

**News and Current Events :: A Christian Plot for Domination?****A Christian Plot for Domination?, on: 2011/8/17 18:00**

"With Tim Pawlenty out of the presidential race, it is now fairly clear that the GOP candidate will either be Mitt Romney or someone who makes George W. Bush look like Tom Paine. Of the three most plausible candidates for the Republican nomination, two are deeply associated with a theocratic strain of Christian fundamentalism known as Dominionism. If you want to understand Michele Bachmann and Rick Perry, understanding Dominionism isn't optional. Put simply, Dominionism means that Christians have a God-given right to rule all earthly institutions."

...

read more: <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2011/08/14/dominionism-michele-bachmann-and-rick-perry-s-dangerous-religious-bond.html>

Re: A Christian Plot for Domination?, on: 2011/8/21 0:06

I saw on Dad's TV tonight that Perry's leading in the polls.

Part of the strong-delusion, is thinking that there is a governmental answer that will end our problems here and abroad. So many talking about the elections - thinking that one man can change the world's problems or at the least - make life more financially secure or safe for us here in the States - when the problem is Global now and nothing will bail us out of our permanently welded ties to the rest of the world and the UN and the amount of debt we are in, to nations such as China - just for one of many.

Surely is time to pray that none of us gets caught up in that delusion. "Put not your trust in Princes"

We need to understand Global Governance Soon.

Re: - posted by mikey2, on: 2011/8/21 10:06

Protestant dominionism reminds me of Rome's vision to rule all nations.

Re: Who are the Dominionists?, on: 2011/8/21 10:17

The NAR are the prime administrators of current "Christian" Dominionism today. I have been aware, and opposed to, the NAR since their beginnings, over a decade ago.

I am amazed at the tentacles these usurpers have entangled themselves in, and the politicians they have aligned themselves with. They want influence in the Oval Office...They want the World. They see themselves as THE qualified prophets and Apostles in the Earth...and demand that authority while they seek to establish it.

They are very similar to the Vatican...and are de facto self-declared popes. The really strange thing about them is their unorthodoxy. All of them supported Todd Bentley, and are filmed extensively on stage with him, endorsing him...and of course...Emma...The winds of Change Demons...and Todd's Karate stylings of "healing"...and his 31 resurrections from the dead.

Re: - posted by Enochh (), on: 2011/8/21 11:01

Wow. I must have had my head in the sand. I am aware of these false teachers but never heard of NAR. There is no answer outside of the gospel....the cross of Jesus Christ. be on guard....the great falling away is in progress and true believers will soon be a minority and unwelcome.

Re: , on: 2011/8/21 11:12

Hi Brothertom,

Thanks for the links. What is amazing is how much this movement flies under the radar. I think its because people are simply dis-engaged. It seems that if any person represents their particular philosophy, then the " Christian background,' or what they actually believe is simply unimportant to most people. This to me, more than anything, is a sign of the triumph of the world over what passes for Christianity. Ultimately, people who are rooted and grounded in this world, believe that the answers to this worlds problems lies with man, despite what prayer calls they may go to or what prayers they may pray.

I would urge all Christians to do a study of what dominionism is and who are the leaders of such a movement and why politics is such an important part of dominionism.....brother Frank

Re: , on: 2011/8/21 13:23

Rachel Maddow is the wrong source to be getting info from.

I think you are going down a rabbit trail chasing dominion theologian.

I would encourage you all to be wise as serpents and gentle as doves on this one.

We need Government. Our nations government and people need to acknowledge God.

We all know that no government or people will be perfect but we need to support righteous candidates who will represent moral, conservative, God honoring laws and ways.

Lastly, I will quote Judge Roy Moore, "Seperation of church and state does not mean seperation of God from Government."

Our Government officials should acknowledge the laws of nature and of natures God, otherwise men become God and make their own laws.

Ps 9:17 The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God.

Ps 22:28 For the kingdom is the LORD'S: and He is the governor among the nations.

Ps 33:12 ¶ Blessed is the nation whose God is the LORD; and the people whom he hath chosen for his own inheritance.

