

**News and Current Events :: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes**

**US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes - posted by White\_Stone (), on: 2010/1/18 13:55**

(<http://abcnews.go.com/Blotter/us-military-weapons-inscribed-secret-jesus-bible-codes/story?id9575794>) ABC News Blog

Comments?

**Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes , on: 2010/1/18 16:18**

The guy whining about it is off his rocker... there is no "constitutional separation of church and state". Only idiots believe that, not people who have actually read the Constitution.

But... it is a bit of a canundrum.

One more thing: we can try to pretend that this is not a religious war all we want. The fact is our enemy certainly see it as a religious war. As long as our enemies see it that way... that's the way it is. It is a spiritual war.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by White\_Stone (), on: 2010/1/18 17:10**

Perhaps I should have stated my feelings about this when I started the thread, sorry.

I see nothing wrong with it.

I have read of bullets made by prisoners of WW2 having scriptures inside them instead of gunpowder. This story was in a book I read many years ago. Since I rarely get rid of a book, one day I might come across it again. When I do, I will post the story in its entirety as I am sure I perhaps misremembered it. (It is an age related thing, not willful.)

Regards,  
white stone

**Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes , on: 2010/1/18 18:21**

That's awesome that company was doing that!

"spiritually transformed firearm of Jesus Christ"

That's awesome too. STFJC's

I know there are many who think that certain wars we've been engaged in are wrong. I'm not judging about that, only saying the thing with the guns is COOL.

It is terrible for Michael Weinstein! The Lord Jesus has an STFJC pointing at Mr. Weinstein with Luke 9:26 inscribed on it.

**Re: , on: 2010/1/18 22:48**

Wow

**Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2010/1/23 14:45**

Hi everyone,

I appologise for bringing this thread back up but it came to mind this morning and I wanted to share a few things with you all.

I suppose that whatever our opinions are, what would matter most is how does the Lord Jesus feel about this: because it is His word and His Name and reputation that are being used and invoked.

I believe that the scripture teaches that God uses earthly powers to administer justice and also punishment in the Earth; but that, I believe, includes all earthly powers and not just those that have a "Christian" heritage.

But there is something troubling about putting the Word and Name of the Lord Jesus into these things.

I believe that states are God's agency on Earth for justice and that His Church is His agency on Earth for salvation, **and that these two can never be conjoined except it cause much hurt and leave us with something that we will be at great pains to extricate ourselves from.**

I have said before that I'm not convinced that the scripture forbids Christians from participating in earthly governments, and I still feel that way, but I believe that in regards to individuals and how they may personally have liberty of conscience to do those things, as unto the Lord, but not under the banner of the Church of the Lord Jesus, with the exception perhaps of military chaplains that are being asked to perform a service to states as agents of the Church and where such service would of necessity be conspicuously done in Christs' name.

But I believe that the state and its weapons should never be used in any way that would give the impression they are agents of the Church of Christ or being used in its service.

Yes, I believe the scripture teaches that God uses human agencies and that He is active among them, even in their use of weapons, but I think that is more often by means of coercion, and without their agreement or even knowing it, that is, that God may either force their hand(as with Pharaoh), or drag them with hooks in their jaws(Ezekiel 38:3-4), or by turning them(Proverbs 21:1), or driving them wherever or however He will(Ps 44:2, Is 22:15-19, Dan 4:23-25).

But this is not the relationship that is expressed in the Scripture between God and the Church, between Christ and the people who are His and are called His bride. This relationship is expressed in the most intimate terms and the Lord Christ says that He does not call His people servants(though we are still such), but he calls them His friends(John 15:15).

And so for the State and its weapons and exercises which it has been given by God to exercise in the Earth, for it to be mixed into the work of the Church is a very indecent intrusion.

And so also, the Church should never seek to impose its ecclesiastical laws or practices upon the State: by this I mean it's doctrines, beliefs, and customs that are unique to it alone in the Earth(Luke 10:22, John 6:63). For the Church to do so would be a very indecent thing also and to profane those Holy things that God has given to it.

By all means, I think that governments can wisely and judiciously aid Christian people and the Christian Church by giving it and them liberties and protections which should be given. And by all means the Church can as a whole aid governments by praying for their leaders and living quite and good lives.

But, as far as I'm concerned, the two should never ever be mixed to any point where it can no longer and without even the slightest difficulty, distinguish between....

...which is which.

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/1/23 15:52**

Quote:

-----But there is something troubling about putting the Word and Name of the Lord Jesus into these things.  
-----

Hi Chris.

Actually it made me sick when I first read that these beautiful scriptures were being put on weapons. That someone could do this... this is complete, total blindness.

"For we are not as many which corrupt (deal deceitfully with) the word of God..." (2 Cor. 2.17).

"For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal..." (2 Cor. 10.4).

**Re: - posted by hiscomm, on: 2010/1/24 19:34**

"I believe that states are God's agency on Earth for justice and that His Church is His agency on Earth for salvation, and that these two can never be conjoined except it cause much hurt and leave us with something that we will be at great pains to extricate ourselves from."

That's a strange statement coming from a fellow from Philadelphia. If we held to your opinion we would of never had a Revolutionary War, because 80% of the Independence messages came from the Clergy. In fact, the shot that was heard around the world happened on the Church lawn of Rev. Jonas. Eight of his congregation members died that day from British lead. As he was looking down at their bodies he said "From this day will be dated the liberty of the world"

And yes over the last fifty years the majority of the church has held to that wicked opinion. It's called Abandonment theology.

Because of that theology America has been stripped of it's spiritual heritage. As a result the people have been stripped of their virtue. Because of that theology the "legislation" (which is somebody's concept of morality) that has oozed up into Law has not been the morality of Jesus Christ! And as a result of this the enemies of God have gotten there way in America, here are a few of their quotes:

Karl Marx "We make war against all prevailing ideas of religion, of the state, of country, of patriotism. The idea of God is the keynote of a perverted civilization. It must be destroyed."

Lenin: We have to use any ruse, dodge, trick, cunning, unlawful method, concealment, and veiling of the truth. The basic rule is to exploit the conflicting interests of the capitalist states."

Lenin in 1922: First we shall take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia. After that, we shall surround and undermine the U.S.A., which will fall into our hands without a struggle.... Like an overripe fruit."

Remember what we said about keeping our virtue in which we have lost, at the founding James Madison made this state

ment:

We have staked the whole future of American civilization, not upon the power of government, far from it. We have staked the future of all our political institutions upon the capacity of mankind for self government; upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern ourselves, and to control ourselves, to sustain ourselves according to the Ten Commandments of God.Â”

The founders based this whole form of government on our ability to live virtuous lives according to the Bible. As the Abandonment Theology took hold The Bible was banned in 1963, and as Lincoln stated "the philosophy in the school room in one generation will be the philosophy in government in the next." Those same people now are our judges and leaders and they gave the following ruling: Let's see and discern if Jesus Christ would have a problem with this ruling:

"It is unconstitutional for the Ten Commandments to hang on the walls of a classroom since the students might be lead to read them, meditate upon them, respect them or obey them. Â”This is not a permissible state objective".

U.S. Supreme Stone v Graham 1980

" The only foundation of a free Constitution is pure Virtue, and if this cannot be inspired into our people in greater measure, than they have it now, they may change their rulers and the forms of government , but they will not obtain lasting liberty. John Adams

"A patriot without religion in my estimation is as great a paradox as an honest man without the fear of God. Is it possible that he whom no moral obligations bind, can have any real good will towards men? Can he be a patriot who, by an openly vicious conduct, is undermining the very bonds of society?...The scriptures tells us "righteousness exalteth a nation." Abigail Adams

And finally the end result of America as we know it, thanks to abandonment thinking in which Founding Father John Witherspoon founder of Princeton College observed: "Nothing is more certain than that widespread immorality and corruption of manners make a people ripe for destruction. Beyond a certain point even the best constitution will be ineffectual and slavery must ensue".

So our penalty for not bringing about "Legislation" that Jesus Christ would be in agreement with is a government of soft tyranny like we see coming on us now in the U.S or a communist take over, or an outside force coming in and forcing it's will over the people. Let's look at Viet Nam, we were trying to help stop the spread of that evil, and the generation that's in power now wanted us out. We leave alright, and in four years the communists who we were fighting, came in and tortured and executed 2 million men, women and children. You can now go to Cambodia, the place we left in the "name of peace" and gaze on piles and piles of skulls and bones. You can look at the trees that were used to bash the heads and bodies of the infants to death in front of their mothers. Ah yes, don't want to get involved in the things of this world.

"If I profess with the loudest voice and clearest exposition every portion of the word of God except precisely that point which the world and the Devil are at that point attacking, I am not confessing Christ however boldly I may be professing Christ. Where the battle rages, there the loyalty of the soldier is tested. To be steady in all the battlefields besides is mere flight and disgrace, if the soldier flinches at one point" Martin Luther

**Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2010/1/24 22:01**

Hi everyone,

hiscomm, welcome to the forums. I'm not from Philadelphia(but live here presently), my wife is though.

About this,

Quote:  
-----"I believe that states are God's agency on Earth for justice and that His Church is His agency on Earth for salvation, and that these two can never be conjoined except it cause much hurt and leave us with something that we will be at great pains to extricate ourselves from."

That's a strange statement coming from a fellow from Philadelphia.  
-----

I think it would be helpful to include something else I wrote first if I could?:

Quote:  
-----By all means, I think that governments can wisely and judiciously aid Christian people and the Christian Church by giving it and them liberties and protections which should be given. And by all means the Church can as a whole aid governments by praying for their leaders and living quiet and good lives.

