

News and Current Events :: ABC.com to air debate on God online

ABC.com to air debate on God online - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2007/5/3 14:53

[Image: <http://photos.sa-media.com/newsimages/23623.jpg>]

NEW YORK, May 3 (UPI) -- Actor Kirk Cameron and author Ray Comfort will square off in New York with two atheists to debate the existence of God live on ABC.com.

The debate will be Wednesday after the network rescheduled it from Saturday to capture a larger audience, Comfort said in a news release.

Comfort, who says he can prove God exists scientifically, said ABC originally offered him four minutes to present his case. After conferring with Cameron and the atheists, the time was raised to 13 minutes. ...

read more: http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=upiUPI-20070503-123151-3667R&show_article=1

Re: ABC.com to air debate on God online - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2007/5/3 15:01

From Ray Comfort's newsletter:

Quote:
 -----When ABC ran a story in January about hundreds of atheists video-taping themselves blaspheming the Holy Spirit, Ray contacted the network and told them he could prove God's existence, absolutely, scientifically, without mentioning the Bible or faith. He said that he and Kirk would like to challenge the two originators of the "Blasphemy Challenge" to a debate on the existence of God. ABC loved the idea. The debate will be filmed for Nightline in New York City, and will be streamed LIVE on their website (<http://abcnews.go.com/Nightline/>) on May 5, 2007.

As you probably know, Ray has credentials for this debate as the author of God Doesn't Believe in Atheists, a speaker at Yale on the subject of atheism, and a platform speaker at the 2001 American Atheists Inc. annual convention. And Kirk, possibly the most highly respected ex-atheist in Hollywood, is the perfect choice to address the unscientific nature of Darwinian evolution.

Please keep this event in your prayers. We couldn't be more excited about the opportunity!

<http://abcnews.go.com/Nightline/>

The Nightline Face Off

<http://abcnews.go.com/Nightline/story?id=3130360&page=1>

Does God Exist? Be a part of the debate

<http://abcnews.go.com/Nightline/story?id=3114967>

Re: ABC.com to air debate on God online - posted by damers (), on: 2007/5/3 15:16

Surely Ray can't totally prove that God exists? I've seen his arguments and some are good, but they don't prove that God exists.

Certainly opening up the law before all America could be a good thing.

Jesus have all Your way with every word of this debate. Use it to pierce hearts, to change hearts. Turn America over with Your own hands for Your glory. I pray in Your holy, precious name. Amen

Re: - posted by Isaiah64, on: 2007/5/3 17:10

Quote:
-----Surely Ray can't totally prove that God exists? I've seen his arguments and some are good, but they don't prove that God exists.

I agree, it's extremely difficult to prove the obvious. It's like trying to prove $1+1=2$ or that the sun exists. ;-)

This is an excellent chance for the Gospel to be preached to millions of people. They probably won't show it on Nightline, but at least those who will watch it online will get to hear it.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/3 19:06

What a sad form of apologetics. You can't prove the existence of God through scientific inquiry. It takes nothing less than a revelation.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2007/5/3 19:25

Quote:
-----What a sad form of apologetics. You can't prove the existence of God through scientific inquiry. It takes nothing less than revelation.

I am pretty sure Ray Comfort realizes this and is only allowing this to happen because it opens more doors for people to "seek" and "grope" after the living God. and may they be found of Him.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/3 19:51

Good quote:

"Natural religion has no name for God which can bring any hope or comfort to frail, mortal man; nor could man by his own wisdom and searching have attained to the knowledge of any name for the infinite Creator of all things... The Name has to be revealed..."

~ David Baron "Israel in the Plan of God"

Re: - posted by SeanHobson (), on: 2007/5/3 19:52

Is there any way to "tape" this live recording? I will be taking finals in school when it's aired (2pm eastern) and I really don't want to be stuck with the edited, watered down version that's gonna be rebroadcasted on nightline. Any help?

Thanks

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/5/3 19:57

Quote:
----- it opens more doors for people to "seek" and "grope" after the living God

Certainly Ray knows a thing or two about sharing Christ with skeptics. It is true that the Gospel is received by grace...yet this does not mean it is irrational and outside of the realm of reasonable thinking. Many people's skepticism is poorly reasoned or even just a thin excuse, and perhaps once they are patiently shown at least the rational plausibility of a Creator, their hearts would be more prepped for faith.

Still, knowing how important the grace of God was to us who believed...we pray that Jesus will be seen not merely as a side in an intellectual contest, but as alive through the conduct of two witnesses demonstrating the power and truth of th

e Holy Spirit.

...the testimony of our conscience, that in holiness and godly sincerity, not in fleshly wisdom but in the grace of God, we have conducted ourselves in the world...

Blessings,

MC

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/5/3 20:15

Quote:

KingJimmy wrote:

What a sad form of apologetics. You can't prove the existence of God through scientific inquiry. It takes nothing less than revelation.

They already have a revelation of God through scientific(observable) inquiry.

Rom 1:19 Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them.

Rom 1:20 For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:

I'm assured you already know these verses. It's not 'sad' to point out what men already know. For if it was, it would be 'sad' for Paul to have written those verses. Wouldn't it?

Of course, that knowledge alone will never save them from sin.

Act 17:24 God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands;

Act 17:25 Neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things;

Act 17:26 And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation;

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/5/3 20:17

Quote:

KingJimmy wrote:

What a sad form of apologetics. You can't prove the existence of God through scientific inquiry. It takes nothing less than revelation.

I think that you are missing the point here, Jimmy. Ray will do almost anything to get an opportunity to preach the gospel. In his book, "The Way of the Master", Ray mentions how he had began going to college campuses to debate atheists about the existence of God. He said that he pays professors for their time, and they in turn try to prove that God doesn't exist, take their money, and run. He then is left with a room full of "atheists", who have just heard his point of how the "Human conscience is evidence of the existence of God", where he takes them through the Law, and points them to the Saviour.

The point isn't the apologetics, but to utilise such a tool to create an opportunity to warn sinners of judgement, and preach the gospel. Come now, when did you last see a faithful gospel presentation in prime time? Surely you can see the genius of this approach?

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/5/3 20:18

Quote:

KingJimmy wrote:
Good quote:

"Natural religion has no name for God which can bring any hope or comfort to frail, mortal man; nor could man by his own wisdom and searching have attained to the knowledge of any name for the infinite Creator of all things... The Name has to be revealed..."

~ David Baron "Israel in the Plan of God"

I agree, that's a good quote.

Re: ABC.com to air debate on God online - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2007/5/3 20:54

We should bathe this thing in prayer. Let the word of God be heard!

In Christ,

Ron

Re:, on: 2007/5/3 21:21

Before I was a Christian, I heard a really convincing proof of the existence of the God. It is designed for people who believe in the big bang, to show them that even if that were true it is logically impossible without God. It goes like this:

- 1)All things that began to exist have a cause.
- 2)The universe began to exist.
- 3)Therefore, the universe has a cause.

Premise 1 is true, because there aren't any counterexamples. Someone who believes in the big bang wouldn't argue premise 2. Therefore, the universe has a cause.

Furthermore, because science claims that at the moment of the big bang, both time and the physical universe were created, the cause must have existed outside of time, and be immaterial - both characteristics of the God of the Bible.

This argument had a huge impact on me, when my faith was in science. I have used it with a number of people at my university who are like I was when witnessing, and it has been really effective to show that there actually are some really good reasons to believe in the God of the Bible.

I wonder if Ray will use something like that.

"What makes more sense? That the world was created by no one out of nothing, or that the world was created by God out of nothing?" -unknown

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/3 21:26

Quote:

They already have a revelation of God through scientific(observable) inquiry.

General revelation is a true thing, but it is not something you can prove through scientific inquiry. General revelation is something that people more-so naturally intuit as human beings created in the image of God than through interpreting data recorded in an objective manner.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/3 21:29

Quote:

The point isn't the apologetics, but to utilise such a tool to create an opportunity to warn sinners of judgement, and preach the gospel. Come now, when did you last see a faithful gospel presentation in prime time? Surely you can see the genius of this approach?

