count me out.

Martin Luther King was a follower of Jesus, and a great man.

**Re: UK evangelicals considers violence to defend faith, on: 2006/11/5 15:12**

Quote:  
-----The church is urged to come to a consensus that "at some point there is not only the right but the duty to disobey the state". ...  
-----  
Isn't there a world of difference between following the leading of the Holy Spirit and walking in newness of life - which cannot be taken away from the believer - and forming a religious pressure group to challenge government policy?

I'd be asking myself about stewardship of time....

**Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2006/11/5 15:21**

Quote:  
-----Meanwhile, I'll go and find my tin hat  
-----

That's funny!

MC

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/11/5 15:30**

As I have listened to Martin Luther King I have never recognized that 'certain sound' of the gospel trumpet. I don't denigrate the man; perhaps he was a 'great man'. I was simply commenting on the fact the the 'Evangelical Alliance' had chosen some strange examples to illustrate its points.

I found this on the web..

The late Tom Skinner, an African-American evangelist, wrote in his *Black and Free* (1968).  
"I am not sure that Martin Luther King knew Jesus Christ in the evangelical Christian context. One of the few reporters to interview King on his religious thought, was Presbyterian layman Lee Dirks, of the National Observer. Dirks found few traces of the hard fundamentalism in which King was reared. King rejected the idea of original sin; that is, he rejected the concept that a person is born separated from God. MLK accepted the deity of Jesus Christ, and the fact that Jesus Christ was divine, only in the sense that He was one with God in purpose; he believed that Jesus Christ so submitted His will t

o God's will, that God revealed His divine plan through Jesus Christ; but he did not accept the fact that Jesus Christ was actually God or actually the Son of God, or God manifested in the flesh. Reflecting much of the liberal instruction he received in liberal institutions, he considered the virgin birth a mythological story which tried to explain that Jesus Christ had moral uniqueness, rather than the fact that His birth was a literal fact--that is His virgin birth. . . . He missed on important fact, and that is that man must be regenerated, his attitudes must be changed, a revolution must first occur within his heart, before it can occur in society (pp. 136-138)."