



Scriptures and Doctrine :: American Revolution

American Revolution - posted by IWantAnguish (), on: 2010/3/11 23:32

How many of you would have supported the founding fathers?

How many would have remained neutral?

How many would have fought for the British?

Re: American Revolution, on: 2010/3/11 23:35

No good can come of this post :)Frank

Re: American Revolution - posted by MaryJane, on: 2010/3/11 23:37

Quote:
-----How many of you would have supported the founding fathers? How many would have remained neutral? How many would have fought for the British?

Why does this matter? What is the point to the question? What does it have to do with the Kingdom of God?

God Bless
maryjane

Re: American Revolution - posted by IWantAnguish (), on: 2010/3/11 23:37

Curious because of the theology that the founding fathers held... and the foundations of the American Constitution... that our rights come from God... not from government.

Re: - posted by Areadymind (), on: 2010/3/11 23:47

Quote:
-----No good can come of this post :)Frank

:)

Re: - posted by KathleenP (), on: 2010/3/12 5:20

Amen.

P.S. I lost my rights at the cross, and this isn't my home.

Re: American Revolution, on: 2010/3/12 8:14

Quote:
-----How many of you would have supported the founding fathers?

How many would have remained neutral?

How many would have fought for the British?

I'm excited to see this question. I've been giving this a lot of thought recently. I don't know what I would have done. I don't

I don't know enough about the different circumstances people were in. I've been studying revolution and when it could be the right thing and when it is not. I haven't come to enough conclusions yet to try and give a solid answer here though, sorry.

Quote:

-----Curious because of the theology that the founding fathers held... and the foundations of the American Constitution... that our rights come from God... not from government.

I think they're right about that. I believe God established governmental rights because the public as a whole has needs that should be met and protected by a government. The public only has these needs because the individual people have them. The individual people have needs because God made them that way.

So the God-given needs of individuals are what create the need for government.

I'm reading John Locke's two treatises on government. I just started the first one.

Furthermore, I believe the epistemology of self-evident truths ("we hold these truths to be self-evident") is fundamental to true religion.

Re: , on: 2010/3/12 8:22

Quote:

-----No good can come of this post :)Frank

False prediction.. I was edified.

Re: , on: 2010/3/12 8:26

Quote:

-----I lost my rights at the cross

I lost my rights by sinning and got them back at the cross.

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2010/3/12 11:34

Quote:

-----Curious because of the theology that the founding fathers held

My son and I spent some time last night trying to do some research on this part of your topic. So far we have read about Thomas Jefferson, and George Washington. Both men have had much written and said about their faith from those who want to establish it and those who want to disprove it.

It's been an interesting history lesson at least.)

God Bless
maryjane

Re: - posted by IWantAnguish (), on: 2010/3/12 12:08

I grew up in public schools and never really learned anything about the Constitution... the origins of the Christian worldview behind the scheme of the foundations of America... and also that 'freedom of religion' meant freedom of protestant Christianity to those in colonial America.

Only recently have I begun to understand the founding fathers and their theology / worldview... George Whitefield supported the American Revolution even though he was English...

Interesting tidbit... Those who went to fight against England in Massachusetts went to the grave of Whitefield (who had been decomposing for some time)... opened the tomb and each took a piece of his clerical robe with them into battle, because of the preaching / theology and faith of Whitefield that encouraged them for the fight against tyranny.

Re: - posted by IWantAnguish (), on: 2010/3/12 12:26

Quote:

-----I lost my rights at the cross, and this isn't my home.

You seem to differ in your understanding of public rights / Christianity from Apostle Paul...

Acts 22:24-29

24The chief captain commanded him to be brought into the castle, and bade that he should be examined by scourging; that he might know wherefore they cried so against him.

25And as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by, Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned?

26When the centurion heard that, he went and told the chief captain, saying, Take heed what thou doest: for this man is a Roman.

27Then the chief captain came, and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, Yea.

28And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was free born.

