I write this as a conservative evangelical Christian. I am anti-abortion and hold all the usual 'conservative' views. But I have come to believe that the Tea Party is one of the most misguided and misleading movements in America - especially since it claims to be so "Christian".

I saw a piece written by pro-Tea Party activist recently who quoted statistics saying that the majority of Tea Party members are evangelical Christians. He coined the term, "Teavangelicals". He says they are going to have a new Awakening and "Take Back America". I don't know what kind of "Awakening" he is talking about, but it is very different from the true spiritual Awakenings of the past. America certainly needs a Revival. But not the kind that these guys are pushing. I believe it is a counterfeit of the real thing. And if we fall for the counterfeit, then the true can be utterly lost.

So what exactly is the problem with the "Teavangelicals"? Below is a very basic list of things that, in my view, make this movement truly un-Christlike and unchristian:-

(1) -An Unhealthy Mixing of Christianity with Nationalism-. When you "wrap the cross in the flag" so-to-speak, you instantly distort the entire message and essence of Christianity. You are taking two totally different "kingdoms" and mixing them together. Jesus said: "My kingdom is not of this world." So in mixing Christianity with Nationalism, you are totally distorting what His kingdom truly stands for. Thus you get "Patriotic" actions such as saluting the flag or the Pledge of Allegiance being seen as "Christian" things to do. Marching off to war becomes a "Christian" activity. The two "kingdoms" are being completely confused. There is a great deal of this happening in the church in America right now - and the Tea Party is really pushing it. -Utterly distorting what real Christianity is all about.

(2) -Being Basically the Biggest Supporters of WAR in America-. (This is closely related to # 1). One US commentator seriously stated that without the support of the American Christians the war would be over much quicker - because they are the staunchest and strongest supporters of War in the whole country. Now, can you imagine Jesus being like this? Can you imagine Him telling his disciples, "I want you to support military invasions and the shooting, killing and destroying of thousands of people"? -Because that is what WAR is. Does it sound "Christian" to you? Can we find anywhere in the New Testament where true Christians had this attitude? NO! They wouldn't have dreamed of being the biggest supporters of War in their generation! Just think what a terrible testimony this is today - to all the unbelievers who are watching. How un-Christlike. No wonder they call us "War-mongers".

(3) -Siding with the Rich and Against the Poor-. This is the exact opposite of Jesus - as we see again and again in the gospels and
the entire New Testament. Pay close attention to the following words of Christ- "Woe to you that are rich, for you have received your comfort" (Lk 6:24), "How hard it is for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven" (Mt 19:23) and "You cannot serve God and Money." (Mt 6:24). Jesus also said: "Blessed be you poor, for yours is the kingdom of heaven" (Lk 6:20) and "I have come to preach good news to the poor" (Lk 4:18).

Can you imagine Jesus coming across like today's "Tea Party" Christians - where they seem utterly against the cause of the poor, and totally for the Rich and the 'Big Money' interests? Perhaps we have forgotten that Big Business exists largely for MAMMON and GREED. Can anybody tell me anything "Christian" about that?

(4) -HEALTH CARE - Denying it to the Needy-. (Related to # 3). I am not talking about "ObamaCare" here. I have no comment on ObamaCare one way or the other. What I am talking about is a general attitude amongst Christians. I cannot tell you the number of emails that I've gotten from believers who want to deny poor uninsured Americans any decent Health Care. (I guess because they are lower-class and can't afford it).

Do you know that millions and millions of Americans are being denied basic Health coverage that is totally taken for granted in other countries? And that it is the CHRISTIANS who want to deny it to them? And do you know that there are multitudes of Americans who wind up bankrupt or losing their home simply because they can't pay their medical bills? Does that sound like a "Christian" ideal to you? Does it sound like something that believers should be fighting for? -Fighting on the side of Big Business against the "little people" who can't afford to pay? What kind of "Christianity" is that?

(5) -Pushing the Idea that "Political" Answers can Solve America's Problems-. To me, this is the worst deception of all - the idea that America's problems can mainly be solved with "Political" activism, or a change of government, or a new President. The USA's problems are almost entirely SPIRITUAL. It is because she has lost her way SPIRITUALLY that is causing all the other problems. And to get the Christians all caught up in a "Political" movement is a total distraction. A PRAYER movement - Yes! A "Political" movement - NO! It will not solve the problems in any real way at all. In fact, it is like a "counterfeit" Awakening - to push the Christians into Political activism instead of focusing on the SPIRITUAL. It is like a false savior - a "pseudo" solution. The problems in America are Spiritual - and they need Spiritual answers. Not this "counterfeit" that gets everybody caught up in Political fights.

In summary, I want to say that I believe that many of the attitudes and behaviours of the "Tea Party" evangelicals in America are totally un-Christlike and unchristian. They come across as ugly, mean-spirited and anger-filled. It is awful to see real believers caught up in anything so unlike Jesus.

I would like to challenge every Christian reading this to forward it to your conservative friends. Tell them to come and meet me over at our discussion board, if they think they can prove me wrong. I am open. If they think they can prove from the New Testament that Christians should be thinking and behaving the way these
"Tea Party" people behave, then let them come. I will be waiting.
THE CHALLENGE is LAID DOWN.

Re: WHY the "TEA PARTY" is UNCHRISTIAN by Andrew Strom, on: 2012/7/10 13:02

Oooohh kaaya. I am just a little confused.. Is not our brother an Aussie? Or from down under? While I certainly share his sentiments. Why is he getting riled up over an American political party?

Bramndter.

Re: WHY the "TEA PARTY" is UNCHRISTIAN by Andrew Strom, on: 2012/7/10 13:33

These "political Christians" ARE the excuse the world will use to persecute Christians world-wide and Andrew listed many of the reason why. There are more reasons caused by political activism that I've seen - but what he wrote is needed - though I doubt, from personal experience, that neither this or any other words will dissuade those that I encounter on a daily basis.

They love this present evil world and the things in it. Are not citizens of Heaven in their minds and worship 'freedom' and the constitution over & above His Word of taking up their cross and following Him daily. And some will even kill to maintain their place in this world for that reason - yet tell the world that it's their "God given unalienable right".

The LORD giveth and The LORD taketh away.
When a country is Godly - it's leaders will do what's right.
This country and the entire world is so depraved now - it's just a matter of time before the innocent as well as the guilty are under captivity and worse.

We are being misrepresented world-wide by those that call themselves by His Name and we'll bear the consequences of their words and actions - no way around or out of it.

We can 'try' to reason with "patriots" for their lifes' sake, though it will cost us ours.

Thank you, Brothers!

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2012/7/10 15:22

Quote:
------------------------------------------Oooohh kaaya. I am just a little confused.. Is not our brother an Aussie? Or from down under? While I certainly share his sentiments. Why is he getting riled up over an American political party?
------------------------------------------

Brother Andrew has ministered in america for MANY years and has had a great burden for america. He was close to even staying and becoming a citizen I believe at one point. He loves and really has a burden for Christians in America.

I believe the danger is that political engagement of Christians over engagement to the kingdom of God can leave the church powerless and devoid of its power. We are to build up the "church" spiritual and not try and christianize nations and institutions. I do believe it is not bad for society to be morally changed because of Christians as the salt of the earth.

But in no means is our goal to Christianize nations or countries. That is what religious systems do that are not "led of God to do so". If a president of the country or many in leadership become christian that is fine and we rejoice but we never control controls as the body of Christ. We are a separate "nation" a separate "kingdom" with a king over it: Jesus Christ our Lord.