**But, as far as I'm concerned, the two should never ever be mixed to any point where it can no longer and without even the slightest difficulty, distinguish between....**

**...which is which.**

-----  
(emphasis added)

I wanted to include that because I think it is especially relevant in a topic with a subject like this one, where a government's military weapons are being inscribed with references to scripture and the words of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The only "**opinion**" here that matters about **that** is the Lord Jesus Christ's, because they are His words, and it is His name and reputation that are being used.

As to what you called 'Abandonment Theology', my opinion here was not that Christians are forbidden in scripture to participate in civil governments as individuals, but that civil government should never become confused or mixed with the Church as a whole.

Which civil government of the past that has openly and conspicuously mixed the two so as to call itself "Christendom" should we begin to examine (if you like) in order to set forth just what evils the Name of Christ has been associated with because of it so that we can see plainly how great a loss and pains the cause of Christ has suffered, in order to know that we need not do it again?

Perhaps we could start with Spain? Or what Columbus did to the natives of America 'under the banner of Christ' while he

e was Admiral of the open seas, the title granted to him by its monarchs?

I think that the quote you provided from James Madison says the most of all:

We have staked the whole future of American civilization, not upon the power of government, far from it. We have staked the future of all our political institutions upon the capacity of mankind for self government; upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern ourselves, and to control ourselves, to sustain ourselves according to the Ten Commandments of God.Â”

**Re: - posted by hiscomm, on: 2010/1/25 13:58**

Hi:

After reading your post again I think we're both in agreement that it's not wise to have a "State" religion. And of course the founders did not want that either. The founders of our country were born in and lived through the revivals of Jonathon Edwards and George Whitefield. George Whitefield is buried in Massachusetts in the basement of a church unless they moved him. We have a rich Christian Heritage that has been marginalized and revised. I also understand over the years we Christians have not been the best examples of Jesus Christ.

Every year you see the ACLU attacking "the free exercise thereof" and other symbols of the Christian Faith. In our country there are churches on every corner and the majority of population espouse the Judeo Christian Religion. Since it has been our heritage and the verifiable history of this country I don't think we should have allowed it to be taken away from the public square. It was taught in our schools for the first 200 years and I think the words of life did a good job keeping us stable. Today you're not allowed to post or talk about anything of Christian nature in the school or governmental venues. Which should be left up to the communities to decide. Oh but you can talk about your Muslim religion or your witchcraft or your humanism, all that's ok. Just don't mention Jesus Christ or anything he's associated with. The Separation of Church and state is a farce. It's not in the Constitution. It was made up. In 1948 it was lifted out of a letter by Thomas Jefferson to Danbury Baptist Association in which he was reassuring the elders that the Federal Government did not have the power to control the affairs or decisions of the churches in America. It was written 13 years after the debate in which he was not even at the debate, but in 1948 the enemies of God have exulted his statement "building a wall of separation between Church and State" which has done so much for our society and the cause of Christ.

In 1802 Thomas Jefferson wrote the enabling act for Ohio to become a state and that the government in Ohio needed to be in agreement with the Northwest Ordinance which article III read "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessarily to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged.Â”

But now the Teachings of the Bible have been ordered struck from the public view in America, the people have to be protected from the Bible. Freedom is the choice to choose Life or Death. In America the choice for individuals to choose to freely share their faith in public has been taken away by the Lie of Separation of Church and state. If a company wants to put scripture references on their products I say God Bless Them! And we need to remember, that there are Just wars. Just wars 3000 years ago, and today. Oh yea, we fight against principalities and powers, that guess what, use people to kill, steal and destroy other innocent people.

It's flat out wrong, to check your Bible at the door, or your faith at the door when you enter into a school or other governmental venue. Especially when our ancestors came over here in order to practice their religion of choice freely.

Sincerely

**Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes , on: 2010/1/25 15:11**

Hi Chris(JD),

I really appreciate the care and clarity with which you explained your view. It makes sense to me. It seems to be something about appropriate boundaries, rather than 'either-or'.

The retrospective vision of the 'warrior monk' has always disturbed me; but the inscribing of killing machines with the word of God, as if the method or the cause are essentially endorsed by Him. somehow goes even further.

hiscomm,

I appreciated your quotes from the verbal arsenal of past politicians, in particular, and your contributions in general. As Chris said 'welcome'!

**Re: - posted by Nellie, on: 2010/1/25 16:27**

Amen Krispy.  
It is a Spiritual War.  
Thank God, we win in the end.  
God Bless all.  
Nellie

**Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes , on: 2010/1/25 17:19**

It seems like a good thing for people to have bible verses in front of them no matter what situation they are in. I want bible verses to be available to soldiers on both sides of a conflict. It sounds like a good evangelism tool. Our army has homosexuals in it. Maybe one of them will be convicted by thinking about Jesus Christ and repent.

Soldiers are often in dangerous situations. A lot of them are very young men who urgently need to be right with the Lord. Reminders of God's word seem like a good thing to me.

**Re: , on: 2010/1/25 17:24**

I found a couple bible verses that some would see as being relevant to the scripture references on the firearms. What do you folks think about these?

"Let the high praises of God be in their throats and two-edged swords in their hands to take vengeance on the nations, to punish the people of the world, to put their kings in chains and their leaders in iron shackles, to carry out the judgment that is written against them. This is an honor that belongs to all his godly ones. Hallelujah!"

"Praise be to the Lord my Rock, who trains my hands for war, my fingers for battle."

**Re: - posted by hiscomm, on: 2010/1/25 19:48**

Hi:

God did say that David was a man after his own heart. David's job was a warrior, along with his ancestors Moses and Joshua and they killed many of men swinging those swords, impaling with those spears and shooting those arrows. It's a bloody business taking the promise land and they did it passionately and with no apologies. From what I read about David, I wouldn't put past him if he did not carve a few praises into the implements he used to carve up God's enemies and meting out judgement on those who's sin had reached their limit. Then the righteous sword, ax or spear of judgement did it's work.

"Praise be to the Lord my Rock, who trains my hands for war, my fingers for battle." thank you benjoseph for that "sharp

" eye on the scriptures!

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/1/25 19:54**

Isn't somebody going to call attention to the fact that we are under a New Covenant now, and wrestle not with flesh and blood, but with spiritual forces... and that our weapons therefore must be spiritual weapons, and not carnal ones?

Surely we know that by now.

**Re: - posted by hiscomm, on: 2010/1/25 20:26**

Hi: I agree! And I'm sure our Christian soldiers in Afganastan who meet face to face with death everyday are doing just that, and probably with more intensity than what we usually do, and then they head out with their weapons in hand to do their job.

Deuteronomy 6:4-9 4"Hear, O Israel! The LORD is our God, the LORD alone. 5And you must love the LORD your God with all your heart, all your soul, and all your strength. 6And you must commit yourselves wholeheartedly to these commands I am giving you today. 7Repeat them again and again to your children. Talk about them when you are at home and when you are away on a journey, when you are lying down and when you are getting up again. 8Tie them to your hands as a reminder, and wear them on your forehead. 9Write them on the doorposts of your house and on your gates.

Philippians 4:8-9 8And now, dear brothers and sisters, let me say one more thing as I close this letter. Fix your thoughts on what is true and honorable and right. Think about things that are pure and lovely and admirable. Think about things that are excellent and worthy of praise. 9Keep putting into practice all you learned from me and heard from me and saw me doing, and the God of peace will be with you.

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/1/25 20:55**

Quote:  
-----and then they head out with their weapons in hand to do their job.  
-----

They might be doing just that under the banner of the UN or the USA.

But they certainly cannot do that, they cannot use those kinds of weapons, under the banner of the Kingdom of God.

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2010/1/25 21:18**

Hi ADisciple...

Quote:  
-----They might be doing just that under the banner of the UN or the USA.

But they certainly cannot do that, they cannot use those kinds of weapons, under the banner of the Kingdom of God.

-----  
Are you saying that it is impossible to be a child of God and serve as a soldier?

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/1/25 21:57**

Quote:  
-----Are you saying that it is impossible to be a child of God and serve as a soldier?  
-----

I'm saying it's impossible to go forth in the Name of Christ and the Gospel of the Kingdom... with guns and tanks and bombs, with earthly carnal weapons.

And so a child of God will have to come to some kind of conviction as to what "flag" he is fighting for. If he's fighting for his country, as a patriotic citizen of his country he might feel in good conscience he could take up arms.

But if he's been conscripted into another army that's being mustered to fight the battle of the Kingdom of God and the Day of the LORD-- if his conscience bears him witness that he's heard THAT call-- he will have to OBEY that call. He will have to forget all about fighting for an earthly flag. He'll have to forsake all, and present himself before the Commander of the armies of heaven, and put on the panoply of God, and learn how to use spiritual weapons.

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2010/1/25 22:33**

Hi ADisciple...

I don't think that anyone was saying that you could spread the Gospel of Jesus Christ via earthly weapons.

However, there are many believers who feel that you can wholeheartedly serve Lord while also serving in the military.

I believe that it is possible to accomplish spiritual and earthly things *simultaneously* -- just like you can pray for your physical needs to be met while you still go to work.

