



General Topics :: Pat Robertson's comments

Pat Robertson's comments, on: 2005/8/23 9:49

"We have the ability to take him out, and I think the time has come that we exercise that ability," Robertson said Monday on the Christian Broadcast Network's "The 700 Club."

"We don't need another \$200 billion war to get rid of one, you know, strong-arm dictator," he continued. "It's a whole lot easier to have some of the covert operatives do the job and then get it over with."

"You know, I don't know about this doctrine of assassination, but if he thinks we're trying to assassinate him, I think that we really ought to go ahead and do it," Robertson said. "It's a whole lot cheaper than starting a war ..."

I think ol' Pat is a loose cannon. Probably time for him to retire and enjoy the laid back life. There is certainly a time for military action... but I dont believe it is the church's place to advocate assassinating someone. That is not what the "great c ommission" is about.

Krispy

Re: Pat Robertson's comments - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2005/8/23 10:36

Pat's just trying to protect his investment he does want any bombs landing on his material things, maybe he plans on taking them with him. Just kidding! I really don't know what to think about his comments, Thank God it's a good thing he is not the President. :-?

Re: Pat Robertson's comments - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/8/23 10:36

2Tim. 3:1 But know this, that in the last days perilous times will come: 2 For men will be lovers of themselves, lovers of money, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, 3 unloving, unforgiving, slanderers, without self-control, brutal, despisers of good, 4 traitors, headstrong, haughty, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God, 5 having a form of godliness but denying its power. And from such people turn away! 6 For of this sort are those who creep into households and make captives of gullible women loaded down with sins, led away by various lusts, 7 always learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.

Luke 6:

45 A good man out of the good treasure of his heart brings forth good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart brings forth evil. For out of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaks.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: Pat Robertson's comments - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/8/23 13:09

Quote:
-----but I dont believe it is the church's place to advocate assassinating someone.

What makes us think that CBN has anything to do with church? ;-)

General Topics :: Pat Robertson's comments

Re: Pat Robertson's comments - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/8/23 14:52

For what it is worth, what in the world does Pat Robertson really know about politics and wars? I think sometimes when I see him on Fox News and the like, he has some decent insights... but so does about anybody else at a Coffee Shop.

Also, how do we know knocking out another head will not cause the rise of another more awful one... or perhaps create several more leaders who are able to better motivate others to the same wicked ends? Do we assassinate people simply because it is cheaper to do so? Of course, if they counterstrike, perhaps their strike will be more devastating than what ours was? Maybe Bin Laden has a plan already devised should he be taken out of the picture that somebody is probably ready to fulfill. 'Tiz all crazy.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/8/23 14:55

Quote:

Thank God it's a good thing he is not the President.

Well, he obviously thought one day God thought it would be a good idea for him to be such.

Re:, on: 2005/8/23 14:59

I think he's just getting cranky in his old age. Maybe this Venezuelan dictator walked across Pat's lawn or something...

Krispy

Re:, on: 2005/8/23 15:53

Here is some more comments Pat Robertson made concerning blowing up the State Department:

Introducing Mowbray on his show, Robertson said that a reader of his book could conclude that the State Department needed a nuclear explosion.

"I read your book," Robertson said. "When you get through, you say, 'If I could just get a nuclear device inside Foggy Bottom, I think that's the answer,' and you say, 'We've got to blow that thing up.' I mean, is it as bad as you say?" Robertson said.

"It is," Mowbray said, although his book never suggests that the State Department should be blown up with a nuclear device.

Foggy Bottom is the nickname for the State Department's Washington headquarters.

In a June interview with Mowbray on the "700 Club", Robertson made similar remarks.

"Maybe we need a very small nuke thrown off on Foggy Bottom to shake things up like Newt Gingrich wants to do," he said.

+++++

I think I hear a song... ah yes... can you all hear it? Listen...

*They're coming to take me away, HA HA
They're coming to take me away, HO HO HEE HEE HA HA
To the funny farm
Where life is beautiful all the time
And I'll be happy to see
Those nice, young men
In their clean, white coats*

And they're coming to take me away, Ha-haaa!

Krispy

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2005/8/23 16:55

God imparted great wisdom to King Solomon and he declared that you are the essence of the contents that are within your heart. It is a matter of fact that whatever is in your heart, whether good or bad, will eventually come to the surface and be revealed by the words that you speak. Jesus confirmed this in Luke 6:45 when He said, "A good man out of the good treasure of his heart brings forth that which is good, and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart brings forth evil, for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks." Not only will the thoughts of your heart be revealed with words, but those words will create an atmosphere around you. It is a circle of events. Your heart thinks, your mouth speaks, and then your life becomes what you have spoken. It is not a mind over matter thing. It is a principle of God's word, for His word says that there is life and death in the power of the tongue (Proverbs 18:21). So be careful what you think and be cautious of your words, for that is what you will become.

James said that our tongue is like the rudder of a ship that controls and steers the vessel. Consider your course of direction. Where are your words taking you; towards the hazardous rocky shores or to the smooth deep waters?

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/8/24 11:44

KrispyKrittr wrote:

Quote:

-----I think I hear a song... ah yes... can you all hear it? Listen...

Just a thought.

Doesn't Scripture teach that if one is a true believer, God restores the mind and renews daily those who are His?

The song He gives us overcomes the songs of this world.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by gpet17, on: 2005/8/24 13:21

Right on!.....Pat is full ofHimself.

Re: Pat was "misinterpreted", on: 2005/8/24 14:48

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - Conservative U.S. evangelist Pat Robertson, who called for the assassination of Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez, said on Wednesday he was misinterpreted and there were a number of ways to "take him out" including kidnapping.

"I said our special forces could take him out. Take him out could be a number of things including kidnapping," Robertson said on his "The 700 Club" television program.

"There are a number of ways of taking out a dictator from power besides killing him. I was misinterpreted," Robertson added.

Pat is just digging the hole deeper and deeper. Lying on top of advocating murder. How can people be followers of such a man?

Bubbaguy

Re: - posted by TheophilusMD (), on: 2005/8/24 14:55

Quote:
-----How can people be followers of such a man?

It's a good thing we're not following a man.

Re: - posted by GaryE (), on: 2005/8/24 15:14

So, everybody thinks Pats statement was wrong. Much of the world's oil is very close to being in control of radicals who hate the West. What does everyone think is the answer to the fact that the West is getting very close to bending their knees to the radical terrorists of the world?

