



## News and Current Events :: Roy Moore Removed as Alabama State Chief Justice

### Roy Moore Removed as Alabama State Chief Justice, on: 2016/10/3 19:14

Just read that the Alabama Ethics Committee removed State Supreme Court Justice Roy Moore from his post. His crime. It was not for embezzling money. It was not for any scandal of fornication. It was not for wrongfully handing down unjust decisions.

The reason Roy Moore was removed from being Chief Justice of Alabama was that he opposed to gay marriage.

By the way. This was in a so-called conservative Biblical state. Alabama. Truly the long arm of the LBGT can reach even into the so called conservative southern states.

Some have said that Roy Moore was being political about this. I do not know what the state of his heart is. But at least I'm glad somebody still has convictions to stand up for.

I think of that statement that came out of God is Not Dead Part 2, in which the teacher said I would rather stand with God and be judged by the world. And stand with the world and be judged by God.

Let me rephrase that statement again and say we should rather stand with God and be judged by the LBGT. That stand with the LBGT and be judged by God.

Would that more would be like Roy Moore and the County Clerk in Kentucky and stand for Biblical truth. But to do such may very well get yourself thrown in jail.

I do foresee a time when pastors who are true to the word of God will be taken away in handcuffs surrounded by teams to waiting government SUVs.

But then I wonder does anybody in the forum really understand what I'm talking about? Probably not.

Simply my thoughts.

### Re: Why We Need Reformation - Bob Mumford - posted by docs (), on: 2016/10/4 8:15

This is the second time Roy Moore has been removed from office. The first time was because he refused to obey an order to remove a monument to the Ten Commandments.

Quoting,

Why We Need Reformation

In Romans 13, Paul tells us to obey the government as a principality ordained of God. This precipitates the much discussed question of whether to conform or not to conform to the laws of the land. Because the kingdom of God is revolutionary, its nature presents us with the problem of civil disobedience. Do we obey God or man? In Romans 13, Paul is seeking to modify that revolutionary tendency, seeking to avoid human reactions which are motivated by selfish ambition and are always counter-productive.

Francis Schaeffer predicted that there would be conflict between the constraints of the kingdom of God and world systems in his small but important book titled "A Christian Manifesto." None, in my opinion, could have written such a straight and needed insight into how ruling forces function in our own society. Schaeffer said the day was fast approaching when the principalities ruling our nation will have departed so far from God that Christians would be forced to choose God and His kingdom over the laws of the land. This was written twenty years ago.

There will come a time in Western society when we may have to resist and refuse our own government. As long as it is in any way doing what it is supposed to do, we are commanded to obey it and respond properly because it is the ruling fo

... and as much is ordained by God. The opposite, we must remember is anarchy, which is most troubling with every man doing what is right in his own eyes.

My wife and I recently watched for the third or fourth time Schaeffer's video series from the 1970s entitled, "How Shall We Then Live?" We can see the issues of the systems of our society more clearly today than when Francis Schaeffer first gave us these insights. Our nation was originally founded on biblical standards of love and liberty. My prayer is that God would give us a gully washing reformation, not just a revival, which would turn this and other nations toward Himself.

Years ago God brought reformation to Great Britain through John Wesley. This reformation dealt with slavery, changed the child labor laws, closed the bar rooms, addressed the issues of financial injustice, and shook up the entire country - a revival that brought real and lasting change rather than just emotional response. Reformation does not mean legalism or more rules, but a revelation of His government and Lordship. It means that we are learning to bring our organizations as well as ourselves under the Lordship of Jesus Christ. Reformation, properly understood, means the breaking of the arches and ruling forces, wherever they may be.

(Bob Mumford - from "Dr. Frankenstein and World Systems" - copyright 2003 - pg 58-59)

**Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2016/10/4 10:22**

The opposite of obeying government is not anarchy. The opposite of all rule is anarchy. Submission to the law of Christ and throwing off the rule of human civil law is not anarchy.

True anarchy is a shadow and really does not exist. Even rebels who "free" themselves from another's rule admit of their own kind of rule, chaotic and insane as that rule may sometimes be. It is the tyrant, though, who calls it anarchy when his rule is thrown off, as if he alone is legitimate in his sphere.

If anarchy were that which the tyrant calls it, the tyrant IS the anarchist. It is the one who asserts himself as ruler -- even through "democratic" means -- who has cast off God in Christ as King and Sovereign and has substituted his own counsel in the rule of men. That would be the anarchist, no matter how reasonable.

We have to be careful right now in our choices of words, brothers and sisters. They matter. Thinking of anarchy as the rejection of civil authority is a tool of anti-Christ. Warning or cautioning believers against anarchy is a fool's errand. It requires us to swallow that the existing order is God's order. It isn't. He does, indeed, ordain it to show forth His power -- and He will show His power when the fall of it is great at His hand. We submit unto those who operate this order of things in hope that they will repent and be saved.

