

General Topics :: Bonhoeffer

Bonhoeffer, on: 2006/1/15 21:46

Since there is much misunderstanding about this man of God, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, I thought I would post up a few bits on his walk and life with the Lord:

Quote:
-----In 1930 he went to the United States as a guest of Union Theological Seminary, NYC. There he was dismayed at seeing how frivolous American seminarians were concerning the study of theology. His dismay peaked the day a most moving passage from Luther's writing on the subject of sin and forgiveness was greeted with derisive laughter. Bonhoeffer retorted, "You students at this liberal seminary sneer at the fundamentalists in America, when all the while the fundamentalists know far more of the truth and grace, mercy and judgement of God than do you." Quickly he recognized the plight of black people in the US, worked among impoverished blacks in the city, and worshipped regularly at a Baptist church in Harlem. In 1931 he returned to Berlin and resumed his university teaching.

While he was certainly a gifted scholar and professor, Bonhoeffer was always a pastor at heart. Not surprisingly, then, at the same time that he lectured he also instructed a confirmation class of 50 rowdy boys in one of the worst slums of Berlin. His first day with the boys was remarkable. As he walked up the stairs to the second floor room the boys at the top of the stair-well pelted him with garbage and began chanting repeatedly the first syllable of his name, "Bon, Bon, Bon..." He let them continue until they wearied of it. Then he quietly began telling the boys of what he had known in Harlem; how there existed another group of people whose material prospects were as bleak as theirs; how it was that Jesus Christ neither disdained nor abandoned anyone; that no human being, however bleak his circumstances, is ever God-forsaken. Bonhoeffer moved into the boys' neighbourhood and lived among them until the instruction was over. Many of the youngsters remained his friends for life.

from Life Together, on: 2006/1/15 22:04

Quote:
-----"Christianity means community through Jesus Christ and in Jesus Christ. No Christian community is more or less than this. Whether it be a brief, single encounter or the daily fellowship of years, Christian community is only this. We belong to one another only through and in Jesus Christ." (Page 21)

Quote:
-----That we belong to each other in and through Jesus Christ lifts all that we do to a very high plane. When we sing we do not do so as individuals or even independent local groups rather, "It is the voice of the Church that is heard singing together. It is not you that sings, it is the Church that is singing, and you, as a member of the Church, may share its song." (Page 61)

more from Life Together, on: 2006/1/15 22:09

Quote:
-----Within spiritual community there is never, nor in any way, any "immediate" relationship of one to another, whereas human community expresses a profound, elemental, human desire for community, for immediate contact with other human souls. . . . Human love is directed to the other person for his own sake, spiritual love loves him for Christ's sake.

Quote:
-----It is also God's will that every day should be marked for the Christian by both prayer and work. Prayer is entitled to its time. But the bulk of the day belongs to work. And only where each receives its own specific due will it become clear that both belong inseparably together. . . . the

prayer of the Christian reaches beyond its set time and extends into the heart of his work, it includes the whole day, and in doing so, it does not hinder the work, it promotes it, affirms it, and lends it meaning and joy.

Re: more from Life Together - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2006/1/16 5:09

Quote:

-----To confuse Christian brotherhood with some wishful idea of religious fellowship is to poison it at its root.

Oh...it's so tempting to put quotation marks around the whole book:-).

Beware Bonhoeffer - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/16 5:24

I would like to sound a cautionary note concerning the teaching of Bonhoeffer. He is very quotable but he was certainly not 'conservative evangelical'. He acknowledged his debt to Barth who is another much quoted 'neo-orthodox'. Some time ago I posted a short note on (<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?viewarticle&aid13933>) Barth here on SI. Most of what was said there would equally apply to Bonhoeffer. For a short critique of Bonhoeffer this article may be useful. (<http://www.rapidnet.com/~jbeard/bdm/exposes/bonhoeffer/general.htm>) Bonhoeffer. The final 14 point summary should be sufficient to alert Bible believing Christians to his position.

Re: Beware Bonhoeffer - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2006/1/16 10:07

Ron, thanks for posting this link. I never knew Bonhoeffers' theology was as bad as this....

