

Scriptures and Doctrine :: This is War!??

This is War!?? - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2005/10/3 16:29

If there is already a thread on this please direct me.

Can a Christian go to war? I have heard some say "True Christians don't go to war." Is that a true biblical statement?

They use these verses:

Mat 5:44 But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;

Mat 26:52 Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.

Re: This is War!??, on: 2005/10/3 16:38

I thought it was the issue of "unjust" war.

And as I understood it a "just" war was a war of national survival....where the survival of the nation is in peril.

Re: This is War!?? - posted by Warrior4Jah (), on: 2005/10/3 17:03

Check 2 Kings 6:8-23, especially verses 21-23!

The king held a big meal (instead slaying them) for his enemies and since then they didn't come back to Israel again!

Well furthermore WW2 springs to mind.. I'm glad that was ended although it had to be through war.

I don't think war is justified if there is another way to resolve a conflict.

Well you don't want to be the first to start a war for sure. :-)

For the rest this is a tricky question...

I don't want to be a soldier in some army if that means that I would have to kill someone.

Thought about that lately.. what if you kill someone and that person goes to hell.. :-?

(Not that killing christians would be good either..)

Hmm I don't know.. what if nobody wants to pick up arms while your nation is attacked?

Re: War: What's it Good for - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/10/3 17:11

Check out this audio sermon by a Brethren in Christ pastor in Toronto (Bruxy Cavey):

WAR, WHAT'S IT GOOD FOR?

EDIT: I Can't get the link to work from this post, so go to (http://www.themeetinghouse.ca/sermons_search.php) Sermons Then a third of the way down you will find the title: War, what's it good for?

Diane

Re: Sermons about violence committed by the church - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/10/3 17:32

There is an excellent series of sermons also by Bruxy Cavey called When Darkness Falls.

You will find these messages very stirring. They cover the darker aspects of church history, like the crusades, the witchhunts, the inquisition, when the church used violence - believing it was justified by God.

Sorry, I can't get this link to work in this post.

You will have to find it yourself by going to (http://www.themeetinghouse.ca/sermons_search.php) Sermons and then find, "When Darkness Falls"
It's worth it!

Diane

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2005/10/3 18:20

The people that are saying this are ex-mininities (spelling). I run into them when we go out street preaching.

They would say that the early Christians would just lay down and not fight because their kingdom is not of this world...

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/10/3 19:02

Quote:

-----They would say that the early Christians would just lay down and not fight because their kingdom is not of this world...

Assuming of course that there were no early Christians who were also Romans serving in the military... ;-)

Re: This is War!?? - posted by Smokey (), on: 2005/10/3 20:31

I don't see anywhere that Cornelius the Centurion in Acts chapter 10 renounced the army and deserted..

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/10/3 20:55

I don't see it either.

From reading the New Testament, it seems that viewing Christianity and Soldering as incompatible vocations is a false dichotomy.

One of the stranger aspects of the early church was an apolitical inclusiveness of believers who participated in industries such as secular government, war, and slavery, that seem totally odds with the Jesus' kingdom teachings.

I think it makes an interesting discussion for us Christians who are wanting to return to the "ancient path."

MC

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/4 4:37

Quote:

-----They would say that the early Christians would just lay down and not fight because their kingdom is not of this world...

This is where we have to carefully divide the word of truth. There surely can never be any justification for Christians to take up arms to defend their Christianity. The separation of church and state needs to be carefully maintained here. Some religions have spread by the sword eg Islam but true Christianity could never so spread. Christ sent out his disciples as sheep among wolves, and still does. "Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight..." (John 18:36a, KJVS)

The area of examination is rather 'should a Christian take up arms to defend his wife and family' or 'himself, if the attack i

s against him as a citizen and not a Christian or, by extension, should he take up arms to defend the country in which he lives. Did you notice how carefully I expressed that last sentence? :-) As regards the 'world' Christians are usually agreed that we are to be 'in it' but not 'of it'; what about the country in which we live?

We are now into the territory of 'patriotism' in the proper sense of the word. from L.L. patriota "fellow-countryman" (6c.), from Gk. patriotes "fellow countryman," from patrios "of one's fathers," patris "fatherland," from pater (gen. patros) Patriotism has to do with physical origins. Technically an immigrant can never become a 'patriot', in the way that technically a man can never be 'hysterical'. :-) The way we now use the word has to do with a sense of loyalty and belonging and, when under pressure, it is a test of where our ultimate loyalties lie. A famous British spy once said that if he were put to the test as to whether to betray his country or his friend, he hoped he would have the courage to betray his country. I know that that will be a controversial statement, but it has a link with another recent thread and this verse of scripture; "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." (1John 3:16, KJVS), The word 'ought' here has to do with what a man 'owes' and his 'duty'. Consequently it would not be wrong to paraphrase this sentence as 'we owe it and it is our duty to lay down our lives for the brethren'. That means my ultimate loyalty is to my family in Christ rather than to my natural family or to my 'patria'. "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." (Luke 14:26, KJVS) This is disturbing stuff I know, but we cannot ignore these statements and we must not dilute them to make them acceptable.

Agape, of course, is much more than 'duty'. Christ laid down his life for those who were his enemies. Christians have always disagreed on the topics of pacifism, the remarriage of divorcees, and what to do with repentant apostates. One of the 'patron saints' of this site, Leonard Ravenhill was a pacifist; some of his closest associates in his earlier days supported Christians going to war in 'non-combatative' roles, and some went to war as full soldiers.

What are we to do with these variations of conviction? "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." (Rom. 14:5, KJVS)

"And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. 14:23, KJVS) Personally I cannot premeditate these things. I cannot answer the familiar question which begins 'but what if your wife...' God gives 'grace in due time' and I must trust him to make the way plain in 'due time'. In the interim, I want to give the widest liberty of conscience to every Christian. I will try to give an account of why I believe what I believe, but not to persuade another to change his mind. For myself, to use the language of that British spy, I would hope that I would have the courage to be a pacifist in 'due time' but to boast of such, ahead of the test, would be folly.

Quote:

-----One of the stranger aspects of the early church was an apolitical inclusiveness of believers who participated in industries such as secular government, war, and slavery, that seem totally odds with the Jesus' kingdom teachings.

I think it makes an interesting discussion for us Christians who are wanting to return to the "ancient path."

-----Some of these come from the concept of "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called." (1Cor. 7:20, KJVS) To slaves Paul specifically instructed that if possible they should accept freedom. Soldiering is a kind of slavery in that a man is totally under the command of another; the fact that it is voluntary does not alter its nature. We are slaves to Christ, by choice, but slaves nevertheless. The 'chain of command' in military terms is absolute and initial training is designed to instill this into the new soldier. He must not think, he must obey. This is the essence of slavery.

It is true that Cornelius' 'calling' is never questioned, nor is that of Onesimus. The question that a man must answer is 'what would you choose'? Should a Christian choose slavery? Should a Christian choose soldiering?

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2005/10/4 8:51

This is a good thread. I thank everyone for their input. I guess what's confusing to me is that I would never go to the military or war, but I don't see a problem with others doing it..

I guess I'm just searching to check my motives for that last statement. Why would I not go? Why does it not bother me that others go?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/4 8:56

I can't help but think about how in the time of our Lord it seemed that some of the Roman cohorts served in both military and police type roles. A study of the Roman armies as they developed is quite extensive, but I think in the time of Christ the soldiers in those areas served a double function. Which leads me to ponder the passage:

Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. (Romans 13)

It seems from this passage that in the New Testament period God still expects order in the Earth as this is His ordinance and He has allocated authority to rulers to maintain that order. I key in on the portion... *For he is the minister of God to thee for good.* This has to denote some sort of protection of the public from *him that doeth evil*. Minister of God that beareth not the sword in vain? Here minister is diakonos and the next time it is used after this passage is:

Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers: (Romans 15:8)

These ministers who wield the sword are called "God's ministers to thee for good." I think this is a place where I would really have to use judgment and discernment. Is the role I am in in step with God's ordinance? Certainly the Nazi's would have had to say no to this (they are easy to point out). What about all police operations or military operations? If the particular one in question is walking worthy of their vocation and in harmony with God's ordinance- the question for me would be easier to answer. Although for me I have also had a hard time placing myself in either a police or military role hypothetically, as it seems to contradict all my conscience to kill people. However, if I were a police officer I am certain that God would equip me with the right understanding for that vocation. The officer probably could not imagine himself preaching? No?

It has always been my hope that I would never have to be in such a position. But if that time should come I have to believe God would give grace and lead in such a way as would harmonize with conscience.

Re:, on: 2005/10/4 9:02

Zechariah

Chapter 4

6 Then he answered and spake unto me, saying, This is the word of the LORD unto Zerubbabel, saying, Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the LORD of hosts.

This is good enough for me.

Bub

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/10/4 9:53

I was converted on my way to do military duty, and have put my service to my country on the altar more than once to see if God would lead me away from it. So far it is 'no' every time.

One thing you may notice about the New Testament, the most oft mentioned secular job, correct me if I am wrong, is the soldier (centurion, captain, officer, soldier, guard, etc). God clearly uses pagan and ungodly nations to bring justice today, just as he did in the Old Testament. So supporting your country's military doesn't mean you support all your that your country stands for, anymore than protesting your country's military makes you righteous. It is not ungodly to desire the destruction of a wicked nation.

Yes, many of our own countries have their corruption, but we are also free to preach the gospel. It is not coincidence that countries where the gospel is not outlawed have prospered. There is much more to it than that, I know, and the judge of all the earth will do right. He will give justice to nations and individuals right down to you and I.

Nahum 1:2-3

God is jealous, and the LORD revengeth; the LORD revengeth, and is furious; the LORD will take vengeance on his adversaries, and he reserveth wrath for his enemies.

The LORD is slow to anger, and great in power, and will not at all acquit the wicked: the LORD hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet.

On killing. Remember God wrote on the tablets with His own finger in Exodus 13:20, "Thou shalt not kill." But God also told the same nation in Deuteronomy 20:16, "But of the cities of these people, which the LORD thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth."

Is this a contradiction? Certainly not. God's rule of living is to not kill. However, there is as Ecclesiastes 3:3 says, "A time to kill." So does this mean that everyone God uses to bring justice is holy? No. Does this mean that everyone who is used to bring justice is evil? No. It is clear to me that a Christian can be a soldier, and can even kill given a particular situation. However, thirsting for death is evil. Remember David.

Would you kill a drug-induced rapist, who was beyond feeling pain while he was breaking into your home if you had a gun? People say, 'I would just shoot to wound him.' I won't gamble the safety of my family if I had one shot. My daughter and wife's lives are too precious. If I had the opportunity to tie him up and witness to him, of course that is the route of choice. But let's be real. What is the state of mind of someone like that? What is the state of mind of many nations today?

Applying that to the battlefield, I hope I never have to even shoot at anyone. However, I will obey the orders given to me, up to the point that I feel that my orders violate the commandments of God, via His Word or His Spirit. Someone says, "thou shalt not kill." Well keep reading through the Old Testament if you are going to stand on Old Testament.

Num 32:6b "Shall your brethren go to war, and shall ye sit here?"

Num 32:23 of going armed before the LORD to war "But if ye will not do so, behold, ye have sinned against the LORD: and be sure your sin will find you out."

In addition to Romans 13...

1 Peter 2:13-17

Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; Or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well.

For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: As free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king.

Re: - posted by Christisking (), on: 2005/10/4 11:09

Quote:

“Christians have always disagreed on the topics of pacifism, the remarriage of divorcees, and what to do with repentant apostates.”

I believe you are mistaken on this point Ron. Although it is true that Christians have disagreed throughout the ages on pacifism and what to do with repentant apostates, it is very recent that the remarriage of divorcees has ever been called into question. It is only in the past 50 years that the remarriage of divorcees has ever been on the table as a debatable topic. (since the rise of feminism and the sexual revolution) Throughout the first 1950 years of church history every denomination in every country, during every historical age has agreed 100% on the issue of the remarriage of divorcees. This is one issue denominations have been universally united.

I know it seems that way Ron, but it is just not true. 75 years from now, if the church continues down its current path of compromise and weakness, someone will write on this forum. “Christians have always disagreed on the topics of pacifism, the marriage of homosexuals, and what to do with repentant apostates.” although in 75 years it very well may seem this way, it just simply won't be true.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/4 11:25

Quote:
----- It is only in the past 50 years that the remarriage of divorcees has ever been on the table as a debatable topic. (since the rise of feminism and the sexual revolution) Throughout the first 1950 years of church history every denomination in every country, during every historical age has agreed 100% on the issue of the remarriage of divorcees. This is one issue denominations have been universally united.

If you had our history you would have a different perspective on this. The Church of England came into existence in the 16th century as a result of disagreement on the question of divorce and remarriage.

Going back further the distinction between divorce and annulment was really part of the same dilemma.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/4 13:19

Quote:
-----If you had our history you would have a different perspective on this. The Church of England came into existence in the 16th century

There is a really good documentary on all this that went on that is hosted by Ken Conolley (sp?). It is on the history of the English Bible from Moses until the landing of the Mayflower- as a video series of 4 tapes called "The Indestructible Book." It is a real good synthesis of a lot of history and it is quite interesting to watch even for those who don't like history.

Re: - posted by Christisking (), on: 2005/10/4 15:34

Here are some New Testament Scriptures to consider in regards to Christians and the military and/or war. We must remember that Jesus' teachings changed a lot of what was taught under the Old Covenant. We are now under the New Covenant and many rules have changed. Hence we are not sacrificing live animals in church on Sunday. As New Covenant Christians we are to no longer perform ceremonial hand washings or shaving our heads in purification rituals under Old Testament law - also, many would argue that we are also not to be going to war according to the teachings of Jesus and the New Covenant. Before you pull out Old Testament Scripture to try to justify war, remember you could also pull out Old Testament Scriptures to justify polygamy. Polygamy is clearly forbidden in the New Testament and under the New Covenant - is not the same with war???

~~~~~  
John 18:36

36 Jesus answered, "My kingdom is not of this world. If My kingdom were of this world, My servants would fight, so that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now My kingdom is not from here."

If you can not justify fighting in defense of Jesus Christ, how could you justify fighting in the defense of country, self, wife, child???

Luke 14:25-27

26 "If anyone comes to me and does not hate his father and mother, his wife and children, his brothers and sisters—yes, even his own life—he cannot be my disciple.

Luke 14:33

In the same way, any of you who does not give up everything he has cannot be my disciple.

~~~~~  
Matthew 5:38-42

Go the Second Mile

38 "You have heard that it was said, 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.' 39 But I tell you not to resist an evil person. But whoever slaps you on your right cheek, turn the other to him also. 40 If anyone wants to sue you and take away your tunic, let him have your cloak also. 41 And whoever compels you to go one mile, go with him two. 42 Give to him who asks you, and from him who wants to borrow from you do not turn away.

Love Your Enemies

43 "You have heard that it was said, 'You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' 44 But I say to you, love your enemies, bless those who curse you, do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who spitefully use you and persecute you, 45 that you may be sons of your Father in heaven; for He makes His sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust. 46 For if you love those who love you, what reward have you? Do not even the tax collectors do the same? 47 And if you greet your brethren only, what do you do more than others? Do not even the tax collectors do so? 48 Therefore you shall be perfect, just as your Father in heaven is perfect.

How is it possible to not resist an evil person and still be in a military that claims to resist evil people or nations? How is it possible to work in a military position and not in some way be supporting (as your full time occupation) the killing of the nations enemies? Can you support an organization in a full time capacity that drops bombs on and puts bullets in the heads of their enemies and at the same time claim to love, bless and do good to your enemies? In the case of the American military, unless they start loving the enemies of America, blessing those who curse them (the American armed forces) and doing good for those who hate them, they are in direct disobedience to the teaching of Jesus. How could you work for such an organization and still claim to be a Christian? A strip club would be no more disobedient to the teachings of Jesus than the USMC is - what would you think of someone who worked for a strip club and claimed to be a Christian? Would the argument that "I'm not a dancer, I just collect the money at the door, order the liquor and make sure the bar is stocked." be an acceptable excuse?

~~~~~

### 2 Cor 10:3-5

3 For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh. 4 For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, 5 casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ,"

If the army you served or the war you were fighting was using earthly weapons and warring in the flesh, you would again be in violation to Scripture. Remember we are talking New Testament not Old Testament.