29Then straightway they departed from him which should have examined him: and the chief captain also was afraid, after he knew that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him.

=====

Paul knew HIS rights as a ROMAN citizen.

I know my rights as an American.

The American Constitution explicitly states that all people are born under the authority of God, with the freedom to express Christian religion.

This is my right as an American... I cannot say the same about somebody born in another nation. Thus I will hold onto my American rights of freedom in Christ under God.

Re: - posted by hoohouu (), on: 2010/3/13 8:23

Quote:

-----Paul knew HIS rights as a ROMAN citizen. I know my rights as an American. The American Constitution explicitly states that all people are born under the authority of God, with the freedom to express Christian religion. This is my right as an American... I cannot say the same about somebody born in another nation. Thus I will hold onto my American rights of freedom in Christ under God.

True, Paul knew his rights as a Roman citizen. He simply had to state what he was a Roman citizen and they stopped, for the time being. But the topic of conversation is revolution, and armed revolution at that. The Apostle Paul offered no resistance, but only spoke to them. The only place you find a Believer in Christ using a sword is Peter in the garden. He was rebuked.

Re: Jesus carried no sword., on: 2010/3/13 10:21

"So far we have read about Thomas Jefferson, and George Washington. Both men have had much written and said about their faith from those who want to establish it and those who want to disprove it."

maryjane

George Washington was also an avid Mason; no doubt a secret society rooted in Paganism... Jefferson was a Deist ; a far cry from a born again believer.

Both were upper class intelligentsia and political leaders , and the reason for their commitment to armed revolution was more on moral grounds, than spiritual. They were just fed up with being vassals to England's whims and graft, and figured out that they had a good chance to overthrow their dominion over the colonies.

They did a very good job constructing the modus operandithe method that the government operates in; the Constitution. However, as far as a born again believer participating in armed revolt....? consider the life of Paul the apostle, or the first martyr Stephen.....mowing down the Roman armies with his hand held machine gun, just like Rambo.

I don't think so. You must be killed by the sword, if you live by it. Jesus has another way...."RESIST NOT EVIL!", and overcoming evil with love and goodness. When the Romans came to capture Jesus, Peter decided to stand for the injustice, and drew his sword, and attacked..."MY KINGDOM IS NOT OF THIS WORLD!".....Jesus said.

Liberty has morphed into gross permissiveness, and our rights have turned to laws that protect our immorality. Democracy is not necessarily the Christian way. The will of the people; by the people and for the people can become but a polite mob rule. Sodom was a democracy. The majority of the people decided it was good sport to rape any stranger they wanted to. It became legal and accepted as tolerable.

"UNLESS THE LORD BUILD THE HOUSE, THOSE WHO LABOR , LABOR IN VAIN!"

Our kingdom is of Heaven, where our King dwells also. He didn't carry a sword.

Re: , on: 2010/3/13 12:02

Quote:
-----The Apostle Paul offered no resistance, but only spoke to them. The only place you find a Believer in Christ using a sword is Peter in the garden. He was rebuked.

This sounds like an argument for total pacifism. Actually it may be more like two or three arguments all in one.

1. The Apostle Paul didn't physically defend himself against Rome in the book of Acts. (Therefore Christians should never defend themselves against any government?)
2. The Lord told Peter not to use his sword to defend him (Jesus) from arrest. (Therefore no Christian should ever use force to defend someone?)
3. There are no stories of Christians in combat or using force. (Therefore it is forbidden?)

If I understand these arguments correctly, they don't seem logical.

1. Paul was appointed by the Lord to preach to kings. ("he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel" - Acts 9:15) Appealing to Caesar may have been more of an evangelistic tactic than a self-defense tactic. Also, if I understand the chronology correctly, it seems the Holy Spirit had already prophesied

that Paul would be delivered to the Gentiles by the Jews (Acts 21:11). I don't see how this could be used as proof that revolution is always immoral.

2. The Lord's arrest is another situation where it had been prophesied before hand what would happen. Jesus willingly laid down his life as a sacrifice for our sins. He did not want anyone to defend him and had authority from God to give up his life in this way. I don't see how this would apply to revolution.