I understand and am truly sympathetic with such an approach. However, so far as I understand, they are only going on the air to prove through the scientific method that there is a God in a debate with atheists.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/3 21:43

K_Day,

I agree with the argument that is made. Such is simply the good ol' "first cause" argument, which has existed for many years now. However, do understand that such an argument, as strong as it is, isn't without a degree of assumption. For the argument of first cause, can only prove that there was some sort of first cause. The argument cannot in and of itself prove what that first cause is. It is our assumption as believers the first cause was God.

However, to the atheist, their assumption is that it was some sort of physical thing. Both are assumptions on our part, and neither is any more "provable" than the other. The logic can only show us that there was a first cause, but not show what that cause was.

Re:, on: 2007/5/3 21:49

Quote:
-----I agree with the argument that is made. Such is simply the good ol' "first cause" argument, which has existed for many years now. However, do understand that such an argument, as strong as it is, isn't without a degree of assumption. For the argument of first cause, can only prove that there was some sort of first cause. The argument cannot in and of itself prove what that first cause is. It is our assumption as believers the first cause was God.

Yeah, that's a good point. Given what atheists believe about the big bang, however, this proved "first cause" would have to exist apart from time and physical matter (since they believe the big bang created both). These two things characterize God, and not anything else I can think of. When the argument was presented to me, that made the assumption that the cause is God a lot easier to accept than anything else.

But your right. Its certainly not without loopholes. I am happy I heard it though!

-K DAY

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/3 22:03

Quote:

Given what atheists believe about the big bang, however, this proved "first cause" would have to exist apart from time and physical matter (since they believe the big bang created both). These two things characterize God, and not anything else I can think of.

Well, not necessarily. The assumption of the atheists is that there has always been something. Thus, the big bang was

n't something out of nothing. They would say that this something, in essence, was always around-- in essence, eternal.

Quote:

When the argument was presented to me, that made the assumption that the cause is God a lot easier to accept than anything else.

I agree.

Re:, on: 2007/5/3 22:14

Quote:

Well, not necessarily. The assumption of the atheists is that there has always been something. Thus, the big bang wasn't something out of nothing.

Haha, sounds a bit circular...Not to mention that at this point they do exactly what the criticize Christians of doing - straying away from the scientific method.

Quote:

They would say that this something, in essence, was always around-- in essence, eternal.

Yes, I would say that too . :-D

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/3 22:54

Quote:

Not to mention that at this point they do exactly what the criticize Christians of doing - straying away from the scientific method.

Indeed, which is why I'm not a big fan of arguing with atheists about the existence of God to begin with. When Moses confronted Pharaoh and demanded in the name of God that Pharaoh let the Hebrew people go, Pharaoh's response was, "God who?" Moses didn't then go offer Pharaoh an apologetical explanation about who God was, and why Pharaoh was n't God. Rather, He simply continued to proclaim God to Pharaoh, and demonstrated who God was.

Sadly, our apologetics these days is sadly lacking.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/3 23:06

I would also add that, as it has been pointed out by many theologians, that the Scriptures never set about to prove the existence of God. Rather, they let God prove His own existence, and assert rather strongly time and time again that He will. For indeed, it is something only God can do.

Such is why I'm not overly excited about such a debate. I love Ray Comfort and Kirk Cameron, and have much respect for the ministry the Lord has given them. But, unless this debate in some manner shows forth the power of God, I am not interested in it if it's merely going to set forth some tired old argument with a merely jargon loaded canned gospel presentation.

Re: ABC.com to air debate on God online - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/5/4 23:31

There is a fair amount of optimism here concerning this upcoming debate...I hope you all are right...reckon, I am a tad bit pessimistic. I have seen recordings of debates between Bob Harrington and Madelyn Murray O'Hare; Faye Wattleton (head of Planned Parenthood) vs. Randell Terry...and was NOT impressed. Mr. Terry was so emotional while Ms. Wattleton was as cool as a cucumber that he looked so ridiculous.

Oh, well...I just hope God will be honored and that their egos will have been crucified before the event..

ginnyrose

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/5/4 23:37

Quote:

KingJimmy wrote:

I understand and am truly sympathetic with such an approach. However, so far as I understand, they are only going on the air to prove through the scientific method that there is a God in a debate with atheists.

Have you ever heard Ray Comfort "prove through the scientific method that there is a God in a debate with atheists"? The extent of his "scientific method" are to point to a building, and compare a banana with a coke can. He merely sets up a rational explanation of the existence of God, and then all but ignores the comments of his opponent.

Considering that Ray teaches much on the futility of using apologetics in evangelism, I'm surprised at your reaction.

To quote Ray himself:

Quote:

The Bible warns us to avoid foolish questions because they start arguments (2 Timothy 2:23). Most of us have fallen into the trap of jumping at every objection to the gospel. However, these questions can often be arguments in disguise to sidetrack you from the "weightier matters of the Law." While apologetics (arguments for God's existence, creation vs. evolution, etc.) are legitimate in evangelism, they should merely be "bait" with the Law of God being the "hook" that brings the conviction of sin. Those who witness solely in the realm of apologetical argument may just get an intellectual decision rather than a repentant conversion. The sinner may come to a point of acknowledging that the Bible is the Word of God and Jesus is Lord—but even the devil knows that. Always pull the sinner back to his responsibility before God on Judgment Day, as Jesus did in Luke 13:1-5.
(Cameron, K., & Comfort, R. (2004). The school of biblical evangelism : 101 lessons : How to share your faith simply, effectively, biblically-- the way Jesus did (236). Gainesville, Fla.: Bridge-Logos Publishers.)

In essence, Ray heard about two guys who started a movement that called for people to post a video on YouTube of themselves blaspheming the Holy Spirit. In return, they would receive a free copy of Hawkins' book "The God Delusion". After much weeping, he thought he'd take advantage of such an opportunity to get on TV to preach the gospel.

The big joke about Ray's atheist debates is that he actually loses the debate, in terms of the way that debates are rated. However, his goal is to knock that one chink in the armour of atheistic reasoning, whilst hammering their conscience with the Law.

For an example, just so you know that I'm not just making this up, check out
(<http://www.wayofthemaster.com/mp3/BCAD.zip>) Atheist Debate: BC/AD. Ask yourself, who do you think won the debate?

If you don't want to download the audio, his (<http://www.livingwaters.com/downloads/AtheistDebate.pdf>) Debate outline can be found here.

Re: - posted by SeanHobson (), on: 2007/5/7 21:03

Quote:
----- **Is there any way to "tape" this live recording?** I will be take finals in school when it's aired (2pm eastern) and I really don't want to be stuck with the edited, watered down version that's gonna be rebroadcasted on nightline. Any help?

Re: - posted by lovegrace, on: 2007/5/7 22:23

K_Day, the theory that you heard was called the 'kalam argument'. It was founded by Muslims I think.

I somewhat agree with KingJimmy about the methodology of Apologetics. I don't think that there are any Scriptural evidences to intelligentially convincing people of Christ.

I think ultimately there is needed revelation but God can use a debate but as far as I've seen, isn't something that He has used to ever start a revival.

I believe Apologetics should be for the believer and help unbelievers rethink their lives. Keep in mind, repentance is all about the thought-life. (Change the way of thinking)

Just my two cents, if it's worth anything.

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 1:44

Does anyone know if this is posted online anywhere? Was anyone able to watch it?

-K DAY

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 13:24

Is anyone listening to this debate right now?

The entire debate will be streamed Wednesday, May 9, at 1:00 p.m. EDT (10:00 a.m. PST) on <http://abcnews.go.com/nightline/>, then again at 2:00 p.m. EDT (11:00 a.m. PST) on <http://abcnews.go.com/abcnewsnow/>, and an excerpt will be aired that night on ABC's Nightline.