~~~~~

As for Cornelius, the Bible doesn't say one way or another if he changed careers. The Scripture also teaches that many prostitutes believed in Jesus (Mat. 21:31-32) and is likewise silent as to whether they change careers or not. We rightfully and automatically assume that they left their profession since it was clearly denounced by and against the teachings of Jesus. Why do we not automatically assume the same of Cornelius since his profession was also clearly denounced by and against the teachings of Jesus?

~~~~~

I'll end with some more words for thought from one of my favorite anti-war, anti-military Christian pacifists -

"Would we send our daughters off to have sex if it would benefit our country? Yet, we send our sons off to kill when we think it would benefit our country!" Leonard Ravenhill

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/4 16:06**

Hi ChristIsKing,

Quote:  
-----If you can not justify fighting in defense of Jesus Christ, how could you justify fighting in the defense of country, self, wife, child???

But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel. (1 Timothy 5) It would seem in the case of wife and child at least (and other family members) that *security* must be somewhere on the list of 'provisions' that those of one's own house would in fact need.

Quote:

-----26"If anyone comes to me and does not hate his father and mother, his wife and children, his brothers and sisters—yes, even his own life—he cannot be my disciple.

Luke 14:33

In the same way, any of you who does not give up everything he has cannot be my disciple.

I want to look at perhaps what appears on the surface to be the most radical passage of scripture in all of the Bible- Luke 14:26;

If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. The Greek word here for 'hate' is *miseo* and it carries a meaning that spans from the deepest "detestation" to a simple "loved less."

Now, as a point of reference Jesus also told us to love our enemies (Matthew 5:43). John the Revelator told us that a person who hates his brother is in darkness (I John 2:9) a murderer (v.11a) and we know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him (II John 2:11b). It would make no sense for our Lord to tell us to 'detest' our family and love our enemies. This is proven in the fact that the Prodigal Son has not repented until he came to himself and reunited with his family. So we see right off, that repentance for some will mean reconciliation with father, mother, sister, brother, etc. While others whose family would force them to choose between Christ and the family- they would have to choose Christ. This was the case with many families in the first century as hostilities grew against Christians until they were even being cursed by fellow Jews in the synagogues (*birkat ha minim*). This is not a matter of leaving home because of a conflict in personality or even a basic disagreement in religion. Jews who turn to Christ to this day often do it knowing their family will render them dead and perform a funeral for them.

We see then that the context determines whether our Lord means to "detest" or to "love less." Let me give you two basic hermeneutical rules to always go by before we move on: 1) allow scripture to interpret scripture 2) a text without a context is a pretext.

Vines dictionary of New Testament Greek words gives us some insight into the full gamut of the meaning of 'hate'. He also speaks specifically to its meaning in Luke 14:26. He writes that *miseo* is used to indicate a relative preference for one thing over another, by way of expressing either aversion from, or disregard for, the claims of one person or thing relatively to those of another. In Matthew 6:24, and Luke 16:13 it demonstrates the impossibility of serving two masters. In Luke 14:26, as to the claims of parents relatively to those of Christ. In John 12:25 it speaks of disregard for one's life relatively to the claims of Christ. We can simplify this by comparing two passages:

He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. (Matthew 10:37)

If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. (Luke 14:26)

Notice Matthew 10:37 is saying essentially the same thing as Luke 14:26. In one passage we are told if we "love family more" we cannot be a disciple and in the other passage we are told if we don't "love family less" we cannot be a disciple. This essentially means that you love everything less than Christ. It does not mean you 'detest' your family. An example of this is seen by comparing two more passages:

Then answered Peter and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore? (Matthew 19:27) 'Forsaken' here is the Greek word *afieemi* and it essentially means "to let go." It is translated as 'forgive' in some passages to indicate that the transgression was allowed 'to drop.' If we interpret the passage as thus it is seen how the next passage can be equally true without contradiction:

Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? (I Corinthians 9:5) We see here that the same Peter (Cephas) had a wife that he 'lead about.' The Greek word for 'lead about' meant that he took her with him wherever he went. This is not forsaken in the sense of leaving behind, but is *afieemi* or 'letting go' in the sense that he did not consider her a possession to be grasped (Philippians 2:6). He lived his life as though he had no wife, etc. (I Corinthians 7:29). To have forsaken his family in the sense of abandonment would have meant he denied the faith and become worse than an infidel. (I Timothy 5:8) Moreover we are told to Honor

our father and mother which is the first commandment with promise, that it may be well with thee and thou may live long upon the earth (Ephesians 5:29). If any curse his father or mother let them die the death. (Matthew 15:4; Mark 7:10) Detesting the family also does not square with Paul telling the men to love their wives as Christ loved the Church. (Ephesians 5:25)

So what did our Lord mean in these passages on hating family? He meant that we must love them less than we love Him and if it comes down to following Him or them- we follow Him. This does not mean we seek an occasion to be rude to our parents or leave our wives, but are to win them over as they behold our chaste conduct coupled with reverence (I Peter 3:2). We are to serve and provide for them as much as is possible to fill their needs. Submission would be the most likely way to win those disobedient and unbelieving parents and family members who had rejected the word, or who attended to no other evidence of the truth of it than what they saw in the prudent, peaceable, and exemplary conversation of the child. Preach not so much with the precept of the mouth, but with the practice of reverential servanthood.

Use not your liberty in Christ as a cloak of maliciousness. As it is written; As free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king. Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. For this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God. For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps: Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously:. (I Peter 3:16-23) You, as a believer, have an obligation to your family to provide for their needs as much as is possible when they are unable and respect them all their days.

I'll leave off for comments...

**Re: Neither - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/10/4 16:13**

This speaks to a whole host of subjects;

Quote:  
-----Personally I cannot premeditate these things. I cannot answer the familiar question which begins 'but what if your wife...' God gives 'grace in due time' and I must trust him to make the way plain in 'due time'. In the interim, I want to give the widest liberty of conscience to every Christian. I will try to give an account of why I believe what I believe, but not to persuade another to change his mind. For myself, to use the language of that British spy, I would hope that I would have the courage to be a pacifist in 'due time' but to boast of such, ahead of the test, would be folly.  
-----

Patrick, think there is a lot here to consider, that which was written earlier. Personally am not fond of having to be forced into taking sides in these regards, Republican\Democrat, Pacifist, etc. Neither would be my response, not as a cop out but for the reasons already mentioned, it's just not that cut and dried. Example:

Quote:  
-----If you can not justify fighting in defense of Jesus Christ, how could you justify fighting in the defense of country, self, wife, child???  
-----

Compare that with:

In I Timothy 5:8 is one of the strongest statements in the Bible: "If any one does not provide for his relatives, and especially for his own family, he has disowned the faith and is worse than an unbeliever," (RSV). Or, as the King James has it, he is "worse than an infidel."

**Re: ... uh - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/10/4 16:15**

That was a bit uncanny Robert, didn't see your reply until just as I responded...

**Re:, on: 2005/10/4 16:16**

Super cool quote by Ravenhill there Patrick. Super cool.

IF we could say without even a shred of a shadow of a doubt, that we were going to war, to save another nation from persecuting Christians ... even then it would not seem Scriptural, from the 'N.T.' standpoint ... and can we say without even a shred of a shadow of a doubt, that we have a 100% "JUST" nation or 'Just' motive for being in any war right now ?

The O.T. wars were over Israel, by "God's" command and instruction and when He "hadn't" said to fight, Israel would get whalloped. Israel is the "only" nation that had/has God's name on it, Scripturally, and even there, some of the Rabbi's say, they will only have peace when Messiah comes.

Touchy subject, but like with that other thread, over "who has the bigger or better heart" ... Our main target is to **not go beyond what is written**.

The same ones who say we are wrong to quote Rev. 18 or 19 verses over the rejoicing of "GOD'S" judgment, feel it's O. K. to take judgment into 'our own hands' and blow people to hell in the military or wherever.

Now I'm really stumped :-? .

LOVE.

**Re:, on: 2005/10/4 16:20**

Ha, when I pushed reply, "nobody's" reply was there but Patrick's.

I must be the slowest typist here then.

**Re: - posted by Christisking (), on: 2005/10/4 17:20**

Both Robert and Mike are trying to read into the 1Tim 5:8 making it say something it does not and trying to expand it's meaning. We are told in to provide for our families, we are not told to fight for the security of our families. The first and second century Christians who were martyred by the household never took up arms to fight their persecutors. Did they pick up sword and fight the Roman soldiers taking their wives and children of for torture and slaughter in the arena? No? Why? Because it was against the teachings of Jesus. According to you misguided interpretation these early Christian martyrs and Christian martyrs throughout the centuries and even today in 10/40 window and many other parts of the world are worse then infidels for not providing for the security of their families. (this would include the Anabaptist and Mennonites - do you really think the Bible refers to these people as worse than infidels?) The truth, my friend, is that no sword or gun or bomb or army or government or nation can provide for the security of your family, this task, my brothers, is up to God. Their have been mouth of Lion that have been shut and guns that have refused to fire as families took a passive stance to their persecutors and families slaughter by the sword fighting and killing their enemies till last breath. ( and visa versa - it's up to God) We must be careful brothers (Mike and Robert) to not twist Scripture to make it mean some thing it does not mean and was never intended to mean.

Secondly, I agree 10000000% on what Robert has to say in regards to Luke 14:26. You miss took what I was trying to get across by a long shot Robert. I was trying to show the comparison of our love for Jesus and our love for our family and who and what comes first - which is exactly what the Scripture is trying to show us. Of course we aren't supposed to literally hate our families - that is just insanely ignorant and stupid.

I don't agree with the words of any man 100%, but on this issue I have to agree with Ravenhill and stand next to him agreeing that both of you are mistaken and it really is that cut and dry. Ravenhill thought it was that cut and dry and so do I. You are more then welcome to disagree us if you want, but if you study the Scripture with an open heart and mind I think you will come to agree that Ravenhill and myself are most likely correct on this matter. Yoder and Hauerwas also hav

e some good things to say on the subject.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/5 10:41**

Hi ChristIsKing,

This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away. Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, (II Timothy 3:3)

Notice how this "without natural affection" is sandwiched in here with a host of other vile attributes. The word for natural affection here is *astorgos* and it is has the root *storge* from which we get the concept of the stork bringing the newborn child. It is a natural love that a mother has for her offspring- an instinct that would cause a mother, whether human or beast to protect and nurture its young.

There must be a distinction made between being persecuted for "His names sake" and being attacked for some other type of reason. Personally I could not imagine a mother handing her baby over to madman in the name of Christ. I could not imagine a man standing by with hands folded while his wife or daughter is being raped or beaten. I could not imagine a man not guarding and protecting his family. I cannot imagine being derelict in the name of Christ. That fights against every principal of humanity. I would really like to save you honey- but I'm a Christian. I would really like to rescue you kids - but daddy is a Christian and Christians's are non-combative in all circumstances.

Again, the enemy has run the doctrine of turning the other cheek off the rails and into left field. Think through the ramifications of this and see if the results are not to become the very thing you despise.

I have yet to see anyone take on the "they are God's ministers" and they "bear not the sword in vain" issue?

**militant pacifism and pacifist pacifism - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/5 11:00**

Quote:  
-----We must be careful brothers (Mike and Robert) to not twist Scripture to make it mean some thing it does not mean and was never intended to mean.  
-----

I also disagree with Mike and Robert on this particular understanding, but to call it twisting the scripture is unwarranted. Biblical 'scripture twist'ers' always had an agenda and a motive. This is quite different to brethren having differing convictions.

Quote:  
-----I don't agree with the words of any man 100%, but on this issue I have to agree with Ravenhill and stand next to him agreeing that both of you are mistaken and it really is that cut and dry. Ravenhill thought it was that cut and dry and so do I. You are more than welcome to disagree with us if you want, but if you study the Scripture with an open heart and mind I think you will come to agree that Ravenhill and myself are most likely correct on this matter.  
-----

I am a pacifist but I think there are two different kinds of pacifist. There are militant pacifists and pacifist pacifist. I am a pacifist pacifist and I think Ravenhill was too. In his early years in the UK leading up to the outbreak of WW2 Ravenhill was a founding member of the Calvary Holiness Church, a second blessing holiness denomination. The leader and close personal friend was Maynard James. James believed that Christians should not take up combative roles in the coming conflict. Ravenhill was a full pacifist and, presumably, would not put himself under the authority of the British government. I am unsure about this because such out and out pacifists usually spent some time in prison and Ravenhill did not. There were other colleagues and associates who took up arms. This difference of opinion was never allowed to hinder their fellowship together.

I have met senior officers in the army who 'in spirit' are pacifist. They are employed in doing the dirty jobs that someone has to do. They never try to convince me of their position. I am aware that often it is their position which makes mine a

comfortable choice in this time. I will readily talk with them about why I hold my convictions but I will not bully them into believing what I believe; I am too great a believer in the autonomy of the conscience. I am convinced that this is a position that Ravenhill would have been happy with. To challenge the status quo is a necessary part of the preachers task, but finally the individual must be left the liberty of making their own choice.

I have met soldiers who would share George Fox's sentiments when in offer of a commission in Cromwell's army he replied "the Spirit of the Lamb has slain the spirit of war in me". I have also met militant pacifists who are at war with all who hold different opinions. I know which ones I think best express the Spirit of the Lamb.

**Re: militant pacifism and pacifist pacifism - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/10/5 11:44**

Quote:

-----How is it possible to not resist an evil person and still be in a military that claims to resist evil people or nations?  
-----

Patrick, your words are very compelling, and there seems to be no way around them.

Quote:

----- To challenge the status quo is a necessary part of the preachers task, but finally the individual must be left the liberty of making their own choice.  
-----

This is no different for any aspect of the Christian walk. People must make their own choices. The real choice is this: Whom will you choose to be your master. Often that choice involves two important trusts in our lives: our nation or God.

Ultimately we must choose which kingdom we will belong to. If we choose God's kingdom, then we can also be assured of his direction, his protection, his defence, his miraculous deliverances, his provision for our families, his angels etc. Even death cannot separate us from our King and the kingdom we belong to.

However, if we do not choose the narrow way, then we are left to our natural defences. There are no Biblical bylaws for those who do not choose Christ. If one does not choose Christ, then it is dangerous to be a pacifist. You can't count on God, because you don't believe you can.

Any nation must have armies to maintain itself – unless it chooses to be a theocracy – and fight the wars that are in the heavenly places. But, on this side of eternity, there is no theocracy. Even Israel never did succeed being one. They preferred a king, an army, etc. And, God did go along with that to some extent, but he also commanded that their kings be under his authority. The battles that they won were not in their own strength. Think of Gideon's 300!!! Imagine our nations trying that!!

To abstain from fighting in earthly wars, while at the same time refusing to fight the spiritual war that God called us into is merely handing the victory over to our true enemy.

I believe that we could make a far better impact on this earth by fighting the spiritual forces of evil with GOD'S WEAPONS.

Just maybe sending Bibles and missionaries (under God's authority) does more than sending soldiers and guns.

**Re: militant pacifism and pacifist pacifism - posted by Christisking (), on: 2005/10/5 11:58**

First of all, thank you philologos for pointing out my choice of words and how they could be mis-taken - I apologize if my wording "twisting" was taken to mean that I was accusing Mike or Robert of having an agenda or motive - I was just implying that they were turning the Words (twisting) to mean something they don't say and something they were never meant to mean. Again I apologize if my wording was taken for other than what I intended of if my choice of words was bad in implying something other than what I meant.

Quote:

"I will readily talk with them about why I hold my convictions but I will not bully them into believing what I believe...To challenge the status quo is a necessary part of the preachers task, but finally the individual must be left the liberty of making

g their own choice...I have also met militant pacifists who are at war with all who hold different opinions. I know which ones I think best express the Spirit of the Lamb.Â”

I agree completely. Many times have I been tempted and provoked into getting into some endless back and forth trying to prove each others position right or wrong. Although this goes on way too much on this forum, I am happy to say that never once have I argued in such a contentious manner and I never will. I have always stated my point of view with Scriptural backing in a questioning and thought provoking style. I will answer questions and discuss what I have stated, but never ever have or will try to prove my way of thinking right. Robert and anyone else is welcome to disagree if they like, my point of view is not always right (often wrong) and they certainly don't have to answer to me on Judgment Day. But as always, I encourage to search the Scripture with an open heart and mind applying proper hermeneutical principle and let the Holy Spirit teach and instruct while searching for Truth and the Heart of God. Amen philologos, I am also a pacifist pacifist.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/5 12:01**

I felt I might have been wrong with my historical data so I checked it out. This is an extract from the biography of Maynard James: man of fire.

...the threat of war in 1938 had prompted the leaders of the Calvary Holiness Church (Maynard James, Leonard Ravenhill, Jack Ford, Clifford Filer) to register the Movement as a religious denomination, and this was obtained at the Supreme Court of Judicature in January 1939. This not only gave the Calvary Holiness Church some status during difficult times, but also exempted its ministers from probable conscription, although at that stage no-one knew how things would develop.

Maynard was 37 years of age when war broke out, (Ravenhill was 32. RB) and many of the other pastors were younger. They had to face up to the implications of military service, for though they themselves could receive exemption, this certainly did not apply to the young men in their congregations. Leonard Ravenhill and Jack Ford took pacifist positions, although Jack believed it was right for Christians to take up non-combatant duties. Maynard's attitude on the other hand, was not so clear. His study of the Bible and history led him to believe that God sometimes used force to further his will, and he was a great admirer of such men as King David and Oliver Cromwell though he did not think it appropriate for a Christian minister to take up arms. When Jack Ford wrote an editorial putting forward the pacifist viewpoint, Maynard insisted on a footnote which stated that believers were free to make up their own minds on the issue, according to their conscience.

This would explain why Ravenhill was never imprisoned due to his exemption as a minister. It also shows how men with differing convictions in this matter continued to work together without trying to change each others' minds.

**Re: militant pacifism and pacifist pacifism - posted by GaryE (), on: 2005/10/5 12:10**

Dear Ron,

Apparently, George Fox believed that all Christians, and not just clergy, can speak in the Spirit and be used by God to do so. I totally agree with this.

I like that quote of George Fox, "the Spirit of the Lamb has slain the spirit of war in me". The trouble with George Fox to me is, in my opinion he was probably a militant pacifist making war with all the Puritans who held a different opinion than he did. From what I've read, he would go into a Puritan church and disrupt everything. It sounds to me like what Fox was doing would be like me walking into the services at the different churches that people go to that are on this forum and making a disturbance because their opinions are different than mine. I don't think the spirit of war was slain in George Fox at all if that was in fact the case and I don't think that this is the Spirit of the Lamb.

Your point was a very good point though.

In Christ,  
GaryE

**Re:, on: 2005/10/5 12:14**

About defending our own family.

If I were a man, and I came home to find someone raping my wife, I would use whatever means to incapacitate the guy.

I just have 3 problems with guns.

I don't condemn anyone who has them, for legal purposes, as long as the 2nd Amendment holds, but the problem is, once you have one, you begin to "Trust in it" ... and that can be very dangerous to place trust in anything, even just a little bit, but God.

The other problem is, once you have one, you are "tempted" to use it.

Now say you come home at nite, and someone is in your house.

There is a chance you may go for your gun, and if in prolonged darkness and suddenness of sounds etc. etc., you may shoot at that moving target (even trained police have made mistakes here) ... and kill some kid who just was stealing your TV and just sent him to an early trip to hell.

Maybe it wasn't God's will for him to go to hell just then.

Most people killed wind up there. :(

The other problem comes then, if you "trust" in it, then when the 2nd Amendment goes, WHICH IT WILL, then what ?

I've heard people on the radio saying, that "when they come for my guns, I'll kill them until they kill me" or "they'll have to take it out of my cold stiff hand". :-?

I think these people's families, would rather have them alive without the gun ... don't you ?

Hoy Vey.

I'm sure no one here feels that extreme, but my point is just that, it may be a good idea to start trusting God SOLELY now, then a weapon.

A 2X4 ain't a bad idea though ... Ha.

**Re: This is War!?? - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2005/10/5 12:14**

This is indeed a hard question. I've recently pondered the following thought. If I was to have to choose between the rod of a cruel dictator and resisting him in combat, which would I choose? Interestingly, I've asked several people (both Christian and Woldling) which they would choose, and few could stomach the dictator.

I'd usually ask if they were for or against war, to which they'd usually reply "Against" (Australians aren't quite as trigger happy as Americans tend to be). When I introduce the cruel dictator, they change their mind.

Myself, based upon my understanding of the Sermon on the Mount, I'd like to say "Bring on the dictator." (If I could shut my flesh up long enough:-)) Let's face it, Paul never ran for Emperor. None of the Apostles went to war.

It's a hard call, because there are so many conflicting emotions to blur our reason. On one hand, passivity could be considered to be negligence. On the other, to resist oppression could be equivalent to resisting God.

