



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Questions on Defending Others

Questions on Defending Others, on: 2009/11/29 18:24

In my understanding "genuine biblical revival" would be a widespread movement of people who love God with all of their heart, soul, mind, and strength and love their neighbor as themselves. This requires, among other things, knowing how exactly to love our neighbor as much as ourselves.

Here are some questions about how we can apply the command to love our neighbor as ourselves. These questions are not for christian pacifists or nonviolent christians.

Would you kill a murderer if it was the only way you saw to save the life of your own child?

What if the government said you were not allowed to defend your child against the murderer?

What if your wife hired the murderer?

What if it was your neighbor's child?

What if the child wasn't born yet?

What if it cost you your own life?

Re: Questions on Defending Others, on: 2009/11/29 21:13

Who are you? There is nothing in your profile. You haven't introduced yourself..

I ask because we have been getting alot of "new" people to the forum but in reality they have been here before and are now being sneaky.

In regards to your questions of "what if" I ask what would you do?

Re: , on: 2009/11/30 0:16

Quote:
-----I ask what would you do?

I don't know. I was pacifist until this year.

Re: - posted by Leo_Grace, on: 2009/11/30 0:19

There are several long threads on this topic already - that's why you'll probably find few takers here. Why don't you read those threads in this section to see what others think.

Re: Leo_Grace, on: 2009/11/30 1:26

Can you point me toward the threads you mentioned or tell me how I could find the relevant posts?

I figure if someone knows the right answers they may not need a lot of words to explain.

Re: - posted by Leo_Grace, on: 2009/11/30 1:50

Quote:

IglueAsp wrote:

Can you point me toward the threads you mentioned or tell me how I could find the relevant posts?

I figure if someone knows the right answers they may not need a lot of words to explain.

Unfortunately, many people claim to have the right answers, and they don't necessarily agree. You'll have to sift through it all and glean what you want.

Below are the links to two threads with slightly different points of view:

(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id30531&forum36&276) Will You Kill or Be Killed?

(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id30804&forum36&29) Does the New Covenant Teach Non-Resistance,,?

Happy reading!!

Re: , on: 2009/11/30 2:05

Thank you for getting those links for me but it looks like the topic of those threads is pacifism.

Re: - posted by Leo_Grace, on: 2009/11/30 3:08

Quote:

IglueAsp wrote:

Thank you for getting those links for me but it looks like the topic of those threads is pacifism.

The second one is against the "doctrine" of non-resistance.

Re: Questions on Defending Others, on: 2009/12/1 9:41

"Whatever force is legitimate to defend the life of a born child is legitimate to defend the life of an unborn child."

Is it true?

Quote:

-----Would you kill a murderer if it was the only way you saw to save the life of your own child? Seems like it would be wrong not to.

What if the government said you were not allowed to defend your child against the murderer? Wouldn't that undermine the very foundation of their authority?

What if your wife hired the murderer? no difference

What if it was your neighbor's child? love your neighbor as yourself

What if the child wasn't born yet? "who is my neighbor?"

What if it cost you your own life? no difference

Re: Questions on Defending Others, on: 2009/12/1 9:54

I believe in gun control.

;-)

Krispy

Re: Krispy, on: 2009/12/1 10:08

Quote:

-----I believe in gun control.

practice makes perfect?

Re: , on: 2009/12/1 15:29

Quote:

-----"Whatever force is legitimate to defend the life of a born child is legitimate to defend the life of an unborn child."

True or False?

Here is another way to think about the question..

In defense of both born and unborn children, should we use necessary force or only whatever force the government allows?

I hope no one is overly intimidated by these questions. I haven't gotten any responses yet. I asked a similar question in a crosswalk forums and had a great discussion going but the thread was removed and my username locked out. Hopefully they'll explain why that happened or change their mind about it.

I've seen atheists pose this question to pro-lifers but I've never heard a reasonable response. I'm not an atheist. I think we should know whether defending the unborn is loving our neighbor as ourselves or not.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2009/12/1 16:39

Hi IglueAsp...

In this nation, it is legal for a person to use "appropriate force necessary" in order to protect the life and limb of someone else. If someone were to break into a house and attempt to harm a member of their family, they are legally allowed to take the measures needed in order to protect and defend them.

Now, the laws vary from state to state. In some states, the law protects the residents through a set of laws known as a "castle doctrine" (which is actually taken from Matthew Henry's commentary on Exodus 22 regarding "a man's house is his castle"). However, every state allows a person to legally act in good conscience to defend someone else from harm. In other words, a man is not guilty of "assault" if he is defending the life or limb of someone else who is being attacked.

I suppose that the major difference in this particular scenario is that abortion is, unfortunately, legal in this nation. A man cannot legally claim "self defense" in regard to the life of an unborn child because the killing of that child is authorized by the state (through legislation and/or court decisions by a certain segment of politicians).

While it could be argued that defending the unborn might be *morally* correct, abortion is (unfortunately) a legally protected practice in this nation and the desired prerogative of the mother. To "protect" the unborn through physical means is against the law. I suppose that, in cases like these, it will be God who will ultimately dispense justice when we all stand before Him in Eternity.

Quote:

"Whatever force is legitimate to defend the life of a born child is legitimate to defend the life of an unborn child."

True or False?

So, my answer would be "false." As Christians and citizens of the nation into which God placed us, we are bound to the laws of this land. It is legal to protect a *born* child from danger. However, in the case of abortion, it is illegal to protect such a child from being killed through physical means. The best defense, perhaps, is through legislation, petition and good, old-fashioned preaching about this unrighteous, evil practice.

Re: ccchhrrriiiss, on: 2009/12/1 21:46

Thanks for the reply ccchhrrriiiss!

This stood out to me:

Quote:
-----every state allows a person to legally act in good conscience to defend someone else from harm. In other words, a man is not guilty of "assault" if he is defending the life or limb of someone else who is being attacked.

If this were true, wouldn't it include unborn children as well as fully grown fetuses like you and I?

Since pro-lifers are famous for urging that the unborn be treated no differently from the born, I would expect a pro-lifer to desire the law to read, *"every state allows a person to legally act in good conscience to defend unborn babies from harm . In other words, a man is not guilty of "assault" if he is defending the life or limb of an unborn baby who is being attacked."*

What do you think about that? Would that be a morally correct state of the civil law to authorize defense of the unborn just as it already does in the case of born children?

I don't ask that question to start a political discussion but in order to get at the deeper moral issue which you hinted at in your post:

Quote:
-----it could be argued that defending the unborn might be *morally* correct

Indeed, it has often been argued that this is the case. This is a very important question then, because, as you said,

Quote:
-----it will be God who will ultimately dispense justice when we all stand before Him in Eternity.

You seem to have advocated that we should obey the civil law regardless of whether it contradicts the moral law. Is that your objection to the statement about legitimate force then?

I would disagree with that stance because the obligation to obey the moral law is what gives civil law a right to exist in the first place. The one is more fundamental than the other.

Please correct me if I've misunderstood you.

You also said,

Quote:
-----The best defense, perhaps, is through legislation, petition and good, old-fashioned preaching about this unrighteous, evil practice.