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 15:28

I just watched some clips of the debate. It makes me sick to my stomach. It is sad to see those atheists. They are so amazingly full of pride, especially the girl. She argues so arrogantly, and is constantly making stupid jokes and making fun of Christianity.

I am not really sure what the point of this is. Ray is an evangelist, not an expert at apologetics. It doesn't seem to have an evangelizing effect, but rather the effect of making Christians look stupid. The atheists are incoherent in their arguments as well...

I used to always read transcripts from Christian philosopher William Lane Craig who would debate the philosophy heads at prestigious universities and just make them look silly. Craig would be putting those atheists on their face.

Re: - posted by lovegrace, on: 2007/5/9 17:51

I watched the videos and out of what I saw, Kirk and Ray didn't do that great of a job. Good try on getting the gospel out there though.

I recommend :Ken Ham and Dr. Phil Fernandes

Dr. Phil is philosophical but for good reason. At first I didn't like it, but truly he gets to the root of the issue.

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/5/9 18:20

After learning that the 'arena' of debate was supposed to be rigorously limited to "science", I was thinking neither party was really qualified to represent their side.

Still I admired Comfort and Cameron...and felt broken hearted at the people demanding there is no God.

MC

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 18:24

Quote:
-----After learning that the 'arena' of debate was supposed to be rigorously limited to "science", I was thinking neither party was really qualified to represent their side.

Very, very true. I got the same impression. The atheist girl at one point even said that there isn't even solid evidence that Jesus really existed... Wake up girl.

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 18:32

Quote:

Compton wrote:
Still I admired Comfort and Cameron...and felt broken hearted at the people demanding there is no God.

MC

It was heart-breaking. They're lost. They're facing eternity without God, and there is no fear whatsoever. 'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God'. Psalms 14 and 53 are very applicable here. But, oh! are we weeping for them? I was thinking how human reasoning and arguments alone cannot draw these people to Christ, it is God that draws men to Himself (John 6:44). We need to pray that God will work on Brian and Kelly's hearts and also for those in the audience and those who listen to this debate.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/5/9 18:52

Whenever I see scenarios like this, I think of what would happen if a holy man filled with the Spirit like Charles Finney stepped to the podium and God the Holy Ghost showed up. It's happened before, you know. In one sweeping move, the entire atheist's argument is brought to utter shambles, the unbelievers and mockers fall on their faces and weep and wait for mercy.

How we need men like this, men whose ministries are endorsed with the terrifying presence of God. The old path guys never needed to give a reasonable scientific hypothesis for creation; the *Creator* demonstrated Himself through them instead. The debate is over, the atheist converted. Dwight Moody with a sixth-grade education totally demolished Oxfordian sycophants with the awful presence of God. Could you imagine if God the Holy Ghost suddenly entered that television studio?

Debate over.

Reminds me of during one of Charles Finney's revivals when the Presbyterians were "falling out" under the power of God while the Methodists mocked. A dangerous, dissenting rift was developing. Pretty soon, however, the Methodists began "falling out" to the Presbyterians' amazement, and God instantly healed the rift. Finney didn't have to explain or defend anything; God took care of it all.

I pray God take care of these poor atheists in such a way.

Brother Paul

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/9 21:27

What the world needs is men full of resurrection power. I admire Ray Comfort much, but, sometimes I am sad that so much of what he does is simply canned stuff.

If any man speaks, let him speak as the oracle of God.

Re: - posted by jordanamo, on: 2007/5/9 22:08

I saw only 15 minutes of the debate from a website and can't judge either way until I see the full debate.. from what I saw-- both of their arguments were much lacking, both stumbled, and both generally sucked when it came to the debate format. Would've been much better with different people on opposing sides. Art Katz versus Richard Dawkins-- cmon baby ;)

Jordan

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/9 22:20

From what I saw of the debate, Ray and Kirk looked pretty bad. It's sad too, for some folks that are supposed to be so well versed in apologetics Ray and Kirk seem totally at loss for what more philosophically minded atheists argue. They seemed totally baffled as if they had never heard some of these arguments before. :(

Re: - posted by lovegrace, on: 2007/5/9 22:45

Quote:

PaulWest wrote:

I think of what would happen if a holy man filled with the Spirit like Charles Finney stepped to the podium and God the Holy Ghost showed up.

Finney believed there was no need for Historical Apologetics, from what I've learned. He was very experienced-oriented. Which, leads to some Charismatic 'weird' movements. Where, "We feel this is of God but we have no bases."

I know this sounds, 'Heart-wrenching' but, as far as I know, it's true. We can't just have a 'Holy Ghost' experience. We need something to solidify our walks with Christ. I heard John Beerve (you might not like him but he makes a good point) "Preaching is good. Teaching is good. But preaching only blasts you to a new level. Teachings helps you maintain it."

BUT, I think more people need to have the Faith of Finney/Wigglesworth and Preaching of a Spurgeon (don't forget a tempered character) and you'd be set for revival anyway.

I don't think defending the faith with historical/scientific/non-Christian religions are wrong because the Apostle Paul looked into other faiths and used that as a spring-board for the Gospel, just look at his message at Mars Hill in Acts.

I strongly believe we need the Holy Ghost to move like in any 'revival' days but we also need strong teaching to keep us and maintain us in those times. Don't forget one of the main reasons revival stopped is because of false teachings.

Also, I'd like to say that I haven't seen the Comfort debate in full but from what I saw, it didn't look that good.

Re: - posted by Smokey (), on: 2007/5/9 23:01

Where in the bible are we directed to "debate" our faith? My bible says: Tit 3:9 But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain. Tit 3:10 A man that is a heretic after the first and second admonition reject;

There is only one directive that Jesus gave: Mat 28:19 Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Mat 28:20 Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.

Scripture clearly tells us to avoid long winded debates with the unbeliever, we are instructed to share the good news, and allow Holy Spirit to do the convicting. In my opinion, there is an urgent need for sold out Spirit filled believers proclaim

ng the gospel in the town square..
Sure looking forward to REVIVAL conference 2007!
Blessings Greg

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/5/9 23:07

Quote:

-----We can't just have a 'Holy Ghost' experience. We need something to solidify our walks with Christ.

I think the 'Holy Ghost' experience is necessary in many cases to spearhead a person into a place where his/her walk will then become solidified with Christ. Remember, this is a debate attended by, from what I could tell, unbelievers and arrogant atheists predominating. How would we solidify their walks?

I mentioned Finney because I happen to be in the middle of reading his autobiography. Amazing. There are accounts of mockers and atheists (such as these on ABC) that were put on Daniel Nash's "prayer list" that were eventually brought under such conviction and terror through Finney's preaching that their conversions in themselves caused fresh waves of brokenness and fire to sweep throughout the towns. You are absolutely right, Lovegrace, after such experiences the converts must be disciplined and have their walks solidified in sobriety.

Brother Paul

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/5/9 23:24

I think it's pretty clear Ray and Kirk didn't go on TV to win an intellectual debate. Ray saw an opportunity to witness the Law and utilize his WOTM evangelism weaponry. He pretty much knew the two atheists wouldn't accept his scientific "evidence", and that his opponents would proceed to make Kirk and himself look like two fools in the eyes of the crowd.

I'll bet he's looking at that one person out in crowd - or in TV land - confident that God's Word won't return void. His third line of "evidence" told it all: "The greatest evidence of God's existence comes through personal experience." And then he explains how to "have" this experience.

Re: ABC.com to air debate on God online - posted by nowornever, on: 2007/5/9 23:43

I love Ray and Kirk, but I am sorry that they felt it was necessary to debate these two atheist nationally. Simply put "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen". If we could prove the existence of God then it would not require faith to believe. Having said that, I believe God's word will not return to Him void.