I think the only safe thing to do is ensure the avoidance of corruption and loftiness so that oppression can be considered wisely (See Ps 73:8). Sticky situation. I guess, I wouldn't want to be a participant in taking an innocent human life (and not all soldiers are guilty, or choose to be there)....but that's me.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/5 13:24**

Just to clarify I do not have a gun and do not serve in the military. It would be my intention to stop a person from hurting my family not simply gun them down as I had an occasion. I would try to incapacitate them for capture or merely render only the force necessary to protect.

As far as police and military goes, I would like to couple my post from Romans with this passage from Acts 23:

10 And when there arose a great dissension, the chief captain, fearing lest Paul should have been pulled in pieces of them, commanded the soldiers to go down, and to take him by force from among them, and to bring him into the castle.

11 And the night following the Lord stood by him, and said, Be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome.

12 And when it was day, certain of the Jews banded together, and bound themselves under a curse, saying that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul.

Paul knew that he was in great danger. He had been privy to these Jews who sought to kill him. It is interesting to note here that he made a practical decision to call the authorities.

17 Then Paul called one of the centurions unto him, and said, Bring this young man unto the chief captain: for he hath a certain thing to tell him.

18 So he took him, and brought him to the chief captain, and said, Paul the prisoner called me unto him, and prayed me to bring this young man unto thee, who hath something to say unto thee.

19 Then the chief captain took him by the hand, and went with him aside privately, and asked him, What is that thou hast to tell me?

20 And he said, The Jews have agreed to desire thee that thou wouldest bring down Paul to morrow into the council, as though they would enquire somewhat of him more perfectly.

21 But do not thou yield unto them: for there lie in wait for him of them more than forty men, which have bound themselves with an oath, that they will neither eat nor drink till they have killed him: and now are they ready, looking for a promise from thee.

22 So the chief captain then let the young man depart, and charged him, See thou tell no man that thou hast shewed these things to me.

23 And he called unto him two centurions, saying, Make ready two hundred soldiers to go to Caesarea, and horsemen threescore and ten, and spearmen two hundred, at the third hour of the night;

24 And provide them beasts, that they may set Paul on, and bring him safe unto Felix the governor.

Paul here appealed to the Roman army for protection. This is not in contradiction to the earlier revelation that he was going to be taken on to the higher Roman authorities. It seems to me to be a contradiction to utilize an army that you feel is valid or illegitimate? If they were in contradiction to his convictions, why had Paul called an evil operation to his side for protection? Does his calling of them to his side not in some way validate their vocation?

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do

hat which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil (Romans 13)

Now, is it not reasonable to assume that Paul knew that when the Roman army intervened in his case that there could be bloodshed? If these ruthless men who had bound themselves to such an oath, in an age when zealotry was commonplace, had broken forth upon him in their midst, that maybe there would be fighting and possibly loss of life? Why did not Paul here simply- "resist not evil." Why did he not here merely trust in the Lord to save him? Could it be because he recognised the army's vocation as valid and it was no sin or strain of conscience to make a practical decision to alert the authorities?

**Re: This is War!??, on: 2005/10/5 13:49**

Robert, that was a very 'sound' post and very well written and put.

I guess, some of us were just answering the initial question asked by PreachParly.

We need Police ... no question about it, and the majority of them, I respect more than I can say.

And if this were a Righteous Nation, I would re-enlist. (if I didn't have to shoot anyone and were young enough.) :-?

I really liked your post and see both sides.

My comments, I guess, were more toward the first post on here, that's all.

Thank you and God Bless.

Annie

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/5 14:01**

Quote:  
-----Paul here appealed to the Roman army for protection. This is not in contradiction to the earlier revelation that he was going to be taken on to the higher Roman authorities. It seems to me to be a contradiction to utilize an army that you feel invalid or illegitimate?  
-----

hi Robert

Has someone suggested that it would be invalid or illegitimate for a country to have an army or a police force? Paul sometimes acted for his own conscience sake and sometimes for the conscience of others. His vows and oaths come in this latter area but sometimes by making a point he was able to secure freedom for others. This was what he did in Jerusalem as recorded in Galatians 2:5. It was not for his own comfort that he resisted the Judaisers but 'that the truth of the gospel might continue with you'. I suspect his call on the civil authorities was in the same vein. It may even be that Paul had an eye to the danger of his persecutors accruing even more guilt.

I recognise the army's vocation as valid. It is part of God's providential care for a rebellious world and as such they serve as his ministers. The question rather seems to be one of whether the Christian ought to be part of this provision or whether his conscience would forbid him.

In the UK, certified ministers of religion are not allowed to do jury service. (I think this is still the case) This may be concession to their calling but it may also be that the civil arm knows that they 'cannot be trusted'; they will either be the 'hang 'em and flog 'em brigade' or the 'do-gooders' who will let them off with a stern word. I don't know whether the US has this system. I raise the point because, to my mind, there should be absolutely no difference between the freedom of conscience of a 'clergyman' or a member of his congregation.

I have frequently said here that we must not force each other into our own belief system, so I am not trying to do that. P

perhaps I am missing something but I just cannot imagine Jesus, Paul, Peter or John taking up a baseball bat to defend their family.

**Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2005/10/5 14:03**

These posts are very thought provoking....

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/5 14:38**

Hi Ron,

Quote:  
-----I recognise the army's vocation as valid. It is part of God's providential care for a rebellious world and as such they serve as his ministers. The question rather seems to be one of whether the Christian ought to be part of this provision or whether his conscience would forbid him.  
-----

I understand. I would ask whether God would call a Christian to such a vocation? However, I have to point out in my own mind that it is difficult for me to imagine on the one hand God establishing a whole facet of His providence to the exclusion of a righteous influence. If God ordained something and then excluded Christians it would seem that He has established an anti-Christian establishment (just thinking out loud here).

Quote:  
-----I have frequently said here that we must not force each other into our own belief system, so I am not trying to do that. Perhaps I am missing something but I just cannot imagine Jesus, Paul, Peter or John taking up a baseball bat to defend their family.  
-----

It is not hard for me to imagine Him in this regard as He was found with zeal for the House of God and took up a chord and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers.

And when he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep, and the oxen; and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables; (John 2:15)

It seems that under the right circumstances He had taken up a weapon to drive men back from their folly. There is no indication that He was beating them or injuring them- but was merely driving them out. Yet, I'm sure also He wielded not the sword in vain here either.

For the record I have never driven a robber from my home, but there have been times when I thought I may need to. The reason I have trouble imagining Jesus, Paul, or John defending their wife or children is that they had none. Peter led a bout a wife, but we don't know a whole lot about that. I suppose though in all honesty, it would be easier for me to imagine our Lord or Paul intervening than to allow them to be abused. Also, when I look at the Revelation of how Christ loved the Church, and how He recompenses His wrath and fury upon the enemies of His bride, I have to take that at least somewhat into account.

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re:, on: 2005/10/5 14:44**

Robert's post was very good.

And he had every right to post it.

(Excuse me, but I've had a very upsetting day, by things I've heard on the news).

But if my husband had a base ball bat in his hand and stood there and watched me being raped ... I think I'd question his love forever.

And I don't even kill bugs and neither does my husband.

Edit to blab on:

And why did He ask the disciples how many swords did they have, and when they said two, he said, that's enough ?

**Re: Enduring violence - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/10/5 14:58**

Quote:

-----These posts are very thought provoking....  
-----

I agree and have been reading this discussion with great interest.

Without any additional commentary from me on domestic law, homeland security or preventative wars, I did want to add a kind of before and after observation on enduring violence...

Sometimes, when I read between the lines, there seems to be an astounding change in the hearts and minds of Jews who became Christians in regards to Rome...this change can almost be pinpointed to that time when Jesus fulfilled His earthly ministry and Pentacost began.

Before...

"One of the party drew his sword and struck at the High Priests'servant, cutting off his ear...Matthew 14:47"

"Look Lord, ...we have two swords here." Luke 22:38

"Lord, shall we use our swords?" Luke 22:49

And a case of "after." I found this ancient glimpse of early Jewish Christians especially vivid...Josephus 70 A.D. describing early Christian families who were caught fleeing during the sacking of Jerusalem "War".

"Six hundred of them were caught on the spot; all who escaped into Egypt...were arrested and brought back. There was not a person there who was not amazed on the endurance and---call it what you will---desperation or strength of purpose displayed by these victims. For every torture and laceration of body, devised for the sole object of making them acknowledge Caesar as Lord, no one submitted nor was brought to the verge of utterance; but all kept their resolve, triumphant over constraint, meeting the tortures...with bodies that seemed insensible of pain and souls that well-nigh exulted in it. But most of all were the spectators struck by the children of tender age, not one of whom could be prevailed upon to call Caesar lord. So far did the strength of courage rise superior to the weakness of their frames."

When I read this, I am struck by the fact that this remarkable behavior is not culturally rooted, as evidenced by the disciples recorded willingness to use the sword, and also evidenced by the Roman's amazement at a conquered people they thought they knew everything about. Somehow everyone of these Christians, including the children, demonstrated a willingness to endure violence without saving themselves. (Except by fleeing...) I find episodes like this deeply challenging; ultimately impossible to premeditate myself in, or even worse, my family in such a situation.

MC

**Re:, on: 2005/10/5 15:12**

You know, this confusion just continues on, though I hold to being a pacifist and plan to stay that way .... I just did a search on all the Commentaries on e-sword over these verses in Luke and 10 or more Commentaries popped up and I'm still reading.

Luk 22:35 And he said unto them, When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye any thing? And they said, Nothing.

Luk 22:36 Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one.

Luk 22:37 For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, And he was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me have an end.

Luk 22:38 And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/5 15:44**

Quote:  
-----I find episodes like this deeply challenging; ultimately impossible to premeditate myself in, or even worse, my family in such a situation.  
-----

Mike,  
Me neither, but I find tremendous encouragement in that the people who endured these things were people like me, and what God can do for one He can do for another. It's the old puritan adage; he never gives dying grace until the dying hour.

Robert  
I appreciate your position and am content to leave it at that.

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/6 15:51**

Psalms 75:

4 "I said to the boastful, "Do not deal boastfully,"  
And to the wicked, "Do not lift up the horn."  
5 Do not lift up your horn on high;  
Do not speak with a stiff neck." " " "  
6 For exaltation comes neither from the east  
Nor from the west nor from the south.  
7 But God is the Judge:  
He puts down one,  
And exalts another.  
8 For in the hand of the LORD there is a cup,  
And the wine is red;  
It is fully mixed, and He pours it out;  
Surely its dregs shall all the wicked of the earth  
Drain and drink down.

Also Jeremiah 25:

Jer. 25:15 For thus says the LORD God of Israel to me: "Take this wine cup of fury from My hand, and cause all the nations, to whom I send you, to drink it. 16 And they will drink and stagger and go mad because of the sword that I will send among them."

Jer. 25:17 Then I took the cup from the LORD'S hand, and made all the nations drink, to whom the LORD had sent me : 18 Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, its kings and its princes, to make them a desolation, an astonishment, a hissing, and a curse, as it is this day; 19 Pharaoh king of Egypt, his servants, his princes, and all his people; 20 all the mixed multitude, all the kings of the land of Uz, all the kings of the land of the Philistines (namely, Ashkelon, Gaza, Ekron, and the remnant of Ashdod); 21 Edom, Moab, and the people of Ammon; 22 all the kings of Tyre, all the kings of Sidon, and the kings of the coastlands which are across the sea; 23 Dedan, Tema, Buz, and all who are in the farthest corners; 24 all the kings of Arabia and all the kings of the mixed multitude who dwell in the desert; 25 all the kings of Zimri, all the kings of Elam, and all the kings of the Medes; 26 all the kings of the north, far and near, one with another; and all the kingdoms of the world which are on the face of the earth. Also the king of Sheshach shall drink after them.

Jer. 25:27 "Therefore you shall say to them, "Thus says the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel: 'Drink, be drunk, and vomit! Fall and rise no more, because of the sword which I will send among you.' " 28 And it shall be, if they refuse to take the cup from your hand to drink, then you shall say to them, "Thus says the LORD of hosts: 'You shall certainly drink! 29 For behold, I begin to bring calamity on the city which is called by My name, and should you be utterly unpunished? You shall not be unpunished, for I will call for a sword on all the inhabitants of the earth," says the LORD of hosts.

This cup that the Lord gives to the nations of this world, does He also make those who abide in Christ drink from the same cup?

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/10/6 23:25**

Please notice the words of Christians in the New Testament to soldiers:

Luke 3:14 And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages.

Acts 10:31 And said, Cornelius, thy prayer is heard, and thine alms are had in remembrance in the sight of God.

Phil 4:22 All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Caesar's household.

In the first case, John Baptist didn't tell them to turn their back on the Roman government and lay down their arms, he just said not to abuse their authority. And Peter certainly could have told Cornelius to give up his job. How about the saints that worked for Caesar's capital guard? Paul seemed to be happy they were Christians, and yet not a word of telling them to give up their profession.

On carrying weapons:

Luke 22:36 Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one.

John 18:11 Then said Jesus unto Peter, Put up thy sword into the sheath: the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?

I don't think I need to add a word to the first quote. Those are the words of Christ. Secondly, Jesus could have told Peter to get rid of his sword. Then why did he tell him to put it back in its sheath?

As far as questions about people in the Bible picking up a bat and so forth, need I remind that Jesus is God. And that same God killed multitudes of His enemies with fire and brimstone. Fire came down from heaven and consumed people. He sent an angel that killed 185,100 in one night. He destroyed some of the Jews with flaming serpents who would not look to the brazen serpent. He turned tables over and drove men out of the temple. He dropped Ananias and Sapphira dead on the spot for lying. And He is also going to have most of the people He made cast into a lake of fire.

If someone chooses not to go to war because his or her conscience accuses them, God bless you. Do it for the glory of God. But taking the stance that Jesus is totally passive, and doesn't bring justice to evil-doers takes quite a bit of skipping

g over quite a few Scriptures. I understand we are under a New Testament of Christ's blood, but that doesn't change the fact that God is angry with the wicked every day.

Jesus took the punishment of death on the cross for sin, to show that evil is deserving of death. He took capital punishment on Himself for our sin. He showed that sin is worthy of justice, judgment, and punishment by allowing man to put Him on the cross. Jesus believes in justice.

I don't own a gun, personally, but as far as the 2nd Amendment goes, that amendment is to make sure we can defend ourselves in case the government goes bad, not so we can go to the gun range. The New World Order may not come about in our lifetime, but whenever it comes, they don't want the citizens carrying heat.

I spend about six days a week right now teaching and preaching the gospel and Bible, and the subject of military has only come up a couple of times. I do, not as often as I should, witness to strangers, pass out tracts and CD's, and hope to one day begin street preaching. But as far as this military debate goes, on what stand we should take with war and so forth, I am still also waiting with my brother for someone that takes an anti-war position to answer the question of the sword carriers being 'ministers of God' from Romans 13....

The three institutions that God designed for us to keep people in line are: the family, the church and the government. If the family isn't doing the job, then the church can get the wicked in line. When the church fails, that minister who carries the sword doesn't seem so ungodly all of a sudden.

I'll just say the obvious. Should we have let Hitler continue? Should America and England just have sat back and let him continue his bloody reign. Or do we have a moral obligation to stop a man like that?

"For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/7 10:42**

I had not thought to add anything more to this discussion. I think both views have been expressed pretty thoroughly and I doubt that much can be added either way. However, this passage has surfaced once or twice... Luke 22:36 Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one. What are we to make of this statement. Perhaps if we widen the context we may see more. "And he said unto them, When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye any thing? And they said, Nothing. Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one. For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, And he was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me have an end. And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough." (Luke 22:35-38, KJVS) Is this really an admonition to 'arm' for the future struggle? If so, what kind of an army is this whose total military might is 'two swords'?

In his commentary on the New Testament at this point John Wesley has It shall not be the time of cock crowing this day - The common time of cock crowing (which is usually about three in the morning) probably did not come till after the cock which Peter heard had crowed twice, if not oftener. 35 When I sent you - lacked ye any thing - Were ye not borne above all want and danger? 36 But now - You will be quite in another situation. You will want every thing. He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one - It is plain, this is not to be taken literally. It only means, This will be a time of extreme danger. 37 The things which are written concerning me have an end - Are now drawing to a period; are upon the point of being accomplished. Isa 53:12. 38 Here are two swords - Many of Galilee carried them when they travelled, to defend themselves against robbers and assassins, who much infested their roads. But did the apostles need to seek such defence? And he said; It is enough - I did not mean literally, that every one of you must have a sword. 39 Mt 26:30. 40 The place - The garden of Gethsemane.

Robertson's Word Pictures has Buy a sword. This is for defence clearly. The reference is to the special mission in Galilee (Lu 9:1-6, Mr 6:6-13, Mt 9:35-11:1, ). They are to expect persecution and bitter hostility (Joh 15:18-21). Jesus does not mean that his disciples are to repel force by force, but that they are to be ready to defend his cause against attack. Changed conditions bring changed needs. This language can be misunderstood as it was then.

38 Lord, behold, here are two swords. They took his words literally. And before this very night is over Peter will use one of these very swords to try to cut off the head of Malchus only to be sternly rebuked by Jesus (Mr 14:47, Mt 26:51f, Lu 22:50f, Joh 18:10f, ). Then Jesus will say: "For all that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Mt 26:52). Clearly Jesus did not mean his language even about the sword to be pressed too literally. So he said: "It is enough". It is with sad iron

ny and sorrow that Jesus thus dismisses the subject. They were in no humour now to understand the various sides of this complicated problem. Every preacher and teacher understands this mood, not of impatience, but of closing the subject for the present. These words moreover were spoken in the upper room immediately prior to the journey to Gethsemane. Where would they sell their garments and buy swords at that time of night. The Lord's rebuke of Peter for using a sword seems to settle the matter beyond doubt. It was a regular occurrence for words which he intended to be understood figuratively to be interpreted literally; the woman at the well, the Jews who objected to his statements that they must eat his flesh and drink his blood. It seems to me that this is just another of a long list of such misconceptions.

Personal pacifism, for me, is not a theological stance. I don't know how I would respond in the classical circumstances of 'what if your wife...'. I cannot premeditate armed violence but I honestly don't know how I would react at such a time. Sitting here in the comfort of my home I am a pacifist and I would hope that in very different circumstances I could remain true to my present convictions, but honestly... I just don't know.

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/7 10:45**

Brother wrote:

Quote:  
----- don't think I need to add a word to the first quote. Those are the words of Christ. Secondly, Jesus could have told Peter to get rid of his sword. Then why did he tell him to put it back in its sheath?  
-----

Jesus then said, "Matt. 26:52 But Jesus said to him, "Put your sword in its place, for all who take the sword will perish by the sword. 53 Or do you think that I cannot now pray to My Father, and He will provide Me with more than twelve legions of angels?"

The Holy Scriptures teach that those who use the sword will die by the sword.

Paul wrote:

Romans 13:

4 For he is God's minister to you for good. But if you do evil, be afraid; for he does not bear the sword in vain; for he is God's minister, an avenger to execute wrath on him who practices evil.

The kings of this earth are the tools by which God executes His judgement on those who practice evil. They are used as "an avenger to execute wrath on him who practices evil."

Yet these very same kings are not righteous. For further understanding please go to the thread, [https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id=7498&forum=36&10](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=7498&forum=36&10)

At the end of Romans 12 we hear this precept:

Rom. 12:17 Repay no one evil for evil. Have regard for good things in the sight of all men. 18 If it is possible, as much as depends on you, live peaceably with all men. 19 Beloved, do not avenge yourselves, but rather give place to wrath; for it is written, "Vengeance is Mine, I will repay," says the Lord. 20 Therefore

"If your enemy is hungry, feed him;  
If he is thirsty, give him a drink;  
For in so doing you will heap coals of fire on his head."  
21 Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.

In Romans 13 we also find this exhortation.

Rom. 13:11 And do this, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep; for now our salvation is nearer than when we first believed. 12 The night is far spent, the day is at hand. Therefore let us cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light. 13 Let us walk properly, as in the day, not in revelry and drunkenness, not in lewdness and lust, not in strife and envy. 14 But put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh, to fulfill its lusts.

sts.

Also James identifies why wars exist.