As heartfelt as language like Mumford's is in Docs' quote, it still nails our shoes to the floor of this order of things and tells us that if we run out of our shoes we may be anarchists. It is not true.

**Re: David , on: 2016/10/4 10:26**

When Paul wrote Romans 13 one of the most wicked men in the Roman Empire was the Caesar. This was Nero. And certainly Paul argued that we as believers should submit to the governing authorities when the laws were meant to provide for an orderly society. Temporal government is a blessing and a grace of God that prevents us from falling into the law of the jungle. Paul brings this out quite vividly in Romans 13.

But when the Roman emperors who came after Caesar started saying they were divine. And requiring the Christians to offer sacrifices to them. This was where the Believers had to draw the line and say we must obey God rather than men.

This has always been the tension that believers have lived in. Believers who are committed to Christ realize that His spiritual kingdom is not of this temporal realm. They live with the rule of King Jesus in their hearts. But Believers also recognize that they are citizens of various geopolitical entities. Thus the tension is obeying God in the midst of temporal government. And even at best governments are corrupt. Because we are governed by men who basically or evil in their hearts.

From the times of the first century church under the Roman emperors up through the Reformation that tension for the believer has always been when to obey God and when to obey the government. And at what point when the laws of man conflict with the laws of God. Does one obey God over man?

The early Anabaptists face this question when church and state were fused into one. And the baptism of infants was req

ured. Many Anabaptists lost their lives for the truth to believe that believers only were to be baptized and not infants. We may look back in history and say this is pretty minor issue for us today. But it had great relevance for those that were living under the hybrid of church and state. Eventually the anabaptist Believers in Christ felt that this was a stand for truth. And for this stand for truth they paid a heavy price.

The issue today that may bring persecution upon believers in America will be a stand for traditional marriage. This has already been evidenced by the Kentucky county clerk, who as a Christian, felt she could not in good conscience issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples. As such he paid the price by going to jail. She was willing to suffer for her convictions.

I think this is the same situation with Roy Moore being removed from his position as the Chief Justice of the Alabama Supreme Court. Because he chose to act in accordance with his conscience as being informed by the laws of God. He would not issue injunctions which would allow where same sex marriage in Alabama. Given the politically correct climate of the day. He was removed.

There are those Christians who will blindly say that because this is a law of the land it must be observed. And they will appeal to Romans 13.

Then let me ask the question do those Christians and perhaps those in the forum who would reason thus. Vladimir Putin has recently signed legislation in Russia that says Christians cannot share their faith in the public Arena. This is the law of Russia. Yet Believers are under a mandate to go and share the gospel to all creation. Are believers in Russia expected to obey the law of Russia. That law which would prohibit them from sharing Christ outside of their church.

Let me pose another question. My understanding is that there is legislation that has been passed in Canada which make it illegal to speak out against homosexuality and the LBGT. Evangelical pastors are expected to preach the whole counsel of God. So what do you do when you come to Romans 1 period skipped over those verses which talk about the origins of homosexuality because of all the land says you cannot speak out against this. Or to go on and preach the whole counsel of God and realize one made pay the cost of preaching the word of God. If one speaks out against homosexuality in Canada they can suffer up to two years or longer in prison and fines.

There will come a time when each believe we will have to determine when they will obey God rather than men. To blindly say that we must follow Romans 13 when the laws of man conflict with the laws of God it's simply not going to cut it.

Ken Miller took a stand for righteousness. Some wangelicals said he got what he deserved. Because he violated federal law. Just because the law is at the federal level does this mean this was right in the eyes of God.

Our Supreme Court recently mandated that it is all right or two of the same sex to marry. This is the law of the land. If an Evangelical pastor, in good conscience, says that he could not marry a couple who came to him for a marriage ceremony. And this pastor is thrown into Federal Prison. Are we going to glibly say well this pastor got what he deserved. Because he violated federal law.

It was grievous to hear Christians say that the Kentucky Clerk got what she deserved because she would not hand out a marriage license to same-sex couples. And I'm talking about Evangelical Christians.

It makes me wonder what so-called evangelical Christians will say when it comes time to take the mark. This will be the law of the land. Yet to take such a mark will bring eternal condemnation to our soul. Yet I can hear the so-called evangelical Christians saying to those who are being herded to the death camps and guillotines. Well they got what they deserve. After all they violated the law of the land. But is a law of the land always right in the eyes of God???

Simply my thoughts this Tuesday morning.

-bbs-

**The context of the words - posted by docs (), on: 2016/10/4 10:41**

Brother Mumford didn't write,

"The opposite, we must remember is anarchy, which is most troubling with every man doing what is right in his own eyes ."