In the long run this "perhaps" may be true. But perhaps not. And certainly not for any children who have been killed since you wrote that. These educational and legislative tactics do not determine the inherent morality of using force to defend the helpless, born or unborn. If they are effective, good. We still must answer whether a duty to defend others can be subject to civil law. Can it? If so, why? And how do we determine when civil law can override moral law and when it cannot?

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2009/12/1 23:46

Iglue,

In scanning your posts it appears to me you are making the point that it would indeed be justifiable to do whatever it takes to protect the life of the unborn, even so far as to engage in civil disobedience... and may that include the killing of the abortionist? I seem to get this sense....

You are using a lot of philosophy and rhetoric to make your point, arguing and making it appear that logic would justify to use whatever means to protect the unborn.

Let me ask YOU a question: how long have you worked in the pro-life ministry?

I await your reply, and if I do not answer it soon it means I am away from the computer...But I do want to hear your answer - it is very important to me. I want a brief answer - I do not have much time for long posts...

ginnyrose

PS: If you have answered this question in any of your posts, please direct me to it, please. You see I have limited time to read all of them. Thank-you!

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2009/12/1 23:54

Quote:

IglueAsp wrote:

Quote:
-----"Whatever force is legitimate to defend the life of a born child is legitimate to defend the life of an unborn child."

True or False?

Here is another way to think about the question..

In defense of both born and unborn children, should we use necessary force or only whatever force the government allows?

I hope no one is overly intimidated by these questions. I haven't gotten any responses yet. I asked a similar question in crosswalk forums and had a great discussion going but the thread was removed and my username locked out. Hopefully they'll explain why that happened or change their mind about it.

I've seen atheists pose this question to pro-lifers but I've never heard a reasonable response. I'm not an atheist. I think we should know whether defending the unborn is loving our neighbor as ourselves or not.

You do as the Lord guides you, but you will suffer the consequences of man's law if you break the law.

Love brother. Love.

You can never go wrong with love. You may go wrong with arming yourself for battle and defending others, but you will never go wrong with loving your neighbor as yourself.

Would you kill yourself? Is this loving yourself? Did our Lord tell us to harm others, or to love others? Did the Lord tell us to defend, or to turn the other cheek?

When all else fails, turn to love.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2009/12/2 0:06

I glueAsp...

Quote:

I glueAsp wrote:

This stood out to me:

Quote:

-----every state allows a person to legally act in good conscience to defend someone else from harm. In other words, a man is not guilty of "assault" if he is defending the life or limb of someone else who is being attacked.

If this were true, wouldn't it include unborn children as well as fully grown fetuses like you and I?

Well, the law (or laws in this case) aren't limited to *intent*. In this particular case, the law extends a right to defend (by protection) only as legally defined by the state. Since abortion is currently legal (since 1973) in various measure in every state of this nation, a person cannot be protected by the law for "defending" someone who cannot be legally defended under the law. In other words, a person is not guilty of an "assault" if he is defending a person (as defined by law) from an attacker, but he would be guilty of "assault" if he attacked a surgeon about to perform an abortion simply to "defend" the pre-born child.

Quote:

-----Since pro-lifers are famous for urging that the unborn be treated no differently from the born, I would expect a pro-lifer to desire the law to read, "every state allows a person to legally act in good conscience to defend unborn babies from harm. In other words, a man is not guilty of "assault" if he is defending the life or limb of an unborn baby who is being attacked."

What do you think about that? Would that be a morally correct state of the civil law to authorize defense of the unborn just as it already does in the case of born children?

Actually, there are already federal laws and laws in many states that protect the life of the unborn in certain circumstances. Even in a liberal state like California, there are laws that make it a criminal offense to kill a child that hasn't been born yet. A few years ago, infamous California resident Scott Peterson was convicted under California's fetal homicide law. Not only was Peterson found guilty of killing his wife, but he was also found guilty of killing his own pre-born son -- a double homicide. This state law became a basis for what was known as "Conner's Law." This law, Public Law 108-212, was passed by Congress and signed by President Bush in 2004 and declares it a crime to injure or kill a "child in utero" while in federal land (within federal workers) while the perpetrator is committing another crime.

Now, it should be noted that abortion clinics are exempt from this particular law (PL 108-212) because it can only be used in cases in which another crime is taking place. Since abortion is currently legal in most states, abortion practitioners cannot be prosecuted for a crime (unless they are performing an "illegal abortion").

Personally, I would like to see the initial Supreme Court case that legalized abortion to be reassessed. This case was highly unique. The Justices of the High Court actually allowed Roe's attorneys to leave and return almost a year later because their case was so flimsy. Roe's attorneys returned and made it a case about the "right to privacy" (part of the 14th Amendment's "Due Process" clause). They argued, and seven justices agreed, that a woman has a "right to privacy" when it comes to the child living within her body.

Interesting. However, does a "right to privacy" apply to a *death* simply because it takes place within the privacy of a person's own...person? Remember the "Castle law" that I spoke of earlier? A person is able to use physical force ONLY when there is a threat of life or limb. Using this as a primer, then the "right to privacy" in regard to abortion should occur only if a woman's life is in danger. Oddly enough, it is this same clause ("Due Process") of the 14th Amendment that has the greatest chance of actually overturning abortion. One could argue that unborn children are robbed of "due process under the law" simply because of their mothers (and abortion clinics) desire for "privacy." Most Constitutional attorneys feel that this would be the strongest argument AGAINST abortion.

Actually, it is highly unlikely that the Supreme Court would make abortion *illegal*. It is possible under a "due process" or "equal protection" argument. However, the slightly conservative Court would probably simply reverse the notion that a m

other's "right to privacy" is extended to abortion and then hand the right to law back to the states. In other words, it would be a lot like it was BEFORE Roe v. Wade. Remember, certain states protected abortion even before the 1973 ruling. Even Texas allowed abortion before 1973, but only if the life of the mother was in danger. This is similar to the concept of homosexual "marriage." Some states currently allow homosexual couples to be married (only because of the actions of judges and/or legislators) while the vast majority do not.

Quote:
-----I don't ask that question to start a political discussion but in order to get at the deeper moral issue which you hinted at in your post:
Quote:
-----it could be argued that defending the unborn might be *morally* correct

Indeed, it has often been argued that this is the case. This is a very important question then, because, as you said,
Quote:
-----it will be God who will ultimately dispense justice when we all stand before Him in Eternity.

You seem to have advocated that we should obey the civil law regardless of whether it contradicts the moral law. Is that your objection to the statement about legitimate force then?

I would disagree with that stance because the obligation to obey the moral law is what gives civil law a right to exist in the first place. The one is more fundamental than the other.

Please correct me if I've misunderstood you.

I think that you understood me...but not in the ultimate application of this concept. One is certainly more fundamental than the other. I certainly feel that abortion is morally, ethically, medically and spiritually wrong. However, the law protects this in many circumstances. As a Christian, I am called to abide by the laws of the land in which God has placed me. Now, since this is a "*government of the people, by the people and for the people,*" I have a voice in legislation. I feel that it would be much more effective to attempt to stop abortion through practical measures of legislation rather than by resorting to unlawful physical means.