Ps 47:8 God reigneth over the heathen: God sitteth upon the throne of his holiness.

Job 12:23 He increaseth the nations, and destroyeth them: he enlargeth the nations, and straiteneth them again.

Appolus and brothertom are of course free to post their thoughts as am I. I will probably not respond to anymore on this particular thread cuz I don't have time to get into a debate on this.

God bless to all, John

Re: A Christian Plot for Domination? - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/8/21 13:45

I think that the author of this particular article shouldn't make such deep assumptions about individuals or figures that she did not have the opportunity to interview for clarification.

It is funny, but many of these same journalists (and would-be journalists) -- especially at The Daily Beast -- were unwilling to apply the same level of criticism toward individuals like President Obama during his run for the White House -- even though he provided quite a bit more questionable anecdotes from his own religious background and associations. So, this raises a question about the author's perceived motives.

The danger is that the author is assuming that Rick Perry believes in "Dominionism." There was no evidence whatsoever presented that would substantiate such a view. The author never interviewed the Governor. The author cited another article that also failed to seek clarification with the Governor. While it provides a brief explanation of the error of "Dominionism," it fails to link either candidate to such a belief. So, the entire article reeks of assumption, connecting dots, insinuation, hearsay, rumor and even conspiracy.

This shouldn't surprise anyone. This tactic has been used in politics for quite some time. Any time a person who professes a faith in Christ decides to run for a public office or participate in public service, some will undoubtedly scrutinize their faith. In many instances, they will try to paint them as what they affectionately call a "wingnut" or make insinuations about their views and label such views as "extreme."

In one of my classes during grad school, we had a guest speaker who had served in Bill Clinton's administration. He mentioned the "strategic tactics" that were engaged during the two election campaigns in order to "lessen the impact of Evangelical Christians during the election." He pointed out how, in 1992, they created a strategy to use Christians themselves to spread questions about then-President George H. W. Bush. This man said that he knew the impact that Christians could have on elections and policy. So, they decided to "use" certain Christians to publicly take issue regarding Bush's religious beliefs and his choice of words (following the first Gulf War) regarding "a new world order" -- and even implying that he personally believed that Muslims would go to Heaven. This issue was purposely leaked to major media outlets.

This speaker stated emphatically that the goal was to use "denominational differences" to cause friction and lessen the impact of evangelicals during the election. He claimed that it worked, citing a decline in turnout among evangelicals in 1992...the amount that supported third party candidates (such as Ross Perot)...and a small increase in the number of evangelicals who supported Clinton. He emphasized that every strategy like this was vital to the election since none of the candidates would obtain a majority and the margin of victory would be about 5% of the vote.

I listened to the guest speaker and it caused me to wonder why the man wasn't embarrassed about admitting such dishonesty. This man was admittedly aware of the large amount of people who claim to have been "evangelicals" and "Christians" and just how easy it can be to stir dissension in their midst.

After all, the word "Dominionism" is often incorrectly thrown out in churches regarding individuals who believe that Christians have an opportunity to serve in areas like government, school boards, military, or other public offices. It seems that whenever an individual says that he feels the liberty -- or even a call -- to serve in such a public manner, someone will undoubtedly come out from behind a pew (or elsewhere) and unleash the "D" word. When, in reality, many of those individuals who serve in such public arenas don't embrace the actual views of "dominionism" -- such as a view that Christians have a "God-given right to rule all earthly institutions."

During college, I attended a church where one of the church elders decided to run for the school board. Prior to this, he was well-beloved and highly regarded in both the Church and community. When he decided to run, it was odd that some loud members of the church actually stepped out and raised issue about him. This was the first time that I had ever heard the "dominionism" word -- and it was used as a slight against that man. This man was a successful small business owner and had a large family. Somehow, the insinuations started flying to the point where a few very loud church folks went so far as to claim that he had "supported NAFTA," that he "wasn't tithing" and even publicly questioning the man's faith and status as an "elder" in the church. Such rhetoric somehow made its way out of the church and into the community.