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/1/25 22:50**

Quote:  
-----I don't think that anyone was saying that you could spread the Gospel of Jesus Christ via earthly weapons.  
-----

Maybe not, but putting gospel verses on gunsights to kill men with? THAT is not the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Quote:  
-----However, there are many believers who feel that you can wholeheartedly serve Lord while also serving in the military.  
-----

I realize that. The distinction I was making was between two flags, two banners. In the Lamb's war, with His banner before you-- the banner of the Kingdom of God-- you simply cannot use earthly carnal weapons.

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2010/1/25 23:22**

Hi ADisciple...

Quote:  
-----Maybe not, but putting gospel verses on gunsights to kill men with? THAT is not the Gospel of Jesus Christ.  
-----

I don't think that anyone was trying to argue that these weapons were meant to spread the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It was the conviction of the now-deceased owner of the company who professed faith in God. I can't question the validity of that.

he faith (at least, successfully)...so I can't pretend to know the underlying motivation of his heart.

Quote:  
-----I realize that. The distinction I was making was between two flags, two banners. In the Lamb's war, with His banner before you-- the banner of the Kingdom of God-- you simply cannot use earthly carnal weapons.  
-----

Yet, it seems like you are saying that we must walk under one banner in an "either/or" fashion. I am a Christian...and, as such, I do the work of an evangelist...while I also hold another "secular job" (if there is such a thing) in order to provide for my house. I believe that it is possible to live, move and have our being under the banner of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ while also "*rendering unto Caesar what is Caesar's*" (if that makes sense). We can provide for our families...support the Lord's works...and still pay our taxes at the same time. Likewise, many of us believe that you can serve in the military of our temporary citizenship while serving God as a citizen of our Eternal country.

No one is advocating the use of earthly weapons to spread the Gospel or for the fighting of spiritual battles. I think that those particular "earthly" weapons are for "earthly" battles that God does ultimately orchestrate. After all, no kingdom will rise or fall without His doing. Sometimes, however, those kingdoms rise and fall by the use of "earthly" weapons.

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/1/26 1:05**

Quote:  
-----Likewise, many of us believe that you can serve in the military of our temporary citizenship while serving God as a citizen of our Eternal country.  
-----

Hi Chris.

This is something that has been debated at great length on other threads. I only made one comment on one of them once, quite a while back. But I have wrestled with this quite a bit.

I do recognize that John the Baptist had advice for soldiers. It doesn't appear he told them to quit the military.

Jesus healed a centurion's servant, and the gospel when first opened to the Gentiles went to a centurion named Cornelius. We are not told if these men came to the time when they found it necessary to put the military behind them.

Quote:  
-----it seems like you are saying that we must walk under one banner in an "either/or" fashion.  
-----

I am saying, simply, that no man can go forth with carnal weapons and think to do so in the Name of Jesus Christ for the advancement of the Kingdom of God. This is why... to put scripture verses that pertain to the Gospel of Christ and the Kingdom of God on gunsights used to kill men... surely we blush at this. We ought to. We ought to be further along than this.

That war-- concerning the Kingdom of God-- is a spiritual one, and requires spiritual weapons. I'm sure you agree with that. Take Zwingli the reformer, for example. He was killed in battle trying to fight what was a spiritual battle with carnal weapons. Or the Crusades. They went forth with carnal weapons purportedly in the Name of Christ. With the result that there are men in the earth who still spit contemptuously when they hear the word "Christianity."

Quote:  
-----I think that those particular "earthly" weapons are for "earthly" battles that God does ultimately orchestrate. After all, no kingdom will rise or fall without His doing. Sometimes, however, those kingdoms rise and fall by the use of "earthly" weapons.  
-----

Maybe so. But the Kingdom of God never rises by the use of earthly weapons.

I think Chris-- and I'm giving you my own conviction on this-- I think that perhaps many Christians in good conscience have fought for their flag in days past, and perhaps do so even now. But the hour is so late. It's my conviction that we are now entering "the evil day." And in the light of that-- speaking for myself-- I am hearing an increasingly urgent call to put on the whole armour of God and be part of this spiritual army the Lord is conscripting and training. I want very much to be part of that army, one of those who are left standing on the field when it's all over, victorious over all.

There'll be no more wars to fight after that battle.

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2010/1/26 2:45**

Hi ADisciple...

I understand your views about this and the wrestling that you (and many of us) have had regarding this. I suppose that my main point is that many of us believe that you can still serve the Lord -- be a part of His "army" -- and also participate in the events of this temporary citizenship into which God has placed us.

I disagree with any war that is waged in the name of Christianity. However, I do believe that there are just causes. It is difficult to explain to some that I do not embrace violence...but that I do agree with defending my family...the weak...or even service in the military or police.

Last week, my wife and I were reading through the Book of Acts. When the apostle Paul was standing before Festus, he presented his defense against the charges that were brought before him.

Quote:

-----  
**Acts 25:8-11**

8 While he answered for himself, Neither against the law of the Jews, neither against the temple, nor yet against Caesar, have I offended any thing at all.

9 But Festus, willing to do the Jews a pleasure, answered Paul, and said, Wilt thou go up to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these things before me?

10 Then said Paul, I stand at Caesar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest.

11 For if I be an offender, or have committed any thing worthy of death, I refuse not to die: but if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal unto Caesar.

**Acts 25:8-11 NIV**

8 Then Paul made his defense: "I have done nothing wrong against the law of the Jews or against the temple or against Caesar."

9 Festus, wishing to do the Jews a favor, said to Paul, "Are you willing to go up to Jerusalem and stand trial before me there on these charges?"

10 Paul answered: "I am now standing before Caesar's court, where I ought to be tried. I have not done any wrong to the Jews, as you yourself know very well. 11 If, however, I am guilty of doing anything deserving death, I do not refuse to die. But if the charges brought against me by these Jews are not true, no one has the right to hand me over to them. I appeal to Caesar!"

-----  
Of all people, Paul was willing to be a martyr for the cause of Christ Jesus. If he had done something unlawful (according to the Law of Moses, the Temple law or the Law of Rome), he was willing to pay the penalty. Yet, he wasn't willing to be a martyr if it was due to something that he did that was NOT unlawful.

I am mentioning this to demonstrate the understanding and respect that Paul paid for the laws of Moses, the Temple and Caesar. He did not break any of those laws...and was willing to legally defend himself against an accusation that said otherwise. Similarly, there is a difference between a *spiritual* war and a *physical* war. Like Paul, we are citizens of our Eternal kingdom. However, Paul declared that he was also a citizen of Rome (Acts 22:27). He then used the intricate legal system of the godless Roman Empire as a means to take the Gospel of Jesus Christ to Caesar (Philippians 4:22).

I completely agree with the notion that "carnal" weapons are not the weapons of our spiritual warfare. However, they are the weapons of earthly warfare. They are the weapons that were used by men that God used to raise up kingdoms, empires and even republics. I think that there is some serious debate about whether or not all physical resistance is a "sin" or indicative of individuals who aren't marching beneath the banner of Christ.

You mentioned, "*Jesus healed a centurion's servant, and the gospel when first opened to the Gentiles went to a centurion named Cornelius. We are not told if these men came to the time when they found it necessary to put the military behind them.*" However, I think that this is worded somewhat differently than it should be. It wasn't whether or not these men "came to the time when they found it necessary to put the military behind them" -- but whether or not it was necessary at all. The Scriptures are silent on this matter...because we have no record of Jesus, John or Peter EVER telling them as much (at least, plainly or directly).

I definitely agree with the gist of what you are saying. We are strangers and pilgrims on this earth. I do believe that we are living in the last of the last days too. However, I also believe that we are still in the places of our temporary citizenships for "such a time as this." We can have faith that God will provide for us according to His riches and glory...while also working hard with our own hands as a means for God to provide on our behalf. I hope that this makes a little more clear where I am coming from.

For the most part, I know that we agree on our allegiance to Christ Jesus. He is definitely the most important thing to each of us! He is the center of our universe! At the same time, we still have responsibilities to those around us (such as our wives, children, family, neighbors, local congregations, paying taxes, etc...). I personally believe that we can honor God wholeheartedly and with a pure heart while we fulfill those things that we believe to be "earthly" responsibilities as well.

The Lord bless you, dear brother!

**Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes , on: 2010/1/26 6:33**

Hi Chris,

I'm not sure what you mean by 'Of all people', with regard to Paul. Surely he is one person (after martyring so many Christians) who would see the point of, and understand, martyrdom?

Quote:

-----He did not break any of those laws...  
-----

Ah. I believe this is a rather selective view, because there is no doubt, he had stopped bringing *sacrifices for sins*. In fact, it's interesting isn't it, that the New Testament doesn't tell us whether the Temple veil was repaired, so that the next day of Atonement could be kept. The rending of the Temple veil from top to bottom, was God Himself saying there was no need of another day of Atonement, but obviously, to Jews who continued to refuse Jesus Christ, this must have been an abomination; just as their sacrifices for sins would have been an abomination to God.

Quote:

-----there is a difference between a spiritual war and a physical war.  
-----

Indeed. And David knew this also. But because of the killing he had done, he was not allowed to build the first Temple - even though it was, undoubtedly *lawful* killing.

The question AD is raising, is whether there is any such thing as 'lawful killing' under the New Covenant?

I, personally, can see that there may be, if one is being attacked. But, I am most unsure whether it is permitted under the New Covenant, to go - being a Christian - into another sovereign state, and start killing their people; yes, even if they are armed conspirators of another religion, against my national state.

Frankly, what do we expect? If they were *Christians*, they wouldn't **be** armed conspirators against another Christian population.