The church of Jesus Christ is so very weak in America and when evangelicals give their strength and time to support a political party even as admirable as it is, it is a sad thing. We must be about the work of the kingdom of God, praying, sharing Christ with others and seeing them born again of the Spirit and added to the church spiritually.
Revival does not come any other way. We must seek to see Jesus Christ as the true head of the Church again and not let society dictate to us how to live as Christians.

We stay away from political discussions on the forums but I feel a "right political discussion" is to convince believers that we are of a spiritual kingdom and not one of this earth and our engagement to the earthly kingdom needs to be "minimal" compared to the heavenly one.

Re: , on: 2012/7/10 15:32
Brother Andrew makes many good points in his piece. I say amen to it..........bro Frank

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/7/10 16:49

Quote:
-------------------------Oooohh kaaaay. I am just a little confused... Is not our brother an Aussie? Or from down under? While I certainly share his sentiments. Why is he getting riled up over an American political party?

Brother Andrew has ministered in america for MANY years and has had a great burden for america. He was close to even staying and becoming a citizen I believe at one point. He loves and really has a burden for Christians in America.
-------------------------

Yes. Andrew lived in KC from early 2004 until the later half of 2006. He held many meetings here and cofounded a homoeless ministry for a while. He lived here for about 4 years give or take and is quite familiar with the US.

Re: WHY the "TEA PARTY" is UNCHRISTIAN by Andrew Strom - posted by ccchhhrrriiss (), on: 2012/7/10 20:02

While I understand the sentiment which Brother Andrew Strom is sharing, I strongly disagree with some of his points and the basis for his conclusion.

Disclaimer: I do not consider myself a "Tea Party" advocate at all. I have never attended a "Tea Party" rally. I have never aligned myself with the "Tea Party" in any official capacity.

One problem that I have with the scrutiny of believers who participate in voicing an opinion or selection of workers in this unique "government of the people and by the people" is that there is a common accusation that such individuals believe that "political answers can solve America's problems" (Andrew's point #5). The believers that I know who understand the issues are completely aware of the SPIRITUAL needs in this country and that they are NOT solved by political means.

America -- like the rest of the world -- has a SPIRITUAL problem. The people of America need to cry out to Jesus Christ. Period. There is no doubt in that.

At the same time, there are practical seemingly "worldly" standards by which we often consider issues of morality/immorality and righteousness/unrighteousness. An unsaved person or a collective nation can hold a moral or righteous position on an issue even without realizing the spiritual basis for it.

When I was a teenager, I spent many weekends ministering in the government projects located in my town. One day, I spoke with a pregnant woman who admitted that she was about to have an abortion. I explained the spiritual reasons why abortion is wrong, but she didn't understand those reasons (for they are spiritually discerned). However, I also mentioned the physical process of an abortion to that woman. A couple of weeks later, I saw that woman again. She did not have her scheduled abortion. I had hoped that it was because of the spiritual reasons that I gave. However, she told me that the reason she didn't have her abortion was because of my description about how developed her child was at this point in gestation and how I had told her that she wouldn't be able to ever know how her son would turn out.

Abortion is a sin. Yet, it is also a policy.

There are two ways to deal with abortion.
On a spiritual plane, we present Christ to others. We should be doing this ALL OF THE TIME! A consequence of what happens when individuals meet the Lord is that they will give up any embrace of abortion because they know the heart of our Creator.

Simultaneously, on a public policy plane, we can choose individuals who oppose abortion for service positions (from local servants to the White House). While they may not necessarily be believers, they take a moral or righteous position on an issue that has a spiritual basis.

In this article, Andrew is meandering into issues of public policy (like government health care) even while simultaneously proclaiming the spiritual basis. This is no different than what believers who vote in elections do. They educate themselves in issues and prayerfully vote according to a clear conscience before God.

Knowingly or not, Brother Andrew is taking positions on issues that are based in policy. Unfortunately, he is stating a very surface-level perspective which inadvertently insinuates that those who are opposed to government health care mandates are somehow in favor of denying health care to the poor. This is a light yet incorrect perception of a very deep problem. There is no question about a need to help the poor. When we are instructed to help the poor in the Scriptures, we aren't told to give it to Rome to disperse among the poor. We are told to proactively and cheerfully give from ourselves directly to those in need (and not by compulsion or through a government mediator).

Thus, a major issue is about the extent of the government's involvement (or mandates) to "help the poor" and whether or not a particular plan is the best way to accomplish it. In terms of the current health care legislation, it isn't even about the government's role in helping the poor but in the government's mandate that people BUY insurance. I know Christian doctors who are opposed to current health care regulation (that often PREVENTS them from helping the poor) yet believe in helping them in other ways. One doctor that I know travels to Mexico or off-shore (via Mercy Ships) where doctors are bound to strict regulations in order to administer simple, life-altering care. So, the issue on Point #4 isn't quite so simple as "Christians want to deny health care to the poor."

One very important thing to remember is that the "Tea Party" is not a massive organized entity like the NAACP, LULAC, or an organized political party. It is more or less a movement with little oversight. The binding belief for the "Tea Party" derives from the original Boston Tea Party in 1773 concerning the concept of "taxation without representation." Most individuals who identify themselves with some of the issues raised by the "Tea Party" movement (including a few believers here on SermonIndex) are upset with tax dollars being raised and spent by elected government officials on policies, proc edures and other things that are contrary to the views of the people who they are supposed to represent. For instance, many do not want their tax dollars spent on the abortion of babies (like it will be expanded "for the poor" under the recent health care legislation).

I agree that there are individuals who exhibit attitudes and behaviors that are quite unchristian or do not reflect the heart of Christ. Yet, that is true in many Churches (and even Christian web forums) too. I have known "spiritual" individuals who will grow extremely angry and even talk behind the backs of others if a person doesn't embrace the things that they teach proclaim. Now, I don't think that it is correct to judge or stereotype an entire movement or organization -- no matter of how loosely it is organized -- based upon the views of a few that are repeatedly demonstrated on the news. It would be like considering SermonIndex to be a community of Calvinists because a few members have boldly and loudly proclaimed their views as such.

I could go through each point that Brother Andrew presents, such as the allegations or stereotypes that the Tea Party is "pro-war" (there is a big difference between war for wars' sake or believing in justice or national defense via military actions), or that Christians are meandering into "Nationalism" when they hold to issues that might also be embraced by Tea Party people.

I don't know the extent of Brother Andrew Strom's knowledge of the people who are involved in the Tea Party. I don't know if he has firsthand knowledge or has an opinion that is based upon things that he read in newspapers, online or watched on television news.

I will say that a Tea Party rally was held just across the Bay from us -- in a very Liberal area that is hostile toward Conservatives and Christians -- and the reporters commented that they can't recall a rally that was ever so peaceful, clean and where people just got along. That same rally was presented on another station as being "fringe," "radical" and "extreme." A few weeks later, there was a homosexual "pride" rally -- completely with all manners of ungodliness, immorality and
nudity -- in San Francisco and no members of the media (that I read) mentioned words like "fringe," "radical" or "extreme ."

Now, I am not telling anyone to go out and join Tea Parties or other political, moral or social causes. I am just saying that I believe that it is possible to see this world as needing Jesus Christ while also understanding that this fallen world doesn't know that it needs Christ or that Christianity is the basis for morality and righteousness (which exalts a nation). I believe that it is possible to know Christ and seek His face in regard to any participation in this world in which we live (temporarily).

**Re: Chris, on: 2012/7/10 20:28**

You believe the brother asked someone to show him from the New Testament why the Tea Party is Christian.

Bearmaster.

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2012/7/10 20:42**

I didn't say that the "Tea Party" is Christian. That wasn't my claim nor the essence or point of my post. Nor was I attempting to take up Brother Andrew Strom's "challenge" either.

