

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Did Jesus Mean This Literally?****Did Jesus Mean This Literally?, on: 2014/8/7 11:54**

Mathew 5:43-45

You have heard that it was said, `You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.` But I say to you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven; for He causes the sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain to the righteous and the righteous.

I this to be taken literally? Are we commanded by the Son of God to love our enemies?

Posted by Blaine Scogin

Re: Did Jesus Mean This Literally? - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2014/8/7 12:00

The question is why would we not want to take it literally?

Re: Did Jesus Mean This Literally?, on: 2014/8/7 12:02

Pray tell dear brother, what are some of the non-literal explanations of this verse that you have heard...you have piqued my curiosity:)

Re: Did Jesus Mean This Literally? - posted by MaryJane, on: 2014/8/7 12:25

Greetings Bear

Yes it is to be taken literally. We are told to love our enemies and pray for those who persecute us. In all my time walking with JESUS I have not heard any other teaching except to love our enemies.

I read testimony of a woman, she was a nurse and missionary who was held in a Japanese prisoner of war camp during world war two. She spoke about how she would pray for those who tortured and abused them. She said no matter how cruel they were to her she could not bring herself to hate them. She felt sorry for them and prayed for them to see their need for JESUS.

God bless
maryjane

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/7 12:32

CS Lewis said something along the lines that if you cannot or do not love your enemy, then ACT as if you did and perhaps the feeling will follow.

We can't "try" to love someone emotionally. We either do or we don't. I think Jesus is talking about acting as if we loved them. We do not have to have warm fuzzy feelings. But the command is not to "feel" but to act.

That's my 2 cents.

Re: Did Jesus Mean This Literally? - posted by jenny1234, on: 2014/8/7 12:53

bearmaster,
Did Jesus Mean This Literally? Reply To This Post |

Mathew 5:43-45

You have heard that it was said, `You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.` But I say to you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven; for He causes the sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain to the righteous and the righteous

The answer is yes.

I pray for my enemy the evil one his spirits all the time, and I Pray with my heart.because I get attacks.

John 5:39 King James Bible

Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me

John 5:40 And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.

John 6:63 It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2014/8/7 13:00

by TMK on 2014/8/7 9:32:01

CS Lewis said something along the lines that if you cannot or do not love your enemy, then ACT as if you did and perhaps the feeling will follow.

We can't "try" to love someone emotionally. We either do or we don't. I think Jesus is talking about acting as if we loved them. We do not have to have warm fuzzy feelings. But the command is not to "feel" but to act.

That's my 2 cents.

Greeting TMK

We can love others emotionally and deeply if it is through the HOLY SPIRIT. If we try to do anything in our own strength you are correct it can not be done, but we can love others by the strength of HIM who lives in us.

Also if GOD looks at the heart and judges by what lies there in, isn't wrong to think JESUS would only be talking about external behavior here? We are told if you say your hate your brother you have murdered him,1 John 3:15, if you look at a woman with lust in your heart you have committed adultery Matthew 5:28. Considering these things don't you think JESUS meant to literally love, cause anything else would be of self and fake right?

God bless
maryjane

Edit: here is the quote from CS Lewis, "Do not waste time bothering whether you "love" your neighbor; act as if you did. As soon as we do this we find one of the great secrets. When you are behaving as if you loved someone, you will presently come to love him."

(In reading that I think it is saying that if you walk in faith demonstrating love to others you find in CHRIST that you soon do love them)

Re: , on: 2014/8/7 13:43

Saints did Jesus really mean that we are to love our enemies? Or was He quoting a vague ideal? Something that is to be established in the millennium? He really cannot mean we are to love the Islamic Jihadist? Those who are beheading our brothers and sisters in foreign lands?

Certainly these verses cannot mean what they appear to imply?

Bearnaster

Re: , on: 2014/8/7 13:48

A few weeks ago I was in a Sunday school class. The discussion had turned to persecution and suffering. One man said that if an Islamic Jihadist came to his home he would have his rifle ready and kill them and let God sort it out.

A ministry leader was reported as saying if Federal authorities came to take his children he would defend his family with a 30/30 and let them and he answer to God.

So does Jesus really expect us American Christians to love our enemies.

Bearnaster

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2014/8/7 13:51

Love for Enemies

43 "You have heard that it was said, 'Love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' 44 But I tell you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, 45 that you may be children of your Father in heaven. He causes his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the righteous and the unrighteous. 46 If you love those who love you, what reward will you get? Are not even the tax collectors doing that? 47 And if you greet only your own people, what are you doing more than others? Do not even pagans do that? 48 Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

Greetings Bear

Read the rest of the verses in Matthew. Do you really think Jesus is speaking of a vague ideal?? No HE is instructing us to love our enemies. Let me ask do you believe that JESUS does not love those who persecute brothers and sisters in other countries? If an Islamic Jihadist threw down his sword and turned to CHRIST and repented wouldn't he be just as accepted as you and I? For all have sinned and JESUS came to forgive us our sins. You and I were once enemies of GOD until we came to JESUS and the cross.

*God bless
maryjane*

Re: - posted by davidkeel (), on: 2014/8/7 13:58

I believe this scripture here means we are to AGAPE Love our neighbour. This kind of Agape love isn't the PHILEO love which some may think is required.

Saying that we can only love our enemies when we feel affectional love (PHILEO) is the way a lot of Christians believe is the only way we should operate.

However, we don't need these feelings of PHILEO Love from God before we can AGAPE Love our neighbour in the way mentioned in this scripture. This AGAPE love is the kind where we do the right thing as a responsibility, whether we feel like doing it or not. It is a part of the Christian life where we deny what our flesh is telling us to do.

Those who have discovered this secret life of self denial can go on to become mature in God.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/7 14:16

Thank you david... That is essentially what I was trying to say.

Bear you do not have to love an Islamic jihadist coming to kill your family, in the sense that you like him a whole lot. But you must feed him if he is hungry or give him something to drink if he is thirsty.

Whether you need to surrender your family is another matter altogether.

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2014/8/7 14:28

Greetings bear:

I came across this short teaching on loving your enemies. Perhaps there is something in it for you.

God Bless
maryjane

When you hear the command, "Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you..." (Mat. 5:44), it sounds like it would be a little bit of a problem or a war of self-control that God has invited us into. But that's really not the case exactly.

If you are like Jesus, you will have enemies. There will be those that hate us, falsely accuse us, persecute us, twist and manipulate, or lie about any of us and so on. Jesus said that will happen. If that's not happening to you, then you're not much like Jesus. Jesus said no man is greater than his master. They did those things to Him, and if you're like Him they will do those things to you. If you're NOT like Him, then you don't have to worry about any of that because all men will speak well of you and it won't be a problem. You'll be "loving, kind, and wonderful" and no one will ever feel as if you are a threat to them or intimidating to them. If you don't walk in truth and you aren't like Jesus, then you won't have any enemies. So, everyone who is like Jesus will have enemies. Otherwise, we're a liar and the truth is not in us. Jesus promised us that we would have enemies if we're like Him, because we're not better or more loving or spiritual than He is.

Assuming that there are those that would call themselves our enemies, how then do we love them? One foundational issue that has to be established in our hearts is that God found us as His enemies. Now that doesn't sound like something most of us would want to think about ourselves in our pre-Christ era. We didn't assume that we were enemies of God. We didn't think or say, "I hate God." I think I'll attack Him. But the Scriptures are clear that if we love the world, we are enemies of God. But, if there's pride in our hearts and lives and we're filled with self-love, then we're enemies of God. "God opposes the proud but gives grace to the humble" (Prov. 3:34; Jas. 4:6). There's a war going on. In other words, we are His enemies.

Now, what did He do to us as His enemies? He didn't assume that we would continue in that path of hating the truth and crucifying His Son without first opening His heart and being willing to be betrayed by a kiss. He exposed Himself to us, not to compromise the things that are true, but under the assumption that perhaps we'd change if we could see His love. So then, God didn't lower His standard. He didn't say it's okay to be self-centered, hateful, lazy, proud, worldly, vain and egotistical, loving the things of the world, being filled with idolatry and greed, with slanderous tongues and temper. He didn't say, "That's okay, and you could be My friends anyway." Those things do make us at enmity with God.

What He did was, He gave us an opportunity out of His kindness to turn from those things. We were His enemies and He opened His arms, not to accept our sin, but in willingness to forgive us if we repented. If we would turn from those things, He would overlook and remember our sins no more.

Basically, this idea of loving our enemies is remembering that we were God's enemies. He didn't lower the standard for us, but He was willing to give us opportunity after opportunity to make it right without penalty, without remembering our iniquities. He was willing to give us opportunity after opportunity to make it right.

The standard remained the same, but forgiveness was full and free for those that would turn to Him, empty themselves, ask for His forgiveness and turn away from the things that made us His enemies.

Loving our enemies is to continually be open to remembering their iniquities no more if thereâ€™s a turning from them; a willingness to not hold their sins against them.

Re: - posted by Beige, on: 2014/8/7 16:17

I think we must not confuse our "personal" enemies with the spiritual war that is occurring between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of Satan.

1. If we have personal enemies because of our own carnality then we must enter into a attitude of repentance and reconciliation as the Holy Spirit leads us.
2. If they are enemies of ours because they and we are members of opposing forces in spiritual warfare then we must look beyond the person and identify the spiritual forces behind his or her actions and bind the strongman or whatever God desires us to do in intercessory prayer. We do not seem to have a problem with this when we pray for an unsaved loved one; even though he or she are members of the kingdom of darkness.
3. If they are physical persons and spiritual enemies who physically desire to hurt us or our loved ones we must defend ourselves both physically and in spiritual warfare. Unless, of course God directs us not to. Scripture is full of examples of divine protection and assistance in defense of the Godly.

There is scripture in Revelations that speaks of a time when God gives Satan power to overcome the saints -- but, I do not think we are there yet -- and pray we are not. The current persecution and murder of the saints in the middle east may be occurring because someone else has disobeyed God's instructions to protect them.

Perhaps the key here is to love all people as Christ does and desire their salvation. And to be able to hear God's voice thereby obeying His instructions. I am reminded of David Wilkerson's ministry in New York when he reached out to dangerous gang members -- David listened to God and plundered darkness for the glory of our Lord. David overcame evil by doing good! David went to this ministry motivated by love. But, we can not truly love our enemies until the old sin nature in us is dead -- And Christ is manifest in us.

Re: And What of Just War?, on: 2014/8/8 12:19

Brethren I appreciate the feedback from your posts. And must say I am pleasantly surprised. For I thought some in the forum would take the opposite approach.

So is we are to take the command of Jesus to love our enemies. Then why do evangelicals push for temporal war?

How can Christians claim to love their enemies and yet support for American fire power in places like Afghanistan?

For that matter how could the church have entered into the notion of supporting the taking up the sword to vanquish her enemies?

Bearmaster

Re: - posted by flameoffire (), on: 2014/8/8 12:33

An excellent follow-up question, though it opens another discussion that has been debated here before.

I am an advocate of Christian non-violence or pacifism. Loving our enemies means not killing them. Wars send scores of people into eternity unprepared and God desires that all people repent and come to the knowledge of Him. One of the official reasons Rome persecuted early Christians was because they refused to serve in the military.

In addition, if someone breaks into my house and kills me, I go to heaven. If they break into my house and I kill them, they go to Hell. There is no question that they deserve it, but so did I. I have been forgiven and know mercy, and I want to be willing to lay down my life to give them a greater opportunity to receive that mercy.

Though I am passionate about this view, I respect and honor those who serve in our military. I know God's grace is powerful and covers a multitude of sins, and we all must be obedient to our conscience. I minister alongside a number of former soldiers who reach out to the Muslims they once fought because while they were in Iraq and Afghanistan, God gave them a love for their enemies.

Re: And What of the Land Letter?, on: 2014/8/8 12:49

On October 3rd, 2002, five prominent evangelical leaders sent a letter to President George W Bush. In the letter these leaders outlined their support for a 'just war' preemptive invasion of Iraq.

The leaders are as follows.....

Richard Land

President of Ethics and Religious Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention. (Presumably Richard Land originated the above letter that bears his name)

Chuck Colson

Founder of Prison Fellowship Ministries

Bill Bright

Founder of Campus Crusade for Christ, now known as Cru.

James Kennedy

President of Coral Ridge Ministries

Carl D. Webster

President of the American Association of Christian Schools

(The above information is on Wikipedia)

My question is how can noted evangelical leaders as the men above want to share the love of Jesus Christ around the world, and yet support an invasion into a nation that was never our enemy.

As I post this the weight of what is occurring in Iraq to our brothers and sisters is our responsibility. At least the responsibility of the American church that supported Bush's invasion of that nation.

Obviously something about loving your enemies got lost. And more like bid fire from heaven (remember shock and awe) was applied.

So what went wrong here?

In light of the Land Letter, did Jesus really mean for American Christians to love their enemies? And do we need to repent if supporting an invasion of a nation that was never our enemy.

Bearnaster

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/8 13:59

Bear- if the US. has the power to rescue Christians in Iraq or Syria from terrorists who want to kill them should we do so ?

Should police stop home invasions by thugs into Christian homes or just let them invade?

Better yet if someone is invading my home to harm my family should I even call 911 or let them have their way?

Re: , on: 2014/8/8 15:03

Flameoffire as I read your thoughtful post I was reminded of the story of Jacob DeShaver. He was part of the Doolittle raid over Tokyo in WWII. His plane was shot down. He was a prisoner for the duration of the war.

DeShaver hated the Japanese. While in prison he read a Bible and became a Christian.

After returning home he studied at a mission school and returned to Japan to share the gospel of Jesus Christ to a people he once hated. His 30 years in Japan saw many Japanese come to the love of the Savior by DeShaver's love for them.

One amazing thing about this story. The commander of the Japanese who bombed Pearl Harbor became a Christian. He and DeShaver who once were enemies, now brothers on Christ, spoke at many evangelistic rallies. Their testimonies inspired others to come to Christ.

Truly a testimony of the transforming power of Christ. The transforming power to make enemies become brothers.

Bear.

Re: , on: 2014/8/8 15:13

TMK Jesus said in Mat.5:38-39

You have heard that it was said `An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.` But I say to you do not resist an evil person, but whoever slaps you on your right cheek, turn the other to him also.

Brother did Jesus mean that literally?

Bear.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2014/8/8 16:00

We have an example of the Apostle Paul resisting evil men in Acts ch.25.

What we see in this chapter is Paul as a prisoner in Cesarea giving a defence before Felix the governor. He realises that the Jewish High Priest and Religious leaders are planning to kill him, therefore he appeals to Caesar. Note what he says in verse 11. " If I am an offender, or have committed anything deserving of death I do not object to dying, but if there is nothing in these things of which these men accuse me, no one can deliver me to them. I appeal to Caesar."

Back in Acts ch.22 v.22-29 we also see Paul question the legality of being scourged as he was a Roman citizen. His appeal to the law of Rome got him off and that was what led him to being taken into prison at Cesarea and then eventually Rome, and his later execution. The point is that there are times that it was right for him to resist evil (not with force) and he accepted his eventual destiny only when he knew it was God's will for this.