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/5/10 0:31

Seeing the intellectual lostness of Mr. Sapien, the blind zeal of his lady partner, the one lady in the audience who revealed such a desperate hopelessness before the specter of cancer...as well as the sneers of the audience in general...all of this led me to a sense of deep appreciation for the saints of God. In fact, though I had some initial fretting over the smirking unbelief of the atheists...these men speak abusively against whatever they do not understand; and what things they do understand by instinct, like unreasoning animals—these are the very things that destroy them. (Jude 1:10) it soon gave way to a preoccupation with gratefulness to God for each of the saints...most of all those here at SI.

...I thank my God through Jesus Christ for all of you, because your faith is being reported all over the world.

Yes, the Christian looks like a fool to the scoffer. I was considering that without the grace given while we were yet

sinners, we would still be scoffers too, profaning first in our hearts, and then convincing ourselves by our own corrupt deceptions and imaginations, that there is no God.

Thinking of this did indeed remind me just how precious each saint in the Church is. In the world that is under the influence of the evil one, a child born of God under new influence, is no ordinary commodity. Every brother and sister in Christ is the result of a supernatural meddling into the life of a once hard, smug, and rebellious sinner.

Really, how a person comes to Christ is truly a work of God. When it comes right down to it, the regeneration of a heart can not be mapped out into an evangelistic method or predictable procedure by experts.

Creation may be described and measured by scientific laws but its existence is not explained or repeatable by them. Yet men can become too proud to concede that the universe declares the glory of God..."The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth His handiwork" (Psalm 19:1). Just as miraculous are the believers who see Jesus and say Lord, I believe., and we should not be too proud to give God the glory for the faith that we are given. The New Man's heart is not at all the old man's heart repurposed, or a mere refurbished old thing...but a wholly new creation in Christ Jesus to testify of the glory and the love of God.

"For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them" (Ephesians 2:10).

Blessings,

MC

Re: ABC.com to air debate on God online - posted by davidt, on: 2007/5/10 2:00

Quote:
-----From what I saw of the debate, Ray and Kirk looked pretty bad. It's sad too, for some folks that are supposed to be so well versed in apologetics Ray and Kirk seem totally at loss for what more philosophically minded atheists argue. They seemed totally baffled as if they had never heard some of these arguments before. :(

I think that Ray and Kirk were under spiritual warfare. It is also hard because if you are not super sharp and mess up just a little and can't have quick clear answers they will turn unreasonably on you even if you later answer their questions. Though large evidences are given they will take little arguments and stand on them. And **yes i did think Ray's main objective was not to win the atheist but to hit a wider audience.**

Quote:
-----Whenever I see scenarios like this, I think of what would happen if a holy man filled with the Spirit like Charles Finney stepped to the podium and God the Holy Ghost showed up. It's happened before, you know. In one sweeping move, the entire atheist's argument is brought to utter shambles, the unbelievers and mockers fall on their faces and weep and wait for mercy.

I totally agree with you on this! However I also think what Ray did is "Great!". I mean he was on national television and has faithfully preached for years and now he is where he is doing what he is doing. As Paul reasoned with Felix there was fear but not just a total weeping, it is not always about the anointing of the preacher but also the soil of the heart.

Re: - posted by UniqueWebRev (), on: 2007/5/10 2:00

From Ray and Kirk's point of view, if they sowed one seed, or watered one sown, if a single soul who's heart had been made ready for God saw them get slammed for the Name of God, and His Reality, I think they would count the time well spent.

What I sorrow over is that the world now jumps at the chance to scoff at even the idea of God.

I know that this 'scoffing' means Jesus is waiting to be let loose by the Father, though both are in equal sorrow as anger

at the unbelief in our world. And much as I would like for Jesus to come now, and prove to the unbelievers how foolish w as their 'elite viewpoint', I know that the Father and Jesus would also rather that Ray and Kirk sow just one more seed, o r water another. But it must have been painful for any Christian who watched.

As if Atheism were something to root for..how unutterably sad for those who did, and may never see God except at Judg ment day, and then in agony from hell. How terribly, grossly, and painfully sad.

We need to pray for their eyes to be opened, in hope that God will make them an example of Christianity in triumph.

Blessings,

Forrest

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/10 11:01

Kirk and Ray did an amazing job!

Why do I say that? Because they opened their mouths and spoke the truth about Jesus Christ and God. The results ar e in God's hands. I am proud of their boldness. May we have more Christians be so bold!

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/10 11:30

Quote:
-----I think it's pretty clear Ray and Kirk didn't go on TV to win an intellectual debate. Ray saw an oppurtunity to witness the law and utili ze his WOTM evangelism weaponry. He pretty much knew the two atheists wouldn't accept his scientific "evidence", and that his opponents would pro ceed to make Kirk and himself look like two fools in the eyes of the crowd.

I'll bet he's looking at that one person out in crowd - or in TV land - confident that God's Word won't return void. His third line of "evidence" told it all: "T he greatest evidence of God's existence comes through personal experience." And then he explains how to "have" this experience.

Amen brother.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/10 11:58

Quote:
-----What the world needs is men full of resurrection power. I admire Ray Comfort much, but, sometimes I am sad that so much of what he does is simply canned stuff.

If any man speaks, let him speak as the oracle of God.

I had a brother come to me this AM stunned that it seemed they struggled like they did in the debate. He seemed a bit d ejected by it. I looked at parts myself and concluded something similar to what KingJimmy is saying here. The world nee ds more than soundbite answers to things. There is more of a dynamic to witnessing than controlling the conversation th rough loaded questions intended to achieve a desired result. I am trying to be very respectful here as I believe in the wor k that they are doing and admire them both very much.

I also don't think the objective is to 'win an argument'. But we need to always be ready to give an answer to folks that me ets them where they are. This requires unction, wisdom, and much study. there are two ways to learn:

- 1) Take notes and copy them onto the test
- 2) Come to understand the subject in such a way that you can defend the topic in public.

If you have a good grasp of the subject you can reason with folk. Sound bite answers do not work in the environment I a m referring to. You have to have a good grasp of your subject. You need to know it through and through. You have to an swer your own hard questions and in so doing get to know what others might want to know. If they are interested in truth and you know your subject there is possibility for real and fruitful ministry.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/10 12:02

I praise the Lord that thousands of atheists have heard the truth of Jesus Christ.

Let us not forget that men are persuaded by the Spirit of God, not by the words of men.

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/5/10 12:14

Quote:
-----If you have a good grasp of the subject you can reason with folk. Sound bite answers do not work in the environment I am referring to. You have to have a good grasp of your subject. You need to know it through and through. You have to answer your own hard questions and in so doing get to know what others might want to know.

I think this is one of the problems with so many that use "evidential apologetics." They may memorize a few isolated facts and hope that will hush the one they are talking with. It rarely ever does.

People do the same in theology. They think if they can find one isolated verse that shows their view, surely it will silence anyone who disagrees.

To try to defend or give an answer for your faith, you have to have it, and an understanding of it.

Pro 4:7 Wisdom the principal thing; get wisdom: **and with all thy getting get understanding.**

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/5/10 12:17

Quote:

JaySaved wrote:
I praise the Lord that thousands of atheists have heard the truth of Jesus Christ.

Let us not forget that men are persuaded by the Spirit of God, not by the words of men.

Amen.

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/5/10 12:43

Quote:

RobertW wrote:

Quote:
-----What the world needs is men full of resurrection power. I admire Ray Comfort much, but, sometimes I am sad that so much of what he does is simply canned stuff.

If any man speaks, let him speak as the oracle of God.

I had a brother come to me this AM stunned that it seemed they struggled like they did in the debate. He seemed a bit dejected by it. I looked at parts myself and concluded something similar to what KingJimmy is saying here. The world needs more than soundbite answers to things. There is more of a dynamic to witnessing than controlling the conversation through loaded questions intended to achieve a desired result. I am trying to be very respectful here as I believe in the work that they are doing and admire them both very much.