In Christ,
GaryE

Re:, on: 2005/8/24 15:31

Quote:
-----So, everybody thinks Pats statement was wrong. Much of the world's oil is very close to being in control of radicals who hate the West. What does everyone think is the answer to the fact that the West is getting very close to bending their knees to the radical terrorists of the world?

Freedom of speech is one thing... yelling fire in a crowded theater is against the law. Pat Robertson shooting his mouth off does not help our relationship with other countries at all.

If someone says these things about President Bush they could go to jail. A representative of the Body of Christ should not be going on the air promoting these types of things.

I know the answer is not putting our government in an awkward position, and creating an "international incident".

Krispy

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/8/24 15:40

Quote:

So, everybody thinks Pats statement was wrong. Much of the world's oil is very close to being in control of radicals who hate the West. What does everyone think is the answer to the fact that the West is getting very close to bending their knees to the radical terrorists of the world?

So, we should kill another head of state just because they might not play very fairly when it comes to oil?

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/8/24 15:43

I can't believe Robertson is trying to politic (lie) his way out of this. Here is a quote of what Robertson says...

Robertson told viewers of his longtime show, "The 700 Club," on Monday that Chavez was turning his oil-rich South American country into "a launching pad for communist infiltration and Muslim extremism all over the continent." (Full story)

"If he thinks we're trying to assassinate him, I think we really ought to go ahead and do it," said Robertson, founder of the Christian Coalition

(CNN)

<http://www.cnn.com/2005/US/08/23/robertson.chavez/index.html>

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/8/24 15:46

On a personal note, I used to highly consider going to Regent University to work on a Ph.D in Renewal (Charismatic/Pentecostal) Studies after I complete my Masters. Now I think I'm highly considering otherwise. (Btw, Regent is the university Robertson heads up.) I think I'd rather go to liberal Harvard University.

Re: - posted by GaryE (), on: 2005/8/24 16:04

My question is, What does everyone think the governments of the West should do about this problem? Do you really think that we should just pretend it isn't so?

In Christ,
GaryE

Re:, on: 2005/8/24 16:39

Gary,

The solution is conservation and alternative energy; not wars for oil. The American auto fleet went from about 5% SUVs in 1990 to over 50% SUVs in 2004 and gas mileage fell significantly. Americans, and automobile drivers everywhere, are essentially subsidizing the same people who are funding the terrorists (the Saudis and the Iranians). The irony is all those yellow ribbons on cars saying "support the troops." The dependency on inefficient cars in the first place is funding the terrorists.

Switch all those SUVs for hybrids and we can lessen our oil dependency significantly, lessen pollution and global warming AND deny the terrorist funding. (not to mention save money at the pump.)

Bub

Re: - posted by GaryE (), on: 2005/8/24 16:54

We are very close to having a severe problem overnight. The idea of lowering our energy rate in some way will not work until it has happened and any way you look at it this will take a long time. The only answer is to have a secure energy supply that can't be disrupted by terrorists or dictators in some oil rich country.

In Christ,
GaryE

Re:, on: 2005/8/24 17:03

We have our own oil resource in Alaska. Lets go get it.

But I also agree with Bubba. There are alternatives out there, but when someone goes to patent it the big oil companies buy 'em out.

As for this guy in Venezuela... I dont have a solution. Quite frankly I wasnt aware there was a problem until ol' Pat said what he said. But a broadcaster has and preacher like Robertson has no business insiting a riot in another country and causing our national security to be even more unstable. Thats reckless and irresponsible.

Krispy

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2005/8/24 17:12

I don't know for a fact but I would bet the biggest oil field on earth is under israel.

plastic pat not the only one, on: 2005/8/24 18:02

"Murder on their minds: Robertson not alone among conservative media figures.

Pat Robertson's recent call for the assassination of Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez has sparked significant media coverage. But Robertson, host of Christian Broadcasting Network's The 700 Club and founder of the Christian Coalition of America, is not the first to make a comment of this sort. Indeed, Media Matters for America has documented several other instances of conservative media figures advocating or musing about the execution of people with whom they disagree.

O'Reilly said LA Times' Kinsley wouldn't "get it" until terrorists "cut off his head"

Fox News host Bill O'Reilly said that the Los Angeles Times editorial board wouldn't understand his objection to legal representation for detainees at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, until terrorists kill editorial page editor Michael Kinsley.

From the May 17 broadcast of Westwood One's The Radio Factor with Bill O'Reilly:

O'REILLY: No, no. I want you to read it. Go to LATimes.com. I want everybody in the country to read this editorial, 'cause it just -- I mean, you'll be sitting there pounding the table like I did. How can they -- how can they think this way? How can anyone think this way? You know, "Shutting down Guantánamo and giving suspected terrorists legal protections would help restore our reputation abroad." No, it wouldn't. I mean that's like saying, well, if we're nicer to the people who want to KILL US, then the other people who want to KILL US will like us more. Does that make any sense to you? Do you think Osama is gonna be more favorably disposed to the U.S. if we give the Guantánamo people lawyers?

E.D. HILL (co-host): No, of course not.

O'REILLY: I mean, but this is what they're saying. It is just -- you just sit there, you go, "They'll never get it until they grab Michael Kinsley out of his little house and they cut his head off." And maybe when the blade sinks in, he'll go, "Perhaps O'Reilly was right."

Glenn Beck confessed that he was "thinking about killing Michael Moore"

Clear Channel radio host Glenn Beck said he was "thinking about killing Michael Moore" and pondered whether "I could kill him myself, or if I would need to hire somebody to do it."

From the May 17 broadcast of The Glenn Beck Program:

BECK: Hang on, let me just tell you what I'm thinking. I'm thinking about killing Michael Moore, and I'm wondering if I could kill him myself, or if I would need to hire somebody to do it. No, I think I could. I think he could be looking me in the eye

e, you know, and I could just be choking the life out -- is this wrong? I stopped wearing my What Would Jesus -- band -- Do, and I've lost all sense of right and wrong now. I used to be able to say, "Yeah, I'd kill Michael Moore," and then I'd see the little band: What Would Jesus Do? And then I'd realize, "Oh, you wouldn't kill Michael Moore. Or at least you wouldn't choke him to death." And you know, well, I'm not sure.

Coulter said the debate over Clinton should have been "whether to impeach or assassinate"

Syndicated columnist Ann Coulter argued that the national debate during the Monica Lewinsky controversy should not have focused on whether President Bill Clinton "did it," but rather "whether to impeach or assassinate" him.