James 3:13 Who is wise and understanding among you? Let him show by good conduct that his works are done in the meekness of wisdom. 14 But if you have bitter envy and self-seeking in your hearts, do not boast and lie against the truth. 15 This wisdom does not descend from above, but is earthly, sensual, demonic. 16 For where envy and self-seeking exist, confusion and every evil thing are there. 17 But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, willing to yield, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy. 18 Now the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace by those who make peace. 1 Where do wars and fights come from among you? Do they not come from your desires for pleasure that war in your members? 2 You lust and do not have. You murder and covet and cannot obtain. You fight and war. Yet you do not have because you do not ask. 3 You ask and do not receive, because you ask amiss, that you may spend it on your pleasures. 4 Adulterers and adulteresses! Do you not know that friendship with the world is enmity with God? Whoever therefore wants to be a friend of the world makes himself an enemy of God.

Put on Christ and you will not entertain the temptations of the flesh. The question is what do we lust for?

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/7 10:58**

It is also well known in Church history that after Constantine the whole "the violent take it by force" mentality came on pretty strong. Hence the Jews view the cross as a sword dipped in 2000 years of Jewish blood. Horrible it is.

There was an episode at our house once that seemed to be possibly someone coming in or something late at night. This was about 10 years ago. I afterward asked my wife that in times like those, who are you looking to for protection? She says, I'm looking to you. I then replied, but who do you suppose that I am looking to? She answered, I suppose you are looking to God.

Make no mistake for me, when things get worrisome I am looking to God. I don't doubt that I may have to somehow be physical, but I am looking with trust in God. So really, I am probably no different than anyone else in that regard.

I have and will call the police. I used to have a neighbor that beat his wife all the time drunk. The police have come and had to kick the door in to save her. I never went next door and told him to stop. I let the police handle it.

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/7 12:06**

Psa. 149:1 Praise the LORD!  
Sing to the LORD a new song,  
And His praise in the assembly of saints.  
2 Let Israel rejoice in their Maker;  
Let the children of Zion be joyful in their King.  
3 Let them praise His name with the dance;  
Let them sing praises to Him with the timbrel and harp.  
4 For the LORD takes pleasure in His people;  
He will beautify the humble with salvation.  
5 Let the saints be joyful in glory;  
Let them sing aloud on their beds.  
6 Let the high praises of God be in their mouth,  
And a two-edged sword in their hand,  
7 To execute vengeance on the nations,  
And punishments on the peoples;  
8 To bind their kings with chains,  
And their nobles with fetters of iron;  
9 To execute on them the written judgment—  
This honor have all His saints.

Praise the LORD!

Do the hearts of the nations sing as the people of Israel? Yes the saints are used to destroy the wicked. But who goes before them?

In Christ

Jeff

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/7 12:09**

Maybe the question really is, What is the purpose of war? What can be learned from Scripture?

Jer. 2:19 Your own wickedness will correct you,  
And your backslidings will rebuke you.  
Know therefore and see that it is an evil and bitter thing  
That you have forsaken the LORD your God,  
And the fear of Me is not in you,Â”  
Says the Lord GOD of hosts.

In this particular instance, God is bringing a evil nation to destroy Israel because of their disobedience.

How many other Scriptures speak of this same precept?

In Christ

Jeff

**Re: This is War!?? - posted by beenblake (), on: 2005/10/7 14:27**

I have two brothers in the Navy, both of whom I love dearly. One I can say without a doubt the Lord lead Him there. I believe He did do so to teach him a lesson in servitude.

"Can a Christian go to war? I have heard some say 'True Christians don't go to war.' Is that a true biblical statement?"

Christians certainly can, but whether or not they should is another question. I can't answer that question for anyone, not even for myself. I know that if I didn't, my father would be greatly disappointed.

One of the things that does interest me about this topic, however, is the issue of submission and authority. The apostle Paul said on many occasions that we should submit unto others and unto our masters (which can include all sorts of leaders from bosses to government to our elders). In the ten commandments, it says we should honor our mother and father.

Love in itself is an act of submission. When we love someone, we give ourselves over to them. Our will toward them becomes one where we wish the absolute best for them, and we are willing to sacrifice our self in order to give them the best.

The submission we are called to is not one of force, but of willingness. Wives are not forced into submission under their husbands. Rather, they are asked to willingly submit unto their husbands as an act of love. Likewise, we all are supposed to willingly submit unto each other as an act of love.

The question is, what if our masters or our parents for example ask us to do something we think is wrong. If our parents ask us to steal, then what would we say? Should we honor them? What if a husband asks his wife to lie? Should she? What if your King commands that you lead the army head on, full knowing that it will lead to your death? Should you do it?

It seems to me that God values obedience and humility immensely, not only to Him, but to all those who have been given authority over us. When Jesus was on earth, He obeyed all the authorities over Him. He honored His parents. He paid taxes. He submitted unto Romans allowing them to torture Him.

Of course, He did not sin or obey any command to sin. And that is where the conflict arises. What do we do when we are commanded to sin when we have submitted ourselves willingly unto someone in love?

Additionally, what would we say in regard to the Protestant reformation? If Luther or Tyndale had submitted unto the Catholic Church, they would have never translated the bible into the language of the day. And what of Martin Luther King?

The question of military and war I think is one that definitely makes us realize our need for Jesus. The Church is filled with veterans.

In addition to all this, I think there is one other topic that needs to be thought about. What of those who are Christian and are at war? What of the soldiers on the field?

I have a Christian friend who disagrees with war. He has been to Washington several times to protest, and also is a part of a large movement for social reform.

One of the things that bothers me is my friends lack of respect and love for those who are in war. They are over there as servants for our benefit. And yet, he gives them no support and instead ridicules the actions of the soldiers.

This is truly a test in our own grace and mercy. For what should we do? Should we support those who are engaged in such evils as murder? Or should we rebuke them for sinning?

And what of the president? How should our response be to the leader of our military?

Questions to ponder....

Blake

**Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/10/8 0:35**

Brothers,

I suppose some of us just have different views on what to do when wars are going on. I appreciate some of you addressing the issues I posted.

I really love Wesley's stuff, but I just disagree with his comments concerning the sword. I don't want to force our country's will on anyone. That is a whole issue in itself, I know. I am not in support of our country taking land, or for forcing anyone to believe, but I think someone owning a gun is not un-Christian.

I will agree that man in general tends to be pretty blood-thirsty. I was not a Christian when I joined the military, and I have seen that there are many who love death that wear the uniform. However there are also those who live and breathe Jesus Christ, just as we do. I have witnessed to guys I was around in the military, and heard other guys witnessing. There were false brethren, strong Christians, and everything you see in the established church. One misconception is that you must love death to serve, and that if you are a Christian in the military, you are a weak one.

This is what I see of our Master's life. Sometimes he was passive. He stood speechless before Pilate, He didn't resist arrest, and He didn't fight the guards who He could have sent legions of angels against. Sometimes He was not passive. His chasing of the Pharisees, His upbraiding of the disciples for their unbelief and laziness, His evasion of mobs, His telling the 12 to take up two swords, to me give a picture of balance and a time for everything.

Ecclesiastes 3

To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven:

A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted;

A time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to break down, and a time to build up;

A time to weep, and a time to laugh; a time to mourn, and a time to dance;

A time to cast away stones, and a time to gather stones together; a time to embrace, and a time to refrain from embracing;

A time to get, and a time to lose; a time to keep, and a time to cast away;

A time to rend, and a time to sew; a time to keep silence, and a time to speak;

A time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace.

I suppose much of what we believe on war goes back to our doctrinal beliefs. I believe Old Testament to be a reflection of today, just as New Testament is a reflection of today. I think that we will realize how many of our current doctrines are wrong when we arrive in glory, just as the Jews were surprised at the words of Christ, and were not prepared for what God in the flesh said. They were not prepared for His mercy then. I think the opposite will be true of Christ's return. I think everyone, me included, is not fully prepared for what the wrath of the Lamb will be like.

This is just my thought, but I think that Christianity today, largely places Christ into a position of human love and miracles, when in fact Jesus' return is not one of mercy, it is one of justice. When we do street evangelism, and talk with other professing Christians, I am somewhat overwhelmed at how lovey-dovey everyone thinks Jesus is. I don't hear about how He is jealous, just, and angry with the wicked, but always forgiving. To me it is balance again. He is forgiving sometimes, but also angry with the wicked.

Passive Christians, please answer these two questions. I won't take your head off, but please be prepared to defend your position.

1) If your stand is that a Christian should not be in the military, or something similar, what about a Christian being a police officer?

2) Should America and England have remained passive as Christian nations while Hitler's siege continued?

EDIT: One more question. Would you go soul-winning with a Christian who was in the military? Yes or no.

**Re: - posted by Christisking (), on: 2005/10/10 15:09**

Concerning Luke 22:38 -

"Jesus used this episode with the swords to teach an object lesson. The worst crime in human history was about to take place. The innocent Son of God was about to be falsely arrested, tortured, and killed. If there was ever a time for Christians to use the sword and physical resistance, this was surely it!!! But Jesus wouldn't permit His disciples to use the sword to defend either Him or themselves. (all of whom - except John - were martyred with no physical resistance) When Jesus had told them not to resist evil, that's exactly what He meant! Even when the crime of all crimes was being committed.

Matthew's account adds one more detail about what Jesus told Peter, "But Jesus said to him, 'Put your sword in its place, for ALL who take the sword will perish by the sword. Or do you think that I cannot now pray to My Father, and He will provide Me with more than 12 legions of angels?' When God wants to protect us, His angels are sufficient." David Bercot - The Kingdom That Turned The World Upside Down

Tertullian - son of a centurion c.160–c.230 "in disarming Peter, disarmed every soldier for all times"

Quote:

"This is just my thought, but I think that Christianity today, largely places Christ into a position of human love and miracles, when in fact Jesus' return is not one of mercy, it is one of justice. When we do street evangelism, and talk with other professing Christians, I am somewhat overwhelmed at how lovey-dovey everyone thinks Jesus is. I don't hear about how He is jealous, just, and angry with the wicked, but always forgiving. To me it is balance again. He is forgiving sometimes, but also angry with the wicked."

I agree 100%

Quote:

"2) Should America and England have remained passive as Christian nations while Hitler's siege continued?"

Neither America or England are "Christian" as many would like you to believe. In fact, the very concept of a "Christian" nation is an oxymoron like a "fast slow car" or a "loud quiet noise" or a "cold hot pan" nations are earthly kingdoms of man and have nothing to do with Christianity or the Heavenly Kingdom. So I am not concerned with what America or England or any other country did in regards to Hitler, but as for Christians - Jesus told us to resist not evil. He did not put a definition as to what level of evil person or what circumstance of physical evil are permissible to resist. No. Jesus said resist not evil. (note on Mat 5:39: context is to physical resistance to physical evil perpetuated by and evil person - therefore this is not applicable to resisting the devil or spiritual evil, hence or battle is not an earthly battle, but a spiritual battle)

iritual war fought with spiritual weapons) If you feel that Hitler was an evil man and you are a Christian you are command ed by your Lord and Master to physically Â“resist notÂ”. For a Christian to physically resist would be in direct violation to the commands of Jesus. To say a Christian is supposed to physically resist such evil would, in my opinion, be tantamou nt to calling Jesus a liar. Jesus plainly said Â“resist not evil.Â” (again - context is to physical resistance to physical evil p erpetuated by and evil person )

**Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/10/11 0:13**

First of all I just want to say to you and to anyone reading this that I respect your opinion, I am just going through this to search out the matter for us and for others to His glory.

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

Prov 25:2 "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing: but the honour of kings is to search out a matter."

I must admit that there are certain Scriptures that I take literally that others don't. For example in Matt 5:37 Jesus says th at anything more than 'yes' and 'no' are of evil. I conduct myself and my speech so that I don't have to even promise peo ple things, but rather if I say I'll do something, that is sufficient. My words should not need an emphasis of 'I promise I'll d o it.' Some disagree, that's fine.

This is apparently your take concerning the sword, and anyone who is standing on the words of Christ is okay in my boo k. I will just agree to disagree. I think that other Scriptures lead me to the common sense decision that weapons are not outlawed to the Christian. But like I said earlier, there are some verses that I stand on literally that others would say com mon sense would clearly show a non-literal interpretation is more correct.

I just think that Jesus' intent was to have the sword present, and I think that the fact that Jesus rebuked Peter after cuttin g off the servant's ear, showed Peter's lack of knowledge about God's plan. The man needed his ear to have 'faith by he aring.' He needed his ear to hear the gospel. Peter and the others had not grasped this.

Jesus healed the ear, thus giving the ability for others to have 'faith by hearing.' Peter was called Satan (earlier on obvio usly) by Christ because he didn't want Jesus to go to the cross. The sword incident showed that Peter should not take u p his sword, but his cross, which he was avoiding. Peter wanted to fight for Christ, but wrongly. Peter wanted to fight for Christ's cause in the flesh. Peter was not willing to die for Christ. He only wanted to fight for Him. Peter wanted control a nd earthly rule.

So I don't think this was a New Testament outlaw of weapons for defence, I think it was showing that His Kingdom is not of flesh and blood. To show we should take up our cross. God first, not our cause (the sword) first, whatever it might be. Thus, 'Put up again thy sword into his place.' So the sword does have a place, but not in the throneroom of our mind and heart.

Please notice the wording of the KJV. It is not all that they take the sword shall perish 'by the sword' (NAS, NKJ, NLT), b ut 'all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.' I take this to mean that all they that take the cause of this wor ld, shall perish with their worldly cause. If the sword itself was evil, why didn't Jesus tell Peter to get rid of it right then? Fu rthermore why did He have them bring two to the garden? That's a mental picture. Jesus and the 12 walking there, two o f them with swords. It seems if Jesus wanted to outlaw the sword, He would have said so earlier.

I appreciate you handling the Hitler question, and again I respect your answer. I actually improperly loaded that question , as I, too, think there are not any Christian nations today on earth, and won't be until Jesus sits down on the throne.

You answered the other issues, now what about police officers? Off limits to Christians in your view or not?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/11 5:24**

hi letsgetbusy

Quote:

-----Please notice the wording of the KJV. It is not all that they take the sword shall perish 'by the sword' (NAS, NKJ, NLT), but 'all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.' I take this to mean that all they that take the cause of this world, shall perish with their worldly cause. If the sword itself was evil, why didn't Jesus tell Peter to get rid of it right then? Furthermore why did He have them bring two to the garden?

I've been away for the weekend so I haven't all the thread in sequence but I noticed this and thought I would add a comment.

In fact, in this instance, the other versions are correcting the KJV translation. The phrase 'with the sword' is often used in the scriptures, 8 times in the NT and almost 50 in the OT. The phrase never means 'with the sword' in the way that you are suggesting. To say 'with the sword' in the sense of 'together with, or at the same time as, the sword' the Greek would use the preposition 'meta' which means 'together with'.

In the Greek of the NT the preposition used in these phrases is 'en' which is a very interesting preposition. Thomas Newberry wrote, concerning the preposition 'en': 'en' - "in", of time and place; also "of" the instrument and manner, equipment or qualification. Greek prepositions were usually used in a very precise way in Biblical Greek and one of the reasons that 'en' is so interesting is that it is the preposition used in the contentious phrase 'baptised in/with/by the Spirit'. There is really no good reason for translating it 'with' but the translators of the KJV had a vested interest in translating like this because of the other phrase... 'baptised in/with/by water'. The Anglicans behind the KJV wanted to maintain the fiction that sprinkling a baby 'with' water was a baptism but the most natural rendering would be 'in water' not 'with water'. The point that Newberry is making is that the preposition is often used to show 'instrumentality'. This may seem very technical but it simply means that 'en' can be used to show the 'instrument' by which some action was achieved. The 'thing' then becomes the 'instrument'. I will resist the temptation to talk about 'baptism in/by the Spirit' in this context but will concentrate on the idea of the 'sword' being the 'instrument'. The logic goes like this, a man is killed by (en) the instrument of the sword; death is in the 'power' of the sword, death is 'in' or 'by' the sword.

The 56 uses of the phrase 'with the sword' in the scriptures already make it plain that the 'sword' is the instrument by which those who take up 'the sword' will die. The Greek use of the preposition 'en' makes it quite impossible that the way the Lord used it here was to suggest that they would perish 'at the same time as, or together with' the sword. This is a very plain statement that those who live 'by the sword' will die by the same instrument.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/11 5:27**

Quote:

-----One more question. Would you go soul-winning with a Christian who was in the military? Yes or no.

The easy one first. :-)

YES, YES, YES, YES, YES, YES, YES, YES, YES, YES, YES,

**Re: - posted by HakkaMin (), on: 2005/10/11 6:53**

Philologos,

Let's just say you currently head my list for cut-and-paste champion. Thank you for continuing to fill my research files - and my mind - with easily digestible insight into Biblical Greek. Please keep 'em coming!

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/11 9:47**

Almost 25 years ago I picked up a book called

([http://www.amazon.co.uk/exec/obidos/ASIN/0551009705/qid1129036464/sr1-1/refsr\\_1\\_0\\_1/026-8182286-9454055](http://www.amazon.co.uk/exec/obidos/ASIN/0551009705/qid1129036464/sr1-1/refsr_1_0_1/026-8182286-9454055)) Does the Bible teach pacifism? by R E D Clark. UK users can still get second hand copies through Amazon.co.uk although the US branch doesn't seem to have any. It is a very thorough, 130 page book, which has answers to just about all the objections that have been raised so far here on SI.

One chapter is particularly interesting in which he sets out the case for 'love your enemies' being 'national enemies' and not 'personal enemies'. I think he carries his case. He also has chapters which include 'bearing the sword' of law enforcement etc. It is a very good marshalling of Biblical evidence for his case and I may post some excerpts if this thread continues.

nues.

One chapter is headed "Christians and war - the story". Having shown that Christ's comments on 'loving your enemies' has to do with national enemies he continues.....if this is what Jesus actually taught, we might expect his early disciples also to have understood him in this sense. After all, it was easier for them to interpret his teaching than it is for us. What, then, did they understand him to say about participation in violence? Did they refuse military service?

It is a historical fact that for two centuries Roman soldiers who became Christians refused any longer to carry arms and, in many instances, were martyred for their refusal. The fact that some of the martyrs (eg Maximilian, martyred in 295 AD) were canonized by the church in later times shows that they were not isolated eccentrics. Speaking of the writings of the Christian fathers in this period, R.H.Bainton writes: 'All outstanding writers of the East and the West repudiated participants in warfare for Christians'. (Harvard Theological Review 1946,39,189. See also his book Christian Attitudes to War and Peace, 1961. Also C.J.Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, 1940 and Jean-M Hornus, It is not lawful for me to fight, 1981)

The early Christian attitude is the more striking in view of the fact that in those days there was but one civilized government in the world - the Roman, which had endured for a thousand years. Its soldiers were, in a sense, the policemen of the world. The only wars that Rome knew were frontier wars against savages (barbarians) and occasionally against rebels. In the first written criticism of the Christian faith of which we have knowledge, Celsus (about 170-180 AD) argues that the pacifism of the Christians will be the world's undoing in Christianity prospers, "if all men were to do the same as you" he writes "there would be nothing to prevent the king from being left in utter solitude and desertion and the forces of the empire would fall into the hands of the wildest and most lawless barbarians." From this passage it seems that Celsus, writing in Rome, had never heard of a Christian who was not a pacifist." He contends that from the 2nd century to the time of Constantine Christians were usually taught that, if they had been converted when in the army, they should remain at their work in peace time but that they should refuse to receive training in killing and should leave the army at once if called upon to fight. (These injunctions were laid down, for example, at the council of Arles in 314 AD). Bainton adds that "Ecclesiastical authors before Constantine condemned Christian participation in warfare but not necessarily military service in time of peace." Some of this makes more sense when we remember that the duties of a soldier in these early Christian centuries included much that is now undertaken by the police, post office, fire service and civil service. The army transported mails, looked after prisoners and, in Rome, organized the fire service. Clark also quotes the Tertullian reference made earlier "Christ, in disarming Peter, ungirt every soldier". and the quotation from the martyr Marcellus "I threw down my arms: for it was not seemly that a Christian man, who renders service to the Lord Jesus Christ, should render it also by inflicting earthly injuries". It was not until Augustine of Hippo that the theory of the 'just war' was developed by the Catholic church.

Interesting to hear some of these things?

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/11 12:28**

Rom. 8:28 And we know that all things work together for good to those who love God, to those who are called according to His purpose.

Maybe the question is, "what purpose does God have for me?"

All the things that Satan brings upon fallen men with the purpose to destroy and kill God works in those circumstances to glorify His name. Throughout the OT we are given examples of God's refining work in those who believed. God allows war to bring about His will.

Judg. 3:2 (this was only so that the generations of the children of Israel might be taught to know war, at least those who had not formerly known it),

What comes from the knowledge of war?

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/11 13:04**

Hi Ron,

I think it is helpful to maybe continue looking at this from a historical perspective. I personally would enjoy you sharing more of the book since I will likely be unable to find it in a reasonable amount of time.

I am also sharing some information on the first century

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id7575&forum42](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id7575&forum42)) Jewish Freedom Movement to shed some light onto the volatile nature of the political and religious scene that would ultimately lead to unimaginable bloodshed in Jerusalem in 70 and 135 CE- just decades after our Lord ministered. Our Lord's teachings were not in a vacuum (of course), but what was He addressing in His teachings? What were the mindsets He was challenging?