Quote:
-----You also said,
Quote:
-----The best defense, perhaps, is through legislation, petition and good, old-fashioned preaching about this unrighteous, evil practice.

In the long run this "perhaps" may be true. But perhaps not. And certainly not for any children who have been killed since you wrote that. These educational and legislative tactics do not determine the inherent morality of using force to defend the helpless, born or unborn. If they are effective, good. We still must answer whether a duty to defend others can be subject to civil law. Can it? If so, why? And how do we determine when civil law can override moral law and when it cannot?

Like I said, I think that the best method of protecting unborn children is through legal means. This includes legislative means (speaking with members of Congress) AND through word-of-mouth. Remember, abortions are only legal in this nation BECAUSE women choose to kill their pre-born children. Their reasons will often vary. However, if we remind the women of this nation (and the world) that this is a *moral* and *spiritual* crime, it has a chance to stop the root (which I think is *selfishness*).

When I was a teenager (shortly after becoming a Christian), I used to visit the government housing projects. There was a very poor, uneducated woman that I spoke with who was about to have an abortion. She had already gone through "Planned Parenthood" counseling, which encouraged her to kill the child in her womb. She said that she knew that abortion was considered a sin, but she didn't know anything else about it. She was even under the impression that an unborn child is "not alive."

I explained to this woman that I was a child who escaped an abortion. I told her that my biological father tried to force my mother to have an abortion, but she refused. He then physically beat my mother (by punching her and kicking her in the stomach) in an attempt to force my "abortion." By the grace of God, I survived...and with no birth defects. When I explained the truth about the biological development of unborn children (from a biology textbook), she was horrified. She decided to NOT go through with the abortion. A few years later, I saw that little boy. They still lived in the projects, but he

and his family were attending the church that I attended.

Again, according to the New Testament, I feel that we have a spiritual obligation to obey the laws of the land. Further, you have a responsibility to your own family first. If you were to physically and illegally "defend" an unborn child, you will be arrested. Consequently, you will not be able to provide for your own family (which, according to I Timothy 5:8, would make you "worse than an infidel").

Ultimately, we will all stand before our Judge. I believe that every mother who chose to claim that she had a "right" to kill her unborn child will be held just as accountable as those abortion clinics that physically slaughtered their unborn babies. The best way to stop it is to handle it at the root. In this case, this is the selfishness of some of the women in this world. In addition, legislative means help to stop the practice at the source.

Just a thought, but there was a policy case that I read about a few years ago. American narcotic officers were having a problem with a particular drug. They had been arresting many people who were dealing these drugs, but the problem seemed to have been getting out of hand. Finally, they tried something entirely different. They attempted to lay the ax to the root (so to speak). Instead of tracking down and arresting the dealers, they decided to go after the chemical manufacturers of the active ingredients. It worked. Within months, drug arrests had dropped dramatically. As a result of the success with this campaign, the US worked with pharmacies to limit sales of medication that contained the active ingredients for another major illegal drug, methamphetamine. Now, these OTC drugs are only sold behind the counter and in limited supply. While some drug dealers are able to get around it (through theft or multiple buyers), these steps have already had a noticeable effect upon the drug scene.

I wholeheartedly believe that this would be the best and most correct method of preventing future deaths. In addition, it doesn't resort to any sort of lawbreaking on our part. I hope this helps...and makes a little more sense.

: -)

Re: ccchhrrriiiss, on: 2009/12/2 2:50

Hi ccchhrrriiiss,

Thank you for sharing all of that. That was a great story about the woman who repented of hurting her baby.

You said,

Quote:

-----As a Christian, I am called to abide by the laws of the land in which God has placed me.

Do you mean without exception? What if God requires something contrary to the laws of the land? Your statement seems to assume that the national rulers will never outlaw obedience to God. Or it assumes that defending the unborn is NOT obedience to God. Either way, could you justify the apparent assumption?

Quote:

-----you have a responsibility to your own family first. If you were to physically and illegally "defend" an unborn child, you will be arrested. Consequently, you will not be able to provide for your own family (which, according to I Timothy 5:8, would make you "worse than an infidel").

Why did you put the word "defend" in quotation marks? I know they would not use that terminology on the police report, but defending an unborn child is a coherent, specific, and legitimate concept whether it is right or wrong. Perhaps you are thinking of things in legal terms whereas I am approaching it from a standpoint that considers the overriding obligation to obey God rather than man. I am aware of the general state of the civil law regarding the unborn. What few people seem to have considered is how God sees this. What is our obligation in *his* supreme court? That is why I asked those questions to see what you thought of it morally. Is defending the unborn inherently right or wrong? Should it really be up to the federal or state government? Is defending other humans a God-given duty or a government-given right? And why?

About being an infidel... According to your reasoning all POW/MIA soldiers with families are infidels. Jesus must also have been an infidel when he left his mother to be taken care of by someone else. A much better example is that the apostles could have avoided being arrested by simply not preaching the gospel. They could have just followed the laws of the land and "as Christians". Why did they prefer to be criminals? Why did they do what they knew would mean getting arrested? Shouldn't they have been more concerned with their own families than with preaching? Or what if I was able to provide financially for my family even if I was arrested and perhaps even executed? Would that mean I am free from the charge of

being worse than an infidel? Obviously the verse must assume that the cause of neglect is selfishness and not self-sacrifice. Remember, we are talking about saving lives. Your objection using this bible verse appeals to the possibility of poverty, which I think is invalid because the church would take care of my family if it meant lives would be saved.

In summary, I still don't know what you think about the following questions:

Is it inherently morally right or wrong to defend the unborn with the same force we would use for born children? Why or why not?

If defending the born and unborn children is a duty, is this duty inalienable and God-given or is it man-given? Why or why not?

Would that be a morally correct state of the civil law to authorize defense of the unborn just as it already does in the case of born children?

Can a duty to defend others be subject to civil law? Why or why not?

How do we determine when civil law can override moral law and when it cannot?

Do overall pro-life tactics DETERMINE the inherent morality of using force to defend the helpless (born or unborn) OR is defense inherently morally right even though better (legal) tactics win out as the greater of two goods?

I hope you will be patient with the number of questions I have. I simply see getting to the bottom of these questions as being the most important goal of my studying this matter.

Re: Miccah, on: 2009/12/2 3:20

Thanks Miccah!

I deserve a lot worse than the consequences of man's law! May the Lord teach us how to suffer as Christians and not as evil doers.

I agree we can never go wrong with love. Isn't it amazing how God has revealed this solid truth to us? It is like a warm solid rock to cling to in the middle of an exhausting ocean of confusion.

Why did you ask if I would kill myself? Are you a non-violent Christian? The bible says that no murderer has eternal life. What is suicide other than murdering yourself?

I appreciate the excellent advice but I think you probably misunderstand the turn the other cheek passage as meaning we should not defend others.

If you want to discuss nonviolence I'd be glad to in a separate thread if you start one. I haven't committed myself against nonviolence but I haven't had my objections to it answered yet so I can't in good conscience be a pacifist.