The quote appeared in Coulter's book *High Crimes and Misdemeanors: The Case Against Bill Clinton* (Regnery, 1998):

In this recurring nightmare of a presidency, we have a national debate about whether he "did it," even though all sentient people know he did. Otherwise there would be debates only about whether to impeach or assassinate."

Re: plastic pat not the only one - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2005/8/24 18:41

Robertson apologizes for assassination remark
Associated Press

VIRGINIA BEACH, Va. — Religious broadcaster Pat Robertson apologized today for calling for the assassination of Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez, only hours after he denied saying Chavez should be killed.

"Is it right to call for assassination?" Robertson said. "No, and I apologize for that statement. I spoke in frustration that we should accommodate the man who thinks the U.S. is out to kill him."

Chavez, whose country is the world's fifth-largest oil exporter, has emerged as one of the most outspoken critics of President Bush. He accuses the United States of conspiring to topple his government and possibly backing plots to assassinate him. U.S. officials have called the accusations ridiculous.

On Monday's telecast of his Christian Broadcasting Network show "The 700 Club," Robertson had said: "You know, I don't know about this doctrine of assassination, but if he thinks we're trying to assassinate him, I think that we really ought to go ahead and do it. It's a whole lot cheaper than starting a war, and I don't think any oil shipments will stop."

He continued: "We have the ability to take him out, and I think the time has come that we exercise that ability. We don't need another \$200 billion war to get rid of one, you know, strong-arm dictator. It's a whole lot easier to have some of the covert operatives do the job and then get it over with."

Today, he initially denied having called for Chavez to be killed and said The Associated Press had misinterpreted his remarks.

"I didn't say 'assassination.' I said our special forces should 'take him out,'" Robertson said on his show. "'Take him out' could be a number of things including kidnapping."

He later issued the apology on his Web site.

When the AP had called Robertson on Tuesday for elaboration, spokeswoman Angell Watts said Robertson would not do interviews and had no statement about his remarks. He also declined several interview requests today.

On Tuesday, the State Department called Robertson's remarks "inappropriate."

Re: Pat Robertson's comments - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/8/25 4:48

Yes. Less politics, more preaching.

Re: plastic pat not the only one, on: 2005/8/25 6:23

Neil, you're right... the people you quoted are loose cannons, but the issue is not about liberal or conservative politics. The issue is if someone who claims to be a preacher of the gospel and also broadcasts worldwide should be calling for the murder of anyone... not to mention a head of state.

I do not expect any less from the people you've quoted. Bill O'Reilly is a Roman Catholic who apparently doesn't consider phone sex to be adultery. Glenn Beck is a Mormon. And Ann Coulter has never claimed to be a Christian so far as I know. So they speak and live out of the darkness of their hearts. No surprise there. I could point at liberals and quote some pretty outrageously vile junk that has flown from the mouths of Howard Dean and Michael Moore... just to name a few.

But again... this thread is NOT about politics. It's about a Christian "leader" who needs to be quiet.

Krispy

Re: Religion and Politics - posted by GaryE (), on: 2005/8/25 12:25

There is a problem with mixing religion and politics. If you write a letter to a newspaper about abortion you are writing something that is a religious and also a political opinion. If you are writing about the right to bear arms in the US you are writing something that is just a political opinion. It seems wise for the people who are on this site to stay with religious opinions and not carry over into political opinions.

Pat Robertson along with many other Christian leaders in the media are both religious and political leaders. When he made the statement that included the word assassination, he was making a political statement. Pat made a statement that he should not have said but to be fair with Pat, I have to say that in the few months I've read these posts I've read many notes that should not have been written. Probably most people who would now ridicule Pat have written or said something they regret.

When I was a child, I saw a cartoon that was trying to teach how to overthrow a country. The cartoon said, "you need to undermine the leaders of a country to overthrow that country". Politics work the same way. Political groups seem to try to get elected in the US by doing this. By telling a lie over and over many people believe the lie then those that believe the lie go and tell the lie too.

Religion also works the same way. Is it wise for me to dissemble a religious leader with my lips or someone else writing a post just because they say or write something that I disagree with or is different than my theology? Isn't it just pride that would cause me to do this instead of a heart to advance the Kingdom of God. There is a difference between saying an opinion and trying to cut someone down with our lips. Slander and tale bearing are sins. {tale bearers and a gossipers are often telling the truth}

How come no one suggested prayer for Pat? Who out there has recently prayed for GW?

In Christ,
GaryE

Re., on: 2005/8/25 13:11

I disagree somewhat. I understand what you're saying, but we also have the right to address public (political) matters as well. A great majority of our Founding Fathers were believers. Where would we be if they did not address the political matters of the day? We'd still be under the rule of a king.

But then... as Mel said in "The Patriot"... why should I trade one tyrant 3000 miles away for 3000 tyrants one mile away? There was a lot of insight in that statement.

Krispy

Jesus....help us please., on: 2005/8/25 22:27

[Image: <http://www.latimes.com/media/photo/2005-08/19097809.jpg>]

photocaption:George Roller, left, of the Center for Christian Statesmanship, and Jeremy Bouma, of the Statesmanship Institute, help offer seminars for members of Congress and staff, teaching them to mine the Bible for ancient wisdom on modern policy.

COLUMN ONE

Grooming Politicians for Christ

Evangelical programs on Capitol Hill seek to mold a new generation of leaders who will answer not to voters, but to God.

By Stephanie Simon

Times Staff Writer

August 23, 2005

WASHINGTON — In the blue and gold elegance of the House speaker's private dining room, Jeremy Bouma bowed his head before eight young men and women who hope to one day lead the nation. He prayed that they might find wisdom in the Bible — and govern by its word.

"Holy Father, we thank you for providing us with guidance," said Bouma, who works for an influential televangelist. "Thank you, Lord, for these students. Build them up as your warriors and your ambassadors on Capitol Hill."

"Amen," the students murmured. Then they picked up their pens expectantly.

Nearly every Monday for six months, as many as a dozen congressional aides — many of them aspiring politicians — have gathered over takeout dinners to mine the Bible for ancient wisdom on modern policy debates about tax rates, foreign aid, education, cloning and the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

Through seminars taught by conservative college professors and devout members of Congress, the students learn that serving country means first and always serving Christ.