This is especially true because it would be incorrect to label or stereotype any group -- from the Tea Party to the Boy Scouts to a local congregation to the Church as a whole -- based upon a perception derived from the purported conduct of a few.

However, I could go through individual policy positions that the Tea Party groups embrace and how they reflect a Christian view of morality over immorality and righteousness over unrighteousness.

I think that we can agree of a need to PRAY diligently and fervently before we make any decisions (such as voting) or in evolve ourselves in any group. This, I believe, is more helpful than trying to impose our own interpretations, opinions or ideology-reaching and imposing limits that we would spread according to a personal conclusion for such situations.

**Re: , on: 2012/7/10 20:56**

I agree Bearmaster, Chris failed to even come close to addressing the points that Andrew made. Its not good enough, nor ever has been to use the argument "well I don't know anyone who thinks like this." It such a limited argument. It is, of course, limited to those who "you know." Which could be two or ten or maybe even 20. I know that Andrew has travelled all over this country in his ministry and lived here. That is why he made usch an interesting speaker at the Wales conference, simply because he had travelled all over Africa for months and had seen first hand, time and time again, all the evils of the prosperity gospel. And quite aside from all that, his points are biblicaly sound.............bro Frank

**Re: , on: 2012/7/10 20:56**

delete, double post.

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2012/7/10 21:25**

Frank,

However, the "limited argument" (as you call it) would never be needed if well-meaning believers didn't stereotype or label an entire group based upon a personal assumption that it is reflective of the group as a whole.

When a believer turns to ACCUSATIONS of a group and subtly inserts the assumption that all or most believers who vote, participate in service, etc... think and behave a certain way, then I believe that they have given in to an age old "who THEY know" -- or how they think others feel/think/pray/stand/believe fallacy.
Now, I am not attacking Brother Andrew or anyone who shares his opinion. I have read many of Brother Andrew's posts and I agree with most of what he writes. In this case, I do not agree with everything that he writes here. He makes valid points on the base spiritual issues. That is not in question. However, it is in the operation of those things and how they relate to believers who may feel led to vote or respond in which I disagree.

Of course, we should be careful about proclaiming anything to be "biblically sound" when such things are based upon our own opinions that aren't expressly, clearly and exactly spelled out in the Word of God. Every division in the Body of Christ began when one believer (or a group of believers) felt that something was "biblically sound" that others did not.

As sincere children of God, we all believe that we are following sound doctrine. If we didn't, we wouldn't be sincere believers. This is my constant prayer. I believe that this is true of others including many of those that I might disagree with.

It is always dangerous when a believer will not allow another the grace to wholeheartedly seek God for answers in such issues that are either non-essential to the faith or not expressly clear in the Word of God. Even if they claim that something is expressly clear, the fact that there is disagreement among sincere believers makes such a claim moot.

In this case, we should impress believers to seek the Lord before involving themselves in such groups. We should pray erfully and honestly present our issues or concerns -- especially those that aren't based upon rumor, deduction, reports, stereotypes or assumptions -- and allow the Holy Spirit to have His work in leading and guiding believers. I understand that there are some who have said that "God led them to a truth" that believers should not vote. At the same time, I have heard others claim to be "told" the opposite. The same is true of many other issues as well.

On a personal level, I prefer to avoid allowing someone else's claims distract me from prayerfully and purely seeking the Lord on every such matter for myself and that His Spirit would guide me in all truth. I can listen...and pray about what they say. However, that is sufficient in how I would allow someone to influence me. I pray that only the words that they speak that reflect the heart of God (rather than the flesh or intellect) on such matters should influence me.

Re: , on: 2012/7/10 22:22
I had resolved to take a long break from posting, which I will continue to do. However I felt compelled to thank ccchhhrrrrii issf for responding the way he has.

thanks again Chris.

Re: , on: 2012/7/10 23:13
Chris writes........

"When a believer turns to ACCUSATIONS of a group and subtly inserts the assumption that all or most believers who vote, participate in service, etc... think and behave a certain way, then I believe that they have given in to an age old "who THEY know" -- or how they think others feel/think/pray/stand/believe fallacy."

And then in the very next sentence writes.........

"Now, I am not attacking Brother Andrew or anyone who shares his opinion."

Rather than accusing him of being an accuser, or subtly inserting assumption you should just go to his site and have a conversation with Andrew himself. I would urge you to do that Chris, make your points to Andrew, say what you said here, and I know that he will reply to you. He has a great site and has an enormous e-mail list of Christians from all over the world. He gets information coming in from everywhere and he travels frequently all over the world. He may just be more qualified to speak on this subject than you may think. That is my advice to you Chris, I know that you have given this very advice many times, it may be time to take your own advice........bro Frank
Re: WHY the "TEA PARTY" is UNCHRISTIAN by Andrew Strom - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/7/10 23:25

For some reason the thoughts of the Wehrmacht belt buckle and it's slogan, came to mind, Gott mit uns.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2012/7/10 23:32

Interesting post by Andrew. I think much of the spirit of what he said is right, though I do disagree with him as to some of the specific things he said. Some of his generalizations are unfortunate. But, be that as it may, his essay reminds me of an old Art Katz saying: "You are far too American."

And being "far too American" is definitely where many Christians are in this country, no matter what political affiliations they have. We don't realize that the "politics" of the kingdom of heaven are far too radical for both the right or the left. And many Christians on all sides do not realize they are being co-opted by the powers that be to simply play the same old tired game that has been played for centuries now. Being uncritical and undiscerning, they lose the ability to truly speak and say something significant.

For example, in the recent healthcare debate in America, I did not come across one Christian who espoused Jesus Christ as our true healer, and that men ought to look to Him continually for healing. Perhaps there was a Pentecostal or two out there who reminded people that provision for healing was provided in the atonement—by His stripes we are healed. But I didn't run into any such Pentecostals personally.

Nor did I hear anybody point out the fact that insurance companies aren't actually the ones that are refusing to provide medical services. Rather, it is hospitals who are refusing to provide medical services. Insurance companies just an attempt to make the cost of health care more affordable. But at the end of the day, it is the responsibility of hospitals to show mercy to others, including the poor. They should be the one's who make healthcare more affordable. We shouldn't even need insurance companies. Yet for all the rhetoric I heard, nobody on either side of the isle so much as pointed a finger at hospitals for being a major part of the problem. For the issue wasn't really about helping the poor receive affordable healthcare. It was really just a power grab plain and simple.

Were any of these things argued by anybody of significant voice in the church? A people who are supposed to be discerning above all others, and able to see into the heart of these issues? Not that I'm aware of. And why? Because we have been co-opted by the powers that be to play their game. They could not make any such arguments at the end of the day because, as Art said, "they are far too American."

Again, a generally good article that strikes a good chord with me. But I feel the note is perhaps a little too flat. And I feel some of the points Andrew made were a little too Australian.

**edited/revised**

Re: - posted by Matthew2323 (), on: 2012/7/11 0:48

The author of the original post is correct in stating that the Tea Party is not a Christian movement, however, it is not for the reasons he suggests.

(1) The misuse of John 18 is tragic. Read the verse in context and you will see why Jesus says His kingdom is not if this earth. In verse 35, Pilate tells Jesus, "Your own nation and the chief priests delivered you to me..." Thus Jesus is distancing Himself from the earthly nation of Israel which will be destroyed in 70 AD (Matthew 24) Another reason is give in the next verse, "Jesus answered, "My kingdom is not of this world. If My kingdom were of this world, then My servants would be fighting so that I would not be handed over to the Jews; but as it is, My kingdom is not of this realm." His kingdom is not of the earth because it does not wage war as the earth does; in this context using the sword to free Jesus. The phrase "of this world" is referring to its method of operation, not its location. Remember, John the Baptist stated, "the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Besides, if Jesus' servants had physically fought to keep Him from being handed over to the Jews, how would things have gone for those of us who look to Jesus for salvation? If "righteousness exalts a nation" (Proverbs 14:34) then there is nothing in this passage to suggests that Christians cannot be nationally-minded.