Wish I had read this before I posted on another thread....

ginnyrose

Re: Beware Bonhoeffer - posted by Conqueror, on: 2006/1/16 10:08

I have a feeling that Bonhoeffer was like any other great saint, alive or dead...he was human. And like any human he would be prone to "human understanding".

There is not a teacher, past or present(outside scripture) that I have read that I agree 100%. Not Lewis, not Tozer, nor Murray, not Wilkerson, not Ravenhill...

But all of these teachers, Bonhoeffer include, have way more that I do agree with than I disagree with. But its my responsibility to take the teachings of these secondary teachers and compare them against the Bible.

all that to say..."don't throw the baby out with the bathwater" :) Bonhoeffer was human and prone to human error. If you don't agree with a couple of things he said doesn't mean he was always wrong.

Re: Beware Bonhoeffer, on: 2006/1/16 10:43

I found absolutely nothing wrong in "Life Together", and I will be looking very hard at "The Cost of Discipleship".

There is much that you and I disagree on Ron Bailey....we can start at Israel and move outwards.

Much we agree on, we start at Jesus Christ and Him crucified and move inwards.

Re: - posted by Conqueror, on: 2006/1/16 11:57

I read Cost of Discipleship and thought it was excellent. He is the first man I know of who coined the term "cheap grace".

I got his "Letters and Papers From Prison" for Christmas but haven't had a chance to read it. I got my father in law that documentary on him. Gonna borrow it from him.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/16 18:12

Quote:
-----But all of these teachers, Bonhoeffer include, have way more that I do agree with than I disagree with. But its my responsibility to take the teachings of these secondary teachers and compare them against the Bible.

...which is the only point I would want to make on this particular topic.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/16 18:14

Quote:
-----There is much that you and I disagree on Ron Bailey....we can start at Israel and move outwards.

Much we agree on, we start at Jesus Christ and Him crucified and move inwards.

I have no idea what this is supposed to mean.

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2006/1/16 18:23

Quote:

Conqueror wrote:
all that to say..."don't throw the baby out with the bathwater" :) Bonhoeffer was human and prone to human error. If you don't agree with a couple of things he said doesn't mean he was always wrong.

I guess when you think about it, if this wasn't applied, we'd have to reject the protestant reformers and go back to Rome; -).

Re:, on: 2006/1/16 19:01

Bonhoeffer a christian??? Are you for real? This man was nothing more than an antichrist.I don't care if he won the Nobel Peace Prize Award.YUK!!!

Why would you want to read that for???

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/1/16 20:14

To help clarify a bit, from my understanding of it (though rather limited), Neo-Orthodoxy is essentially a two-faced belief system. It has it's academic side, that pretty much accepts liberal convictions concerning textual criticism, history, etc., concerning the Scriptures.

However, it also has it's "confessional" nature to it which pretty much says that it doesn't care too much about the scholarly findings, though accepting of them. The Neo-Orthodoxy say that in spite of what we believe to be true scientifically, historically, and scholarly, we are going to go ahead and confess the confession of the orthodox Christian credo. Essentially to the Neo-Orthodox, it doesn't matter if the claims of the Scriptures are actually objectively true. To them, all that matters is the confession.

So, to the academy they'll concede the findings of scholarship. When playing Church however, they'll essentially sound like the historical Christian faith. Thus, Bonhoeffer is widely read amongst evangelicals, and is quoted approvingly from the likes of Ravenhill, Katz, Christianity Today, etc., who are probably unaware of the underlying foundations and convictions of people like Bonhoeffer or Barth.

Essentially the Neo-Orthodox theologians are knowingly enter into a delusion. They truly believe the reality of the claims of Christianity are mostly false, yet desire to go ahead and believe and confess it's claims anyway. Thus, they can look very conservative and evangelical, and warmly received by many.

And no doubt, some of their insights are outstanding from which we as Christians can glean from. Even though Bonhoeffer is a Neo-Orthodox theologian, who can possibly deny the wonderful insight he offers in books like "Life Together?" This goes for any theologian. Even Ravenhill sometimes quoted from some liberal sources when he believed they were right about some of the things they said.

Re: Beware Bonhoeffer - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/1/16 23:25

I'm a bit confused how Bonhoeffer could say this...

