

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Jesus and his teaching accentuate the end of all killing!!!!****Jesus and his teaching accentuate the end of all killing!!!! - posted by Mangan (), on: 2008/3/1 10:59**

Hi I got a few questions that I wish to have answered:-?.

- i. Is Jesus for war against nations?
- ii. Is Jesus for defendng your country and in that you have to kill people?
- iii. Is Jesus for retaliation against earthly enemies?

a. I find no indications in NT that Jesus is for either the national state or anything like that. His new and regenerated people seems to be constituted of all races and of all ethnical groups i.e. one people of many in Him.

b. I found no indications in NT that a born-again and a follower of Christ should "enlist in the army".

c. If all the people of the world is a potential christian - a brother and a sister; then we can under no circumstances as Christians kill (even if Mr Bush or other leaders says so because it has no new testamental passage to support such).

Well what is your opinion??? Personally and according to my inner voice I believe that God in light of Christ is against all killing period; - even in terms of capital punishment because Satan is the author of death not God.

Therefore for me Jesus is the first pacifist and we as his followers are obligated to follow him in that manner as well.

Sincerely Magnus

:-D

Re: Jesus and his teaching accentuate the end of all killing!!!! - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2008/3/1 11:14

Magnus,

Have you checked out the thread on "Let's Talk about Peace" on the "General Topics" forum? This thread deals with this issue. There is enough reading there to keep you busy for a long time.

Blessings,
ginnyrose

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2008/3/1 11:22

Thanks ginnyrose! I did not know that. I will check it out.

Sincerely Magnus :-)

Re: Jesus and his teaching accentuate the end of all killing!!!! - posted by Tears_of_joy, on: 2008/3/1 11:49

Here is the link:

(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id15338&forum35&281) We Need to Talk About Peace

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2008/3/1 11:56

Thanks for the link!

This is an urgent question for me - a burden.

Noone benefits from war.

Sincerely Magnus :-D

Re: Jesus and his teaching accentuate the end of all killing!!!! - posted by rowdy2 (), on: 2008/3/2 12:03

Reply to Mangan

Here is a link hot off the press.

I carried weapons in defense of the innocent for nearly twenty five years. I would not think twice today in killing to protect the innocent. Your biases are showing when you take positions in defense of mass murders that declared war on the civilians of America.

Why is America hated in the world? Our government knows but is unwilling to offend other western governments by calling them welfare dependants who depended on us for protection for all the last century. Granted we received strategic benefit. Now that the threat of the Soviet Union has passed for the moment we are despised and belittled in our efforts to defend our selves and others by those that take a holier than thou attitude while their young people shirk their duty and scoff at our young men and women sacrifice. Europe has thrown out the basic laws that underpins civilization that say if you harm one of us then you have harmed us all. The strong will defend the weak and the helpless and our God judge between us.

Eddie

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/3/2 13:12

Hi Magnus...

Quote:

-----Noone benefits from war.

No one?

The Jews who were rescued from concentration camps might argue that they benefited from the outcome of World War I. Former slaves might argue that they benefited from the outcome of the Civil War. Americans might argue that they benefited from the outcome of the Revolutionary War. South Koreans might argue that they benefited from the Korean War. Israelis might argue that they benefited from the Six Day War. Kuwaitis might argue that they benefited from the first War in Iraq.

Who benefited from a *lack of participation* in war? The North Vietnamese communists who quickly conquered South Vietnam following the pull out of US troops. The Germans during both WW1 and WW2 before US participation. The Soviet Empire before the US voiced opposition to Soviet communist aggression. Al Qaeda enjoyed growth during the 1990s when little was done to stop the growth of their terrorist organization.

The question is not whether or not war can produce benefits. Obviously, the world that we live in -- including the preservation of freedoms -- has been shaped by war. The fact that we can enjoy freedom of the press and write these posts is possibly due to the victory of the West over forced communist aggression from the Cold War. There are believers in North Korea who are still killed for their faith. I can't help but wonder if the outcome would have been different if MacArthur had been allowed to win in Korea.

:-)

*EDIT:

Was Jesus ever in favor of war? Did the Lord ever favor war? If we look through the Old Testament, did God ever instruct a nation to go to war?

Re: Does Jesus Hate All Killing? - posted by 21stCPuritan, on: 2008/3/2 14:28

First, if we are to answer the question if Jesus is against all killing, we must go to the scriptures.

All Governments are in Authority according to God's Will: Romans 13:1-7 and have the power to protect themselves THOUGH KILLING if needs be!

Romans 13:3 For rulers hold no terror for those who do right, but for those who do wrong. Do you want to be free from fear of the one in authority? Then do what is right and he will commend you. 4 For he is God's servant to do you good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not BEAR THE SWORD FOR NOTHING. He is God's servant, an agent of wrath to bring punishment on the wrongdoer. So I see no prohibition of any Christian joining the army, or killing enemies when ordered to by GOD-ordained authority. It is not a clear command so do not twist scripture by saying Christians can't and shouldn't join the Army, show me the scripture that says it.

I also remember several Scriptures from the Old Testament.

"Those who live by the sword shall die by the sword," and "Whoever sheds man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."

So God-ordained Governments as an agent of wrath have the right and duty to protect its citizens, through war if need be, and even from other citizens. I also remember Israel being ordered to kill all the inhabitants of the Land, leaving none alive! Men, Women, and Children! God Commanded it! They did not have a choice, and all men age 20 and up were in the Army regardless, that is the purpose of numbering the people - the numbers are men who could go to war!

Also Death was not from Satan, but a punishment from GOD for Sin Romans 6:23 "For the Wages of SIN is Death,..." We all think that Everything evil comes from Satan, it doesn't, we are fallen, evil people unless acted upon by grace, even Christ called us evil "If you being evil know how to give good gifts..." So even death itself is ordained by God!

The Commandment is NOT "Thou shalt not kill", but "THOU SHALT NOT COMMIT MURDER." A big difference. Cities of refuge were set up in the Old Testament exactly for the purpose that you may accidentally kill someone. Murder is an act in anger (anger in the heart also being murder), whereas a child may run out into the street and I can not stop the car in time not to hit and accidentally kill them. I didn't plan on it, but it happened, it may or may not have been my fault.

Be careful not to twist the words of Christ, especially since THE WHOLE BIBLE is the WORD OF GOD.

In conclusion:

We as Christians are called to Love our neighbors and our enemies. I am called to love my Wife as Christ loved the Church - even laying down my life. This means that if someone is in my house doing harm to my wife, I must do anything and everything to protect her, even kill an intruder if I can do no else, even if it mean I die in the process. Governments are authorities given by God to protect its citizens. If the US in WWII would have just let the Japanese invade and take over the country "because we don't believe in war" we would be a Japanese nation, or even a muslim country, or California would belong to Mexico.

Murder is what God hates. Killing is sometimes necessary and unavoidable, does that mean Jesus hates ALL killing? I will not know until I see Him in glory!

for now let's just go with what He has said and commanded for us, and not attribute anything to Him that contradicts scripture, or is not written!

SIDEBAR: This post is not intended to demean anyone personally, but it is intended to edify through the truth by destroying Speculation. So many today worship a God of their own making. "My God could never do that" and yet if you read scripture plainly and in context God can and will do anything He wants and wills to do. Even if it offends our humanism. Stop claiming the Bible to be the infallible Word of God, and Believe it is The Word of God! To God Be All The Glory!

Re: - posted by pastorfrin, on: 2008/3/2 14:50

If it is true that it is God's will for Christians to fight in wars. Then all Christians should sign up for the military immediately.

If Jesus Christ expected those saved by the washing of His blood to participate in war, He would have made it very clear for them to do so.

Instead, He made it very clear that they are not to.

John 18:36

Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.

Who's kingdom do you belong to and who is your king?

If you wish to follow the Old Testament, then live under all of it.

Read history, what kingdom in this world has ever truly benefited from war?

Rev. 18:1-8

And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies. And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities. Reward her even as she rewarded you, and double unto her double according to her works: in the cup which she hath filled fill to her double. How much she hath glorified herself, and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give her: for she saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.

And it will be utterly destroyed by the Lord.

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2008/3/2 15:07

do we see Jesus carry a sword? does he ever kill anyone? does he ever fight?

if we follow him, if we are his disciples...shouldnt we be like him?

Jesus said if his kingdom was of this world they would fight...

so if you fight for earthly things, it shows what kingdom you belong to.

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2008/3/2 15:17

Wow! This thread is moving by itself even though this topic has been dealt with elsewhere and pretty much all sides covered as well, concerning this hot issue.

Even so. A few words should however be uttered in defense of what I believe to be the will of our Lord and God: Jesus Christ.

i. I consider myself to be a Christian in that I take careful heed to all that my Master has taught me.

*He is the way: We shall walk in the same manner and conduct as he did.

*He is the truth: That means that his words has eternal value especially for every Christian and that we should read all of her scriptures in the light of the Eternal Truth: Jesus himself.

*He is the life: My life shall reflect his life as he lived it in order for me to finally gain the eternal life (after I by His grace h

ave kept the faith and finished the course).

So when my Master teach me to kill my enemy; no wait! To love my enemy - well then killing is out of the question. So when my master tells me to defend the national state with weapon or to prevent an attack by making a preventive war against a presumed enemy (such as Iraq or maybe soon Iran or Putins Russia)well then I see Jesus in my dreams with a machine-gun or riding on a fighter. No wait! I see Jesus asking me: Who is my neighbour and that I should love my neighbour as my self; killing is out of the question.

ii. Jesus has never and will not ever give us the imperative to kill not even in defence. After the incarnation and the teachings of Christ and the life of Christ in which he claims that he has fulfilled the Law, -we are to live by His Law (which is best explained in the Sermon on the Mount) and rather suffer evil than to do evil; rather take the pain then to pay it back in full.

iii. Think about this: How would all the nations of the world react if a Country of considerable size and might just decided not to retaliate any evil done to it??? Confused or what?

iv. "We have to ask ourselves the worn out phrase: What would Jesus do?". "What would Jesus do" in our place. We have a long way to go before we understand what it is to do our Masters will.

v. Is it not enough that God has established an eternal Hell for the ungodly. That makes it urgent for us to bring out the gospel to the nations - Jesus own gospel; not by sword but by the power of the Holy Spirit. If every man is a potential Christian then we cannot go about killing.

"For the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ" Jn 1:17.

Sincerely Magnus :-D

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2008/3/2 15:23

Hi hmmhmm...

To which "kingdom" did the Apostle Paul belong? Was he simply a Christian with no ties to an earthly citizenship? Yet Paul invoked his own earthly citizenship to prevent his flogging in Acts 22:22-29. Would it be proper to suggest that Paul had a dual citizenship?

Of course, our great citizenship is in Heaven. But we still have a responsibility here on Earth as well. Jesus instructed us to "*Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's*" (Matthew 22:21). This could come through taxes (as Jesus instructed), through taking part in a census (as Joseph and Mary did) or through invoking a citizenship and earthly law in order to take the Gospel to rulers.

I've always found it interesting that we never read of Peter instructing Cornelius (the Roman Centurian) to abandon his post (Acts 10). He was a "devout" man who "feared God" who also knew "devout" soldiers. In fact, the Lord spoke to him through a vision saying, "*Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God*" (Acts 10:4). This soldier, onto whom the Holy Spirit fell, was a citizen of Rome. We have no record of Peter telling Cornelius (or any other soldier) to abandon their position -- a position that some suggest could bring them into conflict with the faith.

Is it possible to maintain a citizenship in Heaven while serving God through your citizenship on Earth?

:-)

Re: - posted by hmmhmm () , on: 2008/3/2 15:30

Quote:

ccchhrrriiiss wrote:

Is it possible to maintain a citizenship in Heaven while serving God through your citizenship on Earth?

:-)

with God everything is possible, I know there are accounts in scripture where the Lord also speaks to soldiers and what you mentioned. And he does not say you must do this and that. I guess it is possible.

But i may should have explained some more, but i think if we follow Christ. Should we pick up a gun and start shooting let say communists? from my very limited understanding, its not them who is the enemy. so why if we are truly a follower of Christ should we fight?

Maybe i am just now being impacted by my recent reading of the 1500 anabaptists.... :-(

anyway, I just have some problem with a man with an ak 47 shooting people saying he serves the Lord. Swedish or who ever. It just seem for me not to go well together. But as i said, i have very little knowledge in this subject and have not studied it in depth.... but its just dont sit right with me.

