



## General Topics :: Article on President Bush

### Article on President Bush - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/8/2 16:02

Here's an article by Dr. Patrick Johnston titled "Why Christians Should Not Vote for George Bush."

<http://www.wherethe truthhurts.org/tractsbooksread.php?w=59>

I normally avoid politics, but I'd very much like to hear what you all think of it. Frankly, it convinced me (I was already leaning in that direction), and it appears very well documented. Dr. Johnston doesn't bend over backwards to pull his punches, but he is fair.

Please consider this prayerfully, and please bring up any objections (or agreements) you may have.

### Re: Article on President Bush - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/8/2 16:12

Quote:  
 -----I normally avoid politics, but I'd very much like to hear what you all think of it. Frankly, it convinced me (I was already leaning in that direction), and it appears very well documented. Dr. Johnston doesn't bend over backwards to pull his punches, but he is fair.  
 -----

One great thing about SermonIndex being a forprofit ministry rather than a non-profit at this point is that we can discuss political issues and I could even endorse one side :-P considering most of the viewership of this site is American (65%-75%) I think this is a great topic to discuss. I have heard alot of biblical teaching on that Christians shouldn't even be **involved** with politics at all. I have been able to view the Kerry Campaign abit and he is clearly not as much a professed christian as George Bush? I am not even sure if John Kerry is a Christian, though in his speeches he uses alot of biblical phrases for his own means. In the Video recording:

(<http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid4224>) The Power of Prayer (video) by Keith Daniel , he says that 'we should not criticize George Bush but rather pray for him, hes the only president of a country that is professed born-again!'. Thats just my 2 cents im not american so I don't have very strong political views.

### Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/8/2 16:50

Quote:  
 -----I have heard alot of biblical teaching on that Christians shouldn't even be **involved** with politics at all.  
 -----

That's another very important topic, particularly when constrasting that view with theonomy/reconstructionism, but let's get to that one later :)

Quote:  
 -----I have been able to view the Kerry Campaign abit and he is clearly not as much a professed christian as George Bush?  
 -----

Kerry is officially a Roman Catholic, but pretty much just a nominal one, even some of the bishops and such in that church want to deny Kerry communion because of his pro-choice views.

Quote:  
 -----Keith Daniel, he says that 'we should not criticize George Bush but rather pray for him, hes the only president of a country that is professed born-again!  
 -----

I'm glad, to an extent, that Bush at least professes Christianity and seems more serious than Clinton or Kerry, and I agree that we should of course pray for our leaders (and all national leaders), and I agree that we should not "criticize" him in the sense of being wantonly gossipy or denigrating out of some kind of vengefulness or bitterness or the like, but we are commanded to "judge righteous judgment" and to "judge a tree by its fruit," and upon close examination President Bush's fruit isn't looking good.

Again, I'd like for people to read the article I linked to (I'd post it here, but it's big, though I may wind up having to post it if I want people to actually read it). Could someone here contact Mr. Daniel and ask him to read the article and respond?

A few of the more significant points:

George W. Bush is not strictly pro-life.

"

On the campaign trail, President Bush professed to be "pro-life", but with exceptions -- he believes abortion to be justified in cases of rape and incest. The New York Times reported, "It was the same tempered language that George W. Bush typically uses to discuss abortion, which he opposes except in cases of rape, incest or risk to a pregnant woman's life." As Alan Keyes pointed out in the Presidential debates and in various speeches, such pro-life exceptions that allow the innocent to be killed in some circumstances disqualify President Bush from being pro-life at all. If President Bush would justify the killing of one innocent person under his jurisdiction, he is disqualified from being a good person, much less a good leader.

"

(in that, and other quotes from the article, I've omitted the documentation links, which you can find at the bottom of each page in the article linked in the first post)

Bush has appointed more openly homosexual persons to places of power than any other president (more than all of them combined, I think).

"

President Bush has stated that he has no qualms about hiring homosexuals, and he has proven it. He has appointed open homosexuals to high government positions at a rate that makes Bill Clinton look like a homophobe! On April 9, 2001, he appointed a renowned homosexual activist Scott Evertz to the Office of National AIDS Policy, which was the first appointment of an open homosexual to this federal position. On June 18, 2002, he transferred Evertz to direct U.S. Policy on Global Fund for AIDS and appointed another homosexual activist to take over as new director of the Office of National AIDS Policy. On September 18, 2001, President Bush appointed a homosexual activist to be Ambassador to Romania at the protest of the Romanian government. Furthermore, President Bush authorized a Clinton policy that allows an "unmarried partner" of a foreign aid worker to be given the same status as a married spouse. So the ambassador's homosexual lover accompanies him to official government functions, travels with and resides with him on the taxpayers' tab. On August 22, 2001, President Bush appointed an open homosexual to the U.S. Commission on Fine Arts. He presided over the appointment of another open homosexual to oversee the choice of civilian personnel at the Pentagon. The Bush administration posted a job for a "gay and lesbian program specialist" at the Department of Agriculture. On November 1, 2001, President Bush appointed an open homosexual to the State Department as an arms control advisor, which was the first appointment of an openly gay person to a senior arms control post. President Bush insisted that openly homosexual Congressman Jim Kolbe of Arizona be given a prominent speaking role at the Republican National Convention. On January 25, 2002, President Bush appointed many openly gay Republicans to the President's Advisory Council on HIV/AIDS.

"

And a very sobering thought concerning the role of American Christians in all this:

"

The church has largely neglected its Biblical duty to judge a tree by its fruit, to "judge righteous judgment." George W. Bush's is a counterfeit conservative. If judicial activists pervert the covenant of marriage to accommodate the sodomites, it will be because of politicians like George Bush who appoint them. The blame for the assault on the traditional family and the unborn can be laid squarely at our feet because of our negligence in preferring pragmatism over principle, political power over persecution, and religious pluralism over Christ. The Supreme Court has forsaken God ultimately because the professing church has forsaken God. Thousands of "the least of these" are murdered every day in America because the majority of professing Christians voted for it or failed to vote against it. The only truly pro-life, pro-family, constitutional candidate for President who was on the ballot in 2000 was the Constitution Party's candidate, but that vote would have required a faith that works.

"

And that brings us to the alternative: Bush and Kerry aren't the only ones running for President! Most of the others aren't

't any better, it seems, but there is one shining light:

<http://www.constitutionparty.org>

Please do check that link out as well, I was positively elated when I read their platform and agreed with essentially every word (what a shock to someone so opinionated as me), and discovered they're probably going to be the biggest third party involved in the presidential election (unless Nader makes a really good showing).

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/8/2 17:03**

Quote:  
-----And that brings us to the alternative: Bush and Kerry aren't the only ones running for President! Most of the others aren't any better, it seems, but there is one shining light:  
-----

WOW all Christians in America should definetly check this out. I really think we have no viable option except this man and this party as you brother Keith I was throughly impressed with their stances and their determination to run the country as did the forefathers with moral excellence and respect unto God.

"George Washington feared two threats to America above all others. First, the corrupting influence of political parties with their spirit of faction and selfishness; **and second, the weakening of the influence of religious morality on public life.** On both counts he was right - the Democrats and Republicans have betrayed us, and squandered the Founders' legacy of liberty and justice. Countless government officials in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government take their oath to uphold and defend the Constitution with no understanding of the responsibilities that oath entails."

---

[Image: <http://www.sermonindex.net/images/forum/2004/july/peroutka.jpg>] **Michael Anthony Peroutka Accepts Constitution Party Nomination for President of these United States**

by Michael A. Peroutka  
Constitution Party Candidate for U.S. President

Mr. Chairman, Madam Secretary, Members of the National Executive Committee, Delegates to the Constitution Party Convention, Members of the Constitution Party, My fellow Americans, Dear Brothers and Sisters...

I am proud and honored and humbled to accept the nomination of the Constitution Party for the Office of President of the United States.

Just four months ago in Maryland, when I publicly announced that I would seek this nomination, we talked about the cultural and spiritual decline that we see all about us in America today.

We expressed our deep concern for our republic. We wondered what sort of Country we've become.

We wondered what sort of Country sends mothers and Daughters and wives and sisters to fight and bleed and die its foreign undeclared -- undeclared wars.

We wondered what sort of country sends sodomites to fight its foreign undeclared wars.

We wondered about what kind of an administration declares war on something so vague, so amorphous, and so undefined as Terrorism. We worry about such dangerous and sloppy thinking. Since terror is not an enemy, but the tactic of an enemy, we wonder how such a war could ever be won. How could such a war ever end? How do you defeat a tactic especially when you practice the same tactic yourself?

We wondered that it's the same sort of country that tortures and executes more than one million of its unborn every year.