Was Paul wrong in these things?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/8 16:10

Bear--

Being slapped is one thing. Being murdered or raped is another. I don't see Jesus instructing on that.

Re: , on: 2014/8/8 17:10

So TMK what about rape or murder. Did Jesus Mean literally that we are not to resist an evil person or love our enemies or was this just filler?

Bear

Re: , on: 2014/8/8 17:13

Brethren let me put the question this way. Can you see Jesus packing a Sig Sauer with a conceal and carry permit. With the rationale to protect his family.

Bear

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/8 17:44

bare not having a wife or children will make it impossible for you to understand what it means for us to protect them ,to protect the innocent ,, do we turn the other cheek when your child is being raped in your front yard ,,or do i go out there and kick the shit out of the evil man ,and save the child from possible murder

jesus spoke of church and personal conduct ,,he didnt apply that to national security .like many amish do

amish people are reaping the security and peace of a nation that is willing to die ,so that our prayers are answered ,that we may live a quiet and peace full life as paul said,,and at the same time condemning those who make it possible for them to live the quiet and peace life they love ,,it is ludicrous to not in some way support those whom god uses to answer our peace prayers

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/8 17:56

All I am saying Bear is that Jesus did not instruct what to do to an evil person who is attempting to murder maim or rape your family.

He said to love your enemies and do good to those who persecute you. He did not tell us to stop loving our families in the process.

Like I said being slapped or spit upon while sharing your faith and turning the other cheek is one thing. I think that is what Jesus was talking about. You can't take that instruction and turn it into the idea that we must lay down and allow loved ones to be killed by evil men if we can prevent it.

Let me ask you this. If you were in church and a dear brother was preaching and a mad man rushed the pulpit with the obvious intent to do great harm to the brother preaching, would you intervene if you could?

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/8 17:57

christians and muslims are being slaughtered by radical jihadists right now thousands are being lined up and executed ,,these evil men have taken over iraq's largest city

watch the horror of 1500 being killed like dogs muslims going to hell because other muslims what they did for resisting the evil regime

this is the worst thing i've ever seen <http://shoebat.com/2014/07/29/rare-footage-muslims-create-literal-river-human-blood-butchering-1500-innocent-people/>

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/8 19:14

Also....

<http://www.gospelherald.com/articles/52128/20140806/chaldean-christian-leader-isis-systematically-beheading-children-in-iraq.htm>

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/8 19:17

Let me state plainly:

If Jesus was near a child and a man with a sword intended to behead that child, I have no doubt whatsoever that he would have done what he could to protect the child.

How could a person NOT think that?

Re: , on: 2014/8/8 19:52

TMK I find it interesting when these discussions come up there are the what if sceneries that are brought up.

Let me ask you and others in this forum. Is God not capable of protecting His own?/ Does he need our help in keeping a fire arm in the home to protect a Christ centered family?

God has said that the angel of the Lord encamps around those who fear Him. Jesus did not need Peter`s sword to protect Him. He could appeal to His Father who would have given Him 12 legions of angels. Yet He gave His life so that we could have salvation.

Do you or others not believe God can protect those who ask Him for such? Do We feel we need a Gluck tucked inside our belt for protection when God has angels for protection?

Either His Word is true or not? Either we believe it or not? Either Jesus really means we love our enemies or we disobey Him.

My thoughts.

Bearnaster

Re: , on: 2014/8/8 19:55

So TMK how would He have protected that child?

Bearnaster

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2014/8/8 20:23

Quote:
-----If Jesus was near a child and a man with a sword intended to behead that child, I have no doubt whatsoever that he would have done what he could to protect the child.

How could a person NOT think that?

This is a fictitious dilemma. A person does NOT think this way if s/he lacks any power advantage â€” such as a weapon, status, size, etc.

But this is difficult to comprehend if weâ€™ve been shaped in a culture of power (the most powerful nation in the world, yes?). We arenâ€™t aware of how many power advantages we have, to deploy them whenever we sense threats to our stability! When Jesus taught about loving your enemies â€” he was talking to his followers who had NO power advantage â€” those under the Romans, religious powers, etc.

I believe that to truly understand what it means to "love your enemy" we have to visit the lives of believers who had NO power advantages. Read testimonies by those undergoing persecution where even if you did have a weapon, you would dare not use it for protection because the powers that be would destroy you in a flash. Prison testimonies are so insightful because you can see the tremendous power of love - a totally different kind of power.

One more thought: Consider how people instinctively respond to someone asserting power over them - be that a weapon, controlling, dominating behaviors, etc? That person senses threat and reacts defensively - fight or flight. That person cannot allow himself to be vulnerable or honest. The dominant person has created an unsafe relational context. It's NOT an invitation to lay down a weapon.

Power is NEVER the way we advance the kingdom of God and that is our calling.

Diane

Re: , on: 2014/8/8 20:31

Diane thank you for your insightful post. Very thought provoking.

Blaine

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/8 21:19

I still say that Jesus was not talking about or expecting a believer to allow their family to be slaughtered.

If you can show me where he says that please do and I will stand down.

Jesus would have protected the child in my hypothetical any way He could. He would not have simply stood by and watched.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/8 21:20

How is it loving to your family to allow them to be killed or whatever if it is in your power to stop it?

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/8 21:28

brothers and sisters I agree with these two articles on this topic as I believe they provide solid biblical answers for Christians:

What does the Bible say about killing in war? Is killing in war a sin?:

<http://www.gotquestions.org/killing-in-war.html>

"What does the Bible say about self-defense?":

<http://www.gotquestions.org/self-defense.html>

During this huge crisis hour in Iraq I thank God that some relief and protection is finally coming to those being persecuted. May we continue to pray for strength and mercy for these dear people and for God to restrain this fiercely demonic force.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/8 21:52

Romans 13:3-5 also came to mind here, which those articles did not reference:

"3 For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil. Do you want to be unafraid of the authority? Do what is good, and you will have praise from the same. 4 For he is God's minister to you for good. But if you do evil, be afraid; for he does not bear the sword in vain; for he is God's minister, an avenger to execute wrath on him who practices evil. 5 Therefore you must be subject, not only because of wrath but also for conscience' sake."

So God appoints certain "moral" governing authorities for the restraining of evil in this world. This is something good for the human race, without which there is total anarchy and unrestrained bloodshed.

Re: The Sermon on the Mount as Kingdom Living, on: 2014/8/8 22:45

It has been said that the Sermon on the Mount were Jesus's instructions on how we are to live in His kingdom. His kingdom is a rule of His Spirit in our hearts. We live out His kingdom reality in this present world.

Either we take the Sermon on the Mount at face value as commands of Jesus to be lived out or we reject it. But in so rejecting the Sermon on the Mount we reject Christ Himself. For He, The Word, cannot be separated from His spoken Word.

Do We try to explain Mat.5:28 away with emotional what ifs. Here Jesus says looking upon a woman with lust in one's heart is committing adultery. The statement is pretty straightforward.

So then are Mat. 5:38-48 any less straight forward. Taken at face value we are to love our enemies, not resist our enemies, and pray for those who persecute us.

Now I am sure that all in the forum will agree that looking at a woman with lust in our hearts is wrong. And we would agree with Jesus that this adultery. No what if scenarios.

Can we agree that Jesus meant what He said that we are to love our enemies? Can we agree that Jesus meant what He said that we are not to resist an evil person? Can we agree that Jesus meant what He said that we are to pray for those who persecute us?

If one cannot agree to the above then their issue is with Jesus Himself.

Bearnaster

Re: , on: 2014/8/8 22:57

Yes Oracio, to govern a nation, God has instituted governments. This is His means so that we do not fall into anarchy.

However governments do not have the right to invade sovereign nations and destabilize their countries. This is what happened when the U S invaded Iraq. We bear the responsibility of what is happening in Iraq. If we had left Saddam Hussein alone there would be no Islamic Caliphate slaughtering Christians.

But the grievous thing was that 5 prominent evangelical leaders encouraged Bush to invade Iraq. This is documented in my earlier post regarding the Land Letter. Thus the American Church bears the responsibility of the tragedy that is unfolding in Iraq.

Somehow the teaching of Jesus about loving your enemies has gotten lost.

Bearmaster.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/8 23:16

So bear, what would you say about Hitler and Nazi Germany? Was it wrong to go to war against him to stop the massive genocide of Jews and others and the taking over of the world by him?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/8 23:43

Bear I am curious what you think Jesus meant when he said not to resist an evil person? I mean what do you think he was talking about?

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/9 0:11

Regarding the passage in Matthew 5 about not resisting an evil person, I believe our Lord is referring to insults or injuries that are not life-threatening. We must consider the whole counsel of God here, especially and particularly the New Testament. In Luke 22:37-38 our Lord told the disciples to continue carrying the two swords they had already been carrying. Swords were carried for protection against murderers.

I'll share part of Matthew Henry's "insights" :) on that passage here as I think he breaks it down pretty good:

"II. What the New-Testament precept is, as to the complainant himself, his duty is, to forgive the injury as done to himself, and no further to insist upon the punishment of it than is necessary to the public good: and this precept is consonant to the meekness of Christ, and the gentleness of his yoke.

Two things Christ teaches us here:

1. We must not be revengeful (v. 39); I say unto you, that ye resist not evil;â€”the evil person that is injurious to you. The resisting of any ill attempt upon us, is here as generally and expressly forbidden, as the resisting of the higher powers is (Rom. 13:2); and yet this does not repeal the law of self-preservation, and the care we are to take of our families; we may avoid evil, and may resist it, so far as is necessary to our own security; but we must not render evil for evil, must not bear a grudge, nor avenge ourselves, nor study to be even with those that have treated us unkindly, but we must go beyond them by forgiving them, Prov. 20:22; 24:29; 25:21, 22; Rom. 12:7. The law of retaliation must be made consistent with the law of love: nor, if any have injured us, is our recompence in our own hands, but in the hands of God, to whose wrath we must give place; and sometimes in the hands of his viceregents, where it is necessary for the preservation of the public peace; but it will not justify us in hurting our brother to say that he began, for it is the second blow that makes the quarrel; and when we were injured, we had an opportunity not to justify our injuring him, but to show ourselves the true disciples of Christ, by forgiving him.

Three things our Saviour specifies, to show that Christians must patiently yield to those who bear hard upon them, rather than contend; and these include others.

(1.) A blow on the cheek, which is an injury to me in my body; "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek," which is not only a hurt, but an affront and indignity (2 Co. 11:20), if a man in anger or scorn thus abuse thee, "turn to him the other cheek;" that is, "instead of avenging that injury, prepare for another, and bear it patiently: give not the rude man as good as he brings; do not challenge him, nor enter an action against him; if it be necessary to the public peace that he be bound to his good behaviour, leave that to the magistrate; but for thine own part, it will ordinarily be the wisest course to pass it by, and take no further notice of it: there are no bones broken, no great harm done, forgive it and forget it; and if proud fools think the worse of thee, and laugh at thee for it, all wise men will value and honour thee for it, as a follower of the blessed Jesus, who, though he was the Judge of Israel, did not smite those who smote him on the cheek," Micah 5:1. Though this may perhaps, with some base spirits, expose us to the like affront another time, and so it is, in effect, to turn the other cheek, yet let not that disturb us, but let us trust God and his providence to protect us in the way of our duty. Perhaps, the forgiving of one injury may prevent another, when the avenging of it would but draw on another; some will be overcome by submission, who by resistance would but be the more exasperated, Prov. 25:22. However, our recompence is in Christ's hands, who will reward us with eternal glory for the shame we thus patiently endure; and though it be not directly inflicted, if it be quietly borne for conscience' sake, and in conformity to Christ's example, it shall be put upon the score of suffering for Christ."

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/9 3:31

it always bites me when i hear people elevate one part of Scripture out of biblical context like the sermon on the mount ,, as if it can be pitted against the rest of scripture or it becomes the lever to twist the rest of scripture in to agreement ,,;like e blain has done ,,blain have you sold all your possessions yet and given it all to the poor like Jesus said in a certain sermon

in the same chapter Jesus said do to others as you would have them do to you

who would liked to be helped if a group of rapist was try to sodomize you or your wife ,,would you like god to send some one to you aid in answer to you prayer ,,then do the same to you neighbor if you see him in trouble love your neighbor as you self ,and treat him as you would want to be treated ,,dont dare sit on you hands and watch ,,

can god protect supernatural a person or his Christian family yes ,but does he always use that method NO ,LOOK AT SCRIPTURE ,, the governments are also god ministers,, exacting judgment and protection as oraco posted ,,in Romans

i think it is cowardly to not protect the Innocent , and hypacalvinitic to say god is souvern so we can sit on our hands ,,if my neighbors child is abducted in front of me ,and i shrink back and do nothing and the child is murdered,,i say well god is sourven he did nothing so it is gods will ,WHAT UTTER BALONY thats blasphemy

god answers the prayers of the afflicted and persecuted in may different ways ,,it might just be through you one day

pray that we may led a quite an peacefull life said paul and contribute to that desire if the opatunity arises ,rather then condemn those who unselfisly do

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/9 4:34

Romans 12:17-21 (New Revised Standard)

[View In My Bible](#)

Romans 12:17-21 (New Revised Standard)

17 Do not repay anyone evil for evil, but take thought for what is noble in the sight of all. 18 If it is possible, so far as it depends on you, live peaceably with all. 19 Beloved, never avenge yourselves, but leave room for the wrath of God; for it is written, "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, says the Lord." 20 No, "if your enemies are hungry, feed them; if they are thirsty, give them something to drink; for by doing this you will heap burning coals on their heads." 21 Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.

i think we all can agree with most paul said here what ever side you sit one pasifest or not

but one verse here is one that changes the thrust of this message 18 If it is possible, so far as it depends on you, live peaceably with all.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Did Jesus Mean This Literally?

what are the implications of this verse „clearly the effects the whole context and general outcome of applying this scripture to our life

the pacifists will say it is always possible to live a quiet and peaceful life „but the bible says only if it is possible „showing that there will be or there might be times when it will not be possible or even times that will be impossible to live peacefully with some men „„„period full stop „„„„

now we can talk about exactly what we think Paul is talking about „regarding what exactly could arise in a Christian's secular life that would be considered an example of what Paul had in mind „„and was he speaking in a secular or spiritual context „„as a church „or as a citizen of a state „or as a secular office like a centurion or something similar a temple guard „„but to deny what Paul has said is dishonest to the text „blind exegesis

what does Paul mean or is he even suggesting that there may be more than one reason to not be able to live peacefully with all men

how do we tie this in to chapter 13 the following verses without forgetting this one verse

any one have any thoughts

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/9 6:17

Amen Gary and Oracio.

Good 'ol Matthew Henry!

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2014/8/9 8:18

Quote:
----- Jesus would have protected the child in my hypothetical any way He could. He would not have simply stood by and watched.

So then: the only two alternatives are aggression and passivity?
Something is terribly wrong with this theology!!

Quote:
----- â€œthe passage in Matthew 5 about not resisting an evil person, I believe our Lord is referring to insults or injuries that are not life-threatening.