Re:, on: 2008/3/2 15:35

"We have to ask our self the hackneyed: "What would Jesus do" in our place. We have a long way to go before we understand what it is to do our Masters will." Sincerely Magnus

Hackneyed - means - Practiced; accustomed.

Asking oneself, What would Jesus do? Or what would HE do when still in the flesh here, only gets factored in when we "choose" to use that way of reasoning.

Otherwise - I've seen some mocked for using the acronym W.W.J.D.? as if it were a sin to ask oneself. Has it become the "hacked-up" question instead?

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2008/3/2 15:47

Romans 13:1-7 must be read according to its proper context.

Paul is not saying anywhere that a Christian shall carry a sword. No, not a Christian, but the Roman soldier should!

Guys, You have to understand that the Christian movement in the first century formed a subculture. They had only one goal: preach the gospel, and wait for the Lords return when He shall bring about a new heaven and a new earth. The first Christians thought of themselves as belonging to a different Kingdom (which Jesus had explained to the twelve) - much different than any former kingdom include the old Israel. The Kingdom of Jesus is not the kingdom of the earthly David.

Further more: in Rom 13. Paul is just stating the obvious fact that his followers should respect authority because God has established it (and acts through it in a strange way - just as he uses anything) for the sake of spreading the gospel (by means of the augustian peace). This authority that Paul is refering to is not Christian, it is authority of the Roman emperor Nero and his local authorities.

In conclusion: Let the heathen (unaware of its divine appointment or imperative) carry out Gods punitive will in the society. In meantime let us who consider us to be followers of Christ show the world the splendour of the Lord Jesus Christ through the message of peace and love; and let us call all people to repentance, all sinners to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thereby receive eternal life through him.

In christ all men are brothers and sisters.

Sincerely Magnus ;-)

Re., on: 2008/3/2 15:57

I've never been quite sure on this topic; and have been reluctant to get involved in discussion because of this. Also because I respect dear Pastor Frin very much, and hate the thought of disagreeing with him!

To me the answer depends on the question: Does the Lord deal with nations in the same way as Jesus commanded His own disciples, and set us the example?

And, if not, does He deal in the same way with the nations NOW, as He did before Christ came?

His character hasn't changed, but His way of dealing with mankind has.

But in what way and to what extent, and to whom?

We can't argue against warfare from the Ten Commandments, because "thou shalt not kill" uses a word that also means murder. Killing enemies in battle was actually *commanded* by the Lord!

As said in the recent thread on justice and judgement, it may be the *duty* of a public servant to pronounce judgement against a criminal - even maybe the death penalty.

A soldier is a public servant.

John Baptist didn't tell the soldiers who came to him, to get out of the army:

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

The word "do violence" here is nothing to do with fighting in a war, or even, as these soldiers, (and those today in Afganistan, Iraq etc), using military means to govern and keep peace. John was speaking of misuse of power, by bullying civilians:

Strong's says:

1286 διασείω v. From 1223 and 4579; GK 1398; AV translates as "do violence to" once. 1 to shake thoroughly. 2 to make to tremble. 3 to terrify. 4 to agitate. 5 to extort from one by intimidation money or other property.

The question is, have the OT principles of righteous warfare changed? Is the Lord really saying that we should not fight in a war? Is He saying that Christians should only serve in the armed forces as medics or chaplains, or in administration, or other work that involves no actual fighting?

And also: What is He saying about a particular war that our own country is engaged in? Is it a just war in which it is right to fight?

For a Christian who is already in the forces, in combat capacity that is a truly difficult one!

Our government tells us that we are fighting a just war. Perhaps we are? But what does God say?

Very, very difficult. I'm (selfishly) glad this isn't a personal issue for me!

To get things in perspective, even in the just wars that Israel fought in OT times, the wars that the Lord told them to fight, HE did not actually take sides!

I'm fascinated by Joshua's encounter with the "Captain of the Lord's host". Joshua approached Him, thinking He was a soldier like himself, maybe even an enemy spy.

"Friend or foe?!" challenged Joshua (as one does in the army). "No" said the Lord!

What sort of answer is that?!!!

Well, actually the Biblical account goes like this:

Joshua 5: And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and, behold, there stood a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand: and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries? 14 And he said, Nay; but as captain of the host of the LORD am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my lord unto his servant?

The Captain of the Lord's host doesn't take sides, but He may command us to deal with an enemy:

Chapter 6: 2 And the LORD said unto Joshua, See, I have given into thine hand Jericho, and the king thereof, and the mighty men of valour...

...16 And it came to pass at the seventh time, when the priests blew with the trumpets, Joshua said unto the people, Shout; for the LORD hath given you the city.

17 ¶ And the city shall be accursed, even it, and all that are therein, to the LORD: only Rahab the harlot shall live, she and all that are with her in the house, because she hid the messengers that we sent.

There's no easy answer, but these are a few thoughts and Biblical guidelines.

Sorry this is so long.

Love in Him

Jeannette

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2008/3/2 15:58

HE_Reigns, Thanks! According to my swedish-english lexicon (now I realize that it isn't the best one :-P). Thanks for the correction.

I think in my native language and writes in english (which could lead to a lot of grammatical and syntactical errors - just as you discovered. It would be easier for me if you guys understood swedish).

What I meant was:

"We have to ask ourselves the worn out phrase: What would Jesus do".

Sincerely Magnus

Re: - posted by 21stCPuritan, on: 2008/3/2 16:29

I agree with the context, but it must also be taken into today. I do not live in the Roman Empire, and I cannot submit to it. Again, I do not see that I cannot become president, or a senator, or an IRS agent, or mayor, or a King according to the Scriptures. The Bible does not forbid me to carry out such a duty; therefore, it is not wrong, prohibited, or a sin to be in the army, in the senate, or in any place in office. Also to resign myself into thinking that no Christian should ever be in such a position would lead to the fact that all governments are corrupt because they are run by heathens. So yes I believe in context, but I also believe in living application for today because if the Bible is not applicable for today - throw it away we don't need it.

Second Paul is writing after Christ's death and resurrection, and in so doing is setting an ongoing standard until Christ's return whether the government be Roman, American, Canadian or other. I live in the New Covenant, I also live in the world for the time.

The position you put forward would also require the need for the eradication of local police forces as well. In which case, all lawlessness would prevail. The police are sometimes required to kill people.

Next, In Christ all men are brothers and sisters was unclear to me. "All men who are IN CHRIST are brothers" is the true meaning to that statement. If I am outside of Christ I am not a brother, I am an enemy and hater of God. (Romans 8, 1 Corinthians 3) 2nd Corinthians 6:14 "Do not be unequally yoked with non-believers" So how can someone I am to have no

close fellowship with, be my brother? The BOMFOG (Brotherhood of Man, Fatherhood of God) heresy is a lie taught by Jehovah's witnesses and Mormons (Romans 8:14) "For all who are led by the Spirit are sons of God" Is that what you mean?

Jesus is loving and merciful, but he is also wrath and vengeance, and when He returns He will not use the heathen as weapons of wrath, rather His angels, and His elect, and even himself.

Jesus (God) hates as well as loves - preach the whole truth. "Jacob have I loved, Esau have I hated" (Romans 9) Psalm 5:4-5 "You HATE all evildoers."

So much for God hates the sin but loves the sinner, you cannot divorce the sin from the sinner. We are not sinners because we sin, we sin because we are sinners.

I take joy in the Love of Christ. I rest in the mercy of God and his grace through the sacrifice made in my place. I also take joy in "vengeance is mine, I shall repay" - says the Lord

To preach the love of Christ is only half the message. God is Holy, Holy, Holy, and God is Just. I am not trying to sound like I hate love and peace, but love and peace came at a cost because justice still had to be served.

The problem with this whole issue is the Sovereignty of God in all things. If God has numbered your days (psalm 139), If God has ordained all things that come to pass, can me joining the army, killing with orders, be against God's will if He ordained who and what I am to become? Is God's will not good, acceptable, and perfect.

The facts of the matter is: joining the army and killing on orders is not a sin because God has not commanded that I should not do so. Sin is a violation of a command of God. Repent and believe is not a choice to be made (contrary to modern so-called christianity) Repent and Believe is a command from God and that is why it is a sin not to repent and believe.

So once again - print the scripture that prohibits me from joining the army, protecting my country, or that I cannot hold off because I am a Christian and I will not do so! Be careful not to put a law upon a man that is not a law as the pharisee did.

Lastly; If God did not take side with the Israelites, they would not have been guaranteed to win. God fights for His people. The sin of David at the end of His life was numbering the people. He numbered them to know how big his army was, instead of trusting in the Lord to fight his battles, this is why the Lord judged the people because of David's sin. Trusting in self, instead of God. God does take sides, the problem is not is he on our side or theirs, the question is are we on His. God has his side - then there is our sides.

Re: - posted by 21stCPuritan, on: 2008/3/2 16:38

Or What did Jesus Say, so I can do it! ;-)

I really dont like too well WWJD - sorry

I think my wife's family is from Sweden, but I don't think they speak swedish - sorry

GOD BLESS YOU - Praise Him

also by God's grace, when we enter heaven, I would speak with you in the same language!

I also love your greek signature - Yes He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life!

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2008/3/2 16:52

Ok. clarification: I meant potential brother and sister. We do not know who is going to respond correctly to the invitation; however the calling to eternal brother- sisterhood is to all men, period.

Regarding the contextual reading, I beg to differ. Why did not the first Christians in the first century care about the national state or tried to bring about freedom for Israel by participation in the rebellion against Rome? Why didnt Paul or Jesus teach their disciples to make earthly careers or to make it big in this world? Look again closely, what your Master is teaching in his Word.

Secondly: I strongly believe that there are occupations (just as the first Christians believed, such as being a soldier) that Christians should not even consider. Being in the justice department or a president of a capitalistic country is not wrong in itself (just as long you are not violating the law of Jesus Christ as it is explained in Sermon on the Mount).

Thirdly: God is working through the authority to bring about justice - but this authority does not have to be Christian. God is still doing his will. So Christians do not have to participate in killing either it is in war or as an executioner in the service of the state.

Sincerely Magnus
;-)

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2008/3/2 17:04

Yes brother! In heaven we will all speak the same language (swedish :-P).

have you read greek as well?

Sincerely Magnus

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2008/3/2 17:56

Quote: Chris wrote

No one?

The Jews who were rescued from concentration camps might argue that they benefited from the outcome of World War I. Former slaves might argue that they benefited from the outcome of the Civil War. Americans might argue that they benefited from the outcome of the Revolutionary War. South Koreans might argue that they benefited from the Korean War. Israelis might argue that they benefited from the Six Day War. Kuwaitis might argue that they benefited from the first War in Iraq.

Who benefited from a lack of participation in war? The North Vietnamese communists who quickly conquered South Vietnam following the pull out of US troops. The Germans during both WW1 and WW2 before US participation. The Soviet Empire before the US voiced opposition to Soviet communist aggression. Al Qaeda enjoyed growth during the 1990s when little was done to stop the growth of their terrorist organization.

Ok! Sure I agree with you. I also realize that I was thoughtless when I wrote "noone". Surely a lot of unsaved people and nations as well got a better world to go to hell from. And a lot of Christians had a better world to preach the gospel in and likewise send converted people into heaven;-).

Im not either against the struggle for democracy or freedom in the field of world politics. However God in his infinite wisdom brings about such a justice in the world through the providence i.e. by means of using unsaved (and in some cases believers who should have known better) people and nations to carry out His will in wars. Just as Rom 13 says.

My point is that we as Christians should not take any part in the above - but instead concentrate our efforts to show the world a different kingdom - a foretaste of Jesus own kingdom which He is about to bring into the world (in futurum). From that perspective no Christian benefits from war while it goes against the will of our Master and Lord Jesus Christ.

I personally believe that a true Christian cannot kill anyone, since everyone is a potential brother or sister. As long as you live - as long as time consists - repentance is possible. We should not exclude anyone from that possibility or should we?

Sincerely Magnus
:-D

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2008/3/3 6:50

Eddie wrote:

"Why is America hated in the world? Our government knows but is unwilling to offend other western governments by calling them welfare dependants who depended on us for protection for all the last century. Granted we received strategic benefit. Now that the threat of the Soviet Union has passed for the moment we are despised and belittled in our efforts to defend our selves and others by those that take a holier than thou attitude while their young people shirk their duty and scoff at our young men and women sacrifice. Europe has thrown out the basic laws that underpins civilization that say if you harm one of us then you have harmed us all. The strong will defend the weak and the helpless and our God judge between us".