They learn to view every vote as a religious duty, and to consider compromise a sin.

That puts them at the vanguard of a bold effort by evangelical conservatives to mold a new generation of leaders who will answer not to voters, but to God.

"We help them understand God's purpose for society," said Bouma, who coordinates the program, known as the Statesmanship Institute, for the Rev. D. James Kennedy.

At least 3.5 million Americans tune in to Kennedy's sermons, broadcast from Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. Since 1995, the unabashedly political televangelist has also reached out to the Beltway elite with his Center for Christian Statesmanship in Washington.

The center sponsors Bible studies, prayer meetings and free "Politics and Principle" lunches for members of Congress and their staffs, often drawing crowds in the hundreds.

The Statesmanship Institute, founded two years ago, offers more in-depth training for \$345.

It's one of half a dozen evangelical leadership programs making steady inroads into Washington.

The most prominent is Patrick Henry College in Purcellville, Va., an hour's drive from the capital. The college was founded five years ago with the goal of turning out "Christian men and women who will lead our nation with timeless biblical values." Nearly every graduate works in government or with a conservative advocacy group.

The Witherspoon Fellowship has had similar success, placing its graduates in the White House, Congress, the State Department and legislatures nationwide. The fellowship brings 42 college students to Washington each year to study theology and politics—and to work at the conservative Family Research Council, which lobbies on such social issues as abortion and same-sex marriage.

Such programs share a commitment to developing leaders who read the Bible as a blueprint.

As Kennedy put it: "If we leave it to man to decide what's good and evil, there will be chaos."

"I'm sure there are people who won't appreciate the fact that this class goes on here in the Capitol," Myal Greene said one recent evening.

He glanced around the stately dining room, reserved for the institute by a member of Congress. (House regulations allow private groups to hold events in the Capitol as long as they are noncommercial, nonpolitical and do not discriminate based on race, creed, color or national origin.)

To Greene, there could hardly be a more appropriate location. He considers his private faith and his public duty inseparable.

Greene, the deputy press secretary for a Republican congressman from Florida, signed up for the Statesmanship Institute in part because he felt his Christian ethics were under constant assault—from lobbyists offering him free steak dinners, from friends urging him to network over beers.

The seminars proved a revelation. In one, Greene learned that ministers ran many of America's earliest schools. He hadn't thought much about education policy before that class. Now he plans to fight for history lessons on the Founding Fathers' faith, science lessons drawn from the Book of Genesis and public school prayer.

"It's one thing to have a position on one or two issues," said Greene, 26, who was wearing a wristband printed with the slogan "Jesus Is My Homie." "This class has you look deeper. It gives you an intellectual consistency."

On this night, the topic was bioethics. As the students unwrapped deli sandwiches and brownies, prominent bioethicist Nigel M. deS. Cameron praised them for thinking about the "great questions of the day" through the prism of faith.

Too often, he added—to a few startled looks—"Christians are not noted for using their brains."

In an hourlong lecture, Cameron argued that Christians must move beyond denouncing abortion to see the "moral outrage" in other common practices, such as paying Ivy League students to donate eggs in the quest for a perfect baby.

"Taking human life made in God's image may not be as bad, from God's point of view, as making human life in your own image," said Cameron, a professor at Chicago-Kent College of Law. "Our humanity, warts and all, is what we have been given to steward. It's not to be manipulated."

When Cameron called for questions, one student tentatively raised his hand to ask about embryonic stem cell research—specifically, the use of "spare" embryos, frozen in fertility clinics. "Under current practice, they're going to be discarded unless they're used for research, he said. "What do we say about that, as Christians?"

Cameron did not hold back.

"They're going to die anyway, right?" he said, indignant. "We don't apply the same principle to death row inmates. They're going to die anyway, so why can't we get some use out of them? We'd be able to do some fascinating experiments.

"The principle of manipulating human life to get experimental benefit," Cameron said, "that is a very, very serious line to cross."

The philosophy animating Cameron's lecture — that federal law should be based on biblical precepts — troubles the Rev. Barry W. Lynn, executive director of Americans United for Separation of Church and State.

"This nation was founded specifically to avoid the government making religious and theological decisions," Lynn said. "We are not to turn the Holy Scriptures of any group into public policy."

Kennedy counters that evangelicals have every right to put up candidates who vote what they believe to be God's will — and let voters judge them.

To which Lynn responds, with exasperation: "He says that because he knows in a majority Christian country, the Christian view is going to be expressed by more voters. They have no problem imposing their biblical worldview on every American."

Evangelical conservatives acknowledge that's their goal.

And they now have a systematic plan for achieving it.

Early evangelical leaders were determined social activists, championing causes such as the abolition of slavery and the prohibition of alcohol. But in the 1920s, a theological dispute split the movement. The more liberal ministers pushed for continued engagement in politics — and went on to take leading roles in the civil rights movement and Vietnam War protests.

The conservative faction called for withdrawing from politics and focusing instead on building up the church.

"Getting into politics didn't fix anything. It just diverted them from saving souls," said Jim Guth, a political science professor at Furman University in Greenville, S.C.

With the legalization of abortion in 1973, some fundamentalists began to argue that they had an obligation to try to arrest society's moral decay.

"We realized we were having our little holy huddles but not having any influence in Washington," said George Roller, a former public school teacher who now directs Kennedy's Center for Christian Statesmanship.

Ministers such as Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson jumped headlong into politics. They succeeded in helping to elect conservatives, starting with President Reagan. "But things haven't changed very much," said Robert D. Stacey, chairman of the government department at Patrick Henry College.

"Our candidates tick off the right policy positions, but it turns out, once they're in office, they're willing to compromise an awful lot — not just to bend but to break," he said. "Now, religious conservatives are saying they want the real thing."

To develop such steadfast politicians, evangelicals are building on decades of work by nonprofit groups such as the Leadership Institute and Young America's Foundation, which train conservatives in grass-roots activism, effective campaigning, even how to launch a right-wing magazine.

The new evangelical initiatives reach out to the same up-and-coming leaders, but put them through courses that sound a lot like a seminary.

"If you're clinging to conservatism just because you like conservatism, you don't put yourself on the line for your beliefs," Stacey said. "Your positions need to come from something deeper and more meaningful."

That message resonates with Jessica Echard, 23, who completed the Statesmanship Institute last year.

Growing up in rural West Virginia, Echard believed passionately in her church's teachings against abortion, but thought little about such issues as economic policy or foreign trade.