'Bonhoeffer proclaimed that God was dead...Rejecting the objective unalterable moral standards of the Bible, Bonhoeffer proclaimed a situational ethics -- that right and wrong are determined solely by the "loving obligations of the moment"

...and this:

"You students at this liberal seminary sneer at the fundamentalists in America, when all the while the fundamentalists know far more of the truth and grace, mercy and judgement of God than do you."

What am I missing here?

Re:, on: 2006/1/17 0:00

Quote:

-----Rejecting the objective unalterable moral standards of the Bible,

I think the key word is 'objective'. We all know the Mosaic Law was an objective statement which could not bring about the change of nature required to stop sinning. Even John's 'he has the witness in himself' is not an objective way of defining what makes Christians die for Christ. If Bonhoeffer had Christ on the inside, and a good brain, then he realised that the power of Christianity was not in objective argument, it was in communion with Him. He may have developed some strange ways of trying to communicate this paradox which do not sit easily with linear thinking or objective statements which assume (without experiencing them) that the moral standards in the Bible are automatically correct.... whereas I would say, they are only correct because they do indeed lead towards fellowship with God and therefore, true spiritual health - two statements which can only be made from within those truths - subjectively.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/17 5:11

KingJimmy's

Quote:

-----Essentially to the Neo-Orthodox, it doesn't matter if the claims of the Scriptures are actually objectively true. To them, all that matters is the confession.

You are right here, Jimmy. I think there is a clear 'post-modern' strand to the neo-orthodox. This supports the idea that it does not matter what it says it matters what you hear it saying. Consequently the Bible is the witness of the witnesses who may be wrong in their facts and full of error, nevertheless their testimony is authentic and what I hear validates it. This is a crazy idea and much on the lines of those who would have said that the Christ of History is irrelevant, what matters is the Christ of experience. This is a subtle snare. Christianity is an historic faith based on events which happened in time and space; if they did not happen 'we are of all men the most foolish'. This is why Bonhoeffer would accept the witness of the evangelical/fundamentalist while rejecting the basis (the fundament) of that position which is an inerrant record. He derides the rationalist because the rationalist demands evidence; Bonhoeffer and Barth need no evidence other than the witness of believers.

The post-modernist says meaning lies with the hearer and the 'truth' is what is received not what was said or intended.

General Topics :: Bonhoeffer

This is not so far from Barth/Bonhoeffer. They reacted against the sterile rationalism of their day by adding a faith element but there is no integration; reason and revelation are kept in separate watertight compartments.

Quote:
-----And no doubt, some of their insights are outstanding from which we as Christians can glean from. Even though Bonhoeffer is a Neo-Orthodox theologian, who can possibly deny the wonderful insight he offers in books like "Life Together?" This goes for any theologian. Even Ravenhill sometimes quoted from some liberal sources when he believed they were right about some of the things they said.

This is true too and has always been true. Jude's quotation from the book of Enoch does not validate the book of Enoch. Paul's quotations, in Acts 17, from heathen poets (see below) does not validate those poets. But simply finds a point of agreement with them. To find a point of agreement with Barth and Bonhoeffer is not difficult, to elevate the men to the description 'man of God' is foolhardy and dangerous. Many have insights into truth who are not God's men. I can find remarkable insights into truth in the writings of Oscar Wilde but that does not make him a 'man of God'.

As certain even of your own poets "As also some of the poets among you." Aratus of Soli in Cilicia (ab. B.C. 270) has these very words in his Phaenomena and Cleanthes, Stoic philosopher (300-220 B.C.) in his Hymn to Zeus has ?? ??? ??? ????? ??????. In 1Co 15:32 Paul quotes from Menander and in Tit 1:12 from Epimenides. J. Rendel Harris claims that he finds allusions in Paul's Epistles to Pindar, Aristophanes, and other Greek writers. There is no reason in the world why Paul should not have acquaintance with Greek literature, though one need not strain a point to prove it. Paul, of course, knew that the words were written of Zeus (Jupiter), not of Jehovah, but he applies the idea in them to his point just made that all men are the offspring of God. Robinson's Word Pictures of the NT

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/1/17 9:02

Quote:

This is true too and has always been true. Jude's quotation from the book of Enoch does not validate the book of Enoch. Paul's quotations, in Acts 17, from heathen poets (see below) does not validate those poets. But simply finds a point of agreement with them.