In reality, the man was a father who was simply concerned about the schools that his children and grandchildren were attending. He had hoped that he could allow his faith and Biblical views about righteousness and unrighteousness to influence the local school district (a special government district) through such an office. He didn't have a desire to "take over" the district with Christianity or any sort of view about "a God-given right to rule all earthly institutions." Yet the damage

was done. This man won the election, but some people never looked at him the same way.

I don't know if Rick Perry belongs to such a belief. However, I am willing to refrain from even entertaining such an insinuation until I know for certain. Politicians often invoke their religious faith or religious principles during elections. Of course, it seems that any time a candidate invokes a claim regarding his Christian faith, the "dominionism" insinuation is pushed back into fray.

Do these candidates really believe such odd notions about Christian dominion over earthly institutions? I suppose that this would have to be asked from candidate to candidate. However, I certainly don't think that there is enough evidence for this author to claim that Perry or Bauchmann is "deeply associated" with it. And, of course, it makes one wonder why the author -- a Jewish feminist -- and those that she seems intent on provoking aren't equally concerned or puzzled about the "liberation theology" elements from President Obama's own religious background.

If we aren't careful, we will end up giving credibility to such things without full certainty. At the same time, I think that we should be careful about straying into the realm of politics or political discussions when they can very well lead to the type of quarrels that we hope to avoid here. Like things above said, we may find ourselves doing down a winding rabbit trail that serves to distract us from the "straight and narrow."

Re: , on: 2011/8/21 20:35

"I would urge all Christians to do a study of what dominionism is and who are the leaders of such a movement and why politics is such an important part of dominionism."

I reiterate this point. I think you will find that one of the top proponents of dominionism helped organized the recent prayer gathering in Texas. Sad thing is, politician and "minister," are manipulating each other..... brother Frank

Re: , on: 2011/8/21 22:24

If Perry had organized public prayer meetings during his three terms as Governor I would not have any suspicions about him.

But he did not, so it is only normal to be a bit wary of him since he organized such a grand public prayer meeting just before he announced he is running for Prez.

Edited. TMI

Julius

Dominionism is very alive in America. It is interesting how it has crept into many different kinds of denominations.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/8/22 0:18

Hi Julius,

Quote:

"If Perry had organized public prayer meetings during his three terms as Governor..."

How do you know that Perry had not organized any public prayer meetings previously? We don't know him personally (at least, I don't think that anyone here does), so how can we say that he hasn't organized public prayer -- perhaps on a more local level -- previously?

I will say that I was attending college in Texas during 9/11. In the days following that, I remember Perry making similar public calls for prayer. Even according to the Office of the Governor's website, I quickly found three of them from the past year alone. I remember some environmentalists here in California scoffing over Governor Perry's proclamation more than a year ago when he called for prayer after the explosion and sinking of an oil rig in the Gulf. In fact, according to this most recent proclamation, the Governor stated specific reasons as to why he was calling for Texans to pray:

Quote:

In 1775, the Continental Congress asked the colonies to join in prayer, seeking wisdom as they faced the responsibility and opportunity of building a new nation. As leaders of that young nation assembled in 1787 to craft a Constitution, Benjamin Franklin implored the framers to pray for guidance, famously declaring, "The longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: that God governs in the affairs of men." Decades later, during a time of national turmoil, President John Adams declared "a day of solemn humiliation, fasting and prayer," asking citizens of all faiths to pray for America's protection from danger. Later, as civil war tore our young country apart, President Abraham Lincoln proclaimed a day of national fasting and prayer, saying "It behooves us ... to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray to the God that made us." During World War II, with our troops locked in battle on the beaches of France, President Franklin D. Roosevelt led the nation in prayer, "As we rise to each new day, and again when each day is spent, let words of prayer be on our lips, invoking Thy help to our efforts."

Given the trials that have beset our country and world - from the global economic downturn to natural disasters, the lingering danger of terrorism and wars that endanger our troops in Iraq, Afghanistan and theaters of conflict around the globe, and the decline of our culture in the context of the demise of families - it seems imperative that the people of our nation should once again join together for a solemn day of prayer and fasting on behalf of our troubled nation.