The institute gave her a framework for evaluating those topics.

Now the director of the Eagle Forum, a conservative lobbying group founded by Phyllis Schlafly, Echard says Jesus would approve of a call for lower taxes: "God calls on us to be stewards of our money."

She dips into the Bible to explain her opposition to most global treaties, reasoning that Americans have a holy obligation to protect their God-given freedom by avoiding foreign entanglements.

"The Scripture talks of taking every thought and making it captive to Christ, and that's what the Statesmanship Institute helps us do," Echard said.

Like other evangelical training programs, the institute avoids endorsing any party or position. Lecturers this year include a Democratic congressman and a Republican who says the Lord inspired him to buck President Bush by demanding a timetable for withdrawing from Iraq.

Homework includes readings from the Bible — but also from Nietzsche, Engels, Machiavelli and Henry Kissinger.

"We don't tell our students what to think," Roller said.

Yet professors also make clear that "there absolutely is an objective truth," in the words of Paul J. Bonicelli, academic dean at Patrick Henry College.

Hannah Woody, for instance, came away from the institute's seminars confident that abolishing the Department of Education is not just a Republican goal, but also a Christian imperative.

The Bible gives parents — not some distant bureaucracy — the primary responsibility for raising children, said Woody, 26, who hopes to one day run for governor in her home state of North Carolina. (For now, she's working as a legislative assistant for a Republican congressman from Kansas.)

Kennedy offers a similar take on education policy in the gilt-edged, leather-bound Bible his staff delivers to each new member of Congress. In an introductory essay, Kennedy quotes Scripture to explain God's views on taxes, capital punishment, gay rights and a dozen other issues. Most of the policy prescriptions he finds in the Bible dovetail neatly with the Republican agenda.

That focus on legislative victory disturbs some evangelical leaders, who would prefer to work on spreading Christian values throughout society.

"Too many programs start with the idea that if we right-wing, conservative policies, we'll change America and God will be pleased," said Ryan Messmore, who runs a leadership academy aimed at helping young Christians share their faith through the arts, the media and other professions.

But to Rep. Walter B. Jones, a North Carolina Republican, it's clear the institute is "doing the Lord's work."

The nation needs more politicians who take their cues from God, not Gallup, or "our morality will crumble," he warned. "We won't recognize America."

Roller shares that fear. So he ended the recent class on bioethics with a plea: "Heavenly Father, we pray you will help us to know how we should respond to these issues."

The students answered as one: "Amen."

Re: - posted by paula4jc (), on: 2005/8/28 15:20

Last year I read a speech of President Hugo Chavez, he professes to have a personal relationship with Christ. Pat Roberson, a profess Christian calling for the assassination of another Christian.

Wickedness has indeed abound that the love of many has become wax cold. Come Lord Jesus come!

(www.paula4jc.com) www.paula4jc.com

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2005/8/28 19:52

Hi paula4jc...!

Quote:
-----"Last year I read a speech of President Hugo Chavez, he professes to have a personal relationship with Christ. Pat Roberson, a profess Christian calling for the assassination of another Christian."

As we all probably know, not everyone that claims to be a Christian truly knows Christ. The historical record of Hugo Chavez shows quite clearly that, while he may "*talk the talk*", he definitely does not "*walk the walk*" of being a true Christian. In fact, after having studied him intensely during a *Latin American Politics* graduate course last year, I am almost convinced that Chavez is mentally unstable. He has quite a few "issues" (including connections with the Columbian drug trade, supporters of an athiestic communist/dictatorship, and international terrorism) that are creating many problems in the region, his relationship with the United States, and notable intolerance for Christianity.

Now, I do not agree with Pat Robertson's comments concerning assassination. Robertson's justification for an assassination in order to "save lives and money" sounds alot like terrorists who bomb abortion clinics in order to prevent abortion. Of course, abortion is a disgusting act of sinful desperation. But *murder is not an option*. Both are sin.

I urge everyone to pray for believers in Venezuela (and other latin american countries). The persecution for authentic Christians is quite intense and seldom reported.

:~)

Re: Jesus....help us please. - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/8/28 20:10

Quote:
-----"It's one thing to have a position on one or two issues," said Greene, 26, who was wearing a wristband printed with the slogan "Jesus Is My Homie." "This class has you look deeper. It gives you an intellectual consistency."

That is hilarious! :-? *consistency?*

Re: - posted by GaryE (), on: 2005/8/29 0:27

RESPOND TO EDITOR E-MAIL STORY PRINTER FRIENDLY FOXFAN CENTRAL

Raw Data: Statement by Pat Robertson
Wednesday, August 24, 2005 STORIES

Â•Robertson Apologizes for Chavez Remark

The following is a statement released on Wednesday by religious broadcaster Pat Robertson in the wake of his controversial statements made on Monday regarding Venezuelan president Hugo Chavez:

VIRGINIA BEACH, Va., August 24, 2005--I want to take this opportunity to clarify remarks made on the Monday, August

General Topics :: Pat Robertson's comments

22nd edition of The 700 Club where I adlibbed a comment following a very brilliant analysis by Dale Hurd of the danger that the United States faces from the out-of-control dictator of Venezuela, Hugo Chavez. In this story, Col. Chavez repeatedly claimed that Americans were "trying to assassinate him"

"In my frustration that the U.S. and the world community are ignoring this threat, I said the following:

Thanks, Dale. If you look back just a few years, there was a popular coup that overthrew him; and what did the United States State Department do about it? Virtually nothing; and as a result, within about 48 hours, that coup was broken, Chavez was back in power. But we had a chance to move in. He has destroyed the Venezuelan economy, and he's going to make that a launching pad for communist infiltration and Muslim extremism all over the continent. I don't know about this doctrine of assassination, but if he thinks we're trying to assassinate him, I think we really ought to go ahead and do it. It's a whole lot cheaper than starting a war, and I don't think any oil shipments will stop. But this man is a terrific danger, and this is in our sphere of influence, so we can't let this happen. We have the Monroe Doctrine, and we have other doctrines that we have announced, and without question, this is a dangerous enemy to our south, controlling a huge pool of oil that could hurt us very badly. We have the ability to take him out, and I think the time has come that we exercise that ability. We don't need another 200-billion-dollar war to get rid of one strong-arm dictator. It's a whole lot easier to have some of the covert operatives do the job and then get it over with.