Exactly. On a personal note, I really struggled with Jude's quote of Enoch for the longest time. At one point I was actually so distressed over it that I nearly ripped Jude out of my Bible. But before I did, God gave me peace about Jude, and later I came to understand thus.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2006/1/17 9:35

This reminds me of something I told our deacon one time: seems to me that theologians or preachers can complicate the most simple things.
BTW, he agreed!

ginnyrose

Re: - posted by Conqueror, on: 2006/1/17 9:45

LOL. Ginny, couldn't agree more. I have mentioned that before to my Sunday School class when we were discussing the Christian walk.

It becomes complicated when we apply our finite human understanding to God's word....or try to fit the word into a mold that we created.

Re: - posted by suzy (), on: 2006/1/17 12:47

Quote:
-----Bonhoeffer a christian??? Are you for real? This man was nothing more than an antichrist.I don't care if he won the Nobel Peace Prize Award.YUK!!!

It is quite outrageous to call Bonhoeffer an anti-Christ. Regardless of his theology being discussed here, his life and his works showed that he loved God and the Jewish people.

Before and during the 2nd world war Bonhoeffer opposed Hitler and Nazism when Hitler wanted to put the German church under his direct control, and spoke out his opposition openly. He was one of the few Germans who opposed the anti-semitic policies of Hitlers. He was banned by the Gestapo from preaching, teaching and publicly speaking! And he worked with some of Hitler's opponents to get rid of him - very dangerous.

He was arrested in 1943 after money used to help Jews escape to Switzerland was traced to him. He was put into prison and concentration camps, and eventually hanged in April 1945.

Captain Payne Best, an Englishman, who survived pays this tribute to the prison-camp pastor: "Bonhoeffer was different , just quite calm and normal, seemingly perfectly at his ease. . . . His soul really shone in the dark desperation of our prison. He was one of the very few men I have ever met to whom God was real and ever close to him."

Tell me, would you be willing to preach openly against 'the crowd' during a world war, stand with the 'opposition' (the Jews) and help them escape? Would you be willing to go to prison for Christ and to be martyred?

By the way, the meaning of the Greek word 'anti' can also mean 'instead of' as well as 'against'. Bonhoeffer certainly was not 'instead of Christ' nor 'against Christ'. I expect to meet him in Heaven!

Sue

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/1/17 13:27

It was mentioned earlier that on a practical level, Bonhoeffer was an atheist. I think this is perhaps best exemplified in the thing he is known best for: the conspiracy plot he was part of to assassinate Hitler. Biblically speaking, this action is entirely contrary to Scripture. If Bonhoeffer would have truly been a Christian, he would have put his faith in God by bowing a knee in prayer and praying for God to bring about deliverance.

Quote:

Tell me, would you be willing to preach openly against 'the crowd' during a world war, stand with the 'opposition' (the Jews) and help them escape? Would you be willing to go to prison for Christ and to be martyred?

As Paul said, if I give my body to be burned, but not have love, it profits nothing. There are many people who do many courageous acts in history, but these acts will by no means justify one before God. We are justified by grace through faith.

In reality, Bonhoeffer didn't believe in the essential claims of the Christian faith. To him, it doesn't matter if Christ really existed and if Christ really lived a sinless life, and if Christ really rose again. He'd confess these things happened as his theology demanded him do so, but to actually believe these things happened, he found of no importance, and would've probably preferred to deny these essentials.

If you do not believe that Jesus Christ is truly Lord, you cannot be saved. Bonhoeffer might have believed Christ to be "his" lord, but in reality, probably not truly the Lord. Thus, Bonhoeffer was not been saved.

Re: Discernment ministries - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/1/17 13:41

I have to admit that I was very disturbed to read this stuff about Bonhoeffer. I had always regarded him as a Christian hero. Only, I could never figure out why he would have become involved in the conspiracy plot. That is not the way of Christ. King David refused to touch King Saul, and instead said, "touch not...." If Bonhoeffer had listened to God, he could have spared his life. God had already taken care of the "villain"

Now it makes sense, in view of his theology.
edit:

Quote:

-----Bonhoeffer was an atheist. I think this is perhaps best exemplified in the thing he is known best for: the conspiracy plot ...