While I do share both of your frustration about, what you term "canned stuff", I sometimes feel that avoidance of "canned stuff" can be "formulaic" in itself. Like Jordan, I would love to see a Katz vs Dawkins debate, however I note with Art that one moment he will speak for two hours on three lines that woke him up at 3am the night before, while the next he read verbatim from meticulously prepared notes.

I note of one occasion that he addressed a Jewish assembly, only to be mercilessly torn down by one rabbi after another, mostly objecting to him quote KJV, rather than Hebrew scriptures. When he spoke of this event, he told of going home dejected, all of his associates were embarrassed of him, and God gave Him no assurance that he had His mind in what he had done.

Weeks later, an old lady came to him and told of how her son attended the meeting, and was deeply impressed with the manner in which he had simply spoken his beliefs, and calmly endured such relentless ridicule. After hearing Art speak, the boy bought a copy of Ben Israel, and gave it to his mother after reading it. The lady had some further questions to ask, after reading the book, and after receiving her answers gave her life to Christ. Such is the love of God, to lead His servant through such incredible rejection, in order to lead one soul to Himself.

My point in all this is to highlight what many have already stated, and yet seems to be being ignored by some, today there are many atheists who have heard the gospel who may never have heard it faithfully presented before. Think of how many atheists would have tuned in, just to see the "Christians get a whooping". This has been promoted all over YouTube, by atheists mocking Ray and Kirk, making digs about how bananas are their "worst nightmare".

Consider how these atheists appeared, in that they couldn't even show their opponents common courtesy. It's not apologetics that changes lives, but it's "changed lives" that changes lives. We need to accept the fact that the message got out. After all, it is the **preaching** of the Cross, which is foolishness to some, and offensive to others, that God has ordained to save men by, not the **proving** of the Cross.

Re: ABC.com to air debate on God online - posted by MSeaman (), on: 2007/5/10 13:07

I did watch part of Ray's part of the debate, but didn't see the whole thing. Ray Comfort and Kirk Cameron went into this whole thing knowing that they would be ridiculed and heckled. They are used to it. They use it to their advantage. The atheists were in a group, so they could all boo, hiss, heckle, ridicule together as a group. But Ray and Kirk always give the law, and usually follow up with the Good News. So each of those atheists when on their own had their own conscience to deal with. It's easy to scoff when there are others around. Not so hard when God's Spirit is convicting you individually in your car, or your bed or wherever. Do you think that our God didn't know who would be in that audience and whose heart was just waiting to hear the Word?

Praise God, His Word went forth. A seed was planted somewhere. I have no doubt that God had someone He wanted to reach before this ever started.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/10 13:18

Quote:
-----Aaron's: Consider how these atheists appeared, in that they couldn't even show their opponents common courtesy. It's not apologetics that changes lives, but it's "changed lives" that changes lives. We need to accept the fact that the message got out. After all, it is the preaching of the Cross, which is foolishness to some, and offensive to others, that God has ordained to save men by, not the proving of the Cross.

Well spoken.

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/5/10 13:20

Quote:

MSeaman wrote:

I did watch part of Ray's part of the debate, but didn't see the whole thing. Ray Comfort and Kirk Cameron went into this whole thing knowing that they would be ridiculed and heckled. They are used to it. They use it to their advantage. The atheists were in a group, so they could all boo, hiss, heckle, ridicule together as a group.

Here's a portion from Ray's newsletter:

Quote:

Just a quick note to let you know that the debate went wonderfully.

When I say "wonderfully," I have to qualify it. It was like an open air with an unreasonable and loud heckler. The "heckler" in this case wasn't just the two atheists we were there to debate, but the fifty atheists in the audience. As per ABC's stipulations, the audience was composed half-and-half -- fifty Christians and fifty atheists. The Christians were very quiet and polite -- the atheists weren't. It was very apparant who was who in the audience. It seemed that no matter what we said, it was completely ignored by Brian and Kelly (the atheists) and then followed up with their anger, mockery, and insults. But as with a good open air, the heckler is simply a platform to speak to the crowd who is listening. In this case there is a crowd of millions who will hear clear, concise evidence for the existence of God. How incredible. So I am delighted, because of what we were able to say.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/10 14:24

I would encourage everyone to give a listen to the *whole* debate as little snippets do not do justice to it in its entirety. I jumped the gun on the debate coupling the brother's concerns with past concerns I have had and then listening to a portion that did not do justice to the whole debate.

He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him. (Proverbs 18:13)

I have a much better sense of what happened having listened to the whole debate. I still believe what I said in the previous post. I just think Ray and Kurt did well in presenting the Gospel and had not as much leaned upon the Q & A thing as I originally believed. Praise God Christ is preached!!

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2007/5/10 15:14

Could it be that an apologetical church is an apostating church?

Praise God for Kirk Cameron and Ray Comfort being a good reasonable example of those that believe in a literal hell and a gospel that saves.

But may we strive to seek the power of God and a holy life being the most effective church as God intended it.

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2007/5/10 15:25

Can someone please provide a link where I can download the audio of this debate?

Thanks,

Ron

Re:, on: 2007/5/10 15:26

Quote:

-----I would encourage everyone to give a listen to the whole debate as little snippets do not do justice to it in it's entirety.

Good advice. Do you know where we can find this?

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/10 16:32

<http://abcnews.go.com/nightline>

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/10 16:46

I also encourage everyone to watch all of the debate. Kirk and Ray faithfully presented the gospel and this thrills my soul!!!

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/10 17:57

Actually, in my opinion, their presentation of the gospel message was lacking. Such is what I expected, as WOTM as great as it is in many things, is lacking terribly when it comes to an actual gospel presentation. So much so I would say few people could actually get saved from such preaching.

As shocking as this might seem to many of you, and as harsh as this might come across, it is the truth. Romans 10 says that if we confess Jesus as Lord and believe in our hearts that God raised Him from the dead, we can be saved. But the central fact, the resurrection of Jesus Christ, is almost entirely lost in our modern gospel preaching, including that of WOTM.

If you go back through the ABC debate, you'll spend more time watching Ray Comfort point to a Coke can as proof of God, rather than pointing to the resurrection of Christ. In fact, I don't think the resurrection even gets mentioned in the entire debate!!! I'll give Ray the benefit of the doubt, and assume he mentioned it. But if he did mention it, he mentioned it in such a way that it scarcely caught the viewers attention, and mentioned it in such a way as it to be of no consequence. And I believe our lack of resurrection preaching simply comes from our lack of resurrection living. And if we aren't living lives grounded in that resurrection, it's no wonder our ministries are so little concerned about it.

And it is because of this that I cannot rejoice with the many of you who believe some great thing occurred with Ray and Kirk getting on national TV. For no gospel was truly preached. Since when does going through a few of the Ten Commandments constitute gospel preaching? An Orthodox Jew could have said much of the very same things! Rather than rejoicing, I'm quite saddened over the entire thing. And I'm all the more saddened that the many of you are excited about the entire thing!

How is it that so many of you who hear all sorts of sermons about revival, anointing, and the resurrection not notice such a horrible lack?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/10 22:05

Quote:

-----How is it that so many of you who hear all sorts of sermons about revival, anointing, and the resurrection not notice such a horrible lack?

But you will recall that the topic of the discussion was not the Gospel, but whether or not one could prove the existence of God. His audience was atheists. How can the men get to Romans 10 in 13 minutes when he was dealing with atheists? Is it not in Romans 1 and 2 where he should have been?

If Ray had stood up and read 'prophetically' the thoughts and hearts of them the people, many, including many Christian

s, would have thought he (Ray) was of the devil. That is the sad reality of where we really are today. If we want to talk about uncton and NT preaching- we going to have to start talking about the *demonstration* of the power of God.

1 Cor 2:4-5

And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power:

That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.