When I think about those little babies being hurt and killed and they would probably scream if they had air in their lungs.. . How awful it must be for them! They must be so terrified and alone feeling if they are developed enough to have those emotions. If it was me, if I was being hurt and torn apart or whatever else before I was even born, I would want someone to save me. I would probably wish that someone would come and kill the monster who is destroying me. This makes me wonder if I have been loving my neighbor as myself or not. One of the apostles warned that the love of many people would grow COLD because lawlessness would abound. What if that is what has happened regarding the unborn? What if we have all seared our consciences by neglecting them?

Thanks again for the encouragement to love.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2009/12/2 3:33

IglueAsp wrote:

Quote:

Is it inherently morally right or wrong to defend the unborn with the same force we would use for born children?

Why or why not?

No. You are called to suffer for Christ, not make others suffer.

Quote:

-----If defending the born and unborn children is a duty, is this duty inalienable and God-given or is it man-given?

Why or why not?

Respectfully, you are starting your question out weighted towards your pre-determined beliefs. It is not your duty to defend anyone (outside of your family), except spiritually in my belief. To say that defending others is a duty in my opinion is not a "Lord" question, but more of an opinion of circumstance.

The Lord defends. The Lord needs no hands of man to make things happen or not. The Lord's will WILL be done regardless if you or I or anyone else is alive.

Quote:

-----Would that be a morally correct state of the civil law to authorize defense of the unborn just as it already does in the case of born children?

Sickening as it is, the law of the land is the law. Morally there should be no abortion. Morally there should be no pre-marital sex. Both are sin, yet you are willing to stone one and not the other?

Quote:

-----Can a duty to defend others be subject to civil law?

Why or why not?

Depends. Are you a trained, qualified professional that the civil law hires to defend others or not? If so, yes it is subject to civil law, since you are working under the law. If you are not one of the above, then you are called to pray, tarry and fast for as a defense.

Quote:

-----How do we determine when civil law can override moral law and when it cannot?

Good question that cannot be easily answered. First thing to do is seek the Lord in these matters, and set aside things t

hat are taught by men. There are many folks out there that are very persuasive in their arguement, and they are dead WRONG.

Seek first the Kingdom, and the King. If you are truly walking with Him, He will not lead you astray.

Quote:
-----Do overall pro-life tactics DETERMINE the inherent morality of using force to defend the helpless (born or unborn) OR is defense inherently morally right even though better (legal) tactics win out as the greater of two goods?

Questions a bit choppy, but it has been a while since I was in collage :-P

First, what pro-life tactics are you speaking of, force? Inherent, by whom? If you are talking of hurting doctors or providers of abortions, then I would say that the pro-life tactics that you are talking about go completely against the Word of the Lord.

Deuteronomy 32:35 (NKJV)

35 Vengeance is Mine, and recompense;
Their foot shall slip in due time;
For the day of their calamity is at hand,
And the things to come hasten upon them.Â'

As for the second part of your question, defense is not inherently morally right. I know many interpret the Bible to say this, but there are many who believe otherwise.

Are you absolutely positive that the Lord says to use force to defend the unborn? Are you willing to sin to achieve an objective? Because harming others could very well be leading you into sin. Ends never justify the means. Even Jesus stated that if His kingdom was of earth, his disciples would fight. But it is not. He chose to suffer.

I'm not sure if I helped or not. I am 100% against abortion. I just am not sure that force should be used. Too much personal emotion involved, which in turn can cloud judgements.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2009/12/2 3:41

IglueAsp wrote:
Quote:

When I think about those little babies being hurt and killed and they would probably scream if they had air in their lungs... How awful it must be for them! They must be so terrified and alone feeling if they are developed enough to have those emotions. If it was me, if I was being hurt and torn apart or whatever else before I was even born, I would want someone to save me. I would probably wish that someone would come and kill the monster who is destroying me. This makes me wonder if I have been loving my neighbor as myself or not. One of the apostles warned that the love of many people would grow COLD because lawlessness would abound. What if that is what has happened regarding the unborn? What if we have all seared our consciences by neglecting them?

Brother, I agree with you more than you may know. I am not a pacifist by any means. All I was trying to say is that we can NEVER go wrong by treating others with love, whereas you may go wrong by treating others without love (ie. force).

As for "killing the monster"... Vengeance is not yours, it is the Lord's. You will be judged in the same measure that you judge others.

Please don't take this as a pass for abortionists. I believe that there is a special place in hell for them, but they ALSO need

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Questions on Defending Others

ed the Lord's mercy and grace. Who are any of us to deny the chance to change their ways and receive grace from the Lord.

Think about it. If you would harm someone and they would pass away, maybe you snuffed out their chance for mercy and grace. Is this in the Lord's will? Did you become their judge, or do we leave that up to the Lord? Also, the actions of using force, as a believer, may make another brother stumble. You may also be sinning in the process of using force. Are any of these outcomes acceptable for you because of your wanting to use force?

Brother, fight abortion, fight it long and hard. Fight it in prayer, protests, fasting, with judges, etc... but in my opinion, leave the force in the Lord's hands. :-)

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2009/12/2 3:42

double post removed

Re: ginnyrose, on: 2009/12/2 3:47

ginnyrose,

You said,

Quote:
-----In scanning your posts it appears to me you are making the point that it would indeed be justifiable to do whatever it takes to protect the life of the unborn, even so far as to engage in civil disobedience... and may that include the killing of the abortionist? I seem to get this sense....

No. I can understand why might have jumped to this conclusion having only scanned what I posted though.

Quote:
-----You are using a lot of philosophy and rhetoric to make your point, arguing and making it appear that logic would justify to use whatever means to protect the unborn.

That is your interpretation of what I've said, again, probably from reading through quickly.

Quote:
-----Let me ask YOU a question: how long have you worked in the pro-life ministry?

Why are you more curious about how long I've worked in a ministry than about anything I've posted? Seeing as it wasn't important to you to do more than skim over some things I've written and then assume I was advocating something that I am not, why is it so important to you to have this question answered?

I would prefer if you read, understand, and answer my questions before asking me any about myself.

Re: Miccah, on: 2009/12/2 3:57

Miccah, Thank you for the responses. I plan to respond as soon as I can. It's way past my bedtime.

Re: Questions on Defending Others - posted by Lysa (), on: 2009/12/2 6:15

Quote:

lgueAsp wrote:

Quote:
-----I ask what would you do?

I don't know. I was pacifist until this year.

This thread has peaked my interest in your statement above. Can you talk about what changed you from a pacifist?

And the second thing I wanted to ask is, have you read, (<http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/4602>) The Kingdom of God Is

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Questions on Defending Others

Within You by graf Leo Tolstoy? I have started reading it (and by no means have finished it) but he was a pacifist with some compelling arguments. And that is why I started reading it, for his reasons.

God bless,

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2009/12/2 10:09

Iglue,

I know you are ticked that I did not read all your posts on this subject. But please hear me out. I have been involved in the pro-life ministry for many years and I have heard every argument in the book for and against abortion. Yours sounds like too much rhetoric fueled by logic and philosophy.