We worried about becoming a country whose president backs homosexual civil unions -- whose president wants to give

asylum and welfare benefits to millions of illegal aliens -- and whose president insists that both he and the Muslims worship the same god. Well, perhaps they do.

We worried about judicial tyranny. We never thought we'd see the day when a federal judge would tell the highest elected judicial officer of a State that he couldn't acknowledge the sovereignty of the God of the Bible and attribute to Him our religious freedom. But this is exactly what U.S. District Court Judge Myron Thompson told Alabama Supreme Court Chief Justice Roy Moore he could not do.

We also discussed the dangers of the one world government agenda and the headlong rush of both major party candidates to give away America's sovereignty to foreign bureaucrats.

We talked about the out-of-control spending on unconstitutional programs that are the dirty habit of both Democrat and Republican administrations despite endless promises to the contrary. These unlawful spending sprees have bankrupted America and made her vulnerable to her enemies -- both economically and militarily.

Keep in mind that those high gas prices mean that the purchasing power of the dollar is slipping, and the weak dollar reflects the low confidence that foreign lenders have in America's economy.

Ask yourself, if I came to you for a loan, would you have some concern if my told you I was going to spend more than I took in this year to the tune of one half of a trillion dollars?!? And, by the way, would it also concern you that I'm 7 TRILLION dollars in debt already!

We talked about the black hole of consolidated, centralized power that our forefathers warned would plague us if we didn't stay true to republican (not democratic) principles. We talked about the dishonor that would be our reproach if we failed to honor God and acknowledge Him as the source of Law and Liberty and Government.

So, we find ourselves today standing amidst the ruins of an American Constitutional Republic, the foundations of which have been destroyed.

This is the key point, ladies and gentlemen -- the foundations have been destroyed.

These conditions I've just described -- significant and challenging as they indeed are -- are not the problem. They are the symptoms of the problem.

The problem is that we no longer stand upon the firm American foundation that was won for us by the courageous and visionary men who lodged here in the winter of 1777.

We talked about rebuilding those foundations and why it is important -- indeed essential -- that we do so.

The Themes of our campaign -- God, Family and the Republic are designed to reflect this vital task.

We must Acknowledge God, Defend the Family and work to Restore the Republic

We begin -- like our forefathers began -- at the beginning.

"In the beginning, God created..." Genesis 1:1

America -- perhaps the only Country ever founded on a creed -- began right here. This first sentence of the Bible is the cornerstone of an American understanding of law and government.

"God Created..." is the very first presupposition upon which the Declaration of Independence and an American view of law and government rests. Jefferson expressed so eloquently in that document that "All men are CREATED equal..." (not evolved equal). He went on to say that the Creator God endowed all men with rights -- unalienable rights -- of life, and liberty and the pursuit of happiness, among others. He went further still and declared that the purpose of government is to secure and protect and defend these God-given rights.

Ladies and gentlemen, this AMERICAN view of government's foundations and purposes -- that there exists a Creator God -- that rights come from Him -- and that the purpose of civil government is to protect and defend and secure these

God-given rights — are the very foundations that we've been talking about.

These are the footings upon which can be poured the structural elements of a safe and prosperous and just and decent society -- A society in which religious diversity is tolerated and not suppressed.

Such diversity is tolerated, it's important to note, not because the men in charge decide to tolerate religious expression, but because God tolerates liberty of conscience.

To those who wrongly criticize our Party saying that we want to establish a Theocracy, we must ask them to give careful attention to what we are saying. Like America's founders, we believe that the acknowledgment of God is not the exercise of a religion. Rather it is the founding philosophy of a government that allows religious diversity.

You know, we live in such a secular age today that it seems strange to talk about God and government at the same time . We've been so brainwashed that we ask, "What does God have to do with government?"

Well, this question would have been easily answered by our founders. They understood the connection between the two

For example, in his October 3, 1789 Thanksgiving Proclamation, George Washington, the father of our country, said "It is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for His benefits, and humbly to implore His protection and favor."

You see, our country was founded by men and women who believed that "righteousness exalts a nation," and that "unless the Lord builds the house, they labor in vain who build it."

If I am elected President, I will, like our forefathers, acknowledge and honor God as the source of law, liberty and government. And I will do everything in my Constitutional power to see that no person who fails to acknowledge God will be appointed to the Federal judiciary!

I will support and pledge to sign the Constitutional Restoration Act introduced in the Senate by Senators Shelby, Brownback and Miller and Graham and in the House by Representative Aderholt of Alabama and others. I support this effort to limit the jurisdiction of the Federal Courts under Article III of the Constitution and will do all in my power to ensure that our right to acknowledge God in public places is in no way infringed.

Furthermore, I will seek to remove from office any federal judge who advocates reliance on foreign law or the decisions of foreign courts -- as some Supreme Court Justices have recently done.

Let me speak for a moment about our second theme -- Defending the family.

## MARRIAGE

Strong families are the backbone of a peaceful, just, and prosperous society. Many don't realize it but the family is a legal jurisdiction. It was actually the first institutional jurisdiction ordained by God. Even before the legal jurisdictions of the Church and the State.

No institution in America is under greater attack than the God-created, God-ordained family. Increasingly we are told by tyrannical, out of control courts, and others, that marriage is whatever people want it to be.

But this is a lie.

Marriage is defined by God alone. And He HAS defined it. He says it is to be only between a man and a woman. PERIOD! And Godly marriage does not need the approval of any civil government.

Let me here declare that I oppose homosexual marriage and civil unions, even as I oppose the hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidies which President Bush and Republicans and Democrats in Congress have supported to promote "safe sodomy" and underwrite the infrastructure of the homosexual movement.

## FATHERHOOD

Last Sunday, we celebrated father's day across America, a tradition going back to 1910 when a woman from Spokane, Mrs. Sonora Louise Smart, grateful for the Godly example of her self-sacrificing father, a man who lovingly raised six children following the death of his wife, drew up a petition to honor all fathers in America.

In 1972, President Richard Nixon formalized the third Sunday in June as a day set aside to give thanks for the special role of fathers.

But today, perhaps the most insidious attack on the American family is the decades-long denigration of fatherhood.

The father is the head of the God-ordained family. He is the leader, the teacher, the provider, the protector. He is the law giver, the judge and the enforcer. The Bible defines his role as the special representative of God and His Word in the sacred institution of the family.

As such, he is the federal head and is responsible for the instruction of his wife and the training of his children in the fear and admonition of the Lord.

To those who seek to destroy our Christian, civilized culture, he clearly poses a threat.

This is why the enemies of America and American law and American government have sought for decades to besmirch his character, render him irrelevant and, indeed, put him to death.

Hollywood movies overwhelmingly portray fathers as drunkards, bullies and buffoons. Television programs show him as selfish, stupid, greedy, uncaring and incompetent.

Government programs, including federal grants to States, actually reward state welfare and social service agencies with monetary incentives when they succeed in BREAKING UP families and removing fathers from their own homes.

You see, by destroying the good name of fatherhood, America's enemies seek to destroy the authority and influence not only of American dads, but also the memory and lasting influence of our FOUNDING FATHERS, The attack on fathers and fatherhood is an insidious attack on the very concept of moral authority, and thus, an attack on the Character of God Himself.

If elected, I promise to end all unconstitutional spending, including grants to State agencies that are rewarded for destroying American families.

## ABORTION

Abortion is also a part of the attack on the family. Our current President has failed to lead on this premier moral issue of our time — which is the systematic slaughter of innocent, defenseless, unborn children in the womb.

For example, he has approved legislation to send additional scores of millions of tax dollars to Planned Parenthood and other groups which promote infanticide.

He has failed to stop the Food and Drug Administration from authorizing the distribution of RU 486, the abortion pill which has already been used to snuff out the lives of thousands of unborn children.

As President, I would do everything in my power to end the national disgrace of abortion -- Starting with a formal acknowledgment of the personhood of every child from the moment of conception.

Furthermore, I will obey my oath, and defend the Constitution, by refusing to enforce the unconstitutional ruling in ROE v . WADE, and will appoint as U.S. Attorneys, only those who will ensure that none of America's precious children are deprived of their unalienable right to life without due process of law.

As President, I would advocate a total ban on all abortions and a total ban on any federal funding of abortions, here or abroad.

Since the first priority of civil government is to protect innocent life, the defense of the unborn would be my first priority in

office.

Finally, let me address our third theme -- Restoring the Republic.

Regrettably, millions of Americans have no idea that the form of government our founders bequeathed us was not a democracy but a Constitutional -- Representative -- Republic. Even sadder -- and a lot more dangerous -- is the obvious fact that most of those running the three branches of our national government -- both Democrats and Republicans -- do not care that our founders gave us a Constitutional -- Representative -- Republic.