The Messianic concepts of the first century were in many cases quite out of step with what our Lord came 'to do'. I think it can be shown from a preponderance of the evidence that many of the Jews had their own self-willed interpretation of eschatological prophecies that viewed the Messiah as the liberator of oppression from Rome; But Christ came to set us loose from Sin. We find our Lord confronted with the fruits of these Messianic concepts over and over again. They had a bad chronology in their eschatology.

I'm just trying to zoom out a bit and look at the bigger picture. I think we can absorb it all together and get a panoramic view of what was happening and then see how we can apply it to our modern day circumstances.

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/11 14:07**

Hi Robert

perhaps before we continue with the history we ought to consider an earlier chapter in the book; it is called 'What does the New Testament say?'. He points out that references to "putting up the sword", or "blessed are the peacemakers", or "do not resist one who is evil..." have often been supposed to apply only to personal encounters and not war; either civil or national. Luther's position, apparently, was that this could only apply to personal enemies. The passage most in question is "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." (Matt. 5:43-48, KJVS) The point that Clark makes here is that all Christians accept the words as having personal application but could they have wider implications? He answers: Paraphrasing the argument in the language of today, we might say that since God has so made the world that the good gifts of sunshine and rain are bestowed upon all men, whether good or evil, we too must copy God by showing kindness to the evil as well as to the good. This would imply that Christians must be kind to tribal, national or political enemies as well as to private ones, for they receive sunshine and rain just as we do. In each point in the passage the Lord contrasts his own teaching with that of Moses. This does not mean that Christ repudiated the law, but had come to fulfil it. We don't have the time to take this tangent. In the first five instances, then, (killing, adultery, divorce, oaths, eye for eye retribution) all is plain: the Old Testament said one thing: Jesus by way of amplification contrasts this with his own teaching. He argues that the law, far from being set aside, but now be fully applied (to the spirit of the offense. my addition) as God intended from the first.

But in the 6th and last contrast we meet a difficulty. According to Jesus the Old Testament teaching was 'You shall love your neighbour and hate your enemy'. Now the Old Testament certainly says 'love your neighbour' but the exact words 'hate your enemy' are nowhere to be found. Nevertheless Jesus clearly implies that the people of his day had been taught to hate their enemy and the context as clearly implies that Moses was responsible for this teaching. Many Christian writers have concluded that the Rabbis must have twisted the Old Testament to make it say just this. This allegation, says Clark, can be found in many Christian commentaries, however... This is simply not true. Moses did not teach the Israelites to hate their private enemies. Nor did the Rabbis. This implication has offended many Jews in past years who believe that Rabbinic teaching is being twisted by Matthew to suit his purposes. In defence, they quote a Rabbinic saying that 'the greatest hero is he who turns an enemy into a friend: and this can only be done by deeds of

loving kindness'. He quotes from the Jewish Encyclopaedia article on 'enemy' is saying the Talmud and the Midrash prove that Jews were bound to love their enemies and so forgive private wrongs. If a man found an enemy and a friend both needing help, he was to help his enemy first. "Rejoice not when thine enemy falleth and let not thine heart be glad when he stumbleth".

There is no doubt at all that the Jews are right. Every Christian who has read the Old Testament knows full well that it contains not the slightest suggestion that a private enemy may be hated. On the contrary it is taught emphatically that he must be loved. In the light of these passages and of the teaching of the Rabbis, it is hardly surprising that the common explanation of our Lord's words proves offensive to Jews. If we accept it, all force in the contrast between the old-time teaching and the 'But I say unto' of Jesus is lost, for the usual explanation makes our Lord say precisely what the Old Testament and the Rabbis said.

What then does the passage mean? There is no difficulty about the answer. How would a man have been understood who spoke of the 'enemy' in occupied Europe during WW2? Of course Jesus meant the national enemy. In his own day that enemy was Rome which occupied his country. But the argument he uses shows clearly that he had in mind not Rome only but all tribal, political and national enemies down all history. God is kind, even to our political opponents and the foreign invader: you must be kind too. He goes on to say that although the words 'hate our enemy' do not occur in that form in the OT, the idea is certainly there. Nations which had been cruel to Israel were to be hated. Of Ammon and Moab it is said: 'You shall not seek their peace or their prosperity all your days forever' Deut 23:6. 'Remember what Amalek did to you on the way as you came out of Egypt... therefore when the Lord your God has given you rest from all your enemies round about... you shall blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; you shall not forget.. Deut 25:17 The imprecatory psalms have the same sentiment, and modern national Israel has sometimes expressed the same. No Jew could have misunderstood what Jesus said. They thought it right to hate the Romans: to hate any national enemy. They had every cause to hate. Thousands of Jews had been cruelly done to death by the Romans. As a boy Jesus could hardly have scrambled around the countryside without coming across the graves of some of the several thousand Jews who had been killed near Nazareth shortly before his parents settled there. The Old Testament said 'hate' but Jesus said 'Love your enemy'. Could he have expressed himself more clearly? That is a long enough excerpt but the implications are interesting too. Nations at war usually denigrate each other with taunts of sub-human and the drill sergeant's task is often to whip up hate against the enemy so that his soldiers go into battle without troubled consciences. It would be an interesting 'pre-action' speech with began 'love your enemies and pray for them'! I am often challenged by the words of Paul to Timothy that our prayer for those in authority should be without 'wrath'. Could we have prayed for Idi Amin without wrath, or Stalin or Hitler or Saddam?

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/11 14:39**

Hi Ron,

Yes, the situation with Rome as the oppressor in Israel during the NT period is well documented. In fairness to them, I think that as long as the occupied were submissive the individuals did not forfeit all their rights, etc. The Jews that were part of those who wanted to take up arms against Rome were probigating the idea that paying tribute to Rome was paramount to acknowledging the emperor as deity. So there were issues that had to be diffused by the Lord, such as "shall we pay tribute to Ceasar?"

There is little doubt that some of the disciples had considered violence as a justifiable means to the Messiah coming to power. The teachings that we find in the Gospels systematically oppose many of these ideologies. I think it stems from a blatant misunderstanding of what it means to be a member of the Kingdom of God. Others have already said similar things on this thread.

Quote:  
-----Nations at war usually denigrate each other with taunts of sub-human and the drill sergeant's task is often to whip up hate against the enemy so that his soldiers go into battle without troubled consciences.  
-----

I recall hearing a general say in an old film that it is impossible to defeat your enemy in war until you hate them. It would seem that those who don't shoot out of hate- do so out of fear or mere self-preservation. I have often placed myself mentally in those places, but have no idea what I would really do. I know that I don't like to hunt because I don't like killing anything. But that is a contradiction because I eat hamburgers and someone had to do the killing.

Yet to revert back to Rome for a moment, what was driving the Roman soldier to wield his sword vainly? Sometimes he was protecting the people. Could it be that somehow that Roman soldier's heart for the innocent caused him to take up his sword against a hostile foe to protect the innocent as would a firefighter take up his axe? Just trying to come to terms with it all. Not trying to be argumentative in the least. I wonder if the Samaritan had been just as noble if he had broke up the scuffle between the robber and the man before he was left wounded?

Quote:  
-----I am often challenged by the words of Paul to Timothy that our prayer for those in authority should be without 'wrath'. Could we have prayed for Idi Amin without wrath, or Stalin or Hitler or Saddam?  
-----

This is a good question. It would be presumptuous for me to say I could; but I would like to hope that no matter who was in power our prayers would not be laced with bitterness.

God Bless,

-Robert

#### Re: My thoughts - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/10/12 7:30

It is easy to believe in using the sword when you are on top and there is some hope of defeating the "enemy" and preserving your life (nation) in the process. But what if you are on the bottom? What if you don't have any means of asserting power over the enemy? Or you can't count on the powers-that-be to defend you? Then what? Then our rationale for using the sword falls apart. We realize that the sword is only "trustworthy" if it is backed up by brute power and dominance.

We are told that God is our fortress, our deliverer, and our defence. Do we believe this?

God clearly promised to preserve Israel IF they would trust in him. Even when they were taken captive by Babylon, they were told to remain there and not try to fight or flight. Of course they followed the same logic as most people do today - and thought God's idea was ridiculous. So they fled to Egypt.

Then when Jesus came, the Jews expected him to conquer their enemies through brute power - the sword and dominance - and make them into a nation. Jesus did not. In fact he was stripped of all power to dominate - other than by dying. He was building a spiritual eternal kingdom - and if we are his followers, then THAT is the kingdom we should be fighting for (with his weapons which does not include a sword). In the Bible the sword is a symbol of power, control - symbolizing God's authority - through his word and the Spirit. I ask where in the Bible was anyone won to Christ at the point of a man-made sword? IT would seem that, people were won by the use of God-given weapons - faith, the Spirit, love etc.

Jesus did not come with a sword. He came as a human - stripped of his divine power. HE never used it to assert himself over another. He modelled the non-violent approach to enemies - and taught it, not in the rare, obscure reference - but very clearly.

We question God's ability to protect us because we don't trust him, and also because we prefer to take justice into our own hands. Jesus will return with a sword to bring final judgment. But we are CLEARLY told that vengeance is reserved for God.

Our desire for the sword could be an indication that the preservation of our earthly kingdom is more important to our sense of identity and security than God's eternal kingdom.

If God did not obligate himself to preserve Israel as a nation, why should he be under any obligation to preserve any nation today. Nations rise and fall, and they fall when they stray from God (right?) If God will bring a sword against our nations as a form of judgment, then no matter how hard we try to fight back, we won't win (in the long run). Only repentance will work (That is an unlikely sword in our fleshly minds)

Nevertheless, we cannot deny that God works within and through the evil on this earth - including war and strife.

Quote:

-----2) Should America and England have remained passive as Christian nations while Hitler's seige continued?

They DID remain passive when they could have prevented it. And then, they did not deal with the problem when they should have, and just let it get worse for a while before finally intervening.

Just yesterday I interviewed a British war veteran (to put a feature in the local paper) I asked him: "Do you think the war could have been prevented?" He said and emphatic, "Yes". He pointed out that in Britain Hitler was considered a hero for a while because he was anti-communist.

There is a lot to take into consideration when we try to decide whose fault it was: We must consider how the Germans were treated after WW1 -- with no mercy whatsoever. We must consider the ideologies in the German Culture prior to the war -- the patriarchal families where the children were required to hop to the commands of the father without asking any questions... Or the pagan influence, the pride, the rising nationalism. (Oh, the dangers when one's nation becomes one's god) -- or the failure of spiritual leaders to put God first and preach it at all costs.

We like to glorify those whom we designate as our war heroes. But we fail to realize who the real hero is -- God himself. We hear little about the miracles that God performed. (My grandfather, a believer and leader in the underground movement in Holland wrote of many miracles) We fail to hear about the intercessory work of Rees Howells. (How many of you know about him?)

Here is another thought:

Why was Hitler so evil? His beliefs about white supremacy?, his promotion of euthanasia for all the people? ...? ...mmmmmm that hits rather close to home, doesn't it?

In my opinion the war was a very sad commentary on the utter failure of man to live by God's principles -- to trust him and follow his leading. Really there are no heroes at all. We are not the victors. We cannot boast of the achievements of man. We can only acknowledge the reality of the depth of our sin nature.

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/12 10:52**

Sister Diane wrote;

Quote:

----- I ask where in the Bible was anyone won to Christ at the point of a man-made sword? IT would seem that, people were won by the use of God-given weapons -- faith, the Spirit, love etc.

My father spoke of the time when he was about to be captured by the Koreans in North Korea. He was a sargent in charge of a machine gun nest. He realized his utter helplessness and prayed for God to deliver him from this situation. He was taken prisoner and release at the end of the war.

I believe God uses war to cause men to bow down before Him in the hope that they would cry out to Him. I believe God uses war to destroy those whom He judges.

Quote:

-----Just yesterday I interviewed a British war veteran (to put a feature in the local paper) I asked him: "Do you think the war could have been prevented?" He said and emphatic, "Yes". He pointed out that in Britain Hitler was considered a hero for a while because he was anti-communist.

In another thread, "these days are evil," I cover this topic. Hitler was a hero for the American and English industrialists. Hitler was an ally to the American ownership class. You see, the rule of democracy, in the form of Communism threatened the right of ownership of the princes of America and England. Now again, we have entered into an era of facism. I saw a new term coined today. The papers are starting to talk of Islamo-facism. This now is a threat to the existing facist systems of this world. Facism most correctly resembles the types of governments that are spoken of in Daniel.

We choose to be blind to the evil that surrounds us. Why? Because we look to this world for our provisions. We use the sword to maintain economic control of this world's dark treasures. Thus most of the nations are made drunk by the wine of fornication with the great whore Babylon.

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/12 15:09**

Quote:

-----2) Should America and England have remained passive as Christian nations while Hitler's seige continued?  
-----

for myself this is a different question. The church was never intended to legislate for the world. The issue of nationalistic pacifism is somewhat different to the issue of personal pacifism. I would never seek to press pacifism on the nations. My questions relate more to what the Christian response should be.

**Re: Break from the war, an aside - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/10/12 15:52**

Quote:

-----We fail to hear about the intercessory work of Rees Howells. (How many of you know about him?)  
-----

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id2309&forum41#14618](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id2309&forum41#14618)) Rees Howells/Intercessor  
([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id2764&forum34#17622](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id2764&forum34#17622)) Rees Howells, excerpt: Ethiopia

**Re:, on: 2005/10/12 16:32**

quote from Rookie

"I believe God uses war to destroy those whom He judges."

God judges and destroys innocent women and children that are collateral damage from war? Your statement implies that God sends people to war, when clearly they choose it out of their hard heartedness and evil greed.

RE Hitler: I've heard this one way too many times. Hitler came to power because of the shape Germany was left in after world war I, which happened largely because European countries had standing armies with nothing to do. Thus the folly of the military is exposed. If you have one, you will use it for something bad eventually. The US had a large military with nothing to do, so we invaded Iraq. On and on it goes. We were attacked on 9/11 because of the bravado of the military espousing USA. We went around acting like the rulers of the world and, of course, someone took offense.

The military is a waste of national treasure and many, many lives.

Bubbaguy

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/12 18:18**

bubaguy wrote:

Quote:  
-----God judges and destroys innocent women and children that are collateral damage from war? Your statement implies that God sends people to war, when clearly they choose it out of their hard heartedness and evil greed.

-----  
They do choose to follow the ways of Satan. The masses are made drunk with the wine from the kings who fornicate with the great whore. When I say that God judges through the use of war and the avenger is the king this is because Scripture says it is so.

Jer. 7:18 The children gather wood, the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead dough, to make cakes for the queen of heaven; and they pour out drink offerings to other gods, that they may provoke Me to anger.

Ezek. 9:6 Utterly slay old and young men, maidens and little children and women; but do not come near anyone on whom is the mark; and begin at My sanctuary.Â” So they began with the elders who were before the temple.

The day of the Lord that is to come will be no different.

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/10/12 20:59**

Roadsign said:

Quote:  
----- Where in the Bible was anyone won to Christ at the point of a man-made sword? It would seem that, people were won by the use of God-given weapons Â– faith, the Spirit, love etc.

-----  
Response by Rookie:

Quote:  
-----My father spoke of the time when he was about to be captured by the Koreans in North Korea. He was a sergeant in charge of a machine gun nest. He realized his utter helplessness and prayed for God to deliver him from this situation. He was taken prisoner and released at the end of the war.

-----  
That reminds me of the line: "There are no atheists in fox holes" In other words when one is desperate, they suddenly believe there is a God and cry out to him.

War makes desperate people. While God uses war, like any other refining fires to draw people to himself, I don't see Christ calling us to be instruments of judgment. ... ie: We'll show them they are wrong! We'll make them pay for their evils, and they'll just have to admit they are sinners. And that's how we'll get them to convert.

How do you try to get someone saved when you are trying to kill them?

I suspect Rookie, that you are not using your example to justify the sword or any kind of brute force as an attempt to convert unbelievers  
Diane

**Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/10/13 10:42**

Brothers and sisters,

I respect your opinion if you take a position of pacifism, but I think you are going a bit far when you have begun to have a distaste for the military.

"he is the minister of God to thee for good"

His purposes are good.

"he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God"

So his bearing of the sword is good in God's sight.

"a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

Justice is of the LORD. So if he is God's minister upon evil, why would you say that his cause is evil?

"Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation."

The purpose of the sword is not to kill the unconverted (cutting of his ear, his ability to hear the gospel), it is to bring justice on evil. I would say that God has everything under control. So to say that justice is not being done is saying God has not used the minister of the sword.

This subject still has not been addressed. What about policemen? If the military is a waste, what about cops? Remember that they are just a local military. Can a Christian be a police officer or a member of a SWAT team?

"For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing."

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/13 10:55**

Romans 13 was written at a time when there was much unrest among the Jews. To exhort believers (Jewish or non-Jewish) to remain in subjection to the Roman authorities was completely contrary to the Zealot and Pharisaical cause. The Zealots were perhaps leaders of the first revolt (70 CE), but the Pharisees from Jamnia (Yavneh) were jockeying for power and ultimately anointed Bar Kochba as messiah in around 135 CE.

And this is an aspect of the issue we have yet to tackle. Why did the Jews not want to submit to Rome? Judas the Galilean said it would be paramount to breaking the first commandment because Caesar exalted himself as deity. The Christians would not fall in line with the zealot or even Akiba's cause because to do so would be to deny Christ and come under a false messiah. This divided the believing Jews from the non-believers as the non-believing Jews viewed those who would not take up the sword and fight as traitors.

So the issue is a little more involved than merely violence and war.

**Why war? - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/10/13 11:50**

Quote:

-----The purpose of the sword is not to kill the unconverted, it is to bring justice on evil.

-----

It just happens that the unconverted get killed and also the converted - when destructive weaponry is used. It gives no more opportunity to repent.

What is the purpose of justice? To prevent the evil from occurring again? To destroy evil? Does it work? Wasn't WW1 the war to end all wars? What about the Crusades?

It seems that far too much evil has been done in the name of God – when “Christians” have banded together to eradicate evil by the use of the sword. There is no limit to how much horror is done when man determines who are the evil ones. And it is always the OTHER guy who is the evil one.

We all have a natural God-given need to see justice. Justice is an attribute of God. Only when sinful man takes revenge into his own hands, it only creates trouble and builds walls. It harms everyone.

Note how this kind of thinking affects our every day lives - when we want justice for the wrong doer. Think of the “wars” between marital partners. Each wants to make the other “pay” for their wrongs and so they take justice into their own hands – even if it is as subtle as by withdrawing affection and eye contact.

If man could handle justice then why did Jesus warn against the administration of it?

You are assuming that evil is a person or persons or a nation. But Eph. 6:10 says otherwise. Evil is a principality in the heavenly realm, and we are REQUESTED to fight it – with our God-given weaponry (if we have it)

I find it interesting that Jesus never put anyone in prison, or brought accusations against people (like the Pharisees did) However, he set the captives free – free from sin. He forgave the evildoer who repented. He sought repentance in all his earthly relationships with man. Can't we do that???????????

It is tragic when the Christian community has nothing better to offer the evil in the world than a mere man-made sword.

I would rather be part of the underground – rescuing those who are endangered by the abuse of power from higher authorities (whether a sword or other) Is that not our calling?

And leave justice for God to handle like he said he would (several times in Scripture)

Our HIGHEST calling is to be followers of Christ, regardless of our temporal occupation – including being a police officer. It is not the occupation, but the way we conduct our daily decisions within that position. Carter Conlon was a policeman and he set an example of integrity and honesty among his peers. That made him stand out.

The conduct of many law enforcements is tragic – goes outside of good ethics. Whenever one has power, one can easily abuse it. So – it is the heart condition that counts more than the role.

Rather than say no one can be a police officer, we should say no one should live his life in his own strength and by his own reasoning. He needs the authority of God in his life, and God will direct his affairs.

The Jews mentioned above who revolted were really revolting against God. They were not called to apply the sword to evil Caesar, but to walk the second mile with the soldier, to heal the centurion's daughter, etc ... and be content in the FREEDOM that Christ came to give their souls.

Diane

**Re: Why war? - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/13 12:12**

Quote:  
-----Rather than say no one can be a police officer, we should say no one should live his life in his own strength and by his own reasoning. He needs the authority of God in his life, and God will direct his affairs.  
-----

I can certainly agree with this. I know personally a police officer who is a brother in the Lord who tells of how God has literally saved his life before. People have shot at him at almost point blank and their gun jammed, etc.

I recall as a child a police officer who was retired telling a story of being in a stadium where a ruckus was developing. He

walked over to the man causing the trouble and told him, "You are coming with me." He resisted greatly and rather than do violence to the man he said to him- "In the name of Jesus Christ you will come with me." The man surrendered to the officer and went with him.