Isn't that the whole point?

Re: , on: 2010/1/26 10:48

Quote:  
-----I, personally, can see that there may be, if one is being attacked. But, I am most unsure whether it is permitted under the New Covenant, to go - being a Christian - into another sovereign state, and start killing their people; yes, even if they are armed conspirators of another religion, against my national state.  
-----

If the aggressor's first actions will be lethal to the innocent then it would be necessary to prevent their first actions in order to defend the innocent. The churches' doctrine of Just War is consistent with preemptive strike. This same principle can be applied in individual self-defense scenarios or in the defense of another individual.

Modern technology greatly changes the nature of combat. In the past it could have made sense to stand and wait for your enemy to run at you with spears and swords. Today it is different because of high-speed, long-range transportation and weapons. It doesn't make sense to wait until the nuclear missile is close enough to use Aikido.

Quote:  
-----Frankly, what do we expect? If they were Christians, they wouldn't be armed conspirators against another Christian population.

Isn't that the whole point?  
-----

I couldn't tell what you meant here.

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/1/26 12:05

Hi again Chris.

Quote:  
-----It wasn't whether or not these men "came to the time when they found it necessary to put the military behind them" -- but whether or not it was necessary at all. The Scriptures are silent on this matter...because we have no record of Jesus, John or Peter EVER telling them as much (at least, plainly or directly).  
-----

No they don't... not in so many words, anyway.

But then again I think of these verses:

"Come behold the works of the LORD, what desolations He hath made in the earth. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; He breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder; he burneth the chariot in the fire" (Ps. 46.8,9).

Throughout history, Christians have fought for the flags of their countries... and prayed for God's protection as they did so. Sometimes that has even meant that men praying to the same God went out to kill one another. But I am not going to debate over what any man-- who is trying to be faithful to the measure of light he has in his conscience-- feels he has to do.

But I do pray we will all of us seek to come to greater and still greater Light. There comes an awesome, fearful time when God brings things in the earth to such cataclysmic desolation and upheaval that... He causes all wars to cease "unto the end of the earth." It's difficult for me to reconcile that this being the case, He would at the same time be sanctioning the involvement of "his own" in them.

I had an uncle who was in WW I. And I recall reading as a boy a letter from him I found in my grandmother's attic. He had written (from the trenches somewhere), "Surely this is Armageddon, mother."

In fact they called WW I "the war to end all wars." It appears, sadly, they were wrong.

But there IS a war that ends all wars, and it's called, in fact, Armageddon. It's a spiritual war fought with spiritual forces with spiritual weapons.

There comes a time-- and I hope we don't have the outlook that puts this way off in the future somewhere on one of these

e dispensational time charts-- there comes a time when, walking in the Light of the Lamb, those who are called to involvement in THAT battle must put the earthly ones forever behind them.

Quote:

-----The Lord bless you, dear brother!  
-----

And may he bless you, too, Chris.

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiss (), on: 2010/1/26 12:30**

Hi Alive-to-God...

Quote:

-----Ah. I believe this is a rather selective view, because there is no doubt, he had stopped bringing sacrifices for sins. In fact, it's interesting isn't it, that the New Testament doesn't tell us whether the Temple veil was repaired, so that the next day of Atonement could be kept. The rending of the Temple veil from top to bottom, was God Himself saying there was no need of another day of Atonement, but obviously, to Jews who continued to refuse Jesus Christ, this must have been an abomination; just as their sacrifices for sins would have been an abomination to God.

-----  
I was actually using Paul's own testimony before Festus in regard to this matter:

Quote:

-----  
**Acts 25:8-11**

8 While he answered for himself, Neither against the law of the Jews, neither against the temple, nor yet against Caesar, have I offended any thing at all.

9 But Festus, willing to do the Jews a pleasure, answered Paul, and said, Wilt thou go up to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these things before me?

10 Then said Paul, I stand at Caesar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest.

11 For if I be an offender, or have committed any thing worthy of death, I refuse not to die: but if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal unto Caesar.

**Acts 25:8-11 NIV**

8 Then Paul made his defense: "I have done nothing wrong against the law of the Jews or against the temple or against Caesar."

9 Festus, wishing to do the Jews a favor, said to Paul, "Are you willing to go up to Jerusalem and stand trial before me there on these charges?"

10 Paul answered: "I am now standing before Caesar's court, where I ought to be tried. I have not done any wrong to the Jews, as you yourself know very well. 11 If, however, I am guilty of doing anything deserving death, I do not refuse to die. But if the charges brought against me by these Jews are not true, no one has the right to hand me over to them. I appeal to Caesar!"

-----  
Notice that Paul proclaimed that he was not guilty of breaking any "law of the Jews, the Temple or Caesar" (Acts 25:8). In fact, Paul said that would have not defended himself (via his legal rights) and would readily lay down his life if he had been guilty of such a thing (Acts 25:11). However, since he was NOT guilty of the things for which he was accused, Paul used his rights as a Roman citizenship to defend himself and "appeal unto Caesar" (also in Acts 25:11).

This matter has less to do with the role of a Christian in terms of legal rights within the temporary citizenship to which he or she has been placed...but whether or not that Christian can have the ability to serve in the military forces of that same nation. It is definitely an issue to pray about, study and contemplate. Like I said here and in some of the non-resistance threads, I don't see anything in the Scriptures that decrees such an absolute prohibition. Jesus, John and Peter had the opportunity to clearly state something like that...but did not. In addition, I have known many believers who served in the military (including my own father). I also find it interesting that God has chosen nations and authorities to dispense justice against evil doers. Likewise, Paul stated that had he done something legally deserving of death, he would not refuse to die (verse 11).

Nations rise and fall by the hand of God. The authorities of those nations are established by God. The Word of God even calls them "minister of God for good" (Romans 13:4). That passage includes further instructions about honoring earthly authorities with tribute, customs, and respect. This is also reflected throughout other passages in the New Testament, including I Peter 2:13-21. In fact, this passage states that the various civil authorities are "sent by God for the punishment of evildoers" (I Peter 2:14). Interestingly, Peter instructed slaves (a civic and legal definition) to honor their masters - including the harsh ones (I Peter 2:18). While they are under the banner of liberty that is in Christ Jesus, they still had an obligation and responsibility to their "temporary" and earthly stewardship.

Like you, I have prayed about and studied this matter in depth. I have even considered all of the advise and opinions of others here on SermonIndex -- including angry and accusatory "lectures" that I have received via Private Messages because I disagreed. Rest assured, if I was convinced that the Word of God said something, I would do my best to walk in that way. I just worry that speaking about this matter with absolutes as if it were clearly dictated in the Word of God might not be the best thing. My dad was a teenager when he was drafted at the end of the Vietnam War. I don't know what my reaction would be if I was drafted. I know that many people "conscientiously objected" due to their views (while some did so dishonestly). However, I haven't been placed in such a position. Thus, I am not in the place to proclaim that such Christian men were fighting for any other reason than a responsibility that they may have felt to the country of their temporary citizenship.

**Re: - posted by rainydaygirl, on: 2010/1/26 13:23**

Quote:

-----Like you, I have prayed about and studied this matter in depth.  
-----

---

This I think is what causes such a huge question in my mind? I can say the same thing, that I have studied and prayed and yet I have come to a completely different understanding than you have. I have noticed this on other topics as well. Its confusing to me because I know God wants us to be one body that makes up His bride the church and yet we are not one body in agreement. We fight and argue back and forth all the time. I wonder why there is not more clarity on these things in the Bible or if in our flesh and stubbornness we just don't want to be wrong when it comes to our opinions? I know its not the Bible that is the problem so it has to be that men are the problem. Maybe that is why the we are told 5 Trust in the LORD with all your heart, And lean not on your own understanding;  
6 In all your ways acknowledge Him, And He shall direct your paths. Proverbs 3:5-6

love in Him  
rdg

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2010/1/26 13:33**

Hi rainydaygirl...

I have thought about this too. I have known some very sincere believers who claimed that "God showed them" something...and then some other very sincere believer will claim the same thing...but with a completely opposite view.

I suspect that there are some things that we don't have to agree with. I don't know that all believers will ever agree on every single issue while we are still confined to see "*through a glass, darkly*" (I Corinthians 13:12). After all, the New Testament already demonstrates that there were variances of opinion in the early Church in regard to "doctrine." Perhaps the answer is that we shouldn't be so focused on all of the intricate, non-essential and peculiar matters that are difficult to agree upon. Then again, there are so many "non-essential" matters that many people would argue are "essential!"

I remember seeing an argument between a group of believers who were arguing one of those common arguments about whether or not a person could lose their salvation. One fairly new believer just walked away. Someone asked him where he was going and he replied, "*I just want to know Jesus.*" I think that is a great mindset.

**Re: - posted by harris, on: 2010/1/26 14:35**

"God is a spirit--and we must worship him in spirit and truth"

"Our weapons are not but spiritual--yet pulling down strong holds--in high principalities "

Look heavenly for answers and not earthly.

The Christ Child and the lamb of God be with--he who take away the sins of the world.

in Christ's service,

Gerald Harris

**Re: - posted by rainydaygirl, on: 2010/1/26 14:41**

Hi Chris

Thank you for your reply. Yes I think as long as we in the body care more for our opinions and "being right" then we do for the things of His kingdom there will always be "non-essential" matters that many will tell you are "essential". At the end of the day I think the enemy finds our use of time spent in discussions/arguing these "essential" matters to be a very useful tool...