A few weeks ago, comedian Jay Leno made a remark about the sinking situation in Iraq and the struggle to adopt (impose) an Iraqi constitution. Leno Said, "Why not just give them our Constitution...we're not using it anymore?"

If Jay Leno can get this right, why can't we?

If you have ever read the Constitution, and you've listened to my opponents, you know that neither Mr. Bush nor Mr. Kerry intend to be faithful to the plain text of the Constitution of the United States.

Moreover, you also know that President Bush has recklessly committed hundreds of billions of dollars to programs that are beyond the delegated, enumerated functions of the federal government.

You also know that the major media never seriously questions or investigates this illegality-- or expresses any moral outrage about this oath-breaking.

Anyone who does complain about these outrages is patted on the head, or mocked as an extremist, and told that the Constitution is a living document that must change and adapt with the changing times.

Beware America -- Beware this glib excuse for lawbreaking.

My friend, Franklin Sanders, has written that "to say that the Constitution is a living document is to say that it is dead". He's right. To say that the Constitution evolves is to say that it is not fixed standard and is therefore, in his words, "dead as a hammer".

If the Constitution is dead, it is because the meaning of its words have been crushed and broken by its murderers, and those who have killed it through "deconstruction" -- the redefining of the meaning of its words -- have now become the Supreme Rulers of the Land.

I want to pause here and express my gratitude for two excellent campaign assistants who are everyday and almost everywhere telling the American people why they must vote for Michael Anthony Peroutka and for the Constitution Party. These two men have great media access and they have large and well financed staffs. They work tirelessly and constantly and make the case over and over again that America must elect Michael Anthony Peroutka.

I'm talking of course about George W. Bush and John Forbes Kerry.

It is startling to realize that as you listen to them campaign -- as you listen to them propose unconstitutional spending on unconstitutional programs --they are revealing to you the reasons why you cannot, in good conscience, as an honest American citizen, give them your precious vote.

They are telling you that they will violate their oath of office even before they take it.

Despite what my opponents believe:

- The purpose of civil government is NOT to make sure everyone has health insurance.
- The purpose of Government is NOT to make sure everybody's seat belt is buckled.
- The purpose of Government is NOT to spread democracy to other nations. (First of all, we are not a democracy and "Nationbuilding" is nowhere found in our Constitution.) (Likewise, the title "policeman of the world" is not listed in the powers of the President in Article II)

- The purpose of civil Government is NOT to take care of people who can't take care of themselves. As nice as this idea sounds, this is the job of the family or the Church. These are separate jurisdictions.

- The purpose of government is NOT to educate the children of the State. The State has no children! (The State has never even been pregnant!)

- The purpose of Government is NOT to protect the environment. Government should defend – not attack – private property rights.

These are all SOCIALIST Goals that are based on a Socialist paradigm. They come straight from the Communist Manifesto. They are not based on an AMERICAN foundation.

Remember -- What did Thomas Jefferson, Adams, Washington, and the men who suffered at Valley Forge say about the purpose of government? They said, "To secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

So, again, the purpose of government, in an American understanding, is to protect God-given rights.

The sad truth is that most elected and most appointed officials today think that the purpose of government is to redistribute wealth -- your wealth.

You see, it has to be your wealth because, in the case of the federal government, there is no wealth. In fact, our federal government is broke. Actually it's worse than broke. It's about seven trillion dollars in debt.

At least it was seven trillion when I began my remarks. I'm sure it's worse now.

And it's getting worse and our leaders don't care. At least if you judge how much they care by their commitment to do something about it.

Imagine if we could somehow pass the hat in this room and collect seven trillion dollars and give it to President Bush. Then – then... the federal government would be broke.

So how are the foundations destroyed? They are destroyed because both major parties have forsaken the true purpose of government and the true source of law and liberty.

Both major parties are working to end the American dream.

It is the Constitution Party that is working to realize the dream that Washington's men at Valley Forge fought -- and froze – and died for.

Those soldiers didn't fight for the United Nations and the New World Order.

They fought for American Sovereignty.

Those men didn't fight for a Social Security Number, a progressive income tax or socialized medicine, or other chains of dependence.

They fought for independence.

They men didn't grab their muskets and fight for federal gun control laws.

They fought for personal liberty.

Those heroes didn't risk their lives so that their children would be sent on yellow buses to propaganda mills where they were dumbed down with ritalin (sp?) and psycho-babble -- told that they couldn't pray to God – and instructed in "Values Clarification."

They shivered and worked and drilled and ran and bled and died so that they could raise their children in the fear and admonition of the Lord.

For the past four months, I have been traveling the country, discussing our campaign, its themes and the issues, with people from all walks of life.

I am very encouraged!

All over America, there is a revival of appreciation of, and desire for Constitutional Government.

I see it everywhere from Great Falls to Concord -- And from Portland to Pensacola.

The American people want to support a President and a party that represents the ideas and principles upon which our country was founded.

They want an honest government.

They want an efficient government.

They want a smaller government.

They want a lawful, Constitutional government.

They want an American government.

They want a government that keeps the covenant with the American people.

They are done with federal bureaucracies that parasitically devour the resources and the liberty of a people to whom they are pledged to be accountable.

They are done with federal courts that have forsaken the rule of law -- and seek to rule illegally and unconstitutionally by the fiat of judicial oligarchs who have been methodically eliminating all acknowledgment and memory of our Christian history and heritage.

They are enraged by blatant attacks on the right of the people to acknowledge the God upon whom our nation was founded.

They don't want to waste their vote on the lesser of two evils anymore. They have seen more than enough evidence of evil and corruption from both major parties to realize that it's just as wrong to vote for Gomorrah as it is to vote for the slightly more evil Sodom.

They know that to keep doing the same thing over and over -- and to expect a different result -- is the very definition of insanity.

The American people are done with this national insanity. They are finished with wasting their vote on democrats and republicans who have demonstrated, indeed promised, their lack of fidelity to the United States Constitution.

You see, I'm honored to be associated with the Constitution Party because it is the genuinely American Party.

I know you are not collecting signatures, stuffing envelopes, making phone calls, conducting meetings and giving your hard earned money because you see this party as a path to personal power.

I know that you are doing it because you see it as your Duty to do what you can to Restore the Republic --

That's why I am proud to be standing before you today accepting your nomination, proud -- and humble.

I am honored -- and grateful -- and determined to do my best!

**General Topics :: Article on President Bush**

I am deeply proud to be associated with people who truly care about their government and willing to get constructively involved — not for their own gain but for the glory of God recognizing their covenantal obligation to secure the blessings of liberty to their children's children's children — their posterity.

I believe that with a knowledge of our history and with faith in Divine Providence, we see that God has placed each of us in a particular place, at a particular time, with particular resources and particular passions. We must discern what is His particular purpose for us.

He placed you and me in this room today. He didn't place us at this venue in the Winter of '77. He placed you here at this time in this place for a purpose — for His purpose. You are an important part of His plan.

It's not a question of whether you will respond to his call. He has already called and you are already responding.

I ask you to carefully consider what is happening here. You must listen, and respond and act.

My high school debate teacher, Sr. Theodore of the Sisters of St. Francis, used to say that the result of effective speech is action.

Not emotion — not just a nice fuzzy patriotic feeling -- but ACTION.

She was right. You must listen. And you must respond. But then you must ACT — or my speech was a failure.

A number of years ago, before I had actually met Dr. Curt Frazier, the Constitution Party's Vice Presidential candidate in 2000, I heard him speak to a Party gathering in Baltimore. After the meeting, speaking to a small group, he told of his first encounter with the Constitution Party and its principles, ideals, purpose and vision. He said that this is what he was looking for and felt blessed to find such a group of committed, courageous and self-sacrificing Americans.

He said he turned to his wife and said, "Honey, we're home."

Ladies and gentlemen, like Dr. Frazier, I am home. And the Peroutka Family is home.

You have honored me and my family by placing your faith and trust in us. I thank you and covet your prayers for my family and our campaign team led by my great friend, Attorney Scott Whiteman, as we face the next four months and all the challenges and opportunities ahead.

Taking inspiration from this historic venue where brave Americans displayed patriotic devotion to God and country, I will do my duty and do my best to represent you honorably.

It's good to be home. Thank you.

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/8/2 17:46**

Thank you, Brother Greg, it makes my heart glad to see you react as I did. Thank you also for posting that article, I hadn't read it yet, and it fills me with joy to be reminded of these brave Christian men and women whom God has brought together to oppose the evils of both major parties.

Please keep Michael Peroutka and the Constitution Party in your prayers. It will take an act of God for Peroutka to win, but God's been known to act when His people pray.

**Re: Article on President Bush - posted by Bogoizbrania, on: 2004/8/2 18:14**

If I have been American, I will vote for Bush.  
This is the will of the Lord.