Rather he wrote,

"There will come a time in Western society when we may have to resist and refuse our own government. As long as it is in any way doing what it is supposed to do, we are commanded to obey it and respond properly because it is the ruling force and as much is ordained by God. The opposite, we must remember is anarchy, which is most troubling with every man doing what is right in his own eyes."

Context.

If government is doing what it is supposed to and is not operating outside of God's laws then we are commanded to obey it. If it is doing right and we still choose to disobey it then that is anarchy. I think that is what Brother Mumford was saying. Yet he also stated he can readily see a day coming when Christians will be compelled to no longer obey. That will not be anarchy but rather loyalty and allegiance to God and His laws. The full context of his statements are to be remembered.

**Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2016/10/4 10:46**

Churches will be centers where people line up for that mark, I believe. Pastors will smile as people volunteer for that ministry. It will be a church growth tool. IMO. And I think I am right. :)

I see the Moore matter differently than you do, bro Frank, but your larger point is spot on. Moore is, truly, beside the point. I am not a Roy Moore supporter, and he was MY chief justice as a member of the Alabama State Bar. But, I will say this for him, that his judicial analysis on issues presented to the Alabama Supreme Court were some of the best IMO that we have had and he is unafraid to call out government overreach in even the most controversial areas, i.e., criminal procedure. His absence from those issues in particular is a loss for everyone in Alabama, even those who cannot stand him.

**Re: , on: 2016/10/4 12:00**

Acts 5:27-29

27 When they had brought them, they stood them before the Council. The high priest questioned them, 28 saying, "We gave you strict orders not to continue teaching in this name, and **yet, you have filled Jerusalem with your teaching and intend to bring this man's blood upon us.**" 29 **But Peter and the apostles answered, "We must obey God rather than men.**

---

**Truly we will be coming into a time when we will have to decide whether we obey God rather than man.**

**Simply my thoughts.**

**-bbs-**

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2016/10/4 12:13**

Hi dolfan,

Quote:

-----  
Churches will be centers where people line up for that mark, I believe. Pastors will smile as people volunteer for that ministry. It will be a church growth tool. IMO. And I think I am right. :)  
-----

I think that you're right. In fact, we already see "Christians" and "churches" in the West running to line up to support all sorts of sin (e.g., abortion, homosexuality, sexual promiscuity, homosexual marriage, etc.). After all, entire denominations are being redefined by those who hate biblical principles. I spoke with a guy a few weeks ago who said that he was thinking about leaving his church. When I asked why, he said that the church leadership was going to vote on being more "trans-friendly" and open their facilities' restrooms to anyone who wanted to use them.

In the greater context of this topic: President Obama once famously quipped that "elections have consequences." He won 52.9% of the vote in 2008 and 51.1% of the vote in 2012. Now, I am not trying to delve into politics, but I just want to point out that there were consequences to his election. Things like health care mandates are a consequence, but so are other residual things -- like gay marriage, transgender bathroom policies, etc.

Personally, I don't think that he would have won the election if he had been straightforward and stated that he would push for things like taxpayer-funded abortion, the "Arab Spring" and a Palestinian state with Jerusalem as its capital, gay marriage (with lawsuits against those who oppose it) -- let alone that he would try to use executive power to remove some federal funding to schools in states that didn't allow "transgender students" to use the restrooms and locker rooms of their choice.

The biggest consequences, of course, are in the judicial realm. The greatest real "power" that a president has is in the nomination of judges from lower benches all the way to the Supreme Court. Strict constructionists who analyze and rule by the actual law and its wording are pushed to the side and "living document" activists arrive to interpret and reinterpret the law almost always in accordance to their own political, social views and economic views.

\*EDIT - Well, I should rephrase that. The biggest consequences are always the spiritual ones. As the leaders of a nation choose to embrace sin, the view of sin funnels down to children. Their moral compass -- which would point to heavenly truths -- becomes difficult to interpret. Some will eventually call good things evil and evil things good simply because they are being "trained up" in a mindset and direction in which they should not go.

**Re: The context of the words - posted by dolfan (), on: 2016/10/4 16:07**

Docs, I won't drive too hard on the point. I saw the context and accounted for it. The notion that governments do what is "right" is where I would take off from him, and I know what he means. I also know he means to classify as anarchy that which is unjustifiable disobedience vs justifiable disobedience to civil government. But, unjustifiable disobedience is not anarchy. Anarchy is the absence of authority outside oneself. Unjustifiable disobedience is rank criminality, not anarchy. Anyone who believes disobedience IS anarchy may act accordingly and swiftly learn there is an authority above himself. Whether justifiable or not, the "archy" with superior force, strong shackles and cemented rooms will not care to distinguish but will demonstrate its power and rule and dispel any such fantasies.