This manner of Biblical interpretation is called isogesis â€œ putting INTO the text â€œ as opposed to exegesis. Itâ€™s putting into the text the interpreters own presuppositions and self-justifications.

Quote:
----- How is it loving to your family to allow them to be killed or whatever if it is in your power to stop it?

â€œAllowâ€œ?? This statement itself expresses the language of power. Who has the power to â€œallowâ€œ anything? This is not the language of the oppressed â€œ but the language of those on the side of power. Consider how Jesus responded to Pilate.

Quote:
----- We must consider the whole counsel of God â€œ In Luke 22:37-38 our Lord told the disciples to continue carrying the two swords they had already been carrying. Swords were carried for protection against murderers.

I donâ€™t think so! Imagine going after a Roman legion with 2 swords! Itâ€™s a joke! Itâ€™s like carrying around a water

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Did Jesus Mean This Literally?

er pistol. Imagine a Chinese believer today who is being chased by the authorities. He is carrying a "sword" in case he gets caught by an armed guard. How much hope is there for him if he kills the fellow chasing him? There are 10 million more enemies in the sidelines.

Is Jesus not using irony here to get his point across?

Quote:

----- Romans 13:3-5 "you must be subject"

So God appoints certain "moral" governing authorities for the restraining of evil in this world. ...

Jesus and also Paul were speaking to Jewish audiences under Roman occupation (hardly a moral gov't!) In 70 AD many of these Jews disobeyed this very caution and rose up against the Romans. You know the outcome! The reason for being "subject" to the ruling authorities, (avoid resisting them with power strategies) is for your good. Vengeance has a nasty way of falling back on you. Leave vengeance to God. THAT is a biblical truth.

It's amazing how much vengeance and power mongering happens in the name of "self-defense".

Anger and fear are the driving motives "and these motives have no brakes" even among the "people of God". History proves it to be true.

Diane

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2014/8/9 8:31

Quote:

----- what would you say about Hitler and Nazi Germany? Was it wrong to go to war against him to stop the massive genocide of Jews and others and the taking over of the world by him?

Here we have the classic justification for war. But this argument fails to take into account the myriads of failures and unbiblical principles that preceded this crisis. Consider how Germany was treated after WW1 by the Allies. Hardly forgiveness! Instead, Germany was put under an enormous debt which kept them paralyzed. Why would they NOT rise up against their oppressors "eventually" - when given the chance.

That's the problem with aggression: Eventually it bites back. "Winning" can prove to be very costly down the road.

Diane

Re: , on: 2014/8/9 8:50

Diane I believe you are articulating more clearly than I the New Testament teaching of non resistance. I prefer this term over pacifism. For it is clear that Jesus teaches non resistance to evil in Mat.5:39. That we are not to resist an evil person. In the following verses He even says we are to love our enemies and pray for them.

But why are we to do this. Because we are citizens of another kingdom. I will develop that thought in another post. But Mary Jane reminded us in her earlier post that to not resist an evil person, to love our enemies, and and pray for our enemies is to be perfect as our heavenly Father is perfect. Indeed in Luke 6:55-56, the shorter account of the Sermon on the Mount, JESUS says, love for our enemies brings reward and testifies of our sonship to the Father. Indeed love for our enemies confirm we citizens of His kingdom.

Blaine

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2014/8/9 8:59

by Oracio on 2014/8/8 20:16:03

So bear, what would you say about Hitler and Nazi Germany? Was it wrong to go to war against him to stop the massive genocide of Jews and others and the taking over of the world by him?

I know this was address to bear but I just wanted to add we did not go to war against hilter because he was killing the Jews. We entered WWII because our interests were attacked in Pearl Harbor. In fact the US was asked to help before Pearl Harbor but resisted getting involved until after we were attacked. I don't think you can say the US went into WWII with the motive to protect the Jews.

God Bless
maryjane

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/9 9:28

we may be of a heavenly country „but we are still sojourners if you dont love and protect your wife like Christ did the church and lay down your life ,not one hair on the head of the disciples was harm during the appointed time ,,if your not willing to die to protect your wife and children to save them if your not willing to give up your own life for our neighbors children ,that you baby siting or minding and you let some harm come to them wile under your care ,we are worse then an infidels ,we are reasonsable to provide safety and protection for those who cant do that

that is our moral duty as a human being ,and we should support and pray for our police and soldiours that are gods ministers who preform his duties

Jesus said love our neighbors „not let them be raped and murdered ,beaten „he hasn't said that any where in the bible ,it make me sick to hear „i hope noby ever leave there children in you care , blain „you need to warn people what sort of beliefs you have before you mind there children „or make you mind up to protect them with your life or die trying ,,if we want to let our selfs be beaten and raped go for it brother „but ill probably start to defend my self if some body trys to rape me , ill turn the other cheek but not that cheek No sir ,,and i wont force another to turn there cheek , or expect them to take that in front of my eyes ,weather they are a believer or not ,,if i get permission from another Christian to let a sinner beat them up for being a Christian or cut the head of for there witness of Christ ,by gods grace let all our heads roll for the sake of Christ in the context of our Christian witness when that time comes but till then we are still in this world ,and should contribute the minimum requirements of a human being ,and provide safety to those who cant provide that for them self ,and not cast away those important expressions ,for the sake of thinking we are more spiritual if we do , we become hypocrites in our own count ryes ,loving the peace and safety and security of our god given place of birth and not willing to contribute or at least sport those who are willing to in danger there own lives protect the weak and vulnerable ...

Re: The Two Swords, on: 2014/8/9 9:43

Mention has been made of the two swords account in Luke 22:35-38. Here Jesus tells his disciples if they do not have a sword to go buy one. The disciples respond here are two swords. Jesus says that is enough.

Some have taking these verses to mean that Jesus is giving approval to self defense with carnal weapons. This is erroneous. And it does not fit with the context of the verses.

Diane has given some valid reasons in her post why the disciples were not going to use the swords for self defense. For one thing the disciples were not military men trained in the art of sword fight. And no where do you see the disciples carrying swords on their missionary journeys..

So why is Jesus telling his disciples to get a sword. I believe to teach an object lesson on his way to the cross.

Consider Lk. 22:49 when the disciples ask Lord should we strike with our swords. After Peter cuts off Malchus's ear Jesus says to stop. No more of this. The account in Matthew gives further explanation. In Mat. 26:52 when Peter pulls out his sword to defend Jesus. Jesus tells him to put his sword away. For those who take up the sword will perish by the sword.

A few things come out in the above account. The first thing is that Jesus is living out his teaching in Matthew about resisting evil man. Here he is providing an example of what he taught in the Sermon on the Mount.

The next thing that comes out is that evil is not to be resisted with a carnal weapons of man. Indeed to use the carnal weapons of man to resist evil will result in death of the one using the weapon.

the third thing that comes out is that Jesus is living out the reality of His Kingdom which is not of this world.

At this point I must go to the account of John 18:36. Here Jesus says to Pilot that my kingdom is not of this realm. He goes on to say that if His kingdom were of this world his servants would fight to prevent Him from being handed over by the Jews.

The kingdom of Jesus is not advanced to the carnal weapons of man. But the kingdom of Jesus is advanced to the spiritual weapons of righteousness.

I hope to say more on this in a later post.

Blaine Scogin

Re: , on: 2014/8/9 9:53

Gary are you trained in fire arms? Do you have a conceal and carry permit? Have you ever discharged a fire arm at another person or taken a life? Are you prepared to live with the consequences of taking a life?

These are questions that you and others will need to consider as you as you expound in defending your families.

Re: , on: 2014/8/9 9:59

Brethren I recently spoke with a military chaplain. I asked him if he had counseled those who had taking lives during war. He said yes. I asked him what he observed. The chaplain responded those he counseled felt they have lost part of their soul. By taking a life even in the context if war those counseled felt they had lost part of the humanity.

Even police who draw their weapons and discharge them in the line of duty and take a life often cannot live what the consequences of what they have done.

I believe these are some sobering things that need to be considered before we start take up carnal weapons for self defense.

Blaine

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/9 10:09

Quote:
-----This manner of Biblical interpretation is called isogesis â€” putting INTO the text â€” as opposed to exegesis. Itâ€™s putting into the text the interpreters own presuppositions and self-justifications.

I disagree that I was doing that. Eisegesis is when you isolate a certain part of scripture without considering the context or the whole of scripture. Biblical exegesis takes into account the whole counsel of God's Word and tries to be faithful to all of it not just some isolated portion, knowing that scripture interprets scripture and cannot contradict itself. Eisegesis can be seen in pitting Jesus' words against Paul's words, or isolating certain words of Christ without considering other portions of His teaching.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Did Jesus Mean This Literally?

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/9 10:27

Quote:
-----Quote:

We must consider the whole counsel of God â€¦ In Luke 22:37-38 our Lord told the disciples to continue carrying the two swords they had already been carrying. Swords were carried for protection against murderers.

I donâ€™t think so! Imagine going after a Roman legion with 2 swords! Itâ€™s a joke! Itâ€™s like carrying around a water pistol. Imagine a Chinese believer today who is being chased by the authorities. He is carrying a â€œswordâ€ in case he gets caught by an armed guard. How much hope is there for him if he kills the fellow chasing him? There are 10 million more enemies in the sidelines. Is Jesus not using irony here to get his point across?

By you saying Jesus is using irony there one can argue you are committing eisegesis, reading into the text what is not there.

My point was not that Christ was commanding them to carry swords to protect them from the Roman army, but in self-defense from other individual criminals who may want to kill them. It's like having a gun, baseball bat, knife or pepper spray to fend off someone trying to break into your home to kill you or your family.

Quote:
-----Quote:

Romans 13:3-5 â€¦ you must be subjectâ€¦.

So God appoints certain "moral" governing authorities for the restraining of evil in this world. ...

Jesus and also Paul were speaking to Jewish audiences under Roman occupation (hardly a moral government!) In 70 AD many of these Jews disobeyed this very caution and rose up against the Romans. You know the outcome! The reason for being â€œsubjectâ€ to the ruling authorities, (avoid resisting them with power strategies) is for your good. Vengeance has a nasty way of falling back on you. Leave vengeance to God. THAT is a biblical truth.

Itâ€™s amazing how much vengeance and power mongering happens in the name of â€œself-defenseâ€. Anger and fear are the driving motives â€¦ and these motives have no brakes â€¦ even among the â€œpeople of Godâ€. History proves it to be true.

Diane

By "moral" I think I tried making it clear I did not mean upright or godly, but simply a certain disposition to protect the innocent, that's all. In that sense you can say the police department is "moral" in that they protect the innocent (again, "innocent" in a certain sense), as opposed to them unjustly breaking into homes to do harm to people.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/9 10:36

Quote:
-----by Oracio on 2014/8/8 20:16:03

So bear, what would you say about Hitler and Nazi Germany? Was it wrong to go to war against him to stop the massive genocide of Jews and others and the taking over of the world by him?

I know this was addressed to bear but I just wanted to add we did not go to war against Hitler because he was killing the Jews. We entered WWII because our interests were attacked in Pearl Harbor. In fact the US was asked to help before Pearl Harbor but resisted getting involved until after we were attacked. I don't think you can say the US went into WWII with the motive to protect the Jews.

God Bless
maryjane

Sister, thanks for that clarification. I honestly have not done much study on WWI and WWII. But what I do know is that Hitler and Nazi Germany were responsible for the holocaust and it was not just the Jewish people who were targeted. Regardless of the motives of the US in entering into war against Hitler, we know that it resulted in the elimination of one of the most horrendous evils that has ever come into history. So I guess my main point was, was it God's will for Hitler and Nazi Germany to be stopped through the war? I'd say it was an act of mercy from God.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2014/8/9 10:47

Quote:
----- Jesus said love our neighbors „not let them be raped and murdered ,beaten „he hasn't said that any where in the bible „it make me sick to hear „i hope noby ever leave there children in you care , blain

Here is an unfortunate divide among the people of God â€” an expressed distrust towards a brother assuming that unwillingness to use force is synonymous with condoning violence.

Weâ€™ve also seen here a theology based on imagined worst-case scenarios. Itâ€™s called situation ethics. And this is why every person should put a gun under their pillow. BTW, This is why I dread ever having to find myself in need during the night in a USA city. If I knock on a door for help, the first impulse of the owner might be: â€œYikes! A murderer! Quick get the gun! Bang!!â€ And Iâ€™m dead.
Thatâ€™s human natureâ€™s response to fear: fight or flight, right?

There are countless situations of injustice which are NOT remote:
1. What do you do for the child you meet in the supermarket who is being treated abusively by a domineering angry mother? The child may grow up to vent his anger on his girlfriend (rape).
2. What are you going to do with the poor person who is designated to that lot in life forever because of social policies? (I.e., He stays passive and dumb the rest of his life â€” feeding off social assistance)
3. What are you going to do for the church board member who is being scapegoated by more dominant personalities.

All that to say: While we might refuse to â€œallowâ€ one injustice (imagined), we are blindly overlooking thousands of destructive injustices (actual).

Hereâ€™s the main issue at stake in this discussion:
If we center our calling on the extrapolation of evil, we will do little to foster the gifts of grace â€” those qualities which make better people and a better society (and less murderers, rapists, and enemies).

Tragically, this is a bent in historical Christianity. The gifts of grace (our moral duty) get eclipsed by the mission to fight evil- or, rather, perceived evils. (NOT our moral duty)

Think of the human devastation this has caused historically by a church bent on exterminating â€œevilâ€ (who often were the truly godly).

Are we here in the very act of repeating history?
Just after 9/11 I heard in a press interview where Franklin Graham was asked if he supported the use of weapons of mass destruction against Iraq (ie, terrorists). Graham responded with a resounding affirmative. That shocked me!

Now, we see the suffering of our brothers and sisters in Iraq, caused by an unstable govâ€™t! Will God not hold accountable his people in the most powerful nation in the world â€” those who had been given the power of the Spirit to advance his kingdom with love and grace, going â€œthe second mileâ€, etc, and in that way promoting repentance, and helping create a better world.

Quote:
-----and we should support and pray for our police and soldiours that are gods ministers who preform his duties

Yes, prayer is needed since these are among the people most prone to misuse their power and contribute to escalation rather than de-escalation of violence.

Diane

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2014/8/9 10:57

Sister, thanks for that clarification. I honestly have not done much study on WWI and WWII. But what I do know is that Hitler and Nazi Germany were responsible for the holocaust and it was not just the Jewish people who were targeted. Regardless of the motives of the US in entering into war against Hitler, we know that it resulted in the elimination of one of the most horrendous evils that has ever come into history. So I guess my main point was, was it God's will for Hitler and Nazi Germany to be stopped through the war? I'd say it was an act of mercy from God.

You said it was an act of GOD'S mercy to have the US take out Hitler...Did you know the US left Stalin in control after WWII and he is responsible for killing and bringing about the death of even more people than Hitler was.

What interesting is that we went in and took Saddam Hussein out of power and that is what has created all of this instability in Iraq today. This kind of open persecution of Christians is a result of that instability.

Just some things to consider...

God Bless
maryjane

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/9 11:04

There is no question that Islamist terrorists are trying to take over many parts of the world, including the west, as much as they possibly can and by whatever means. IMO this is the new "Hitler and Nazi Germany".