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/13 12:13**

Sister wrote:

Quote:  
-----I suspect Rookie, that you are not using your example to justify the sword or any kind of brute force as an attempt to convert unbeli  
evers  
-----

According to Scripture, I could never justify the use of the sword. According to Scripture, there is no just war. Period.

James 1:17 Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and comes down from the Father of lights, with whom there is no variation or shadow of turning.

The source of war is of Satan. Those who accept the mark of the beast resemble their father, Lucifer.

My effort in this thread is to point to Scripture which teaches that war will always exist until all things are made new. For those who love God all the things that are meant for evil God turns around so that some might repent and receive Jesus as Lord and Savior.

In terms of my story about my father, he cried out that day. Yet his life is filled with the traditions of religion today. Satan goes to and fro throughout the whole earth seeking those whom he might devour. Whether it is war or false religion he has cast many into the pit.

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/13 12:20**

Brother Letsgetbusy wrote:

Quote:  
-----"he is the minister of God to thee for good"

His purposes are good.  
-----

What does Scripture say of the ministers that God selects?

We are given hundreds of example in Scripture. The evidence clearly depicts that while God does select the kings and princes, they themselves have the choice to obey or rebel against God. It is God's desire that the king obeys yet what does Scripture teach?

One must look at the whole council of God. What do you hear?

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: Why war? - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/13 12:24**

Sister wrote:

Quote:  
-----We all have a natural God-given need to see justice. Justice is an attribute of God. Only when sinful man takes revenge into his own hands, it only creates trouble and builds walls. It harms everyone.  
-----

David cried time after time in the Psalms about this aspect of life.

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2005/10/13 13:42**

It seems that we (or most) agree that war is bad and God doesn't enjoy his creation going around killing each other.

Have we come to a conclusion that it is right or wrong for a Christian to be involved in any of this?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/13 14:04**

Quote:  
-----This subject still has not been addressed. What about policemen? If the military is a waste, what about cops? Remember that they are just a local military. Can a Christian be a police officer or a member of a SWAT team?  
-----

I doubt that there are two of us on this thread with exactly the same views but there is considerable overlap. Sometimes I find myself supporting aspects of quite different positions.

I don't think the police are 'just a local military'. I don't know about your system but over here the policing is by public consent and is for the preservation of peace and order, not conquest. Most of our police are unarmed other than for a baton. It is interesting in the light of the quotes I gave from RED Clark that a distinction was made from earliest times between Christians in the 'military' and Christians 'in the military at war'. The Roman army did duties as postmen, firefighters, civil administrators and many other such 'peace-keeping' functions.

Quote:  
-----The purpose of the sword is not to kill the unconverted (cutting of his ear, his ability to hear the gospel), it is to bring justice on evil.  
-----  
This is an interesting line that you mentioned before but while it may serve as an illustration we cannot use it as a foundation for this discussion. Malchus, we may presume, had two ears and it is unlikely that Peter was attempting to take off his ear. I suspect that Malchus was quick on his feet and consequently did not lose his head to Peter's sword.

For myself, I do not regard the armed services as a 'waste'. They may well be part of God's general providential provision for a fallen world. My issues are with the prospect of a Christian taking up arms. I think the thing which concerns me most is the premeditation of violence at this level for the Christian.

BTW I have a son who is a major in the British Army! :-)

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/13 14:15**

Hi Ron,

Quote:

-----I think the thing which concerns me most is the premeditation of violence at this level for the Christian.  
-----

This would also be a deep concern of mine. In our part of the country (world) violence is spoken of very lightly and almost jokingly a lot; but when it comes down to it only a small percentage of people I know are in any way violent. You might hear people talk about "knocking a knot" on someone's head; but they would never do it. It is something I have had to really guard myself against and still need to work on this 'flip' attitude towards a very serious thing.

Quote:

-----BTW I have a son who is a major in the British Army!  
-----

Wow. There are so many twists and turns in these conversations. I never cease to be amazed!

God Bless!

-Robert

**Re: We are called to war - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/10/14 8:03**

Quote:

-----There are so many twists and turns in these conversations.  
-----

Here's another twist:

This morning as I've been meditating on 1 Cor. 15:20, some thoughts seem to be grabbing my attention. I ask you, do you think I'm tracking right?

20But Christ has indeed been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep. 21For since death came through a man, the resurrection of the dead comes also through a man. 22For as in Adam all die, so in Christ all will be made alive. 23But each in his own turn: Christ, the firstfruits; then, when he comes, those who belong to him. 24Then in the end will come, when he hands over the kingdom to God the Father AFTER he has destroyed all dominion, authority and power.

25For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. 26The last enemy to be destroyed is death. 27For he "has put everything under his feet.

You may wonder what these verses have to do with this thread about war. To me these verses speak of a massive military operation going on right now through the present reign of Christ. This thought is portrayed through such hymns as: "Onward Christian Soldiers marching as to war" and "Stand up Stand up for Jesus, ye soldiers of the cross." These hymns have largely been removed from church repertoire BECAUSE of their military flavor.

Actually this may be a good idea because of the danger of them inciting a fervor to fight the WRONG war. Throughout history there has been a tendency of man (in the name of God) to abandon their calling to be soldiers of the cross -- i.e. to seek to reconcile souls to God and into his eternal kingdom, and instead be eager to be soldiers fighting for an earthly kingdom, defending their own worldly securities and identity (nationalism).

The enemies that are being destroyed by Christ seem to be all dominion, authority and power. - the enemies in the spiritual realm - the enemies that control countless people (who, being flesh and blood, are not the real enemy).

I almost inserted this post in the 1000-year thread, because I see an incredible parallel to Rev. 20: 1-6.

I wonder, if we think that our rule with Christ is for a distant era, then we may miss our true calling NOW. And IÂ'm wondering if that doesn't then predispose us to fall for the many temptations to submit to spiritual passivity borrowed from other religions: New Age, Eastern etc. (I see that a lot in our modern churches) It is true that we must surrender our rule of our fleshly nature, it seems that this does not imply a spiritual passivity, ie just let things happen TO us Â– float with the go, and wait for that future era when we will be ruling with Christ.

Scripture reminds us that ALL who choose to follow Christ will find themselves facing a formidable enemy Â– the devil and all his cohorts, and any who would be his willing accomplices. And these enemies are everywhere Â– including our home and churches. That's why the mention of beheaded saints in Rev. 20 Â– those pleading for God to execute justice Â– something not YET happened.

But Scripture also reminds us that Satan is held back 2 Thes. 2:6. He is not the ultimate ruler right now. Christ is, through his death on the cross. That should be very encouraging.

It seems that we who have been given a NEW life in Christ, Â“have been given authority to judgeÂ” Rev. 20:4 , that is, in the heavenly realms, and we have NOW been given the SWORD OF THE SPIRIT which is the word of God- the two-edged sword that judges the thoughts and attitudes of the heart." Heb. 4:12, that divides Â– between right and wrong, that gives us the ability to DISCERN truth from deception , right from wrong, genuine from counterfeit "Â...so that you may be able to discern what is best." Phil. 1:9 "then you will be able to understand what is right and just and fair." Prov. 2:9

If we are fighting with God's weapons this should be the one of the outcomes:

"The wisdom that comes from heaven is  
first of all pure,  
then peace-loving,  
considerate,  
submissive  
and full of MERCY  
and good fruit,  
IMPARTIAL,  
and sincere." James 3:17

Diane

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/14 12:25**

Sister Diane wrote:

Quote:  
-----It seems that we who have been given a NEW life in Christ, Â“have been given authority to judgeÂ” Rev. 20:4 , that is, in the heavenly realms, and we have NOW been given the SWORD OF THE SPIRIT which is the word of God- the two-edged sword that judges the thoughts and attitudes of the heart." Heb. 4:12, that divides Â– between right and wrong, that gives us the ability to DISCERN truth from deception , right from wrong, genuine from counterfeit "Â...so that you may be able to discern what is best."  
-----

This is very true, likewise in Hebrew 5:

Heb. 5:12 For though by this time you ought to be teachers, you need someone to teach you again the first principles of the oracles of God; and you have come to need milk and not solid food. 13 For everyone who partakes only of milk is unskilled in the word of righteousness, for he is a babe. 14 But solid food belongs to those who are of full age, that is, those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.

What is it that prevents us from exercising this discernment? What clouds our view?

In Christ  
Jeff

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/14 13:45

Hi Jeff,

Quote:

-----What is it that prevents us from exercising this discernment? What clouds our view?  
-----

For though by this time you ought to be teachers, you need someone to teach you again the first principles of the oracles of God; and you have come to need milk and not solid food. For everyone who partakes only of milk is unskilled in the word of righteousness, for he is a babe. But solid food belongs to those who are of full age, that is, those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil. (Hebrews 5:12-14)

I don't know how this really relates to the whole War issue, but I believe the key to this passage is understanding the link between spiritual understanding and discernment and the right use of God's Word to discipline our senses.

If we think about our senses as being doors into our mind and heart- we will take greater care in disciplining them. How can we cast down imaginations when we allow our eyes and ears to partake of every evil thing? The sheer volume of vile material coming in is too much to withstand unless we take aggressive steps to keep ourselves from these things. Blessed is the man that condemneth not himself in those things which he alloweth. I know the context is a little different, but I believe the truth is consistent.

If we do not take control of our eyes and ears and other senses, we have not guarded our heart. If we do not guard our heart- the abundance of evil will show forth in our conversation (in this case our words). Our tongue allows us to sense the condition of our heart. When we open our mouths- everyone gets a clear picture of our heart. My 5 senses reveal what is 'outside'- my tongue reveals what's 'inside'.

I think our conscience is also one of our 'senses'. It would make 7 total in this model (sight, hearing, touch, taste, smell, 'tongue', and *conscience*).

When we give our senses away to vain things we soon start to lose spiritual insight. Notice what the writer to the Hebrews says... you have come to need milk. This was not the former case- but it is now your condition. You used to understand the 'meat'- but your eyes are darkened again and you need the 'milk'.

The connection to all these things as I see it is that it is not 'milk' or 'meat' until we become a doer of the work. My 'meat' is to do the will of Him that sent me. This is how we are nourished- not that we hear- but we hear and do. If we hear only and do not hear and do, then we become like one who has not eaten for a while. We simply cannot 'digest' strong foods. The whole process of eating lighter foods has to be restarted until the 'stomach' can handle the meat. I see it all as a big spiritual metaphor.

So to answer the question- the answer of what is clouding our discernment- it is simply our refusal to walk in the Truth that we know.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/14 17:18

Here's a little excerpt from the journal of George Fox. The government of the day tried to persuade him to take a lead in the civil war. I will quote it without comment. The time of my commitment to the house of correction being very nearly ended, and there being many new soldiers raised, the commissioners would have made me captain over them; and the soldiers cried out that they would have none but me. So the keeper of the house of correction was commanded to bring me before the commissioners and soldiers in the market-place, where they offered me that preferment, as they called it, asking me if I would not take up arms for the Commonwealth against Charles Stuart. I told them I knew whence all wars arose, even from the lusts, according to James's doctrine; and that I lived in the virtue of that life and power that took away the occasion of all wars.

Yet they courted me to accept of their offer, and thought I did but compliment them. But I told them I was come into the covenant of peace, which was before wars and strifes were.

They said they offered it in love and kindness to me because of my virtue; and such-like flattering words they used. But I

told them, if that was their love and kindness, I trampled it under my feet. Then their rage got up, and they said, "Take him away, jailer, and put him into the prison amongst the rogues and felons." So I was put into a lousy, stinking place, without any bed, amongst thirty felons, where I was kept almost half a year; yet at times they would let me walk to the garden, believing I would not go away.

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/15 12:27**

Hi Brother Robert

All that you wrote is good. Yes the world competes for our allegiance. The world seeks to have its way in all believers. The world seeks to cloud the issues of life we find ourselves immersed in day by day.

In your last sentence, "it is simply our refusal to walk in the Truth that we know" brings this thought to mind. I believe this whole discussion on war brings the question up over and over again, "what is the Truth that we know?"

I was raised to believe in the "American dream." My dad was a WW2 and Korean War Veteran. He has two purple hearts and a silver star. He was a Korean POW. He was also a drill sergeant. He also was a coal miner and steel worker. He worked hard to provide for his family. He is what the leaders of this nation call a patriot. All of these traditions were taught to his children. Before Christ, my father's traditions, made up the substance of what I hoped for. For 40 years of my life I strove to find satisfaction in the substance of my father's traditions. Since Christ, the contents of the substance of what I hope for has changed. One by one the vain traditions of my father have been removed and filled with a truth I had never seen before.

The word of God continues to separate from me those things that cloud my vision of His kingdom. There have been major battles for my life according to the jealous striving of the Holy Spirit with my carnal mind. My carnal mind has been polluted with the spiritual leadings of Satan. It is the Holy Spirit who strives against this carnal mind so that He might free me from the lies of Satan.

The essences of this battle in my life has been centered on the Holy Scriptures. Time after time the Word of God has shown me things, that I once believed to be the truth, was in fact a lie that had been planted by my former father Satan. My heart has many times sought to keep that which is not of God. Fear of losing fellowship with the world has always been present in these battles. The world will love its own. This love that I have been trained to seek before Christ is the very thing that clouds my pursuit of Him in all truth and Spirit.

Time and time again, the Holy Scriptures have shown me this in my walk. I have found that when I am feeding on the bread of life, the word of God, this precept continues to bring light into what was once total darkness. The light that Scripture brings into understanding God and His ways begins to sharpen my senses of what is of Satan. Yet it still remains that I must continue in the word of God seeking light so that I might overcome that which seeks to ensnare me.

How does this precept pertain to war? War is the outcome of Satan training his children to strive for that which will never satisfy. We have been taught to look only at Romans 13, yet how does this teaching of men work with for example; Ezekiel 17:

11. Moreover the word of the Lord came to me saying, 12. Say now to the rebellious house; "Do you not know what these things mean?" Tell them, "Indeed the king of Babylon went to Jerusalem and took its king and princes, and led them with him to Babylon. 13. And he took the king's offspring, made a covenant with him, and put him under oath. He also took away the mighty of the land, 14. that the kingdom might be brought low and not lift itself up, but that by keeping his covenant it might stand. 15. But he rebelled against him by sending his ambassadors to Egypt, that they might give him horses and many people. Will he prosper? Will he who does such things escape? Can he break the covenant and still be delivered? 16. As I live, says the Lord God, "surely in the place where the king dwells who made him king, whose oath he despised and whose covenant he broke-with him in the midst of Babylon he shall die. 17. Nor will Pharaoh with his mighty army and great company do anything in the war, when they heap up a siege mound and build a wall to cut off many persons. 18. Since he despised the oath by breaking the covenant, and in fact gave his hand and still did all these things, he shall not escape. 19. Therefore thus says the Lord God, As I live, surely My oath which he despised and My covenant which he broke, I will recompense on his own head. 20. I will spread My net over him, and he shall be taken in My snare. I will bring him to Babylon and try him there for the treason which he committed against Me. 21. ALL HIS FUGITIVES WITH ALL HIS TROOPS SHALL FALL BY THE SWORD, AND THOSE WHO REMAIN SHALL BE SCATTERED TO EVERY WIND; AND YOU SHALL KNOW THAT I, THE LORD, HAVE SPOKEN."

Now to understand this section of Scripture one must seek other Scripture which speaks of this time. How many are willing to seek?

So Brother Robert, yes one must be a doer of the word of God. But first one must sit by His side and listen to the words that He speaks to your heart. How many are willing to do battle against the substance that Satan has trained us to strive for?

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: Romans 13 - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/10/15 15:07**

Quote:  
-----We have been taught to look only at Romans 13  
-----

If the Jewish people had heeded these words of Paul in Romans 13, they could have spared themselves from the gruesome destruction of their culture, identity, temple, worship, and countless lives. They did not wait for God's judgment on the Roman Empire, but revolted against them.

I think Romans 13 is telling us NOT to rise up against powers who are oppressing us. It does NOT, on the other hand call us to take up the sword in DEFENCE of the ruling gov't. We are required to pay taxes, revenue, respect and honor (Rom. 3:7) (Do you see anything about serving our gov't with the sword in that?)

It is very costly to remain loyal to God's kingdom and refuse to take up the sword. Very few have the faith to do so, and very few are willing to be labeled a traitor.

It is also very costly to sell yourself to an earthly kingdom. The wars prove it.

Which kingdom would you rather die for?

Quote:  
----- the world competes for our allegiance  
-----

If it is not the world, it is the religious establishment.

When we put our denomination or any our religious institution ahead of God's kingdom, we run the same risk: fight for our right to exist as a visible earthly entity, kingdom. Then it is only a small step towards nationalism. We only repeat the Babel Tower story, including a lot of other Biblical narratives.

PS Thanks, Rookie for sharing your testimony. It is very touching to me. If all professing Christians in America felt that way, then the ruling powers would have to rethink their decisions. They might not have an army to maintain their power and dominance. Maybe they would then be encouraged to turn to God and trust him.

Diane

**Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/10/17 0:25**

With some of the posts it is hard to tell, but some I definately disagree with. This is the overall message that I am receiving from my pacifist brothers and sisters:

'It is wrong to take up arms.'

But in the same token, it seems that overall, those who take this view don't seem to have a problem with police taking up arms.

So I conclude that it is the worldly cause that is the evil, and not the weapon itself. It is either one or the other.

1) Either cops and soldiers are wrong for carrying weapons

or

2) The weapon is not the problem, but the cause behind it

I posted the latter as my view, but it seemed that everyone who took the pacifist position disagreed with my statement that it is the worldly cause that is the problem. Most seemed to post that it was the weapon itself that was the problem (the sword). But yet no one seems to have a problem with cops?

Please BRIEFLY state, if you are a pacifist, whether it is carrying a weapon that is the problem, or the cause behind it.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/17 9:55**

Quote:  
-----Here's a little excerpt from the journal of George Fox. The government of the day tried to persuade him to take a lead in the civil war  
. I will quote it without comment.  
-----

This is a wonderful book for those who have not read it. If I recall correctly he would not compromise with the powers that be in any way even if it meant he could secure his release.

Thanks for sharing Ron.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/17 10:12**

Hi. Bro. Jeff,

That is a wonderful post. It seems that you had quite the reputation to try to live up to by the world's standards. Shedding the compulsion to try to walk in the expectations of others is quite a task at times. I recall a minister once saying that one of the things we need loosed from the most is the opinions of men. This is even more challenging when it is parents. It seems almost natural to want to please our earthly fathers. This is another reason why it is important that we do not glorify our former lives when we were in sin. Boasting of sensational things we once did gives impressionable minds a reputation to try to live up to.

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re: the "sword" - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/10/17 12:08**

Quote:

----- Most seemed to post that it was the weapon itself that was the problem (the sword).  
-----

An important consideration here is dealing with word usage. We must deal with the spirit of the issue, not just an object. I tried to get that across, but I guess I didn't. Thanks for pointing that out.

To me "sword" stands for any form of fleshly "taking vengeance into our own hands" - ranging all the way from the example I gave earlier in marital relationships (withdrawal of love) to using weapons for mass destruction. Really the "sword" begins in our own minds where our sinful nature rules our reasonings, rationalizations, decisions.

We must put down our "swords" and die to the flesh. Then God will give us new weapons that are more effective. I see no room for anything else in Scripture.

I'd love to meet, read about Christians who were truly walking in the Spirit who also used the Sword. I don't think I have read of one missionary story where that was true. Think of the dangers such men as Hudson Taylor endured, and many others. Yet none of them seemed to defend themselves or their families with the sword. They trusted God. Had they used the sword, their ministry and trust would likely have died.

A cop or anyone else whose life is ruled by the flesh will eventually misuse his power - whether to kill the body, emotions, or spirit. These people are dangerous with a weapon in their hands.

War, I think, is the final outcome of spiritual degeneration.

Here is another thought:

Perhaps, those who are called by God to be ministers of RECONCILIATION, and ambassadors of Christ are not called to be bearers of swords. (like Christ) Nevertheless, believers accept the sword bearers, just like Jesus accepted them. And what is so wrong with trusting God to use them to protect us, if he so chooses, (which is not always the case) while at the same time we do OUR job - preach mercy, peace, redemption.

PS I'm glad that our society has a lot of other ways to administer justice and peace - without using the sword. Maybe if we made better use of those ways - then things wouldn't get so bad that we'd have to resort to the sword.

Why not do a study on this, and think of all the ways following God's word shows us how to prevent the degeneration of ethical morality?

Diane

**Re: - posted by GaryE (), on: 2005/10/17 12:52**

Our perspectives on issues are often influenced by our past experiences. Often a person comes to the Lord at a latter time in life and having been in the world and influenced by it up to conversion, the person has to sort out what they believe in.

Brother Jeff, your experiences were totally different than mine. My family was not military people at all. I grew up in the Viet Nam era as a liberal and a pacifist. I avoided the war accepting all the liberal media and educational propaganda that was shoved at me in the Sixties. It was only after conversion that I rejected my tradition of being a pacifist.