In times of trouble, even those who have been granted power by the people must turn to God in humility for wisdom, mercy and direction. In the spirit of the Book of Joel, Chapter 2, Verses 15-16, I urge a solemn gathering of prayer and fasting. As those verses admonish: "15 Blow the trumpet in Zion, declare a holy fast, call a sacred assembly... 16 Gather the people, consecrate the assembly..." As Jesus prayed publicly for the benefit of others in John 11:41-42, so should we express our faith in this way.

THEREFORE, I invite my fellow Texans to join me on August 6 at Reliant Stadium in Houston, as we pray for unity and righteousness - for this great state, this great nation and all mankind. I urge Americans of faith to pray on that day for the healing of our country, the rebuilding of our communities and the restoration of enduring values as our guiding force.

THEREFORE, I, Rick Perry, Governor of Texas, do hereby proclaim August 6, 2011, to be

A Day of Prayer and Fasting for Our Nation

in Texas, and urge the appropriate recognition whereof.

In official recognition whereof, I hereby affix my signature this the 23rd day of May, 2011.

RICK PERRY
Governor of Texas

So, the Governor specifically cites the current state of the world as the rationale behind this particular call for prayer. In doing so, he was echoing what many previous US presidents -- and others -- have done for centuries. After all, each and every previous President of the United States has made at least one public call for prayer for various reasons and circumstances (for whatever that is worth as far as motives are concerned).

I suppose that the numerous times that he has made such calls -- mostly without much coverage in the press -- might have lacked the scrutiny because he wasn't a candidate for President. I suppose that the scrutiny is to be expected.

Quote:

"...I would not have any suspicions about him."

I must ask if this is really what we are called to do. Are we called to have "suspicions" about the faith of a presiding Governor simply because he asked for public prayer...or because some highly partisan feminist author claims that the Governor is "deeply involved" in the "Dominionist" heresy -- without even providing any evidence?

There are individuals in this nation who deeply "hope" that Christians do not have any influence whatsoever in government, elections or policy on the local or national level. As the guest speaker in one of my classes noted, they will go to great lengths in order to lessen the voter turnout -- especially for those who might vote according to their conscience on issues like abortion, homosexual marriages, etc...

Please do not mistake me: I am not defending Rick Perry (or Michelle Bauchmann) at all. I met Rick Perry once, but only

y in passing. He seemed to be a nice guy. Still, I don't know him enough at all to make any such verdict about where he stands in this matter...and I wouldn't trust a media where the journalist (in this case) admitted her own prejudices in the forward of her book on the subject.

However, I would like to point out my belief that there is a very big difference between believing that Christians have the liberty to vote, participate in public office, serve in the military, etc... and the heresy of "Dominionism."

This world is ultimately racing toward judgment --- no matter who is President of this one nation in the short term. However, I don't know if we are supposed to simply throw our hands up in surrender in regard to our families, neighbors, schools and responsibilities to the nation of our temporary citizenship. Sometimes, I think that we are a bit far-sighted in terms of eschatology. We know that the end will come...and it will be pretty bad. However, we still live in the here in now -- doing what we can for the Lord and working on behalf of our families, neighbors and even strangers.

I remember a man who prepared for Y2K -- because he was convinced that it would be the beginning of the Great Tribulation. So, for a few years, he was gathering food and building an underground shelter. The expense was great...and his family suffered in the short term for it. When January 1, 2000 rolled around, I thought that he would feel pretty dumb. Yet he was satisfied that he was preparing for the Tribulation. During Christmas, I ran into him. He still has his underground trailer and stockpile of food. However, much of that food (11 years old now!) is expiring...two of his kids are not serving the Lord...and his marriage is in trouble. He had prepared and worked for a future and neglected what was immediately important in the short term.

As believers, we are all where we are "for such a time as this." Hopefully, we are making the most of this opportunity -- these talents -- that the Lord has given us according to His good will. We know that Christ is coming soon. We don't know the exact dates (and there are plenty of debates about the specific nature of that timing). However, we still have the responsibilities that are clear in the Word of God for our families, ourselves, our Churches, our neighbors, our communities and even the nations of our temporary citizenship.