Let me tell you this: in all the years I worked as a counselor at a Crises Pregnancy Center, counseling pregnant ladies who wanted an abortion, NEVER, NOT ONCE, NO ONE EVER advocated the use of force or violence against any abortionist. And who were we? Concerned people from all shades of Christianity. I was the only one who adhered to Biblical Non-resistance. The others belonged to a variety of churches including Assembly of God, Charismatic, Baptist, Presbyterian, Catholic. Some of the volunteers were military wives.

If you are interested in STOPPING abortion, you go to the churches and start preaching to the people sitting in the pews and tell them that fornication is sin and that the biblical mandate to not allow it to be named once among you is still in the scriptures and is God's will.

You can close AB clinics and people will still keep on sinning. Closing a AB mill will not solve the spiritual problem. Most of the those having abortions are religious women! And some will tell you they know AB is sin but they plan to go have one and then come back home and ask God to forgive them!!!! I am not making that up! For some reason they never come back to us after they did this and they refuse to answer our phone calls.

Sir, if you want to stop abortion get the folks in the pews to quit their immorality/sinners and then you will see a drop in abortions and you will not have to resort to violence ("do violence to no man") - you will be Biblical and will not have to hire a lawyer to defend you.

Now, I must go and will be gone most of the day.

ginnyrose

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2009/12/2 11:11

Greetings

I have to agree with ginnyrose on this. Teach in the church that fornication is sin, teach them about dying to self and living daily for Christ and you would see a huge difference in people. Stop lying to people, stop telling them that they can live their life on their own terms and God will forgive them in the end.(speaking in general way here not at anyone person) If we would teach Biblical truth and share the love of Christ with others then you would see a decrease in the need for abortion. I was a "professing christian" got pregnant as a teenager and contemplated abortion, sadly there are way to many "professing christians" out there that are doing more then contemplating they are going through with it. If they would only teach the truth about sin, instead of calling it a mistake...

God bless

mj

Re: Lysa, on: 2009/12/4 12:40

Hello Lysa,

Thank you for the link to Tolstoy's book. I downloaded the text file to my laptop so I can read it offline.

I do tell people that I am not a pacifist because it is true. However, I am still studying the arguments of pacifists with an open mind. I am unwilling to commit one way or the other without examining the subject as thoroughly as I ought.

In the meantime, to the best of my knowledge, it would be sin for me to refuse to use force to defend (for example) my daughter if someone was attacking or trying to kidnap her. If extreme and harmful force was necessary to protect her then I would see no difference in my obligation.

It would also be sin for me to come to a definite conclusion about this without doing my best to examine the arguments for or pacifism. So I've read and heard many such arguments and many arguments against the duty to defend those in need with necessary force. Although I hope I am wrong, I even expect Tolstoy's book to contain nothing that I have not already heard.

Along those lines, I would be very interested to know if you find anything in his book to be a particularly compelling argument against using force to defend others.

I don't have the skills necessary to retrace my entire train of thought as I've begun to open my mind to the possibility of pacifism being wrong and unsupported by scripture. And I'm not sure if that would be the most helpful way to answer your question anyway.

There are quite a few things I have come across that have influenced me to change my mind about pacifism. I'll see if I can find those that would be worth sharing.

Re: - posted by Leo_Grace, on: 2009/12/4 13:08

edited Forgot that I had posted that link already earlier.

Re: Questions on Defending Others, on: 2009/12/4 15:05

Quote:

- 1)Would you kill a murderer if it was the only way you saw to save the life of your own child?
2) What if the government said you were not allowed to defend your child against the murderer?
3) What if your wife hired the murderer?
4) What if it was your neighbor's child?
5) What if the child wasn't born yet?
6) What if it cost you your own life?

Question 1, would be no. I'd probably do some heavy damage, but not murder.

Question 2, I would defy the government.

Question 3, seems to be a foolish question not worth answering.

Question 4, same as as answers 1, 2

Question 5, This is where the question becomes even more weird. According to the above questions, you have a wife that might have hired the murderer, and then you have a question what if the murderer kills the unborn child. The unborn child is in the wife. So the wife hires the murderer to kill her unborn child.

Question 6, No one can really answer this question until your facing death in the face.

Re: ginnyrose, on: 2009/12/4 20:34

ginnyrose,

I admit I was a little upset in reaction to your first post. I did not mean to let the emotion get the best of me and I am certainly not continuing to be upset at you or anything like that.

The reason I was upset is because of the way your question sounded to me. I will explain and maybe you will understand.

First, I am not upset that it sounded as if you jumped to the conclusion that I was promoting using violence against abortionists. I object to your misrepresentation of my posts because I had not promoted anything other than understanding why people will defend born children but not the unborn. That does not upset me because I can see how

someone might mistakenly assume that was my intention to promote violence.

However, your question seemed to me to suggest that the number of years I've worked for pro-life organizations would have some relevance to whether people should defend the born and unborn equally. This is why I was upset. I took it to mean: *"If you haven't been working for years in pro-life organizations than you don't are not qualified to promote defending the born and unborn equally."* I would like to apologize if this is an incorrect understanding of what you wrote. To me it seemed that you had ignored me, misrepresented me, and then demanded an answer of me with a question which I felt was not only wrong but insulting. I hope you will forgive me if I have jumped to any hasty conclusions about you. I have no hard feelings.

Thank you for sharing your experience.

I don't see any benefit in discussing this with people who hold to pacifism. It would be like discussing the right way to evangelize with someone who didn't believe in evangelism.

I do have some experience with the pro-life movement. My father has been in executive positions in NRTL affiliates my whole life. My mother co-founded a birth right near my hometown. I've understood the evil of abortion for a while now.

I'm sure you'll understand that it doesn't matter how many people never promoted defending the born and unborn equally. That doesn't determine whether it is right or wrong. As for preaching against fornication... of course we should do that. But even if suddenly no one fornicated ever again, that would only save the babies in the future. It wouldn't save any children who are scheduled for an abortion next week.

So, if it is right to defend the born and unborn equally then it would be right to do both: Defend AND preach.

If you want to discuss pacifism, let's discuss it separately, privately, or perhaps in another thread so as not to confuse this thread. Just let me know. You are free to use my email also.

Re: Miccah, on: 2009/12/4 22:06

Dear Miccah,

I rushed through this reply so it may be blunt in places. That was only to allow myself time to finish the whole thing and not to be short with you or anything like that.

I did take time to carefully consider everything you said though. Hopefully you will find that to be true as you read.

Quote:

Quote:

-----Is it inherently morally right or wrong to defend the unborn with the same force we would use for born children?

Why or why not?

You are called to suffer for Christ, not make others suffer.

This does not answer the question at all. Unless you believe that we should not defend born children either, your answer should explain why you would treat the unborn differently when it came to protecting them with force. Your statement also presents a false dichotomy. Following Jesus may mean doing things that are unpleasant for others. I could just as easily say "You are called to suffer for Christ, not to passively let others suffer." Both my statement and yours shallowly miss the deeper issue.

Quote:

Quote:

-----If defending the born and unborn children is a duty, is this duty inalienable and God-given or is it man-given?

Why or why not?

