

General Topics :: Agendas

Agendas - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/9/8 14:43

Calvinism, politics and nonresistance. Has anyone else noticed an unhealthy tendency as of late to use these forums as a launching pad for personal agenda? We are very close to the Revival Conference -- it is right behind the corner, as a matter of fact -- but you sure can't tell from the topics in these forums. I think at one time yesterday I logged on and saw four different Calvinism threads and three dedicated to nonresistance propaganda and politics alone.

O brethren, it grieves my heart to log on and see the obvious. I write this post with fear, as I really hoped someone else would have stepped up by now. Dear brethren, this is not good, and I would exhort us again to gird up the loins of our minds and see what is happening in our midst. There are much weightier things to discuss than the same transient drivel that contaminates just about every other Christian forum on the internet. These topics can actually be toxic when they flow in at disproportionate rates, and they've killed many a forum on the internet. But SermonIndex is to be different and peculiar! Please, in God's Name, let us "rise up and go" (Mark 14:42) and head out to deeper, cleaner waters.

Brother Paul

Re: Agendas - posted by BrokenOne (), on: 2007/9/8 14:50

Amen Brother Paul. Thank you for saying this.

Re: Agendas - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/9/8 15:05

Rightly said and also duly noted. Attempted somewhat in a rather longwinded post towards some of it ...

Have grown weary of this combatant style 'ministry' that is being touted out and brought into this fellowship.

Quote:
 -----SermonIndex is to be different and peculiar! Please, in God's Name, let us "rise up and go" (Mark 14:42) and head out to deeper waters.

Indeed, and once again find that displeasurable duty to have to try and moderate those who do have a penchant for causing strife and doting about with barbs and unnecessary comments, careless in words and topics, little consideration for others and indeed bringing in these agendas or missions they might be on.

If you are new and are used to other forums and these types of things are normal fare there, they do not work here. We have a mission here and that is towards edification and conduct and charity amongst others within these bounds.

Please read the disclaimer at the bottom of this post.

Thank you brother.

Re: Agendas - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/9/8 15:12

moving on to bigger better things.....

Re: Agendas, on: 2007/9/8 15:18

What I'm feeling is stymied.
 I love the Scripture and doctrine section, but finding endless contentions over Calvinism vs Whatever leaves little room to discuss much else.
 I appreciate that this Website carries Authors of both views and not one sided as some Sites are.
 This particular debate has persisted since the beginning and how are we, the non-scholars - to force our view to either side a possibility ?

General Topics :: Agendas

"Agenda" is a word I wouldn't use in a Christian circle though, because the word itself brings "division" - but to render it a s that some may be needlessly over-zealous in one particular view, may help to bring solution without accusation and th us work more toward the desired unity that may be being sought.

Pointing out a non-balance in a fellowship type gathering is a delicate subject.

The timid may be put to fear as to what they can speak of, the sensitive may feel they are part of an "agenda" if they've posted to one of these subjects and God only knows the heart of those in His Body that post here.

To even say "excess" must be done cautiously.

I believe that when an entire section of a Board is taken over with one subject - then yes, you do have some overtly over-zealous subjects.

Thank you for the open venue to express ourselves, within sensitive and considerate levels.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/9/8 15:28

Quote:

-----We have a mission here and that is towards edification and conduct and charity amongst others within these bounds.

Thanks for backing me, brother.

We don't realize it, but topics such as these generate a truckload of strife between the brethren, and the flux of such topics always seem to come into our midst privily. If unheeded, they balloon into what is currently happening in the forum. This is no accident by the enemy. The Revival Conference is coming soon, and many who are currently reading/participating in these squabbles will go to the meetings. Some of them will consequently go to the SI conference with bruised consciences, still having contention with another brother or sister from these discussions. There will be no joy at the prospect of meeting, but instead there will be chips on the shoulders.

I don't expect everyone to see this, or even agree with me, but such things are true and can be used contrary to the cause of Christ. This is a critical time when everyone needs to be of "one mind" and "speak the same" and I fear many can enter into this conference disunified...especially if the tenor of the forum remains the same up until October. Even those who choose not to participate in these divisive threads are somehow indirectly affected, as these themes seem to be present at almost any given time one logs on.