My grief is in hearing believers complain about people (men woman and children, Christian and non-Christian) receiving some aid and protection from the US. If we were those people we would be thankful for whatever help we can get from any other nations.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/9 11:09

Sister Mary, I understand your point and where you are coming from. The only thing I'd say is that if there are people, including many children being beheaded and murdered by the masses it is our responsibility to weep with those who weep and to ask God to intervene on their behalf, just like the believers were fervently praying for Peter's well-being when he was put in prison.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2014/8/9 11:28

Quote:
----- By you saying Jesus is using irony there one can argue you are committing eisegesis, reading into the text what is not there.

True.
What example/parable, etc does Jesus provide to support your own interpretation, Oracio?

Quote:
----- My point was not that Christ was commanding them to carry swords to protect them from the Roman army, but in self-defense from other individual criminals who may want to kill them. It's like having a gun, baseball bat, knife or pepper spray to fend off someone trying to break into your home to kill you or your family.

What would be an example ' from scripture, or from the testimonies of believers? In all my reading of testimonies/books written by believers encountering threats, I don't see one example of this particular interpretation. Besides, this method only 'works' if you are lucky enough to be more powerful or have an advantage. Again ' it relies on power advantage - your own. And it is fear-driven.

Have any of you heard of the practice of de-escalation?

Diane

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2014/8/9 12:05

by Oracio on 2014/8/9 8:09:26

Sister Mary, I understand your point and where you are coming from. The only thing I'd say is that if there are people, including many children being beheaded and murdered by the masses it is our responsibility to weep with those who weep and to ask God to intervene on their behalf, just like the believers were fervently praying for Peter's well-being when he was put in prison.

I agree we do need to be in prayer and seeking GOD'S will on this. Prayer is the best weapon we could ever use in this battle.

God bless
maryjane

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/9 12:23

Quote:
-----I agree we do need to be in prayer and seeking GOD'S will on this. Prayer is the best weapon we could ever use in this battle.

God bless
maryjane

Amen. My main point here was that God sometimes uses certain powers that be for the restraining of such evils as we are seeing in Iraq and other places, and that type of restraining is something good we can pray for. God can easily restrain evil in this world by sending angels to wipe it out. But instead He chooses to allow much of it and sometimes uses governing authorities to restrain it. It seems some of us are against asking God to restrain certain evils by the governing authorities of this world.

The issue of self-defense and self-preservation is another somewhat related issue. I believe the Bible allows and teaches it in certain life-threatening circumstances. But I can respectfully agree to disagree.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Did Jesus Mean This Literally?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/9 14:27

Quote: "Have any of you heard of the practice of de-escalation?"

It might work on a sane sober and reasonable person. Few people that invade your home in the middle of the night are any of these things.

I realize these are hypotheticals. Thank The Lord I have never personally had to deal with this situation.

But we have to talk about the situations because those are the type of situations where we have to decide whether we will use force to protect our family from great bodily harm. I believe we are charged by God to protect our families. What would Abraham, Isaac, Jacob or David had done if someone tried to harm their family. I recall Abraham giving chase to recover by force those who were kidnapped. Was God pleased? Yes. He sent the priest Melchizedek.

Diane I am curious what your response would be if a crazed individual invaded your home?

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2014/8/9 14:56

Quote:

----- Diane I am curious what your response would be if a crazed individual invaded your home?

I have no idea!

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2014/8/9 15:13

Quote:

----- But we have to talk about the situations because those are the type of situations where we have to decide whether we will use force to protect our family from great bodily harm. I believe we are charged by God to protect our families.

Let me share a true testimony: A Christian man was walking down a city street when he noticed a young woman being dragged into an alley. Suddenly it became evident that she was pinned against the wall with a weapon in her face. The Christian found himself racing to the scene. He stood between the woman and the criminal and yelled, "Don't kill her, take me!" The would-be murderer dropped his gun.

Now this Christian had a young family depending on him but, of course, that didn't enter into his mind as he raced to the scene. This incident happened when he was a young man. Now he is a pastor, and uses this story to inspire his parishioners to trust God and NOT use weapons of harm.

There are two powerful instincts which drive every human being when they perceive a threat: fight or flight. It's the natural fear response.

When we extract a scriptural interpretation which supports our lower animal-like instincts to attack or run we need to check out our rationale: Is it from God or from instinct. Is it faith driven or fear driven?

Fleeing is often the right response to danger - as we often read in missionary stories. (You don't hurt anyone in doing so). But so far in this discussion, the choice-of-the-day seems to be the "attack" response. I wonder why.

Diane

Re: , on: 2014/8/9 16:06

Diane thank you for sharing the story of the young man who put himself between the attacker and his victim. For this testimony shows that there is another way to resist evil without the use of carnal weapons.

Indeed none of us know what we would do in a life or death situation. And I honestly pray we never have to find out. But if Jesus said do not prepare in advance what you will say to your persecutors but that he would give us the words to say. I trust if we find ourselves in a life or death situation the Holy Spirit will prompt us to do the right thing.

Blaine

Re: , on: 2014/8/9 16:12

I believe when Jesus said do not resist an evil person and we are to love our enemies does not mean that we sit idly by and see others come to harm. But to protect others does not mean that one has to carry a firearm. I believe the story Diane shared illustrates that one can save another from harm without the use of a firearm.

My thoughts.

Blaine

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/9 16:45

Sure, anything might work. The question is what will usually work.

We must distinguish hoping from planning.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/9 17:55

brother blain im not talking about using a gun on somebody ,, i dont own a gun im just talking about defending the weak in our care tho im a trained bowhunter and have bows and arrows ,i would not think about using that type of extreme force to stop some body ,,and im talking about a christian who is a police officer of a soldier ,doing his job with a clear conscience to defend the country god has placed him in for the sake of weaker and innocent ,,im not talking about defending my own neck from jihadists in a personal scene when in the mission field ,or if the took over australia ,,i see that as completely another context in which the bible teaches we should be will to die for

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2014/8/9 18:18

Quote:

----- Sure, anything might work. The question is what will usually work.

Usually?

How many cases do you know, or any of us know of murderers entering our homes, to arrive at a proposal that usually works?

Quote:

----- We must distinguish hoping from planning.

I do not feel called to make a plan for when a would-be murderer enters my home. The variables are infinite. I leave that to the insurance companies. They are good at considering all the possibilities. And that's why you need a wheelbarrow to carry their policy manuals.

In this discussion are we not drifting far from what Jesus intended when he taught to "turn the other cheek", etc regarding our response to enemies?

Diane

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/9 18:34

well Diane unwillingness to protect those who are placed in your care is condoning violence ,,just as if my wife was severely beat my son and i chose not to protect but said god will sort it out ,i became an an abuser gutless worthless worse than an unbeliever for i did not do my mini min duty to look after my own family

this is theology based on the full council of Scripture ,as Pall said it is all inspired sufficient ,to equipped us for every good work reproving and correction ,,but i am expressing that through real life situations which a binding on human and Christian conscience,,,i know what im prepared to do sister if i was out you house and a drunk dude knocked on the door or grabbed you by the hair and started dragging you outside ,, i hope you dont mind ,i would by the grace of god through the spirit discern the situation and if my using force in a loving manner towards you would escalate the situation , i would swiftly do what i could deal with the situation and protect you even if it meant i would be hurt ,and at the same time i would stop the aslant from committing more sin and subdue him ,and appeal verbally to his conscience to convict him of sin ,,

sister we are not talking 3 other situations who wrote ,,we can but lets not go on a rabbit trail ,or use use that to somehow build a straw man to build an out of context argument ,,just make another thread with the topics im sure we all have biblical principles to apply to those ,,chalk and melted cheese really

now you misrepresent me by saying that im advocating a bent Christianity ,,and im saying that as a church we should destroy evil ,that is blasphemy in my eyes for a church group ,,and false again you say that im elevating a mission to fight evil over spiritual and moral duty's as a Christian,,,but that is typical of social media ,,being that we really dont know each other nor our devotional life ,,many people fall in to judgment because of that ,but we need to be careful all the same ,and strive to to not facilely judge one another due to a hand full of posts

i wont even answer you last points but to say i dont as a Christian support unnesasary force and war crimes to bring about justice ,,but i do know the powers that be are appointed by god as Paul said

Re: , on: 2014/8/9 19:04

Gary, my brother, you are implying non resistance to non action. To say that I believe in non resistance to evil does not imply I would be non active if faced with a life or death situation to myself or others. What would I do in such a situation ? The Holy Spirit would have to give wisdom.

In an earlier post Diane shared how a young Christian man came to the aid of a potential murder victim by putting himself between the victim and the attacker. The young man shouted to the attacker take me. The attacker ran off.

Granted maybe not all situations line this will have such an ending. Perhaps this is the key. And perhaps the answer to some of TMK's questions. To be ready to lay down our lives to save others if need be.

But what the young man did that Diane shared about took far more courage than drawing a handgun.

Blaine

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/9 19:43

well i would not own a gun or use it so i agree ,,

you right not all situations will end like that testimony , ,, we can only assume it was gods power at work or it may be the more regular thing that happens some times when a criminal gets busted and seen they flee the scene ,it would be great if that is always the case ,,but is not and i wont rely on that as my only form of action to take and i really hope if you saw my wife being abused in the street ,,that you might have a plane b and c ,in case ,,thats take more courage then just saying take me or even pulling a gun,,if plane b and c needs to come into effect so be it ,,,,,but let me know how you go if you in a situation maybe like a rape ,,my wife a Little 5 foot woman had to cop punches by fending off rapists in kings cross when she worked on the street in ministry ,,yea let me no how saying to a rapists , take me, will go for ya ,,some how blaine i got my doubts offering your bum to a some rapists will be very appealing to them ,,i dont think Jesus would

uld do that ,Jesus made a wipe and drove them all out of the temple ,, that Jesus ,did not ask them nicely to leave ,,but u sed what was a necessary force led by the spirit ,to stop crimes being committed ,,he did that twice according to the two accounts in scripture ,and all his disciples saw him do it and he sinned not

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2014/8/9 20:12

On the topic of defending ones home I remembered this was posted by RDG and I just thought it was a really good reminder to consider.

God bless
Maryjane

(Post from RDG)

I wanted to say thank you Chapel for posting this article and providing the link. It gave me a lot to think about. I actually have found myself in the kind of situation where someone broke into my home its a very terrifying thing to wake up and see a strange man standing in your room, especially when your a fourteen year old girl. God is good though and faithful, He was with me then and I pray and trust that He will be always. I have also found myself in another situation that was equally as frightening to me. After I first got married my husband worked a night shift and I found myself home alone often. Because of my prior experience I was not really ever comfortable being by myself. There had been some criminal activity in the neighborhood not for from us so I had my dads hand gun in the house. One night I found myself being woken up to the sounds of someone rattling around the back door of my house. I looked at the clock it was still hours before my husband was due home from work. I was panicked and I grabbed the gun, put my finger on the trigger ready to shoot whoever was trying to get through my door. I left the lights off, but I could see a figure through the back window of the door and I remember shaking and crying because I was so afraid and I did not want anything bad to happen. I remember yelling at the person on the other side of the door to just go away or I would shoot them. I heard more noise like something being knocked over so I began praying out to God and asking Him to help me. I prayed and prayed that the person would just go away. In that moment the Lord just gave me this overwhelming since to not fire the gun. He just gave me the strongest feeling of calm and peace in that moment to put the gun down. I placed the gun on the counter and just stood there listening and waiting. A few moments later I heard my husbands voice calling out to me, he had gotten off of work early and did not have his keys to let himself in the house. He had gone to the back door because he had been knocking at the front door of the house for over 15 minutes for me to let him in, he thought that I would hear him better since our room was not far from the back door. It had been storming out that night and I did not hear him knocking at all. I had almost shot my own husband because I had allowed fear to rule me. We do not have a gun in the house any longer, and unless the Lord shows me differently I probably never will. I don't pretend to have all the answers to all the "what if" questions that are thought up and posted about, all I can say is that no matter what I want to follow Jesus(as I am sure all of you do as well). I trust that in the moment no matter what is happening He is going to be there with me and my family and that is really all I need to know.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2014/8/10 7:29

Quote:

----- I had almost shot my own husband because I had allowed fear to rule me.

You posted a powerful testimony by RDG, Mary Jane. MANY THANKS.

We can never underestimate the power of fear. We also can never underestimate our own potential to cause harm. I spoke earlier about POWER. And now I repeat what another has noted: WE ARE MOST DANGEROUS WHEN WE ARE NOT AWARE OF OUR POWER.

It may not be a gun, but it can be the power of language, status, privilege, money, etc. We can use all of these to harm another "even our loved ones.

What did Jesus mean by the metaphors "walk the second mile", "return the other cheek" in reference to confrontation with our enemy?

In what way is Jesus offering us a POWER-FULL strategy?
(I don't think this has been discussed much yet)

Diane

Re: A Kingdom Orientation, on: 2014/8/10 8:41

Mathew 6:33

But seek first His kingdom and His righteousness, and all these things will be added to you.

1 Corinthians 4:20

But the kingdom of God does not consist in words but of `power`.

Colossians 1:13-14

For He rescued us from the domain of darkness and transferred us into the kingdom of his beloved Son, in whom we have redemption and the forgiveness of sins.

Philippians 3:20-21

For our citizenship is in heaven from which also we eagerly wait for a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will transform the body of our humble state into conformity with the body of His glory by the exercise of the power that He was even to subject all things to himself.

I think Diane's preceding post is a good segway into what I have alluded to on this thread. That is that we are part of a kingdom orientation.

If the Sermon on the Mount is merely understood to be a collection nice esoteric sayings by Jesus then we miss it. The Sermon on the Mount is much, much, much, more!!!

The Sermon on the Mount must be understood to be a pattern of Kingdom living in the reality of Christ. The Sermon on the Mount must be understood to be the practical righteousness of Christ ruling in our hearts.

In chapter 5 of Matthew He says `you were told` but `I say`. Here Jesus is clearly establishing His authority as King over our hearts. He is declaring a new internal righteousness that supersedes the external righteousness of law. He is fulfilling the New Covenant where He is writing His laws upon our hearts. This is why Jesus tells us that unless our righteousness surpasses that of the scribes and Pharisees we will not enter the kingdom of heaven. The righteousness He describes is His internal righteousness that is wrought by the Holy Spirit working in our hearts. This is the righteousness of His kingdom.

Thus we see His righteousness is an internal dynamic that requires a new orientation of how we treat others. It is a new righteousness that requires us to love our enemies. It is a new righteousness that requires us to not resist evil by force. But overcome evil by His love that is worked out in a heart by the Holy Spirit. It is a new righteousness that requires us to pray for those who persecute us. This is the righteousness of His kingdom.

Thus the Sermon on the Mount is not esoteric sayings that would be nice to follow. But the Sermon on the Mount is the constitution, yea the blueprint, yea the charter of how we live as citizens of his kingdom. In essence the Sermon on the Mount is the law of Christ written on our hearts.

I opened this thread asking did Jesus mean this literally. Did He mean that we are literally to love our enemies? Did He really mean that we are not to resist evil except through His love?