Im not too sure that your analysis is correct. I have listened to americans who, beyond doubt, have a sound and critical outlook regarding their nation. I can not see any such thing in your overestimation of american foreign policy (such as the conflicts in Asia during the 60s as Vietnam, and how about CIA:s involvement in South America, or the bombings of Iraq because of supposed evidence of nuclear production:- this just, to name a few, I can open my history books and give a lot more examples). It is always refreshing regarding humbleness to consider that America in part was taken from the Native Indians. Just to remind you: The pilgrims did not enter a landmass that was so to speak empty. The wealth and construction of America initially, as you might remember was established by the institution of slavery!!!! Let's not go into field of domestic politics - in which the american capitalistic (Babel-like)holistic idea rules at the expense of the weaker and less fortunate. Concerning the domestic politics I can go about forever to show the undgodliness.

Regarding Europe, I pretty much agree with you. I have never - and probably we have not (since well let's say the world rule of Britain) been acting as "the worlds conscience". This is still the role or part that US plays and it provokes a larger amount of nations - even nations that US consider to share a lot of values with.

Sure Europe is thankful for US last minute unselfish contribution in the war (or was it Pearl Harbour that finally made US enter). Sure Japan is thankful for the A-bomb. The war, we have to remember could not been won without all the allied forces together (including Sovjet).

However one thing still remains: I consider myself to be a Christian, not a swede, not a european, not too much connected to my nation - but connected to my Christian family world-wide.

My country is the world-wide Church, and that Church are living by the Masters Word. Our Master has taught us not to retaliate - but to love and show the world a different Kingdom.

May God help us all.

Magnus

:-o

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2008/3/3 6:56

a interesting view

(<http://downloads2.sermonindex.us/15/SID15424.mp3>) Nonresistance—The Theology of Martyrdom by Dean Taylor

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2008/3/3 7:13

Tjenare min svenske broder! Skall IÄsa IÄnken omgÄende. Jag sÄg att du spenderat tid med anabaptismen - intressant. Det finns en enorm sprÄngkraft i denna teologi. Min docent pÄ universitetet Arne Rasmusson Är som jag fÄrst Är det just anabaptist och dessutom rÄtt radikal.

Hans doktorsavhandling heter "Church as Polis" (har dock inte IÄst den).

FortsÄtt din vandring som du har bÄrjat den,
din broder Magnus

:-D

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2008/3/3 7:41

HallÃ¥ broder :-)

IÃ¥nken Ã¥r till en predikan av dean Taylor, som Ã¥r just anabaptist, frÃ¥n charity ministries i Amerika. Och det Ã¥r vÃ¥r deras synpunkt som speglas dÃ¥r. Intresant Ã¥r det iaf, och personligen lutar jag nog Ã¥t deras tolknings sÃ¥tt i denna frÃ¥ga. Boken jag lÃ¥st nyligen Ã¥r Carl Kilsmos "Den Tredje Reformationen" och var mkt bra och intresant.

ska leta fram Arne Rasmussons avhandling och bita in i den , tack fÃ¥r tipset

Guds frid och nÃ¥d!

Christian

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/3/3 11:36

Hi MagnusÃ¥...

Quote:

However one thing still remains: I consider myself to be a Christian, not a swede, not a european, not to much connected to my nation - but connected to my Christian family world-wide.

My country is the world-wide Church, and that Church are living by the Masters Word. Our Master has taught us not to retaliate - but to love and show the world a different Kingdom.

This is wonderful, but it denies your earthly citizenship. Becoming a Christian doesn't mean that we are forced to renounce our earthly citizenship. You are still a Swede. I am still an American. But first and foremost, we are believers. My faith in Christ takes preeminence over any secondary citizenship. However, my earthly citizenship remains intact. For instance, I am a Christian and a musician. My music, however, is influenced and dictated by my relationship with Christ. However, I didn't renounce music after meeting the Lord - although I did count *all things* as loss and dung compared to the knowledge of Christ Jesus (Philippians 3:8). Does that make sense? Likewise, Paul did not renounce his citizenship. Consider Acts 22:27: *"Then the chief captain came, and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, Yea."*

Quote:

----- Im not either against the struggle for democracy or freedom in the field of world politics. However God in his infinite wisdom brings about such a justice in the world through the providence i.e. by means of using unsaved (and in some cases believers who should have known better) people and nations to carry out His will in wars. Just as Rom 13 says.

My point is that we as Christians should not take any part in the above - but instead concentrate our efforts to show the world a different kingdom - a foretaste of Jesus own kingdom which He is about to bring into the world (in futurum). From that perspective no Christian benefits from war while it goes against the will of our Master and Lord Jesus Christ.

This is a sincere thing to say, except you also said this:

Quote:

Im not too sure that your analysis is correct. I have listened to americans who, beyond doubt, have a sound and critical outlook regarding their nation. I can not see any such thing in your overestimation of american foreign policy (such as the conflicts in Asia during the 60s as Vietnam, and how about CIA:s involvement in South America, or the bombings of Iraq because of supposed evidence of nuclear production:- this just, to name a few, I can open my history books and give a lot more examples). It is always refreshing regarding humbleness to consider that America in part was taken from the Native Indians. Just to remind you: The pilgrims did not enter a landmass that was so to speak empty. The wealth and construction of America initially, as you might remember was established by the institution of slavery!!!! Let's not go into field of domestic politics - in which the american capitalistic (Babel-like) holistic idea rules at the expense of the weaker and less fortunate. Concerning the domestic politics I can go about forever to show the undgodliness.

Regarding Europe, I pretty much agree with you. I have never - and probably we have not (since well let's say the world rule of Britain) been acting as "the worlds conscience". This is still the role or part that US plays and it provokes a larger amount of nations - even nations that US consider to share a lot of values with.

Sure Europe is thankful for US last minute unselfish contribution in the war (or was it Pearl Harbour that finally made US enter). Sure Japan is thankful for the A-bomb. The war, we have to remember could not been won without all the allied forces together (including Sovjet).

For a person who doesn't want to get involved with such things, do you see how such commentary adds fuel to the fire of political discussion? You have just become a vocal critic of America's foreign and domestic policies from a very questionable perspective. If someone were to counter such statements, they would be dismissed as someone who "defends the political system." I'm not going to comment on what fallacies that I perceive from your commentary. However, I might wonder how you can mention your opinions when you said that "we as Christians should not take any part." By voicing such criticism, you have taken part.

I have read very carefully some of the words written by various believers who decry the involvement of Christians in the legislative systems of this world. Some would claim that it is unbiblical to join the military. Others go so far as to claim that voting is the result of "kneeling to the Government idol." I am often reminded of Paul's use of the Roman political system in order to avoid a flogging and "appeal unto Caesar" – just to take the Gospel unto Rome. In addition, I consider what the outcome of this nation would be if the Christians just withdrew. What would happen if believers stopped voting, influencing the legislature or proclaiming righteousness to a government "of the people, by the people and for the people?"

Who would be pleased by a lack of involvement by believers in the voting process? Abortionists would be thrilled. Gay activists would be thrilled. Pagan religions would be thrilled. Peddlers of pornography would be thrilled. Atheists would be thrilled. Those who endeavor to remove any semblance of faith from the public or government would be thrilled. Some Islamic nations would be thrilled (since the "Evangelicals" are often the loudest pro-Israel segment of the electorate). It makes me wonder if Satan is also interested in the non-involvement of believers.

For all of America's flaws, it is still a wonderful place to live. I've traveled throughout the world, and I am always pleased to return. This nation is certainly flawed. But America is far different than what is often portrayed via the media (news, movies and television). Although you claimed that "the American capitalistic (Babel-like) holistic idea rules at the expense of the weaker and less fortunate," I am struck by the fact that so many "weaker and less fortunate" still see America as a land of opportunity. That is why we have millions of people coming into this nation illegally every year. An open market allows people to have the opportunity to provide for their families – which is completely Scriptural (1 Timothy 5:8).

I suppose that it is difficult to juggle the difference between acceptable governmental involvement and a Christian sort of patriotism. Can a believer be a soldier? Should a believer vote? Should a believer become involved in a political process (from a city engineer to the President of the United States)? Should a believer even use the political/legal system to advance the Gospel? I've read the Scriptures more times than I can count. I've read the writings that attempt to decry any such involvement. While I understand the hesitancy for such involvement, I have never found a clear prohibition in the Word of God. In fact, I tend to believe that, as a husband, son, brother and future father, I believe that I should do whatever I can to ensure what is best for my family.

:-)

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2008/3/3 12:33

Well Chris, you're conjoining two different discussions one with you and the other with Eddie. In the last case I tried to answer the evident lack of self-criticism concerning one's nation.

However, I'm still not being inconsistent. I am against (on valid New Testament grounds, primarily the teachings of Jesus Christ) war, killing, capital punishment and so forth ...

I'm also following the teaching of my Master, which includes paying taxes. Likewise the former indicates voting and participation in society. I do not put into question the teachings of the New Testament.

It is impossible not to be political in today's high-technological and globalized world; because everything you say or do has political repercussions one way or the other.

As a Christian you are not forbidden to have certain views concerning our nation or other countries especially if it is ungodly (read Revelation, and you will see a lot of political references to Rome).

The question we have to ask ourselves is how far our participation should go. Should such involvement imply killing in the name of your country?

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Jesus and his teaching accentuate the end of all killing!!!!

Sincerely Magnus :-o

Re: Jesus and his teaching accentuate the end of all killing!!!! - posted by rowdy2 (), on: 2008/3/4 19:56

Reply to Mangan

You are right to question the correctiveness of political decisions regardless of the country. Hind sight clearly shows glaring examples of failures in past foreign policy decisions of the U.S. and maybe one of the ones you cited could have been such a failure, but that is not the question.

I am not a respecter of persons but I respect the service and sacrifice of all that serve the weak and the innocent. I find ample opportunity in the NT for our Lord to have rebuked those that bore arms but choose not too.

Matt.8:5-13

And when Jesus was entered into Capernaum, there came unto him a centurion, beseeching him, And saying, Lord, my servant lieth at home sick of the palsy, grievously tormented. And Jesus saith unto him, I will come and heal him. The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst come under my roof but speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed. For I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to this man, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it.

When Jesus heard it, he marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven.

But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. And Jesus said unto the centurion, Go thy way; and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour.

Lk.7:1-10.

1 Now when he had ended all his sayings in the audience of the people, he entered into Capernaum. And a certain centurion's servant, who was dear unto him, was sick, and ready to die. And when he heard of Jesus, he sent unto him the elders of the Jews, beseeching him that he would come and heal his servant. And when they came to Jesus, they besought him instantly, saying, That he was worthy for whom he should do this, for he loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue.

Then Jesus went with them. And when he was now not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to him, saying unto him, Lord, trouble not thyself for I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof Wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say in a word, and my servant shall be healed. For I also am a man set under authority, having under me soldiers, and I say unto one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it.

When Jesus heard these things, he marvelled at him, and turned him about, and said unto the people that followed him, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And they that were sent, returning to the house, found the servant whole that had been sick.

Matt.27:54 Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God.

Many question whether America motive is service to civilization or are we an evil country? Are Christians who serve their country and bear arms and work in life and death situations evil? I say no to both.

Eddie

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2008/3/4 20:59

Quote:

-----Also because I respect dear PastorFrin very much, and hate the thought of disagreeing with him!

I think he would be the first to dissuade you from feeling such a compulsion. :-)

MC

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2008/3/5 6:42

Eddie! Your exegesis of the bible passages you used are beyond doubt oversimplified!! Let me give a counter example: There are two thieves at the cross - one of them got saved, Ergo: God legitimize the noble occupation of being a robber: -P.

When the gospels mention soliders it is always in the narrative or the historical context. The passages you mentioned just confirms - the power of faith on the one hand; and the centurions realization that Jesus must have been the Son of God on the other. Nothing else is said. If you compare this passages to the overall teachings of Christ - you do not even have building-block to create such a presupposition.

Sincerely Magnus
:-D

Re:, on: 2008/3/5 7:52

I agree w/ Ccchhrrriissss... You say no one benefits from war, but I disagree.

Jews certainly benefitted from WWII. African-Americans benefitted from the Civil War. American citizens benefit everyday from the Revolutionary War.