Respectfully, you are starting your question out weighted towards your pre-determined beliefs.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Questions on Defending Others

I don't see how. It is an entirely hypothetical question which assumes nothing other than the fact that born and unborn children are equal in value.

Quote:

-----It is not your duty to defend anyone (outside of your family), except spiritually in my belief.

I've never heard of such a philosophy. Why would I be any less willing to defend my nephew or niece than my own children? Or why would I let my second cousins die but not my own son? What about my third cousin's children? My fourth cousins? This just sounds like partiality to me. Perhaps you could explain where you came across this idea.

Quote:

-----To say that defending others is a duty in my opinion is not a "Lord" question, but more of an opinion of circumstance.

If it is opinion then it cannot be inherently wrong.

Quote:

-----The Lord defends. The Lord needs no hands of man to make things happen or not.

Dumping our responsibilities back onto God does not glorify him nor does it justify us. The question is not whether God "needs" this or that, but whether God expects of us to do this or that. Does God need you? Is that why he commands that you love your neighbor as yourself? Of course not. He commands it because it is right and good. I'll quote a reply I sent to a friend about this same topic before. This is really getting into pacifism and not the topic of the thread though.

Quote:

-----**4. Only God has the authority to make these life and death decisions.**

You wrote, "*The Bible states that God holds the keys to life and death, not us.*"

I don't know if I've understood you correctly here. Jesus said he has "the keys of hell and of death". Is that the verse you are referring to? That verse (in its context) doesn't seem to say what I understood you to mean. The message I took from your statement is that we should not play God by deciding who lives and who dies.

We do and must make life and death decisions. What is deciding to let someone be killed if not deciding who lives and who dies? What is more of a life and death decision than deciding not to defend someone when you are able to do so? Whatever my belief or course of action is, I am undeniably making a life and death decision. I hold the "keys to life" for the person in need of defense. God has put them in my hand. Should I toss these keys at God's feet and maintain that I had no responsibility? Should I say to God, "You must intervene. I will not be held accountable for such decisions. They are your duty. You are able to control everything, therefore you must control everything. I refuse to control what you have put into my power to control. You must do it. Why should I receive glory for such responsibilities? Should not you be the one to receive all the glory? I refuse these responsibilities for I know better than you what contributes to your glory."

Quote:

-----The Lord's will WILL be done regardless if you or I or anyone else is alive.

God's will is not being done when someone refuses to do their moral duties. Because men have refused to obey God, the Lord taught us to pray "thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven". God will put an end to sin soon. Until then, and even after that time, we cannot simply say "anything goes because God is in control." We must always do everything that is our duty to do.

Quote:

Quote:

-----Would that be a morally correct state of the civil law to authorize defense of the unborn just as it already does in the case of born children?

Sickening as it is, the law of the land is the law.

Of course the law of the land is the law of the land. This doesn't answer the question but only states the obvious. The question is what the law of the land SHOULD be, not what it IS. Everyone knows what it already is.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Questions on Defending Others

Quote:
-----Morally there should be no abortion. Morally there should be no pre-marital sex. Both are sin, yet you are willing to stone one and not the other?

Who said anything about stoning people? Stoning was a retributive form of justice or punishment. I have only been asking about defensive force, not punishment, vengeance, governmental justice or anything like that.

Furthermore, stoning fornicators will not save babies who are about to be killed. In a way, it would probably contribute to far less abortions. Phinehas would be the expert on killing fornicators. I'm not qualified to give an opinion at this point. Murder however is clearly so severe that it can require taking a life in order to prevent it. Another difference between abortion and fornication is that the baby doesn't fall in love with the doctor first. Fornication requires consent. Baby killers don't ask the baby's permission.

Quote:

Quote:
-----Can a duty to defend others be subject to civil law?
Why or why not?

Depends. Are you a trained, qualified professional that the civil law hires to defend others or not? If so, yes it is subject to civil law, since you are working under the law. If you are not one of the above, then you are called to pray, tarry and fast for as a defense.

That would mean that if the government outlawed defending one's own children, then only police officers could defend their children. Do you agree with that? Is the right to defend your own children something the government gives you or is it something God gives you?

Quote:

Quote:
-----Do overall pro-life tactics DETERMINE the inherent morality of using force to defend the helpless (born or unborn) OR is defense inherently morally right even though better (legal) tactics win out as the greater of two goods?

First, what pro-life tactics are you speaking of, force?

I meant - If violence is not the best tactic does that mean that it would be completely wrong? or does it mean that it couldn't be the second best tactic?

Quote:
-----Inherent, by whom?

I meant - Is it inherently right or wrong for anyone to defend babies with force? Is it, in and of itself, sinful or righteous to defend the unborn from being killed?

Quote:
-----If you are talking of hurting doctors or providers of abortions, then I would say that the pro-life tactics that you are talking about go completely against the Word of the Lord.

Deuteronomy 32:35 (NKJV)
35 Vengeance is Mine, and recompense;
Their foot shall slip in due time;
For the day of their calamity is at hand,
And the things to come hasten upon them.Â'

Defense is not vengeance. They are completely different words, concepts, motives, etc. The only thing they have in common is that they can both mean violence. That is probably why people confuse the two. The topic of this thread is not vengeance against murderers, it is about defending the helpless from being murdered. The bible says not to avenge yourselves (even in the "old" testament) but it never says not to defend others (even in the "new" testament).

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Questions on Defending Others

Also, what if an abortion provider tried to kill your own already born child while the two of you were walking down the sidewalk? Would it be a sin to kill him to protect your child if you saw no other way? What is the difference between that and the babies at the clinics? It's not like they are able to run anywhere to get away.

Quote:
-----As for the second part of your question, defense is not inherently morally right. I know many interpret the Bible to say this, but there are many who believe otherwise.

It sounds like you think it is neither right nor wrong to defend someone with force. You are undecided?

Quote:
-----Are you absolutely positive that the Lord says to use force to defend the unborn?

Did I ever say anything like that? I thought I just asking questions. I didn't mean to do anymore than just discuss whether it is right or wrong and deal with various objections. My intention has not been to promote anything except understanding the truth.

Quote:
-----Are you willing to sin to achieve an objective?

That doesn't seem like something worth asking.

Quote:
-----Because harming others could very well be leading you into sin.

It is either sin or it is not. It is not a question of whether it would "lead into" sin, only whether it is right or wrong to defend the born and unborn equally.

Quote:
-----Ends never justify the means.

That's not true at all. You can't rationally believe that. Perhaps you meant "The ends don't justify ANY AND ALL means."

Quote:
-----Even Jesus stated that if His kingdom was of earth, his disciples would fight. But it is not. He chose to suffer.

That's out of context. Jesus said "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews" The Lord intended to let them wrong him in order to redeem them from their sins by his death. You can't apply that to a helpless child who is being murdered against his or her will. You can't decide for them that they should be a martyr. You only (after God) have the right to decide that for yourself.

Quote:
-----I'm not sure if I helped or not. I am 100% against abortion.

good. You seem undecided on the use of force however. You seemed to contradict yourself at times. I am not trying to convince you of anything though. I'm only trying to sift through people's objections.