There would be no need to talk apologetics if the dead were raised in the name of Christ (Acts 20:9-12). There would be no need for apologetics if devils came screaming out of people in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 8:7). There would be no need for apologetics if a man lame from birth stood to his feet and began walking in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 3:6-12). There would be no need for apologetics if the power of God was manifest in the place to a level where the people went to sacrifice to the ones who called on His Name (Acts 14:8-13). There would be no need for apologetics if when folk lied to the Holy Ghost in the midst of the congregation their bones were carried out like Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5). There would be no need for apologetics if once we left off preaching we were caught up by the Holy Ghost and carried off to another location (Acts 8:39). And many more like things we could say; but when is God going to begin to bear us witness both with signs and wonder and gifts of the Holy Ghost according to His will of our message (Hebrews 2:3-4).

We can talk about a lot of things but where is the demonstration of the power of God that accompanied the preaching of the Gospel in Acts that seemed to be front and center?

Re:, on: 2007/5/10 22:56

Quote:

-----In fact, I don't think the resurrection even gets mentioned in the entire debate!!!

I exhort you dear brother to listen to the entire debate as well as the interview with the host. The Resurrection was proclaimed.

I do share your desire for more of it to be preached and taught. Shouldn't we all desire more of it? Nevertheless it was preached... Kirk and Ray were limited in their time and they covered a lot of vital truths in the gospel in such a short amount of time. Praise the Lord for that. I'm sure we both desire for them to spend more time presenting these truths. Do not fault them for this. They had a limited time. They preached the whole counsel of the gospel.

Quote:

-----But if he did mention it, he mentioned it in such a way that it scarcely caught the viewers attention, and mentioned it in such a way as it to be of no consequence.

They did mention it and it caught my attention. My spirit rejoiced greatly at the sweet sound of it being proclaimed to lost and dead hearts.

For you to say there was no consequence in the way they preached it, is for you to affirm that I didn't rejoice in God at the hearing of it. Do be careful of what you say, of what you don't know as fact. "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him." -Pro 18:13 "Doth our law judge any man, before it hear him, and know what he doeth?" -Jn 7:51

Quote:

-----Since when does going through a few of the Ten Commandments constitute gospel preaching?

If it were so that this was all that they preached, you would have a reason to be grieved, and I would share your tears. However, they did not just preach the law. They proclaimed future punishment, the righteous judgment of God, the deity of Christ, the cross of Christ, the resurrection, repentance, and faith.

I would love to hear an hour long sermon on each of these points. Each are vital and most necessary. But, again they had a limited amount of time and each of these vital truths were proclaimed. Praise the Lord for that.

The resurrection is a must in our presentation of the gospel. However, if one does not hear the Law of God and the righteous judgments of God demonstrated at the cross of Christ, they will not be persuaded.

If you start your presentation with "Jesus rose from the dead", there is going to be no understanding of the resurrection if you don't proclaim why Christ died.

I do not assume you are not aware of the use of the law and its importance in evangelism. But, your statement about the Law and Gospel preaching is a familiar one that has its roots from hell.

"The LORD is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honorable." -Isa 42:21

"The law is the first message of the cross. There are three truths of the Bible that stand or fall together. They are the law of God summarized in the Ten Commandments, the cross, and the righteous judgment of almighty God. Why do I say that these truths stand or fall together? Because you cannot touch one without touching the others.

1. If you do away with the Ten Commandments, there is no such thing as sin ("...sin is the transgression of the Law" -1 John 3:4). If there is no sin, the cross is not necessary.

2. If you do away with the cross, you have no answer to the sin question, and there is no hope for sinners.

3. If you do away with the righteous judgment of almighty God, who cares about sin, the cross, or Christ? The law is the first message of the cross." -Ernest C. Reisinger

God bless you dear brother and I am blessed to hear your desire for the resurrection to be proclaimed.

-Abraham

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2007/5/10 23:47

Why is it so hard for us to accept that we so often fall short?

I think of Peter preaching in the power of the Holy Spirit. It brought such conviction that men were "pricked in their heart." The word in the original is much stronger, more like they were "cut in half." That's how devastating Peter's words were. And they repented. "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" (Acts 2.37)

Or Stephen. Those who heard him, the same thing happened. "They were cut to the heart." But this time they didn't repent: they stoned him.

Why? It was the Holy Spirit.

"Nevertheless I tell you the truth: it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send Him unto you. And when He is come HE will reprove (convict) the world of sin..." (John 16.7).

It takes more than the law to convict of sin: it takes the Holy Spirit. Do you think a few atheists are too much for the Holy Spirit? When HE is there, the results will be either repentance, or stoning.

Is it too hard for us to accept that largely we lack this? Isn't this why we are seeking Him for revival? (Although we need much more than revival.) But no, we "have another go at it" in our own strength, and wonder later why we fall flat on our face.

I am tired of seeing the Ark getting carried into battle against the Philistines, and getting captured!

AD

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/5/11 8:51

Quote:

ADisciple wrote:

It takes more than the law to convict of sin: it takes the Holy Spirit. Do you think a few atheists are too much for The Holy Spirit? When HE is there, **the results will be** (emphasis added) either repentance, or stoning.

Is it too hard for us to accept that largely we lack this? Isn't this why we are seeking Him for revival? (Although we need much more than revival.) But no, we "have another go at it" in our own strength, and wonder later why we fall flat on our face.

I am tired of seeing the Ark getting carried into battle against the Philistines, and getting captured!

AD

I'm sorry, I'm unaware that anything was "captured" here. And with your observation of what "the results will be", when the Holy Spirit anoints a message, I guess Paul wasn't anointed when he preached on Mars Hill (Acts 17). After all, four decisions and a expression of interest from some of the hearers, "does not revival a-make". Why is it that we continually feel the need to "lean on our own understanding" when assessing whether God is, or isn't involved in something?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/11 8:53

Quote:

-----Is it too hard for us to accept that largely we lack this? Isn't this why we are seeking Him for revival? (Although we need much more than revival.) But no, we "have another go at it" in our own strength, and wonder later why we fall flat on our face.

I am tired of seeing the Ark getting carried into battle against the Philistines, and getting captured!

There is a lot here and others may see more, but:

- 1) Is there conviction of sin in our ministry?
- 2) If not, Why? Is there a sense that God is near?
- 3) How is conviction of sin brought about? How is God made near? Or is this a proper way of thinking?
- 4) Is the Holy Spirit automatically 'there' when the Gospel is preached or are there 'criteria' for Him being present?
- 5) If God does the 'sending' will He not also make provision?
- 6) What is revival?
- 7) What brings about revival?
- 8) Is the Ark in effect on a 'cart' in many cases?
- 9) What does it mean for the Ark to be on the shoulders of the priests?
- 10) Who are the priests?
- 11) What role does the 'leading' of the Holy Spirit have in all this?
- 12) Do the priests carry the Ark whithersoever *they* will?

I'm going out on a limb here, but I think we can't give lip service to God being front and center in our waiting on Him. If we do what He wants done it will be anointed (I use that term loosely). If we do what we want to do- no telling what will happen.

ppen. What does it mean to be 'led by the Spirit?' Does it mean that God 'signs off' on what I do because I spent 3 hours in prayer? If that works, where's the power? Wheres the unction? The disciples raised a lame man to His feet in the name of Christ because they 'had' something. On their way to pray they 'had' something. What did they have? It was not silver and gold? What was the 'such as I have' that they 'gave unto thee'? Notice they 'had' it on the way *to* prayer and not *from* prayer. What was it that the sons of Sceva wanted to buy with money? I have never had an offer like that. No one ever came to me and said, "Man give me that ability and I will pay you!" What are we missing? This is the pink elephant in the middle of the room that no one wants to acknowledge. The NT Saints; deacons, apostles, etc., walked in the power of God. They had the 'full' package. They were 'full' of the Holy Ghost.

Quote:

-----Could it be that a apologetical church is a apostating church?

Could it be that we are drifting away from God and doing a lot of things in the name of God and He is not showing up?

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/5/11 9:47

Suddenly the conversation is much larger than Ray Comfort and Kirk Cameron.