The answer to that question has to be a resounding YES!!!!!! Jesus Christ means literally that we are to love our enemies. Jesus Christ means literally that we are not to resist an evil man except through His love. Jesus Christ means that we are to pray for those who persecute us. He means this literally because as King he commands it.

But also Christ means this literally because we are citizens of His kingdom. As citizens of His kingdom we should have t

he passport of the Holy Spirit stamp on our hearts. We should have His Spirit working within our hearts to make us more like Him. The New Testament tells us that we are being transformed, yea even conformed into his image. As such we take on his heart and mind. As such we can truly love our enemies only in a way that Jesus ever could.

These are my thoughts on this Sunday morning.

Blaine Scogin

Re: , on: 2014/8/10 9:56

I didn't know gun control debates were allowed on SI :).

Do we really want to open these floodgates?

Here is a novel idea...the pacifists need not own a gun and need not use any force to offend their families and then also let those who want to own a gun and want to use force to defend themselves...do so. And then close the argument?

Brother Blaine I wonder what good comes from some of these topics? They are about as fruitful as the C vs A debates:) Let people just believe what they want to and leave them alone. Just a suggestion as I have seen the sparks fly on yet another SI thread. I wonder what unsaved or new Christians think when they read this stuff and think of the time devoted that could have been put to better use...especially at a time like this when thousands of believers are being slaughtered. Who cares who is right, let's just pray for those being slaughtered. I hope no one takes this personally as I truly love the people on this forum, such a devotion to the Lord...you have no idea how much you all inspire me!!!

Re: , on: 2014/8/10 11:18

Mark I think. The discussion has been good in this thread. All be it spirited and intense. But good insights from the posters.

I believe this issue has a direct bearing on how we view those who are slaughtering Christians. It affects how we pray for those who are enemies.

Mark, certainly you have seen my posting Persecution Watch on the board. There is an open invitation to any in the forum to come and lift their prayers on behalf of the persecuted. We do this 3 nights a week and sometime 4. By God's grace we have done this for 4 years. I honestly don't know if we can do a 5th year because my people are weary as am I.

This is why I am encouraging you to get your call online. Because bro we cannot bear this burden alone.

Blaine

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2014/8/10 17:14

Quote:
----- Here is a novel idea â€¦. And then close the argument?

awakened,
You claim to offer a "novel idea", but I suspect you know that your post is a classic "door closer" - with a ring of sarcasm.

This would be an example of what I was implying earlier regarding the use of power. It's not the power of a gun, but the power of words. It's shooting down - not physical bodies, but people's ideas, thinking processes, and the possibility of growth as a Christian community.

Quote:
----- let those who want to own a gun and want to use force to defend themselves...do so.

End of discussion! It's a civil right, after all!

Awakened, did you read the testimony Mary Jane posted? I hope you did. It reminds us that we are not talking about personal private rights; lives are at stake!

Quote:
----- Who cares who is right

Our private values affect lives. And when an entire nation holds a faulty value ' huge people groups can be at risk.

Quote:
----- I wonder what unsaved or new Christians think when they read this stuff and think of the time devoted that could have been put to better use

The unsaved care a lot about the church's views on self-defense. And they would be glad to see such frank discussion. Outsiders are troubled about the conservative evangelical wing. For a good reason: History demonstrates that when the Church gains power, it also becomes dangerous ' in the name of self-defense, and for the 'cause' of God. I would like you to comment of my earlier reference to the two kinds of priorities: the extrapolation of evil or the flourishing of the gifts of grace.

Lastly, going back to your earlier post (the only other one you posted) ' do you not see a danger in accommodating Jesus's teaching regarding enemies ie, perceived threats? (which is what I think Bearmaster means when he uses the word "literal" - vs non-literal)

Diane

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/10 18:41

Mark--

I am not sure guns were even mentioned explicitly until your post.

There had been discussion of whether to defend against home invasion or not but at least I have not mentioned guns-- at least I don't think I have.

Re: Command of Jesus - posted by Sree (), on: 2014/8/11 2:03

I do not have time to go through the entire conversation to see where it is heading. But based on what I saw there are many situational questions like how can i defend if a person attacks me, my family, can a nation defend it self, can a nation go for a war etc.

Let us just keep it plain and simple. Jesus commanded us to love our enemies. Who are our enemies? Those who hate us and cause evil to us. In our day today life we see lot of such enemies, many cause harm knowingly and some unknowingly. For example recently I had someone who was trying to cheat money from me. It was very difficult to love him and be respectful to him and at the same time politely demand the money as I am in need of it. But with God's grace I was able to overcome after many failures in this test. So when it comes to enemies, let us not think big about those who may persecute you or kill you. Let us start from simple things and try loving them.

The point is no one can give an explanation on how to love the terrorists or avoid war etc. We need to get a personal revelation from God to answer these questions posted here about war, terrorism etc. No answer will be satisfactory. To get a personal revelation we need to be first faithful in little things. God will not speak to someone about the need of war or fight against terrorism until he is faithful in little things. Start with little enemies, start with the driver who overtakes you in r

oad against traffic rules. Avoid getting angry with him.

Re: - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2014/8/11 5:33

To love ones enemies is a trait only Jesus Christ himself exhibited.

To the natural man such things are impossible.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/11 6:03

it was interesting how jesus loved the money changers by driving them out of the temples like goats with a wip , and flipping all there tables ,,but he still loved them ,,im nealy certain many people would called that voilence agreshion and even hate

its a thought to ponder though,,

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/11 7:00

the two greatest commandments love god and ;love your neighbor ,,not love you enemy's that obviously down to three further down

i think many well meaning Christians put love you enemy on the scale at 2 pushing the love your neighbor out of the dominant spot with love god ,and in doing so will they talk about about loving our enemy's ,they nullify to some extent the love we should have to wards our neighbors

if my neighbor is being abused and attacked by a drunken dude ,,what should i do take the second command to love my neighbor to heart as the dominant prominent command ,and protect him if i can ,,or forget about my neighbor and and say well i cant do anything really i must love my enemy which means blow him kisses and pray and maybe yell take me instead or go out get punched in the cheak and then turn the other cheak mean wile my neighbor hasn't got any cheek's left they fell off wile i was serenading our local enemy ,,,,,,,, or maybe i could make a whip of small cords and scare him down the road . saying this street is a street of prayer and safety and you have made it a boxing ring ,,no im joking with that last bit about the whip ,,or maybe that is an option ,,as sree said maybe something like that might come as a rev aluation thing so to speak ,,,,,,, get you head around this brethern ,,the temple full of Gard's and priests salesmen Phari see scribes ,money changers ,and Jesus drove the money changes and salesmen out ,,the zeal for god house had well and truly eaten him up ,, the passive delicate Jesus ,seems to be a bit different form the way many people picture him

we are exhorted to walk as he walked ,, he loved righteousness and hated lawlessness ,,but hey i dont think it would be a good idea to take a whip to you local congregation , unless of course they all prosperity poopers ,,god will understand in that case ,,nooo that was a joke

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2014/8/11 8:17

Quote:

----- the two greatest commandments love god and ;love your neighbor ,,not love you enemyâ€™s

Jesus gave the Parable of the Good Samaritan to demonstrate this command. NOTE: The neighbour WAS the enemy. Not only that: Jesusâ€™s audience would have known that the wounded man himself could have been an enemy - setting a trap for would-be helpers, only to rob them while they were trying to help. That was common on this road.

Gary, I am concerned that you are trying to make scripture accommodate your fears. You keep drawing on fictitious scenarios â€œ imaginary people, none of which truly are your â€œneighborâ€ â€œ or ever will be your â€œneighborâ€.

The â€œneighborâ€, as Jesusâ€™s parable teaches, is the person whose path we cross: A real person we encounter in our lives â€œ not even an imagined image of that person.

NOTICE how Jesus put a twist to the question asked of him: Who is my neighbour?â€ The real issue is not who this person might be, but who WE might be to that person! When you are fear-filled, you will never be a neighbour.

Gary, Can you comment on the testimony Mary Jane posted: The example of where the threatening invader was the woman's husband, whom she perceived IN HER IMAGINATION as a dangerous enemy?

Would some comment on these fear-based responses in scripture:

- Peter sinking when he looked back at the storm clouds.
- Peter striking the soldier with a sword (aiming to cut off his head)
- The Israelites in Gideon's day hiding in the wine-vats.
- More examples: (Can any of you add some?)

Can someone provide a biblical text showing that it is virtuous to harm your enemy or any threatening person?

Diane

Re: , on: 2014/8/11 8:42

Diane,

My sister no such text will be found. At least not in the New Testament, that I believe guides our conduct in Christ. There are those who will appeal to the Old Covenant writings to justify vengeance against those who have wronged them. But if we are guided by the teachings of Jesus and as citizens of His kingdom then we will not harm even our enemies.

On Rom.13:10. Paul reminds us that love does no harm to a neighbor because love is the fulfillment of the law. The law of Christ.

Could it be that Jesus is teaching us under the New Covenant even our enemy is in fact our neighbor?

Blaine

Re: The Story of Dirk Willems, on: 2014/8/11 9:12

Brethren is it possible that we can love our enemies? Is it possible that we can even do good to them?

Please consider the account of Dirk Willems. This brother was of the early Anabaptists. Because of his love for the truth of Christ he was arrested by the authorities. Dirk knew in His imprisonment that certain martyrdom awaited him. Thus turning together bed linens he made a rope. And escaped the tower in which he was imprisoned.

Being pursued he made a dash across a pond of thin ice. Dirk made it to the other side. But his pursuer being much heavier fell through the ice. Dirk heard the man cry for help. This man was his enemy. He was the guard charged with keeping him in prison. For Dirk to turn and help this man would be to lose his chance of escape. And would be to risk imprisonment again.

Yet without hesitation Dirk turned and helped the man out of the freezing water. The grateful man wanted to let Dirk go. But the burghmaster reminded the man of his sworn duty to the state. Thus Dirk Willems was remanded back to prison.

This dear brother for loving his enemy and doing good suffered a horrible martyrdom. But received a royal welcome into heaven.

This is one example of a brother who truly lived out the convictions of the Sermon on the Mount. This is one example of

a brother who took seriously his Lord's command to love his enemy and to do good to him.

Dear saints I am not making this story up. It is recorded in Martyrs Mirror. It can be verified by Google.

I am sure this story has something to say to our hearts.

Blaine Scogin

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/11 10:17

Bear that example is not the same as a home invasion scenario.

I would hope that none of us would simply let that man drown to save our own skin.

Re: , on: 2014/8/11 10:40

TMK,

Brother we can come up with scenerio after scenerio. What about this.....What about that.....

The command is still the same to love our enemy.

Ok. Let us talk about home invasion. Would you feel more secure having a 12 gauge or a 45 in your home? Would you be able to blow an intruder away and feel good you have done the right thing?

I posted earlier what a military chaplain told me about counseling those who took other lives in the course of war. This m an told me that those who have taken lives felt that something of their soul was ripped away. Police officers who draw th eir weapons and discharging them taking a life have to go through counseling. Some never get over the consequences of taking a life. Even the rationale of taking a life in the line of duty does not deliver them from the nightmares and the lo ss of their humanity. I ask you can you live with that as a Christian?

Brother have you not read what RDG posted about the woman almost shot her husband because of fear of an intruder? Diane has been speaking to us about the power of fear. We as Christians have not been given a spirit of fear but the po wer and the peace of Christ himself.

I assume you are a husband and a father. You want to protect your home as any good husband and father should. Do y ou not pray protection over your home and family? Do you not read Psalm 91 over your home and family? Do you not tr ust your loved ones to the God who says that the angel of the Lord en camps around those who fear Him?

Brother if you pray protection over your home. And take other common sense precautions such as locking your doors. And maybe investing in a good security system with a direct link to the police. Then God will protect you without the nee d of a 12 gauge or a 45. But with all of that if God does allow a home invasion perhaps it might be that you bring that per son to Christ.

My thoughts.

Blaine

Re: - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2014/8/11 12:01

I think Blaine, to challenge another persons conviction about a matter which really is not a salvation issue creates undue angst amongst brethren who may not have the same faith as you.

You are free to proceed, 12 gauge or not, but for the brothers and sisters who feel its their right as parents and protector s to arm themselves let God be the one who works that level of faith into their hearts.

Friends, this brings me to the one thought that has been going through my mind the whole time I have been following thi s thread. The goal of Christs commands is not for us to claim some security in the fact that we are obeying our Lord . Be

cause that is what it really boils down to.

The goal of Christ's commands is to totally expose that our understanding of righteousness and God's are two totally different things. That without the gift of righteousness that is found in him no man could measure up to God's requirement.

That was Jesus' mission when he preached, to show, conclusively for all time that without him, without God himself taking the place of man, we can and could do nothing.

Re: , on: 2014/8/11 12:28

Zeke,

The one who challenges our convictions is Jesus Himself. I did not write the Sermon on the Mount. He did. That is why I asked did Jesus mean this literally.

Granted the topic under discussion is loving our enemies and not resisting an evil person. But in Mat. 5 thru 7 there is a broad range of commands and exhortations that compel us to live out His kingdom reality.

I indicated in an earlier post that the Sermon on the Mount is our guide to kingdom living. Some one took exception to my emphasizing the Sermon on the Mount at the expense of other scripture. Say the law given at Sinai. But we have none other than the Son of God Himself saying `You were told` But `I (Jesus Christ) say`.

Here He establishes His right to rule with a new internal ethic of heart obedience as opposed to the old code of external obedience.

This is why Jesus says unless your righteousness surpasses that of the scribes and Pharisees you cannot enter the kingdom of God. Jesus is speaking of an internal righteousness of the heart that supersedes the external righteousness of code.

The question for us is do we take the commands of the Sermon on the Mount to be binding on us.

Blaine

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2014/8/11 13:00

Quote:

----- â€œ not resisting an evil person.

I realize that these words come from Jesus, but I think we need to be careful in our use of these words. This quote is about what NOT to do. And we are instinctively bent on focusing on what NOT to do. We tend to have a far smaller concept of what we actually can do â€œ what God has given us for living godly lives in an evil world.

We are NOT called to be passivists but activists!

Iâ€™d say that we all have a wee bit of the proverbial fruit from the Garden of Eden still stuck between our teeth. Remember how Satan and Eve both distorted Godâ€™s truth by focusing on and even exaggerating the prohibitions. â€œâ€œâ€œ not even TOUCH the fruit,â€œ said Eve. It was a lie she herself concocted.

We can subtly talk as if God is a miser: He wonâ€™t let us do things, not even things that are good for us, like protecting one another. Or we talk as if God is too small to handle the big stuff â€œ like the burglar in our kitchen at night.

I really feel that this discussion is a bust if we cannot leave each other in utter awe over what we CAN do, what we DO have â€œ in Christ. I believe we will do far better if we focus on nurturing the gifts of God rather than the extrapolation of evil.

Hereâ€™s the question: What HAS God given us â€œ in Christ? And how can we let these gifts flourish in an evil and de

praved world ' and in that way see victory over the enemy ' the REAL enemy?