Is it right to call for assassination? No, and I apologize for that statement. I spoke in frustration that we should accommodate the man who thinks the U.S. is out to kill him.

Col. Chavez has found common cause with terrorists such as the noted assassin Carlos the Jackal, has visited Iran reportedly to gain access to nuclear technology, and has referred to Saddam Hussein and Fidel Castro as his comrades. Col. Chavez also intends to fund the violent overthrow of democratically elected governments throughout South America, beginning with neighboring Colombia.

As I report the news daily from around the world, I am acutely conscious of the fact that our nation is at war. Not only are there active wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, but there is a war of terror being waged against civilized nations throughout the world.

We are in the midst of a war that is draining vast amounts of our treasure and is costing the blood of our armed forces. I am a person who believes in peace, but not peace at any price. However, I said before the war in Iraq began that the wisest course would be to wage war against Saddam Hussein, not the whole nation of Iraq. When faced with the threat of a comparable dictator in our own hemisphere, would it not be wiser to wage war against one person rather than finding ourselves down the road locked in a bitter struggle with a whole nation?

The brilliant Protestant theologian, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who lived under the hellish conditions of Nazi Germany, is reported to have said:

"If I see a madman driving a car into a group of innocent bystanders, then I can't, as a Christian, simply wait for the catastrophe and then comfort the wounded and bury the dead. I must try to wrestle the steering wheel out of the hands of the driver.

"On the strength of this reasoning, Bonhoeffer decided to lend his support to those in Germany who had joined together in an attempt to assassinate Adolf Hitler. Bonnhoffer was imprisoned and killed by the Nazis, but his example deserves our respect and consideration today.

There are many who disagree with my comments, and I respect their opinions. There are others who think that stopping a dictator is the appropriate course of action. In any event, the incredible publicity surrounding my remarks has focused our government's attention on a growing problem which has been largely ignored.

.....

This was on Fox news on Sunday Evening.

Early in my Christian walk, I had to sort out a lot of my thinking. One of the things that needed sorted out was whether it was wrong to fight in a war or even whether it was wrong for a police officer to shoot someone as a Christian officer doin

g his duty. Eventually I came to believe that it is ok to be in a war and it is ok to shoot a criminal if he is a threat that can't be stopped any other way.

What led me to conclude this was a story of a woman being beaten outside of an apartment while many people inside heard her screams and did nothing. My conclusion is that as a Christian you can't just stand by and let evil take over. Apparently, this is what Mr. Bonnhoffer was saying and it is very similar to what John Knox was saying. It is also what the founding fathers were saying when they risked their lives to revolt against King George.

In Christ,
GaryE

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/8/29 1:02

Quote:
-----One of the things that needed sorted out was whether it was wrong to fight in a war or even whether it was wrong for a police officer to shoot someone as a Christian officer doing his duty. Eventually I came to believe that it is ok to be in a war and it is ok to shoot a criminal if he is a threat that can't be stopped any other way.

I believe that the police and the courts have the authority and clear conscience to use force to keep civil order. Paul did not seem to apologize when he said...
"Do you wish to have no fear of the authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive its approval; for it is God's servant for your good. But if you do what is wrong, you should be afraid, for the authority does not bear the sword in vain! It is the servant of God to execute wrath on the wrongdoer."

So the right of the government to execute wrath upon its citizens who do wrong is fairly established here. The question that is not explicitly answered in this particular scripture: does God give one government the right to execute wrath upon another government?

MC

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/8/29 10:53

Brother Gary wrote:

Quote:
----- It is also what the founding fathers were saying when they risked their lives to revolt against King George.

Wasn't King George and the nation of England a Christian nation?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/8/29 11:00

Brother Mike wrote:

Quote:
-----The question that is not explicitly answered in this particular scripture: does God give one government the right to execute wrath upon another government?

James 1:19 So then, my beloved brethren, let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath; 20 for the wrath of man does not produce the righteousness of God.

Many times the nation that is used by God to destroy another, according to His judgement, believes that they are righteous. Yet what does Scripture say?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by GaryE (), on: 2005/8/29 12:15

It's my understanding that John Knox was the first of the leaders of the reformation to take a stand that it is the right of the people to resist an evil government. This had to be the thought of the founding fathers of our country. It was apparently thought by the founding fathers that King George was an evil tyrant.

In John Knox's time, there had been a church state government run by the Roman Catholic Church. The Inquisition had been in full swing and many reformers had been murdered. For a season there was a Protestant in control of Scotland then when that person was gone there was another Roman Catholic set up as queen. John faced her down and was willing to kill her if it had to be, taking the position that it is the right of a Christian to resist evil. This is my limited understanding of that situation and this is also the position that I personally believe is right.

While I don't think we should be building an empire, I don't think we should allow an evil people to build one either.

In Christ,
GaryE

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/8/29 12:36

People like John Knox and King James who was responsible for commissioning the King James Bible lived in the 1500's.

John and Charles Wesley, and George Whitefield (sp?) came to America as missionaries during the 1700's.

What did the Founding Fathers consider evil that warranted revolt against the government they were subjected to?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/8/29 13:07

In terms of Hugo Chavez, he was elected by large majority twice in democratically. In a recent recall election, former President Jimmy Carter monitored the recall and he verified that the recall vote was properly carried out. So it is the will of the people that Chavez remains president of Venezuela.

Here is a list of some of the things he has done for his nation's people,

Mission Robinson—teaching more than 1.3 million people to read and write in the space of 16 months, a world record in this field

Mission Ribas—secondary education for just over 1 million people so far, who were denied this basic human right during the 4th Republic

General Topics :: Pat Robertson's comments

Mission Barrio Adentro Into the Neighborhood—to provide free primary health care for more than 10 million people up to now, and who did not have access to health care in the past— unless they paid for it

Mission Simoncito—care and education for pregnant mothers and their children from gestation to kindergarten, to ensure a healthy start to life

Bolivarian Schools—integral schooling including free health care and meals, with the objective of inculcating patriotic, humanitarian values in the upcoming generations.

On the other hand his government controls the oil industry that the US buy 59% of the Venezuelan oil. The US has a history of overthrowing democratically elected leaders when they seek to maintain control of their own resources, and reject foreign encroachment on what God has given them,

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by GaryE (), on: 2005/8/29 13:53

The early settlers of the colonies had charters to establish their own governments in the colonies. After enduring the hardships and dangers of establishing this land, the English government came here and took these agreements away. {This is much like being a trucebreaker and a thief.} The English government made the effort to tax the people without giving them a voice about this and the colonies were also forced to trade with England only. King George took the position that it was the chief duty of the colonists to submit to him.