I, like many others, believe that Christians have the liberty to serve the Lord at home, at work, and even by participating in the policy decisions at various levels of organizations (from school boards to the White House). I even believe that Christians can make decisions in the voting booth (hopefully, better than anyone else). And, of course, the ultimate goal is NOT exert some silly and heretical "dominionist" philosophy that Christians will take over the Earth. But, we can influence those around us for the Lord and even regarding matters of righteousness and unrighteousness.

Anyway, I hope that I wasn't misunderstood in regard to this. We should certainly "test everything" -- and our faith is reserved for Christ and Christ alone. We shouldn't be afraid of educating ourselves about cults, sects, and the various heresies out there. However, we should also be careful (as things above noted) about chasing about rabbit trails and how that can serve to distract us from what is most immediately important. We should especially be careful about entertaining accusations and insinuations about someone in an office too. And, of course, we should be slow to make such accusations ourselves.

The man that I spoke of in my last post (the one who was elected to a school board) was probably disappointed by the insinuations uttered by individuals who simply disagreed with him. Somehow, the suspicions turned into insinuations and the insinuations turned into accusations. It would have been one thing if they had originated from the world. However, these came from some probably-well-meaning members of the Body of Christ and were conveniently "leaked" to the world. No matter how well-meaning or subtle, such mischaracterizations can serve to damage someone's testimony.

Anyway, I am praying about all of this. And, I suppose, that is the best thing that we can all do!

The Lord bless you exceedingly!

Re: , on: 2011/8/22 11:54

The more I read Christian forums, the more I am convinced they are the whack jobs. They are the "out there" Christians . Well, I mean about 80% of them are on any given board are. Yes, they are children of God and bought by the shed blood of Jesus Christ and on their way to heaven. But, they are also whackey in some way--myself included I guess.

Re: - posted by Veronica226 (), on: 2011/8/22 17:03

Quote:
-----The more I read Christian forums, the more I am convinced they are the whack jobs. They are the "out there" Christians. Well, I mean about 80% of them are on any given board are. Yes, they are children of God and bought by the shed blood of Jesus Christ and on their way to heaven. But, they are also whackey in some way--myself included I guess.

This is the second time you have said something like this. I agree with whoever it was that said something to you last time, I am disturbed that you call GOD'S children "whack jobs." Then the question is, why stay? If most "christians" on Christian forums are "whack jobs" then why don't you leave them all? Is it because you like stirring up trouble? Or is it because you are genuinely seeking something?

Endzone, I seriously think you need to listen to this: <http://media.sermonindex.net/12/SID12975.mp3>

Re: - posted by AbideinHim (), on: 2011/8/22 17:21

I tell you what, you can side with the liberal news media and bash those that stand for Christian principles, but I am going to side with those that stand with the Lord on the things that are on his heart.

There are three main areas in this nation that God is going to judge and it has nothing to do with the economy, only that it will effect us economically.

1. Abortion
2. the acceptance of homosexuality and redefining marriage as between two consenting adults regardless of the sex.
3. Israel

I will always support those in office that are on God's side on these three main issues regardless of their views on the economy.

There are some of you that bashed Bush and the conservatives during his administration, and I see that you are at it again. Yes, there are some that are placing their faith in men, and this isn't the answer, but I would still much rather see a Christian man or at least one that supports Christian principles than one that believes that God has no place in this society and has a liberal agenda, which is wrecking the judicial system of this nation.

Mike

Re: - posted by UntoBabes (), on: 2011/8/22 17:22

~

Re: A Christian Plot for Domination? - posted by twayneb (), on: 2011/8/22 22:30

I think Brother Frank's admonition to learn what Dominionism is all about is a sound admonition.