For reflection: Is that, generally speaking, the main priority/focus of discussions on SI ... of my contributions?

Diane

Re: - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2014/8/11 13:03

Blain,

don't you see that this is impossible? Obviously not because we still talking about it;-D.

Quote:

-----But in Mat. 5 thru 7 there is a broad range of commands and exhortations that compel us to live out His kingdom reality.

Compelled by what? And for what reason?

Quote:

-----Jesus is speaking of an internal righteousness of the heart that supersedes the external righteousness of code

Thats the whole point that Jesus was trying to make, righteousness at this level is impossible for man to attain to, righteous
ness must be received as a gift, no man can measure up to the righteous requirements of God, accept one!

Quote:

-----The question for us us do we take the commands of the Sermon on the Mount to be binding on us.

For me, only so far as it drives me towards my saviour, because this is impossible for man to adhere to.

Re: , on: 2014/8/11 13:30

Zeke,

If you are saying the commands of the Sermon on the Mount cannot be lived out in the flesh then I agree. To live out th
e reality of Christ`s commands is as impossible as trying to keep the moral law of Sinai.

But I was implying, but let me state explicitly. That if one confesses faith in Jesus Christ. If one is born again. And if on
e has the Spirit if Christ Himself living within them. THEN one can keep the commands of Christ as articulated in the Se
rmon on the Mount. Even loving our enemies. This is why Dirk Willen could do good and save his enemy. He was filled
with the Spirit of Jesus.

Jesus reminds us in John 15 that apart from Him. That is Him living in us and we in Him we can do nothing. But then P
aul declare in Phil. 4 I can do all things through Christ who gives me strength.

Brother if we do not have the power of Christ in us then the Sermon on the Mount is nothing more than esoteric sayings
giving sweet filler to Mathew.

But the Sermon on the Mount are actually the law of Christ written on our hearts by the Holy Spirit who.lives in us. Thro
ugh Him we live out His commands which John tells us are not burdensome.

Blaine

Re: Can the Sermon on the Mount be Lived Out?, on: 2014/8/11 13:49

Brethren I think the two post by Diane and Zeke bring forth a question. Perhaps restating what was originally asked in the thread.

My question is can a Spirit-filled Christian live out the reality of the Sermon on the Mount

Blaine

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/11 14:30

The thought came to mind, "Did Jesus mean this literally, 'If your right eye causes you to sin, pluck it out...And if your right hand causes you to sin, cut it off'? That's from the same chapter and the same sermon. What's my point? There is an underlying principle behind those commands to pluck out and cut off one's body parts, namely, stay away from sin because it is serious in God's sight.

So what is the underlying principle behind the commands to turn the other cheek and not to resist an evil person. Basically, we must not have a vengeful heart toward those who would harm us but rather a heart of love toward them no matter what. This kind of loving example we see clearly displayed in the NT, beginning with our Lord Himself as He prayed from the cross, "Father forgive them for they know not what they do", and then continuing with the first martyr Stephen. In the case of our Lord He willingly submitted himself to the governing authorities when it was time for Him to die for our sins. In the case of Stephen he willingly submitted himself to the governing religious authorities and he was trapped and outnumbered so there was no possible way for him to escape.

But again, that does not negate the allowance and need to protect one's self or family or neighbor when there is a need and opportunity to do so. I know that can seem to sound like a contradiction but there is none really.

Someone can read those verses about not resisting evil and turning the other cheek and think, "Well, that means there should never be any kind of war to resist any supposed evil at all." That's exactly what many unsaved war protesters have tried to say about those verses. But we know from other parts of scripture that being a soldier is not in itself a sin and there is law enforcement ordained of God to protect from evil.

Does this command to love our enemies also apply to Christian police officers while on duty? Surely it does apply to them also, even while on duty, doesn't it? But how is it possible for them to love someone while at the same time trying to shoot them with a gun in order to stop them from committing a murder?

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/11 15:47

Let's look at Micah 6:8

"He has shown you, O man, what is good;
And what does the Lord require of you
But to do justly,
To love mercy,
And to walk humbly with your God?"

These verses are really extraordinary.

The first thing God commands is that we do justly.

Justice is important to God. Helping and defending the innocent, the orphan, the widow, etc. Those things are indeed very important to the Lord. And we ought to seek justice. We ought to pursue it as believers in Christ. But look what the next line is.

We are to love mercy. Our desire to pursue justice should be tempered by loving mercy. That means that if I have the opportunity to show mercy, then it should be my natural reaction to do so.

Lastly, we are to walk humbly with our God. We don't lift our selves up or exalt ourselves above others, but we put ourselves in our proper place--at the feet of Christ, apart from Whom we can do nothing.

I desire to love my enemies. But I am not going to love them in such a way that I despise the innocent by letting my enemies run over them. What if I don't kill an intruder, I just pin him down on the ground and turn him into the police. Is that loving? The guy is going to go to jail. He is likely to stay there a long while, too. That doesn't sound very merciful or very loving at all. But the issue isn't whether I loved my enemy enough, it is whether I did it correctly. I can love him and seek to be merciful to him, but not at the expense of my loved ones. We can sound all religious by saying that Christians ought not to ever resist an enemy, but that is not what this passage says.

Somebody, please show me an example in the Scriptures where someone threw an innocent, defenseless person under the bus in order to love their enemies.

If you look for those examples, it NEVER speaks well of them. Think of Absalom and David. Think of what resulted because David refused to defend the innocent and seek justice.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/11 16:05

i have to go to work ,,but just quicky ,,you bother hit the nail on the head oraco and havoc ,,that is keep the scripture in context and not isolating scripture

dian that is a pefect example of turning the comand to love our neibours in to love our enemys nulafify the word of god through ones traditions thats what saying before

samaritans are brothers of the jews and neibors in a real scence part of the tribes of jacobs ,,jesus is saying they are also your neoubours ,,so treat them as such ,,the seconed comand extends to them ,,jesus is saying there not you enemys they worship the same god ,,,,,

dian theres no fear in me so that is a false acusations rember fear is sin .sos it is best you dont accuse people of being in sisen unless you are verry sure about that ,,i take the comand to not be afraid literaly and bind ,,maby it is not me tha tis breaking that comand,,cheak your heart and be convinced in your own mind sister

blessings

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/11 16:15

Amen havok20x. But some will say, that was all OT.

As a brief side note here, when Jesus said, "you have heard it said to those of old..But I say to you...", He was correcting the peoples' understanding of God's moral law. The religious leaders had twisted and clouded the true intent and meaning of God's moral law. Our Lord was emphasizing the true spiritual nature of God's moral law. But He was not doing away with the moral law revealed in the OT. That moral law is now called the law of Christ in the NT.

However, when Jesus said, "You have heard it said...", without the qualifying, "to those of old", He was rejecting their own made up traditions that were not even part of the OT law.

Re: , on: 2014/8/11 17:03

But then brethren as I advocated in another thread the New Testament or the New Covenant writings are the greater revelation. Heb. 1:1 establishes that in these end times God has spoken through His Son.

Jesus Christ is the ultimate revelation of God. Thus we live by His teachings and those of His apostles. We do not live by the law of Moses but by the law of Christ. His law clearly laid out in the Sermon on the Mount.

When He said `You were told` but `I say` Jesus is clearly establishing His right to rule as King in our hearts.

When He said to seek first His kingdom and righteousness He is implying kingdom living in the righteousness as laid out in the Sermon on the Mount. This is the righteousness that the Spirit of righteousness writes on our hearts. Thus it is possible to live out the kingdom reality of Mat.5 thru 7. This is why I posed the question can a Spirit-filled Christian live out the reality of the Sermon on the Mount.

Blaine

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/11 17:15

Brother,

We need to rightly divide the word of truth on this. Jesus Christ is indeed the greatest revelation that there ever has been or ever will be. The OT law can't touch Him in regards to that. But we generate a false dichotomy when we divide the OT into the "old covenant" and the New Testament into the "New covenant".

The dividing line is not as clear as the blank page in your bible that separates the Old and New Testaments.

And again, I want to stress that while the entirety of the old covenant is contained within the Old Testament, the Old Testament is not comprised entirely of the Old Covenant.

That tree does indeed contain apples, but those apples are NOT the entire tree. See what I mean?

Jesus Christ did not come to obliterate the law. No. He came to fulfill it. Jesus is the greatest revelation and He is the revelation that sheds light on the point and purpose of the old covenant.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/11 17:18

God's speaking to us through His Son in these last days and Jesus being the greatest revelation of God to mankind does not abolish the moral law of God that was preached through the prophets in the OT.

God's moral law is unchanging because God's righteous character is unchanging. Jesus is the same yesterday and today and forever. The parts of the OT that are not binding on us today are the civil and ceremonial laws as they were all shadows pointing to Christ. But nowhere do we read of the moral laws revealed in the OT as merely a shadow, rather they are reinforced in the NT.

We cannot devalue the OT scriptures because they are filled with moral instruction that is very binding and applicable to us today.

Re: , on: 2014/8/11 17:36

Oracio

Respectfully brother I disagree. The law at Sinai was given to Israel to show them their need for a Savior. Christ abrogated the law at the cross and gave us a new law to live by His Spirit.

In Col. 2:16-17, Paul tells His readers that no one is to judge them in regard to good, drink, a new moon or a Sabbath day. He says these things are a shadow of what is to come. But the substance belongs to Jesus.

In Heb.10:1 the writer tells us the law is only a shadow of what is to come.

I could go on and cite other scriptures. But Heb.8 shows that there is a distinction between the Old And New Covenant. And we are under the New Covenant. The Old Covenant has passed away. Paul developed this though in 2 Cor.3.

I could go on. But suffice to say the believer is ruled by the indwelling Holy Spirit and not by the external code of Sinai.

Blaine

Re: , on: 2014/8/11 17:39

Brethren I might add that Jew never made the distinction of the civil, ceremonial, and moral law. They looked up on the Law as a complete covenant. A covenant that has passed away with the introduction of the New Covenant.

Blaine

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/11 17:50

Brother,

But the Jews did divide the OT into 3 parts - The Law, The Prophets, and The writings.

Even to them the covenant was contained only in the Law.

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/11 17:51

Also references to the old and new covenant are almost exclusively spoken of in the New Testament with regards to salvation by grace or salvation by works.

Re: , on: 2014/8/11 17:57

Brethren we can go around on the law in which case we should go to the thread I started a few days ago entitled Are Both Moses and Jesus Binding on the Believer.

But I wonder if we can redirect to Diane's comment and question. She said we are called to be activists, not passivists. I agree. So how can we live out the reality of non resistance to evil and love of our enemy in this crooked depraved world?

Blaine

Re: , on: 2014/8/11 18:01

Jesus says if we love our enemies and pray for those who persecute us we sons of our Father in heaven.

So what does He mean here?

Blaine

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/11 18:02

brother Blaine, then how do you interpret these verses from the NT,

"If you really fulfill the royal law according to the Scripture, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself," you do well; 9 but if you show partiality, you commit sin, and are convicted by the law as transgressors. 10 For whoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is guilty of all. 11 For He who said, "Do not commit adultery," also said, "Do not murder." Now if you do not commit adultery, but you do murder, you have become a transgressor of the law. 12 So speak and so do as those who will be judged by the law of liberty."-James 2:8-12

"What shall we say then? Is the law sin? Certainly not! On the contrary, I would not have known sin except through the Law. For I would not have known covetousness unless the law had said, "You shall not covet." 8 But sin, taking opportunity by the commandment, produced in me all manner of evil desire. For apart from the law sin was dead. 9 I was alive once without the law, but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died. 10 And the commandment, which was to bring life, I found to bring death. 11 For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it killed me. 12 Therefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy and just and good. 13 Has then what is good become death to me? Certainly not! But sin, that it might appear sin, was producing death in me through what is good, so that sin through the commandment might become exceedingly sinful. 14 For we know that the law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin. 15 For what I am doing, I do not understand. For what I will to do, that I do not practice; but what I hate, that I do. 16 If, then, I do what I will not to do, I agree with the law that it is good. 17 But now, it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells in me. 18 For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) nothing good dwells; for to will is present with me, but how to

o perform what is good I do not find. 19 For the good that I will to do, I do not do; but the evil I will not to do, that I practice. 20 Now if I do what I will not to do, it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells in me. 21 I find then a law, that evil is present with me, the one who wills to do good. 22 For I delight in the law of God according to the inward man. 23 But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. 24 O wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death? 25 I thank God--through Jesus Christ our Lord! So then, with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin."-Romans 7:7-25

Those and other passages clearly teach that the moral law as revealed at Mt Sinai is certainly binding today even for Christians. But we are no longer under the ultimate judgment and curse of that law as those are who are outside of Christ. And we are now able to fulfill the moral law by the power of the indwelling Spirit. But there is no true dichotomy between NT moral law and OT moral law.

Regarding the Sabbath(which you point out from Col.2), it was ultimately fulfilled in Christ as our ultimate rest from our own works. But there is also another principle behind it that is also applicable to us today, namely, the need for us to rest at least one day in the week. That is how God designed our bodies to work.

But God's moral law is not only seen in the Ten Commandments but also in other parts of scripture. The Ten Commandments are the principle list of God's moral law revealed in the OT.

Re: , on: 2014/8/11 18:04

Havok,

So bro don't you believe we are sanctified by grace. :):):)

Blaine

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/11 18:05

Brother, I love you and I am grateful for the passion you have for Jesus and the persecuted believers; however I am asking you not to cut us off just because we disagree. This is a really important issue that ties in directly with this discussion

Re: , on: 2014/8/11 18:17

Oracio,

I believe the royal law is articulated in Mat.21:34-40. Simply stated love of God and love of neighbor. Don't have time to type it out.

Also interesting as we are talking about loving our enemies.

Now that you alluded to James. What do you think he means by the law of liberty in that same chapter.

Blaine

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/11 18:30

I am set apart to God through the blood of Jesus Christ.

The royal law has hanging on it the law and the prophets.

Re: , on: 2014/8/11 18:32

Havok,

Not trying to cut you off bro. But thought we had covered this in my other thread. But oh well.

You and Oracio are focussing on the Old Covenant law being restated in the New Covenant.

But brothers remember the dynamic of the New Covenant is the Holy Spirit.

Consider Rom.7:6. Paul says we have been released from the law so that we serve in the newness of the Spirit and not in the old way of the written code.

Paul further developed the above thought 2 Cor.3:6 when he says he is a minister of the new covenant of the Spirit. He says the letter kills but the Spirit gives life. All on 2 Cor.3 contrast the letter of the Old Covenant to the Spirit of the New Covenant which is far greater.

Also Gal.5:18 says if we are led by the Spirit we are not under the law. That is why when Paul list the fruit of the Spirit he says against these characteristics which the Spirit works out in our lives there is no law.

Blaine

Re: , on: 2014/8/11 18:41

Brother a been a good spirited discussion. But I got to stand down. Maybe we can pick up again.

But let me leave you with this question. If we have the indwelling presence of Christ Himself living within us by His Spirit, why do we need the law if Sinai?

Love you both. Gotta catch bus home. Been chillin at Panera Bread.

