

the Outlook Blog

YOU ARE INVITED to participate in the Outlook Blog! This blog presents an ongoing opportunity for dialogue on matters of faith, theology, and ethics. You must be logged in to post, and our goal is to have this blog moderated by its users. Please direct questions concerning this blog to the webmaster via our [Contact Us](#) page.

- [home](#)
- [tags](#)
- [Search](#)
- [Feed](#)

[What could be more American? by David True](#)

Do you support the building of an Islamic community center near Ground Zero? I wouldn't be surprised to hear this question or a similar one asked during a 2012 presidential debate. The effort to build what some call a mosque near Ground Zero has recently become something of a national issue thanks to a [Tweet by Sarah Palin](#) . Of course,

[Palin is far from being alone](#)

, which prompted defenders of the proposal. Among the best of these is Robert Wright's opinion piece in The New York Times,

[A Mosque Maligned](#)

. Wright takes on several critics of the community center and makes them look, well, un-American. He accomplishes this in two easy steps (or at least he makes them look easy). The first is simply to examine their reasoning, which turns out to be little more than guilt by association — -and very loose association at that. This, Wright reminds us, is in the same style as the infamous witch-hunts of Joseph McCarthy. Wright's second move is to base his support for the mosque on our war with Al Qaeda.

"Bin Laden would love to be able to say that in America you can build a church or synagogue anywhere you want, but not a mosque. That fits perfectly with his recruiting pitch — that America has declared war on Islam. And bin Laden would thrill to the claim that a mosque near Ground Zero dishonors the victims of 9/11, because the unspoken premise is that the attacks really were, as he claims, a valid expression of Islam" (emphasis added).

This is the war of ideas: Bin Laden's intolerance vs. the U.S.'s freedom of religion. Al Qaeda targets adherents of other religions, we respect the rights of all adherents. An open and shut case. I really like it. It reminds us of the first principles of our social contract that binds us together in this huge dysfunctional family we call the United States.

I like it and yet I can't help but notice that the positive basis of Wright's argument is war. What

motivates this simple act of fairness? War. This seems terribly ironic when one considers that the debate (at least on the surface) is about the location of a community center that has the stated purpose of promoting tolerance and reconciliation. Aren't reconciliation and compassion the reasons that many people of faith would give in support of the mosque? Wouldn't most Americans agree that we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us? One might argue that Wright comes close to this with his appeal to the First Amendment and its standard of equal respect.

Still, why not begin with an appeal to reconciliation? The community center is intended to be a symbol of our refusal to be alienated from one another by terror, hate, and fear. Why then, allow ourselves to be divided by our deepest and most sacred beliefs? Indeed, wherever we Americans find meaning and purpose, don't many of us believe in the path of reconciliation and peace? What could be more American?

Perhaps Wright assumed that if he began with an appeal to reconciliation, he'd be written off as dangerously naive. I suspect that many of my fellow Christians would oppose Wright's position but also that they would be even more resistant to it if he had grounded it on reconciliation. Wright, ironically, offers a more humane position based on war than that of many Christians, whose entire lives are supposedly based on peace.

Similarly, some on the Left would likely judge my question (What could be more American?) to be hopelessly naive. America, they insist, is an Empire dedicated to perpetual war. My question, however, is intended less as a descriptive statement than an aspirational one. If it sounds naive, consider a president who governed a nation at war with itself and still managed to speak of "[ch](#)
[arity for all](#)
." If it continues sounds naive, consider an African-American minister who after being stabbed, beaten, and wrongly jailed, still spoke of black children and white children living in peace together. If it still sounds naive, consider the imam and his vision of a [welcoming community center](#) around the corner from a place where madness consumed the hopes of thousands. What could be more American?

DAVID TRUE is associate professor of religion at Wilson College,

Chambersburg, Pa.