(2) The problem with the wars that the American government has perpetrated in the last few years is that by our Constitution, they are illegal. War, in and of itself, is not sinful. Don't forget, "The Lord is a warrior; the LORD is His name." (Exodus 15:3) The wars are being used by both major parties to bankrupt and destroy this nation. The truth of the matter is that these wars are another manifestation of God’s judgment against the church in America. Sadly, many profess
ng Christians support these unnecessary military efforts, but until the Church gets right with God, it does not matter one iota if professing Christians support or oppose the warfare.

(3) and (4) can be considered together. The exact opposite of what the author is suggesting is actually the problem: professing Christians in America are just as socialistic as their secular counterparts. There is no biblical imperative that the government should ever take care of the poor and needy. Jesus calls His disciples to this type of ministry and we are to rely on His provision to carry it out. Governments do not have money of their own and they cannot make money (by creating a product) thus they must take money from those who have it. Our Constitution allows taxation to finance a limited amount of activity but when the government exceeds those limits they are stealing money. This means the author is un
nowingly suggesting that it is a Christian concept to steal from one man to help another? God loves a cheerful giver and He does not want us to give at gunpoint. Yes, there are people who genuinely face tough times and that is a perfect opp ortunity for the Church to minister GodÂ’s love, but leave the government out of that equation.

(5) Quote: Â“The USAs problems are almost entirely SPIRITUAL.Â” Amen to that! Nothing will end the political malady that exists in American until the Church gets right with God. This however, does not preclude the need to legally work within the political system. Â“The king's heart is like channels of water in the hand of the LORD; He turns it wherever He wishes.Â” (Proverbs 21:1) The same God who gave His Law to His people, still moves the hearts of kings. Is there anything that prohibits Christians from engaging in law and politics?

So while the author speaks truth when he states that many professing Christians are being misled by the Tea Party, the way he gets from point A to point B is a mystery to me.

Grace and peace,
Matthew

Re: - posted by cccchhrrrilisss (), on: 2012/7/11 1:28

Hi Frank,

I am not attacking Brother Andrew. As I said in my post, I agree with him on much of what he writes in other articles and even the "base" of this article in regard to spiritual things and admonitions to focus on Christ as the answer to spiritual problems in this country.

Moreover, the initial quote was not directed entirely at Brother Andrew. But, yes, it is true that he made a set of accusati ons and claims in the article that lumped together the people of the Tea Party or Tea Party "evangelicals" as being guilty of the things that he listed.

In his post, Brother Andrew accused the people involved in the Tea Party movement as being "an Unhealthy Mixing of Christianity with Nationalism," "Being Basically the Biggest Supporters of WAR in America," "Siding with the Rich and Against the Poor," "Denying it to the Needy," "Pushing the Idea that "Political" Answers can Solve America's Problems," as well as the subtle accusations that were interlaced within the body of his post, such as "Utterly distorting what real Christianity is all about," How un-Christlike," "they seem utterly against the cause of the poor and totally for the Rich and the 'Big Money' interests," "Fighting on the side of Big Business against the "little people" who can't afford to pay," "They come a cross as ugly, mean-spirited and anger-filled."

Those are the accusations that were levied against the group. While I have never attended a Tea Party rally, I know many people who have. Many of them are believers in Christ. They are very unlike the image portrayed in this article. They care for the people in the country they live, but their hearts are on the Lord. In fact, there are a few people who are me mbers in SermonIndex who have either attended some of those sort of rallies or embraced some of the views of the Tea Party (e.g. taxation with representation and standing against immoral abortion and homosexual policies being pushed up on the people of this country, etc...). Again, they do not resemble the picture that is painted by some in the media, the image painted by members of the Far Left or the claims by some in the Church.

As for bringing this up with Andrew:

I have no problem with speaking with Brother Andrew on this issue. However, I don't visit his website and I am not on his mailing list. I do count him as a brother regardless of any disagreement on an issue like this. Regardless of the size of the scope of his ministry, his study/education of this subject or the people that he comes into contact with, I don't think any more or less of his position because of it either. And, of course, I never questioned whether he was "qualified" to speak.
on this subject in the first place. My email is included here and he can also feel free to contact me if he feels led.

By the way, I am sure that there are individuals who may be guilty of the things that Brother Andrew said. However, I feel that it is inappropriate to extend such a broad blanket over either the Tea Party or members of the Body of Christ who might embrace some of those views on matters in this society. Most of the Christians that I know are Christians first and foremost. If they had to choose between Jesus or America, there would be no doubt who comes first for them. Yes, you can say that I may only know 10-12 who are like that (it is actually many more), but that would still break the stereotype. And, of course, the question has to be asked about those who make the accusations first. How many Tea Party folks (especially Christians) do they personally know who fit such a mold? Why must the burden of proof among believers always lay with the accused?

It reminds me of a divisive young man who used to attend a Christian organization that I enjoyed fellowship with during college. This young man wanted to "lead" the organization. However, he was involved in all types of gossip, backbiting and slander (of the "spiritual" kind) which often lessened the impact of any word he tried to share with the group. Because of his conduct, our student organization pastor and leaders didn't allow him to have his way. The Lord was working in mighty ways during college in and through the group. We had wonderful Bible studies, prayer meetings, evangelism ministry and weekly meetings. At that point, the group meetings were standing room only and many students were coming to Christ.

Because this was a registered student organization on campus, we were required to have elections for leadership. This young man ran for every office during every election and never won. Due to the gossip and backbiting that had become an issue, the pastor didn't want to allow any room for division. Still, we tried to help this zealous young man in other ways, including maturity and even ministry.

However, during one meeting, he tried to create a coup d'etat. He brought some of his friends to the meeting unannounced, stood up and interrupted a leaders' meeting. He gave a word about how "God told" him the word "Ichabod" and how "God told" him that "the Lord has left the group" and how the organization was filled with "the Jezebel spirit" (coincidentally, the same thing that a local pastor who wanted more influence in our group had preached and spoke with this young man about). He repeated that "the Lord is not in this group" several times during his diatribe.

When he was finished, someone asked him what the Jezebel spirit consists of. He had no answer. I finally asked him about his claim that "God told" him that the Lord had departed the group and it was filled with the Jezebel spirit. I asked him if he was still a part of the group. He had to admit that he was. So, I asked him, "Did the Lord leave you? Did the Lord depart out of your life? Since you are a part of the group, are you having problems with the Jezebel spirit?"

This young man quickly changed the subject into all of the specific things that "God told" him was wrong with the organization. Namely, he was upset that we were so involved with ministry on campus that we weren't out doing more activities elsewhere. He was also upset with some of the requirements to be a "leader" in the group (which was set up by the school and not the group). And, most importantly, he didn't like the fact that the group held a car wash as a missions fundraiser...saying that we should have met to wash cars for free as a ministry. In other words, he was "told" that God had departed the group over superficial differences of opinion that he had with the pastors and leaders of the organization.

Why am I saying this? I know individuals who are in the Tea Party. They aren't like the description of the first post. They seek the Lord, follow hard after the ways of the Lord, and reflect the heart of God to others. They may disagree with certain elected officials on particular issues of policy...or in specifics about how that policy should be dispersed. However, they are Christ-centered first and their involvement -- like many believers -- is motivated first out of love for Christ, then love for their families and then love for their neighbors, the unborn, etc...