Blaine :):):)

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/11 18:41

But your definition of "the letter" causes the entire OT to be excluded as authoritative. When Paul said all scripture is given...what Books was he talking about.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/11 18:48

Quote:

-----Oracio,

I believe the royal law is articulated in Mat.21:34-40. Simply stated love of God and love of neighbor. Don't have time to type it out.

Also interesting as we are talking about loving our enemies.

Now that you alluded to James. What do you think he means by the law of liberty in that same chapter.

Blaine

"You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your strength."-Deuteronomy 6:5

"You shall not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the children of your people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself: I am the Lord."-Leviticus 19:18

Again, the moral law of God is reinforced in the NT, not abolished.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/11 21:06

Quote:
-----Consider Rom.7:6. Paul says we have been released from the law so that we serve in the newness of the Spirit and not in the old way of the written code.

Brother, what that is saying is that we are no longer under the power and curse of the law but under the grace of Christ, as Paul had already stated in Romans 6:14 "For sin shall not have dominion over you, for you are not under law but under grace." He says the same thing in Gal. 5:18, "But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law."

But Paul goes on to say in Romans 6:15, "What then? Shall we sin because we are not under law but under grace? Certainly not!"

Paul says in Romans 7:7 that sin is transgression of God's moral law as revealed in the Ten Commandments, for he says he would not have known that coveting is sin unless he realized that the law said, "You shall not covet".

Paul says in Romans 7:14 that the moral law of God is good and spiritual, and in verse 22 he says that he delights in the moral law of God, clearly referring to the moral law revealed in the OT and written on our hearts (which are one and the same moral law of God).

Quote:
-----Paul further developed the above thought 2 Cor.3:6 when he says he is a minister of the new covenant of the Spirit. He says the letter kills but the Spirit gives life. All on 2 Cor.3 contrast the letter of the Old Covenant to the Spirit of the New Covenant which is far greater.

In 2Cor. 3 Paul points out the distinction between the ministries of the Old and New Covenants. In the Old Covenant there was a certain fear and a pronouncement of judgment upon all who broke God's law, with not much mention of grace. But in the New Covenant we have the grace of God through Jesus Christ and are not under the curse and power of God's law. In 2Cor. 3:5-6 Paul is saying that the mere "external reading and keeping" of the law (which the Pharisees emphasized) kills. But we are still bound to obey God's moral law through the power of the Spirit, for we see this clearly throughout the NT.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/12 4:36

you guy are forgetting an important verse ,that a certain apostle said ,children obey your parents in the lord for the is right ,,honor you father in mother with is the first commandment with a promise that you may live long on the earth Paul i think was quoting strait from the ten commandments and saying that the promise made is still available and and the command and binding ,,,that verse alone shows Paul's understand that the moral law is still alive

i was thing about this half the day ,,

many many Christians like a sis Dian have made the mistake by thinking the new covenant command to love our enemies was an old testament but it was the Jesus who canceled the old testament law of eye for and eye as Paul said aroused sin in his members through vengeance ,that Jesus completely cancels in place of mercy ,he changed it to love your enemy's it was a new command ,,Jesus also canceled out swearing others and changed the divorce requirements ,,,these are not interpretations of the law in these instances but new legislations tho it is still true the whole law of Moses hangs on the two great commandments ,,love you emenys was new ,and there for does not mean and has never meant love you neighbor this big mistake cause people to elevate love you enemies to the same position as love you neighbor ,

you see god is not a hypocrite and does not contradict him self when he says in time past to love your neighbor as your self and eye for and eye to wards your enemy's ,,if love you neighbor means to love your enemy,,god would have caused his children to stone and kill there neighbor ,making Them break the commandment to love you neighbor ,,and the first command to love god as well ,,,but thats not what happened gods revaluations of mercy and grace happened so men were to lern what that meant

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/12 5:02

2 HONOR YOUR FATHER AND MOTHER (which is the first commandment with a promise), 3 SO THAT IT MAY BE WELL WITH YOU, AND THAT YOU MAY LIVE LONG ON THE EARTH. the letter of eph

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/13 15:44

Q & A: Can Christians defend themselves?

QUESTION

In light of Jesus's instruction to turn the other cheek in Matthew 5:38-42, is it right for Christians to defend themselves and their families such as if an intruder breaks into their homes.

ANSWER

This is an important issue for followers of Christ to consider because it not only impacts self defense but also service in the military and war. The short answer is that it is permissible indeed for Christians to defend themselves and their families and to serve in the military even if that requires the shedding of blood. Let's interact with the teaching concerning turning the other cheek first and then we will present a biblical case for self defense and military service.

Turn the Other Cheek

Most often people read this instruction in Matthew 5 and believe it means that if anyone ever wants to do any sort of physical harm the Christian response is to allow it to happen (pacifism). However, that is not what Jesus was saying in this passage. In Jewish culture, slapping a person's cheek was a serious personal insult. That is what Jesus is addressing. If your pride is injured, allow it. Don't retaliate in kind. Consider the following commentaries on this passage:

• In verses 39-40 Jesus is speaking in hyperbole. We are to resist evil as such (cf. Matt 23), but are not to retaliate for evil done to us. Jesus Himself protested when struck on His cheek (John 18:22-23), but He did not strike back. (Herschel Hobbs, An Exposition of the Four Gospels)

• does not teach, as many have claimed, that no stand is to be taken against evil and that it should simply be allowed to take its course. Jesus and the apostles continually opposed evil with every means and resource. Jesus resisted the profaning of God's Temple by making a scourge of cords and physically driving out the sacrifice sellers and money changers. (John MacArthur, The MacArthur New Testament Commentary: Matthew 1-7)

• don't think that Jesus is telling us never to respond to evil with force (such as in self-defense) or always to literally turn the other cheek when we are slapped any more than his command later in the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew 6:6 means that we should only pray when we are completely alone or his command in 5:29 means that some should literally gouge out their eyes. (John Piper, Did Jesus Teach Pacifism?)

When it is understood in its rightful context, the "turn the other cheek" clause cannot be used to refute self defense.

The Argument for Self Defense

Even if the "turn the other cheek" clause does not disallow self defense, can a biblical case be made to support it? Indeed one can. Consider five pertinent factors:

(1) We are to care for our bodies (1 Cor 6:19-20). While this is certainly not the most persuasive argument, it is not without merit. We have a biblical mandate to take care of our bodies, Christ's present temple on earth, and certainly being passive while being beaten or worse would not fulfill this command.

(2) We are to protect the innocent. One does not need to read the Bible long before one finds God's clear heart for the innocent. (By "innocent" I do not mean innocent of sin, I mean the defenseless such as widows, orphans, the infirm, etc.) God clearly cares for those who cannot care for themselves. The church must follow God's heart and be champions for the weak and defenseless: battered women; the unborn; oppressed minorities, etc. What would you suppose God's heart would be if a criminal broke into a home with a family that included young children? Do you suppose God seeks glory in the husband/father passively allowing his family to be brutalized and slaughtered? Or do you suppose God's heart would be for the husband/father to protect his family?

(3) Jesus clearly allowed self-defense (Luke 22:36). Jesus instructed his disciples to buy a sword if they did not already have one. While some try to spiritualize this instruction, it makes no sense to do that.

(4) Self-defense does not mitigate trust in God. While some contend that self defense negates our need to trust in God

hat does not have to be so. Wayne Grudem argues that taking the proper precautions in life is in accordance with trusting in God. He illustrates by saying he trusts in God to watch over him, yet he uses his seat belt, buys life insurance, locks his door, etc. One can easily refute the argument presented above if it is followed to its fullness. Would a person offering the above argument take medicine? Hold a job? Jump off a skyscraper?

(5) Self-defense prevents and restrains evil. Let's go back to the illustration of the family and the home intruder for a moment. Suppose the intruder intended to break into the home, sexually and physically assault them and then murder each family member. Surely that would be evil. Now suppose the husband/father stopped the intruder by the use of physical force. Evil would have been restrained.

Clearly one can see the Bible condones self defense and followers of Christ don't just have liberty to do so, but have an accountability to do so as well.

The Argument for War

The argument for war (serving in the military) is similar to that of self defense, however, a handful of other pertinent verses deserve mentioning. The clearest passage for supporting the military is Romans 13:3-4 where we read that the government is an agent to do good and it was given the sword for a purpose. The context allows for capital punishment as well as military interventions. First Peter 2:13-14 echoes this passage.

Another important passage is Luke 3:14 where some Roman soldiers approached John the Baptist and asked what they had to do to be right with God. John's response included their need to be content with their wages which assumes their profession was not a problem.

Beyond these passages that are proof texts for the military, Romans 12:21 instructs the church to overcome evil with good. In most cases that might include living righteously so that unrighteous living is overshadowed, but at times doing good to overcome evil requires military force. What would have happened had the world allowed the evil of Hitler to continue? Al Qaeda? Consider what MacArthur says:

“Not to restrain evil is neither just nor kind. It fails to protect the innocent and has the effect of encouraging the wicked in their evil. Proper restraint of evil, however, not only is just but is beneficent as well.”

Principles for Self Defense

Now that we have seen the biblical case for self defense and the military it is time to consider some basic principles in their use. First, when it comes to self defense the idea is to protect oneself and others from physical harm, not the loss of property. Second, the least amount of force necessary should be used. Third, physical force should be the last resort.

Principles for a Just War

For centuries, theologians and church leaders have been hammering out the concept of a “just war” which means a military action that is morally justifiable. The argument is that not every war is just and grounds must be developed to gauge the justness for the follower of Christ. Some of the early champions of the faith such as Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Martin Luther (who said, “without armaments peace cannot be kept; wars are waged not only to repel injustice but also to establish a firm peace”), and John Calvin have weighed in on this topic. The following five tenants of a just war are widely recognized:

(1) Competent authority – the leaders making the decisions must be competent.

(2) A just cause – the cause must be noble.

(3) The proportionality of proposed means – the military response anticipated must be in proportion to the issue at hand.

(4) The probable costs weighed against the probability of success – The cost of the war (most notably loss of life) must be considered in terms of how likely success will be.

(5) The exhaustion of peaceful means of resolution – Just as in self defense, war must be the absolute last option.

Brian Dembowczyk at 9:00 AM

Re: , on: 2014/8/13 16:08

TMK,

Bro I would commend to you Dean Taylor's book A Change of Allegiance. In this book Dean chronicles his he and his wife came to New Testament convictions on non resistance to evil based on the teachings of Christ.

The unique thing about this book is Dean and his wife served in the U S Army as they were wrestling out their conviction on non resistance. This is not a book written by theologians detached from reality. But a book written by a follower of Jesus living in the real world. If you are truly open to having your paradigm challenged on some things then get the book.

Regarding the home invasion scenario. I emailed a sister in the Mennonite tradition and asked her how many Mennonites owned fire arms. Except for hunting she was not aware if any Mennonites who owned fire arms for personal protection. She went on to say that there were very few break ins and she was not aware if any home invasions where people were injured or murdered. It seemed those in the Mennonite tradition commended their home and family to God's protection.

It seems those who cry the loudest for a fire arm for protection often are the ones who are the target of home invasion. Probably to steal the very gun to protect the home.

My thoughts.

Blaine

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/13 17:49

Hi Bear-

I have never been a victim of crime or home invasion. I try not to live in areas where this is a huge problem but certainly no place is absolutely safe.

I doubt seriously that most Mennonites live in high crime areas but I may be wrong about that.

I confess, though, that I don't want my paradigm changed because I don't think I am wrong. Nor do I necessarily think that those who disagree with me are wrong. I think it is a matter of conscience and interpretation of scripture which as we know sometimes differs from believer to believer.

The article I posted below essentially outlines how I feel about this issue which is why I posted it.

That being said, I do pray that if I am ever confronted by evil that the HS will guide me accordingly. But He will give to work fast!

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2014/8/14 8:31

Quote:

----- this big mistake cause people to elevate love you enemies to the same position as love you neighbor

I have some grave concerns in this understanding:

I think that a truncated understanding of love is at the root of this.

Jesus made NO distinction between our obligations to love our neighbour and to love our enemy. This view arises out of human rationale. It's a clever way to justify one's uncharitable behaviour to one's perceived enemy (which could be anyone at anytime).

Consider the lawyer who asked Jesus the question "Who is my neighbour?" This lawyer was trying to justify himself and his own narrow understanding of "neighbour". By his day the Jews had put very restrictive parameters around the meaning of "neighbour" and Jesus burst it apart by having the "neighbour" be the enemy. But more! It was the enemy (in the lawyer's mind) who understood the meaning of love better than that lawyer himself.

In Paul's teachings who is the "enemy"? (See Eph. 6:10ff)

I am convinced that the best way to get past this barrier here is to examine the lives of believers who lived in a "high crime" area - whose lives were constantly under threat by "enemies".

Here is an example: "God's Double Agent" by Bob Fu - an amazing testimony!!!!

Diane

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/14 15:57

hi there ,,the reason why we make the distinction between those laws of ones enemies and neighbour is because Jesus made the distinction and said those two were the greatest laws

the Samaritans were brothers and neighbours of the Jews partly from the twelve tribes Jesus went to them and preached the gospel and proved that and never any further Paul and Peter were the first to go to the Gentiles

the Samaritans like their Jewish neighbours read from Moses and was waiting for their Christ

Jesus didn't in any way mince the commandments and make love your enemies equal to love you God and love your neighbour ,,he never taught that that my sister is a tradition from men by doing so in practice one can pit the law to love your enemy against the law to love your neighbour ,,by elevating it over emphasizing it and favouring it ,in so doing one refuses to protect and love a precious neighbour from an evil person one would rather shrink back in fear and let them be molested in the name of God and call that loving the molester and abuses over the weak neighbour and weaker sister or brother

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/8/15 1:24

hi Diane in the same place we find the command from God to love our neighbors as our self , we find this group of commands

Numbers 35. These cities shall serve you as a refuge from an avenger, so that the murderer shall not die until he stands in judgment before the congregation.

12. These cities shall serve you as a refuge from an avenger, so that the murderer shall not die until he stands in judgment before the congregation.