[ment \(1\)](#)

September 8, 2010

Posted by [lifework](#) |

Untagged |

[Com](#)

[Burning books burns bridges by Winfield Casey Jones](#)

Last night after hearing another news report about how a Florida pastor (with my same last name) planned to burn a Quran, and then hearing General David Petraeus say this was deplorable and could put U.S. troops in Afghanistan in danger, I put the following on our church sign:

To Burn Another's

Revered Book is Wrong

See Jesus at Matt. 7:12



I wanted to choose my words carefully, but the word limits of the sign were very frustrating! Also I realized that the issue of the planned book burning could get mixed up in some peoples' minds with the issue of the proposed mosque near Ground Zero at the World Trade Center site. (I am one who believes that while the planners apparently have a legal right to build there, given the sensitivities of many people about the place, building right there [instead of a few blocks away] is probably not a good idea because it undermines the stated purpose of creating peace and understanding.) But this has absolutely nothing to do with burning the Quran. The same sensitivity to other peoples' hearts, which might cause the mosque planners not to build right there, should cause any who call themselves Christians not to burn the Quran! I put Matthew 7:12 on the sign because it is a New Testament passage where the Lord Jesus Christ says, So in everything, do to others what you would have them do to you, for this sums up the Law and the Prophets.

As I thought about what to put on our church sign, I did not want to create confusion by referring to the Quran as a "holy" book, because for Christians our holy books are uniquely the Old and New Testaments. I did not want to give the wrong impression that Christians consider another book to be holy. But I also did want to indicate the Quran's importance for Muslims, so I referred to it as a "Revered Book."

One main reason for putting this on our sign: I noticed that those who are putting their lives on the line --- American soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan and still others who wish to share the love and teaching of Jesus in far away lands --- were the ones most bothered by this threatened burning of the Quran because they felt it needlessly burned bridges to Muslim people. The Christian church (but not our secular army!) has been commanded to share Jesus with the whole world, and we know that sharing the good news of Jesus is always relational and involves

loving people deeply and unconditionally. It is most effective when done in a context of love and mutual respect, where deep relationships with those of other faiths provide opportunities to bear witness to our faith in Christ.

As to the Quran, we can definitely affirm some things it teaches: that God created everything, that God is merciful and beneficent, and that God will judge all people. We can also agree with Quranic affirmations that the Old Testament (torah) and New Testament (ingil) are inspired by God, that Jesus is the Word of God and the Spirit of God, that he was born of a virgin, and that he performed many miracles, including raising the dead. There are other things the Quran appears to affirm (some of these may be questions of interpretation) which disagree with the witness of our holy book. The Bible affirms Jesus is God's Son (though of course his conception happened through the Holy Spirit and not through intercourse) and that Jesus died on the cross for the sins of the world and was raised the third day from the dead.

Finally as Kenneth Cragg, formerly at Hartford Seminary and a pioneer of Muslim-Christian dialogue, put it in more than one book, there are important differences between Jesus, the founder of Christianity, and Muhammad, the founder of Islam. As Cragg put it, Muhammad was, among other things, a conquering general, whereas when his disciples started to violently resist those who were arresting him, Jesus said, Put your sword back in its place...for all who draw the sword will die by the sword. Do you think I cannot call on my Father, and he will at once put at my disposal more than twelve legions of angels? Matthew 26:52-3.

Christians would love to have respectful conversations with Muslims about such things, and we know that burning the Quran will never open the door to such conversations but rather will slam it shut. Hopefully Muslims understand that for every Christian who wants to burn the Quran, there are a thousand who are appalled.

In closing, as a minister in the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), I would like to quote from one of our eleven creeds, catechisms, and confessions which, though very fallible, we feel help us interpret Scripture, which is God's infallible Word. The Confession of 1967 at section 9.42 says,

"The Christian finds parallels between other religions and his own and must approach all religions with openness and respect. Repeatedly God has used the insight of non-Christians to challenge the church to renewal. But the reconciling word of the gospel is God's judgment upon all forms of religion, including the Christian. The gift of God in Christ is for all men. The church, therefore, is commissioned to carry the gospel to all men whatever their religion may be and even when they profess none."

Building bridges to people God loves is good. "Speaking the truth in love" (see Ephesians 4:15) is always good. Burning books, especially ones revered by people whom God loves and for whom Christ died, is definitely harmful, unkind, and foolish.