What is the difference between this and the present typical Christian view of war? King Jimmy, Are all professing Christians who believe in going to war against the enemy also atheists at heart?)

I found the discernment ministry site, from which the information came from, to be rather brutal in its assessment of Awana and Finney. I wonder if they have gone overboard. Are their claims about Bonhoeffer validated?

Diane

Re: Suzy, on: 2006/1/17 18:19

Post removed;

Moderator
Mike Balog

King Jimmy, on: 2006/1/17 18:22

Bro, If I'm not mistaken aren't you in your early twenties or something?.....if that's correct, your last post about Bonhoeffer being an "atheist" and "not been saved" really highlighted the fact you're still a young man with a whole lot of growing up to do.

no offense.

Re: King Jimmy, on: 2006/1/17 18:53

I'm in my 30's almost 40 so what does that have to do with anything???

The man's an atheist according to the article. Didn't he promote a book about God being dead? If so are we that desperate of Christians that we have to embrace every man that comes down the pike?

I could care less who's in my camp. I'm not willing to compromise because someone's an intellectual or greatly esteemed by man. I'm concerned with what they believe.

If that article is true then he's an antichrist.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/1/17 19:38

Quote:

What is the difference between this and the present typical Christian view of war? King Jimmy, Are all professing Christians who believe in going to war against the enemy also atheists at heart?

To my knowledge, those typically in favor of just war do not promote the assassination of their own leaders.

Re: King Jimmy - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/1/17 20:22

Quote:

Bro, If I'm not mistaken aren't you in your early twenties or something?.....if thats correct, your last post about Bonhoeffer being an "atheist" and "not been saved" really highlighted the fact your still a young man with a whole lot of growing up to do.

no offense.

I'm a 23 year old seminarian and have some knowledge about Church history and theological perspectives. As said earlier, I'm far from an expert in this area (I prefer to study about John Wesley and the likes), but I am not without knowledge. I think I know enough to say that so far as I understand the Neo-Orthodox perspective, that it is entirely heretical in which the theologian knowingly confesses as truth what he knows to be a lie. He doesn't in reality believe anything he says about God to be true, but instead only make-believes about God. The Neo-Orthodox theologian would feel just as good about professing Hinduism, Buddhism, or any other religion as his faith, but for whatever reasons he has decided, he has simply decided to use orthodox christian belief as his tool for perspective.

We should not let our love for the insights some of these individuals like Barth or Bonhoeffer have offered in their writing distort our discernment of them as "men of God." Such men practically speaking are atheists. They don't "really" believe the things they profess, but really do nothing but "make-believe." Such men are not saved. They don't believe Jesus is really Lord. They don't believe He really died for them. They don't believe that Jesus came back to life. They don't believe that He ascended to the Father. They don't believe He's coming back soon.

With this said, how could somebody that doesn't even really believe these absolute essentials even be saved? I believe any Christian who professes that such a person is genuinely saved who doesn't really believe these most essential convictions of the Christian faith is actually the one in need of a lot of growing up, perhaps they might even need to get saved themselves.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/1/17 20:34

Quote:
-----To my knowledge, those typically in favor of just war do not promote the assassination of their own leaders.

That is because they probably believe in their leaders - even if they are evil. (a little brainwashing maybe)

At least you can't say that about Bonhoeffer. He was on the side of moral justice in this issue and refused to be brainwashed. Surely you don't expect those who blindly follow their leaders to have more virtue than someone who opposes an evil system - even if it is their own.

PS, The discernment site practically made Finney out to be an antichrist. He builds a straw man about emotionalism and falsity in revival. Presumptuous and self-righteous, I'd say.

I would sure appreciate some info about Bonhoeffer from another source.
Diane

Re:, on: 2006/1/17 20:56

roadsign-

"Surely you don't expect those who blindly follow their leaders to have more virtue than someone who defects from a evil system-because they can see through it all."

A person can either choose to serve God or satan take your pick.Choose whom this day you will serve.As for me and my house we will serve the Lord.