Brother Robert, if I could answer your questions I would be some kind of man.

You are describing the shape, form, and volume of a hole...it is not a something that is there but something that is not there. I am convinced it has something greatly to do with the lack of a primitive faith in our God.

We live in such a mechanistic prayerless age, that even most prayers are more expressions of our boastful human virtue than real faith in God. I think we are preaching and prophesying ourselves out of expecting God. We have too many people who claim to know that the sun is setting in the west.

They may be holy prophets indeed but they do not decide the issue...prayer will decide the issue because God has the issue in hand.

Joshua saw that the sun's setting in the west was going to deny God's people a victory. His prayer stopped the setting of the sun and the rising of the moon...our prayers can do that and even more.

Formulaic and step by step methods of prayer, requirements of duration or passion all be damned. I am talking about a primitive expectation of God. Yet even now we bring too much education to bear on Church history, with our sociological, economic, and political explanations for past revivals...unbelieving hubris in the simple power, purpose and provision in prayer. Already we are saying "yes, but prayer must have feet..." and go about our plan without real prayer, or even worse we waste our time in hours of prayer (a spiritless parody) while still believing the outcome is of our own design and doing.

So if we believe the Church in America is finished, please let's not tell others about the hours we've spent in prayer to no avail. Such tellings are a denouncement of not only prayer, but even of the Lord. Such misplaced confidence in our own smart assessment of the church is the most cunning form of idolatry...we may be well informed about a great many matters except about that which God can do.

Samson's strength did not help him when he was thirsty. It was prayer. Likewise our great strength, our heritage of the faith, our knowledge of the scriptures, our experience in witnessing and preaching, our mastery of ancient languages, will not help us either.

Jacob was often a crafty rebel, but when he wrestled with God he was given a ladder. It does not take a great man to pray, but prayer will make great men out of even rebels.

So this is my two cents brother. My confidence is not in prayer...

my confidence is in prayer that sees the Lord. Some will say yes, but we must first be willing to pick up the cross---but I know without prayer the cross is too heavy. Others will say, all depends on holiness, boldness, or sacrifice, or preachers who are unafraid of rebuking....yet all of these outcomes are impossible without the specific kind of prayer that actually

xpects God to send down his fire.

By the way..I doubt God ever "signs off" on our plans...I am a novice but the only signing I can find in the NT is on a man's heart and even on a man's forehead...he signs the man, not the plan.

So let's stop beating each other up for the lack of fire in our own lives. It may take years...but it can also only take a moment...we can't keep prophesying to each other that it's over and then believe our prayers are useful. Prophets may have foreseen the movements of the heavens, but the movements of the heavens can be arrested through prayer.

For nearly a century we have invented and prescribed methods of church. We inventors and prescribers are failures in every sense of the word. Yet, in spite of the failure there is an unction to pray! That there is an unction to pray upon the likes of me has given me the hope that I have been longing for. I believe God will supply a kind of prayer that God answers and his answers are not hidden and mysterious but glorious. I am happy to let this prayer be the last and final calling on my life.

I am happy also to taste the dust dear brothers....I am the weakest here. I have complained and whined about my weak personality often to the Lord. He knows I have envied stronger men...their characters, their command, their influence. Yet in spite of my sin He has been most merciful to me...He has satisfied my soul and let me know He helps the Church. I know the Lord will not be absent from us in our hour of need.

MC

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/11 10:45

Thanks for sharing that MC. I needed that.

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2007/5/11 11:50

Quote:

RobertW wrote:

Could it be that we are drifting away from God and doing a lot of things in the name of God and He is not showing up?

Here's another question to add to the list Robert lays out in his last post.

"The priests said not, Where is the LORD?" (Jer. 2.8)

But as then, so now. We suppose Him to be in the company. We continue on without Him. The Ark of God, when the Philistines finally were able to get rid of it, was put in the house of Abinadab in Kirjathjearim, where it remained long time. Saul, it seems, went his whole reign without being much concerned for the whereabouts of the Ark.

It took David to bring it back. (After he had discovered God's way.)

...When I see in Scripture and throughout Church history what happens when the Lord IS present, I feel ashamed at the way we try so hard to find ways to say He is in the picture when He is so conspicuously absent.

Just prior to the revival in the Hebrides back in the late 1940's, there was a prayer meeting (in a barn, I think it was) and as a few of them were seeking God and agonizing over their condition, one of the young men said something like, "Surely the Lord Jesus Christ can do better than this!"

The rest is history. God met that cry, obviously pleased at the way it honoured Him.

I grieve at the way our God is mocked and scorned among the heathen (because of us). He is able to put His enemies to shame... if we will seek Him for a deeper circumcision!

"Father, glorify Thy Name," cried Jesus. And the Father replied, "I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again" (Jn. 12.

28).

He will be as glorified in the Church as He was in the life of our Lord Jesus Christ!

Let us seek Him that His Glory be revealed! THEN let's see what the atheists have to say. When the Lord is in His Holy Temple, all the earth will be dumfounded before Him.

AD

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/12 10:54

Quote:

But you will recall that the topic of the discussion was not the Gospel, but whether or not one could prove the existence of God.

But this is not really what happened, and as others noted before the debate, Ray was (and did in fact do so) going to spend more time preaching than proving the existence of God. What Ray did was more of a bait & switch. He organized the debate under the auspices of scientifically proving the existence of God apart from faith and the Scriptures. But this he did not stick to by any means, nor did he do-- just as the atheists stated quite clearly in the closing remarks of the debate. His second and third points that attempted to prove the existence of God were far from scientific. It was just typical WOTM pre-canned gospel presentations.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/12 11:04

Quote:

I exhort you dear brother to listen to the entire debate as well as the interview with the host. The Resurrection was proclaimed.

You are right, it is mentioned about 2 or 3 times from my count. One has to be paying extremely close attention to even notice it was mentioned. If one was not listening for it, you would not have noticed it. For it was mentioned in such a way as to be of no consequence. It was mentioned as an "oh, by the way..." as something required to be tacked on after a long gospel presentation, rather than being the very heart of the gospel. And this is typical of our modern day preaching of the resurrection. It is something we staple on to our presentations, because we are orthodox after all. But it fails to be the essence of our message.

Quote:

I would love to hear an hour long sermon on each of these points. Each are vital and most necessary. But, again they had a limited amount of time and each of these vital truths were proclaimed. Praise the Lord for that.

A limited amount of time is not excuse for giving the heart of the gospel scant attention.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/12 11:13

Quote:

It takes more than the law to convict of sin: it takes the Holy Spirit.

Amen. For unless one has a revelation of God and His holiness, the law of God will fail to convict a person of their sins. Granted, through the law comes the knowledge of sin, and we would not know sin apart from the law. But you will not know the awfulness of sin, and knowing it as *your* sin apart from such a personal revelation. The 3,000 that were converted on the day of Pentecost were not such because Peter beat them to death with the Ten Commandments. Rather, what convicted them was the knowledge that the very person they crucified and murdered God had raised from the dead, making Him both Lord and Christ.

Re: - posted by repentcanada, on: 2007/5/12 11:15

Remember the 3,000 on the Day of Pentecost had knowledge of their sins!

Re: - posted by repentcanada, on: 2007/5/12 11:18

They spoke a lot about the debate on Way of the Master Radio, they gave a lot of background info on the debate.

The shows are here:

<http://www.wayofthemasterradio.com/podcast/2007/05/10/may-09-2007-hour-1/>

<http://www.wayofthemasterradio.com/podcast/2007/05/10/may-09-2007-hour-2/>

Re: - posted by nowornever, on: 2007/5/12 15:49

The men that were added to the kingdom were men of Israel. They knew the Law and because they knew the Law, they recognized their sin.

People today think they are good and their goodness is going to allow them to go to heaven.