WINFIELD CASEY JONES is pastor of First Church of Pearland, Texas, and may be reached at wrjones2002@yahoo.com.

[...]

September 8, 2010 Posted by [lifework](#) | *Untagged* | [Comment \(0\)](#)

[Jesus and Muhammad by Tom Hobson](#)

Jesus said to them, "Fight against the unbelievers until idolatry is no more and God's religion reigns supreme. Kill them wherever you find them. Fight for the sake of God those who fight against you. When you meet the unbelievers on the battlefield, strike off their heads, and when you have laid them low, bind your captives firmly. Strike off their heads. Maim them in every limb!"

No, these are actually the words of Muhammad's God in the Quran, Sura 2:190–94, 47:4, and 8:12. And according to revered pro-Muslim historical sources such as the Hadith, Muhammad evidently practiced what he preached. (The only verses of the Quran to forbid the use of force are Sura 50:45, "You shall not use force with them," and Sura 2:256, "There shall be no compulsion in religion," both of which conflict with multiple passages to the contrary.)

Oh, but the Bible has Joshua and the commands to slaughter the Canaanites, you say. Yes, but there's a huge difference: Jesus, our authoritative interpreter of the Torah, sets that violence aside by his explicit teachings. Islam has no one of Jesus' stature to authoritatively do this for the Quran.

What would Jesus think about the proposed mosque at Ground Zero? One thing we know about Jesus is that he absolutely hated hypocrisy. I can only imagine what Jesus thinks about the blind hypocrisy of those who insist on defending the proposed mosque, but who deny the Greek Orthodox the right to rebuild their church there, and refuse to allow even a cross in the Mojave Desert.

So much for the rhetoric of those who claim this is an issue of religious freedom. Yes, these folks have the constitutional right to build this mosque anywhere they want, just as much as we have the constitutional right to publish cartoons of Muhammad, both of which are equally insulting, insensitive, and unwise. And to name it Cordova (a symbol of Islamic conquest) is like erecting a permanent burning cross next to Martin Luther King Jr.'s grave. That's why a supermajority of Muslims themselves are against the building of this mosque.

Newt Gingrich and the Vatican are right. If these folks want a mosque at Ground Zero, let them first allow churches and synagogues in the Holy Land of Islam. Should they be surprised if we

reject the equivalent of a Crusader Memorial Church built next to the Kaaba in Mecca?

What's the difference between a crusade and a jihad? The difference is that the crusade is a tragic perversion of our faith, whereas the jihad is a central pillar of Islam.

Jesus teaches that we can identify true prophets by their fruits (Matt 7:16). The issue is not how noble or peaceful the prophet's followers are, but the results of the prophet's teachings. The fruits of Jesus' teaching lead in the exact opposite direction to the teachings of Muhammad. Let's be honest. Islamic militants are simply following their prophet's literal teaching and example. Christianity has been unjust and hateful to fellow humans only when we have failed to follow Jesus. All the evils done in Christ's name have been done while trying to conquer the world Muhammad's way. Islam has been peaceful only when it fails to consistently follow its prophet, or after it has militarily subjugated its enemies.

Thankfully, most Muslims do not follow the Quran literally or comprehensively. Thankfully, most Muslims are good and peaceful people who have no desire to consistently follow their prophet. These Muslims need our support. We need to take our cue from these Muslims, who appear to be the ones who oppose the building of this mosque.

If you disagree with me, all I ask is that you not play the over-played Islamophobia card. Let's have a logical discussion.

September 7, 2010

Posted by [lifework](#) |

Untagged |

[Com](#)

[ment \(2\)](#)

[The Real "Confessing Church";](#)

Reading a bit about Karl Barth and the situation in Germany, 1933, the term, "Confessing Church" tells a remarkable story of how some refused to erase the boundaries between church and state.

To read about the Confessing Church stirs my heart, and I wonder, "Would I have had the courage to stand, as Barth did, or would I have found ways to quietly compromise my status while telling myself that I was yet a man of integrity?"