Brother Paul

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/9/8 15:34

Quote:

-----"Agenda" is a word I wouldn't use in a Christian circle though, because the word itself brings "division"

Whether or not the word brings division is moot; division is already here because of it. Anytime a person logs onto the forum to expressly propagate an overly controversial topic, such a believer can be said to have an "agenda" -- especially if such has been expressed multiple times to the chagrin of other believers.

(edit) Agendas don't always have to be negative, by the way.

Brother Paul ;-)

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2007/9/8 15:46

Thanks, Brother PaulWest!

Good point! Sadly, I sometimes get caught up into a discussion when the "other side" of the agenda isn't realized, or if I feel that the facts are purposely (or inadvertently) missing. Thanks for bringing this up!

:-)

Re: - posted by PaulWest () , on: 2007/9/8 16:00

Quote:

-----Thanks for bringing this up!

You're welcome. I have an "agenda" too. My "agenda" is to post the products of my quiet time meditations with Jesus. If people told me that my sectarian meditations were becoming a hinderance and an instrument of separation to the Body of Christ, and I selfishly continued to post them, my "good agenda" would then become a "divisive agenda" as I now have knowledge of the unneeded division my meditations are bringing. I suppose it is true that the overly zealous believer may enter into this realm unknowingly, and this can be due to lack of wisdom and discernment. In any case, this thread was created to address such.

Brethren, we should all have agendas, but I say take special heed to your motives propelling them. Even "good" things, such as reformed theology and Biblical nonresistance, when incessantly forced to other believers, can become noxious.

Brother Paul

Re: - posted by hmmhmm () , on: 2007/9/8 16:07

I too get "sucked in" to some threads, but I am thankful for those who flash the redlight, I just read again this sermon by T.A Sparks, and this little out take stood out to me and just spoke so much to me, and bro Paul you spoke about the conference and so on, this just fitted to me in here so I post it here or an excerpt from it.

"Well, all this constituted this crisis of whether they were going to choose this or that, the one or the other. Go back to something earthly from the heavenly, to something tangible from the spiritual, to something temporal from the eternal, something visible from the invisible. And it is quite evident I think, in this letter before you're through, that a division was coming about between these believers. They were dividing into two camps. That is the point of the exhortation "forsaking not the assembling of ourselves together as the manner of some is". Some were saying, "We're not going on with that any further" and they were having their own meetings and their own circle and not going on, not going on in this way. A division was taking place; two companies. Here were those who had seen the heavenly calling and the heavenly vision and were going on with it; here were those who, if they had seen it, were letting it go, were drifting away from it. And what a forceful word that is! It has a nautical meaning in the original, as you know. It's the picture of a ship approaching its moorings on the current and missing its moorings and drifting away and onto the rocks. Lest we come up to this and miss it and drift away and as Israel at Kadesh Barnea were wrecked, we should be wrecked. It's a warning, it's an exhortation."

(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id19453&forum34) Let us go on by T.A Sparks

General Topics :: Agendas

Re: For the sake of Unity., on: 2007/9/8 16:20

Hello Brother Paul, I only dread the thought of using that word "agenda" because it describes or implies "the intents of the heart" that Only God knows.

Over-Zealousness is certainly what I see and feel it is not contributing whatsoever to the desired unity and the first goal of Seeking HIM for HIMSELF FIRST and encouraging one another to make Him our focal point and our only answer to any question pertaining to building up the Saints.

I would love to see more threads that focus on the Person of Christ Jesus - very much so.

And yes, the thought of you all meeting next month has also crossed my mind.
How can those who have split within the Body over certain differences now join in a peaceful spirit?

If a subject has taken more than three threads on one Section of a board and that's a moderate count, then there is schism present - yet I would not want to judge another's "heart" to say this or that person has an "agenda".
Credenda possibly as webster's defines:

Quote:
-----Credenda
CREDENDA, n. In theology, things to be believed; articles of faith; distinguished from agenda, or practical duties.