Quote:
-----I just am not sure that force should be used. To much personal emotion involved, which in turn can cloud judgements.

Right. We should act rationally, not emotionally. Someone who acted emotionally might do a poor job of defending others anyway. Or they might unnecessarily harm innocent people. They would also be acting for the wrong reasons. Another danger of acting emotionally is to shy away from extreme action simply because it is scary sounding. If I were to obey the emotion of fear or anxiety then I would simply plug myself into some video game and get fat and die that way.

Quote:

-----Brother, I agree with you more then you may know. I am not a pacifist by any means.

You said a few things that sounded very much like a pacifistic argument.

Quote:

-----All I was trying to say is that we can NEVER go wrong by treating others with love, where as you may go wrong by treating others without love (ie. force).

I agree. Love is ALWAYS right. Other things are sometimes right and sometimes wrong. Depends on whether they are loving or not. Is defending the born and unborn equally, loving or unloving?

Quote:

-----As for "killing the monster"... Vengence is not yours, it is the Lords. You will be judged in the same measure that you judge others.

You mixed up vengeance with self-sacrificial action again. Defense is taking a risk in order to protect another. Vengeanc e is entirely different. Do you get the difference now? It really has nothing to do with defending others at all.

Quote:

-----Please don't take this is a pass for abortionists. I believe that there is a special place in hell for them, but they ALSO need the Lord's mercy and grace. Who are any of us to deny the chance to change their ways and recieve grace from the Lord.

Another pacifistic objection? I've heard this before.

Quote:

-----Think about it. If you would harm someone and they would pass away, maybe you snuffed out their chance for mercy and grace. Is this in the Lord's will? Did you become their judge, or do we leave that up to the Lord?

Here is my answer quoted from the same reply that I quoted above. I sent this to a friend in response to a study on pacifism he sent me.

Quote:

-----**3. It's wrong to kill someone because they might go to hell.**

You wrote, *"We must realize that if we kill someone, then we have sent them into eternity, no matter how horrible the earthly deed/s they are committing."*

a) This is not logical. I agree with what you said. Eternal life is more valuable than this life. Souls are more valuable than bodies. But to say that this difference in value will always make defensive killing the wrong choice may only be an assumption. This principle cannot be applied consistently to all circumstances. If this principle was valid, we could apply it to any circumstance. It is too easy to show that this principle is invalid. For instance, if one sinner tried to kill two sinners, my refusing to defend them would send two people into hell rather than one. This is not an uncommon situation.

Also, if we should be ready to let all victims die because their attackers might repent and go to heaven, should we also be ready to kill saints because they might repent of their holiness and go to hell? We could actively secure their salvation for a certainty. Would that be even better than securing the mere possibility of the attacker repenting? Obviously that's nonsense. Therefore, if I am consistent, it must not be that the morality of killing hinges simply on my estimation of who or how many people may or may not make it to heaven as an immediate result of my actions.

Quote:

-----Also, the actions of using force, as a believer, may make another brother stumble. You may also be sinning in the process of using force.

Doing what is wrong can be a stumbling block to others for sure. But you are assuming that it is wrong. This is circular reasoning. If defending the born and unborn equally is right then doing the right thing will convict others of their partiality or inaction and promote obedience rather than disobedience. It depends on whether it is right or wrong. It doesn't prove it to be either.

Quote:

-----Are any of these outcomes acceptable for you because of your wanting to use force?

"wanting" is nothing. It only matters what the truth is. What does God want? What is the loving thing to do? Those are the important questions and motivations.

Quote:
-----Brother, fight abortion, fight it long and hard. Fight it in prayer, protests, fasting, with judges, etc... but in my opinion, leave the force in the Lords hands.

I appreciate you sharing your opinion friend. I hope you will forgive my bluntness. This is a rather long reply for me and I didn't want to wait much longer to reply so I went through this rather quickly.

Re: MJ, on: 2009/12/4 22:11

MaryJane,

It seems like everything you said was right but none of it changes whether defending the born and unborn equally is right or not.

We teach that child molestation is wrong. But does that mean that we should not use force to prevent it if necessary? Of course not.

Just like in medicine you have treatment to deal with problems that currently are posing a threat AND preventative treatment to avoid problems in the first place.

Re: Clarification, on: 2009/12/4 22:21

For clarification: I have not been promoting using violence against abortionists as some people have assumed. If it seems that way, that only means that the questions I am asking make it seem like a logical thing to do in your own mind.

I think it is important to understand whether people in general should defend the born and unborn EQUALLY or not. If not, there must be some great reason for the difference.

Furthermore, if I believed it was right to defend the born and unborn equally and also believed it was my duty to promote that as being true, I would not necessarily choose sermonindex.net as the most appropriate place to do that.

I just wanted to clear that up before anyone else gets the impression that I'm trying to convince anyone to follow a certain course of action.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2009/12/4 22:27

Iglue,

Your posts reminded me of some crazies who resorted to violence to 'protect the life of the unborn.' And this is the idea I caught from reading your posts, hence my reaction.

Quote:
-----I don't see any benefit in discussing this with people who hold to pacifism

How do you understand pacifism? do you equate it with Biblical non-resistance? (This really is a contradiction in terms but it is used to mean one does not resort to violence to protect.)

I do not understand your position on this issue as it relates to protecting the life of the unborn. Protecting the life of the unborn is Biblical non-resistance at its finest. To resort to violence to protect the life of the unborn is a contradiction of the worse sort.

I worked in the pro-life movement for 15 years. I was the only one who held to Biblical non-resistance and all the others believed in serving in the military - we had military wives working for us as well as an Air Force Lt. Col.! And we all agreed

in our approach in saving babies. I do do not understand your sentiments at all.

Blessings,
ginnyrose

re: ginnyrose, on: 2009/12/4 23:23

ginnyrose,

Quote:

-----Your posts reminded me of some crazies who resorted to violence to 'protect the life of the unborn.'

Why are you calling people "crazies"?

"With the tongue we praise our Lord and Father, and with it we curse men, who have been made in God's likeness."

In my mind: Pacifism = Nonviolence = what some call "biblical nonresistance"

Quote:

-----To resort to violence to protect the life of the unborn is a contradiction of the worse sort.

Only from an extremely shallow pacifistic perspective. Here is what Hadley Arkes said in an article in First Things which was against using force to defend the unborn. The quote is referring to a man who killed an abortionist in order to save babies' lives.

Quote:

-----Unless we dismantle moral reasoning altogether, or remove the gradations that are critical to moral judgment, it should be evident that these two acts of killing cannot stand on the same moral plane.

(<http://www.firstthings.com/article/2007/01/killing-abortionists-a-symposium-31>) First Things: Symposium Against Using Force to Defend the Unborn

He is right. You have to shut both eyes in order to equate murder with defensive killing. But that's what so many pacifists reflexively do without ever stopping to question their dogmatic allegiance to nonviolence.

Twice you said you don't understand me. I don't get the impression that you are very interested in understanding me. Am I assuming the wrong thing?

I'm just asking a bunch of questions because I don't have all the answers. I've found that most people don't have all the answers.