The term, "Confessing Church" ought not to be ripped from its historical context in

Germany, 1933, and co-opted to serve some smaller purpose.

Every time I read of the "Confessing Church" organization in the Presbyterian Church, my soul is shaken - that some would take virtually a holy-ground moment in time and claim it for their own to describe an in-house theological debate. Yes, a debate of genuine importance with long-lasting implications about the church and its life. But to call this group the "Confessing Church" is to misconstrue history.

The real Confessing Church stood its ground against the false gods of National Socialism.

If there are any comparisons possible to the Confessing Church, it would be those who today protest the casual and careless mingling of church aims and national interests - the most current example of which is Glenn Beck and other lesser lights, who appeal to some of the very worst instincts in our national character.

Instincts found in every nation, and when times are troubled, such instincts rise to the surface, as they did in Germany after WW1, and by the time Hitler came along, he masterfully tapped into them and filled the cup of wrath that was poured out on Germany and the world.

I respect my sisters and brothers on the issues, but I continue to regret their co-opting the title, "Confessing Church."

September 1, 2010

Posted by [tomegg](#) |

[Nazi Germany](#) , [Karl](#)

[Barth](#)

[Confessing Church](#)

|

[Comment \(3\)](#)

[BLOG: Presbyterian Bible Junkie, The parts of Jesus we throw](#)

out

The new proposed language for G-6.0106b calls for us to joyfully submit to the Lordship of Jesus Christ in all aspects of life. But how do we decide which Jesus to follow, in a day when we have wildly different concepts of “What Would Jesus Do? The answer is in our second ordination vow: we “accept the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be, by the Holy Spirit, the unique and authoritative witness to Jesus Christ in the church universal, and God’s word to [us].”

What the Bible says about Jesus trumps any other claim on the market, according to what we have vowed. It trumps the Quran, the Gnostic gospels, Dan Brown’s *The Da Vinci Code*, and the voice of the “spirit” within us. Our vow to accept the canonical Jesus as our authority also does not permit us to play the game of claiming that parts of our picture of Jesus were invented by the early church. The early church was in a far better position than we are to know what Jesus really said and did.

If we claim obedience to a Jesus who is a contradiction to the total witness of the Old and New Testaments, then we are not following the real Jesus.

Which picture of Jesus is correct? The Great Rulebreaker — who came to get rid of dos and don’ts, who came to replace a religion of law with a religion of love? Or the One who had standards for his followers to live by? The problem with Jesus is that it is too easy to make him into the great Fill-in-the-Blank who looks and thinks like us, a “Stepford Savior” who loves us and never contradicts us, a product of our own wishful imagination, an idol (if you will). Look out whenever your Jesus begins to sound and look too much like you: Democrat or Republican, rich or poor, light or dark, permissive or Puritan. If my Jesus makes me too comfortable, if he doesn’t shove me into my discomfort zone at times, it’s not the real Jesus.

To avoid distortions, it is important for us to accept the entire picture of Jesus we find in Scripture, not just the parts we like. We need to embrace both the loving Jesus, and the no-nonsense Jesus who did not tolerate hypocrisy or playing games with God. We need to embrace both the radically inclusive Jesus who welcomed outcasts who were not welcomed by the Pharisees or Qumran, and the One who let the Rich Young Ruler walk away; the One who loved both the woman at the well and Zacchaeus too much to leave them in unrepentant sin. We need to embrace both the One who shows us God’s love more than anyone else in Scripture, and the One who talked about hell more than anyone else in Scripture; the One who gives us a morality too high to reach, and the One who can save the most wretched of sinners. We need to embrace both the Jesus who broke rules that were based solely on human tradition, and the One who beefed up laws where people had gotten lax.

If we settle for anything less than the full Jesus of Scripture, we settle for a distortion.