When I wrote in a reply to a thread earlier that the pacifist position is being a traitor, I was saying that as a person who considers my past pacifist and pre-conversion life as being a traitor. I regret this position that I took and believe it was being a traitor to this nation.

I was rebuked earlier after using the word traitor and maybe I shouldn't have used it, however, the person that rebuked me stated how her past experience had been five years in the military. Benedict Arnold was in longer than that and was an American hero up until the time he betrayed America. {We've met the enemy and it is us.}

As an earlier post said today, "you can't have it both ways", I agree. It was difficult for me after conversion to have to conclude that policemen are in God's will as far as protecting others from evil. Having been previously busted over the head

d by a policeman's three foot flashlight, this was not an easy change. After accepting that police are in right standing in doing the job of protecting citizens against evil, the idea that it is right for the soldier to protect against evil, in or outside the boundary lines of this nation, is accepted by me also. In fact I believe it is the duty of the Christian to stand against evil in any way they can.

In Christ,  
GaryE

**Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2005/10/17 14:17**

I work at a high school and today there was a fight. I was in the library at the time and a boy came up to the librarian and myself and told us there was a fight going on. We both ran over to where the fight was going on. She told them to stop but they would not, so I got in between them and pushed one back onto some stairs and pushed the other away. The struggle didn't last long as soon as I got in between them. It was actually a pretty bad fight. I had blood all over my shirt (not mine!). They didn't swing or try to do anything to me... they were just trying to get to each other.

After I broke up the fight the police officer and a couple principles got there. After all of this I was thinking... If one of the boys would have attacked me.. would I have hit them back? What would I have done? Although I don't know because it didn't happen, I think it was possible that I would have hit him. I was far from mad at anyone.. I just wanted to stop the fight. I couldn't have just stood there and watched. I work here. But then my mind jumps to another time I broke up a fight (while I was in High School) that one of the boys did start hitting me on the top of the head. It was crazy. I just looked at him and told him to stop hitting me. After about him hitting me 5 times and me just looking him in the eye, he stopped. So, really I don't know what I would have done.

Ofcourse no one can really know what they would have done unless it would have been them in the middle, but what would be the correct thing to do in the situation that I was in if the boy would have attacked me?

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/17 14:31**

Quote:  
-----Ofcourse no one can really know what they would have done unless it would have been them in the middle, but what would be the correct thing to do in the situation that I was in if the boy would have attacked me?  
-----

I think I should praise God that He brought you out of the situation without any harm or having to make any such decision. Amazing it is how God protects us!

**Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2005/10/17 14:37**

Quote:  
-----  
RobertW wrote:

I think I should praise God that He brought you out of the situation without any harm or having to make any such decision. Amazing it is how God protects us!  
-----

Amen! I agree to that!

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/17 15:42**

Quote:  
-----Luke 12:11 (KJVS) And when they bring you unto the synagogues, and unto magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say:  
-----

This verse illustrates what Oswald Chambers would call 'spontaneous morality'. It is not premeditated; it is encouraging a dependence on God which 'gives no thought for the morrow'.

Although I have opinions about the rights and wrongs of taking up arms in every day life I must learn to trust Him; I shall not be left without a 'word to say' not without a right action to pursue.

This why after all our discussion on this topic I can still only say "I know what I think but I don't know what I would do".

**Re: the reality - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/10/17 17:22**

Quote:  
-----I know what I think but I don't know what I would do".  
-----

Isn't this the truth for all of us? Who of us can predict how we would respond if we were watching a fight, or if we felt threatened or provoked. I guess that depends largely on our level of spiritual development, and that comes only through divine growth and testings of our faith.

The disciple Peter was impulsive at Christ's arrest, but later on, when his faith was much more matured, he responded to threats differently.

I wonder if you know of Jim Elliot, the missionary who, when 28 yo was murdered along with four other missionaries - pierced by the arrows of violent tribal men in South America. They had no guns to defend themselves. It seems so wrong for this to have happened. Yet as a result of their martyrdom thousands (some say 10,000) became missionaries. Sometimes perhaps it is in God's highest will for us to die.

Should it be any different from the mission field?

If God promises to defend us, then, the challenge for us is to believe it, and also to know that he may prefer to take us.

"For you have delivered me from death." Ps. 56:13

"Precious in the Lord is the death of his saints." Ps. 116:15

"In your struggle against sin, you have not resisted to the point of shedding your blood." Heb. 12:4 I think the struggle with sin, refers to the struggle to let go our own earthly lives - even if it meant death.

Diane

**Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/10/17 22:31**

Here is a quote from the sermon "'Devotions' or Devotion," by Keith Green featured on the home page of this site. Remember that Green was close to Leonard Ravenhill. Green explains clearly he is not a political advocate of handguns necessarily, but went on to explain that it is the cause inside of the user, not the weapon. He used the illustration of shooting his dog dying of cancer.

"...the gun which is still used in murder and robbery wasn't evil in that case, the killing of something at that point wasn't evil in that case."

This other quote of his sums up my view on the entire 'war debate.'

"Motive sanctifies or defiles any action. Motive sanctifies or defiles any action."

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid=4585&commentView=itemComments>

The quotes are stated around 45 minutes into the sermon.

**Re: - posted by Christisking (), on: 2005/10/17 23:54**

Quote:

"Motive sanctifies or defiles any action. Motive sanctifies or defiles any action."

It is sad to hear Keith say such a thing. This is a lie that has been circulating among the church for years. There are many who have the right motive but the wrong actions. Motive absolutely does not sanctify actions that are against the commands and teachings of Jesus. Can you think of a Biblical example where disobedience is excused for good motive? We don't take a person's motives and because they are good bless their actions as good when they are against the teachings of Scriptures. There have been many false teachers who have led many to hell while the whole while having good motives. There is a way that seems right to man, but in the end leads to death. One of many Biblical examples of this is in 1 Chronicles 13. David's motives for moving the Ark were good and pure. "Let us bring the ark of our God back to us, for we did not inquire of it during the reign of Saul." The whole assembly agreed to do this, because it seemed right to all the people. 1 Chronicles 13:3-4 And certainly Uzzah had nothing but pure motives. The ark of the covenant was the presence of God and was about to fall off the cart and smash to the ground. Uzzah's motives to save the ark from falling off the cart and smashing to the ground were pure and good by anyone's standards, but God said don't touch it so Uzzah was struck dead on the spot, regardless of motives. "But when they arrived at the threshing floor of Nacon, the oxen stumbled, and Uzzah put out his hand to steady the Ark. Then the LORD's anger blazed out against Uzzah, and he struck him dead because he had laid his hand on the Ark. So Uzzah died there in the presence of God." 1 Chronicles 13:9-10 When God says "NO" or "DON'T" He means "NO" or "DON'T"!

We should all reject this popular idea that when the Book of Life is opened we will be judged according to our motives, intentions, or heart.

"Then I saw a great white throne and Him who sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away. And there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, standing before God, and books were opened. And another book was opened, which is the Book of Life. And the dead were judged according to their works, by the things which were written in the books. The sea gave up the dead who were in it, and Death and Hades delivered up the dead who were in them. And they were judged, each one according to his works. Then Death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And anyone not found written in the Book of Life was cast into the lake of fire." Rev 20:11-15

Notice how it says "works" not motives, or intentions, or heart. Has the grace of God produced the fruit of good works in your life or have you accepted the grace of God in vain? Do you have the type of faith that saves? Faith that naturally produces good works and righteousness and obedience. Does your love for Jesus manifest itself and prove itself through good works and in obedience to His words? Or do you use motive, intent, or heart to justify your disobedience? If Jesus said don't commit adultery then no motive justifies disobedience, if Jesus said don't build up earthly treasures then no motive justifies disobedience, if Jesus said do not resist an evil person then no motive justifies disobedience, if God said don't touch the ark, then no motive justifies disobedience.

Sorry to say, but my current understanding of Scripture leads me to declare that Brother Green on this point is dead wrong. Motive does not sanctify disobedient or sinful actions. The road to hell is paved with good motives. Although, he is correct in the reverse. Motive can certainly defile actions. For example, being obedient out of a legalistic, pharisaical, or humanistic attitude instead of out of an unquenchable love and desire to please the Savior of our souls, so that our Master may receive "the reward of His suffering" He so rightly deserves.

**Re: motive - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/10/18 7:45**

Quote:

-----There are many who have the right motive but the wrong actions.

I doubt it.

I've often heard these words: "They meant well." or "They really have a good heart (even though their actions were har

mful)." These are humanistic comments and scripture disagrees.

Romans 3:10 reminds us that NO ONE has right motives. "There is no one righteous, not even one; there is no one who understands, no one who seeks God.... Their feet are swift to shed blood.... and the way of PEACE they do not know."

In our flesh we cannot have purely good motives - ex: "the way of PEACE" - though there can be somewhat altruistic motives. Scripture says that the heart is deceitful, though we'd like to attribute "good motives" to it.

If the motive is really from God (his will ruling, not ours) and his Spirit rules within (as opposed to our fleshly nature), then right actions should flow out. How can it not? "Can a fig tree bear olives?" James 3:12

"Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (true faith being the right motive.)

I heard the sermon where Keith Green used the above example, and in context, I would have to agree with him.

That brings us to the important question: What is the motive for someone having a gun?

Self-preservation?

To give one a feeling of security?

Is this a motive that flows from faith? Is it a Godly motive? If so, prove it from Scripture. And then how would you deal with the many scriptures that seem to say otherwise?

Diane

**Re: It depend where you put your BUT - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/10/18 8:22**

Consider these two sentences:

We've got a great and powerful God, BUT the world is full of evil, and evil could happen to us.

OR

The world is full of evil and evil could happen to us, BUT we've got a great and powerful God.

(This thought is taken from a sermon by Charles Price)

The first is really an expression of unbelief. It focuses on this world. It reveals fear, and causes one to take matters into his own hands. This person lives for self-preservation.

The second focuses on God. It leads to faith, trust and inner peace. The one who believes this will carry on with God's purposes - regardless of the risk.

So in the arms issues, each of these belief systems will take us in very opposite directions.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/18 8:48**

Quote:

-----Quote:

"Motive sanctifies or defiles any action. Motive sanctifies or defiles any action."

It is sad to hear Keith say such a thing. This is a lie that has been circulating among the church for years.

-----

It's also a way of justifying the Jesuit morality that 'the end (the purpose) justifies the means'.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/18 10:12

Quote:  
-----For example, being obedient out of a legalistic, pharisaical, or humanistic attitude instead of out of an unquenchable love and desire to please the Savior of our souls, so that our Master may receive "the reward of His suffering" He so rightly deserves.  
-----

One of the things I am trying desperately to come to terms with in this thread as a student of Jewish law is what exactly is the difference between the way (in this and other threads) that the Sermon on the Mount has been codified into a series of laws to be kept as did the Jews the 613 and genuinely walking in the Spirit- in harmony with Christ's teachings?

For example, ChristisKing mentions our Lord's teaching not to lay up for ourselves treasures on the earth, but treasures in heaven in the same sentence with adultery as if it were one of the 10 Commandments. Yet we know that there were wealthy believers in the New Testament as commandments were given to them in the epistles.

My point is, I am seeing a tendency where the teachings of our Lord are drawn out to their strictest conclusion and established as laws and then the whole of the rest of the revelation of the New Testament (and Old) that would have balanced those teachings get explained away with all manner of creative theories to buttress that radical interpretation.

Re: - posted by Christisking (), on: 2005/10/19 0:29

Question

Quote:

"What exactly is the difference between the way (in this and other threads) that the Sermon on the Mount has been codified into a series of laws to be kept as did the Jews the 613 and genuinely walking in the Spirit- in harmony with Christ's teachings?

Answer

Quote:

"being obedient out of a legalistic, pharisaical, or humanistic attitude instead of out of an unquenchable love and desire to please the Savior of our souls, so that our Master may receive "the reward of His suffering" He so rightly deserves."

I think we can both agree upon this?

But we have a definite disagreement upon the following,

Quote:

"our Lord's teaching not to lay up for ourselves treasures on the earth, but treasures in heaven in the same sentence with adultery as if it were one of the 10 Commandments...that radical interpretation"

That interpretation is not at all "radical" as you suggest. (although it may seem that way to a capitalistic American institutional churchgoer) But rather it is a literal interpretation, supported by many other well respected teachers and theologians. "all that, in fact "lay up treasures on earth?" a thing as expressly and clearly forbidden by our Lord as either adultery or murder" John Wesley This along with all literal interpretation of the teachings of Jesus need to be carried out and obeyed with a heart of love for and all consuming desire to please ones Master, Jesus Christ, rather than some hermitish, monkish, legalistic attempt to follow the letter of the law. This, my friend, is where motive does come into play - in matters of obedience and literal interpretation of the commands, words and teaching of Jesus Christ - holiness and righteousness. But never does motive come into play in disobedience or watered down, situationalized, "what if - what about" interpretations of the commands, words and teaching of Jesus Christ - disobedience and worldliness.

Back to the point at hand - our Lord's teaching not to lay up for ourselves treasures on the earth, but treasures in heaven - many especially in the west have been under a strong deceptive spell in regards to this and many of the other supporti

ve teaching in the New Testament about mammon and material possessions. Since the many others who are also supportive of this seemingly "radical" but actually literal interpretation are much better at explaining the issues of laying up treasure than I am, I will let some of them do the talking. Please consider what these men have to say. I think if you were to read the entire New Testament attempting to forsake any preconceived notions, nationalistic or economic ideas and understandings, you would clearly see these men's interpretations as not radical at all, but rather hermeneutically sound and accurate.

"It says here, that all nations were deceived by her sorcery. The Amplified Bible says that the nations were deceived by "her magic spells". It is amazing that the spirit of Babylon has deceived Christians in every nation - by teaching them that they can live for the world - for money, pleasure and honour - and still be pleasing to God and go to heaven when they die, just because they "believe in Jesus". It is exactly as though a spell had been put on them to believe something so contrary to everything that Jesus and the apostles taught and that we read in the entire New Testament. This is the result of the magic spell that Babylon has put upon them, so that they cannot see! It is sorcery!! It is deception!! Consider just one example: Jesus said, "You cannot love God and money. If you love the one, you will hate the other" (Lk.16:13). Yet there are multitudes of believers who think they can love both. They will discover in the final day, that Babylon had put a spell upon them - that they only imagined that they loved God, whereas they loved only money with all their hearts and actually hated God." Zac Poonen

"All those who lay up their surplus income, have not the love of God in them. By surplus income, I mean that which is not necessary for the support of themselves and families. If they lay it up, it must be because they love it. If they preferred the kingdom of Jesus Christ, they would immediately use what they could spare, after providing for the necessities of their families, to the building up of his kingdom. Suppose an individual was on the coast of Africa, and longed exceedingly to return to his home, but had no means of paying his passage, if some one should present him with a purse of gold, would he lay it up, or would he immediately lay it out to gratify the all-absorbing desire of his heart, and pay his passage to his native country? This would be the very reason why he would prize the gift. It would be valuable to him on that account, that by it he might accomplish the object of his heart's desire. Can it be that a man loves supremely the kingdom of Christ, and longs exceedingly for its coming and extension, and yet hoards up his money, instead of spending it for this supremely desirable object?" Charles Finney

"Hoard nothing. Lay up no treasure on earth, but give all you can; that is, all you have. I defy all the men upon earth, ye a, all the angels in heaven, to find any other way of extracting the poison from riches...all that, in fact "lay up treasures on earth?" a thing as expressly and clearly forbidden by our Lord as either adultery or murder. When it is calmly and deliberately done, it is a clear proof of our desiring to be rich. See one reason among many, why so few increase in goods, without decreasing in grace! Because they no longer deny themselves and take up their daily cross. They no longer, alas! endure hardship, as good soldiers of Jesus Christ! --- so few of them (those who lay up treasure on earth) pay any regard to that solemn declaration of our Lord, without observing which we cannot be his disciples: "And he said unto them all, "--the whole multitude, not unto his Apostles only,--"If any man will come after me,--will be a real Christian,--"let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me." (Luke 9:23) O how hard a saying is this to those that are "at ease in the midst of their possessions!" Yet the Scripture cannot be broken. Therefore, unless a man do "deny himself" every pleasure which does not prepare him for taking pleasure in God, "and take up his cross daily,--obey every command of God, however grievous to flesh and blood,--he cannot be a disciple of Christ; he cannot "enter into the kingdom of God." John Wesley "In the same way, any of you who does not give up everything he has cannot be my disciple." (Luke 14: 33)

"Christians who pursue after Mammon (Money or Moneys Worth) have plenty of money to travel whenever they like, and wherever they like. They also have enough to buy whatever they like, whenever they like. Only lovers of Mammon (Money or Moneys Worth) can afford such expensive habits whether they partake in them or build their treasure here on earth in the banks, markets, and properties like a greedy misers. But those who live in comfort and/or luxury or have their treasure built up so that they have the ability to live in the comforts of life can never be witnesses for the Lord in the midst of a suffering, starving and dying world... It will be very difficult for a disciple of Jesus if he is totally honest and wholehearted, to become increased financially beyond his basic needs through his business in a world that is under the dominion of Satan. To become a wealthy man in such a world, one would have to follow Satan's principles in some area or the other, and disobey the principles of God's Word. The Bible clearly says, "Those who want to get rich fall into temptation and a snare and many foolish and harmful desires which plunge men into ruin and destruction." (1 Tim.6:9). One who seeks to be "rich towards God" can never become "rich in this world" (Luke 12:21; 1 Tim.6:17).

Christianity mixed with money has probably led more people away from God than perhaps anything else. Those who do

nÂ't give heed to this warning and who are not careful to avoid these matters will finally become a part of this commercial, religious Â“ChristianÂ” system called Babylon, that will finally be judged by God. The Word of God comes afresh to such people saying, Â“Come out of her, My peopleÂ”. He who has ears to hear, let him hear.Â” Zac Poonen

**Re: - posted by DeanTaylor (), on: 2005/10/19 8:16**

Since I was born again, it has always been a surprise to me that Bible believing-revival praying-faith trusting Christians, involve themselves so much in the affairs, politics, allurements and Â–yes- wars of this world.

A people who claim to trust God, depend on Him, and believe that he answers prayer should not be entangled in the world as American Christian Evangelicals so often do.

DL Moody put it this way. "There has never been a time in my life when I felt I could take a gun and shoot a fellow being. In this respect I'm a Quaker." --D.L. Moody

You see 2 Cor 2:4 says that Â“No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life; that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier.Â”

We have in the Blood of Jesus such a strong weapon that to turn to carnal politics and weaponry to accomplish disputes and conflicts is absolutely nonsensical.

We are promised victory, but our theology in obtaining that victory is in all cases through the cross. It is indeed a theology of martyrdom. In the book of Revelation we see a glimpse of the saints defeating one greater than Hitler, Stalin, or Genghis Khan, they defeated the Beast from the pit of Hell. But look how they did itÂ...

Rev 12:11 And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death.

Remember saints Â“the weapons of our warfare are not carnal but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holdsÂ” 2 Cor 10:4 5

As far as the Early Church is concerned I would quickly agree that they need to be looked at and received with a grain of salt. But when you see them having universally one voice on a subject, separated by language, ocean and continents it should at least make us stop and think. Especially, when the doctrine we end up with goes against the clear teaching of our Master Himself.

Matt 5: 43 Â“Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. 44 But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;Â”

Bro. Dean Taylor  
Ephrata, PA

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/19 8:39**

Hi ChristIsKing,

I had a huge rebuttal, but the Lord said no, so I'll offer just one passage for you to comment on. I do not believe that poverty = spirituality.

*Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; (1 Timothy 6:17)*

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/19 13:27

Hi Dean,

Quote:  
-----A people who claim to trust God, depend on Him, and believe that he answers prayer should not be entangled in the world as American Christian Evangelicals so often do.  
-----

I can agree with this to an extent; but on the flipside of this there is an outcry within evangelicalism today that blisters the 60's generation Christians for holding back in the US and allowing the nation to become almost full on pagan in a lot of ways by avoiding politics, etc. Soon we lived in a nation that was teaching our children evolution in the public schools and had banned prayer. In 1973 abortion was legalized and untold numbers of millions of babies have died. If Christians had gotten involved 50 years ago in some of these areas we may well not be in the shape we are in.

I am finding it difficult to relate to the mindset that believes that we as Christians should just lie down and allow the enemy to overrun the whole of our culture and just trust the Lord. I believe we have an obligation to prayerfully consider who God would have us put into office to lead this nation. You know the enemy is going to be sending out his people? What ever happened to standing up for what was right? Taking a stand on issues? We are the salt of the earth. We are to allow our light to shine whenever we have an opportunity to influence the nation for good.