I have been wondering a great deal just lately what it would look like if we the body lived "The Life" instead of arguing/discussing it what that would actually look like? Probably a lot more like it did when the first followers came together, loving and caring for each other daily from house to house with out regard to self with Jesus as the head. That must have been something to see and no doubt would have drawn many to ask why are you who call yourself followers of Jesus so different.

I like what Paul said, "For I determined not to know anything among you except Jesus Christ and Him crucified. 1 Corinthians 2:2

love in Him  
rdg

**Re: - posted by JesusIsMyLrd (), on: 2010/1/26 14:57**

Quote:  
-----I have been wondering a great deal just lately what it would look like if we the body lived "The Life" instead of arguing/discussing it what that would actually look like? Probably a lot more like it did when the first followers came together, loving and caring for each other daily from house to house with out regard to self with Jesus as the head. That must have been something to see and no doubt would have drawn many to ask why are you who call yourself followers of Jesus so different.  
-----

Amen to that... and if we started walking out our theology, i think we'd find out pretty quick that we're much more similar than we think ;)

Praise God for the encouragement we can get from His church... He's so very good to us!

-nate

Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes , on: 2010/1/26 18:19

Quote:  
-----If the aggressor's first actions will be lethal to the innocent then it would be necessary to prevent their first actions in order to defend the innocent.  
-----

Where does the Bible say this?

Quote:  
-----churches' doctrine of Just War  
-----

came from the Roman Catholic Church, and for political purposes, was adopted by certain non-Roman Catholics. This has nothing to do with furthering the kingdom of God, though; nor, of behaving like the early Christians.

Quote:  
-----is consistent with preemptive strike. This same principle can be applied in individual self-defense scenarios or in the defense of another individual.  
-----

And this pleases God?

Quote:  
-----Modern technology greatly changes the nature of combat. In the past it could have made sense to stand and wait for your enemy to run at you with spears and swords. Today it is different because of high-speed, long-range transportation and weapons. It doesn't make sense to wait until the nuclear missile is close enough to use Aikido.  
-----

Sorry. I just don't buy this argument. But that's okay with me.

Quote:  
-----I said: Frankly, what do we expect? If they were Christians, they wouldn't be armed conspirators against another Christian population.  
-----

Isn't that the whole point?

You replied: I couldn't tell what you meant here.  
-----

I mean, that people who don't have the peace of God in their hearts, who think that their religious aims can be furthered by physical violence (carnal thinking), cannot be expected to live peaceably with others who desire peace because they *do* have the peace of God in their hearts. I would not expect Christians to make war against Christians, and so, to make war against non-Christians makes even less sense.

Look at Paul the apostle, killing Christians. He really believed he was justified in so doing, until the Lord stepped in. Now, after that, unbelieving Jews were trying to kill him, and he was even left for dead once, but his response was not to try and rustle up a band of Christians to help him hunt down and kill the heathen. Rather, he carried on evangelising them.

So.... what had changed in Paul?

Why did he now no longer think it was appropriate to kill those who didn't agree with his (new) religion?

Was it because the Lord had told him he would suffer for His sake? Was it because he couldn't get any other Christians to join him in stamping out the unbelieving Jews (as once he had tried to stamp out believing Christians)? Or was it because Jesus clearly stated that His kingdom is not of this world else His servants would fight for Him, and now, Paul was serving the interests of *that* kingdom?

I think what I'm trying to say is, that Paul thought he was justified in killing people, until his conversion, and after his conversion he didn't think he was justified in so doing. I ask again: what had changed?

Secondarily, do we demonstrate that we have *not* 'changed', when we justify killing unbelievers?

Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes , on: 2010/1/26 18:29

Hi Chris,

The word 'doctrine' appears 49 times in the New Testament. One of the most notable times is 1 Timothy 6:3.

I believe it is dangerous to believe that sound doctrine is variable. It may appear to be variable, but it would be incorrect to imply that God Himself is changing His stance, or, that God Himself has more than one stance on the same issue. The Bible doesn't demonstrate that He does, although He may be seen to deal with similar situations, differently. For Christians, there is unity in the Spirit. This doesn't mean that the Spirit overlooks all our differences, but rather, that in the Spirit, we ourselves abandon our differences, that we may be one in Christ.

I believe if you read scripture long enough, you will see a pattern emerging through all His dealings with men, which demonstrate conclusively that God Himself doesn't change His attitude to anything, although He may occasionally delay or renege on carrying out a threat, which could be defined as a 'change of mind'. He is able to do this, because He too, is capable of repentance, without in any way besmirching His own character.

Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes , on: 2010/1/26 18:48

Hi Chris,

This is a reply to your post to me.

Quote:

-----I was actually using Paul's own testimony before Festus in regard to this matter

My point is, that when Paul said he hadn't broken any of the laws, and was, therefore, not worthy of being convicted of their accusations, the fact is, he was not practising the Judaism handed down to him by his father, was he? He was a New Covenant believer, and they weren't, and he didn't 'appeal to Caesar' for any other reason than the opportunity to preach to him, because he knew that was in God's revealed plan for his life.

He was not appealing to a civil authority as an example of how a Christian should expect the state to give them support. He appealed to Caesar, because he was born a Roman citizen, and it was his civil right to seek justice under Roman law. However he may have hoped for physical justice, the fact is, he wasn't going to worship Caesar as god, as Roman citizens were supposed to do; he didn't even expect to 'get off' with being a Christian. In fact, he **didn't** expect real justice from the Roman system, even though he was entitled to not be put to death for breaking Jewish laws (because he hadn't broken Jewish laws). However, he had, in fact, broken Roman law, by having any other god than Caesar.... and he knew it.

Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes , on: 2010/1/26 18:59

Hi Chris,

More thoughts.

You several times mention that the word of God does not explicitly state a rule (my paraphrase). That's why we need the Holy Spirit. Because - to be slightly lighthearted for a moment - one man's fish is another man's poison, but God knows exactly what He is asking each believer to do, and only those who obey Him can be called 'sons of God'. Romans 8:14. This puts it to bed for me, as I have to answer only for my own responses to His claim over my life through His commands, calls, leading and prompting. 1 John 5:1, 2, 3, 4.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2010/1/26 19:18

Hi Alive-to-God...

Quote:

-----  
The word 'doctrine' appears 49 times in the New Testament. One of the most notable times is 1 Timothy 6:3.

I believe it is dangerous to believe that sound doctrine is variable. It may appear to be variable, but it would be incorrect to imply that God Himself is changing His stance, or, that God Himself has more than one stance on the same issue. The Bible doesn't demonstrate that He does, although He may be seen to deal with similar situations, differently. For Christians, there is unity in the Spirit. This doesn't mean that the Spirit overlooks all our differences, but rather, that in the Spirit, we ourselves abandon our differences, that we may be one in Christ.

-----  
I am not saying that we shouldn't hold to that doctrine that is obvious and transparent from the Scriptures. However, I am talking about those "doctrines" that are actually just a set of "persuasions" about non-essential issues. Remember, no matter how "pure" you think that all of your views may be, there is a church or teacher somewhere who will disagree with you (and more than enough to claim that those doctrinal views are "false").

For instance, while we may lean toward a "pre-trib" or "post-trib" view, is it proper to make a "doctrine" out of those views? Sadly, these are the types of divisions that, although well-meaning, often divide the Body of Christ. One side thinks that the other is not "spiritual" enough or "mature" enough or "insightful" enough to see the "truth" -- and they often point their rhetoric at the other accordingly. Although God and truth do not change...a believer's personal viewpoint and perspective about such things often do. I have long thought that we need to be careful what we treat and express as "undeniable truths." There are definitely some undeniable truths in the Word...but much of what is argued about amongst believers is not.

Quote:

-----  
My point is, that when Paul said he hadn't broken any of the laws, and was, therefore, not worthy of being convicted of their accusations, the fact is, he was not practising the Judaism handed down to him by his father, was he? He was a New Covenant believer, and they weren't, and he didn't 'appeal to Caesar' for any other reason than the opportunity to preach to him, because he knew that was in God's revealed plan for his life.

He was not appealing to a civil authority as an example of how a Christian should expect the state to give them support. He appealed to Caesar, because he was born a Roman citizen, and it was his civil right to seek justice under Roman law. However he may have hoped for physical justice, the fact is, he wasn't going to worship Caesar as god, as Roman citizens were supposed to do; he didn't even expect to 'get off' with being a Christian.

-----  
That is precisely my point. Paul said that he did NOT do anything unlawful (against the law of the Jews...of the Temple..or against Rome)...and if he had...he wouldn't have defended himself. This was a "secular" defense (so to speak...if there is such a thing) that helped save him earlier from a physical beating.

As for how much Paul "knew" about the rationale for his use of an appeal in the Roman legal system, an angel later appeared to Paul on the boat to encourage him and said, "*Fear not, Paul; thou must be brought before Caesar: and, lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee*" (Acts 27:24). The specificities of Paul's knowledge might have been somewhat limited before that angelic visit.

Quote:

-----  
You several times mention that the word of God does not explicitly state a rule (my paraphrase). That's why we need the Holy Spirit. Because - to be slightly lighthearted for a moment - one man's fish is another man's poison, but God knows exactly what He is asking each believer to do, and only those who obey Him can be called 'sons of God'. Romans 8:14. This puts it to bed for me, as I have to answer only for my own responses to His claim over my life through His commands, calls, leading and prompting. 1 John 5:1, 2, 3, 4.