As of about 6 months ago I was blissfully unaware of Dominion Theology, the New Apostolic Reformation, Victorious Eschatology, the Seven Mountain Strategy, the Oaks Initiative, Joseph Company, etc. I had heard of the prophetic movement and of websites such as the Elijah list but I had not studied what these men and women believe, what serves as their primary motivation. I am quite aware of these things now and have done a great deal of study into this movement.

Let me say first that I think it is NOT a good idea for believers to go on "witch-hunts" every time they spot a doctrinal system that they disagree with. I am also totally opposed to frequenting websites that take the tack that "we are here to expose the heresy of such and so". I avoid websites with that tone and flavor entirely and advise other believers to avoid that sort of thing as well.

As believers we need to approach these sorts of topics in a very purposeful way. We first need to do so prayerfully. I know

ow it sounds cliché, but we need to have our hearts right before God and be in the right spirit, operation in and being motivated by the love of God through the Holy Spirit before we proceed any further. Second we need to get our information from only ONE source, and that is the horse's mouth. In my studies I did not go to ANY websites that said, "here is what is wrong with NAR" or etc. I went straight to the websites of the leadership of this movement and studied what they had to say for myself and compared it to scripture. It is too easy for a person with an axe to grind to lift things out of context and string them together in a deceptive way.

That being said, I am very concerned about this movement. I am finding some very key doctrinal statements and motivations that do not square with scripture. I am NOT against prophecy 1 Thes. 5:20, 1 Tim. 1:18. I am NOT against recognizing the ascension gift of apostle along with prophet, pastor, teacher, and evangelist as operational in the body today. I think this is entirely Biblical and amply supported scripturally although I know some here would disagree with me and that is OK. But the NAR and the dominion movement is in my opinion in error at a very foundational level. I would also urge you to prayerfully look into these things and be aware.

That being said I do believe there are many wonderful believers who truly love God and are in relationship with Him that are wrapped up in this move. Pray for them and love them.

Re: , on: 2011/8/23 0:26

Hi Travis, that's a good word brother. As part of my own research, I spent the whole of last year attending IHOP, one of the centers for this teaching and a base for Lou Engle. I believe these guys will pose the greatest threat to Christianity moving forward. I met many wonderful people there, especially young people in their 20s, in fact I became involved in a small home group for a year and half and these young people just soaked in sound teaching. I have studied dominionism for years, as I believe has Brothertom.

As far as some of the other comments go, I just ignore the "shoot the messenger," tactic that has gone on for years in this particular forum. Now, I used to respond :) This is a serious subject and one should not allow their political philosophy to get in the way when considering it. And so again, I admonish my brothers and sisters to do their own research. This teaching has widely infiltrated Christendom. As part of your research, I suggest that you check out what Andrew Strom has to say on the subject, a speaker at the revival conference in Wales and a former part of the "prophetic movement." His website can be found by googling "John the baptist TV." If you go to his articles and read "Why I left the prophetic movement," part one and two, this would be a good start. Brothertom also put up some websites to do your research.....brother Frank

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/8/23 2:52

Hi Frank,

I know that you may feel that we "bump heads" sometimes in the past (often by misunderstanding or misinterpretation), but I don't think that anyone in this thread is disagreeing with anyone else's views on Dominionism. It is certainly a non-Biblical teaching. Also, no one is "shooting the messenger" here...and I think that we have all encouraged believers to study this matter for themselves as they feel led by the Lord (while, as Travis suggested, sincerely endeavoring to avoid "rusting" information from non-primary sources).

My qualm was with the content of the article written by a liberal feminist (who is not a Christian) as quoted in the first post and in the linked article at The Daily Beast. I read the article and then actually looked through Michelle Goldberg's (the author's) book on the subject ("Kingdom Coming: The Rise of Christian Nationalism") on my Nook. While she initially defines Dominionism quite well, it appears that she mistakenly attributes it to almost any Christian who allows their faith to follow them into the voting booth or motivate them to government service (or the decisions they make while serving). It seems that, using her definition of the term, she would have lumped all of the founding fathers of the United States into the same group with Rick Perry. Moreover, this mistaken assessment (about participation) is sometimes echoed by some Christians as well.