This same Jesus, who you called a pacifist, was alive and well from the beginning of time, and He was alive and involved in every event in human history all down thru the ages... including the wars that GOD commanded Israel to fight. You remember those wars, dont you? Where God told Saul to kill every living creature, and Saul disobeyed, and God punished the entire nation for it? Do you think Jesus was standing in a corner wincing as His Father did these things?

I'm not calling Jesus a war-monger. He isnt. But we have to have a balanced perspective on Jesus.

Many anti-America Americans are beginnig to twist and wrench scripture in order to get Christians on their side. They understand that evangelical Christians, when unified, are a powerful voice in this country. So they are making attempts to bring Christians over to the anti-war, anti-America side of things.

I've been to war. I support the one we're currently involved in (tho I have concerns its not being handled properly)... and at the same time... guess what... I'm anti-war! I am against war, and I dont think anyone with a partially operating brain is "pro-war".

But when there is evil in the world, something must be done. Evil prevails when good men do nothing.

No one wants to run into a burning building just for kicks... but when there is a baby in that building *some* men will run in to rescue that baby.

And *some* men when simply stand by and watch, content to let someone else pay the price.

Krispy

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2008/3/5 10:06

Quote:

This same Jesus, who you called a pacifist, was alive and well from the beginning of time, and He was alive and involved in every event in human history all down thru the ages... including the wars that GOD commanded Israel to fight. You remember those wars, dont you? Where God told Saul to kill every living creature, and Saul disobeyed, and God punished the entire nation for it? Do you think Jesus was standing in a corner wincing as His Father did these things?

this is true, God is a warrior, he ordered many wars in OT, but that was then, now we are not in the OT days, God is the

same, its the method that changed.

our weapons are not sword or guns. Our enemies cant be defeated by those weapons. You cant put a bullet in someone and at the same time bless him. You cant shoot someone and shout "i am a christian , I love you!"

it dont fit.

Jesus said

Mat 5:38 Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth:

Mat 5:39 But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.

Mat 5:40 And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also.

Mat 5:41 And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.

Mat 5:42 Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.

Mat 5:43 Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy.

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

Mat 5:45 That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.

Mat 5:46 For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?

Mat 5:47 And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so?

Mat 5:48 Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.

How can we obey that in a war?

Re:, on: 2008/3/5 10:12

Quote:
-----this is true, God is a warrior, he ordered many wars in OT, but that was then, now we are not in the OT days, God is the same, its the method that changed.

Ahhh... so you *are* a dispensationalist. ;-)

Krispy

Re: - posted by Tears_of_joy, on: 2008/3/5 10:15

Quote:

hmmhmm wrote:

How can we obey that in a war?

Here is one living example:

A communist officer told a Christian while beating him: "I am almighty, as you suppose your God to be. I can kill you." The Christian answered: "The real power is all on my side, for I can love you while you tortured me to death."

- Taken from Where Christ Still Suffers by Richard Wurmbrand

Other also:

"In the Tirgu-Ocna prison was a very young prisoner named Matchevici. He had been put in prison at the age of eighteen. Because of the tortures, he was very sick with tuberculosis. His family found out somehow that he was in this grave state of health and sent him one hundred bottles of streptomycin, which could make the difference between life and death."

An officer of the prison offered the young man the package if he would betray his fellow prisoners which he refused. He was then made another offer: betray those prisoners who had turned informants, who were now "denouncing" them, the Christians, and he could have the package. Matchevici's reply is quoted as this

"I am a disciple of Christ and He has taught us to love even our enemies. The men who betray us do us much harm but I cannot reward evil with evil. I cannot give information even against them. I pity them. I pray for them. I don't wish to have any connection with the Communists."

Pastor Wurmbrand says that this young Christian returned to the cell they were in and that he witnessed him die 'praising God'. As he put it

Love conquered even the natural thirst for life.

-Quotations taken from Tortured for Christ by Richard Wurmbrand

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2008/3/5 10:21

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

Quote:
-----this is true, God is a warrior, he ordered many wars in OT, but that was then, now we are not in the OT days, God is the same, its the method that changed.

Ahhh... so you are a dispensationalist. ;-)

Krispy

I dont know brother :-) depends on who you ask

But in those verses we see that Jesus says "ye have heard". Jesus is saying in the OT you had heard this is the way to do it, but now... "I say unto you". Who says? Jesus says that is not the way any more..... I believe Jesus is God. So when he says something I believe it is so.

and he says when someone does all those things he says bless them and love them, if you can do that while shooting them that's good.

Re: - posted by Tears_of_joy, on: 2008/3/5 10:23

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

Ahhh... so you are a dispensationalist.

What is dispensationalist (I'm very little familiar with this term)?

Is it this:

"Ye have heard ...

..But I say unto you"

Re:, on: 2008/3/5 12:03

When Jesus said "Ye have heard...", He was not issuing a new law, or doing away with an old law. He was coming against the "letter of the law" and showing the "spirit of the law".

We can follow a law to the letter, the most miniscule detail... and but still be breaking it because we have missed the spirit behind it.

This is what the people then were doing. More or less, Jesus was not adding to or taking away, He was explaining. On the outside they were obedient, but you will notice that Jesus was dealing with the heart... the inside.

Krispy

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/3/5 12:16

Hi Tears_of_Joy...

The life of Richard Wurmbrand is a wonderful example of how a member of the persecuted Church took to a life of activism (in addition to love and prayer) in order to challenge the actions of an invading government during the Cold War. Mrs. Wurmbrand's entire family had been executed at various Nazi concentration camps because of their Jewish race. Both Mr. and Mrs. Wurmbrand faced torture at the hand of communists for their unwavering faith in Christ.

I am reminded how, out of holy indignation, Richard Wurmbrand grabbed the microphone out of the hands of a leader at an anti-war rally at Berkeley in the 1960s. He began to describe his own personal testimony about the horrors of the "Communist Inquisition" to those protesting the American attempt to rid South Vietnam of the invading Communists. Brother Wurmbrand was arrested for this.

Later that same year, Richard Wurmbrand stripped to his waist at a Senate meeting (on Internal Security). He displayed his deep scars that came from torture at the hand of Soviet communists who quietly invaded his nation (Romania). He urged the Americans to be aware of the horrors of communism and to remain resolved at stopping the spread of militant communism.

For the rest of their lives, the Wurmbrands remained active in the aid of the underground Church. They often appealed for believers to speak or write to their Congressmen in order to use diplomatic pressure to free imprisoned believers. In fact, they often included prefabricated post cards in their monthly newsletters. These were asked to be signed and sent to government leaders in order to obtain the diplomatic release of imprisoned believers who were jailed because of their faith.

The Wurmbrands were wonderful examples of using their lives as "living sacrifices" to expose and end the horrors of the totalitarian, communist or Islamic persecution of believers.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Jesus and his teaching accentuate the end of all killing!!!!

:-)

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2008/3/5 13:49

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

On the outside they were obedient, but you will notice that Jesus was dealing with the heart... the inside.

Krispy

So if we love them on the inside, we can shot them on the outside? and be "good christians" so to speak?

I understand what you saying brother, but how do we obey sermon on the mount in a war? Americas military or any other. Face to face with your countries enemy's? do we obey clear scriptures? or in a war situation we have another set of rules to go by?

In my short life i learned there is almost always the exception that confirms the rule. Probably so in this case.

can we say it is ok to kill people in the right circumstance? there are times when taking another humans life will not be accountable before God as sin?

if so, can we lie also for our country?

can we steal ,rape and the rest of sins also ?

just some thoughts about this.

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2008/3/5 14:25

Quote:

-----can we say it is ok to kill people in the right circumstance? there are times when taking another humans life will not be accountable before God as sin?

Law enforcement and civil protection.

The deeper issue here is that some Christians believe all human government is an affront to God, simply because the state bears a sword that is more lethal than mere metaphor. The graduate student's theory of harmless innocuous law enforcement and state protection sounds wonderful, until you factor human evil into the equation. Scripture is explicit and grave regarding the reality of man's natural beastly disposition; rapacious and lawless without threat of force. Perhaps God is less of an anarchist than some of us dare believe.

MC

Re:, on: 2008/3/5 14:54

Friends, I don't see why when we come to a disagreement that we should pull out 'extremes'.

I haven't met a "Christian" non-resistant that endorses anarchism.

Yes, there are those extreme groups out there that call themselves "Christian Patriots" and the "Identity" groups - Arian Nations - Etc. --- but not HERE.

This is a personal conviction of some of us to be non-resistant.

The "Christian Patriots" plan to fight to keep their guns should we lose our "right to bear arms" should the Bill of "Rights" be annulled through martial law etc.

This is WRONG!

Might does not make right.

If there are those among us, as there was in our Church's History, who do not believe in bearing arms or retaliation - must we group them in with Extremists?

Just my thoughts and heart being one of "them" who just will not bear arms or seek retaliation.

Bless you all.

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2008/3/5 15:14

Quote:

-----Law enforcement and civil protection.

Yes, I can agree and believe so.

I don't believe in pacifism or anarchy, not the other way also. I believe this one can be tricky, we have scripture that explain the rulers and their authority.

But Rom 13:4 was probably meaning Nero, who was a murderer and persecutor. God used that for his own purpose and glory. I don't think it means Christian followers should join in on it.

I am very doubtful a Christian should seek a position where there are a great chance he has to kill someone.

I listened to some sermons, read some stuff, from both sides. Both have some good arguments and scriptures. But I still can't see how we can love someone while we kill them.

Re: - posted by LoveHim, on: 2008/3/5 16:05

i have wondered this kind of stuff as well. i have wondered why Jesus sent his diciples in luke 10 with no money bag or sack, but then in luke 22 He tells them to bring a money bag, sack and to carry a sword. if they didn't have one, He tells them to sell their garment and buy one. Why did He tell them to buy a sword? (luke 22:38) He tells His disciples to buy and carry a sword, but for what? if He never wanted nor expected them to use it, then why did He command them to have one? i don't know that answer, nor do i have any secret motive regarding this issue because i have no answer.

just putting some questions out there for thought.

phil

Re:, on: 2008/3/5 17:07

Quote:
-----I listened to some sermons, read some stuff, from both sides. Both have some good arguments and scriptures. But i still cant see how we can love some one while we kill them.

Because taking a persons life in warfare, whether it be in defense of your country, or to stamp out evil (as in WWII), it is not the same as murder. Murder is about self... about benefitting me.

Putting yourself in harms way to protect other people is not about self... in fact, it is the most selfless thing one can do.

Thats the difference.

You make it sound as if soldiers love war and killing. While there may be a twisted soul who gets off on it out of every 50,000 ... the rest do not.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2008/3/5 17:23

Brother Krispy, one thing besides us being Christians, both living in a great state - that we have in common is that we're Veterans.

You and pastorfrin and me and others are, though of course I didn't see combat, though was in during the Viet Nam era.

Brother, you're the third person I spoke to when I joined here and felt that unity so please understand that this is difficult for me to post.

Your signature presently is -

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!" - Patrick Henry 1775"

When I just now saw it, after reading your post, I got fearful because of all I've heard on the radio.

Brother, if we, as a country, should lose our "freedom/liberty" before the Lord "raptures" us - what will you do ?

I suppose that stays in my mind at this time of my life for many reasons and not just because of you or your signature, but for all "Christians" and not even just in this country of ours.

Any of these countries - even who presently don't have "liberty".
What should or can they do?

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Jesus and his teaching accentuate the end of all killing!!!!

Re:, on: 2008/3/5 17:53

Quote:

LoveHim wrote:
i have wondered this kind of stuff as well. i have wondered why Jesus sent his diciples in luke 10 with no money bag or sack, but then in luke 22 He tel ls them to bring a money bag, sack and to carry a sword. if they didn't have one, He tells them to sell their garment and buy one. Why did He tell them to buy a sword? (luke 22:38) He tells His disciples to buy and carry a sword, but for what? if He never wanted nor expected them to use it, then why di d He command them to have one? i don't know that answer, nor do i have any secret motive regarding this issue because i have no answer.

just putting some questions out there for thought.

phil

Hi Phil

I'm not sure if this is helpful but it seems the kind of sword meant here was a dagger for cutting up food, or for defending oneself against an enemy. Most people would carry one, especially on a journey.

According to Strong's:

"1 a large knife, used for killing animals and cutting up flesh. 2 a small sword, as distinguished from a large sword. 2a cu rved sword, for a cutting stroke. 2b a straight sword, for thrusting"

Apparently Roman soldiers would carry one of these and also the other larger weapon.