I hope that this makes a little more sense.
Re: , on: 2012/7/11 8:06

Chris writes........

"I am not attacking Brother Andrew." That is exactly what you are doing, let me remind you of what you wrote.........

""When a believer turns to ACCUSATIONS of a group and subtly inserts the assumption that all or most believers who vote, participate in service, etc... think and behave a certain way, then I believe that they have given in to an age old "who THEY know" -- or how they think others feel/think/pray/stand/believe fallacy."

This is an attack and you even highlighted the word " accusations." And then you do it all over again in your last post. Chris, far be it for me to point out the obvious, but just because you put a sentence like " I am not attacking brother Andrew, " into your attack does not mean your not attacking him. And once again you use some vague anecdotal argument that you " know, ' some people that are in the tea party and they are not like that. This is an incredibly flimsy argument at best.

And your reply to my suggestion that rather than attacking this brother you say it to him directly( an argument that I have seen you use hundreds of times over the years) is that you " do not go to his website." Well, again Chris, at the risk of stating the obvious, go to his site and state your objections to him personally. Tell him you know five people who are not like that, or however many people it is, therefore he cannot be correct. It would be interesting to see his reply to your charges..........bro Frank

Re: WHY the "TEA PARTY" is UNCHRISTIAN by Andrew Strom - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2012/7/11 11:51

QUOTE:

(4) -HEALTH CARE - Denying it to the Needy.- (Related to # 3). I am not talking about "ObamaCare" here. I have no comment on ObamaCare one way or the other. What I am talking about is a general attitude amongst Christians. I cannot tell you the number of emails that I've gotten from believers who want to deny poor uninsured Americans any decent Health Care. (I guess because they are lower-class and can't afford it).

Do you know that millions and millions of Americans are being denied basic Health coverage that is totally taken for granted in other countries? And that it is the CHRISTIANS who want to deny it to them? And do you know that there are multitudes of Americans who wind up bankrupt or losing their home simply because they can't pay their medical bills? Does that sound like a "Christian" ideal to you? Does it sound like something that believers should be fighting for? -Fighting on the side of Big Business against the "little people" who can't afford to pay? What kind of "Christianity" is that?

I find this troubling.

In our area, which is among the poorest in the nation as for the percentage of its population being on welfare, the medical profession tells us they cannot refuse service to anyone. They are required by law to render services to people regardless of their ability to pay. Of course, they will try to collect but many refuse to pay.

Thus many people abuse the system.

But this is policy, politics, if you will.

What about teaching people they should instead turn to the LORD for their health well-being, instead? Would this not be more scriptural then lamenting the perceived disparity in medical services' availability dependent upon pay?

Personally, I am very much alarmed with the gov intrusion into the medical profession. It would be far better to allow the
principle of supply and demand to govern it. What I really fear in this Obamacare is that when a body gets infirm, is no longer productive the gov will mandate euthanasia because it would be too costly to care for this person. Many people complain about the cost and for justifiable reasons but this possibility of euthanasia scares me.

NOW if the gov insists on fixing the way medicine is practiced the shortest route would be to target the lawyers that are abusing, destroying it with lawsuits. Put a cap on how much a victim can get and limit the amount a lawyer will earn from such a lawsuit. Simple. EDIT: Doing so will lower health costs, rendering health care's availability to those who think they cannot afford it. Malpractice insurance is horrendous.

Yet...are we to not get entangled with world? How can a body survive even alone when it wants to tell you you cannot all ow your children to operate farm equipment or work on the farm? (This proposal has been withdrawn due to the outcry of people.) And it tells you that you cannot sell raw milk! Sometimes I think the gov is issuing stupid rules in an effort to str angle the ability of people to care for themselves, which is something deeply ingrained in the American people. When th ey have disallowed, destroyed people's ability to look after themselves they become dependent upon the gov which will make it easier for it to manipulate its citizens.

As I look at Scripture nowhere do I find that any gov limiting its citizens to self-sufficiency as what we are seeing today. Hmmm....maybe this portends something far more sinister then mere gov intrusion into the lives of its people?

My thoughts.

PS: And no, I have never attended a "tea party". I know little more beyond that it exists.

Re: , on: 2012/7/11 12:15
this is the type of thread where the hearts of men are revealed, and the usual suspects appear.....God is watching, and He is very angry.

Re: - posted by ccchhrriilss (), on: 2012/7/11 12:34
Frank,
Again, I pointed out that Brother Andrew voiced accusations about an entire group. The capitalization was in response t o YOUR post which pondered why I used terminology about a "limited argument" about how "no one that I know thinks lik e" words which amounted to accusations in the article. The point that I was trying to make was that if there had been n o blanket accusation -- which was also devoid of specific numbers that you wanted from my post -- then there wouldn't b e a need for any rebuttal of such a stereotype in the first place.

This was not an "attack" as you call it. I don't even know how anyone could assume that it is. I like Brother Andrew and I have even defended him and some of his words from criticism in the past. I have no motive to "attack" him. I simply di sagree with some of the things that he wrote in this particular article. He is my brother...and I cherish him as such.

Frank, there was no "vague anecdotal argument" when I share an experience. You can call it "flimsy" to your heart's co ntent, but it doesn't change the fact that the picture that Brother Andrew painted about an entire group is based upon...w hat? People that HE knows? Experiences that HE has had? Things that HE has personally seen? Where is your scruti ny for such a "vague anecdotal argument" in regard to the original argument? You didn't even question the individuals o f which he based his article.

Again, I am not attacking this brother. I am simply publicly disagreeing with some of the content of a public article that w as posted here that is critical of an entire group that he may or may not have much experience or familiarity outside of p ublished reports.

As I said, I don't visit his website. I have never visited his website. I don't really have an unction to visit his website. I a m simply responding to some of the things included in his article that was posted HERE in these forums. This is not an attack (and I don't fathom how you can repeat an accusation that it is). If what I wrote was an "attack," then most of the t hings written in these forums over nine years by most of the members of the forums amount to one never-ending attack. No, it is simply a disagreement. I hope that you can understand that. I appreciate Brother Andrew quite a bit even if I di sagree with some of what he wrote and any broad generalizations or accusations of a group and positions of individuals associated with it that was included in this particular article.
Re: WHY the "TEA PARTY" is UNCHRISTIAN by Andrew Strom - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2012/7/11 13:15

Quote:
--------------------I write this as a conservative evangelical Christian. I am anti-abortion and hold all the usual 'conservative' views. But I have come to believe that the Tea Party is one of the most misguided and misleading movements in America - especially since it claims to be so "Christian".
--------------------

Oh really? I did not know that. Is that part of their platform? Where can I read that? I don't support the Tea Party (monetarily) and neither am I am member.

Quote:
--------------------I saw a piece written by pro-Tea Party activist recently who quoted statistics saying that the majority of Tea Party members are evangelical Christians. He coined the term, "Teavangelicals". He says they are going to have a new Awakening and "Take Back America". I don't know what kind of "Awakening" he is talking about, but it is very different from the true spiritual Awakenings of the past. America certainly needs a Revival. But not the kind that these guys are pushing. I believe it is a counterfeit of the real thing. And if we fall for the counterfeit, then the true can be utterly lost.
--------------------

Oh, he just read a piece written by a Tea Party "Member". I thought the Tea Party Organization was saying that it was Christian. I never heard that the Tea Party was formed to bring about Spiritual Awakening to American. Seems like Andrew has seized upon that word "Awakening".