The author somehow tried to link (via "deep association") Governor Rick Perry and Congresswoman Michelle Bachmann to the heresy of Dominionism, but offered nothing to substantiate her claim. This may be due to her simply leaving out the "proof" -- or it could be due to her skewed definition and previous attempts (in her book) to yoke any Christians who attempt to affect the outcome of elections through voting or participation in the electoral or policy process as holding to heretical "Dominionist" views.

Of course, we don't know the motivation of this woman...but I would similarly urge caution and research before accepting her opinions as well. It may be that her own views on politics and policies (dealing with issues like the role of religious faith, abortion and homosexuality) have somehow clouded her perception of Christians who endeavor to engage in government, voting, etc...

As for Dominionism: I agree with you that we should prayerful study this subject if we feel the need or are led by the Lord. And, of course, we shouldn't be guided by personal philosophy or allow our assumptions to think that anyone who feels the liberty to vote or participate in some form of government is falling into the heresy of "dominionism," "kingdom now," or some crazy attempt to have Christians rule the Earth.

However, I would point out that there is a difference between how some define the term "dominionism." Many on the political left (and even some Christians) will use a more loose definition of the term to apply toward any Christian who feels a liberty to vote or influence government, affect policy decisions (such as in regard to abortion, homosexual marriage, or relations with Israel, etc...) or the outcomes of elections according to their conscience before God. Oddly enough, those same individuals often do not voice similar reservations with Atheists, non-Christian religious advocates, homosexuals, abortionists, etc... doing the same.

It was with the author's comments -- and her unsubstantiated claims that implicate two Presidential candidates -- that I felt some concern. I apologize for any confusion...and I hope that clarifies the motivation for my comments.

The Lord bless you.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2011/8/23 18:39

Frank:

My wife and I first visited IHOP in the old double wide trailer days when Metro Christian Fellowship was still going in the FSM building. My son attended a one thing internship about four years ago and had his life turned right side up from what was for us a very scary situation. So I have not animosity toward IHOP. I know and have known many people who are plugged in there and have been blessed at times by the prayer rooms. The people I know and have known have been for the most part solid Christians with a genuine love for God and desire to see God moving in revival. I do still reserve a certain degree of judgment, but I am convinced that something is not quite right there. I know what I perceive the error to be and I would encourage thoroughly checking out the prophetic foundations of IHOP and looking at the men and women who speak very strongly into that work. I believe it strong enough error to be cautious. I am convinced that the recent (Since William Branham) prophetic movement is driving off the cliff.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2011/8/23 18:48

Chris:

I know that there are many definitions of dominionism floating around. I think that is part of the problem. We seem to define things by different terms and then discuss as if we were on the same page. It does lead to some confusion.

Dominionism as I see it is the belief that the church in the last days is going to rise to ascendancy in several key areas or realms of society and government. Dominionists often point to seven key areas among which are government, education, arts and entertainment, business, and I have forgotten the other three. They believe for the most part that we will usher in the return of the Lord by "taking over" so to speak control in these areas and setting up a kingdom for Jesus to come rule over. Included in this system is the idea that one of the key parts of taking over and bringing Christ back is a 24/7 worship and prayer movement. It is believed that the prayers of the saints in this 24/7 movement will unleash the judgments of God and help bring Christ back. This is the reason that dominionists are so politically active. Also included is the idea of the restoration of the apostolic and prophetic foundation to the church.

Now my definition is probably incomplete. Please study for yourself. But it is I think some of the basic tenets of this system of belief. Now I don't believe there is anything wrong with believers wanting to run for office to affect positive moral change to society. God often leads men and women to do just this. There is nothing wrong with prayer and worship going on 24/7. I am all for that. But the motivation for that prayer and worship is important. There is no doubt in my mind that apostles and prophets are still active in the church. I know several people who I perceive to be such. But this movement takes it far beyond what I believe to be sound Biblically.

News and Current Events :: A Christian Plot for Domination?

Maybe that is a definition we can hold in common???

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/8/23 19:10

Hi Travis,

Yes, I agree with your definition. In fact, I think that this is the one that is most commonly understood by believers.