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/8/2 18:25**

Quote:

-----Bogoizbrania wrote:  
If I have been american, I will vote for Bush.  
This is the will of the Lord.  
-----

How did you arrive at the conclusion that it is God's will that Americans vote for Bush?

Is it God's will that we vote for a man who believes, and will politically advocate, murdering an unborn baby is ok if the pregnancy was the result of rape or incest?

Is it God's will that we vote for a man who has appointed more openly homosexual individuals to government office than any other president in history (possibly all of them combined)?

If so, and I don't wish to be mean, but if so we're not talking about the same God.

**Re: - posted by Bogoizbrania, on: 2004/8/2 18:37**

I dont know what you a talking about homous, you cant ignore them like errors in page thats right desision in his politiks. God use a lot of sinner in diferent ways.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/8/2 18:43**

Quote:

-----Please keep Michael Peroutka and the Constitution Party in your prayers. It will take an act of God for Peroutka to win, but God's ben known to act when His people pray.  
-----

Brother I am actually quite shocked that this man has not got barely any media coverage on stations such as CNN and others. I have never seen him once or heard of him and that is wrong. After reading and listening to him I am very thrilled that there is an option like this man for Christians to vote for. How could a Christian vote any other way even if they disagree with small points that the Consitution Party holds to. I am actually going to even call them and see If I can broadcast the DVD from SermonIndex. Here is his campaign website: <http://www.peroutka2004.com/>

Here are some videos that you can watch that will show the heart of this man of God:

Presidential candidate Michael Anthony Peroutka on C-SPAN's Washington Journal talk show  
*On July 3rd Michael Anthony Peroutka was a guest on C-SPAN's Washington Journal talk show. Among the topics discussed were the separation of church and state and the First Amendment, the source of religious liberty, the Iraq war and policy, the economy, the Bush administration's fiscal policies, abortion, gun-control, and others...*

Michael Anthony Peroutka's presidential nomination acceptance speech  
*On June 25 the delegates from Constitution Party affiliates nationwide selected Michael Anthony Peroutka as their presidential candidate. C-SPAN's Road to the White House covered the convention...*

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/8/2 18:45**

Quote:

-----I dont know what you a talking about homous, you cant ignore them like errors in page thats right desision in his politiks. God use a lot of sinner in diferent ways.  
-----

But could you, in good conscience, vote for an openly homosexual person? How about, if you were an elected official, appoint such a person to a position of high authority?

And could you, in good conscience, murder an unborn child because the pregnancy was caused by rape or incest or is endangering the life of the mother? Could you, in good conscience, approve of or in any way support such a murder?

Could you, in good conscience, vote for a man who would?

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/8/2 18:51**

Quote:  
-----Brother I am actually quite shocked that this man has not got barely any media coverage on stations such as CNN and others. I have never seen him once or heard of him and that is wrong.  
-----

I think he's gotten some coverage from the more liberal news sources, but the republican (not necessarily all the conservative) ones are apparently rather tight-lipped about the Constitution Party, because it poses a great threat to Bush's reelection chances. I readily understand why they're not eager to talk about "Bush's Nader," but you're right, it is wrong.

Quote:  
-----I am actually going to even call them and see if I can broadcast the DVD from SermonIndex.  
-----

I'm very happy that you're being so supportive, I think a great many Christians would react in a similar fashion if they actually heard about this beacon of light in a very bleak political world.

**Re: - posted by All2and4Him (), on: 2004/8/2 19:07**

I thought that the article was interesting. On the issue of appointing homosexuals however, it is not wrong to appoint them to places in government. The scriptures expressly forbid Christians from judging those who are in the world.

Personally, I believe that George Bush is weak-willed and easily influenced. I think he is a Christian, but I think he has compromised greatly. I don't know whether or not he has left the faith.

All to and for Him

John

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/8/2 19:16**

Quote:  
-----I thought that the article was interesting. On the issue of appointing homosexuals however, it is not wrong to appoint them to places in government.  
-----

I expected that some would think that way, and I understand, but my main objection is that Bush isn't really pro-life.

Quote:  
-----The scriptures expressly forbid Christians from judging those who are in the world.  
-----

We're not to judge them in the same sense as we're commanded to judge sinning professing Christians, no. But are we not to judge them at all? You presumably wouldn't trust a person who claims to be Christian but is a serial murderer. Would you trust a non-Christian serial murderer? If not, you've judged them because of their history of sin (murder, in this case). Judging in that sense is simply taking the available information and making a decision regarding the character and capabilities of the person.

Anyway, the issue about Bush's appointing homosexuals is less damning (possibly in a literal sense) than his pro-choice-sometimes stance.

Quote:  
-----Personally, I believe that George Bush is weak-willed and easily influenced. I think he is a Christian, but I think he has compromised greatly. I don't know whether or not he has left the faith.  
-----

Let us pray for him. I hold no ill will for him, nor anyone, I simply think we Christians should recognize that he is not our

**General Topics :: Article on President Bush**

political champion and thus should not automatically receive our vote. Indeed, I think it is clear we cannot vote for him at all in good conscience if we understand where God stands and where Bush stands on abortion.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/8/2 19:22**

Quote:  
-----Let us pray for him. I hold no ill will for him, nor anyone, I simply think we Christians should recognize that he is not our political champion and thus should not automatically receive our vote. Indeed, I think it is clear we cannot vote for him at all in good conscience if we understand where God stands and where Bush stands on abortion.  
-----

Personally my feeling is if just a few christians don't vote for Bush then Kerry is a shoe-in. But it would be nice for a large amount of people to vote for the constitution party and thus demand media coverage brings something to peoples eyes that they would not choose to want to hear or watch. This fellow even called homosexuality "Sodomy!" which really is the name for it. Well this political thing is a crux because many of the founding fathers if not MOST were genuine Christians and the moral climate of America was mostly Christian, so the thought of an immoral man in any regard being in any part of office would be deplorable. This "Constitution Party" seems like a move back towards the past and it would be progress to go that way.

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/8/2 19:28**

Quote:  
-----Personally my feeling is if just a few christians don't vote for Bush then Kerry is a shoe-in.  
-----

It is true that if Peroutka campaigns well, Bush will probably lose. Frankly, I think that (in the long run) would be best for the country: with a democrat in the white house many more conservatives will wake up and fight tooth and nail against the liberal agenda, and even if the liberals make a lot of "progress" in their direction, it will only make more clear to more people how dearly this nation needs leadership like the Constitution Party.

And, as "Ten Shekels and a Shirt" points out so clearly, pragmatism must not trump the conscience, and it cannot justify an immoral act.

I'm not trying to tell anyone who they must vote for, just trying to bring out some apparently-not-very-well-known information and asking people to prayerfully consider it (in the light of Scripture) and act according to their conscience.

**Re: presidents - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/8/2 21:50**

Quote:  
-----with a democrat in the white house many more conservatives will wake up and fight tooth and nail against the liberal agenda, and even if the liberals make a lot of "progress" in their direction, it will only make more clear to more people how dearly this nation needs leadership like the Constitution Party.  
-----

I was just saying this to my husband a couple of days ago. I believe that even when Clinton was in office, the christians in this country were more uncompromising because they were a bit more "awake".

Just as we discuss on this forum- what is a true christian? Uncompromising in belief, sold out completely to the Lord, follows Jesus example. All of the standards that we talk about on here are for ALL Christians. You either live a surrendered life or you don't. I am doubting that anyone who is really living the true christian life would last long in office- if they even got there (which would be by God's miraculous power alone.) A true christian who must make public statements would be like one of us, or a speaker or pastor we know who knows the truth. Would America stand for a Tozer, a Wilkerson as president- for that matter, a Greg Gordon or anyone one of us who live for God's true gospel, as president? NO. Our beliefs would keep us from probably ever reaching that level and then, the people would never accept that today.

Someone is either a christian who thinks and acts and believes with the mind of Christ- or they have one foot in the world and one foot in the kingdom. The bible clearly states that this is not acceptable.

I am not into politics at all but i am very aware of who is living for Christ and who is not. At least this guy from the constit

ution party is totally sold out for his beliefs and is not afraid to let people know that. He is not a hypocrite in this way.

Just my thoughts. :-)

**Re: article - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/8/2 21:57**

I hadn't read the article yet that Keith posted.

Quote:  
-----If Bill Clinton was a President in the image of the nation, George W. Bush is a President in the image of the church, having a form of  
godliness but denying the power thereof. "From such turn away!"  
-----

Says much!