So what does Jesus say in his teaching on sexuality? The centerpiece of his teaching on this subject is where he cites a quote from the Torah that is also reaffirmed by the apostle Paul: “the two [man and woman] shall become one flesh” (Matt 19:5 = Mark 10:8). Jesus, the Torah, and Paul all teach that sex was created to form a lifelong inseparable bond between a man and a

woman. Any other use of sex, whether it be fornication, prostitution, homosexual intercourse, or a marriage that is less than lifelong, is a violation of this thrice-repeated central teaching of Scripture on sexuality. Jesus names both porneia (fornication) and aselgeia (a veiled reference to homosexual behavior and similar offenses) on his sin list in Mark 7:21-23.

Jesus' strict puritanical approach to sex may be seen in his teaching that even lust in the heart is a form of adultery (Matt 5:28), and in his teaching against divorce, where his point is that no one can erase a sexual relationship. There is no intellectually honest way to stretch this Jesus into a Jesus who is permissive toward sexual immorality. If we were serious about following Jesus, we wouldn't be having this debate about sex.

Jesus has a whole lot more to teach us, by his words and by his life. As we seek to follow Jesus, let's settle for following no less than the complete Jesus to whom the Scriptures bear unique and authoritative witness.

TOM HOBSON of Belleville, Ill., a PC(USA) pastor for 27 years, has degrees from Gordon-Conwell (M.Div.) and Concordia (Ph.D.), and is currently seeking a call.

August 30, 2010

Posted by [lifework](#) |

Untagged

| [Comm](#)

[ent \(8\)](#)

[Channel Trading Strategy](#)

<http://www.spectrumonlinejobs.com/1249-32.html>

The Ten Steps To Profitable Trading is a simple ten step, short to medium term swing/channel trading strategy developed over many years of successful trading. It maximizes profit and minimizes risk resulting in a consistent 'buy low sell high' trade.

[h ttp://www.spectrumonlinejobs.com/1249-32.html](http://www.spectrumonlinejobs.com/1249-32.html)

August 29, 2010

Posted by [ejazmansoor](#) |

Untagged

| [C](#)

[omment \(0\)](#)

[Jane Spahr on Trial](#)

As I read today's note in the LA Times about Jane Spahr to be tried by the PCUSA, I couldn't help but think of the text for this past Sunday, Luke 13:10-17, Jesus setting a woman free from 18 years of affliction, and doing so on the Sabbath, to make a point (he and the lady could have waited 24 hours) - healing is what the Sabbath is all about.

And then the synagogue leader weighs in - scolding folks, "Hey, we've got six days for work, and if you want healing, come on those days, but the Sabbath is for rest - keep it holy - no work!"

And that's when Jesus lays into the leader and his gang, "You hypocrites. You wouldn't treat an ox or donkey this way - you lead them to water on the Sabbath, so why deny the water of life to this woman on the Sabbath? What better day is there for revealing the love of God and the freedom therein?"

While Jesus stood on the intent of the law, the leader clung to the letter of the law. And according to the law, the leader was right and Jesus was wrong.

So, here we go again, arguing about our laws.

And missing the point of the kingdom of God.

Jane Spahr is technically wrong, if that's the tact we wish to take. Jesus was wrong, too, and someone might have told him, "Wait 24 hours. Then do your healing. No one will be offended, the law will be maintained and everyone will be happy."

But Jesus didn't wait, because love and mercy and forgiveness and hope can't wait.

So ... we'll drag Jane into the mud of our own foolish little world of rules - rules that keep people

bound - hungering and thirsting for a better day.

We wouldn't treat a dog this way.

But people?

Yeah, keep 'em tied up, and tie 'em up all the more with rules upon rules, until no one knows which way is up.

Sure, I am what I am - a supporter of marriage equality, comfortable with the biblical work done by Jack Rogers and others.

And I've been called an apostate, a heretic and a servant of Satan.

No one has the final word, and I surely don't claim that, but with prayer and study, I've made my decision some years ago to no longer wait, and just to keep myself honest, I continue to study and think about these things.

But I write this note with a certain conviction, that Jane Spahr is pointing the way ahead, reminding us what the church and our faith is all about - setting people free. While the charges fly and the legal briefs are prepared, the PCUSA finds itself in the uncomfortable place of the synagogue leader.

That's how I see it these days.