Maybe Jesus was implying that when He was not with them they might have to defend themselves against those who w ere trying to kill them?

Re: - posted by LoveHim, on: 2008/3/5 18:08

Quote:
-----Hi Phil

I'm not sure if this is helpful but it seems the kind of sword meant here was a dagger for cutting up food, or for defending oneself against an enemy. Mo st people would carry one, especially on a journey.

According to Strong's:

"1 a large knife, used for killing animals and cutting up flesh. 2 a small sword, as distinguished from a large sword. 2a curved sword, for a cutting strok e. 2b a straight sword, for thrusting"

Apparently Roman soldiers would carry one of these and also the other larger weapon.

Maybe Jesus was implying that when He was not with them they might have to defend themselves against those who were trying to kill them?

that's exactly what i'm talking about. we hear some say pacifism and not to ever defend themselves, yet Jesus told com manded them to buy a sword and carry one. that's why i am wondering about this out loud. it's worthless for Him to tell t hem to buy one and carry one if He never expected them to ever have to use it. yetm He doesn't want us to muder or kill anyone, so why the command?? to protect oneself?? one's family?? why??

i understand that when it came to one's faith and martyrdom, Jesus tolf peter to put away His sword, but what about in d efense of your family being jumped or mugged from robbers or worse killers? what about that?

these are the questions that i have no answer for and can honestly see both sides. i just know me and if it came to my fri ends and family, i would do all i that i can to protect them. but in cases of martyrdom, i would not deny Christ to protect t hem. that is where i am right now, but i do not know all of these things or have the answers to the very questions i am rai sing.

phil

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2008/3/5 19:14

Hi Annie

Quote:

-----I haven't met a "Christian" non-resistant that endorses anarchism.

Fair enough Annie! My prickly comment was extreme, but not unwarranted entirely.

It is also extreme to impose a unilateral pacifist code of conduct upon all local and national governments, and the Christians serving dutifully within these government roles, via a sweeping misapplication of the sermon on the mount. When it comes to personal affront, the Christian turns the other cheek. However, in the case of government, when it comes to evil, the government bears it's sword, not it's cheek...or it's throat.

My father served as a guard in a state penn, as then retired as a country sheriff. He uses much of his retirement time now to minister in nursing homes around the area...he is not a violent man. But his years in the department demonstrated to me that even a peaceful man must be willing to forcibly confront evil within a lawful and moral authority structure. I do not understand how even pacifistic Christians denounce this basic societal necessity so vehemently.

War is atrocious evil, and capital punishment is grievous. I do not know the half of it. I cannot and will not argue with Christians who abstain from it. Indeed, the world is sick with so much death. Peace and life should be the desire of every Christian. However, there must be law and order within nations until Christ returns...and this sometimes require lethal power. This is not an excuse for abuse of power, or a blind servile patriotism even during cruel despotism...but only a recognition of a principle that is supported at least within Romans, if not elsewhere in the New Testament.

(edit:

Quote:

-----I am very doubtful a Christian should seek a position where there are a great chance he have to kill someone.

Brother, I personally empathize with you here, but also realize this might mean different things to different people.)

I'll let this go. I am thankful to have been able to join such a sensitive discussion with such honorable brothers and sisters.

MC

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/3/5 19:34

Hi Krispy...

Quote:

Because taking a persons life in warfare, whether it be in defense of your country, or to stamp out evil (as in WWII), it is not the same as murder. Murder is about self... about benefitting me.

Putting yourself in harms way to protect other people is not about self... in fact, it is the most selfless thing one can do.

Thats the difference.

You make it sound as if soldiers love war and killing. While there may be a twisted soul who gets off on it out of every 50,000 ... the rest do not.

Very interesting thought.

I read the testimony of a man who lost his wife and entire family in the holocaust. When asked if he appreciated the military forces that liberated his camp, his reply was interesting. He said, "I would have been more thankful had the world c

hosen to do something about this earlier. Perhaps the lives of my family and of millions of others would have been saved. I've thought about this for quite a while. What would have happened if EVERYONE felt the way of the pacifists? The entire world would be ruled in tyranny. Perhaps this is what prompted Brother Wurmbrand to rip the microphone out of the hand of some anti-war activist in Berkeley during the 1960s. Perhaps they were too quick to point to the terrors of war to realize the lives that would be saved as a result of stopping the communist aggression.

Earlier, someone mentioned the atom bomb that was dropped upon Japan. Yes, it is a tragedy to realize that nearly 120,000 people lost their lives in an instant, with many more that died slow deaths over the years. But the American President and military leaders realized this. They chose to drop an atomic bomb in order to SAVE lives. A long lasting war would have caused the deaths of millions (both Americans and Japanese).

I've long wondered what a pacifist would expect of our nation in case of attack. Were we supposed to "turn the other cheek" in regard to the attack on Pearl Harbor? What if a nation would attempt to conquer this nation? Are we supposed to sit back and let the invading army in? Post war intelligence has shown that the Nazis were already plotting to conquer the entire world.

There is, of course, the separation between pacifists and "Christian non-resistance" folk. Some argue that believers should leave such conflicts to the heathen. But do we have any sort of responsibility to our families, children and neighbors? Are we satisfied to sit back and enjoy the benefits of our nation (freedoms, etc...) without contributing anything to it? Are we supposed to be "freedom moochers"? If this nation faced an immediate threat from takeover – are we simply to sit back and watch? If an armed terrorist were to walk into our homes and threaten to kill our children or wife – do we just watch? Don't we have an obligation to even give our lives in order to save others? It would be a terrible shepherd who would sit back and watch his sheep get eaten by a bear or lion. In my opinion, it is a terrible husband who would sit back and watch his wife and children get slaughtered by a violent intruder.

I have no problem with those who conscientiously object to what they feel is "killing." If they cannot serve their wife, children, family, neighbors or countrymen in a capacity that might cause them to shed blood, then they should refrain from doing so. But do they have a right to complain about those who sacrifice themselves for their legal ability to complain?

My dad served in Vietnam. He was still a kid when he found out that he was being drafted into the military. Yet he served his family willingly – when so many others escaped. He never fired a weapon, but worked in electronics in dangerous circumstances. Upon his arrival back to the United States in the 1970s, he discovered the ridiculous anti-war crowds pitting at the returning military men and calling them "baby killers." My dad told me that he simply felt sorry for people who never realized that their freedom to protest was paid for by the blood of those who were willing to die for such a privilege.

To this day, he views his service in Vietnam as bittersweet. He regrets that the US caved in to the anti-war crowd (spurred by the media) who constantly cried for an end to the war. He feels that we, as a free people, let down the people of South Vietnam. The South Vietnamese have faced terrible circumstance ever since. Yet my dad still believes that the US accomplished the overall mission. Communist aggression in southeastern Asia was halted. Vietnam was the last nation conquered by the communists.

I've noticed that those who are the most opposed to Christian involvement in the decisions of a nation (such as voting) are often the most vocal critics of the nation itself. Some have even become virtual gossips about the affairs of the nation – talking about how "dark" the days have become. In my opinion, a person loses their credibility to publicly complain about such things if they aren't willing to step up and prevent such things.

I know that this is a harsh assessment of the matter, but it is just something that I have felt for a while. I love my pacifist and Christian non-resistance brethren. But I also hope that they would respect those who simply disagree with their convictions on the matter. Some of us feel that we have valid spiritual and Scriptural grounds to stand on too.

:-)

Re:, on: 2008/3/5 20:40

Thank you Brother Compton for your patience with your reply. Much appreciated.

I do understand. I've stood on both sides. I was going to go to Israel during the Iraq war and help with the wounded back then.

I was listening and taping 'Rush' at the time and was "gun-hoe".

That really wasn't that long ago. 1991-92.

But since I got saved in '76 for some reason, the LORD put China on my heart. Never have been able to shake that. I thought that was a big enough burden, but gradually after about '94 the burden started to wrap itself around the entire globe and I saw the planet as one people - all equally His creation. All equal.

I'm not condemning the men that are in the Service now. And I support the police funds and hang out the blue ribbon on my fence when one of them is killed locally.

This is a very difficult subject to bring up, because of my fear of divisions among us - but my eyes are on the present state of other countries and our future.

Can't we stop what's gone on in China all of these years to babies and Christians and those in slave labor camps, etc. etc. ? No, we are in financial debt to them. We owe them quite a bit that we've 'borrowed' and they are our source for most everything now and one of the nations on the UN security council.

That's just one nation where the innocent and our brothers and sisters are. Just one of the many where these inhumane conditions thrive without our help.

I suppose the question I asked of Krispy is what weighs on me most also, because we're still Free and it's easy for us to talk like this - but what if we lose our "liberty" tomorrow? What will we do when they come to take our guns away?

And if they take our Police force's guns away ?

What if it should be as Gen. Tommy Franks said, if martial law should come or if we have foreign troops over us - what will we do?

I'm not worried about guys hunting for their food, etc., but I think about a country that has no idea what it is to lose their freedom - not being prepared to one day, in anyway.

How will we react?

As far as why we pulled out of VietNam - just as any good historian would tell you - you may have to dig deeper before you place the blame.

I believe MC that you are a peaceful man and I feel I've probably said enough of what I worry about on this thread. I could end it here and know that in the end that His Love will win out in the hearts of His Saints.

With my deep respect brother.

Re: A Sword - posted by pastorfrin, on: 2008/3/5 20:54

Quote:

LoveHim wrote:

i have wondered this kind of stuff as well. i have wondered why Jesus sent his disciples in luke 10 with no money bag or sack, but then in luke 22 He tells them to bring a money bag, sack and to carry a sword. if they didn't have one, He tells them to sell their garment and buy one. Why did He tell them to buy a sword? (luke 22:38) He tells His disciples to buy and carry a sword, but for what? if He never wanted nor expected them to use it, then why did He command them to have one? i don't know that answer, nor do i have any secret motive regarding this issue because i have no answer.

just putting some questions out there for thought.

phil

Hi Phil,

Hope this helps with your questions.

WAR INCONSISTENT WITH THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST

by David Low Dodge

Part 4

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

As was proposed, a number of objections to the general sentiments that have been advocated shall be stated and answered.

11. Christ told his Apostles to get swords

Objection. Our Lord, just before his crucifixion, commanded his disciples to take swords, and, if any were destitute, to sell their garments and procure them, as they would no longer have his personal presence to protect them. And, as they were to encounter great trials and difficulties, they must, besides relying on providence, take all prudent means for their defense and preservation.

Answer. That our Lord did not direct them to take swords for self-defense is evident because he told them that two were enough, and because the disciples never made any use of them after their Master directed Peter to his away and pronounced a penalty on all who should have recourse to swords afterwards. But the design seems to have been to show by example in the most trying situation where self-defense was justifiable, if in any case, that the use of the sword was utterly prohibited under the gospel economy, and to show the criminality and danger of ever using deadly weapons against mankind afterwards. If Christ's kingdom had been of this world, then, he tells us, his servants would have fought; but his kingdom being not of this world, the weapons of their warfare were not carnal but spiritual. He therefore rebuked them for their mistaken zeal, healed the wound they made, and forbade the use of the sword.

CHRISTIAN NON-RESISTANCE

by Adin Ballou

Chapter 3

Scriptural Objections Answered

Objection 1 — You throw away the Old Testament — Voice of the New Testament — Voice of the Old Testament. Objection 2 — The scourge of small cords. Objection 3 — The two swords. Objection 4 — The death of Ananias and Sapphira. Objection 5 — Human government — Romans chapter 13 — How the apostles viewed the then existing governments — Submission to, not participation in governments enjoined on Christians — In what sense the powers that be are ordained of God — Pharaoh God's "minister" — Also the monarch of Assyria — Also Nebuchadnezzar — The Roman government — Respects wherein government is ordained of God — Paul's conduct in relation to government — Conclusion.

Objection 3 – The Two Swords

According to the 22nd chapter of Luke, Christ directed his disciples to provide themselves swords. “He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one.” Swords could be of no other use than as weapons of war or of self-defense. How can this be reconciled with your doctrine of non-resistance?