3. when you say there are no other stories of "Believers in Christ" using swords, I assume you are limiting yourself to the New Testament books. The Old Testament is full of believers in the Messiah killing other people. The Old Testament, however, contains a lot of history: generational histories, and the history of the nation of Israel. It makes sense that you find stories of combat in such an immense history of generations and nations. On the other hand, the New Testament books are not generational or national histories like the OT. They are four little gospels which cover three years of preaching, the books of Acts which focuses on the preaching of the gospel, a bunch of letters, and one prophecy. The New Testament is more of a history of evangelism than a history of generations or nations. It makes sense that you would find stories of combat in the OT but not in the NT. The NT is so short and focused on preaching. So I don't see how the absence of NT combat stories would show revolution to be always wrong.

Re: , on: 2010/3/13 12:46

Quote:

-----the reason for their commitment to armed revolution was more on moral grounds, than spiritual

What do you mean?

Quote:

-----as far as a born again believer participating in armed revolt....? consider the life of Paul the apostle, or the first martyr Stephen.....mowing down the Roman armies with his hand held machine gun, just like Rambo.

haha Rambo. People seem to think that martyrdom refutes the idea of revolution. Why is that? In the Old Testament God called people both to take lives and to lay down their own lives. Why would it be a contradiction now if it wasn't one back then?

Quote:

-----I don't think so. You must be killed by the sword, if you live by it.

"those who live by the sword" seems to be an expression that is not from the Bible.

Aren't there lots of saints who took up swords who did not die by the sword?

Quote:

-----Jesus has another way...."RESIST NOT EVIL!",

This was not said in the context of revolution or even in the context of mortal danger. I thought the context was face slaps, petty theft, and things like that.

Quote:

-----and overcoming evil with love and goodness.

This is also an Old Testament teaching.

Quote:

-----When the Romans came to capture Jesus, Peter decided to stand for the injustice, and drew his sword, and attacked...

A thousand? Nice. I never noticed that.

I like how the gospel of Mark doesn't even say anything about it. Peter cuts off the guys ear and Jesus starts talking to them

e mob. What impression would people have gotten from the gospel of Mark?

Quote:

-----"MY KINGDOM IS NOT OF THIS WORLD!".....Jesus said.

I thought Jesus said that later to Pilate? He also said that about himself in his particular situation with his people the Jew s. It don't see how it could mean that we are not to participate in any kingdoms of the earth.

Quote:

-----Liberty has morphed into gross permissiveness, and our rights have turned to laws that protect our immorality.

I agree.

Quote:

-----Democracy is not necessarily the Christian way.

I agree. I think different forms of government are more or less suitable depending on the overall morality and needs of the people. I have friends from the former USSR who saw democracy settle in a little too quickly and saw some people suffer from more freedom than they were ready to handle responsibly.

Quote:

-----The will of the people; by the people and for the people can become but a polite mob rule.

True. I would say it already has.

Quote:

-----Sodom was a democracy. The majority of the people decided it was good sport to rape any stranger they wanted to. It became legal and accepted as tolerable.

That could happen under a monarchy as well couldn't it? Were they really democratic?

Quote:

-----"UNLESS THE LORD BUILD THE HOUSE, THOSE WHO LABOR , LABOR IN VAIN!"

I agree. A revolution that God was against would backfire on the participants either in this life or the next.

Quote:

-----Our kingdom is of Heaven, where our King dwells also.

I agree.

Quote:

-----He didn't carry a sword.

He used a custom made whip though.

He also didn't take a wife. That doesn't mean that marriage is forbidden to all Christians.

Also, people seem to assume that Jesus was a pacifist because he was a martyr, but how do we know he never used force in defense of another? We only have record of three years or so of his life. I think, hypothetically, he could have used force to defend a helpless person. I see no reason to think he couldn't have done that.