Without giving them the 10 commandments you are feeding them what they perceive as foolishness and they will never understand why they need to be saved. Furthermore you are intimating that Ray and Kirk are not saved and that the Holy Spirit was not working in the message. You have no idea if one of the hundreds of thousands of people that heard the Gospel on that broadcast were pricked in their hearts. I dare say that even if only one comes into the Kingdom it was worth it.

Re:, on: 2007/5/12 16:42

Quote:

-----He organized the debate under the auspices of scientifically proving the existence of God apart from faith and the Scriptures. But this he did not stick to by any means, nor did he do-- just as the atheists stated quite clearly in the closing remarks of the debate.

All men already believe in God and are already very aware of His existence. "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them."

God has already proven his existence to every man through creation and conscience. "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse."

Ray and Kirk simply pointed this out. That is why they proclaim, "God doesn't believe in athiest"
...and they did it without scripture. It took less than a minute of the time that they were given. Keep in mind, God can't be proven, when He already has proven himself to be the creator.

If someone told me "I don't believe in you" (though they are looking right at me). I can't really prove to them what they already know as fact. but, to make it really clear to them that they do believe I exist, I tell them, "Look I'll prove it to you." and then I gently and lovingly slap them in the face. As they say, "Hey that hurt! Why did you do that!" ...I then tell them "See, you already believe in me, you just hate me and don't want me around. You love your selfish ways so much, that you will believe a lie to fulfill your lusts."

And so it is, men don't want God around because He convicts them of the sin they love so dearly.

They are very aware of His existence.

Ray and Kirk proved God's existence just by walking in the building. They are walking and breathing proof of God's creativity.

I don't recall Ray or Kirk telling anyone that they would not preach the gospel to the world.

"...for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel!"

-Abraham

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2007/5/12 18:29

I was once a blind ignorant atheist, and a fool. God in love brought me to my knees. So there is no doubt God is able to turn an atheist's heart.

I recall a true story I read years ago. But I can't quite recall just where it came from, or what period of Christian history; for that reason I have hesitated sharing it. But maybe someone else will have heard it. If so, please refresh my memory.

Anyway, there was a certain atheist who made a big sound to the Christians about there being no God. And finally he challenged God to reveal Himself out in the open. He told the Christians something like this: "I am going to stand in the public square, and I challenge God to come and meet me. If He's real let Him meet me in the public square and reveal Himself."

So at the appointed time the atheist went to the public square. A crowd gathered around. And the man again shouted His challenge to God, and shook his fist in the air. "Come on! Come and meet me!"

Some time elapsed, with the man boasting his victory. "See," he taunted the Christians. "There is no God."

But then a tiny stinging fly flew into the man's eye... and he cried in pain and groped about for someone to take him by the hand.

Whether or not the man later repented and turned his heart to God I don't know.

But those who are blinded by the pride of their heart need more than a debate on their own terms to be made to see. Our God is able to reveal Himself and put to silence the ignorance of foolish men. (He likes to use the weak and foolish things to confound the wise.)

But WE ourselves are going to have to get closer to Him first; He is going to have to touch our own strength and wisdom first!

I want to see God come forth in such wisdom and power and authority that there will be no question: was God there? Did that do any good? etc. etc. And we end up arguing among ourselves whether or not that was of God. And our enemies laugh among themselves.

The story above happened during a time when a measure of God's Presence and anointing was among His people. An

d it's because of that that God met the atheist in the public square.

But what about today? Where is God's Presence? Apparently the atheists have a web site where they are gathering to gether to consolidate their position and boldly "take the pledge" against God. I tremble to hear that. But sadly, I think it likely they might be able to do this untouched. God, be merciful. We need You to visit us, Lord.

And one more thing. Many use this thought, "If even one soul was saved, it was worth it." I just feel that's not good enough any more (if it ever was). That doesn't satisfy me; I am sure it doesn't satisfy God either. If you planted a quarter section of ground and only one blade came up you would call that a total crop failure.

God is ABLE and WILLING to do MORE, and GREATER, and show Himself GOD! If He can find a willing seeking people! He is BREAKING to reveal Himself! "Let God ARISE, and His enemies be SCATTERED! Let them also that hate Him flee before Him. As smoke is driven away so drive them away; as wax melteth before the fire so let the wicked perish at the PRESENCE of God" (Ps 68).

AD

Re: you might have something there - posted by dohzman (), on: 2007/5/12 20:45

Recently I have been in the midst of a real life battle. So I have been spending great amounts of time studying and praying and seeking the Lord. One day a week or so ago I decided to relax somewhat from this discipline while still in the midst of this battle which is still raging in my circumstances (even now as I write this). I sat down alone at home, my wife and children went to the store, out of boredom I picked up the TV remote (even though I watch less than 2 hrs worth of TV per week), and I started to flip through the channels, not really looking at anything in particular, out of the clear blue I heard the Holy Spirit speak to me very unexpectedly and very clearly, He asked me a question, I'll share the question and then make a comment. The question was, "In the OT when the saints of old faced life or death situations (at this point my mind flooded with scripture almost faster than I could contain), do you suppose they sat and watched TV?"

I promptly turned off the TV and redirected my attention on the Lord and have from that time till now have been meditating on His Word and His Word (if you know what I mean). I believe that when Israel was surrounded by, say, Assyria, they had any trouble in that situation hearing from God and obeying. And that after all is true revival. I don't believe the church is desperate for Revival and I don't believe individual believers are. If it was a matter of either I see God move today in my life or I die, then maybe, just maybe the Lord whom we seek would suddenly appear. I'm talking to myself here but I'm also asking Jesus to change me in the midst of this trial inside and out. At the end of the day it's still to him that has an ear to hear, and if "you" would be my disciple, the call is still to the individual. Revival is still the response of one person who will be desperate enough to remove everything out of their life and to hear and obey God's voice to them.

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2007/5/12 22:17

Quote:

dohzman wrote:

Revival is still the response of one person who will be desperate enough to remove everything out of their life and to hear and obey God's voice to them.

Yes. In fact there is nothing more a "life and death" thing itself than flipping the channels of the TV. If it truly registered on us that it was "for our life" would we be so easy going about it?

It really is, I believe, us, and not the cold-hearted atheists who the Lord has His attention on right now. In fact cold-hearted

ed atheists have through history provided the Lord with some of His best men.

So it's not them: it's the lukewarm He has His difficulty with.

AD

Re: ABC.com to air debate on God online - posted by davidt, on: 2007/5/13 1:44

I went to the Transformed Conference today in Kansas. As I thought Todd said they were under a spiritual warfare they hadn't quite seen before! They said that man had a demon, and the Kirk, Ray, and Todd were all taken back by it.

Re:, on: 2007/5/13 2:59

Quote:

-----They said that man had a demon, and the Kirk, Ray, and Todd were all taken back by it.

How was the conference? A Demon... do say more.

Re: - posted by davidt, on: 2007/5/14 1:32

Quote:

-----How was the conference? A Demon... do say more.

That is about the gist of it. Todd didn't talk about it that much, just very emphatically. He just said they hadn't really seen anything of the likes of that and that all three of them knew certainly that it and he was demonic and the whole room.

The conference was great. It was in a big Baptist church. They preached and exhorted and then Ray gave a solid altar call of repentance "without any music or heads down". Ray is a prophet I think he is intense. I think that through these conferences the expansion of the ministry is sky rocketing across America and soon internationally. On Way of the Master youtube account they have a clip of Todd talking to the guy.

Re: ABC.com to air debate on God online - posted by ravenmolehil, on: 2007/5/21 11:55

Paris Reidhead gives an account of trying to prove the existence of God in a similar situation; but comes to a different perspective in doing so...

Deliverance of Power 37mins

<http://64.34.176.235/sermons/SID0115.mp3>

(goes into the topic around min 9)

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/21 13:32

Quote:

-----They said that man had a demon, and the Kirk, Ray, and Todd were all taken back by it.

I wonder if the demon was taken back by the fact that Kirk, Ray, and Todd all had the Spirit of God in them...