Quote:
--------------------So what exactly is the problem with the "Teavangelicals"? Below is a very basic list of things that, in my view, make this movement truly un-Christlike and unchristian:-
--------------------

Ok, so now after establishing his premise (Tea Party Member says Tea Party is Christian) he is going to list out reasons why it is not.

He is saying a worldly organization is unChristian.

Pilgrim
Edited

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrrllisss (), on: 2012/7/11 13:15

Hi Sister Ginnyrose,

Quote:
--------------------
What about teaching people they should instead turn to the LORD for their health well-being, instead? Would this not be more scriptural then lamenting the perceived disparity in medical services' availability dependent upon pay?

Personally, I am very much alarmed with the gov intrusion into the medical profession. It would be far better to allow the principle of supply and demand to govern it.
--------------------

In terms of policy, this is the greatest concern about this particular health care legislation. As much as many disagree with how it exists in current form, many individuals see it as a "gateway" or "stepping stone" to something that is even worse
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e. It is not as this article makes it seem that Christians or Tea Party people want to "deny healthcare" to the poor. That is a flawed assertion.

There is a difference between disagreeing with legislation and saying that those who disagree with it are motivated to deny health care to the poor. First of all, there is a major question in relativity in regard to what it means to be "poor" in this country. There have been times in my life that I had nothing to eat for days...and I didn't feel "poor." There are people who live off of the benefits of the government who have less "life worries" than I have since I finished graduate school...and the government calls them "poor" and "impoverished." I have traveled overseas and ministered to the "poor" in those nations...and the difference between the "poor" in Mexico or other countries and the "poor" in the United States is astounding.

I disagree with this legislation but I have spent my life assisting those in need. To accuse individuals who don't accept this legislation of "denying health care to the needy" or "siding with the rich over the poor" is to adhere to one of the tenant principles of Liberation Theology...which teaches that it is the government's and taxpayers' responsibility to meet each and every need. Liberation Theologians fail to understand that when Jesus told us to help the needy, he didn't mean that we should give it to the government. In fact, there is a Scriptural principle that men should work and provide for their families. To do it for them would be to partake in causing them to be "worse than an infidel." Yet, it often is the antithesis of "self-sufficiency." Instead of becoming a virtuous woman, it turns our women into those who sit by the wayside expecting much of life and provisions to be directed and dispersed by the government.

With all of the distrust of the government and separation that Christians constantly call for, Liberation Theology calls for the government and the Church to work hand-in-hand. Yet, those who adhere to it fail to understand that the government doesn't work well with the church. They may provide more "health care" -- but they also want to provide more abortion, morning-after pills, gender reassignment surgeries, marijuana as a "medication," methadone and other forms of "health care" that may be contrary to Scripture.

Liberation Theology simply calls upon the Church to join all of society in giving alms (via taxes) to elected officials in the Government to disperse such funds as they see fit. One local Liberation Theology pastor mentioned that he believed that Americans should be taxed at 10% -- a "tithe" -- so the government could fulfill the church's role and that they would no longer have to "tithe" to the local church because of it (just give offerings to support buildings and that same preacher).

The requirements of "Obamacare" are extensive. Not only are the specific requirements unreported and simply ignored by the media (because they would only serve to lower already low support for the legislation), but individuals will not know how it affects them until the requirements kick in by 2014. Not only will it require all Americans to BUY health insurance, it will cause those who can't afford it to sign up for government entitlement services so that they can receive a subsidy that will help them offset the cost. Everyone will be required to BUY insurance, but the amount of the subsidy will be different according to income.

For a self-employed couple that barely squeaks by on $38,000 per year, they will have to come up with an additional $3,600 per year to pay for insurance and that is WITH the government subsidy that they would be need to sign up for. If they don't buy insurance, they will be fined $1,390 by the IRS. If they don't pay it in time, they will be assessed further penalties. If they don't pay the penalties, they risk having their income and possessions taken by the IRS to cover the amount owed. If they still don't pay, they risk being JAILED for it. One analyst recently mentioned about how unpopular Obamacare is (according to most polls), but pointed out that it would be even more unpopular when people can't afford it start receiving fines and jail time.


So, a disagreement with Obamacare is not about simply wanting the poor to not have health care. It is simply wanting to devise a system that is not as intrusive, confusing or convoluted as the one that was designed behind closed doors. The worst thing that would happen without Obamacare would be the SAME HEALTH SYSTEM that has existed in this country for many years. There were other suggestions for health care legislation, but they were ignored in favor of this bill that was crafted behind closed doors. It is so messy and convoluted that our local Congresswoman told me that she is not "smart enough" to read and understand it.

"BTW, you can use the "calculator" link above and below from the Washington Post to see how Obamacare's mandates will affect your specific individual and family mandate requirements for purchasing health insurance and the fines for dec
lining to do so.


Quote:
--------------------------
What I really fear in this Obamacare is that when a body gets infirm, is no longer productive the gov will mandate euthanasia because it would be too costly to care for this person. Many people complain about the cost and for justifiable reasons but this possibility of euthanasia scares me.

--------------------------

Sister, we should not fear such things. Even if this is not overturned, the Lord is still in control of our lives. His eye is on the sparrow...and you are worth more than many sparrows. Be encouraged! As you said, the Lord desires for you to trust in Him for all such things. Yes, there are consequences for such policies, legislation and laws designed by elected representatives of collective consent. However, our path is ordered of God. There is no fear in His leading.

Be encouraged, dear Sister!

Re: WHY the "TEA PARTY" is UNCHRISTIAN by Andrew Strom, on: 2012/7/11 13:23

This, top me, is at the root of the issue, and I think needed to be addressed. There is much of this ideology being inserted into the Christian message as Christ; Patriot/worship as Christ worship. It is a mixture, and is "cause" driven as righteousness; and is rooted in the spirit of error.

Strom speaks:
"An Unhealthy Mixing of Christianity with Nationalism-
When you "wrap the cross in the flag" so-to-speak, you instantly distort the entire message and essence of Christianity.

You are taking two totally different "kingdoms" and mixing them together. Jesus said: "My kingdom is not of this world."

So in mixing Christianity with Nationalism, you are totally distorting what His kingdom truly stands for. Thus you get "Patriotic" actions such as saluting the flag or the Pledge of Allegiance being seen as "Christian" things to do.

Marching off to war becomes a "Christian" activity. The two "kingdoms" are being completely confused. There is a great deal of this happening in the church in America right now - and the Tea Party is really pushing it. -Utterly distorting what real Christianity is all about."

Andrew Strom..........................

He' right. Here is a recent "Tea Party" conference:

Religious Right 'War' Room: This Weekend's Awakening
http://www.rightwingwatch.org/category/people/rick-joyner

The Freedom Federation – an anti-Obama amalgam of Religious Right groups, "apostolic" ministries, and the corporate-funded astroturf Americans for Prosperity – is holding its third annual Awakening conference in Orlando, Florida this weekend. HereÂ’s how it describes the event:

Uniting our Voices Around Shared Values: Turning Voices into Votes!

"A war is raging against our shared values. Our faith and freedom are under attack. Silence in the face of this war is not an option. Decisive action is needed. Join with others who share the core values that make America a great nation. Take a stand for righteousness and justice and be part of a new revolution to take back America. The time has come to turn our voices into votes and to change the course of history."

So now we become Crusaders; fight the holy war.
The danger is that through mixture, we fall away.

Roman Catholics, Non-believing Jewish Rabbi's, and Prosperity queen Gloria Copeland and John Hagee too, along with other religious figures all join together, to fight the crusade to win America back as God's land. By laying down the
Christian sword, the blood driven repentant gospel, and picking up such a righteous cause, they lay down Christ Himself, our only answer.