Re: - posted by hoohouu (), on: 2010/3/13 13:28

I think Bro. Frank is correct. Nothing good will come of this. People will only argue, so I had to delete my latest post.

Because of Christ, Matt

Re: No Peace for the revolutionary?, on: 2010/3/13 14:40

"This sounds like an argument for total pacifism. Actually it may be more like two or three arguments all in one."

No Benjoseph, it isn't an argument at all, but simply my opinion. It is simply some thoughts that I hold to about Americanism, and armed revolution as a offshoot that compliments Christian behavior.

I really wasn't trying, or will I, to prove a point. As far as "total pacifism", I see the Christian walk as something close to that. Turn the other cheek, overcome evil with good, and see to it that we are not "Brawlers"..to fight for our rights. As Paul the Apostle admonishes us, that we would;

"To speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, shewing all meekness unto all men."

Titus 3:2

"Also, people seem to assume that Jesus was a pacifist because he was a martyr, but how do we know he never used force in defense of another? We only have record of three years or so of his life. I think, hypothetically, he could have used force to defend a helpless person. I see no reason to think he couldn't have done that."

Benjoseph.

This comment is so brazenly foolish it astounds me, and shows me that you really don't have much of a grasp on WHO Jesus is, and His character.

Possibly because you have little comprehension on who "The Lamb of God" IS, you substitute aggression and combativeness in your reactions to vent. Knowing that this will surely offend you, I apologize in advance, but I must say that you are not my enemy.

Back to the subject. Christians involved in armed revolution. No.

I don't condemn anyone for their choices, for it is not my walk with God that another does. I realize that there are many, many Christians in the Armed services who may disagree with me. I respect our armed forces.

Revelation 13:10

"If anyone is destined for captivity, to captivity he goes; if anyone kills with the sword, with the sword he must be killed. Here is the perseverance and the faith of the saints."

Meditate on this.

I think our brother Appolus was acting in a prophetic sense "smelling" the capacity for this thread buzz up...and he may be right, but armed Revolution?

Know Jesus; know Peace.

Re: , on: 2010/3/13 14:46

Quote:

-----I think Bro. Frank is correct. Nothing good will come of this. People will only argue, so I had to delete my latest post.

?

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2010/3/13 15:10

Quote:

-----I think Bro. Frank is correct. Nothing good will come of this. People will only argue, so I had to delete my latest post.

After praying about this I have to agree with Frank.

God Bless
mj

Re: , on: 2010/3/13 15:20

Quote:

-----"This sounds like an argument for total pacifism. Actually it may be more like two or three arguments all in one."

No Benjoseph, it isn't an argument at all, but simply my opinion.

oops.. I thought I wrote that to hoohoou. But anyway, I didn't mean argument in the negative sense that implies malice. I just meant a logical argument. A logical case for something. Arguments are good, the bible is full of logical arguments.

Quote:

-----It is simply some thoughts that I hold to about Americanism, and armed revolution as a offshoot that compliments Christian behavior

I really wasn't trying, or will I, to prove a point. As far as "total pacifism", I see the Christian walk as something close to that. Turn the other cheek, over come evil with good, and see to it that we are not "Brawlers"..to fight for our rights.

I don't think brawling and revolution are the same thing. Though an immoral revolution would be no better. Also, it sounds like you were saying that brawlers are people who are fighting for their rights?

Quote:

-----As Paul the Apostle admonishes us, that we would;

"To speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, shewing all meekness unto all men."

Titus 3:2

I agree with this. But the extent to which you are taking it implies that we shouldn't discipline children.

Quote:

-----Benjoseph.

uh oh

Quote:

-----This comment is so brazenly foolish it astounds me, and shows me that you really don't have much of a grasp on WHO Jesus is, and His character.

Possibly because you have little comprehension on who "The Lamb of God" IS, you substitute aggression and combativeness in your reactions to vent

?

Quote:

-----Knowing that this will surely offend you, I apologize in advance,

?