Its not about who's stink smells the best.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/1/17 21:37

Quote:

That is because they probably believe in their leaders - even if they are evil. (a little brainwashing maybe)

This is simply not accurate. Far be it, many who hold to the just war belief believes Scripture forbids us to rise up in rebellion to those who are set up above us in the Lord. It does not call for us to agree with everything they say, or do everything they call for us to do (where it disagrees with the teaching of Scripture). To my knowledge, those that believe in just war believe that only those in authority have the right to wield the sword.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/18 5:15

roadsign's

Quote:
-----The discernment site practically made Finney out to be an antichrist. He builds a straw man about emotionalism and falsity in revival. Presumptuous and self-righteous, I'd say.

I have given previous cautions on the site but the data is usually accurate even if the judgments are severe. It is an axiom for historians to 'check your sources'. If you really need to know 'check your sources'. It would be folly to embrace the site's judgment without research just as it would be folly to embrace mine without research. ;-)

Re: Bonhoeffer, on: 2006/1/18 5:38

Quote:

-----To my knowledge, those that believe in just war believe that only those in authority have the right to wield the sword.

Hi KJ,

I haven't followed any of the threads on 'war' in detail but regarding the last sentence of your last post, are you saying there is a scriptural case for 'leaders' to wield the sword and that makes it ok? (Please, I don't need a long answer - just a pointer, if you would, thanks.)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/18 5:39

KingJimmy's

Quote:
-----I'm a 23 year old seminarian and have some knowledge about Church history and theological perspectives. As said earlier, I'm far from an expert in this area (I prefer to study about John Wesley and the likes), but I am not without knowledge. I think I know enough to say that so far as I understand the Neo-Orthodox perspective, that it is entirely heretical in which the theologian knowingly confesses as truth what he knows to be a lie

I am a 63 year old bible student and although I would not use Jimmy's language to define Bonhoeffer's spiritual state I must consider Barth/Bonhoeffer's position before I recommend his writings to others. I have found 'truth' in the most unexpected places but I must ask whether the 'truth' is intrinsic to that man's teaching or not. The danger with Bonhoeffer is his 'philosophy' of truth and revelation. As some posting on this site, Barth/Bonhoeffer believed that bible facts could be 'true' and 'inaccurate' at the same time. They believed that there could be 'truth' in the inaccuracy. They believed that in the Bible we have not 'the word of God' but words from men in which they bear witness to a God who is true. So every word these witnesses say can be false and yet their witness can be true. They had no confidence in the scripture being 'God breathed'; it was 'man-breathed' but is an authentic witness to man's experience of God.

I don't know whether you will see what this is doing. It is really saying there is probably no solid foundation but go ahead and build on it anyway. It doesn't matter to the neo-orthodox whether or not the facts are true, what matters is the sincerity of the witness. Barth/Bonhoeffer attacked the rationalists because they had no faith, but Barth/Bonhoeffer's 'faith' was in facts that they doubted or disputed. This is really saying 'it doesn't matter what you believe as long as you believe'. This is deadly advice. Let me illustrate; Some years ago a Roman Catholic priest accidentally 'consecrated' a chalice containing 'paint thinner'. He believed that he was drinking the actual blood of Christ, but he died just the same.

In the Barth/Bonhoeffer gospel as long as you believe it doesn't matter whether you are believing fact or fiction. This is just cerebral superstition: faith without revelation is superstition. Some may study Barth/Bonhoeffer and come out unscathed but if our quoting of them leads believers to think that their testimony can be trusted we have done a disservice to the believer.

It is not the occasional word which is wrong in the teaching of the neo-orthodox but the whole structure. You can have a rotten house with some good articles inside it, but be very cautious who you invite to visit and don't make yourself comfortable there.

There is an account of a meeting between Barth and Francis Schaeffer that some might find helpful. Schaeffer's separatist preaching frequently decried the weaknesses of Karl Barth's theology: "Neo-orthodoxy gave no new answer. What existential philosophy had already said in secular language, it now said in theological language." In 1950 Schaeffer visited the renowned theologian at his home in Switzerland. There he asked Barth, "Did God create the world?" Barth answered, "God created the world in the first century a.d." Francis gestured out the window to the forested hillside and asked, "This world?" Barth replied, "This world does not matter." This was a signal moment for Schaeffer, confirming that modern thought presumed that religious truth and material truth consisted of two separate realities. He spent the rest of his life dissenting from this view, insisting that "Christianity speaks of true truth." His commitment to the unity of truth reinforced his lifetime insistence that the Bible was inerrant in all respects. He refused to countenance the idea that the Bible's history and science might be less true, or even differently true, than the Bible's theology. This shows very plainly the way in which for Barth/Bonhoeffer "religious truth and material truth consisted of two separate realities" so that a biblical statement can be both 'truth' and 'error' at the same time.