Agenda to me is more equivalent to prevaricate.

From Webster's again.

Quote:
-----Prevaricate
PREVAR'ICATE, v.i.
1. To shuffle; to quibble; to shift or turn from one side to the other, from the direct course or from truth; to play foul play.
eg. "I would think better of himself, than that he would willfully prevaricate."
2. In the civil law, to collude; as where an informer colludes with the defendant, and makes a sham prosecution.
3. In English law, to undertake a thing falsely and deceitfully, with the purpose of defeating or destroying it.
PREVAR'ICATE, v.t. To pervert; to corrupt; to evade by a quibble.

I suppose it is just the accusatory tone of such words that are directed at the person themselves rather than the 'action' of them.

Our main purpose is to build one another up in the Most Holy Faith - and that can be done by just doing it.

Appreciate you taking the time to attempt to take all due caution and precautions necessary to get us back on His Purpose in our lives and lives together as the corporate Body of Christ.
Engendering Peace at all costs.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/9/8 16:38

Quote:
-----I only dread the thought of using that word "agenda" because it describes or implies "the intents of the heart" that Only God knows.

Brother, not according to the Latin. This was not the purpose I had in mind when I used this word. Agenda is better defin

ed as personal action for a preconceived cause, the cause being evident by the action.

Quote:

-----I would not want to judge another's "heart" to say this or that person has an "agenda".

Neither would I, brother. I am sorry if you think I am judging hearts here in the forum; I assure you I am not, but I *am* observing patterns and calling out what I see as unhealthy. Is this wrong? This is more or less along the same lines of Paul asking: "are ye not carnal" to the "I am of Paul" and "I am of Apollos" Corinthian church crowd. He observed agendas.

But, brother, we seem to differ on the definition of "agenda", and it may be that you are trying to make "agenda" have a purely negative connotation which I don't think it has. I did not say "creedenda" or "prevaricate", and I really don't know why you linked those words. They are not semantically related to the Latin word *aggendum*. Why didn't you just simply look up the word "agenda"? Webster's states this:

Agenda - a program of things to be done; *specif.*, a list of things to be dealt with at a meeting.

The infinitive root for "agenda" is *agere*, which is Latin for "to act".

Quote:

-----Agenda to me is more equivalent to prevaricate

Interesting. How so? *Prevaricare* means literally "to walk crookedly", whereas *agere* simply means "to act". These are two separate roots. I don't see any implicit connotations of "crookedness" or "straddle" or even "evade the truth" in the verb *agere*...but now we're getting technical. Word origins have long been a fascination of mine, so I would be delighted to uncontentiously hatch this out with you if you like.

Brother Paul

Re: - posted by pastorfrin, on: 2007/9/8 16:51

Brother Paul,

Why not make a list of the topics the Lord has given you as appropriate to be discussed on this forum. ;-) I'm joking brother this is not an attack.

Quote:

-----Brethren, we should all have agendas, but I say take special heed to your motives propelling them. Even "good" things, such as reformed theology and Biblical nonresistance, when incessantly forced to other believers, can become noxious.

Brother, does your computer have a mouse in which you can click on a topic or are you forced by some unforeseen force to read every post. When we begin to tell others what their motives are and what spirit they are posting in, then are we not making ourselves the judge of all others. Should we all post devotionals, as I often do? What about the gospel, should we leave it out because some may be offended by it? The name of Jesus is no longer politically correct, and cannot even be used in the Presidents prayer breakfast; Should we cease to use the name of Jesus?

How many different dominations and doctrines do you think will be in attendance at the revival conference? Is this not an agenda possibly ripe for division? Do we cancel it, because it is possible, of course not, we pray for the unity only the Lord can bring by His Spirit.

You see Brother Paul, the Holy Spirit is the one who brings unity and without Him fully controlling our lives through the Word of God there is no unity, even among Christians.

When we all come together and agree completely on everything, it will be for one of two reasons; 1. We have been called

d to forever be with the Lord, or 2. We have compromised our faith in Jesus Christ and have completely given over to the beast.