Quote:

-----but I must say that you are not my enemy.

tom, I'm going to end my response here because I want to be able to discuss this topic without making the moderators feel like they need to intervene.

Re: - posted by IWantAnguish (), on: 2010/3/13 17:16

Could you define what you mean by 'respect,' when you say you respect the armed forces?

If everyone held your opinion during World War II while Hitler went crazy... what would have happened?

Revelation 21:8 But for the cowardly, unbelieving, sinners, abominable, murderers, sexually immoral, sorcerers, idolaters, and all liars, their part is in the lake that burns with fire and sulfur, which is the second death."

Could you please interpret the definition of cowardly in the context of that verse for me.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2010/3/13 17:39

Quote:

-----After praying about this I have to agree with Frank.

Dear Mary, I appreciate this and some of the others also.

If there is anyway to discuss this, it is not with drawn swords. Thank you and others for your example of laying down your rights here for others.

Re: , on: 2010/3/13 18:18

Whether Christians should fight in wars is a non-essential issue. The important thing is that we fight with each other. If the Lord did not want His servants bludgeoning one another with opinionation, He would not have invented Fundamentalism. He invented the Internet so we could debate Christian ethics without killing each other. He invented war to kill sinners. Thanks to His Servant George Bush there are 600,000 sinners dead and 4 million displaced in Iraq.

P.S. Brother Frank has the gift of prophecy.

Re: - posted by knitefall, on: 2010/3/13 18:32

Just sat through six hours of a seminar by Dr. Peter Marshall. Skeptical at first but WOW! Total win for knowledge of what it was like for men to be Under God when the Nation was created. He shows how it was not for religious freedom they came, as they had that already in Holland before coming here. The Nation was erected by God for the purpose of being an example to other nations plus for the work of God in freeing men spiritually around the globe. And his presentation goes a lot better from there. On JSM.org he will be ministering at 6 Sunday. Don't forget about the clock change either!

So this Nation was and still is important to God. Through compromise, it has become what she is today. Get the DVDs if this is for you. PS, when this was founded, it was for everyone... and the members all knew that. Thanks for the post.

Re: respect and the cowardly, on: 2010/3/15 13:04

IWantAnguish said to me:

Could you define what you mean by 'respect,' when you say you respect the armed forces?

If everyone held your opinion during World War II while Hitler went crazy... what would have happened?

Revelation 21:8 But for the cowardly, unbelieving, sinners, abominable, murderers, sexually immoral, sorcerers, idolaters, and all liars, their part is in the lake that burns with fire and sulfur, which is the second death."

Could you please interpret the definition of cowardly in the context of that verse for me.

.....

I am a Viet Nam combat veteran , of the USMC, decorated with a Purple Heart, a Cross of Gallantry..., and several more medals, for my service to this country. My father also served in WW2, and was disabled in combat., and my older brother , Gary, lost his life while in uniform in 1970, in the Asian theatre.

I wasn't yet a born again believer at that time, . I understand the need for a strong military, as tyrants exist, and citizens must be protected from them. My own position today, though , as a servant of Christ Jesus, has changed. I cannot see joining an army to revolt against our country.

Remember that this is what this thread is about, and my comment; Armed revolution. Am I a pacifist? I try to be, but it mostly in the spiritual realm in order to lay down my life for the sake of Christ. I still own guns, and honestly, if an invader crashed into my home and threatened my innocent family; as a very last resort; I probably would shoot them. Maybe try to wound them; but stop them, for sure.

As far as Revelation 21:8 is concerned, cowardly is also translated fearful. In context, it means those who are given over to the spirit of fear, the anti-thesis to faith. To me, those who are afraid to stand in the Lord, in the face of menace, or martyrdom, or persecution would fall into this category. Oddly, I believe that it would include those who through fear of losing their life, took up arms to protect it.

Revelation 13:10

"If anyone is destined for captivity, to captivity he goes; if anyone kills with the sword, with the sword he must be killed Here is the perseverance and the faith of the saints."

The patience of the saints is believing that either through life or death, the Lord is able to keep us.