August 24, 2010 Posted by [tomegg](#) | [Sabbath](#) , [PCUSA](#) , [Ordination for GLBT persons](#)
,
[Jane Spahr](#)

'
[GLBT Concerns](#)

|
[Comment \(2\)](#)

[What could be more American?](#)

Do you support the building of an Islamic community center at Ground Zero? I wouldn't be surprised to hear this question or a similar one asked during a 2012 presidential debate.

The effort to build a mosque near Ground Zero has recently become something of a national issue thanks to a Tweet by [Sarah Palin](#). Of course, [Palin is far from being alone](#), which prompted defenders of the proposal. Among the best of these is Robert Wright's [A Mosque Maligned](#)

. Wright takes on several critics of the community center and makes them look, well un-American. He accomplishes this in two easy steps (or at least he makes them look easy). The first is simply to examine their reasoning, which turns out to be little more than guilt by association — and very loose association at that. This, Wright reminds us, is in the same style as the infamous witch hunts

of Joseph McCarthy. Wright's second move is to base his support for the mosque on our war with Al Qaeda.

"Bin Laden would love to be able to say that in America you can build a church or synagogue anywhere you want, but not a mosque. That fits perfectly with his recruiting pitch — that America has declared war on Islam. And bin Laden would thrill to the claim that a mosque near ground zero dishonors the victims of 9/11, because the unspoken premise is that the attacks really were, *as he claims*, a valid expression of Islam" (emphasis added).

This is the war of ideas: Bin Laden's intolerance vs. the U.S's freedom of religion. Al Qaeda targets adherents of other religions, we respect the rights of all adherents. An open and shut case. I really like it. It reminds us of the first principles of our social contract that binds us together in this huge dysfunctional family we call the United States.

I like it and yet I can't help but notice that the positive basis of Wright's argument is war. What motivates this simple act of fairness? War. This seems terribly ironic when one considers that the debate (at least on the surface) is about the location of a community center that has the stated purpose of promoting tolerance and reconciliation. Aren't reconciliation and compassion the reasons that many people of faith would give in support of the mosque? Wouldn't most Americans agree that we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us? One might argue that Wright comes close to this with his appeal to the First Amendment and its standard of equal respect.

Still, why not begin with an appeal to reconciliation? The community center is intended to be a symbol of our refusal to be alienated from one another by terror, hate, and fear. Why then, allow ourselves to be divided by our deepest and most sacred beliefs? Indeed, wherever we Americans find meaning and purpose, don't many of us believe in the path of reconciliation and peace? What could be more American?

Perhaps Wright assumed that if he began with an appeal to reconciliation, he'd be written off as dangerously naive. I suspect that many of my fellow Christians would oppose Wright's position but also that they would be even more resistant to it if he had grounded it on reconciliation. Wright, ironically, offers a more humane position based on war than that of many Christians, whose entire lives are supposedly based on peace.

Similarly, some on the Left would likely judge my question (*What could be more American?*) to be hopelessly naive. America, they insist, is an Empire dedicated to perpetual war. My question, however, is intended less as a descriptive statement than an aspirational one. If it sounds naive, consider a President who governed a nation at war with itself and still managed to speak of "[charity for all](#)."

If it continues to sound naive, consider an African-American minister who after being stabbed, beaten, and wrongly jailed, still spoke of black children and white children living in peace together. If it still sounds naive, consider the imam and his vision of a [welcoming community](#) center around the corner from a place where madness consumed the hopes of thousands. What could be more American?

DAVID TRUE is associate professor of religion at Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.

[\[...\]](#)

[ent \(2\)](#) August 23, 2010 Posted by [lifework](#) | *Untagged* | [Comm](#)

[The Enemy Within](#)

Have ya' read the latest "Layman" (August, 2010) and its "Letters to the editor"?

The anger runs deep.

And I'm sympathetic ... there have been times in my life, more than I like to admit, when anger, self-righteous anger (which, of course, all anger is, right?), ruled the day, and the night as well, violating the advice of Scripture, to not allow the sun to go down on one's anger.