This is at the root of the Tea Party. The issue I might have with this article, is a penchant for generalizations, and "THE CHALLENGE is LAID DOWN " mentality. ...., but I do think it relevant, as we are living it out today.

We live in perilous times, and are witnessing the "Great Falling Away" prophesied:

"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition;"

This Patriot gospel is false.

"Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.

The form of Godliness is that American Christian Conservative Patriotism must save us, and the truth is that the power denied must come from Jesus’ sacrifice and Resurrection alone, not a vote or a political crusade.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrrilisss (), on: 2012/7/11 13:30
Hi BrotherTom,

Those are good points. However, please remember that men like that and fringe elements do not reflect the views and attitudes of everyone. It would be like judging SermonIndex by a few individuals who might share an agreement on a particular matter and voice it on this website.

By the way, the website that you referred to is run by a pro-homosexual, pro-abortion, and extremely Liberal group known as "People for the American Way. " The website is dedicated to "monitoring and reporting on the activities of right-wing political organizations."

And, of course, if you visit the PFTAW website, you will learn just what groups -- especially churches -- that they consider "right-wing." These include any churches that preach that abortion or homosexuality is sinful.

Re: , on: 2012/7/11 13:30
Well Chris, fair enough. You have the opportunity to respond to the author directly with the many criticisms you have voiced here but you choose not to. Hmmm......bro Frank

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrrilisss (), on: 2012/7/11 13:38
Hi Frank,

I have simply responded on this website to the author’s words that were posted on this website.

It is no different than responding to something that Zac Poonen or some other preacher said in a message that is posted or included here. In the past (as you reminded me), I have encouraged individuals to contact firsthand sources whenever possible. However, this was to validate information or substantiate the truth about what was actually said/stated/written rather than relying on mere secondhand published reports. In this case, I don’t think that there is a question as to what Brother Andrew wrote. I am simply responding to what Brother Andrew wrote.
I will pray about finding his website and responding to it. However, since I am not a member of his website (nor can I recall having ever visited it), I haven't felt the need or an inclination to do so.

**rethinking......;), on: 2012/7/11 14:17**

Ccchhhrrriissss wrote:
"Hi BrotherTom,
Those are good points. However, please remember that men like that and fringe elements do not reflect the views and attitudes of everyone."

Thank-you Chris: I wanted to make that clear when I wrote about generalizations below. It's like saying that the Democrats are all wicked anti-family Commies! ;)

I was aware that this was not a Christian website, and anti-Romney, but just culled the facts relevant.

I wrote:
"The issue I might have with this article, is a penchant for generalizations, and "THE CHALLENGE is LAID DOWN " mentality. ...., but I do think it relevant, as we are living it out today."

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2012/7/11 14:36**

Well said, Chris. I agree with your philosophy on this issue.

**QUOTE:**

"One local Liberation Theology pastor mentioned that he believed that Americans should be taxed at 10% -- a "tithe" -- so the government could fulfill the church's role and that they would no longer have to "tithe" to the local church because of it"

Some thinkers have said that it is this very thing that has hurt, damaged the church in its ministrations to the poor.

The gov's job was never to financially support the poor. This job belonged to the people who did it voluntarily.

Under the OT law farmers were not to glean the corners of their fields - they were to leave it for the poor to harvest. Also, anything that fell during harvesting was to be left for the poor. This is a fine principle to assist the poor. They work for it and appreciate what they get unlike handouts today that promotes more greed and laziness.

The early church helped the poor. The women went from house to house to nurse the sick. It was the church that educated the children, not secular society - these rich hired tutors to do this job. The church was not as selective.

Anyways, the gov through taxation has robbed the church of its ability to serve the poor in this country and in the process has imbibed its philosophy in how to assist the poor. Too many resort to handouts that result in dependency on his victims. Likely easier this way, ya reckon?

Tragic how money has perverted Biblical humanitarianism..

(BTW, I highly recommend the book "Under the Influence - How Christianity Transformed Civilization" by Alvin J. Schmid t.)

ginnyrose
Re: , on: 2012/7/11 15:36

Hi Chris, in the past you have encouraged others to contact the source in order to gain clarity as to their views. Consistancy demands that you now follow your own advice brother. You can find Andrew here and tell him about your assertions here on SI and then he can respond to them and give clarity to the things you have written about him http://www.johnthebaptisttv.com/ I look forward to seeing your conversation with him, perhaps he can tell you how he came about his conclusions and you can tell him about your own research into the Tea Party and the people that you know personally.......... bro Frank

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2012/7/11 16:07

Frank,

This is the third time that I have tried to explain the difference between my encouragement of others to contact sources in other topics and what I have done in this particular topic.

In topics where individuals have raised an allegation about a person, I have suggested that they contact that person for clarity.

For instance, someone on SermonIndex (who is no longer here) once claimed that the original NIV had a homosexual woman on the translation committee. This claim was made with the evidence coming from a couple of websites that all quoted the same book as a "source." So, I actually contacted that woman in question. This woman responded via email and clarified that she was NOT a translator for the NIV, was not a practicing homosexual at the time that the translation was being created and had no influence in the translation or language or wording of the NIV. She was simply consulted on a few occasions in regard to English grammar usage. This was in contrast to the claims of the one book that many websites, periodicals and other books cited as "evidence" of homosexual influence in the NIV. The person who made the claim here on SermonIndex was using those secondhand "sources" and repeating it as if it were true. However, the truth was very different than the books suggested.

Many of the other claims that were made by this brother caused me to contact the company that produced the NIV, the translators and other Bible language experts for clarification when they were on the receiving end of accusations. Ultimately, the accusations that were mostly taken from "sources" that quoted one another ended up being either embellishments or simply out-and-out lies. The company that produced the NIV in 1978 even felt led to print a document that answered the myths, rumors and lies that were being spread. Yet, the accusations continued with most individuals citing websites, periodicals, tracts or other publications that mostly cited one another rather than any firsthand source with firsthand knowledge of the translation or its translators.

In this situation, I didn't have to go to Brother Andrew because this was already a firsthand article that he wrote. I don't have to check, validate or verify that this is what he wrote because he signed it. These are his assertions...which were posted as an article on this website...and I simply responded to some of what he wrote.

Like I said, I will pray about approaching him on his own website. I have no motive to take up his "challenge" and "prove" him wrong -- particularly if I don't think that he has "proven" anything in the first place in regard to the claims he made in the article. Now, I am interested in how he came about his conclusions regarding the specific wide allegations that he raised (that I mentioned earlier). Since he didn't cite any evidence for those claims, I might ask him what he used to derive those estimations...and why he felt the need to generalize an entire movement/group and the Christians who might share the same concerns.

Like I said earlier, I will pray about whether or not to contact him. However, I did not feel led to do so because I didn't read this on his website and I have no inclination to take up his "challenge." I do think that the burden of proof with claims like this -- as I have said before -- lay with the person who makes such accusations and claims in the first place. In this case, I believe that Brother Andrew levied a series of generalizations about a movement for which he never explained how he arrived to such a wide determination of the group as a whole and then presented an argument that simply rebutted the generalizations that he had presented.

By the way, he is also free to contact me at any time.
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Re: , on: 2012/7/11 17:41
Chris writes.........

"I don't know the extent of Brother Andrew Strom's knowledge of the people who are involved in the Tea Party. I don't kn ow if he has firsthand knowledge or has an opinion that is based upon things that he read in newspapers, online or watc hed on television news." And then goes on to say................

In this case, we should impress believers to seek the Lord before involving themselves in such groups. We should praye rfully and honestly present our issues or concerns -- especially those that aren't based upon rumor, deduction, reports, s tereotypes or assumptions.