-----  
I agree that we must have the Holy Spirit to lead us. The problem with this is that your inclination of what "truth" the Holy Spirit is leading you to might differ from the "truth" that others feel that the Holy Spirit is leading them to. Here on SermonIndex, we have had quite a few people (and many would-be prophets) who claim that "God showed them" or "God told them" something in regard to a doctrine. The debates often get heated when one group or individual claims to have been "led" toward one notion of "truth" and the other group or individual claims to have been "led" toward another.

That is what I meant about the essential versus non-essential. I have seen believers who claimed that their particular notions about Calvinism (\*both pro and con) were "essential" to a believer. The conversation becomes heated when one side spreads their views with authority or voices them as "absolutes." I just can't help but wonder if these are the very types of divisions that we are supposed to avoid.

Re: - posted by rainydaygirl, on: 2010/1/26 23:34

Quote:  
-----That is what I meant about the essential versus non-essential. I have seen believers who claimed that their particular notions about Calvinism (\*both pro and con) were "essential" to a believer. The conversation becomes heated when one side spreads their views with authority or voices them as "absolutes." I just can't help but wonder if these are the very types of divisions that we are supposed to avoid.  
-----

---

I really think these are exactly the kinds of divisions and endless debates that we are supposed to avoid.

love in Him  
rdg

Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes , on: 2010/1/27 10:42

Hi Chris,

Thanks for your reply.

I've been thinking some more about the context of the comments recorded in the New Testament, as it is from these which we all must form any teaching, which could formally be called doctrine.

For instance, not for one minute, going on the example of Jesus Christ, the disciples when He was alive, or all the apostles after His Ascension, do we find any justification for the killing of another human being. What we find is, that they would rather die first. That is, the **leading Christians**, are not willing to kill; full stop. Their commission is according to Christ's command. How could any modern Christian's commission differ in such material substance, that now it is okay for a **Christian** to kill? Personally, I don't see it, but from what you have said, you do. That's okay. But, you can't base that claim (that's it's now okay for born again Christians to kill) on scripture.

On the matter of civil authorities wielding the sword as part of dealing with lawbreakers, the thing that struck me, is that the comments of Peter and Paul relate specifically to Christians obeying the laws of their own land, and living peaceably wherever possible. The idea that Christians can rise up and overwhelm a government, using physical force (including killing) to get their religious freedom, is not found in scripture. All the more so, when Paul writes from prison 'the word of God is not bound'.

I guess you do see that being put in prison, or being killed for not denying Christ, or for obeying the Spirit's gift and leading in one's life (eg John Bunyan), is considered by God a more precious sacrifice, than defending oneself against unbelievers. We have this clearly in Christ's, Stephen's and Paul's example.

What John the Baptist said to the soldiers 'be content with your wages', was a way of telling them to stop stealing from the local population amongst whom they served their military commander. It's a way of telling *Christians* not to abuse their power, when in 'office'.

Of course I'm aware of being able to turn any topic into 'a discussion'. But scripture never does that. When God gives commands, He has His reasons, and if we purport to believe Him, then talking about why He may have given a different command to another believer is fruitless. The New Testament is so different from Old in respect of the relationship between the Jews and occupying forces, that I don't think any Christian since then, has a reason to hold that killing is a believable expression of godliness.

You know, I wasn't particularly a pacifist (whatever that is) when I joined SI, but I have walked in dangerous situations, and God has kept me, and now, I would rather have goodwill to all men, than die by His sword.

The only reason there is fighting on earth, is that men will not to reconcile with God. If they all *would*, there would be world peace. I think it is this thought mainly, which is behind all my resistance to joining in the physical demonstrations of ungodliness, which any kind of fighting and killing necessarily reveal.

EDIT: I've just posted in the Praise thread, and realise afresh how much Wesley's hymns have influenced my understanding of scripture.

Here is the second last verse of six, and it really sums up something, but please, do go and read the whole hymn.

*Thou saidst 'Where'er I am  
There shall my servant be,  
Master, the welcome word we claim  
And die to live with Thee.*

**Re: - posted by rainydaygirl, on: 2010/1/27 12:00**

Hi ATG

I wanted to ask you something and please do not be offended by my question. I was wondering why is it so important to you that Chris agree with your view point of what you believe the Lord is showing you in this? He has said that he has spent many hours studying and seeking God on this topic, why can't "we" who do not see things in the same way accept his reply and allow for the Holy Spirit to work on each of us to show us God's heart on the matter? I wonder why it is that we always have to keep coming back endlessly debating these matters. When do we step back and say ok I have shared my heart, you have shared yours now let us move forward in Him and be about His Kingdom today?

Please do not think I am trying to put you on the spot because I am not. I have been thinking about this myself (my own behavior) and just wondering why it is that we do this to one another. This topic and many of the others are not a matter of Salvation so why do we spend so much time and energy discussing and debating?

love in Him  
rdg

**Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes , on: 2010/1/27 13:59**

Hello RDG,

Quote:  
-----I was wondering why is it so important to you that Chris agree with your view point of what you believe the Lord is showing you in this?  
-----

Is it possible he has something to learn from my understanding of scripture's purposes, as much as I may have to learn from his? That's part of it.

Really, I'm just participating in a thread, as I am wont to do from time to time - and I have posted back and forth with Chris in other threads. So, this is me, working through a topic, like it or lump it, as best I can. Chris likes to retain his academic distance, but I'm sure if he was put to the test, he'd do God's will as God reveals it to him, and that's all I'd be bothered about.

Many many Christians don't see that the Church is a body, with Christ as the Head, and that if they just keep holding to the Head, they can't get lost, but I don't have that fear for Chris. I more fear the proliferation of unbiblical theology, or of Christians ever thinking it's okay for them to agree with the world while conflicting with Christ's example.

It is a really tough thing to come to an unworldly conclusion, and to live it out in reality, being different from other men or women, especially when it comes to showing our allegiance to 'above' rather than to 'beneath'. I don't think the New Testament teaches that we can do both, but I'm aware that in obeying 'above', separate from, but within the 'beneath', Christians are open to being misunderstood.

This is one reason it's very important for us to get to know each other's hearts, and to keep our hearts right with one another in a healthy way.

Quote:

----- He has said that he has spent many hours studying and seeking God on this topic, why can't "we" who do not see things in the same way accept his reply and allow for the Holy Spirit to work on each of us to show us God's heart on the matter?  
-----

Probably because I don't think the examples in the New Testament are 'non-essential' doctrine, and, while I realise it takes time for a person to come to terms with some of scripture's claims on our lives, I believe part of the function of the body of Christ, is to draw others along with it. One of our generation's most pernicious philosophies, is that we are individuals whose choices and actions do not affect others, as long as they are not directly and physically touched by them. What I'm doing here, is laying out some of the thoughts which have not been expressed in those terms already in the thread, which are compatible with scripture; because, some of the thoughts which have been expressed in this thread are not compatible with scripture's exposition to us, of original Christianity.

I don't think I'm debating any more than Paul did, in the school of Tyrannus (Acts 19:9). It is certainly not 'endlessly' on my part (or Chris' part).

Quote:

-----why it is that we do this to one another  
-----

There are ways, and ways. It is not wrong to discuss, or to debate, as long as we are always hunting down the truth, as it is in Jesus Christ. So, no offence taken.

: -)

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2010/1/27 14:19**

Hi Alive-to-God...

Quote:

-----  
Thanks for your reply.

I've been thinking some more about the context of the comments recorded in the New Testament, as it is from these which we all must form any teaching, which could formally be called doctrine.

-----  
Likewise, thanks for your reply.

I understand the underlying definition of "doctrine" and agree that it can include beliefs and teachings in general. I suppose that the point that I have tried to make is that this is not the definition that people use in many debates. Their doctrinal "teachings" are presented or debated as if they are absolutes and essentials. For instance: Does someone have to absolutely believe in a "pre-trib rapture" in order to be "pure" in doctrine? Some people would argue, "Yes!" Likewise, there are "post-trib" believers who believe the same about their views on the coming of the Lord. In other words, the "doctrine" is usually taught as a fact according to the views of those who are teaching it.

I can't help but wonder if we should present all possible alternatives and leave it to the hearer to make up their own mind. Perhaps the only indisputable doctrine about such a matter that should be taught as an "absolute" is the fact that our Lord WILL RETURN. We can still teach the possible ways that He will return – and we can even include our own opinion (voiced as such) – but with the disclaimer that there are legitimate variances of opinion about the matter.

I hope this clears up what I was referring to earlier when I spoke about "doctrines." There are indisputable truths that are universal and held by all believers because they are undeniable from Scripture. Some of them are included in Hebrew

ws 6. Unfortunately and far too often, opinions are presented as doctrinal truths.

Quote:

-----  
For instance, not for one minute, going on the example of Jesus Christ, the disciples when He was alive, or all the apostles after His Ascension, do we find any justification for the killing of another human being. What we find is, that they would rather die first. That is, the leading Christians, are not willing to kill; full stop. Their commission is according to Christ's command. How could any modern Christian's commission differ in such material substance, that now it is okay for a Christian to kill? Personally, I don't see it, but from what you have said, you do. That's okay. But, you can't base that claim (that it's now okay for born again Christians to kill) on scripture.  
-----

I understand where you are coming from. However, you can say the same thing about an absolute prohibition about serving in the military or defending your wife from an unlawful attacker or your child from a rapist. Of course, I don't think that any Christian would be "killing" in a fit of rage while in a defense of a loved one...or even in military service. If someone attacked my wife, I would simply put a stop to it as best as I could (like disarming him) and then I would call the authorities (who are set up by God to dispense justice upon evil doers). But, like you said, you can't base such a claim (as an absolute and clear prohibition against all forms of killing or defense) on Scripture. Now, you can offer a good scriptural defense for your position (just like I or someone else can).