**Re: - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2004/8/3 11:28**

Hi All,

I find it quite interesting to read about the political climate in your nation. I just have a few thoughts on what I have read. In regards to the Christian guy in politics I will tell you the situation here in our nation. We have a Christian party, in fact we have got two, but I will refer to the bigger one. They had a lot of airtime as all parties were given equal opportunity to speak their ideas forth, and the ACDP (African Christian Democratic Party) really felt that they could get 10% of the vote. Now as a Christian that sounded great. A voice in government, standing on Christian principles etc, etc. So after the election in the province I live in, they gave their votes away to the ruling party, which was instrumental in fashioning our constitution, which by reports, is the most liberal on the planet. All I can say is "go and figure"? WHAT OF THOSE PEOPLE WHO VOTED FOR THEM BECAUSE THEY WERE "CHRISTIAN"? Politics and Christianity, is there a middle line? Me thinks not, but with God all things are possible, even pigs flying.

To give you a quick background picture, South Africa as a nation claims to be +-75% Christian which is very similar to the States. So you would think that getting Christians to vote for someone that is seen as Christian would be simple, but as it worked out they only got 4% of the vote. So where did all the "Christians" go with their vote? In our nation expediency is a big motivating factor in determining what and who gets voted for hence spiritual virtues are way down on the list.

Politics in this nation is still really split down the black/white line, which really becomes fun in the church, because there are now laws that are down affirmative action lines. This is a system in which the previously disadvantaged majority are preferred over the previously advantaged minority, in all segments of government and corporate activity. It is in place to address the imbalances of the past, so that our government, businesses, sporting teams all accurately reflect the demographics of the nation. So in a church you have black and white worshipers, who both love the lord, but one is favoured in the workplace and the other isn't. So the irony is that one member of the same church will experience "persecution", in terms of the jobs that they are able to get, and the other will experience blessing from that same system. Businessmen are being told, unless you have a black partner, forget about doing business. This is especially true in mining and other industries that have exploited people. The minority still owns most of the businesses, so in the workplace, the seeming incompetence of the new regime is always spoken about and because it affects the people that you know, maintaining a goodly attitude and perspective is sometimes difficult.

What is God's plan for our nation, why have we been spared a blood bath? Even without knowing the exact answers, hope springs eternal that God has everything in his hands. One of the redeeming factors is that it makes you trust that God has a plan for your life, so no matter what "it is well with your soul." I am thankful that what is happening in Zimbabwe has not come upon us yet, but I think in God's grace he is helping us transition from the old to the new. One thing about Zim, it has driven the church to its knees and we are seeing great spiritual growth in the churches that we work with. There is such a hunger for truth and just for God, it would seem that when you have nothing, what choice do you have?

As far as Bush is concerned, my perception of him is that he is an American first and foremost. Secondly, I think that he has biblical values that are his personal compass. To be in the position that he is in and be fair and impartial with all the people of the USA is an extremely difficult situation. As much as he is a Christian, he is the president of the whole of the United States, not just the Christian or gay or muslim groups. Does he force his own opinion upon certain segments of the population because they don't believe what he believes? He would look like a dictator, in my way or no way sort of attitude. I will say it again, to be the president of such a varied people group is difficult.

Zeke

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/8/3 12:05**

Someone wrote:

Quote:  
-----And, as "Ten Shekels and a Shirt" points out so clearly, pragmatism must not trump the conscience, and it cannot justify an immoral act.  
-----

These days are evil, and we see the fruits of pragmatism don't we. We read an article like this and the darkness is brought out into the light. The darkness brings disdain within our hearts. Do you see what it means to be conveyed into His light? Do you sense the Holy Spirit striving with our carnality?

We have been talking about the hypocrisy within the church. We have discussed what brings weakness and sickness in to the church. God's truth does not change. It is us who must choose the love of the truth over our carnal inclinations to compromise. It is compromise that gives pragmatism it's power. The condition of our government should not surprise us because we already acknowledge the compromise of the truth within our church. Only a revival brought about by God in His church can change the course of this nation. The witness of the power of the Gospel is the only hope for our nation.

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: Article on President Bush - posted by Rahman, on: 2004/8/3 13:28**

This is a very interesting discussion, and i've been attempting to stay out of it, but i just couldn't after the postings of the brother from Bulgaria, and South Africa ...

Bogoizbrania, from Sofia Bulgaria posted:

--- God use a lot of sinner in diferent ways. ---

And i thought, "out of the mouths of babes, and brothers from a foriegn land posting in broken English" ... But what so powerful, but simple a statement ... To a greater or lesser degree we ALL are sinners, and fall short of the glory of God, but He uses us ALL as He sees fit, to accomplish what He sees fit ... In fact from the time Adam and Eve sinned, God has wrought the birth of His Son to this world via "sinners", and is now in the process of birthing His Kingdom thru the same medium ... we "sinners" ...

i'm reminded of this scripture for those of us who see ourselves as trying harder than the other guy, and in particular those guys who attempt more than just armchair quarterbacking, and really get suited up, and get out there in the actual game, in political and/or spiritual leadership positions ...

Tit.3

Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work, To speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, shewing all meekness unto all men. For we ourselves also were some times foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared,

Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour ...

God Himself is the one who has ordained governments, and by God, someone's got to run them, to be at the helm ... If not you or I, because somehow we may have figured that we're not supposed to be involved in this arena of life, then someone who dares to know that "there is no power but of God" ... Someone brave/crazy/idiotic/etc. enough to aspire to a leadership role that's inevitably gonna get him/her torn apart by a multitude of divergent groups all criticising something about him ... I'm not taking myself out of this scenario for I can be as critical, and as judgemental as the next guy, and neither am I saying that some of the blatant errors (willfully or mistakenly) that our public officials make are not wrong ... But when I find my judgment past prayer, and in the realm of total condemnation, then as with Christ Church, I have to remember this following scriptures ...

Rom.13

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.

Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.

1Tim.2

I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.

Brother ZekeO posted:

--- Politics and Christianity, is there a middle line? Me thinks not, but with God all things are possible, even pigs flying. ---

This made me laugh and shout Hallelujah at the same time ... "With God all things are possible" and the thousand of years of human history with it's war, bickerings, injustices, horrid leaders, mediocre leaders, good leaders, Christian leaders, early Church, Roman Church, Protestant Church, and now apostate Church didn't, hasn't and cannot stop the Plan of God marching thru our time, trampling every obstacle ...

Col. 1: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.

And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.

I don't know about the rest of you but I'm a Christian in America, and from my perspective both scripture and my conscience dictate that I attempt to participate toward the good, or as good as it can be, by casting my vote as to who will lead the nation God placed me in (and for His own reasons I might add) ...

I'm an independent, the dread of both partys, I voted for Perot the first time he ran ... My initial thought was to vote for Perot. Bush because he truly seems the lesser of the two evils, as my country is already in trouble because of abortion, and I dread that "stem cell research" and "gay union/ marriage" be added to our blatant transgressions ... That only says to me that our slope, as a nation, will become even more slippery ... But I have to admit that now I'm looking at this new guy,

party, that i didn't even know existed that's been posted (so thanks brother Keith and Greg for the info) ... Now i may be able to "vote" with an even clearer conscience than voting for Mr. Bush, for my vote to Mr. Kerry is totally out of the question ...

If there are American saints who read this, and have not voted in the past, then if Mr. Peroutka is a good alternative for your "good Christian vote", then please register and cast it ... He may not get elected, but "politics" is about numbers, and if Mr. Peroutka gets enough numbers, he'll at least gain a platform to be heard ...

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/8/3 15:57**

Let God pick the rulers. Let us discern between good and evil. Let us give to Caesar what is Caesar's, knowing the sons of the king do not pay, and let us give to God what is God's.

What does God require? We must love Him with all our strength, mind, soul, and heart. It seems to me if we do this we won't have time, or the desire for this land. We will look to the heavenly country. We will preach the Gospel with the hope that some may become fellow heirs.

Why do we want to go back to Egypt?

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by Rahman, on: 2004/8/3 16:34**

i'm just happy for the scripture below, and the fact that God's plan is not contingent on what we believe to do, or believe not to do ... As with anything i settle in on God's Word as the last word, so will end my thought on this thread with ...

Rom.14

Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs.

Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him. One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks. For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's

So what this scripture says to me is if a saint votes, and he votes as regardeth unto the Lord, it's all good ... and if a saint doesn't vote, and he doesn't vote as regardeth unto the Lord, it's all good ... Either way a fellow saint chooses, as long as it's his regarding as unto the Lord, I ain't mad, and certainly won't judge, and certainly will continue on in love for one another.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/8/3 18:52**

Quote:  
-----The condition of our government should not surprise us because we already acknowledge the compromise of the truth within our church. Only a revival brought about by God in His church can change the course of this nation.  
-----

Brother Jeff I cannot agree with you more ;-) We need this plastered on every pulpit for a month so it can sink in to our spirits. The oneness is on us 'the Church' when watching this video:  
(<http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid4224>) The Power of Prayer (video) by Keith Daniel I cannot but sense the same message being given that the responsibility is for the church to engage in spiritual warfare

against the devil and be the church. **Let us get to warfare on our knees and win our nations back to God.**

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/8/3 20:00**

I was just looking abit at some books on prayer and saw this quote in the book: Prayer the mightest force in the world by Frank C. Laubach

"Most of us can never enter the White House and offer advice to the President. Probably he will never have time to read our letters. But we can give him what is far more important than advice. We can give him a lift into the presence of God, make him hungry for divine wisdom, which is the grandest thing one man ever does for another. We can visit the White House with prayer as *many times a day* as we think of it, and every such visit makes us a channel between God and the President."

**Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2004/8/4 1:38**

Quote:  
-----  
rookie wrote:  
Let God pick the rulers. Let us discern between good and evil. Let us give to Caesar what is Caesar's, knowing the son's of the king do not pay, and let us give to God what is God's.

What does God require? We must love Him with all our strength, mind, soul, and heart. It seems to me if we do this we won't have time, or the desire for this land. We will look to the heavenly country. We will preach the Gospel with the hope that some may become fellow heirs.

Why do we want to go back to Egypt?

In Christ  
Jeff  
-----

Amen Jeff,

This is really none of my business (being that I'm Australia), but don't forget that God (not the devil) is planning for the antichrist to rule the earth. He set Nebuchanezzar over the nation of Judah. God gets more glory from us serving Him under an unjust ruler, than a godly one.

When our Australian elections come, I'll do what I always do, ask Him who he wants to be in power. He'll give us who we need.

**Re: - posted by Will (), on: 2004/8/4 1:49**

Here in NZ, the country is run by a woman who, while in government, has legalised prostitution and soon it seems there will be an alternative for gays who want to get married called a 'Civil Union'.

So let me just say this, if there was a man running for president in my country, who started off each day on his knees in prayer, and studying the Bible, I think I'd be voting for that man. ;-)

Should a Christian vote?

Yes, we are to make Jesus, Lord of all areas of our life, which I believe includes elections.

Who should we vote for?

Seeing as it says in Romans 13:1, "*Let every soul be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and the authorities that exist are appointed by God. Therefore whoever resists the authority resists the ordinance of God, and those who resist will bring judgment on themselves.*" I believe we should vote for the person we believe will run the country according to Biblical principles.

"The White House is never going to run the country." - Leonard Ravenhill

**Re: - posted by Rahman, on: 2004/8/4 10:10**

My previous post by my own determination was to be my final word on this thread, but i am compelled ... in Christ i guess it's better to never say never ...

i thought, and prayed a whole lot about this topic last night, and this little story came to me this morning ...

There once was a servant whose Master gave him a rather sizable choice loin of pork to cure, and a big bag of sea salt in which to preserve it with ... The servant knew that in order to preserve his Masters provision he would have to take his time and apply that salt very carefully, and to every area of the meat, lest decay should find the smallest unapplied site and set in ... Well the servant at first vigorously set about his task, and began salting the meat daily, but only on one side, the side that mattered most to him, then eventually the servant just ceased to salt the Masters provision at all ... Lo and behold one day the servant noticed a foul odor coming from the meat ... The side he had salted looked pretty good but horror upon horrors when he flipped over the meat the side he had neglected was rancid, and full of foul writhing maggots ... What to do? ... Surely his Master would require an accounting for his neglect, so the servant began to vigorously rub salt into the spoiled side of the meat, but no matter how hard, and how much salt he applied, the meat continued to decay, and soon the servant determined it was to late ... In his total disgust the servant began to berate the meat, it was the meats fault that it had gone bad ... And with that rationalization the servant determined that when it came time for his giving an accounting to his Master he would say to Him, "Master I salted all that I thought I should, but somehow decomposition set in anyway" ... But secretly what he wanted to say was, "Master if you wanted the loin preserved correctly, you should have done it yourself" ...

The above scenario reminds me of mature Christians in the 60's who sat idly by while the blow flies and maggots of satan worked their foul decay on our American society thru our governmental courts, by legislating God right on out of our public lives first, then out of our private lives by the trickle down method ... The salt of Christianity wasn't for application in politics, government and/or the voting booth ... It wasn't until the 80's that Christianity began smelling a foul odor, and via the likes of Jerry Falwell and the moral majority, began the attempts of applying "the salt of the earth" to what was already 20 years rank ... So now here it is 40 something odd years later and the Masters servant has just given up, "Master I'm salting all that I think I should, but somehow the decomposition just wont go away, I can do nothing more, it's to late" ...

Perhaps you saints who are anti voting are right, for by now it surely seems that even the salt has lost it's savor, but somehow i just can't seem to stop rubbing it in to all areas of this life, even into what appears to be dead meat, because i believe in resurrection, tho it may be three days dead, and stinketh ...

Lord revive your servant, your Church, it's salt, and resurrect ALL that is dead ... In Jesus precious name ... Amen

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/8/4 12:12**

Brother Rahman wrote:

Quote:  
-----Perhaps you saints who are anti voting are right, for by now it surely seems that even the salt has lost it's savor, but somehow i just can't seem to stop rubbing it in to all areas of this life, even into what appears to be dead meat, because i believe in resurrection, tho it may be three days dead, and stinketh  
-----

I have seen examples of the church being turned into a social welfare service system. I have recently seen people living in third world poverty. I have met brothers and sisters in Christ who live in third world poverty. They are lacking in the things of this world. They are surrounded by the works of Satan. Yet, they reign in Christ. Their joy comes from our Savior.

So the way I see it, Christ is everything to them who seek Him. Christ is the only solution to man's problems. Secular society,(the world), cannot understand this. The laws of God condemn the world. They see Christ's ways as foolishness. We Christians may work and work and work to try to make the world adhere to the precepts and ordinances of God, yet unless they know Christ, they remain with Hagar. Pragmatism and compromise will reign in their lives. The only solution I see is to sow and water, and pray that God gives the increase.

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by Rahman, on: 2004/8/4 12:45**

Brother Jeff you posted:

--- The only solution I see is to sow and water, and pray that God gives the increase. ---

Amen my brother, and let us also pray to God that we "sow and water" much better than we "salt" ... Amen

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2004/8/4 16:52**

the topic of God's will is an interesting one indeed. Who knows the mind of God? What is God's will? I have heard it explained as follows, there is God's perfect will and His permissive will. Perfect will being what He originally wanted and permissive being what He allows in order to make a point or teach a lesson. Now some would argue George Bush's election (or lack thereof depending on your view) is God's perfect will whilst others would say it is His permissive will at work. God does not want to see us suffer or watch us make foolish decisions but if He sees it necessary in order for Him to get through to us, that's what He'll work with. If we have become so fargone as a nation that we would allow someone into office who holds views that contradict the foundations of this nation that then we need to reassess ourselves. When God allowed the Israelites to have a king like their neighbours, he had already told them that He was their king and they had no need of one. He gave them their wish although it was not what He wanted originally so that they could see the futility of such things, being ruled by a man who is a product of his sinful environment only perpetuates the problem. If we as a people were to do what God wants us to do more often, we would become a Godly people and our leaders would be as such.

sometimes God's will does not agree with our own, that's why we are to seek God's will always to see us through each day. Perhaps it is God's perfect will for Bush to be in office, maybe it is His permissive will but nonetheless ALL things work for the God of He that loves the Lord. We should take comfort in that.

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2004/8/4 16:56**

Quote:  
-----Anyway, the issue about Bush's appointing homosexuals is less damning (possibly in a literal sense) than his pro-choice-sometimes stance  
-----

how is this so? do you mean less damning in the sense of it being a lesser sin or that it less chaos as it were?

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2004/8/4 17:05**

Quote:  
-----It is true that if Peroutka campaigns well, Bush will probably lose.  
-----

does he have enough money? the tendency has been that the candidate who has the most and spends the most wins. our system of governance at this time makes it practically impossible for a 3rd party to get involved seriously enough to take the Whitehouse.

**Re: - posted by Rahman, on: 2004/8/4 17:07**

Wow Ironman ...

What a great post! ... Clear, concise and straight to the jugular ...

--- Perhaps it is God's perfect will for Bush to be in office, maybe it is His permissive will but nonetheless ALL things work for the God of He that loves the Lord. We should take comfort in that. ---

Now that's something we can ALL agree on ...

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/8/4 17:27**

Just a thought with the Scriptures being the foundation upon which I write. Now we as a nation like to refer to the OT examples given to us in the books of Kings, Chronicles, and Samuel. We try to draw similar parallels between the nation of Israel then and our nation today. However, are we willing to adhere to God's commands for Israel? Are we willing to apply the same commands to our direction in this country?