Yes, we must be considerate to the feelings of others, but at the same time we must speak the truth God has placed on our hearts, in love.

Let us not be found compromising the Word of God, for the cause of unity.

Ephes. 4:13

Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ:

Is this not what we are all seeking?

In His Love
pastorfrin :-)

Re: Agendas, on: 2007/9/8 16:52

Hello brother Paul,

I'm in agreement with your concern in posting this thread, and am glad of the opportunity to say amen. The word 'unity' has been coming to me, and something of how much more God may be able to do in us and with us, if we are united.

At the same time, having been a person with heels dug in for a long time, to receive something personal from the Lord, perhaps it's ironic that I'm now aware of how out of synch we may be with the Spirit sometimes.

But this is not to say that the Spirit is not moving, to bring us together in the name of Jesus.

There is also the possibility that we interpret words like 'unity' and 'agreement' to mean *unison* and *uniformity*. These may have their place at times, and in certain aspects of seeking to be like Jesus in this world.

But, as an example, my feet are in agreement with my eyes, when I move away from a danger I've spotted, without either of them changing their natural function and purpose. And if I get grit in my eye, then my eye is in agreement with my finger to try to remove the grit. In fact, there'd be a bigger dysfunction in the end, if my hands didn't come to the rescue of my distressed eye... So, how do we get - the eye, the feet, the hand - all focusing on the Lord's will?

Turning to your point about the advent of the revival conference, I was very taken with a quote posted by freedbyjc in the Devotional Thoughts forum (Revival on our Terms - TOZER) in which Tozer puts this perspective on some people's proclaimed desire for 'revival':

Our mistake is that we want God to send revival on our terms. We want to get the power of God into our hands, to call it to us that it may work for us in promoting and furthering **our kind of Christianity**. We want still to be in charge, guiding the chariot through the religious sky in the direction we want it to go, shouting "Glory to God," it is true, but modestly accepting a share of the glory for ourselves in a nice inoffensive sort of way. We are calling on God to send fire on our altars, completely ignoring the fact that they are our altars and not God's.

I thought he'd picked up on something which the individual believer may not be in a position to notice, but, we do well to examine our motives.

Now, I'm aware in posting the next comment, that y'all may think I'm not aware this may look like me posting *my* agenda, namely yet another hymn. But this is sixteen lines of spiritual poetry you will never regret taking to heart, and to which I discovered a great tune last night, which I haven't been able to find anywhere else on the internet.

This tune really is worth taking on board as well, as an ally to the directing of the heart and mind and soul and strength to be given 100% to God. The whole thrust of it is a heart-to-heart invitation to God to take up the life of the singer and d

o what He wants. I've sung it many times, and I believe I've prayed the words most sincerely in the singing. Now, I hope some of you will let the words and music do their work to move you in *whatever* way the Lord desires. God bless you! I hope you don't mind this invitation... :-)

O Thou Who camest from above,
The pure celestial fire to impart,
Kindle a flame of sacred love
Upon the mean altar of my heart.

There let it for Thy glory burn
With inextinguishable blaze,
And trembling to its source return,
In humble prayer and fervent praise.

Jesus, confirm my heart's desire
To work and speak and think for Thee;
Still let me guard the holy fire,
And still stir up Thy gift in me.

Ready for all Thy perfect will,
My acts of faith and love repeat,
Till death Thine endless mercies seal,
And make my sacrifice complete.

Tune: Wilton

(<http://www.hymns-organ.com/Music.php?P1&M1176348511&S419&U1176348511>) <http://www.hymns-organ.com/Music.php?P=1&M=1176348511&S=419&U=1176348511>

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/9/8 17:00

Quote:
-----Yes, we must be considerate to the feelings of others, but at the same time we must speak the truth God has placed on our hearts, in love.

Duly noted, good brother. Let it only be said that this post was never about dictating what others should or shouldn't post, and it certainly wasn't about stifling the offense of the gospel. This was rather about using wisdom concerning the things that *can* stifle the gospel.

Your post is well taken, brother.