Quote:

-----  
On the matter of civil authorities wielding the sword as part of dealing with lawbreakers, the thing that struck me, is that the comments of Peter and Paul relate specifically to Christians obeying the laws of their own land, and living peaceably wherever possible. The idea that Christians can rise up and overwhelm a government, using physical force (including killing) to get their religious freedom, is not found in scripture. All the more so, when Paul writes from prison 'the word of God is not bound'.  
-----

Well, the comments made by Peter and Paul also refer to "evildoers" (I Peter 2:14). During Paul's defense to Festus, he mentioned that he had done nothing deserving of death (according to the law of the Jews, the law of the Temple and the law of Rome). Further, he stated that if he had, he wouldn't even have mounted a defense and would have not refused to die (Acts 25:11). He then used his right as a citizen of Rome (Acts 22:27) to make an appeal to Caesar (Acts 25:11). Interestingly, you can see how the authorities are set up to dispense justice upon those who do wrong (Romans 13:3-4). Since Paul had done nothing wrong, he defended himself using a legal means.

As far as the idea of Christians rising up and overwhelming a government (using physical force): I think that you misunderstood what I was saying. I am not talking about Christians who are conspiring together in order to take over their own government or a foreign government. We are talking about nations that rise up against other nations. If a Christian is a member of a nation, he has certain responsibilities to that nation. He must submit to the laws and ordinances that are set up by the authorities (Romans 13:1-7; I Peter 2:13-14). He must pay his taxes (Mark 12:17; Romans 13:7). He must honor the king (I Peter 2:17). Now, does he have any other responsibilities? Well, a believer has responsibilities to provide for his own family (I Timothy 5:8). He has responsibilities to his neighbors (Romans 15:2). In other words, it seems that we still have natural responsibilities to the temporary citizenship into which God has placed us "for such a time as this."

Now, what about a believer who serves in the military? Until the 1970s, the United States had a "draft." If you were drafted into the military forces, you served in the military. Since then, the US moved to an all volunteer military. It has worked out quite well for the nation— even though this concept is relatively new in world history. Still, the US continues to require all males to register with the Selective Services within thirty days of their 18th birthday. Why? Just in case the need for mandatory conscription arises again. Many other nations have a form of mandatory conscription in the military while other nations (like Israel and Iran) have a forced requirement for military service for every male. In fact, Israel is one of about 23 nations that don't have an "unarmed option." During major wars (WWI and WWII), just about every nation had a form of mandatory conscription or military enrollment. During such times of war (and in peacetime for many nations), there are no such things as omitted "conscientious objectors." The government does not make a distinction between believers and unbelievers in those cases. So, what is the responsibility of the believer in such service?

Cornelius the Roman Centurion was a "devout" and prayerful Italian soldier who "feared God" (Acts 10:1-2). He even had "devout" servants and soldiers beneath him (Acts 10:7). He was even visited by an angel of the Lord who acknowledged him for his prayers to God and service to the poor (Acts 10:3). Now, this was even BEFORE the apostle Peter ever visited the man! So, why was Cornelius serving in the army of the Roman Empire? We don't know.

At the time, Rome had both a voluntary and involuntary military. Regardless, Cornelius was a Centurion. He ruled over an army of between 83-100 men. Centurions were not enlisted men. They were ruling officers. Unlike modern armies, officers were not merely educated men who receive a promotion upon the completion of training. A centurion in the Roman army could have been elected or appointed, but they were usually promoted on the basis of their army record. They rose from the ranks of other soldiers because of their valor or because of a proven ability to lead soldiers in fighting. At any rate, Cornelius was a devout and God-fearing trained fighter who led trained fighters for the Roman Empire. Nowhere in Scripture do we find Peter instructing this man to give up his "secular" job. In fact, Cornelius might have very well been required to serve in the armed forces. This might have been seen as some form of indentured servitude or slavery to the Empire for which, servants were instructed to obey their masters (Colossians 3:22; Ephesians 6:5). As part of that requirement, he was likely required to deal with "lawbreakers" or those who might be a part of a "rebellion" against Rome.

Quote:  
-----  
Of course I'm aware of being able to turn any topic into 'a discussion'. But scripture never does that. When God gives commands, He has His reasons, and if we purport to believe Him, then talking about why He may have given a different command to another believer is fruitless. The New Testament is so different from Old in respect of the relationship between the Jews and occupying forces, that I don't think any Christian since then, has a reason to hold that killing is a believable expression of godliness.  
-----

Actually, Paul even mentioned things in regard to "nature." For instance, Paul invoked nature in his discussion about the length of a man's hair (I Corinthians 11:14). Similarly, we can look at nature as a "type and a shadow" in regard to defense. Most animals will protect their mates and children. Lions will protect their pride. While the rationale might not be to "kill" an intruder, you could argue that it is a godly thing—and even a natural thing—to uphold such a cause. This is certainly a truth in the Old Testament. There are numerous verses about defending the weak, a family member, the poor, the widows and even strangers. In fact, there was actually an obligation. The Law of Moses required individuals to defend the weak. Furthermore, if someone were to take advantage of the weak (like widows and orphans), God stated that he would kill such a person by the sword (Exodus 22:22-24). Interestingly...God said that he would use a physical sword (perhaps...authorities?).

Quote:  
-----  
You know, I wasn't particularly a pacifist (whatever that is) when I joined SI, but I have walked in dangerous situations, and God has kept me, and now, I would rather have goodwill to all men, than die by His sword.

The only reason there is fighting on earth, is that men will not to reconcile with God. If they all would, there would be world peace. I think it is this thought mainly, which is behind all my resistance to joining in the physical demonstrations of ungodliness, which any kind of fighting and killing necessarily reveal.  
-----

I agree. Unfortunately, the entire world has had a spiritual problem ever since the fall of man. Yet nations still rise and fall by the charge of God via the swords of men. And, believe it or not, many Christian men who are willing to protect their families from harm or serve in the military are NOT violent men. They don't long to harm anyone. Rather, we view it as a responsibility. Now, when it comes to personal spiritual persecution, I would definitely be a "pacifist." I would readily give up my life for the Gospel of Jesus Christ! Yet, I wouldn't quickly lay down my life if it was unlawful. Like Paul, I would defend myself with the ultimate goal of continuing to spread the Gospel and to take care of my family. Now, if the law said that my wife must die for her faith, I wouldn't physically fight on her behalf. I would urge the law to be reconsidered or be rewritten (a legal defense within my rights as a temporary citizen), but I would comfort her in the fact that she was blessed to see God's face on the other side of Eternity. Yet, if an intruder wanted to harm or kill my wife without legal merit, I would do what I could to make that NOT happen.

Rainydaygirl makes a good point. So do you. My participation in this thread (or in other threads) is NOT to try and convert you or anyone else to my view or understanding. Rather, I simply want to explain what my perspective is for this issue and the reasons behind it. I trust that ANY other believer that is honest and sincere in their faith before God will seek the Lord for direction about such matters just as you and I have. I simply want to show that there is a difference in opinion regarding certain matters that is both prayerful and studiously contemplative. I am all for the unity of the Body of Christ and for the unity of the Doctrine of Christ. However, I'm not sure that believers will ever agree on every matter under the sun as we sit on this side of that "glass darkly."

That is why I question just which doctrinal views should be presented as absolute requirements for doctrinal purity or whi

ch ones cause us to question the maturity and sincerity of other believers. Many denominations and congregations hold such doctrinal prerequisites that must be agreed upon if a person wants to be fully involved in that congregation or organization. Is this really what God wants? I understand that the essentials of the faith need to be presented and agreed upon. But do we really need to make someone's view about the coming of the Lord or their position about Calvinism a requirement for extending the hand of fellowship to other believers?

**Re: - posted by rainydaygirl, on: 2010/1/27 14:49**

Hi ATG

Thanks for your response. I appreciate what you have shared and I agree that there is much we can learn from one another and what the Lord shows us. At the same time I am also learning that at some point to continue on and on debating and discussing a matter when both sides sincerely believe God is showing them His heart becomes pointless. At some point I think there is room to step back for a time, knowing each person is seeking to live for the Lord to trust that God will in His time open the eyes of the one who is not seeing things as they should. No matter how much I try to persuade another of what I believe the Lord is showing me to be true that person is not going to see until the Lord changes their heart. and the same goes for me when mine understanding needs to be corrected.

I did not mean to imply that you or Chris have been debating this topic endlessly nor was I trying in any way to criticize you or him. I should have been more specific that this topic as well as a few others have been discussed over and over a gain here on the forum. Sadly as Chris mentioned most of the time they end up with one or more persons being attacked and offended. I just do not see how this draws those who are not saved and maybe reading this to the Lord. I realize though that this is just my thoughts and some things that I am seeing:)

Anyway thank you for taking the time to respond to me. I think I should probably take my own advice and back out of this thread. I do not want to make a debate of whether we should debate:)

love in Him  
rdg

Edit: Chris wrote:But do we really need to make someone's view about the coming of the Lord or their position about Calvinism a requirement for extending the hand of fellowship to other believers?