Answer. There is one other use to which the sword might possibly be put. It might be employed on a memorable occasion as the significant emblem of injurious resistance, for the purpose of emphatically inculcating non-resistance. I will attempt to demonstrate that this was the special use to which Jesus intended to apply it in the case before us. He gave this direction to buy swords at the last Passover, just before his betrayal in the garden of Gethsemane. When he had given it, his disciples presently responded, “Lord, behold, here are two swords.” And he said unto them, “It is enough.” Verse 38. How could two swords be enough to arm twelve men for war or self-defense? This single fact shows that such was not the design of Jesus. He had a more sublime purpose. When Judas gave the traitorous kiss, and the multitude approached to seize Jesus, his disciples demanded, saying, “Lord, shall we smite with the sword?” And one of them smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear. Verse 49-50. Matthew (26:52) informs us how Jesus disposed of the sword. “Then said Jesus unto him, ‘Put up again thy sword into his place, for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.’” So saying, he touched the wounded ear, and restored it, suffering himself to be borne away by his enemies without resistance. Thus the sequel proved that he caused swords to be provided, for that occasion, (two only being enough) for the sole purpose of emphatically, finally, and everlastingly prohibiting the use of the instrument, even by the innocent in self-defense. Ever after this, those apostles, and for a long time the primitive Christians, conscientiously eschewed the use of the sword. These three facts prove my assertion. 1. Two swords were enough. 2. The moment one of these was wielded in defense of betrayed innocence, it was peremptorily stayed, the wound caused by it healed, and the sublime mandate given, “Put up thy sword again into his place, for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.” 3. The apostles and primitive Christians obeyed the injunction, never afterwards making the least use of such deadly weapons. This objection then ends in solid confirmation of the non-resistance doctrine, and may be appreciated accordingly.

Just to add a comment on the issue, and this is not aimed at anyone, just a comment.

When will we just plain look at what Jesus taught and lived by example. He is our example to follow. He did not encourage, teach or show by example in any way, that one should take up arms and fight to obtain their freedom, or to protect themselves when attacked.

His disciples did not teach this, and the early church did not teach this.
So why should we?

In His Love
pastorfrin

Re: - posted by cchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/3/5 22:12

Hi pastorfrin...

Quote:

When will we just plain look at what Jesus taught and lived by example. He is our example to follow. He did not encourage, teach or show by example in any way, that one should take up arms and fight to obtain their freedom, or to protect themselves when attacked.
His disciples did not teach this, and the early church did not teach this.
So why should we?

I think that the problem with this statement is the assumption that we who are not adherents to this sort of “Christian Non-resistant” ideology are not looking at “what Jesus taught and lived by example.” We do. This has been an issue

for which I have wrestled a long time. I really question the rationale for killing a man — even in *personal* self-defense. However, I do feel that I would be quite RESISTANT toward a person trying to harm my wife or children.

Yes, Jesus told us to “turn the other cheek” when struck. But he also told us to give to everyone who asks. Do we truly live up to this? If someone were to ask us for our coat, do we give them our shirt as well? If someone were to ask us for our *home* or *car* — would we? At what point is the line drawn? Obviously, Jesus was telling us to love our enemies. But at what point do we perform a disservice to our families? Are we commanded to protect and provide for them? If a person asks for my provisions (money, clothing, etc...) that are intended to be supplied to my wife or children, what would the Lord require of me? If I am commanded to take care of my wife, my children, my family and my neighbors — what should I do if they are threatened with violence?

As Brother Krispy stated, there is a difference between murder and killing (especially in regard to selfish motive). A mean person can *murder* an animal (for sport, boredom or even plain hatred). A hunter *kills* an animal for food. A good father might *kill* a bear or lion that tried to harm his family. The difference, as Krispy pointed out, lay in the motive. What if it were a violent man trying to harm his family (rather than a bear or lion)? While the man never wanted to harm a man — he might be motivated to save his family.

Pastorfrin, are you married? Do you have children? If so, what would you do if someone broke into your home and wanted to physically harm them? Would you continue to *non-resist*? Please understand that I am not asking this precociously. I am genuinely interested in learning your feelings in regard to this (and not the feelings of someone else that might be copied and pasted from someone else’s teachings). Do you feel that it is ever proper or Scriptural to use force — even in defense of your family?

: -)

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2008/3/5 22:15

Hi Annie. Just that we can grow to trust one another more is evidence that we are coming out of the world, and it's divisions.

Quote:

-----I believe MC that you are a peaceful man

Though I am perhaps quick to have confidence in others I know myself too well dear sister. The only true peace I've ever known is in the life of Christ...and as I learn to be quiet and content to desire nothing but to abide in him. Yet, why am I so quick to create turbulence for others who also desire to rest in Christ and in our fellowship with each other? With that in mind, your gentle response is much appreciated too...we can do much to help keep each other in Christ. Wherefore, my beloved brethren, let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath: For the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God. Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls

With tender regard for you sister,

MC

Re: The War To End All Wars - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2008/3/5 23:16

Greetings, all.

I don't really want to enter into the debate about this issue, but I'd like to share something.

I remember, when I was a boy, crawling up into my grandmother's attic and reading letters her son had sent her from the trenches in the Great War (WWI).

That was a long time ago, but I still remember a couple of those letters. In one, after describing things a bit (but only a bit, for the letter had to pass through censorship) he said something like, "Surely this must be Armageddon."

I was a young boy, I didn't know really what Armageddon even was, but I remember the fear it put in me, just reading that letter, and imagining.

And another letter... it was Christmas Day, and a lull in the fighting, and my uncle writes they heard singing from across No-man's-land... in German, carol singing. And after a bit, a few of them recognized the tune, and joined in the singing.

This went on for a while back and forth, the Germans starting a song, then the Canadians... And then some of them got up, and walked out unarmed into No-man's-land with a few gifts... treasures from packages they had received from home, a bit of Christmas cake, canned chicken, other things...

And then out from the enemy trenches came a few of their enemies as well, cautiously, tentatively... And they met together, shook hands, exchanged gifts, cigarettes...

So, here were men (with a Christian heritage and upbringing) in two opposing armies, one day fellowshiping under the Shadow of the Prince of Peace, but the next day back at war, back to the guns, back to killing one another.

...I just mention this because it's still so embedded in my own heart, those old letters.

And embedded also, the question, hasn't there been enough? Isn't the grave full enough yet? I am just saying, just asking-- some Christians in good conscience have fought men's wars; others because of conscience can't do it.

But where are we at now in this point in time? Can't we see where we are at? Take a look around you in this little planet of ours. The strife, the violence, the wars... Isn't it long past time to put an end to it all?

That war, the Great War, was supposed to be the war to end all wars.

It didn't happen, obviously.

But nevertheless, there IS a war to end all wars, and it's actually called the War of Armageddon. And, family of God, it's THIS ONE we are called to fight in, is it not?

"Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles: PREPARE WAR, wake up the mighty men, let the men of war draw near; let them come up; Beat your plowshares into swords and your pruning hooks into spears; let the weak say, I am strong.

"Assemble yourselves, and come, all ye heathen, and gather yourselves together round about: thither cause THY MIGHTY ONES to come down, O LORD" (Joel 3. 9,10).

Isn't God "inviting" the whole world into a battle with Him here, with "His Mighty Ones"? I wonder who will win?

But I wonder if even we Christians have truly comprehended the power and potential of the devastating warfare of the Cross? You have to say, the Cross of Christ is far, far from pacifism: God was on the offensive there, defeating all His (and our) enemies, and "triumphing over them IN IT" (ie, in His Cross, Col. 2.15).

And so, is not this why we who are Christians-- if we comprehend our calling-- are called to "put on the whole armour of God?" For it's the armour and warfare of the Cross He is talking about.

I'm such a slow learner. But I do want to learn... to take up my Cross, and be one of these He calls, "His Mighty Ones." I'm thankful He's so patient with me. I have to be honest, and say it makes me feel weak in the knees, the prospect of this. But I'm glad to discover here in Joel that it's the weak who are to say they are strong!

This fills me with such Hope, that the Lamb of God, with those who are "with Him," the "called and chosen and faithful," is going to, with those mighty spiritual weapons of the Cross, bring all His enemies under His feet... and under OUR feet as well (Rom. 16.20).

"He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; he breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder; he burneth the chariot in the fire.

"Be still and know that I am God: I will be exalted among the heathen, I will be exalted in the earth" (Ps. 46.10).

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Jesus and his teaching accentuate the end of all killing!!!!

I know this is a very big thing. But so is the One in whose Hands this is. And I believe this. And we will yet see this. And so this is where I am identified. This is the Army I am in. And I know I am on the winning side.

Bless you all,
AD

Re: - posted by Tears_of_joy, on: 2008/3/5 23:30

Good word, brother AD.

Re: - posted by pastorfrin, on: 2008/3/6 5:14

Quote:

ccchhrrriiiss wrote:
Hi pastorfrin...

Quote:

When will we just plain look at what Jesus taught and lived by example. He is our example to follow. He did not encourage, teach or show by example in any way, that one should take up arms and fight to obtain their freedom, or to protect themselves when attacked. His disciples did not teach this, and the early church did not teach this. So why should we?

I think that the problem with this statement is the assumption that we who are not adherents to this sort of "Christian Non-resistant" ideology are not looking at "what Jesus taught and lived by example." We do. This has been an issue for which I have wrestled a long time. I really question the rationale for killing a man - even in *personal* self-defense. However, I do feel that I would be quite RESISTANT toward a person trying to harm my wife or children.

Yes, Jesus told us to "turn the other cheek" when struck. But he also told us to give to everyone who asks. Do we truly live up to this? If someone were to ask us for our coat, do we give them our shirt as well? If someone were to ask us for our *home* or *car* - would we? At what point is the line drawn? Obviously, Jesus was telling us to love our enemies. But at what point do we perform a disservice to our families? Are we commanded to protect and provide for them? If a person asks for my provisions (money, clothing, etc...) that are intended to be supplied to my wife or children, what would the Lord require of me? If I am commanded to take care of my wife, my children, my family and my neighbors - what should I do if they are threatened with violence?

As Brother Krispy stated, there is a difference between murder and killing (especially in regard to selfish motive). A mean person can *murder* an animal (for sport, boredom or even plain hatred). A hunter *kills* an animal for food. A good father might *kill* a bear or lion that tried to harm his family. The difference, as Krispy pointed out, lay in the motive. What if it were a violent man trying to harm his family (rather than a bear or lion)? While the man never wanted to harm a man - he might be motivated to save his family.

Pastorfrin, are you married? Do you have children? If so, what would you do if someone broke into your home and wanted to physically harm them? Would you continue to *non-resist*? Please understand that I am not asking this precociously. I am genuinely interested in learning your feelings in regard to this (and not the feelings of someone else that might be copied and pasted from someone else's teachings). Do you feel that it is ever proper or Scriptural to use force - even in defense of your family?

:-)

Chris,

I feel sorry for you; that you would lower yourself to the place of insult. You are yet a child and thus you speak as a child. When I was your age I had been to hell and back and I have the scars on my body, and in my heart and mind to prove it. What have you Chris, what experience do you possess to insult others on this issue.

You say I have only copied and pasted from others on this issue, which is proof you speak from the flesh. There are pages in which I have poured out my heart on these issues, in my own words and from my own experiences. Do you think s

having these things is easy for me? This is not a game of who can score the most points with little digs at the other. You ask, would I defend my family? Yes, I would place my body between them and the attacker, I would gladly take a bullet, knife, or beating unto death for any one of them.

Chris, I would do the same for you or any other brother or sister in the Lord. But I will not return evil for evil to anyone. I will follow the example that Jesus Christ has given to all of us.

Did he ever take up the sword? Did he teach to do so? Did his disciples?

You speak as though you are the one who provides your possessions and your protection.

I can give whatever I have to someone who asks for it, because it is not mine, it is his.

My coat, my shirt, my house and my car; my family and even my life are all his. If he puts me in the place where anyone of them is to be given for 'His sake' who am I to withhold anything. He is the provider of all of my needs and thus I will trust Him for it ALL.

Perfect love casteth out all fear, what are you afraid of?

In His Love
pastorfrin

Re:, on: 2008/3/6 10:11

Quakers have no creed. but some would point to the Peace Testimony as one. it is very relevant to this thread, so here it is.

The Quaker Peace Testimony

We utterly deny all outward wars and strife and fighting with outward weapons for any end or under any pretense whatsoever; this is our testimony to the whole world

. . . The Spirit of Christ by which we are guided is not changeable, so as once to command us from a thing of evil and again to move us into it; and we certainly know and testify to the world that the Spirit of Christ which leads us into all truth will never move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons, neither for the Kingdom of Christ nor for the kingdoms of this world...therefore we cannot learn war anymore.