Brother Paul

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2007/9/8 17:33

Hello...

Quote:
-----Yes, we must be considerate to the feelings of others, but at the same time we must speak the truth God has placed on our hearts, in love.

But isn't this the cause of all of the strife here? One person believes that they are speaking "the truth God has placed" in one's heart -- while others disagree. Some people make it their "agenda" to convert the "misguided" believers here at SermonIndex to the "truth" that God has "shown" them. Wouldn't it be better if we simply discussed issues without applying opinions as fact while still allowing people to make up their own minds on a matter?

I suppose that clarity of the purpose of SermonIndex forums would suffice in this. The forums are not meant to be a forum in which we proselytize for converts to our own particular beliefs or views, but a place for the free discussion of such things.

things that would make us closer to the Lord.

We can argue for months on topics like whether the "rapture" will take place before, during or after the time of "tribulation ." We can even discuss why we believe one way or another. But is it always necessary to coerce one group into our own beliefs?

The cause of strife isn't the discussion of controversial subjects. Rather, it seems to be the disrespect for the opinions of others regarding those subjects. One of my "pet peeves" here is when a brother or sister makes a statement or claim that is based upon an assumption, but introduces it into the forum as if it were a fact that should and must be recognized by all. We need to be careful when introducing statements as "fact" that are merely assumptions based upon opinion.

We also need to be mindful that disagreements about all sorts of matters will continue until we all are made perfect and no longer see behind a veil of our flawed humanity and logic.

:-)

Re: Agendas - posted by HopeInChrist, on: 2007/9/8 18:04

I agree Paul. Especially as of late, I feel like I'm digging through a bunch of mud to get to the jewels here.

HopeInChrist

Re: - posted by hulsej (), on: 2007/9/8 18:43

Yes it's disheartening to see on a site dedicated to revival good men and women sink to such arguments as though the other side is lost and out of the grace of God.

Discussion is fine and can be profitable but to raise to rhetoric of Calvinism Vs Arminianism to one of proselytizing is unalled for. I don't mind someone talking about the finer points of either system of theology, but to say I have to be just like you is dangerously close to being equal to telling me I have to be circumcised.

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/9/8 19:38

Quote:
-----The cause of strife isn't the discussion of controversial subjects. Rather, it seems to be the disrespect for the opinions of others regarding those subjects.

This is a good point to consider. I've had my views altered...that is to say corrected, many many times in the few years I've been here...so thank the Lord for disagreements.

Yet, truth conveyed in diatribes and condemnations sends out conflicting signals. We all remember Job's friends spoke enough truth to write a best-selling Christian book, but they had to ask Job's forgiveness just the same. I suppose we need the right Spirit as much as we need the right argument.

For instance, consider the irony of a Calvinist wanting to prove 'election' by arm twisting...or a non-resistor wanting to eliminate all resistance to their point of view.

I am full of such irony myself, so I am embarrassingly familiar with how such logs in our eyes go unseen. How does Jesus, who sees all of my wretched heart, love me without reserve and irony...while I, who sees very little of the true heart of my brothers, often loves with reserved irony? Is it because I am contaminated with irony? I offer peace but only according to my unconditional terms of surrender...I offer grace but only according to my strict legal code?

Truth is worth fighting for, no doubt. But so is each other! Somehow the brother we love must become as important as the idea we love...without compromise in either arena. (I've noticed Zac Poonen and Kieth Daniels are wonderful examples in this aspect.)

Blessings fellow lobbyists!:-)

MC

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/9/8 19:46

Quote:

-----Somehow the brother we love must become as important as the idea we love....without compromise in either arena

Excellent post, Mike (as usual). There is so much Biblical reality in that one-sentenced quote that it is staggering. Worthy of meditation.

Brother Paul

Re: Agendas - posted by HopeinChrist, on: 2007/9/9 8:21

post removed

**Moderator note:* Due to moderator confusion, a subsequent post was asked to be moved here but this moderator failed to recognize that it was addressing a different aspect, it can be found here;

(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id19457&forum35#151888) Speaking of Agendas

Mike