---

I saw this after I posted and just wanted to add that has been on my heart as well:)

**Re: , on: 2010/1/27 23:39**

Quote:  
-----  
Quote:  
-----If the aggressor's first actions will be lethal to the innocent then it would be necessary to prevent their first actions in order to defend the innocent.  
-----

Where does the Bible say this?  
-----

Personally I think it says this all over the place, but I didn't mean to make a case against pacifism by saying that. It's just the nature of defensive action to sometimes require the first shot. Police officers, for example, are trained to shoot before a possible attacker actually fires their gun at them. It would defeat the purpose of defense if they waited until the aggressors bullet had left the barrel.

Quote:  
----- came from the Roman Catholic Church, and for political purposes, was adopted by certain non-Roman Catholics. This has nothing to do with furthering the kingdom of God, though; nor, of behaving like the early Christians.

-----  
Do you mean "just war" doctrine has nothing to do with God's kingdom? The purpose of just war doctrine is to prevent selfish and unnecessary destruction of human life. I think the disagreement between pacifists and non-pacifists is often over the means of loving God, neighbor, and self - not whether we should do everything out of love or not.

Quote:

-----  
Quote:

-----is consistent with preemptive strike. This same principle can be applied in individual self-defense scenarios or in the defense of another individual.

-----  
And this pleases God?

-----  
One thing about the official summaries of just war doctrine that I've heard which... well... I question whether it honors God - is the requirement that there be a reasonable or good chance of success in using force to protect the innocent.

The Lord is my strength. My chance of success is not my strength. "Indeed, with your help I can charge against an army; by my God's power I can jump over a wall." (Ps 18:29)

Let us always do our best to please God. Let us always love God with all of our heart, soul, mind and strength. I personally think God's pleasure level would plummet if I neglected to protect someone who he had placed in my care. But if I learned that he would be more pleased with me letting them be harmed, then I would do my best to trust and obey. I admit I don't even like to think about neglecting to protect a helpless person but that doesn't determine what is right or wrong. Similarly, not liking to think about using force to defend someone who needs your protection does not decide the issue either. "For even Christ did not please himself, but just as it is written, 'The insults of those who insult you have fallen on me.'" (Rom 15:3) - So it doesn't matter whether men would call me 'too violent' or 'too passive'. Only following righteousness, "perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

Quote:

-----  
Quote:

-----Modern technology greatly changes the nature of combat. In the past it could have made sense to stand and wait for your enemy to run at you with spears and swords. Today it is different because of high-speed, long-range transportation and weapons. It doesn't make sense to wait until the nuclear missile is close enough to use Aikido.

-----  
Sorry. I just don't buy this argument. But that's okay with me.

-----  
Sorry if it wasn't helpful. I just meant to show that 'preemptive' strike is not a radical departure from the traditional principles of defensive combat but can (and ought to) be based on the same principles (love for neighbor and enemy).

Quote:

-----I said: Frankly, what do we expect? If they were Christians, they wouldn't be armed conspirators against another Christian population.

-----  
Isn't that the whole point?

-----  
You replied: I couldn't tell what you meant here.

-----  
I mean, that people who don't have the peace of God in their hearts, who think that their religious aims can be furthered by physical violence (carnal thinking), cannot be expected to live peaceably with others who desire peace because they do have the peace of God in their hearts. I would not expect Christians to make war against Christians, and so, to make war against non-Christians makes even less sense.

-----  
I'm still not sure I follow your reasoning here. It sounds like you are saying there are only two options: Christian pacifism and carnal warmongering. Have you considered that there is third option between all violence and no violence?

Quote:

-----Look at Paul the apostle, killing Christians. He really believed he was justified in so doing, until the Lord stepped in. Now, after that, unbelieving Jews were trying to kill him, and he was even left for dead once, but his response was not to try and rustle up a band of Christians to help him hunt down and kill the heathen. Rather, he carried on evangelizing them.

-----  
So.... what had changed in Paul?

Why did he now no longer think it was appropriate to kill those who didn't agree with his (new) religion?

Was it because the Lord had told him he would suffer for His sake? Was it because he couldn't get any other Christians to join him in stamping out the unbelieving Jews (as once he had tried to stamp out believing Christians)? Or was it because Jesus clearly stated that His kingdom is not of this world else His servants would fight for Him, and now, Paul was serving the interests of that kingdom?

I think what I'm trying to say is, that Paul thought he was justified in killing people, until his conversion, and after his conversion he didn't think he was justified in so doing. I ask again: what had changed?

Secondarily, do we demonstrate that we have not 'changed', when we justify killing unbelievers?

It sounds like you think Paul was completely pacifist in his beliefs based on his response to persecution. Do you think his response to persecution would be totally incompatible with non-pacifist beliefs?

**Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes - posted by reptarz, on: 2010/1/28 10:14**

what about if you're a jew, muslim or other religion & you're in the service, would you fell comfortable using "jesus guns or ([http://www.weapons-universe.com/Knives/Special\\_Ops\\_Knives.shtml](http://www.weapons-universe.com/Knives/Special_Ops_Knives.shtml)) special ops knife "? & whats next? "jesus bombs" falling from the sky?

**a different ministry, on: 2010/1/28 11:45**

i was just re-reading Bonhoeffer's "Life Together" and near the end, he outlined several sorts of ministries, and one i thought made great sense, contained great wisdom in Christ, and that is the "ministry of holding one's tongue".

(along with the ministry of meekness, of listening, of helpfulness, of hearing, of proclaiming, of authority)

it's a most graceful ministry, and i urge all to give it a try.

in Jesus' love, neil

**Re: a different ministry, on: 2010/1/28 12:17**

Quote:

-----the "ministry of holding one's tongue".... it's a most graceful ministry, and i urge all to give it a try.

Does this mean you'd like the forums to cease?

Or, you just don't want to think about whether Jesus would like His name on weapons of destruction?

**beloved , on: 2010/1/28 12:54**

Quote:

-----Does this mean you'd like the forums to cease?

NO! not at all. i praise God in ANY way followers of Jesus can redeem this internet, by loving discourse, or sharing the Word, a prayer in Christ, a word of encouragement.

Love IN Messiah, thats what my heart longs for, among us, among others, to all the world. What is for the secular is for the secular, and what is God belongs to God, and never shall the twain meet. thats all i gotta say.

i love you, neil

**Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes , on: 2010/1/28 16:19**

benjoseph asked

Quote:  
-----It sounds like you think Paul was completely pacifist in his beliefs based on his response to persecution. Do you think his response to persecution would be totally incompatible with non-pacifist beliefs?  
-----

I can't answer for Paul, but from being the hunter, he became the hunted, and that didn't cause him to take up arms. Do you think his example was one of following that of Jesus Christ's life and ministry?

The New Testament clearly reports Jesus healing multitudes of individuals unconditionally, regardless of what had led to their deformity or sickness. And, after it was clear the religious authorities were out to get Him, he continued, knowing that at 'His time had not yet come'. Never once did He try to arrange a pre-emptive strike against those religionists. Neither did Paul.

And Tyndale, in his prefaces to translations of scripture, also indicates that if men in civic authority go beyond the remit God has given them, and do not keep His law themselves, or, if they do not administer the laws of their (nation or city) state faithfully, even if Christians die as a result, we are to take this patiently, knowing that the vengeance of God will eventually catch up with them. There are, also, 1 Thes 2:15, 1 Thes 3:4, 2 Thes 1:4 and 2 Thes 1:6, 2 Cor 1:9.

Christians are always going to be in the minority, because Jesus said so: Matt 7:14.

However, there is an irony, I later realised, in my comment to Natan4Jesus above. I said:

Quote:  
-----Or, you just don't want to think about whether Jesus would like His name on weapons of destruction?  
-----

Because God Himself rained down fire more than once in history. However, I also think that is exactly the point. Only God knows when is the right time to do that, and for men to claim to be killing in His name, is something Paul predicted would happen, and he himself, who had also done that, stopped, after he became a Christian.

**Re: US Military Weapons Inscribed With Secret 'Jesus' Bible Codes , on: 2010/1/28 16:37**

Chris, thank you for your detailed reply. I was much clearer after it, about what you actually think personally.

I (personally), would make a distinction between someone in my house threatening me or my family (whom I would not intend to kill in the first instance) and someone in another country. I've just come across 1 Tim 4:10 (as if I've never seen it before), which plays a large part in my thinking.

Eli Brayley has written a thought-provoking article about the very matter of brethren not agreeing to disagree, if we intend to find true unity in the Spirit. I hope you can find time to read it, and that it will provoke us all into closer fellowship with one another.

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id32415&forum34&6](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id32415&forum34&6)) Thoughts on Christian Unity in The Theological Realm

**Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2010/1/28 17:25**

Greetings

The interesting thing about that teaching on the other thread that you mentioned here is that we are not actually walking together daily. We are coming to a forum and sharing thoughts and what we understand about what the Bibles says on these things but we are not actually walking together daily, caring for one another as we would be in a local assembly of believers. So for me I am not really sure how that teaching applies yet. I have been praying about it as well as this thread also.

I don't personally like the term "agree to disagree" but I do see the point Chris is making about not wanting to get caught up in some of these topics. I am just not sure I see the purpose in all these discussions that never seem to have any real

benefit?  
God Bless  
maryjane

**removed by poster, on: 2010/1/28 18:35**

removed by poster after prayer