13. The cities that you provide shall serve as six cities of refuge for you.

xæÖ, x'Ö¶x:

14. You shall provide the three cities in trans Jordan and the three cities in the land of Canaan; they shall be cities of refuge. xTMx⁴. x^Öµx^a | x^Öx^Öx^Öx^Öx^Öx^Ö x^Ö¶x^ÖÖ, x^ÖÖ'xTMx^Ö x^aÖ¼Ö'x^aÖ¼Ö^Öx^Ö x^Ö¼ x^Öµx^Öµx^Ö¶x^Ö¶x^Ö xæÖ·xTMÖ¼Ö·x^ÖÖ'x^ÖÖ¼Öµx^Y x^ÖÖ'x^Öµx^a x^Öx^Öx^Öx^Öx^Ö x^Ö¶x^ÖÖ, x^ÖÖ'xTMx^Ö x^aÖ¼Ö'x^aÖ¼Ö^Öx^Ö x^Ö¼ x^Ö¼Ö^Öx^Ö¶x^Ö¶x^Ö x^Ö¼Ö^Ö Ö, x^ÖÖ·x^Y x^ÖÖ, x^ÖµxTM x^ÖÖ'x^ÖxæÖ, x^Ö x^aÖ¼Ö'x^ÖÖ'xTM¶xTMx^Ö Ö, x^Ö:

15. These six cities shall be a refuge for the children of Israel and for the proselyte and resident among them, so that anyone who unintentionally kills a person can flee there. x[~]x^Ö. xæÖ'x^Öx^Ö ÖµxTM xTMÖ'x^Öx^ÖÖ'x^Ö x^Öµxæ x^ÖÖ'xæÖ·x^Ö¼Öµx[~] x^ÖÖ'xæÖ·x^aÖ¼x^ÖÖ'x^Öx^ÖÖ, x^Ö x^Ö¼Ö^Öx^ax^ÖÖ'x^ÖÖ, x^Ö x^aÖ¼Ö'x^ÖÖ'xTM¶xTMx^Ö Ö, x^Ö x^Öx^Ö¶x^Öx^Ö x^Ö¶x^ÖÖ, x^ÖÖ'xTMx^Ö x^ÖÖ, x^ÖµxæÖ¼Ö¶x[~] xæÖ^Öx^ÖÖ'x^ÖxæÖ, x^Ö xæÖ, x^ÖÖ¼x^j x^Öx^ÖÖ, x^ÖÖ¼Ö, x^Ö x^ÖÖ·x^Ö¼Öµx[~] x^Ö¶x^Ö¶x^Öx^Ö x^Ö¼Ö'x^Öx^ÖÖ'x^ÖÖ, x^ÖÖ, x^Ö:

16. If he struck him with an iron instrument and he dies, he is a murderer, and the murderer shall be put to death. x[~]x^Ö. x^ÖÖ'x^Ö x^Ö¼Ö'x^ÖxæÖ'xTM x^ÖÖ'x^Öx^ÖÖ'xæ | x^ÖÖ'x^Ö¼Ö, x^ÖÖ¼ x^ÖÖ·xTMÖ¼Ö, x^ÖÖ¼x^a x^ÖÖ'x^Ö¼Öµx^ÖÖ. x^Öx^ÖÖ¼x^Ö x^Öx^ÖÖ¼x^a xTMx^ÖÖ¼x^ÖÖ·x^a x^ÖÖ, x^ÖÖ¼x^Ö¼Öµx^ÖÖ:

17. If he struck him with a fist sized stone which is deadly, and he dies, he is a murderer, and the murderer shall be put to death. xTMx^Ö. x^ÖÖ'x^Ö x^Ö¼Ö'x^ÖxæÖ'xTM x^ÖÖµx^Y xTMÖ, x^Ö x^ÖÖ²x^Öx^Ö¶x^Ö xTMÖ, x^Öx^ÖÖ¼x^a x^Ö¼Ö, x^ÖÖ¼ x^ÖÖ'x^Ö¼Ö, x^Öx^ÖÖ¼ x^ÖÖ·xTMÖ¼Ö, x^ÖÖ¼x^a x^ÖÖ'x^Ö¼Öµx^ÖÖ. x^Öx^ÖÖ¼x^Ö x^Öx^ÖÖ¼x^a xTMx^ÖÖ¼x^ÖÖ·x^a x^ÖÖ, x^ÖÖ¼x^Ö¼Öµx^ÖÖ:

18. Or with a fist sized wooden instrument which is deadly, and he dies, he is a murderer, and the murderer shall be put to death. xTMx^Ö. x^Öx^ÖÖ' x^Ö¼Ö'x^ÖxæÖ'xTM x^ÖÖµx^Y xTMÖ, x^Ö x^ÖÖ²x^Öx^Ö¶x^Ö xTMÖ, x^Öx^ÖÖ¼x^a x^Ö¼Öx^ÖÖ' x^ÖÖ'x^Ö¼Ö, x^Öx^ÖÖ¼ x^ÖÖ·xTMÖ¼Ö, x^ÖÖ¼x^a x^ÖÖ'x^Ö¼Öµx^ÖÖ. x^Öx^ÖÖ¼x^Ö x^Öx^ÖÖ¼x^a xTMx^ÖÖ¼x^ÖÖ·x^a x^ÖÖ, x^ÖÖ¼x^Ö¼Öµx^ÖÖ:

19. The blood avenger shall kill the murderer; he may kill him when he meets him. xTMx[~]. x^Ö¼ÖÖ'x^Öµxæ x^ÖÖ'x^Ö¼Ö, x^Ö x^Öx^ÖÖ¼x^Ö xTMÖ, x^ÖÖ'xTMx^a x^Ö¶x^a x^ÖÖ, x^ÖÖ'x^Ö¼Öµx^ÖÖ. x^Ö¼ÖÖ'x^ÖxæÖ'x^ÖÖ'x^ÖÖ' x^ÖÖ' x^Öx^ÖÖ¼x^Ö xTMÖ'x^ÖÖ'x^ÖÖ¼: Ö¼x^ÖÖ¼:

20. If, out of hatred, he pushed him, or threw something at him with premeditation, and he died, x^Ö. x^ÖÖ'x^ÖÖ'x^Ö

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Did Jesus Mean This Literally?

x'Ö¼Ö°x@x,Ö'x Ö°x•Ö, x" x™Ö¶x"Ö°x"Ö¼Ö³x¤Ö¶x Ö¼x•Ö¼ x•x•Ö¹ x"Ö'x@x•Ö°xæÖ'x™xšÖ° xçÖ, xæÖ, x™x• x'Ö¼Ö' x!Ö°x"Ö'x™Ö¼Ö, x" x•Ö•x™Ö¼Ö, xžÖ¹xª:

21. or if he maliciously struck him with his hand and he died, the assailant shall be put to death; he is a murderer; the blood avenger may kill the murderer when he meets him. x)x•. x•x•Ö¹ x'Ö°x•Öµx™x'Ö, x" x"Ö'x)Ö¼Ö, x"•Ö¼ x'Ö°x™Ö, x"•Ö¹ x•Ö•x™Ö¼Ö, xžÖ¹xª xžx•Ö¹xª x™x•Ö¼xžÖ•xª x"Ö•xžÖ¼Ö•x)Ö¼Ö¶x" x"Ö¹x!Öµx—Ö. x"•Ö¼x• x'Ö¼Ö¹x•Öµxæ x"Ö•x"Ö¼Ö, x• x™Ö, xžÖ'x™xª x•Ö¶xª x"Ö, x"Ö¹x!Öµx—Ö. x'Ö¼Ö°x¤Ö'x'Ö°xçx•Ö¹ x'x•Ö¹:

22. But if he pushed him accidentally, without malice, or threw an object at him without premeditation, x)x'. x•Ö°x•Ö'x• x'Ö¼Ö°x¤Ö¶xªÖ•xç x'Ö¼Ö°xæÖ¹x• x•Öµx™x'Ö, x" x"Ö²x"Ö, x¤x•Ö¹ x•x•Ö¹ x"Ö'x@x•Ö°xæÖ'x™xšÖ° xçÖ, xæÖ, x™x• x)Ö¼Ö, xæ x)Ö¼Ö°xæÖ'x™ x'Ö¼Ö°xæÖ¹x• x!Ö°x"Ö'x™Ö¼Ö, x":

23. or, with any stone which is deadly, and without seeing he threw it down at him and it killed him, but he was not his enemy and bore him no malice x)x'. x•x•Ö¹ x'Ö°x)Ö, xæ x•Ö¶x'Ö¶xÿ x•Ö²x@x•Ö¶x" x™Ö, xžx•Ö¼xª x'Ö¼Ö, x"Ö¼ x'Ö¼Ö°xæÖ¹x• x"Ö°x•x•Ö¹xª x•Ö•x™Ö¼Ö•x¤Ö¼Öµxæ xçÖ, xæÖ, x™x• x•Ö•x™Ö¼Ö, xžÖ¹xª x•Ö°x"•x•Ö¼x• xæÖ¹x• x•x•Ö¹x™Öµx' xæx•Ö¹ x•Ö°xæÖ¹x• xžÖ°x'Ö•xšÖ¼ÖÖµx@x• x"Ö, xçÖ, xªx•Ö¹:

24. Then the congregation shall judge between the assailant and the blood avenger, on the basis of these judgments. x)x'. x•Ö°x@x•Ö, x¤Ö°x"•Ö¼ x"Ö, xçÖµx"Ö, x" x'Ö¼Öµx™xÿ x"Ö•xžÖ¼Ö•x)Ö¼Ö¶x" x•Ö¼x'Öµx™xÿ x'Ö¼Ö¹x•Öµxæ x"Ö•x"Ö¼Ö, x• xçÖ•xæ x"Ö•xžÖ¼Ö'x@x•Ö°x¤Ö¼Ö, x"Ö'x™x• x"Ö, x•ÖµxæÖ¼Ö¶x":

25. The congregation shall protect the murderer from the hand of the blood avenger, and the congregation shall return him to the city of refuge to which he had fled, and he shall remain there until the Kohen Gadol, who anointed him with the sacred oil, dies. x)x". x•Ö°x"Ö'x!Ö¼Ö'x™xæx•Ö¼ x"Ö, xçÖµx"Ö, x" x•Ö¶xª x"Ö, x"Ö¹x!Öµx—Ö. xžÖ'x™Ö¼Ö•x' x'Ö¼Ö¹x•Öµxæ x"Ö•x"Ö¼Ö, x• x•Ö°x"Öµx@x•Ö'x™x'x•Ö¼ x•Ö¹xªx•Ö¹ x"Ö, xçÖµx"Ö, x" x•Ö¶xæ xçÖ'x™x" xžÖ'xšÖ° xæÖ, x"•Ö¹ x•Ö²x@x•Ö¶x" x Ö, x) x@x•Ö, xžÖ¼Ö, x" x•Ö°x™Ö, x@x•Ö•x' x'Ö¼Ö, x"Ö¼ xçÖ•x" xžx•Ö¹xª x"Ö•x)Ö¼Ö¹ x"Öµxÿ x"Ö•x'Ö¼Ö, x"Ö¹xæ x•Ö²x@x•Ö¶x" xžÖ, x@x•Ö•x— x•Ö¹xªx•Ö¹ x'Ö¼Ö°x@x•Ö¶xžÖ¶xÿ x"Ö•xšÖ¼Ö¹x"Ö¶x@x•:

26. But if the murderer goes beyond the border of the city of refuge to which he had fled,

27. and the blood avenger finds him outside the limits of his city of refuge, and the blood avenger slays the murderer, he has no blood

sorry about the length of that

what needs to be seen is that if loving your neighbor means the same as to love your enemy's ,,god would not had contradicted him self and allowed and commanded these verses about the blood avenger ,, that means the blood avenger would have been breaking the command to love his neighbor when he carried out vengeance according to the law

god him self would have been guilty of deceiving the blood avenger to vengeance

im trying to be honest with the bible and it is imposible to say then that the command to love or neighbor is the same as the command from the new covenant to love our enemy's

even the parable of the good Samaritan must be interpolated use sing proper exegesis and in saying that uses Scripture to interpret scripture

no where in the teaching of the good Samaritan is it even employed that that this is a teaching to love our enemy's

Jesus is not saying that that i say parable so that you will know that loving you neighbor means to love you enemy

we relay dont even know who the thief was where he came from ,,but we do know that Jesus would be contradiction the Commons he gave moses in the process of teaching about who our neighbor is and how we should love our neighbor

so in saying that it wasn't the good Samaritans enemy maybe it was a another Samaritan , and Jesus was teaching the Jews that this is how you should always treat your brother dont be afraid to touch and help him even tho he might have been dead ,and the dead body would have defiled you according to the law

maybe the thief was a Jewish man ,,and the Samaritan loved and treated the Jew as his own ,,so the message would have been to the Jew .treat the Samaritan like your self and love him like your own body because they are really your brothers being from the loins of Jacob,,,Jesus preached to the Samaritans and offed them living water long before the gentiles were grafted in to the plan of redemption through peter and Paul ,,this shows that Jesus regarded the Samaritans as related and chosen by god

or maybe the thief was just a a local gentile who lived there a or a sojourner ,,even the law of moses commanded then to be treated well and proper

but to say that the thief was the enemy in the parable ,has no biases in the message or the flow of scriptural context

i agree that we should help that person regardless but in this teaching it has nothing what so ever to do with loving your enemy just a fuller interpretation of the love you neighbor as your self command

the love your enemy was a new command that canceled out the above blood avenger and the eye for and eye and a tooth for a tooth

the two greatest commands are still the same to love god with all your heart mind soul and strength ,and you neighbor as your self

and if we really want dig a little deeper

Pall said especially the house hold of faith

he place even more importance on good works to wards our own brothers and sisters ,,so did James in his letter when he said faith with out works is dead ,,he said if a brother or sister is naked or destitute of daily need extra he placed the priority on loving on brethern ,,so did john the emphasis was on loving our own brothers ,,that even being a fundamental litmus tests on weather you were a Christian

and so did Jesus that was the true test and how the world will no that we really are Christian ,that we love one another and lay our own life down as Jesus did his

now loving you enemy's important but the greasiest commandments are

love god with all heart mind soul and strength

and your neighbor as your self the rest of the commands hang from these two ,,and all the law and the Prophets are so med up in these two commands

blessings

oh all i can say about Maryjane is get rid of the gun for a woman better of locking your self in a room ,, i wouldnt own a Gun for self neighborly defense the cops can handle that ,,

peter walking on water has got nothing to do with the points i was making because i was not talking about loving my wife our neighbor in fear but love like Jesus loved the temple with a whip ,,he obviously knew what he was capable of,, like me,, and did only what needed to be done to get them out of the house of god ,,probably call it minimal force was his plan and thats all i plane to do

peter with the sword ,,dont tell me Jesus deceived peter and made him break gods law by caring a sword ,thats baloney ,,we no that he should no have attacked the authority's ,,but obviously caring the sword was fine considering the rebels in that area ,,dieing as a martyr for our faith is a virtue ,,but getting mugged because you in a bad area of town is not the same as being martyred ,,stupid maybe ,but not a virtue

i wont see you my wife or my neighbors beaten and abused ,,if you tell me you want to be beaten for you faith maybe i might let that happen ,but i draw the line at rape ,i wont stand by and watch ,that would be a loving thing to do

Israelites handing in wine vats is that virtues ,,if you want me to through the bible and the old testament and give verse that show defending if need be harming some one to save others i can give many verse

can you show me any verse that show it is virtuous for a man to stand and watch abuses and injustice take place in the context of his weak and venerable neighbors ,, i know of not a single example

but i dont have any enemy's personally im blessed in that way so in reality if i was defending my lady neighbor who lives with 2 children ,,it would not be from any personally enemy's of mine

but john the baptist told the soldiers to be content with there wages , he called them to repent he cant be contradicting Jesus ,saying love you enemy's ,,both were used by god john prepared the way and there is no way johns preaching was wrong and sinful so when he told the soldiers be content with your pay it shows god is not against national security , and this would also men state security ,,and when those things aren't available then an able man should provide security for the weak

treat others the way i would want to be treated ,,if i was walking down the street and got mugged i hope some kind loving person would come to my aid ,,so ill do the same ,