I simply wanted to point out how the author of the initial article has a tendency to include (in her book and articles) Christians who don't embrace a heretical "kingdom now" type of dominionist philosophy yet are still lumped together under her broad, sweeping definition. Some people are worried about Christian voter turnout or influence of said turnout (*like the guest speaker in my class) and tend to implicate any believer who feels a notion to vote, influence or serve in local/state/national government or policy as having some ulterior motive that they call into question in the same breath where they describe the dominionist heresy.

Again, I apologize for any misunderstanding from my posts. I simply wanted to point out that the original article is short on proof (linking Rick Perry or Michelle Bauchmann to such a movement) and a little broad in how it incorrectly lumps many Christians together with such cultish views. And, yes, brother, I do believe that your definition is one that we have in common.

The Lord bless you!

Re: , on: 2011/8/23 21:03

Hi Travis,

Praise God for your son's life turning around. I have no doubt that he encountered God. I have no animosity towards IHOP. In fact I had great fellowship with the young folk in the house group.

I think you would have to go week in and week out to get a handle on what is "not right," there. It is definitely subtle (and some times not so) I too encourage people to do their own research on IHOP. A good place to start is with the Kansas City Prophets. Like many pentecostal churches (I am a classic pentecostal for lack of a better phrase) there are many great people and I truly believe that the pentecostal movement was a powerful move around the world. Now, Satan knew that too, and I think he and his minions came howling at the pentecostal movement and what we got was the Charismatic movement. And out of that flowed the word of faith, prosperity gospel, obsession with signs and wonders and so on. The presence of God, a thing that was once treasured above all in the Pentecostal movement, was lost when the wolves came in and howled.....brother Frank

Re: A Christian Plot for Domination? - posted by DEADn (), on: 2011/9/2 8:29

I recently heard 2 podcasts dealing with this dominism. I have heard the term but never took it serious and figured it is fringe people who will stay on the fringe. Then I heard Frank Schaffer, son of Francis who was exposing Rick Perry and Michelle Bachmann as being Dominist. I thought that was crazy at first but after hearing him it I found it scary and now I realize why I see people who say they are crazy. For my own opinion, the soundbytes I hear from them they sound ignorant of life in general and I think are poor candidates even for church leadership.

I can't help but think that they want a theocracy something like what we see in Iran? Normally a christian theocracy, on paper would seem like a sign of liberty but when you put in the human nature of it all it spells trouble. Just look around the world of Christianity and its troubles and it sheds light on it all.

What I wonder if how many other people in higher offices support this dominionism mess? How many churches and pastors support this mess?

Re: A Christian Plot for Domination? - posted by DEADn (), on: 2011/9/2 8:38

<http://feeds.feedburner.com/radioactivity>

Look for Friday Aug 26. An interview with Frank Schaffer on this topic. I actually downloaded it into my ipod because I was really unaware of the things he was saying.

The interview comes from wmnf.org a local community radio station in Tampa that I listen to. It is liberal leaning but I listen to get another point of view as I consider myself conservative to moderate.

Re: - posted by DEADn (), on: 2011/9/2 8:48

The more I read Christian forums, the more I am convinced they are the whack jobs. They are the "out there" Christians. Well, I mean about 80% of them are on any given board are. Yes, they are children of God and bought by the shed blood of Jesus Christ and on their way to heaven. But, they are also whackey in some way--myself included I guess.

Endzone

Seeing your words here I have to agree. One thing that I am understanding more and more with christians is we see through our world only through the bible and not using even secular history as a part of our world. As a result it gives us a skewed view of our world and christians end up speaking ignorantly of so many things. I have to include myself into this group as well.

I get really embarrassed at times when I go to some secular forums and see some christians saying certain things that are only half truth because they don't have the whole picture. Seeing what you want to see but leaving the other half of the equation out.

I even see this in Rick Perry and Michelle Backmann, it is embarrassing to listen to the soundbytes they put out because they really do sound ignorant on so many levels.

Just my thoughts.

John aka DEADn