What I mean is this. God commanded the king and his people to get rid of all the high places within the nation. There were a few kings who obeyed God. The nation received the blessing. Are we willing to do that today?

Next, there was only one religion allowed in the nation of Israel then, are we willing to again follow God's command?

God selected the king, are we willing to have a theocracy? Today we demonized the thought of a theocracy in places like Iran, Iraq, or Sudan.

What is the truth according to Scripture?

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by Rahman, on: 2004/8/4 17:38**

Bro. Jeff you posted;

--- However, are we willing to adhere to God's commands for Israel? Are we willing to apply the same commands to our direction in this country? ---

Hmmm ... i'd say NO!

--- God commanded the king and his people to get rid of all the high places within the nation. There were a few kings who obeyed God. The nation received the blessing. Are we willing to do that today?

Hmmm ... i'd say NO!

--- Next, there was only one religion allowed in the nation of Israel then, are we willing to again follow God's command?

Hmmm ... i'd say NO!

God selected the king, are we willing to have a theocracy? Today we demonized the thought of a theocracy in places like Iran, Iraq, or Sudan.

Hmmm ... i'd say NO!

--- What is the truth according to Scripture? ---

Hmm ... we've got a blind date with destruction???

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/8/4 18:39**

Quote:

Quote:

-----Anyway, the issue about Bush's appointing homosexuals is less damning (possibly in a literal sense) than his pro-choice-sometimes stance

-----how is this so? do you mean less damning in the sense of it being a lesser sin or that it less chaos as it were?

I probably should have said "possibly less damning." In either case, I meant that the appointing-homosexuals issue is more easily viewed as a gray area because the constitution says nothing against it (whereas abortion is obviously against the 4th amendment, at least). If one applies Biblical standards, however, there's very little difference (though I think the Bible makes murder a bit more heinous than appointing perverts to positions of power, particularly in 1 John 3:15).

**Re: - posted by madmatg (), on: 2004/8/4 18:44**

KeithLaMothe wrote:

Quote:

-----\ But could you, in good conscience, vote for an openly homosexual person? How about, if you were an elected official, appoint such a person to a position of high authority?

And could you, in good conscience, murder an unborn child because the pregnancy was caused by rape or incest or is endangering the life of the mother? Could you, in good conscience, approve of or in any way support such a murder?

Could you, in good conscience, vote for a man who would?

-----  
I think the question is can you in good conscience vote for someone who isn't a Christian no matter if they are homosexual, anti-homosexual, murderers, pro-life, if they don't believe I can't in good conscience vote for any of them.

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/8/5 20:17**

For those of you interested in the Constitution Party or in supporting Michael Peroutka for president, they're using a "meetup" system where people of a like mind can get together to discuss whatever. You tell them where you are (zip code or city) and they tell you where the nearest group will be meeting and when. Seems like a good idea.

<http://peroutka2004.meetup.com/>

If nothing else, it would probably be a pretty good fellowship time considering the kind of Christian it takes to let their faith dictate their politics, or else it would be a witnessing opportunity (there's at least one conservative atheist supporting Peroutka).

**Re: - posted by SShoe (), on: 2004/8/7 7:20**

"My high school debate teacher, Sr. Theodore of the Sisters of St. Francis, used to say that the result of effective speech is action."

This is part of the letter written by Michael A. Peroutka. Is he Catholic?

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/8/7 16:11**

He affirms the Westminster Confession of Faith, which makes him a Presbyterian unless I'm mistaken.

edit, from [http://www.peroutka2004.com/schedule/index.php?action=eventview&event\\_id=116](http://www.peroutka2004.com/schedule/index.php?action=eventview&event_id=116) :

If the Democrats and the Republicans both claim to honor God, and so does Michael Peroutka, what is the difference?

One difference is this: We mean it. God is not honored when we slap His name into political speech or stick a cross on something completely unholy. Do you remember the Israelites at Sinai? They called their Golden calf Jehovah, and yet what they did displeased God.

We cannot use "religion" to further our political ends. It is not proper to use God to achieve our ends as men. God is the end, we are not. I subscribe to the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Catechisms – the very first statement in the Shorter Catechism is: The chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever.

(end quote)

His vice presidential candidate, Chuck Baldwin, is a Baptist pastor.

**Re: Noisy Bush Babies - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2004/8/7 17:00**

Quote:

-----  
and so does Michael Peroutka, what is the difference? One difference is this: We mean it.  
-----

Are you joining congress? You should be his campaign manager. :-P

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/8/7 17:02**

That was a quote from one of his pages, as I thought I marked off, I just didn't want to use tags because it makes it longer.

**Re: - posted by earnestlycontend (), on: 2004/8/7 20:44**

Hey Bro. Keith,  
thanks for the good info on a new candidate.

My concern, though, is that a vote for Peroutka is actually a vote for Kerry.

Surely we'd both agree that at least being almost totally against abortion, cloning, stem cell research, and gay marriage is better than Kerry's support for such woeful sin.

What are your thoughts?

Kendal  
\*I'll pray for and about this candidate too!

**Re: - posted by earnestlycontend (), on: 2004/8/7 21:26**

by the way, in how many state is Peroutka going to be on the ballot?

is Nader going to be on the ballot in all 50 states?

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/8/7 22:57**

Quote:

-----My concern, though, is that a vote for Peroutka is actually a vote for Kerry.  
-----

This is naturally going to come up, though I don't think it works out mathematically (more like half a vote for Kerry). In either case, the article I pointed to in the first post addresses this, I'll quote from it:

Quote:

-----Typical conservative rebuttal: This is a common reproof conservatives offer when they discover that I have denounced Bush and I support the Constitution Party candidate for President, Michael Peroutka, the only pro-life, pro-family constitutional Presidential candidate on the ballot in 2004.

“A vote for Michael Peroutka is a vote for John Kerry.”

If you are shortsighted, pragmatism will dictate that you vote for the least wicked man who will do the least amount of wickedness and destroy the least amount of your freedoms these next four years. I have a good friend who can't stand President Bush's pro-abortion or pro-sodomite leanings or his big-government remedy for every social ill, but he voted for Bush in 2000 anyway because the one thing he feared more than Bush was Gore. But if you vote for the lesser of two evils every four years, the lesser of two evils will inevitably become more and more wicked! If you vote for the most conservative of two liberals every four years, the most conservative liberal will become more and more liberal! Your vision must be greater than the next four years. You need to vote with your grandchildren in mind.

If you always vote for the most conservative of two liberal candidates, then America will always be justifying the murder of preborn children. Always! In 2020, maybe the lesser of two evils is a pro-abortion sodomite who will charge you only 80% for taxes while the greater of two evils is a pro-abortion communist who charges 95%. Where will we draw the line? There must be some issues on which conservatives will not compromise, and the legal killing of children is one of those issues.

I am going to vote to keep my conscience clean first and foremost. That means I'm going to vote for the best man for the job and pray in faith (not in unbelief) for a miracle. If more saints did the same, we WILL see our miracle. I am praying, "God give us godly leaders who will outlaw abortion and govern us in accordance with the laws of nature and nature's God." How can I pray this prayer and not act in accordance? Should I pray in unbelief (as evidenced by my vote on Nov.7)? Or should I pray in faith, and act in accordance to my prayers?

Voting for Bush over Gore was not “the lesser of two evils,” as it has often been said. It was more evil! When the liberal President Bill Clinton tried to shove his socialistic, liberal nonsense down the nation's throat, conservatives in Congress and around the nation fought him every step of the way. How can so many of those conservatives live with themselves as they support and vote with President Bush as he does the very same thing they so v

igorously opposed with Bill Clinton? It appears that conservatives have unconditional allegiance for their darling, "Christian" President, regardless of how many babies he kills, how many militant sodomites he appoints, how much of our hard-money he steals and spends on nonsense to which we would not donate voluntarily, how many of our constitutional liberties he rescinds with his anti-terrorism legislation, and how successful he has been in four years at doing what Clinton was unable to do in eight! As Alan Keyes admitted when George W. Bush was chosen to be the Republican nominee, Bush is more dangerous than Clinton! The argument for the lesser of two evils only applies when it truly is lesser; but with the Republican Party's capitulation to Bush's liberal agenda, Bush accomplished much more for the left than Clinton ever dreamed!

I would be remiss to mention that many Christian Bush-supporters are not ignorant or naive about the President's liberal tendencies. They hate government-sanctioned child-killing and sodomy and they are aware of Bush's grave shortcomings in these areas, but they believe that promoting godliness in government is a matter of "incrementalism" - a gradual shifting of policies and legislation to the right. The conservative "incrementalists" condemn my approach as an "all-or-nothing" mentality that is doomed to obscurity and failure. I have two comments about the philosophy of incrementalism when it comes to President Bush. First, if Bush is "incrementally" taking us anywhere, it's to the left. The same goes with the Republican party as a whole: they are "incrementally" taking conservatism to the left - we are not taking them to the right. Under G.W. Bush and a Republican dominated Congress and Senate, there are more babies dying at the expense of the taxpayers, there are more sodomite proponents of gay marriage being elevated to positions of government leadership, the central government is getting larger and the Constitutional rights are being undermined even more than under Clinton. Conservatives have been betrayed by Bush's rhetoric, and have not judged him by his fruit.