On the other hand I am not at all for some type of marriage between the Church and any sort of political groups. Our allegiance is to Christ alone. And part of that is that we influence the world for Christ as much as we reasonably can.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/10/20 8:42

Quote:  
-----What ever happened to standing up for what was right? Taking a stand on issues?  
-----

While I believe you are right, nevertheless these words grate me. They conjur up in my mind hardline fanatical "Christians" who go on protest marches, kick their children out of their homes for sinning, write nasty things about the evil and perverted sinners, lobby the gov't, and essentially do nothing to help CURE the problem. And always this line: "We must TAKE A STAND against evil." Frankly, I have seen too much damage done with this kind of philosophy. I don't see it in Scripture.

Doesn't Jesus teach us to stand against evil by doing GOOD. Here is an example: Junk food is bad for you. It does no good to preach against junk food, and all the evil additive, etc. It is better to just SERVE GOOD FOOD. So why don't we apply that in all areas. Where we see evil, DO GOOD. I think we can win a lot more wars by being proactive rather than reactive.  
Diane

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/20 11:13

Hi Diane,

I interpret being 'salt' and 'light' as being actively a part of society to slow the progress of wickedness. This requires both doing good and preaching against the sins of society. There are many means of preaching against or standing against sin. It makes no difference what means is before me- if I have an opportunity to either do good or stand against wickedness I will try to take it.

Quote:  
----- They conjur up in my mind hardline fanatical "Christians" who go on protest marches, kick their children out of their homes for sinning, write nasty things about the evil and perverted sinners, lobby the gov't, and essentially do nothing to help CURE the problem.

-----

I have peacefully protested against abortion and would attend a rally that I felt would please the Lord. I have not kicked out any of my 5 teenage kids out of the house yet. ;- ) I have found that when they slip into sin they generally try to fly the coupe. So throwing them out is not generally a problem in my experience. I have written many tractates, but generally they have not been on moralisms. Maybe I should have outlined these things better throughout the years to expose the lies of the Devil. When we hold silent we re-enforce the enemies lies.

Quote:  
-----And always this line: "We must TAKE A STAND against evil." Frankly, I have seen too much damage done with this kind of philosophy. I don't see it in Scripture.  
-----

If we take the opposite line (and I'm not trying to be sarcastic at all) and "lie down" against evil then we have *not* done our job as the salt of the earth and we get what Jesus said we would get- we are trodden under the foot of men.

However, I do agree that we have to be careful not to become militant on our beliefs and leave Gods grace out of the equation. this is why I believe that folk need to be FULL of the Holy Ghost in ministry. It is simply impossible to figure out what needs to be said in any type of setting. Only God knows the hearts of men and only He can lead us into the scriptures to confront that situation at that time. Too many unseen variables that do not manifest themselves. There are underlying causes of the symptoms we see, etc.

Quote:  
-----Doesn't Jesus teach us to stand against evil by doing GOOD. Here is an example: Junk food is bad for you. It does no good to preach against junk food, and all the evil additive, etc. It is better to just SERVE GOOD FOOD. So why don't we apply that in all areas. Where we see evil, DO GOOD. I think we can win a lot more wars by being proactive rather than reactive.  
-----

I don't believe it has to be one or the other; I believe it must be both. We had the issue of wealth earlier. It does no good at all to take theological positions that we are not actively living out.

Consider this passage:

Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth. (Ephesians 4:28)

Making a difference in society may mean giving that extra car you have to the single mother who lives next door or that man who just got out of prison and don't even have a job yet. It may mean writing that \$500 check to that coworker who needs a transmission in their car that is not saved because God told you to. It could mean allowing that family of 4 to live for free in your lake house. It may mean taking that guy to lunch who has no lunch money or buying a baby bed for that 16 year old girl who got pregnant.

Until we do the works of Him, its all just talk. And I do agree Diane, when we don't do good and we only harp against sin we have done no real service at all.

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re: - posted by Christisking (), on: 2005/10/20 11:34**

I agree with you Diane. It is mind boggling to even think of all the wasted hours spent protesting, trying to pass laws, and effect change through politics, supposed Christian politicians and governmental leaders, under the banner of "We must take a stand against evil". Even if this method worked which it clearly does not. Passing laws to regulate morality does nothing to further the Kingdom of God and change hearts, it does nothing to stop evil if it doesn't change hearts through the blood of Christ. Saudi Arabia and Iran pass laws to regulate morality and still remain in spiritual darkness and death. The problem is not the laws - it is the sins, which Jesus came to set us free from. Even if you were to banned abortion, pornography, gay marriage or any other sin, have you stopped anyone from being swallowed up by the pits of Hell? Has Heaven gained one more soul? Has any one been set free from sin through the blood of Jesus Christ? Political Christianity is a Satanic lie and complete waste of time, money and effort. Can you imagine what the world would look like if all the time and money spent on Political Christianity was spent on winning souls for Jesus and setting people free from sin through the blood of Jesus Christ? If we really want take a stand against evil as a Christian we do good in the face of evil, preach repentance and freedom from sin, Jesus Christ the risen Savior and King, righteousness and holiness with love to a lost and dying world, not try to regulate them with moral legislation and laws - like Iran. Jesus came in the flesh died on the cross and rose from the dead to set captives free - not so that we can look down on them and their icky sins and pass laws to regulate them while they remain in bondage! We should never lie down in the face of sin, but we must fight evil in a Biblical way, not in a way we have made up in our own minds - this always produces negative results, even though the motive may be good.

**Re: - posted by GaryE (), on: 2005/10/20 11:36**

Those words take a stand remind me of someone. Martin Luther said, "Here I stand".

Taking a stand may mean different things to different people but a Christian can not let evil go on around them and not try to do something about it if they can. There is a cost to serve Jesus.

In Christ,  
GaryE

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/20 12:08**

Hi ChristIsKing,

Quote:

-----Even if this method worked which it clearly does not. Passing laws to regulate morality does nothing to further the Kingdom of God and change hearts, it does nothing to stop evil if it doesn't change hearts through the blood of Christ.  
-----

You are blurring two issues together. We do not go to the voters booth to win souls directly. We do not participate in peaceful protests to win souls directly. We do not write our congressmen and senators to win souls directly. We do it so that as salt in the earth we are doing what we can to slow the decadence of society at large. And the level of decadence and deception has a direct effect on the level of bondage people are in to Sin.

Therefore, as repentance preachers and members of the Kingdom of God, we have a vested interest in how wicked our immediate society becomes. No one, even believers are exempt from the temptations of this world. As society plunges down the slippery slope of wickedness the overall spiritual climate becomes more treacherous and hazardous. Our children are subjected to great levels of temptations and wickedness that compete with God for their hearts. They are subjected to lies, lies, and more lies.

If we step back and watch the floodgates come fully open to Sin and degradation in our society we are responsible for our part by our permissive silence. Personally I don't want to be numbered with the generation that ushers in every devilish thing that crosses the debauched and deranged fevered minds of twisted men. You can stand by and watch hell take over if you want, but I'm going to take my place in the hedge no matter if its on a street corner preaching repentance, a youth rally ministering to teens, or a nursing home snatching souls from the burning; Oh and yes, one more place you will find me? At the voters booth.

God Bless,

-RObert

**Re: Not for power... - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/10/20 13:32**

Quote:  
-----Therefore, as repentance preachers and members of the Kingdom of God, we have a vested interest in how wicked our immediate society becomes.  
-----

I certainly agree with this Robert. While it is true that a society must change at the level of individual hearts...once these hearts change how then should they live? How should they speak?

It seems to me that Christians, just by being Christians, can not help themselves from effecting every sphere of society including politics. I am a firm believer in keeping institutional or big business religion out of political entanglement. (Which I think is part of Patrick's concern.) However I am equally a firm believer that individual Christians must not garrison themselves from political responsibility. How can we expect Christians to not want to live according to their regenerated desire for justice, mercy, and morality? A Christian who sits in political silence as his government, his state, degenerate into sinful chaos is a figure of the absurd. It seems impossible for one who is morally concerned to be politically unconcerned because political issues are moral issues, and political legislation is moral legislation. Even budget bills are moral documents!

Our first loyalty is not to a political party but to the Kingdom of God. yet I think the Kingdom is mere orthodoxy until it is put into orthopraxy which must include social as well as political responsibility.

Some people might think I'm sounding like Constantine or worse, Pat Robertson;-) ... but I am not talking about placing lawmakers under the control of the Church...I'm talking about individual responsibility in a secular state.

MC

**Re: - posted by Christisking (), on: 2005/10/20 14:17**

Sorry, Robert but I would have to disagree. You are trying to make up your own humanistic way of fighting evil and hell and are wasting your time and effort. You need to look to the Scriptures to find out how we are to fight Satan and the principalities and powers of this earth.

Quote:

“We do not go to the voters booth to win souls directly. We do not participate in peaceful protests to win souls directly. We do not write our congressmen and senators to win souls directly. We do it so that as salt in the earth we are doing what we can to slow the decadence of society at large. And the level of decadence and deception has a direct effect on the level of bondage people are in to Sin.”

None of the things you mention are winning souls period - either directly or indirectly. If you are not winning souls, then your efforts are useless and a waste of time as a Christian trying to fight against Satan and the powers of hell. Jesus tells us that salt and light is our good deeds, not participating in protests, writing our congressmen and senators, or voting. These can hardly be viewed as good deeds by any one - therefore they are not the salt and light Jesus was referring to. Robert, you must not make up your own definition of what salt and light is in order to justify your political stance or fleshly way of thinking, but rather go by what Jesus told us salt and light is - good deeds - doing good in face of evil. If one was to consider legislating morality as salt and light - one would have to claim Iran as a city on a hill.

Also, participating in protests, writing our congressmen and senators, voting or passing laws to regulate morality does absolutely nothing and is a complete waste of time and a Satanic lie in regards to effecting the level of bondage people are in to sin. The only thing that has any effect on any level of bondage to sin at all is the blood of Jesus Christ. To claim o

ther wise, would be terrible and possibly damning mistake on your part.

The Islamic states have completely stopped the degradation of there society through laws. Would you have us follow the ir example? Are they free from the bondage of sin because they are legally forced to live morally? It seems as you and many others have bought into the same lies they have bought into.

Quote:

“If we step back and watch the floodgates come fully open to Sin and degradation in our society we are responsible for our part by our permissive silence. Personally I don't want to be numbered with the generation that ushers in every devilish thing that crosses the debauched and deranged fevered minds of twisted men.”

I agree with this completely. The problem I have is the un-Scriptural methods of which you attempt to accomplish this. The end does not always justify the means. I am glad you brought this up because it is the perfect example of how good motive can be completely ineffective when we apply our to ideas to accomplishing them. Your ideas are logical, well thought out, and make perfect sense - but they are un-Biblical. The only way to accomplish holding back the floodgates of sin and degradation in our society is the blood of Jesus Christ. You should be very careful about talking the Islamic model for controlling sin and degradation of society and calling it salt and light. If you want to see how to fight the powers of darkness you should read through the New Testament. Many people are tricked into believing such things because they have never read the Bible for themselves. (other read it with preconceived notions and ideas - trying to read into it instead of reading out of it - trying to pick a verse here and there and then applying a translation that matches their current worldly way of thinking) Your motive and intentions are good, my friend, but you must follow the Scriptural way of accomplishing victory over sin, not your own ineffective, humanistic, fleshy way. You are trying to make up your own humanistic way of fighting evil and hell and are wasting your time and effort. You need to look to the Scriptures to find out how we are to fight Satan and the principalities and powers of this earth.

Compton wrote-Quote:

“It seems impossible for one who is morally concerned to be politically unconcerned because political issues are moral issues, and political legislation is moral legislation. Even budget bills are moral documents!”

I understand what you are saying brother, but political morality and morality through politics is morality without Christ - i.e. Iran, Saudi Arabia, etc. As a Christian I am not at all concerned with morality unless it come from blood of Christ setting one free from sin. Morality in and of itself is not the end or even a concern. There are many religions whose members live much more moral lives than your average Christianity claimer. Morality without Christ can be legalism or political and useless to a Christian and the Kingdom of God. I don't care if someone is moral or immoral - I don't care if someone is a Buddhist monk, a Christianity claimer or a prostitute on crack - I care about if the blood of Christ has set them free. Sure the Buddhist monk lives a moral and upstanding life in society, but that is not of my concern, so does the average Iranian. We must be morally concerned as Christians, YES, but we must be focused on morality that comes from the bondage breaking blood of Jesus, and realize it is a completely waste of time and effort and, yes, even a lie from the enemy for you to be concerned with morality in another way, political, legalistic or whatever. Morality without the blood of Christ is a waste of time and a Satanic lie no matter what package you wrap it in.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/20 15:04**

Hi Patrick,

I suppose I shall leave it at that.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/20 15:28**

Hi Compton,

Quote:  
-----It seems impossible for one who is morally concerned to be politically unconcerned because political issues are moral issues, and political legislation is moral legislation.  
-----

A great concern I have had for many years has been the ongoing so-called abortion rights issue. There never was a right; it was created from the bench in 1973. The misconception here is that we are trying to take ground for the Kingdom, when in reality we are trying to recover ground we have surrendered. This nation was born more or less during the First Great Awakening. Finney stood against slavery and was a major influence on that issue during the Second Great Awakening. What is impossible for me to imagine is that how if we have revival in this land and its supposed to change the face of the culture- how is that going to happen if every time someone gets saved they opt-out of their position of influence?

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/10/20 15:58**

Quote:  
-----Morality without the blood of Christ is a waste of time and a Satanic lie no matter what package you wrap it in.  
-----

Patrick,

I can agree that to expect biblical morality without blood of Christ and subsequent indwelling of the Holy Spirit is a futile hope. For the Christian to preach "Christian" morality without Christ would be tragically counter-Christian and in some cases even anti-Christ. It could be said that when the Church is co-opted by the state...it's the Church and not the world that has been converted.

However, I don't see how recognizing these important truths prohibits a Christian from participating in political process. Can't we go to the voting booth and still be of Christ?

Edit: Robert sums up the catch 22, quandary, impasse, lose-lose situation and general pickle I was trying to express...

Quote:  
-----What is impossible for me to imagine is that how if we have revival in this land and its supposed to change the face of the culture- how is that going to happen if every time someone gets saved they opt-out of their position of influence?  
-----

MC

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/20 16:21**

Quote:  
-----What is impossible for me to imagine is that how if we have revival in this land and its supposed to change the face of the culture- how is that going to happen if every time someone gets saved they opt-out of their position of influence?  
-----

Isn't it in the Revival Hymn where God moved on the people of Wales or some place in England where the jails closed down because the Spirit of God caused it to be? Was it because of the government or the prayerful preacher that turned

wicked men towards God?

Preaching in the streets of Sodom and Gamorrah is infinitely better that putting one's hope in another man.

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/20 16:55**

Hi Jeff,

Quote:

----- Preaching in the streets of Sodom and Gamorrah is infinitely better that putting one's hope in another man.  
-----

Absolutely.

Quote:

-----Was it because of the government or the prayerful preacher that turned wicked men towards God?  
-----

Certainly it was the Holy Spirit moving. In this case there was in many cases no need for preaching even. Only the Holy Spirit can change hearts. Finney believed it was our job to change our own heart; but the psalmist cried out for God to do the work.

Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me (Psalm 51:10)

In this I believe we are all in complete harmony. The question is, what are we to do whilst the sinner is still sporting a stoney heart? The very basis on which our law enforcement officers operate is that they execute the laws of the land. When someone transgresses those laws there are penalties (Romans 13). God has given our leaders authority and they function within our legal system. This legal system wields tremendous control over everything from traffic to the classroom. It is the legal system that very possibly could bring street preaching to an end. It could render it illegal to preach the full counsel of God's word in the churches. And while we still have legal rights to minister we need to protect those rights.

No, we cannot legislate morality, but we can certainly sit back (as has happened for decades now) and watch the philosophy of this world overrun the marketplace of ideas until everyone does what is right in their own eyes.

When I was in High School in the 1980's certain behaviors were not accepted at all. In a span of 10 years we watched the whole of our culture slide down towards Sodom. What if they had a Josiah come to power?

When the righteous are increased, the people rejoice; But when a wicked man beareth rule, the people sigh. (Proverbs 29:2 ASV)

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re: - posted by GaryE (), on: 2005/10/20 21:34**

Brother Robert,

Quote:

----- What if they had a Josiah come to power?

.....

The kings anointing, the priests anointing, and the prophets anointing were three different things. The king could not take on priestly duties. When a king did right in the sight of the Lord like Josiah or Hezekiah, there was revival in the land. Sin was rooted out of the land when the king was a godly king. These revivals did not just happen in Judea, the posts were taken to Israel too. In Josiah's day the ashes were poured out at the altar at Bethel which is in Israel where Josiah wasn't king.

In the U.S. the government is much like a kingship authority. Though this authority is divided up among different people instead of on man, the need for a Godly government is real. I really don't know that we will ever have a Josiah type government, but I do know that if the people of this land ever did vote for a Godly government that the sins of this land would be broken down just as the high places in Josiah's day. For one thing the god Molech (abortion) would be destroyed.

The shepherds {Ezekiel 34} who did not look out after the sheep were people who had a God given authority that they abused. They fed themselves and not the sheep. People in authority are the shepherds and it is important that they use that authority in a godly manner. People in government have authority, pastors have authority, and all Christians to some degree have authority. It is important that we use the authority that God has given us in a Godly manner. Voting is an authority that has been placed in our hands and when we don't vote we are just as guilty as the man with the abortion clinic.

In the U.S. we have a God given opportunity to influence our government by voting.

In Christ,  
GaryE

**Re: - posted by Christisking (), on: 2005/10/21 2:02**

Quote:

"It is important that we use the authority that God has given us in a Godly manner. Voting is an authority that has been placed in our hands and when we don't vote we are just as guilty as the man with the abortion clinic."

Are you suggesting that there is a Godly option in America? The social conscience and African American Christians almost solely support the democrats as being the Godly option. The "force morality through legislation" and white American Christians almost solely support the Republicans as being the Godly option. Both claim to be Spirit filled Christians and yet both can't be right. Secular, Church and Biblical history support the minority being right, and social conscience politics is Godly - remember the great separation and the sheep and goats - so am I supposed to support the "baby killing democrats"? On the other hand, abortion is murder and Hollywood is out of control spreading MTV type crap and filth to our nation and our children virtually unchecked, so am I supposed to support the poor hating, big business loving, money hungry republicans. I think we all agree that both political parties and their candidates are evil and to some degree. But when the argument degenerates to who is less evil, you must agree your vote supports evil. To support evil in any degree puts you in the same category as the abortion doctors, right? But shouldn't you be reaching out to the abortion doctors with the love and gospel of Jesus instead of throwing verbal stones at them from across the street? Salt and light doesn't throw stones verbal or literal at the sinners of the world. Jesus loves the abortion doctors and died for them the same as he loves and died for you. Do you love the abortion doctors and weep for them in love? Ah, maybe that's the problem?

The point is the principalities and powers of the earth are from Satan. This includes both republican and democrat - both are principalities and powers of the earth. Neither is any more Godly than the other. So to vote for either one is to cast a vote for evil. Now, I will vote, but only for a Godly man, a suffering servant God whose sole goal and purpose on earth is Jesus Christ and the furtherance of His Kingdom. So I will write in Art Katz, Dave Wilkerson, or Zac Poonen even though I can say with almost certainty none of these men would accept the job as politician if offered. But a vote for republican is just as evil as a vote for democrat and you won't find me casting a ballot for evil of any degree.

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/21 11:12**

And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them. (Ephesians 5:11)

How many political leaders of today would fall under this group who are of the darkness?

Dick Cheney, Carl Rove, Tom Delay, Donald Rumsfeld, Ted Kennedy, Diane Fienstien, Barbara Boxer, Barney Franks  
, and just how many others of the current government are walking in darkness?

Is not the vast majority the sons of Satan?

There are only two types of people, the sons of God and the sons of Satan.

Genesis 3:15, And I will put enmity  
Between you and the woman,  
And between your seed and her Seed;  
He shall bruise your head,  
And you shall bruise His heel.Â”

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/10/21 11:14**

Getting back to the topic of the thread.

World War 1 was said to be the war that would end all wars. Both the Germans and the English claimed God was on th  
eir side. How then was a believer in Christ to obey those in authority over him?

In Christ  
Jeff