.....

2Ti 3:1 This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come.

2Ti 3:2 For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy,

2Ti 3:3 Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good,

2Ti 3:4 Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God;

2Ti 3:5 Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.

.....

Notice in verse 3 it says trucebreakers. It seems to me that this is some of what the English government was doing with the charters.

Also, notice verse 4 where it says traitors. It seems to me that this is what some of our doing right now as a war is going on by not supporting our efforts to root out an evil group of people that want to force their way on the people of Iraq. Someone said, "war is sin". From my position being a traitor is sin.

You mentioned the Methodist John Wesley. It's my understanding that he did not believe the colonies should revolt. Over on this side of the waters, Francis Asbury did.

In Christ,

GaryE

Re: - posted by GaryE (), on: 2005/8/29 14:12

No doubt that if the Communists would get control of this countries wealth they would be able to do a lot of humanitarian programs with the wealth that is here. Do you really want the extreme left to have control here as is going on in Venezuela? It seems to me that the votes have been bought.

In Christ,
GaryE

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/8/29 15:11

Brother Gary wrote:

Quote:
----- The English government made the effort to tax the people without giving them a voice about this and the colonies were also forced to trade with England only. King George took the position that it was the chief duty of the colonists to submit to him.

This is the pursuit of all nations. Back then this form of economy was called Colonialism. Before Colonialism, one was subject to the rule of Feudal Lords. Before that, one was subjected to those who had the power to pillage.

Today we have evolved into just another form of economy which is still based on the precepts founded on the depravity of man.

James 5:1 Come now, you rich, weep and howl for your miseries that are coming upon you! 2 Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten. 3 Your gold and silver are corroded, and their corrosion will be a witness against you and will eat your flesh like fire. You have heaped up treasure in the last days. 4 Indeed the wages of the laborers who mowed your fields, which you kept back by fraud, cry out; and the cries of the reapers have reached the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. 5 You have lived on the earth in pleasure and luxury; you have fattened your hearts as in a day of slaughter. 6 You have condemned, you have murdered the just; he does not resist you.

This Scripture speaks to the **last days**. What signs of evil do we see in these days?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/8/29 15:27

Brother Gary wrote:

Quote:
----- It seems to me that the votes have been bought.

I believe it was Plato who first envisioned the concept "democracy." He wrote back then a warning. He basically stated that if the nation was ruled by the majority, the majority would strip the minority of their wealth. This is a result again based on the depravity of man.

People like Jefferson and Madison understood this principle quite clearly. Back then only white men who owned land could vote,

Dan. 2:36 "This is the dream. Now we will tell the interpretation of it before the king. 37 You, O king, are a king of kings. For the God of heaven has given you a kingdom, power, strength, and glory; 38 and wherever the children of men dwell, or the beasts of the field and the birds of the heaven, He has given them into your hand, and has made you ruler over them all—you are this head of gold. 39 But after you shall arise another kingdom inferior to yours; then another, a third kingdom of bronze, which shall rule over all the earth. 40 And the fourth kingdom shall be as strong as iron, inasmuch as iron breaks in pieces and shatters everything; and like iron that crushes, that kingdom will break in pieces and crush all the others. 41 Whereas you saw the feet and toes, partly of potter's clay and partly of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; yet the strength of the iron shall be in it, just as you saw the iron mixed with ceramic clay. 42 And as the toes of the feet were partly of iron and partly of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly fragile. 43 As you saw iron mixed with ceramic clay, they will mingle with the seed of men; but they will not adhere to one another, just as iron does not mix with clay. 44 And in the days of these kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people; it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. 45 Inasmuch as you saw that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it broke in pieces the iron, the bronze, the clay, the silver, and the gold—the great God has made known to the king what will come to pass after this. The dream is certain, and its interpretation is sure."

With each government the quality diminishes according to Scripture. I believe this Scripture speaks to the quality of "democracy." 41 Whereas you saw the feet and toes, partly of potter's clay and partly of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; yet the strength of the iron shall be in it, just as you saw the iron mixed with ceramic clay. 42 And as the toes of the feet were partly of iron and partly of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly fragile. 43 As you saw iron mixed with ceramic clay, they will mingle with the seed of men; but they will not adhere to one another, just as iron does not mix with clay.

After this form of government has passed, Jesus will establish His kingdom for a 1000 years.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/8/29 15:38

BBC

Venezuela seeks action in US row

Hugo Chavez is an outspoken critic of the US

Venezuela's president says his government will take legal action against a US TV evangelist who called for US agents to kill him.

Hugo Chavez said Venezuela might even seek to extradite Pat Robertson. He also warned he would complain to the UN if the US failed to take action.

Mr Robertson has apologised for his comments, which came amid already tense US-Venezuela relations.

On Sunday, US civil rights leader Jesse Jackson lent support to Mr Chavez.

On a visit to Venezuela, Mr Jackson denounced Mr Robertson's assassination call as immoral and illegal.

He called on the US Justice Department to investigate the matter.

The US State Department has called Mr Robertson's comments "inappropriate".

Extradition

"I announce that my government is going to take legal action in the United States... to call for the assassination of a head of state is an act of terrorism," Mr Chavez said in a televised speech.

"If the US government does not take action that it must take, we will go to the United Nations and the Organization of American States to denounce the US government," Mr Chavez said.

Mr Chavez, who has frequently charged that the US are plotting to kill him, said Mr Robertson was "crazy" and "a public menace".

On Sunday, Rev Jackson said the US and Venezuela should work out their differences through diplomacy.

Diplomatic tension

Mr Robertson's comments came amid tense relations between Caracas and Washington.

President Chavez is a regular critic of Washington, which regards the left-wing leader as a possible source of instability in the region.

The Venezuelan leader has said that US President George W Bush will be to blame if he is attacked.

A week ago, Pat Robertson told viewers of his influential TV show, the 700 Club, that the US should act on Mr Chavez's recurrent complaints that the US was allegedly trying to assassinate him.

The two nations have recently broken off co-operation on combating illegal drugs, though America still buys Venezuelan oil. The nation is the world's fifth-largest producer.

I wonder what would happen to some one with a similar public notoriety as Pat Robertson, if they called for President Bushes assassination?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/29 17:14

Quote:
-----I don't know for a fact but I would bet the biggest oil field on earth is under israel.