Compromise has its place in politics, but Christians can never compromise "Thus saith the Lord." When God forbids murder, we cannot overrule him. It is usurpation and idolatry to think that man - even a universal democratic consensus of men - can overrule God and tolerate legal child-killing. On issues of principle, Christians, constrained by conscience, must draw a line in the sand and say, "No! I'm not going to compromise the Word of God!" If we can compromise to support a Presidential or Congressional candidate who supports the killing of innocent preborn children in some instances, then what won't we compromise on? Would we compromise to support a candidate that supported the killing of Jews, or the elderly and infirmed? Would we compromise to support the "incremental" abolition of kidnapping and enslaving blacks? Would we compromise to support a candidate that supported the killing of Christians? I don't think we would compromise to support a Republican candidate who endorsed the slaughter of Christians, and if not, do we love our neighbor as ourselves if we compromise to support a candidate who endorses the slaughter of our preborn neighbors? I fear for the professing Christians who compromise to vote for a President whom they know justifies abortion and who doesn't want Roe v. Wade to be overturned. Will they look down at their hands on Judgment Day to see them stained with innocent blood? Will they hear, "Inasmuch as ye did it not to the least of these, ye did it not to me"? (Matthew 25:45)

Quote:  
-----Surely we'd both agree that at least being almost totally against abortion, cloning, stem cell research, and gay marriage is better than Kerry's support for such woeful sin.  
-----

Bush's stance on abortion is not acceptable, I cannot in good conscience support any candidate who thinks it is **ever** ok to murder an innocent human being. The sixth commandment is absolute. Voting for Bush would be a sin for me (voting for Kerry would be worse, but one does not choose the less grievous of two sins, one refuses to sin).

Quote:  
-----What are your thoughts?  
-----

I think that Bush might actually do more damage than Kerry could, because his positions are not exactly conservative and the mass of the people who normally oppose the liberal agenda would be more likely to "sleep" under Bush because most of them think they would have a good, reliable conservative in charge and wouldn't have to fight him every step of the way. If Kerry wins, more would fight for a truly conservative/Christian agenda.

Also, if Kerry wins, and this nation does go further down the tubes as a result (and I have little doubt that it would, apart from an act of God), it will be clear to more that there are serious problems with the nation and that truly conservative politics (like those in the CP platform) are the best political way to address them.

Of course, politics are not and can never be our salvation. Only Jesus can save us, now or ever. The church has a lot of repentance to do, particularly over how our shamefully poor job at being fathers is filling the ranks of the militant homosexuals (who cannot reproduce on their own). No amount of political action, money, and harassing our congressmen will change the fact that a lukewarm church is being rightly judged for its failure to obey, and part of that judgment (as indicated in Romans 1) is a proliferation of homosexuality. As Credenda/Agenda put it, we're far too ready to say "Here is evil, let us condemn it," and far too reluctant to say "Here is evil, let us confess it."

Quote:  
-----\*I'll pray for and about this candidate too!

-----  
I'm glad to hear that. Let us keep President Bush, Senator Kerry, and other national leaders (of our nation and others) in our prayers as well, as we are commanded to.

**Re: - posted by earnestlycontend (), on: 2004/8/8 22:15**

In how many states in Peroutka going to be on the ballot?

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/8/9 1:35**

Sorry, forgot to answer that: in the 2000 election the CP (running Howard Phillips) was on the ballot in 41 states, with 7 more taking write-ins (I think that's what they did). This time around it looks like considerably less than that, but the article they have up on it isn't finished. I suppose it could be the new campaign finance reforms making it even harder for the other parties.

The Lord's will be done.

**Re: Article on President Bush - posted by Denny (), on: 2004/8/9 10:10**

Check out ([www.bushrevealed.com](http://www.bushrevealed.com)) [www.bushrevealed.com](http://www.bushrevealed.com)

The information on this site is true and documented.

"You shall know the truth and the truth ....."

**Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/8/9 20:48**

I think Greg Koukl has some valuable things to say on this subject, please prayerfully consider the following clips from an article he wrote about third-party voting in the previous election ;

"Since there is no middle ground on abortion&#8211;"choice" always means a dead child&#8211;then it's critically important we make decisions at the polls that go beyond token moral gestures (something that looks right, but has no impact). We must make choices that have the greatest chance of actually saving children.

The question we're faced with is this: If we were forced to choose between looking virtuous but having no further effect, or appearing ignoble but accomplishing some good, which path should we take? When we must choose one or the other, are we obliged by God to *make a moral statement or to have a moral impact?*

"Here's an example of what I mean. Judie Brown has vigorously opposed legislation targeted narrowly at partial-birth abortion. She's against the prohibition not because she is pro-abortion, but because she is pro-life. As President of the American Life League, Brown asserts that such "incrementalist" solutions "set aside millions of children scheduled for death," the 99% of abortions that don't use that procedure.

As Brown sees it, this is an issue of conscience. A mere ban on partial-birth abortion doesn't go far enough. She can't get behind any legislation that allows a single child to be killed. Anything short of the full pro-life position is an unacceptable compromise.

In this case, however, "voting one's conscience" actually causes much more harm than good. Instead of saving 1% of future victims of abortion, Judie Brown's approach saves none."

"In other words, it's better to choose someone who is committed to eliminating some of the evil, than contributing to the victory of one who is not committed to eliminating any of the evil but, on the contrary, will promote it. This is not a compromise. This is good moral thinking."

"Let me state it plainly: If you are pro-life and intend on casting a "conscience vote" for a third party candidate, you might as well be voting for Al Gore. It will have the same ultimate impact on the safety of the unborn.

If you sleep more comfortably at night because you've voted your principles, then I believe your conscience is misinformed. You've chosen to make a moral statement instead of choosing to have a moral impact.

As one pundit put it, it's better to have a second class fireman than a first class arsonist. There is no victory nor honor in voting for the first-class fireman who had no chance of winning when, in the end, your "conscience vote" actually counted for the arsonist."

You can read the entire article at the following link;

([http://www.str.org/free/solid\\_ground/SG0009.htm](http://www.str.org/free/solid_ground/SG0009.htm)) What's Wrong with the "Conscience Vote"

In Christ,

Ron

**Re: - posted by Denny (), on: 2004/8/9 22:01**

by earnestlycontend on 2004/8/7 21:26:19

"by the way, in how many state is Peroutka going to be on the ballot?"

ANSWER

40 if things work out, but probably 39, 38 would be the least it appears now.

**Re: - posted by Rahman, on: 2004/8/27 11:51**

Hear the Constitution Party's agenda first hand from;  
Jim Clymer, National Chairman, Constitution Party ...

NAT'L CONSTITUTION PARTY (C-SPAN INTERVIEW)  
Real Player Req'd  
[rtsp://video.c-span.org/project/c04/c04\\_wj053104\\_clymer.rm](rtsp://video.c-span.org/project/c04/c04_wj053104_clymer.rm)

FYI for PA. : Mr. Clymer is running for the Senate against Arlen Specter(R) and Joe Hoeffle(D).

A statement Mr. Clymer made that i really like;

Quote;  
"DUTY IS OURS ... RESULTS ARE IN THE HANDS OF GOD" ...

Sounds a lot like ...

1Cor.3: I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase.

**Re: Politics Schmolitics! - posted by Yodi (), on: 2004/8/27 14:54**

Okay, well, there's A LOT that's been said on here and as I started reading the first couple posts, oh boy, this stuff just goes right over my head! I did go to the link to that first article, but where it says Bush appointed a homosexual so and so, or that he believes in abortion in the case of rape or... I forgot what the other reason was - well, there were these numbers that I guess were supposed to be links to where this information was coming from, but my computer said I needed a authorization. So I couldn't look up the proof on what that guy was writing.

I don't listen to talk radio, watch hours of CSPAN during my free time (don't have cable anyway), or get all into this campaign... competitiveness. However, I do exercise my right (rather, privilege) to vote. If we have opportunities as Christians to have a say in the direction of our government and country, why not get involved? As far as I know, George W. Bush is against abortion and homosexuality. Those are 2 pretty big moral issues that could be our country's survival or downfall. I don't deny that President Bush isn't a perfect person, or that he even fails to make all the right political or moral decisions. As far as I know though, he takes a stronger stand morally than John Kerry does. But may God grant us the wisdom.