Excerpts from a Statement by the Quakers to King Charles II (1660)

defending the dropping of an atomic bomb? on people who are not soldiers????

the point is that what we do in this earthly life is temporal, but it can keep us from entering eternity with God. whose temporal life is worth defending with outward weapons at the risk of losing one's eternal self?

bub

bub

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiss (), on: 2008/3/6 10:36

Pastorfrin...

Quote:

I feel sorry for you; that you would lower yourself to the place of insult. You are yet a child and thus you speak as a child. When I was your age I had been to hell and back and I have the scars on my body, and in my heart and mind to prove it. What have you Chris, what experience do you possess to insult others on this issue.

Whoa, brother! I think that you misunderstood! My post was not meant to be an insult to you - not even in the slightest! I thought that I was careful enough to even say so. Please reread it without reading between the lines! You don't need to feel sorry for me, because no insult was intended or even offered. These words were my own thoughts on the issue.

e, and a sincere question about the extent of your Christian non-resistance beliefs in a certain circumstance (the danger of loved ones). I didn't intend for you to become offended by this.

As for scars, brother, I must confess that I have none (at least, none that can be seen with the eyes). This is not to say that I have not been physically attacked for my faith. I have been physically attacked for my faith to the point of shedding blood (and no, I didn't retaliate). Scars? As you have correctly pointed out, not all scars are the results of tears on our physical bodies. Some of them are deeper and far more difficult to heal. But my question was not about scars. It was about whether or not you feel that a believer should practice resistance in cases where our families are in imminent danger. Why would I ask such a question? I was only recently married this past year, and my wife and I would like to eventually have children.

Quote:

You say I have only copied and pasted from others on this issue, which is proof you speak from the flesh. There are pages in which I have poured out my heart on these issues, in my own words and from my own experiences. Do you think sharing these things is easy for me? This is not a game of who can score the most points with little digs at the other.

Again, brother, this is simply not true. I did not say that you only copy and paste from others. I simply stated that I was interested in hearing your own words in regard to this particular question (about defending others). Why? Like I said, I am genuinely interested in learning your views on this matter. As long as I have read your posts, you have been an unwavering advocate of this particular philosophy. And no, we do not agree on every aspect of some things. But I still hold a great deal of respect for you. No, I haven't read all of your posts since you've been on SermonIndex. So if you have addressed this issue in the past, I didn't realize it or read it. And I certainly do not view any exchanges on SermonIndex as a game. You presented a particular philosophy and I asked a question. It doesn't go any deeper than this, and there was no sinister reckoning on my part (and no, this wasn't a set up question either).

Quote:

You ask, would I defend my family? Yes, I would place my body between them and the attacker, I would gladly take a bullet, knife, or beating unto death for any one of them.
Chris, I would do the same for you or any other brother or sister in the Lord. But I will not return evil for evil to anyone.

Thank you for the answer. However, this isn't the same as defending a family member (the extent of my question). This is simply using our body as an obstacle. Perhaps that the question would have been better asked concerning whether or not a husband or father could physically disable a would-be intruder from harming his wife or children. Do you believe that we could wrestle, disarm, resist, etc... a person who is unwavering in his attempt to harm our families?

Quote:

I will follow the example that Jesus Christ has given to all of us.
Did he ever take up the sword? Did he teach to do so? Did his disciples?

You speak as though you are the one who provides your possessions and your protection.

This is a good question and the reason for my consideration in this matter. Jesus told us to turn the other cheek when we ourselves are attacked. Yet we are also instructed to take care of the needs of our families (or we are worse than an infidel). Yes, Jesus did tell us on at least one occasion to buy a sword (although his disciples had two; Luke 22:35-38).

My wife and I live on a lonely country road. Our home is located outside of town, in an area where illegal immigrants are known to be "dropped off." While most illegal immigrants are not dangerous, some have been known to have assaulted or even raped people. A few months ago, an illegal immigrant was found guilty of having killed a husband, raped and murdered the wife, and stolen the possessions of the family—all while a child was in the house. Some illegal immigrants are not in this country just to get a job. Some are transporting drugs and weapons (or money to purchase drugs and weapons). Since we have had illegal immigrants (and police/border patrol) knock on our door at 3 o'clock in the morning, this has become a concern for my wife. Yes, we knelt to pray; but we were ready with a big stick on the other side of the bed too.

Yes, God is both our ultimate provider and protection. But that is not to say that it is a lack of faith to get a job in order to earn a paycheck. When I married my wife, I took a vow to provide for and protect her. In fact, I am commanded by the Scriptures to take care of her or be considered "worse than an infidel" (I Timothy 5:8). Is such provision limited to food, water or clothing? Can it be extended to protection? In Hebrews chapter 11, there were men and women who were commended for their faith. They are instructed to consider the faithful examples of Gideon, Samson, David, etc... "Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions. Quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens." These men did not act in defense of themselves or their own possessions. They acted on behalf of their families and nation (or, in the case of David, also on behalf of sheep; I Samuel 17:33-37). These men realized that God was on their side and their ultimate provider and protector. But they also offered themselves up as a sacrifice and vessel for God to perform. Similarly, God has chosen for us men as the vessel to provide for the physical needs of our families.

Quote:

I can give whatever I have to someone who asks for it, because it is not mine, it is his. My coat, my shirt, my house and my car; my family and even my life are all his. If he puts me in the place where anyone of them is to be given for His sake who am I to withhold anything. He is the provider of all of my needs and thus I will trust Him for it ALL.

I agree. But at what point does our responsibility to our families supersede this instruction to give to whoever asks? Should I take food out of the mouth of my wife in order to provide for someone else? Doesn't this conflict with I Timothy 5:8 ("But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.")? Interestingly, we are told "specially for those of his own house," thereby implying that our responsibility is not simply with our own immediate family, but to others that we might consider our "own." In the United States, most states have "Good Samaritan laws." These laws require that a person must step in to help those around us in times of need. We cannot legally walk away from an accident, a burglary, an attack, a medical emergency, etc... We have both a moral and legal obligation to help.

Pastor Frin, please know that this post (nor my last one) was meant to be construed as an insult. That was nowhere near my intention. I respect your opinions in this issue far more than you probably know, even if I don't necessarily agree with your conclusions. I simply meant to ask your feelings in regard to questions of using force as a means to resist someone who wants to harm my wife or children. Is physical defense ever a possibility?

:-)

Re:, on: 2008/3/6 15:10

Quote:

-----Ccchhrrriiiss wrote:

No, I haven't read all of your posts since you've been on SermonIndex. So if you have addressed this issue in the past, I didn't realize it or read it.

That is why you are still interrogating and preaching to an elder about his family's convictions and leaving faces for him.

Yes, this is The Body of Christ and I do have the right to speak up for a brother who's posts I have read - including yours Chris.

We've had years to get to know Pastor Frin and even all about his family and his history and his present trials and hard work.

I even have you and your wife's picture in my SI files for prayer purposes and to know the age of who I'm addressing. That is a factor in the Body.

Have the Frin's pictures and other member's pictures that they've sent me besides. I find it helpful to see faces that I address and pray for.

Shouldn't we all get to know each other if we're going to post to each other in such a way - after all these years?

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss () , on: 2008/3/6 16:13

Hello HE_Reigns...

Quote:

-----That is why you are still interrogating and preaching to an elder about his family's convictions and leaving faces for him.

Huh?

I am not "interrogating and preaching to an elder," Annie. I simply asked for a clarification about the extent of his non-resistance philosophy. No offense was meant in the slightest (as I have already stated). Those "faces" are not meant as sarcasm, offense, or anything else, sister. So please slow down with such accusations.

Quote:

Yes, this is The Body of Christ and I do have the right to speak up for a brother who's posts I have read - including yours Chris.

We've had years to get to know Pastor Frin and even all about his family and his history and his present trials and hard work.

I even have you and your wife's picture in my SI files for prayer purposes and to know the age of who I'm addressing. That is a factor in the Body.

Have the Frin's pictures and other member's pictures that they've sent me besides.
I find it helpful to see faces that I address and pray for.

Shouldn't we all get to know each other if we're going to post to each other in such a way - after all these years?

Sister, you certainly have a right to read and speak up. But I believe that you have misunderstood this situation. I very much feel a part of this SermonIndex community. I have been here for a long time, and frequented the forums even before becoming a member. I am incredibly thankful to the Lord for this website. It is a treasure - because it contains a wealth of messages from some wonderful men of God! Yet I don't spend every waking hour of every day roaming through the forums. I don't read through every thread or every post. That is why I apologized if he had already covered the specificities of my question in the past.

I don't even know the age of "pastorfrin" - let alone his life story. He obviously is older than me, since he called me a "child" in his last post. But again, I meant (and still mean) no disrespect for the man or whatever *de facto* or *de jure* position he may have at SermonIndex or in the Body of Christ. My inquiry was a simple question asked with sincerity, honesty and without pretense. Even reading over my post again, I still can't figure out why someone would become so offended by it.

Sister, please understand that many of us are not nearly as overtly involved in the SermonIndex forums. I do read many posts in many threads - but most of my time here is spent downloading or reading sermons. I try to limit my participation in the forums. Why? Because I realize how much more I need to learn, and I typically join mostly as a spectator. I've witnessed far more conflicts and arguments and debates than I have ever joined. I try to participate only if I (usually after prayer) feel that I have something meaningful to say or input - or that I have a question about something else. In addition, I do not keep a file (complete with photos) about the various members of SermonIndex. Why? Well, I don't do that with my local Church, either. Besides, there are thousands of members now - and I don't have the time or motive to do something like that.

In my years here at SermonIndex, I have invited many brothers and sisters to fellowship with us. Almost all of them have been blessed by the messages and music. But sadly, I have heard reports on several occasions from people who have been "turned off" by any sort of participation in the forums because of contemptuous ideological conflict. Even my wife limits her participation here because she has read certain words that were uttered in almost vicious condescension. Let me make this clear: I meant no disrespect toward brother pastorfrin as a man, or as an "elder." I do disagree with some of the extent of his "non-resistant" philosophy. Yet I do not believe that I am in the wrong to ask him to clarify it. But I will try to make certain that I no longer use the "faces" when I feel that someone might suspect something sinister by them.

This is getting a little carried away, isn't it?

Re:, on: 2008/3/6 16:34

Quote:

-----This is getting a little carried away, isn't it?

Yes, that was my feeling Brother.

Re: - posted by pastorfrin, on: 2008/3/6 17:51

Hi Chris,

Sorry for the misunderstanding. I do not expect anyone to agree with me on non-resistance or any other matter as far as that goes. Nor do I care about the faces; in fact I have not considered them before. The problem was the cut and paste comment:

Quote:

“I am genuinely interested in learning your feelings in regard to this (and not the feelings of someone else that might be copied and pasted from someone else's teachings).”

I read this at 4:30am this morning and I understood it to mean what it says, thus my response.

Chris I do not know what more I could add. What is there about putting my body between the attacker and who is being attacked do you not understand? I did not say I would resist them in any other way, and I would not; at least that is what I believe I would do.

You never know for sure until you are placed in that situation. I have been trained to kill in one swift strike, that was years ago and it would not be too swift today.

I have a weapons safe filled with weapons that would easily disable or take someone's life. It is locked and the keys are hidden in a different part of the house. They would be useless if someone did break in to do us harm. Since I stopped hunting they have been locked away.

We need to know and have it settled in our hearts what the Lord would have us to do. As I have said in the past, this is up to the individual, I cannot be, nor do I want to be someone else's conscience.

So it is clear and you understand, I would not resist other than placing myself as a shield, and this would be by the grace and strength of the Lord.

In my opinion, most do not look honestly at non-resistance and it is evident by the number of excuses that are made as reasons why it cannot be. If Jesus is our example, then it is Jesus we must follow. Jesus, his disciples, and the early church lived and taught non-resistance.

This can only be received by our faith, trust and hope resting solely in Jesus Christ and steadfastly looking upon His teachings, and these examples; only then will we believe the words of the apostle Paul. I can do all things through Jesus Christ who strengthens me.

When I pray each day for the Father's will to be done in myself, my family and His Church, I trust Him and only Him. He knows what we are made of and if we truly seek Him, then He will prepare us for whatever we must face to bring glory unto His name.

After all; it is His Kingdom, His Power and His Glory and I believe we can rest in the fact that He has it all under control. Blessed is the man who puts 'all' his trust in the Lord.