Have you not heard the Israeli joke that 'we wandered for forty years and settled in the only place in the Middle East which has no oil; now that's what I call guidance!'

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/29 17:22

Quote:
-----Wasn't King George and the nation of England a Christian nation?

England has never been and can never be a Christian nation, and King George was German. I don't know whether or not King George was a Christian. What makes you think he was?

Re: have you noticed....., on: 2005/8/29 17:30

that all those who loudly and publicly wrap our Lord Jesus in the cloth and provisions of both a political party AND a nation's flag have begun to be exposed as greedy murderous hypocrites.....Karl Rove, Tom Delay and now Pat Robertson.

You know, I've been reading thru the Old Testament, and am in 1 Samuel, reading the Portion where the people start to clamor and squeal for a king like other nations.....God does have a lot of patience.

I really pray that the church starts to walk away from political parties and their needs, coz their needs and their requirements are NOT of the Lord's.

A TRUE Godly man does NOT call for the assassination of another nation's leader. A true Godly man does not betray oaths he made. A true Godly man does not get involved in financial scandal and tomchicanery.

When will the church come out of the right wing?

I ask that not to say, when will it come out of the right wing to go into the left wing.....no, that's not what I say. But when will we do what is right, instead of what is right wing.

We say we're in Iraq because we wish to bring democracy to that beleaguered nation, but since the day Hugo Chavez was duly elected by the Venezuelan people, this administration has worked overtime to overthrow him.

I do not admire President Bush, nor Karl Rove, nor Tom DeLay, nor Pat Robertson, nor James Dobson, nor D. James Kennedy.

They profess Christ, but their actions and their words to me, testify otherwise.

As a follower of Jesus, these are men I would NOT model my walk after.

either you are a slave of Christ, or a whore of the republican partyyou can't have it both ways.

Please forgive me if I offended anyone, just unburdening myself and discussing an issue I believe will absolutely destroy the church of Jesus in the U.S., because it will destroy our witness to the world.

I don't have my Bible in front of me this second, but didn't Paul pose the question what do followers of light have in common with belial?

love, Neil

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/29 17:34

Quote:

-----After this form of government has passed, Jesus will establish His kingdom for a 1000 years.

This is an important point, Jeff. Democracy is a very modern concept in its current outworking. I am very concerned at the Western world's determination of imposing democracy on the rest of the world. Many years ago I talked with some church leaders who were re-examining their own church history in which a powerful leader, George Jeffreys, had led a break-away from the denomination he had founded! One old man commented sadly; "I saw, in the end, that Jeffreys wanted us to be free to do what he wanted". Is this the motive of the 'democrats' too?

Re:, on: 2005/8/30 1:54

i wish more of us saw it clearly brother Neil. You know sometimes, i say to myself some days, especially of what has transpired since the election of 2000, YOU HAVE TO BE KIDDING ME! Aren't you amazed after you have read Judges, what is transpiring in our country? It will even get better when you reach Isaiah?
I still shake my head by the blindness of the mass... i.e, the mass of those that profess Christ as their Lord.

Re:, on: 2005/8/30 1:54

sorry! please ignore this

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/8/30 11:46

Brother Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----England has never been and can never be a Christian nation, and King George was German. I don't know whether or not King George was a Christian. What makes you think he was?

I guess I was remembering what I was taught in highschool about the kings of Europe. After the teachings of Calvin took hold back in the late 1500's, the kings of Europe adopted the philosophy of "Divine Rule."

I guess I was loose with the term Christian, There are those who are Christians and there are those who take on the outward appearance of being a Christian,

I also see your point in saying that England was never and will never be a Christian nation, And I will declare the same truth pertaining to the USA.

Nationalism is a wine that causes many to stumble,

Thankyou Brother Ron
In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2005/8/30 11:57

Brother Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----"I saw, in the end, that Jeffreys wanted us to be free to do what he wanted". Is this the motive of the 'democrats' too?

There is a huge war taking place in central Asia. The stakes are high. The USA, Russia, and China are waging a covert war against each other for future dominance in this region of the world,

The strategies of fallen men are seeking to cement prosperity found in the treasures that are of this world,

Job 15:31 Let him not trust in futile things, deceiving himself,
For futility will be his reward.

Job 15:35 They conceive trouble and bring forth futility;
Their womb prepares deceit.Â”

Psa. 78:33 Therefore their days He consumed in futility,
And their years in fear.

There are many fearful people in this world.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/30 12:22

Quote:
-----I guess I was remembering what I was taught in highschool about the kings of Europe. After the teachings of Calvin took hold back in the late 1500's, the kings of Europe adopted the philosophy of "Divine Rule."

The history of this nation is confusing even for folk who have tried to study it and lived here. Earlier kings ruled by Papal consent in that he was their 'vicar' and had the power of excommunication with its consequence in this life and the next.

Henry VIII was essentially a Catholic with himself as Pope. He took the right to choose the bishops. A right which is still nominally held by the British Government. Nominations may come from the Anglican counsels but finally it is in the 'gift' of the monarch's prime minister. (I think that is how it works) Of course, this being England nothing is quite what it seems and the prime minister really just does as he is counselled.

The blood letting in England was worst in the reigns of Henry's children Edward (the protestant) and Mary (Bloody Mary, the Catholic). Elizabeth was the resulting compromise. She favoured a 'reformed theology' with a 'catholic liturgy'. On her death James (James the VIth of Scotland became king.) He was strongly episcopal because he had seen that the 'kir k' in Scotland was controlled by its own elders and not by royally appointed bishops. James was determined to have an episcopal Anglican church in which he could pressure the bishops to do as he wished. The presbyterians insisted that the king must do as the church told him; the royalists believed that the church should do as the king told it. This was the seeds for our Civil War in 1642.

James did believe in the divine rights of kings but this was a hangover from early times rather than a product of the reformation or reformed teaching. Finally the struggle for ultimate power became intense and Charles 1st, the son of James raised his banners in Nottingham in 1642 and declared war on his own parliament. Subsequent kings were trimmed back with almost each succeeding parliament until the present time in which we have a constitutional monarchy where the monarch is permitted to reign but not to rule. That's a great British compromise for you.

During James 1st reign a group of protestants who were somewhat on the left-wing of the reformation decided they had had enough of church and priestcraft and, via Holland, took passage on a boat called the Mayflower...

I think you know the story from there... :-D