Chris, if you do not know the basis of his knowledge on what he wrote, then why say or imply that what he wrote is base d on rumor, deduction, reports, stereotypes or assumptions? Why not just go to the source for clarity rather than express ing your own deductions based on " the people that I know." Time and again you use this and of course it is, as I said, flimsy at best for we do not know who you know Chris. It is very easy to continually say " no one I know thinks this," its eas y to say but it carries no weight. You seem determined not to contact him, that seems very clear, I guess we will just hav e to make deductions as to why you have compelled people over many years to go to the source for clarity, but you your self feel no such compunction. I am not surprised though. This is my last word on this particular subject, it now seems cle ar enough.............bro Frank

Re: - posted by Lotis (), on: 2012/7/11 18:07
Not that I think Chris needs defending, but... He disagrees with Andrew Strom and has explained several times why he d oesn't feel it currently necessary to contact him...and he has presented an example where he has contacted someone to confirm authenticity of a claim, so OBVIOUSLY he isn't afraid to do it when he feels its needed. I don't post here often, b ut I have found very often Chris posts some of the most clear, concise and thorough posts. He hasn't damaged Andrew' s character or tried to deface him in any way, he simply disagrees and has presented his reasons why. In all love and gr ace: quit bustin' his chops will you?

Both "sides" of this particular discussion have great points, and together I think they form the truth. The Tea Party isn't in herently Christian, but its not inherently anti-christ either, so, what is there to discuss?

Re: - posted by cccchhhrrriiss (), on: 2012/7/11 18:19
Hi Frank,

Quote:
----------------------------------
Chris, if you do not know the basis of his knowledge on what he wrote, then why say or imply that what he wrote is based on rumor, deduction, reports, stereotypes or assumptions? Why not just go to the source for clarity rather than expressing your own deductions based on " the people that I know."
----------------------------------

As I said, I already know the extent of his claims...and that he fell into the fallacy of "generalizing" a group based upon w hatever conclusion he made of others. Obviously, many people do not fit into the mold that he presented in his first clai m. Also, his presentation of the reasons is based upon A.) The generalized assumptions that he made; and, B.) Conclu sions that don't take into account what the varying opinions of individuals within the group or those believers who share t hem.

I think that Brother Andrew stated his position clearly enough (enough to write an article about it with his own words) to t he point that I didn't feel that I needed further clarity. After all, I am not attacking Brother Andrew. I am simply respondin g to this specific set of words, claims and allegations raised within the article itself.

Quote:
----------------------------------
Time and again you use this and of course it is, as I said, flimsy at best for we do not know who you know Chris. It is very easy to continually say " no one I know thinks this," its easy to say but it carries no weight. You seem determined not to contact him, that seems very clear, I guess we will just hav e to make deductions as to why you have compelled people over many years to go to the source for clarity, but you yourself feel no such compunction.
----------------------------------
Brother, I don't think that I can make it any more clear than I already have. Moreover, I did not see you asking for evidence, citations or proof to validate Brother Andrew's generalizations in the first place. Rather, you simply said, "Amen" to it and questioned me for questioning his claims (and claiming that I was "attacking" him by doing so).

As I said, there is no question about what Brother Andrew said on the subject. There is no question that he did, indeed, write this piece. And, there is no question in my mind that he generalized a group (and those who share its concerns) through his points. In addition, I have said several times that the burden of proof should be with the person who made the initial allegation. In this case, Brother Andrew staked his claims without any proof. Why is it that you demand that I find it...or call my words "flimsy" excuse for not feeling the need to contact him on his website about something that he undoubtedly wrote that was posted here?

Quote:

I am not surprised though. This is my last word on this particular subject, it now seems clear enough..........bro Frank

Unfortunately, I don't think that you are seeing this "clear enough" because you are repeating the same things over and over again despite my attempts at explanation for your concerns. No matter how many times that I have tried to clarify his, it doesn't seem to help. The primer that I used in the past -- to seek firsthand clarity in regard to allegations -- is not pressing here because we ALREADY have his firsthand account via the article that he wrote. And, as I said, I am not interested in taking up the "challenge" that he wrote. I explained my points HERE on this website and have no desire to repeat myself on HIS website.

I understand that you believe that Brother Andrew "makes many good points in his piece." I have no problem with that. However, I disagree with some of what he wrote and I endeavored to clearly explain why. Yet you attempted to dissect my reasoning -- questioning the extent of my own knowledge and experience in this matter -- but didn't extend the same "caution" for the claims of the man for whose article that I was responding.

Let me be clear: I agree with the underlying words of caution that Brother Andrew presented. I simply disagree with the generalization of an entire group (and those who share the same concerns) based upon unmentioned evidence for his rationale and then a conclusion that was based upon the generalization. If there are people who are like the ones that he describes (save for the flawed policy analysis that he briefly skirted over), then they should heed to his overall advice and turn their eyes to the Lord as we should all be doing anyway.

However, if his generalizations are based upon nothing more than rumor, skewed media reports, over-generalizations or popular sentiment, then he his conclusion about the Tea Party and those who share their concern on issues of abortion, homosexuality, health care, overextended welfare entitlements, deficit spending, etc... as a whole is also skewed.

I may visit his website and attempt to speak with him. However, I do not feel compelled to do it for clarity's sake -- as I have urged in other issues based upon secondhand sources -- because we know that this was his own firsthand words.

Re: , on: 2012/7/11 18:32

this is a very creepy thread.

Re: - posted by Matthew2323 (), on: 2012/7/11 23:24

Quote: "this is a very creepy thread."

Then why read it and post to it?
kingdom vs kingdom - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/7/11 23:45

History seems to prove, That when christians become political they often seem to become the worst enemy that the Kingdom Christians have.

Re: kingdom vs kingdom, on: 2012/7/13 17:49

"History seems to prove, That when Christians become political they often seem to become the worst enemies that the Kingdom Christians have." ProudPapa

Well said ProudPapa. It is such a dutiful temptation though, and it is inspiring to control your own society and to feel like you can righteously contribute to the right thing. Most religious activity makes men feel real good about themselves; it is called self-righteousness.

"Unless the Lord builds the house, They labor in vain who build it; Unless the Lord guards the city, and The watchman stays awake in vain"

I am not saying that we must avoid politics altogether, but that our first priority is God's Kingdom, just like you said. If we reverse this attitude, then we fall into the idolatry of building and establishing our own Kingdom, which always establishes our own righteousness, and Jesus is then hammered into these ambitions that promotes THE CAUSE as Righteous. It creates a religious spirit.

Paul the Apostle cut through it all:

"And I, brethren, when I came to you, did not come with excellence of speech or of wisdom declaring to you the testimony of God.

For I determined not to know anything among you except Jesus Christ and Him crucified."

When we establish our righteousness, like the Pharisee, we begin to subtly hate everyone who differs.

Then He charged them, saying, Â“Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod.Â”

This is that. The spirit of the leaven of Herod is submitting and depending on political authority to establish your cause. Herod was the king, and without his approval you got no power. The Pharisee feared that unless they murdered Jesus, The Romans would come and remove their place, and their nation, so, they did.

When Christians exalt their political positions above Christ, so do they. They trample on their perceived enemies, while rejoicing in their righteous cause.

If every Christian would focus on politics with this in mind, Christ Crucified, and the cause of Christ in social order, we too would turn the world upside down. It was not who did, or who did not get in office who mattered to the early church. They understood who the King was, is, and will be in power, and they acted that way.

Re: Brothertom - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/7/13 22:53

Hi Brothertom, wouderful addition to my thoughts.