The problem with long-standing anger is that it's never accurate in its assessment of the situation. Anger, like a magnifying glass, focuses the heat of a legitimate concern into a white-hot beam that destroys.

The letters in this issue reveal a loss of control. Anger has simply taken over mind and heart.

The enemy, the PCUSA, is all wrong. Which, of course, in even the worst of all times, wouldn't be true - after all, even a broken watch is right twice a day.

I feel for the letter-writers. They've painted themselves into a corner, and there's no way out for them right now. So the corner becomes home, and though the corner is always an uncomfortable place in which to live, it's defended with growing intensity, until all the corner-dwellers have convinced themselves they're living in theological luxury.

There would be a way out, if they could rise above their anger and temper their opinion with the simple reality that the "enemy" is more within them than anywhere else.

And a good dose of humility. But corner-dwellers cannot afford humility, because humility requires some sense of appreciation for the very people being vilified, and a sense of personal incompleteness - that whatever the opinion, the judgment, the theological point of view, no one has a full and complete grasp of God's truth and God's Kingdom.

We are what we are. Fully human and deeply sinful. And all the creeds in the world, and all our protestations to the contrary, our frailty and our fault remain.

Self-righteousness, amplified by limited conversation with other corner-dwellers, exits on all sides of any given question.

The challenge for any of us is this: how to hold an opinion (and that's what it all is, after all) firmly and faithfully, without drifting into ideology (always the danger, and let's just call it idolatry).

My heart goes out to the letter-writers. They're profoundly unhappy, and if they're pastors, my heart goes out, as well, to their congregations. That kind of anger walks into the pulpit most Sundays, for sure, and spills out into the pews, tainting the gospel with the aroma of rot.

So be it.

Church history is the story of our fightings with one another. I guess such will be the case until the final trumpet is sounded.

But until then, does not the gospel call us to something other than merely being angry with one another?

Is there not the Holy Spirit upon whom we can call, and whose influence might temper our restless hearts?

After all, said Paul, our enemies are not flesh and blood, but spiritual powers and principalities.

I think there comes a time when God walks away from a persistently angry person or

organization. As in Paul's letter to the Romans, God abandons us to "shameful lusts," and there is no greater lust than the lust to be right, and no greater shame than the willful condemnation of one another.

[ent \(2\)](#) August 18, 2010 Posted by [tomegg](#) | *Untagged* | [Comm](#)

[Good News in CA](#)

Thank God we live in a Republic rather than a Democracy ... a Republic in which elected and/or appointed officials are empowered to make decisions for us.

As in the case of fair housing in CA, early 60s, the courts determined that restrictive housing covenants were unconstitutional, despite the fact that 65% of California voters wanted to retain them in Prop 14.

I think, too, about Civil Rights and Women's Suffrage ... it was the leadership of the courts that helped us break free of the past and shed the chains of structural racism and discrimination. Yes, both yet exist in practice and attitude for many Americans, but without official approval. That's a huge step to take, and today in CA, another huge step was taken for civil right and Marriage Equality.

And it looks like the legal arguments are in place - whatever perspective some may personally hold on LGBT persons and practices, there can no longer be a constitutional prohibition on their marriage and the rights that pertain thereto.

For a detailed examination on why the proponents of Prop 8 feared a trial such as has just been concluded, check out the following article at [HuffingtonPost](#) . In a nutshell, the "legal arguments" against Marriage Equality simply do not stand up in an American Court of Law.

I have many friends who oppose Marriage Equality and ordination for practicing LGBT persons, and though I cannot agree with them, I cannot deny either their feelings or opinions. Yet they are beginning to realize that moral and theological arguments against Marriage Equality cannot be translated into civil law.

As for me, I long for the day when I will be able to officiate at all weddings. That day is coming, I believe, and it will be a good day for all of us.

[ent \(0\)](#) August 12, 2010 Posted by [tomegg](#) | *Untagged* | [Comm](#)

«

[Start](#)

[Prev](#)

[1](#)

[2](#)

[3](#)

[4](#)

[5](#)

[6](#)

[7](#)

[8](#)

[9](#)

[10](#)

[Next](#)

[End](#)

»