Again, sorry for the misunderstanding and I hope this helps with your questions.

In His Love
pastorfrin

Re: - posted by destinysweet (), on: 2008/3/6 18:58

pastorfrin..Thank you for expressing your heart and convictions on this matter.When I read your posts I am often inspired to share varied lessons I have learned that are in alignment to what you preach..but do not know if they would be appreciated..as they have to do with being obedient to the Holy Spirit not to do harm to another and usually end in the activity of angels to subdue an attacker..some people become very threatened when I share these type of events..either because they do not have a point of reference personally or do not believe God still does this today..Sometimes I am accused of being proud or boastful. The scriptures tell us to do this speak of the mighty works of God. We come under His discipline,this is our desire..not to show off.Heaven forbid..but sometimes we do not know our own motives and so we pray..I do not want to become too timid to speak..for fear of stumbling someone else..this seems wrong as well.

My first thought/intention is that these things ought to be spoken of because they help others to realize that God does these greater things when we believe and obey Him..when we follow Jesus example even when facing death or a beating etc.Why is it ok for the scriptures to bear witness by recording these type of events and today it is frowned upon? I can be inspired by the acts of the Holy Spirit in the lives of the Apostles but I am not allowed to speak of them now..to equip and inspire the body of Christ to believe in these acts today?If God's elect people will not stand in Christ..in His way, embracing the reality of His sacrificial death in the small details how do they expect to see His protective provision on a larger scale when things become crucial.Every small act of obedience is crucial.These are,in part, a type of the solid foundation from where He builds our faith..develops the word of our testimony(Christ in us) which helps us to overcome fear and accusation. I believe the little things I have done to obey His leading provided me with the proof of the pudding..so to speak..the reality of His Word and Will made manifest when He swiftly came to the rescue..rewarding my having been diligent to trust Him at His Word,underlining for me that I could have faith in following this way of the meek and lowly Master..gentle and humble.That I needn't fear.

I hope you will respond to this..you seem so level headed..I will be praying for the release to share further..in the meantime..thanks again for your posts.

I especially enjoyed the ones on Let's talk about peace,on heavenly ambassadorship..is that a word? Helped me to realign in a few places where I'd become too involved/concerned in my mind /emotions with the kingdom of man's government/politics.Much Appreciated!

Re:, on: 2008/3/7 1:41

Brothers and Sisters, I'm asking - please pray for Pastor Frin.

He keeps much of what he faces each day, from us and I feel I have to let this out of the bag now.

He should not have to go through things without us rooting for him.

He has a very large family that he is responsible for in many ways.

7 children and 14 grandchildren and some staying with him and still working a hard physical job and Pastoring his Church as well.

If he doesn't answer right away or as we're used to - please know this - he has been struggling since January with a Dr.s suggestion of checking his bones for a suspicion of cancer again. His blood tests in January were not right, nor this last batch. I'll say this out-right, though you could figure it yourself, he's been dragging since last year. Or is pushing the better word?

Just after last year's relief near Christmas - to hear "cancer" for the third time now again?

I know the love he has for his wife and family.

Beyond what I've seen in most families in my time.

Today he goes for more discussions about more tests with his Dr..

Please let's pull together and just pray.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Jesus and his teaching accentuate the end of all killing!!!!

We need to love and pray for each other more.

He can speak for himself very well - when he's at home and not piled down with these many responsibilities, burdens and issues.

I'm not his spokesperson in the slightest - Just asking for prayer - that's all.

Thanks

Re: Jesus and his teaching accentuate the end of all killing!!!! - posted by rowdy2 (), on: 2008/3/7 4:19

Reply to all

We have discussed very difficult personal questions and my prayer is that I have not offended, nor betrayed anyone, I hate no one.

Jesus taught us to love one another and that is not in dispute. I would never kill out of hatred. That is such a vile concept I know we are not even allowed to consider the matter.

God knows whom He has chosen and I admit I can't rationalize every situation we are placed in as members of the body of humanity. The working of our Lord in our lives is a wonderful mystery to me. I have no faith in my own self. He that chose me knows all things so take what I say with a box of salt and put your trust in Him.

We will all have to give an account of this discourse. Fear could grip one's heart if being weak in faith they threw out their convictions because we brought them into question. No one has harmed me and I pray I have not did any harm.

Eddie

Re: - posted by LoveHim, on: 2008/3/7 8:11

Quote:

-----Brothers and Sisters, I'm asking - please pray for Pastor Frin.

i'm praying now, thank you for putting the need out there. brother pastorfrin, we are praying and believing with you.

phil

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/3/7 11:02

Hi pastorfrin...

Thank you. No offense was taken whatsoever. We can differ in this matter and still be understanding and respectful of one another's opinions about the meaning of the Scriptures in this regard.

You and your family are in our prayers.

:)

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Jesus and his teaching accentuate the end of all killing!!!!

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2008/3/7 13:00

A friend sent me these brief paragraphs they found in the Washington Post. Here, Chuck Colson answers' the question, would Jesus run for President, and what might that look like. Colson's curious but unblinking response seemed relevant to this thread...

The idea of the historical Jesus running for president is on its face preposterous. He was tempted by Satan, who offered Him all the powers of the world, and He emphatically declined (Luke 4). He told the Roman governor Pilate that "My kingdom is not of this world."

The only possible way in which one could deal with this question is to simply assume that someone wanted to be as Christ-like as possible, which means to take a biblical perspective on the various issues. On the death penalty, Christians have historically been divided. In rare cases, nothing less will balance the scales of justice. But the weight of Christian reflection would be against the needless taking of life—and certainly against the taking of innocent life in any form, which deals with the question of abortion, of course.

On the question of Iraq, there is a well-established just war tradition going back to St. Augustine. Muslim scholars over the years have contributed to it. So in a sense it reflects the best of religious thinking. There are those cases where to protect the innocent military forces have to be committed. Would Jesus commit them? No. His kingdom is not of this world. Would someone attempting to follow Jesus as closely as he could commit them? Yes, if it meant the preservation of order, the doing of justice, and the restraint of evil, all of which are the biblical tasks for government.

Re:, on: 2008/3/7 13:04

That's the stance of the CNP alright.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/3/7 13:29

Hi HE_Reigns...

Quote:
-----That's the stance of the CNP alright.

Why was this comment necessary? I agree that force might be acceptable in defense of the innocent -- and I am not a member of the CNP (or any other much maligned organization). Is Chuck Colson even a member?

If not, then making such a statement is the similar to saying that "Christian non-resistant" believers do not support the war in Iraq -- which is the same stance as Al Qaeda...or Quakers...or even the Amish.

In this instance, I tend to agree with Brother Colson. While I don't agree with him on several issues, I've often admired his work with prisoners. I also have noticed that I share some of his same views in regard to the administration of government. He has very intriguing insight as a former Washington insider. I actually met him once at an airport where he was sharing Christ with a pilot.

Re:, on: 2008/3/7 13:44

Quote:
-----Why was this comment necessary?

That does not sound friendly Chris.
You can make my statement say whatever you choose. Anyone can.
I only made a statement to MC's quote.

Just to answer your question that you've asked me....

Quote:
-----Is Chuck Colson even a member?

http://www.policycounsel.org/16332/19101.html?*session*id*key*=*session*id*val*

Quote:
-----If not, then making such a statement is the similar to saying that "Christian non-resistant" believers do not support the war in Iraq -- which is the same stance as Al Quaeda...or Quakers...or even the Amish.

:-(

Re: prayer for pastorfrin - posted by pastorfrin, on: 2008/3/8 8:38

Brothers and Sisters,

I thank each and every one of you for your prayers and concern for my family and me.
Thank you Sister Annie, for bringing this need to every ones attention; I tend not to want to burden others, which is one of my weaknesses.
So as not to divert this thread away from its intended subject, I will update every one on the 'Miracles that follow the plow forum'.

In His Love
pastorfrin

Re: - posted by pastorfrin, on: 2008/3/8 9:42

Hi Brother MC,

Quote:
-----The idea of the historical Jesus running for president is on its face preposterous. He was tempted by Satan, who offered Him all the powers of the world, and He emphatically declined (Luke 4). He told the Roman governor Pilate that "My kingdom is not of this world."

Not only on its face is it preposterous, but according to the teachings and declarations of Jesus Christ it is preposterous.
Rev. 1:8
I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.

Quote:
-----The only possible way in which one could deal with this question is to simply assume that someone wanted to be as Christ-like as possible, which means to take a biblical perspective on the various issues. On the death penalty, Christians have historically been divided. In rare cases, nothing less will balance the scales of justice. But the weight of Christian reflection would be against the needless taking of life—and certainly against the taking of innocent life in any form, which deals with the question of abortion, of course.

With a ninety percent civilian casualty rate coming from modern warfare, how does collateral damage fit in with "against the taking of innocent life in any form"?

Quote:
-----On the question of Iraq, there is a well-established just war tradition going back to St. Augustine. Muslim scholars over the years have contributed to it. So in a sense it reflects the best of religious thinking. There are those cases where to protect the innocent military forces have to be

committed. Would Jesus commit them? No. His kingdom is not of this world. Would someone attempting to follow Jesus as closely as he could commit them? Yes, if it meant the preservation of order, the doing of justice, and the restraint of evil, all of which are the biblical tasks for government.

This is in total contradiction with the teachings of Christ.

Where did Christ teach this just war tradition and to what part did the early church take part in it?

According to this philosophy, would not the Christians living under cruel Roman rule have 'just cause' to deliver those being tortured and killed?

Why did not Jesus or the Disciples lead them to overcome and protect the innocent by fighting a just war?

Could it be because?

2 Cor. 10:3-5

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;

Ephes. 6:12

For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.

Why are people today considered more innocent than in the time of Jesus and his disciples?

We are to follow the teachings and example of the Lord Jesus Christ, not the example or commands of a world government in opposition to the teachings of Jesus Christ.

John 18:36-37

Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence. Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.

In His Love

pastorfrin

Re: - posted by cchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2008/3/8 10:31

Thank you, HE_Reigns...

Quote:

-----"Why was this comment necessary?"

That does not sound friendly Chris.

You can make my statement say whatever you choose. Anyone can.

Forgive me for that, sister. I didn't intend that this comment was to be taken as unfriendly, Annie. I simply meant to ask the rationale behind the comment. What does this discussion have to do with the CNP? Are you insisting that everything that the organization and everything that they believe is evil? What does that have to do with Colson's comments?

Please understand that I know more want to offend or disrespect your own beliefs (whatever they may be) in this issue any more than you probably want to offend or disrespect my own. I would, however, like to point out that there are true believers (like me) who feel that physical resistance can be used in defense of the innocent.

Often, I feel that I am talked down to simply because I feel the liberty (and need) to vote. I know that this is probably not the intention of those who do not believe as such, but the opinions are often presented in a manner that attempts to express that those who do not believe such are on a higher spiritual level. This leaves all of us voters, and wife/children/neig

hbor defenders on a lower, less spiritual plane. Someone even suggested once that those who get involved in government are in danger of giving power to the Antichrist!

It is a good thing to proclaim our opinions. Pastorfrin is a fine example of a person who tirelessly shares his beliefs about Christian Non-resistance with a meek attitude. He has kindly pointed out the differences between pacifism and his beliefs, and he has provided a Scriptural rationale for those beliefs. While I still disagree about the extent of such non-resistance (particularly in regard to whether another cause might supersede the principle), I still respect those beliefs. I don't think that anyone could point to our brother and can him anything but sincere in his endeavor to live up to the Scriptures. Is this not descriptive of all believers? Although we might believe in certain limited involvements with our earthly country, we do so in completely sincerity and honesty after a struggle over the extent of such liberty or need.

Please forgive me if I have come across as being proud or haughty. That is not my intention. I know that you might feel that you have a lot to say in the forums, and I do weigh your words within each conversation as holding the weight of a seasoned believer. I might not agree with your beliefs, opinions or even rationale at times, but it doesn't change my respect for you.

May the Lord bless you exceedingly!

Re: - posted by Zionshield (), on: 2008/3/17 21:58

Nations are held to a different standard than individuals. God has given authority to the gov't to bear the sword. Thou shalt not kill would more accurately be translated thou shalt not murder...even when Jesus reiterated that he revealed hatred as the real culprit not the duty of a soldier. Actually< I'm sure quite a bit was said...too many threads for me to read. D James Kennedy had a great message on this.