The quotation comes from a Christianity Today article which can be found (http://www.markheard.net/heardtribute/archive/schaeffer1_c_today1997.html) here.

Re: What one CLAIMS and what one believes are not the same thing - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/1/18 6:32

Quote:
----- was 'man-breathed' but is an authentic witness to man's experience of God.

Is this belief not common today among most evangelicals - even those who CLAIM to believe in divine inspiration of Scripture? Their lives show that they don't really believe it. Their own experience is their supreme authority, and also what

THEY think the Bible says.

I have heard all too much, 'I believe every word in the Bible. The Bible says it that settles it.... " Yet these same people don't even know what the Bible says about their own arrogance, lack of love, blindness, and deception. That has been so common in my experience that I'd say it is only by the grace of God that I wasn't turned away altogether.

It's easy to look back into history and put a label on something - Neo-orthodox, Gnosticism, Existentialism, but it is much harder to see that we are saturated in that kind of stuff right now. Or we swing into cold dead orthodoxy. And who are any of us to think we are free of it all?

Yes our beliefs are important, but it is not what we claim to believe but what we really believe that drives us.

Perhaps it is an indictment against the church that it took someone like Bonhoeffer who was not so deluded and blind, and could see the dangers of Nazism, and was willing to speak out and warn people.

Also today, maybe it takes the outsider to see our blindness. My fear is that discernment ministries are so quick to proclaim 'antichrist' or 'heretic' and cannot see beyond their own narrow grid.

There needs to be discernment ministries to discern discernment ministries.

Diane

Re: If you knock the Bible, will it fall over? - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2006/1/18 8:41

Quote:

Rebecca5 wrote:

I'm in my 30's almost 40 so what does that have to do with anything???

The man's an atheist according to the article. Didn't he promote a book about God being dead? If so are we that desperate of Christians that we have to embrace every man that comes down the pike?

I could care less who's in my camp. I'm not willing to compromise because someone's an intellectual or greatly esteemed by man. I'm concerned with what they believe.

If that article is true then he's an antichrist.

Maybe I'm a little simplistic at times, but I always thought that Neo-orthodoxy sat in between the two extremes of "Liberalism" and "Fundamentalism", in as much as Liberalism starts fully convinced that there is inaccuracy in scripture (after all, how could Jonah survive being swallowed by a whale) and setting out to find it, Fundamentalism being afraid of any apparent "inconsistency" in scripture and sweeping them under the rug, while the Neo-orthodox boldly wrestling with the most difficult passage, and not emerging until either he or the scripture comes up a winner, knowing full well that he'll lose.

In other words, the Liberal is too afraid that God will appear cruel for creating a hell and so rushes to His defence by explaining it away. The Fundamental is too afraid of God being cruel and so ignores texts that paint him out to be (like hardening Pharaoh's heart, or ordaining Judas' betrayal) in order to "protect" a sinner from rejecting God's grace before he can experience His love. While the Neo-orthodox simply accepts that God's love often times manifests itself in the form of cruelty, and that He knows a lot more about Himself than we ever will, so let Him state conflicting statements within two verses. He is God after all.

I'm sorry, did I say simple?

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/1/18 9:02

Quote:

I haven't followed any of the threads on 'war' in detail but regarding the last sentence of your last post, are you saying there is a scriptural case for 'leaders' to wield the sword and that makes it ok? (Please, I don't need a long answer - just a pointer, if you would, thanks.)

In brief, in Romans 13:1-6 the apostle Paul talks about the state using the sword to administer justice, a gift given to it by God for its ministry.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/1/18 9:03

Quote:

I haven't followed any of the threads on 'war' in detail but regarding the last sentence of your last post, are you saying there is a scriptural case for 'leaders' to wield the sword and that makes it ok? (Please, I don't need a long answer - just a pointer, if you would, thanks.)