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2009/12/4 23:50

IglueAsp

you wrote:It seems like everything you said was right but none of it changes whether defending the born and unborn equally is right or not.

I don't have any answers for you concerning the questions you asked in your first post. I try not to imagine myself in situations where I would have to give answers to "what if" questions. I think for me it best to live my life unto the Lord and to trust that no matter what situation may come He will be there to guide me.

you wrote:We teach that child molestation is wrong. But does that mean that we should not use force to prevent it if necessary? Of course not.

I was molested as a little girl by a family member. I wish things were different, I wish that things had not happened in my life as they did, but I know in my heart I am very thankful that my family member was never harmed in any way. I pray fo

r him to repent, to come to know the Lord and to be saved. He needs Jesus just as much as I do. I pray one day very soon he will come to see this.

You wrote: Just like in medicine you have treatment to deal with problems that currently are posing a threat AND preventive treatment to avoid problems in the first place.

I do not mean to be disrespectful to you but I have no clue what you mean by the last part of your post to me. Sorry I don't think I can be of any help to you in finding the answers you're looking for...

God Bless
mj

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2009/12/4 23:57

IglueAsp

Thank you for replying to my posting. I do appreciate the time that you took to answer my replies.

Please show in scripture where our Lord Jesus commands us to use force against those who are hurting or killing the unborn.

Re: Miccah, on: 2009/12/5 18:39

Quote:
-----Please show in scripture where our Lord Jesus commands us to use force against those who are hurting or killing the unborn.

Why?

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2009/12/5 21:17

IglueAsp wrote:

Quote:
-----Why?

IglueAsp, are you looking for Godly council, or do you want the opinions of men, or are you just wanting to find like-minded individuals that will agree with your position? I truly am confused as to what your intentions are.

You seem to hold to a "force IS allowed" defense for protecting the unborn. I am trying to figure out where in scripture you are getting the idea that using force for protecting the unborn is allowed.

The quickest way to get me to shut up, is to quote some scripture, and show me what our Lord said on this matter. :-)

Re: Miccah, on: 2009/12/6 15:57

Quote:
-----IglueAsp, are you looking for Godly council, or do you want the opinions of men, or are you just wanting to find like minded individua
ls that will agree with your position? I truly am confused on to what your intentions are.

Miccah, I don't understand why you are confused about my intentions. I've restated my intentions throughout the thread.
For example:

Quote:
-----Here are some questions about how we can apply the command to love our neighbor as ourselves.

I think we should know whether defending the unborn is loving our neighbor as ourselves or not.

I hope you will be patient with the number of questions I have. I simply see getting to the bottom of these questions as being the most important goal of
my studying this matter.

I'm only trying to sift through people's objections.

...I just asking questions. I didn't mean to do anymore than just discuss whether it is right or wrong and deal with various objections. My intention has
not been to promote anything except understanding the truth.

I think it is important to understand whether people in general should defend the born and unborn EQUALLY or not. If not, there must be some great re
ason for the difference.

For clarification: I have not been promoting using violence against abortionists as some people have assumed.

I'm just asking a bunch of questions because I don't have all the answers.

Now what is so complicated about wanting to know whether something is right or wrong? It is one of the most basic hum
an needs. It is no more complicated than if I had asked what kind of diet I should nourish myself with, or how much sleep
I should get.

Quote:
-----You seem to hold to a "force IS allowed" defense for protecting the unborn.

You seem to either not trust me or to not retain much after reading my posts. I've specifically stated (I think more than on
ce?) that I am not "holding to" or "promoting" anything. In examining any issue of disagreement it is normal to reason thr
ough both sides. I've been the only one reasoning through the one side so it may seem as if my intention is solely to pro
mote that side. That is why I've restated my intentions often and explained that I am not trying to be one-sided. I'm just st
uck on "my" side until someone else is willing to reason through both sides of the issue without partiality, fear, etc.

Quote:
-----I am trying to figure out where in scripture you are getting the idea that using force for protecting the unborn is allowed.

We are supposed to love our neighbor as ourselves. Is defending born children but not defending unborn children loving
your neighbor as yourself? How could I make the question any more simple? It is not a trick question. I am not trying to d
raft you into a militia group. It's just an honest question that deserves some serious and unbiased attention. In fact, now t
hat I think about it, if the mind that God gave me did not demand a satisfactory answer to this question, I would need to
get my head checked.

Quote:
-----The quickest way to get me to shut up, is to quote some scripture, and show me what our Lord said on this matter.

haha, why would I want you to shut up? Please don't think that I've rejected all possibility that you are a rational human b
eing. I may have disagreed with much of what you said but so what? The fact that we disagree makes our communicatio
n worthwhile so long as we are both interested in learning the truth. It means at least one of us will learn something even
tually. I'd be happy to learn from you the answers to my questions if you truly have them.

Now that I've hopefully cleared up any confusion about my intentions, I believe I left you with with quite a few questions i
n my last post which you haven't addressed. It's fine if you don't know. I don't know the answer to a lot of my own questi
ons.

Instead of agreeing or disagreeing with me you asked whether Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John had ever recorded Jesus as having commanded people to use force to defend the unborn. I didn't see how that was relevant to our discussion up to this point so I asked "why?" - Did you mean to suggest that we are only supposed to obey specifically detailed commands of the Lord? That we are not supposed to extrapolate deeper principles of motive and behavior in order to apply them to a million situations that Jesus never mentioned?

Jesus said to love your neighbor as yourself. So is defending the unborn loving our neighbor as ourselves? If not, then how could it be any different with defending children who are already born?

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2009/12/9 6:35

A short story of what happened.

I was out in my neighbourhood praying and walking. When nearing my house I hear the sound of a fight. As I approach I can see people looking out of their windows, as well as some men viewing two women fist fighting one of the men watching was the boyfriend to the one of the women.

As I got near another man was standing watching the fight, I asked him who it was and he told their names and then proceeded to tell me one of them was 3 months pregnant. I looked over at the pregnant woman's boyfriend who was doing nothing but watching the fight, I stated to him she is pregnant and he shrugged his shoulders.

Without any thought or fear I walked into the middle of the fight and took hold of the woman who was pregnant and was getting a beating and gathered her into my chest. I then turned around to get away from the blows that the other woman was still regaining down on her.

With my other hand I held her back and said very firmly to her that this woman is pregnant and the fight needs to stop her reply was "I was only hitting her head"

I got her away from the scene and into my house where my wife cleaned up her face, from there we got her to the hospital for a check up.

This was me defending a unborn child there was a risk to myself as the men watching could have turned on me, I didn't care I was going to stop it even if I was going to take a beating in the process.

Was I right or was I wrong?

By the way it was a boy and she named him Carl.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2009/12/9 11:49

Hi murrcolr...

Wow, I experienced something similar when I was a teenager!

I think that what you did was right in the sight of God. In addition, what you did was not *illegal* (as what would be true of a person who injured or killed an abortionist).

Quote:

murrcolr wrote:

By the way it was a boy and she named him Carl.

How wonderful!

:)

Re: , on: 2009/12/9 15:35

I mistakenly started a thread rather than a response to this one. anyway, it isn't a bad one.

His grace is sufficient..one down.

tom