In brief, in Romans 13:1-6 the apostle Paul talks about the state using the sword to administer justice, a gift given to it by God for its ministry.

Motives for assassination plot - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/1/18 10:14

Quote:
-----In brief, in Romans 13:1-6 the apostle Paul talks about the state using the sword to administer justice, a gift given to it by God for its ministry.

I prefer to apply this reference in the context of Biblical history - going back to the time of Israelite captivity. Israel was told by God through Jeremiah NOT to rise up against their Babylonian captors, but ACCEPT their place, stay there and trust God. They refused to listen.

In Jesus day, they still wanted to have an independent nation. Jesus and also the Apostles warned them not to rise up against their captors, the Romans. The Jews, however, were rebellious at heart, and could not understand the Kingdom that Jesus came to establish - through ruling in the HEARTS of his people - not a national, political kingdom. Their rebellion led them to rise up against the Romans, which led to the total destruction of their society.

So also, we are not to rise up against the ruling authorities with the motive of establishing our own little "Christian" kingdom the way we want it. We are to trust God as the king of our hearts.

Give to Ceasar what is Ceasar's and to God what belongs to God.

The trouble is that Ceasars want more than they are allowed to have - our total devotion.

As much as Bonhoeffer may have been wrong with the assassination plot, I do believe he was trying to spare the oppressed and the captives, and prevent further human catastrophe. Can there be a more loving motive? At least he didn't "pass by on the other side of the road" like the priests in the parable of the Good Samaritan.

As far as I know, he was not trying to assert his own little empire.
Diane

Re: Motives for assassination plot, on: 2006/1/18 10:23

Quote:
-----In brief, in Romans 13:1-6 the apostle Paul talks about the state using the sword to administer justice, a gift given to it by God for its ministry.

KJ,

Surely this is for the rulers to govern their own people - not to make war with other peoples?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/18 10:58

raodsign's
Quote:
-----Perhaps it is an indictment against the church that it took someone like Bonhoeffer who was not so deluded and blind, and could see the dangers of Nazism, and was willing to speak out and warn people.

Bonhoeffer was a brave man as was his father, a psychiatrist who stood against Hitler's holocaust against the mentally handicapped, but that does not make him a reliable mentor. Many people have died for what they believe. I don't challenge his bravery, I challenge his beliefs.

Quote:
-----There needs to be discernment ministries to discern discernment ministries.

...and then another to discern the discerners of the discernment ministry? ;-) Occasionally you hear someone say something which is factually correct but the spirit behind it is disturbing. There is a creature in the Revelation which 'looks' like a lamb but 'speaks' like a dragon. It is important to listen for the 'spirit' of the voice as well as the statement it makes.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/1/18 13:09

Quote:

KJ,

Surely this is for the rulers to govern their own people - not to make war with other peoples?

You'll find really no restrictions of war in the Scriptures. Even wars we would be appalled at in our Western society, God seems to not only accept but also encourage e.g. the Hebrew invasion of Caanan. Sometimes the prophets spoke out against various wars, as Isaiah does of the Assyrians who went beyond what was acceptable in the eyes of God, but usually it was not the war that was so much spoken out against, as it was the spirit in which some wars were waged.

Re: Bonhoeffer, on: 2006/1/18 15:08

Quote:
-----You'll find really no restrictions of war in the Scriptures. Even wars we would be appalled at in our Western society, God seems to not only accept but also encourage e.g. the Hebrew invasion of Caanan. Sometimes the prophets spoke out against various wars, as Isaiah does of the Assyrians who went beyond what was acceptable in the eyes of God, but usually it was not the war that was so much spoken out against, as it was the spirit in which some wars were waged.

Is it really possible to take the Old Testament standard as ours today? If God has dropped His Name as 'the Lord of Hosts' in favour of 'The Prince of Peace' - that is David in favour of Solomon - the temple (Church) being built in the era of peace that passes understanding.....? My question is not about what national governments choose to do..... (Christians can always flee.) It is more about what any individual Christian should understand is the message of the New Testament towards taking up arms.