

Re: How to Become a Christian, Version 1.01

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.cardiology/2004-09/2501.html>

From: Bob (this one) (*Bob_at_nospam.com*)

Date: 09/29/04

Date: Tue, 28 Sep 2004 23:47:49 -0400

Dr. Andrew B. Chung, MD/PhD wrote:

> *"Bob (this one)" <Bob@nospam.com> wrote in message news:<10lip9imv20hk42@corp.supernews.com>...*

>

>> *Dr. Andrew B. Chung, MD/PhD wrote:*

>>

>>> *"Bob (this one)" <Bob@nospam.com> wrote in message news:<10lh240qhjv9a5@corp.supernews.com>...*

>>>

>>>> *Dr. Andrew B. Chung, MD/PhD wrote:*

>>>>

>>>>> *Answer: Again, no sect here. I have read Romans 13. Does not change what I think about the government.*

>>>>>

>>>>>> *From Romans 13:*

>>>>>

>>>>>> *1Everyone must submit himself to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except that which God has established. The authorities that exist have been established by God. 2Consequently, he who rebels against the authority is rebelling against what God has instituted, and those who do so will bring judgment on themselves. 3For rulers hold no terror for those who do right, but for those who do wrong. Do you want to be free from fear of the one in authority? Then do what is right and he will commend you. 4For he is God's servant to do you good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword for nothing. He is God's servant, an agent of wrath to bring punishment on the wrongdoer. 5Therefore, it is necessary to submit to the authorities, not only because of possible punishment but also because of conscience. 6This is also why you pay taxes, for the authorities are God's servants, who give their full time to governing. 7Give everyone what you owe him: If you owe taxes, pay taxes; if revenue, then revenue; if respect, then respect; if honor, then honor.*

>>>>>

>>>>>> *So... the revolution that established the USA was a wrong thing?*

>>>>>

>>>>>> *No. Why would you believe that God's establishment of "one nation under God" was a wrong thing, Bob?*

>>

>><LOL> *So it was right for Washington (et al) to refuse to "submit himself to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except that which God has established." Somehow, it became ok to do exactly opposite what it says in the passage. Gotcha.*

>

> *The proof of Washington et al being in the will of God is evident in the outcome. Washington et al became the authority established by God.*

So all the dictatorships and genocidal regimes are God's doing, too. All the governments that outlaw religious study so the people have no opportunity to learn about Jesus are God's plan. Those people have no chance at salvation according to your previous statements. God wants people to go to hell? It's part of his plan?

>>*That "under God" wasn't added until the 1950's at the height of the anti-communist lunacy. Perhaps you recall the discussions here a while back about the founding fathers who were Deists, not Christian, for the most part. I knew you would...*

>

> *Perhaps you recall the discussion about non-Christians being used by God according to His will. I knew you would...*

Perhaps you may recall that it's been characterized as another one of your "everything proves that you're always correct" ploys. I knew you would...

>>*But this is a perfectly wonderful example of my "prophecy" at the bottom of the original post – "Just seeing if you can make this into another "Chung's always right" post." <LOL> Came through, Andrew, just like I knew you would.*

>

> *With the blessing of His power, it is easy to "come through" and glorify Him without any effort.*

<LOL> Ever the fool. Twist, twist in the wind...

>>>>*It*

>>>>*was to reject the authorities and kill them.*

>>>

>>>*God unmaking what He has made is not a sin for Him.*

The *people* who did it violated the tenets of Romans 13. They each and together specifically disobeyed the instructions.

>>*Did God shoot all those redcoats and Hessians?*

>

> *If the deaths of those redcoats and Hessians were not according to His will, they would not have died (i.e. He could have had the musket balls bounce off harmlessly).*

Right. Suspend all those laws for the paltry sake of governmental succession. Bwah...

>>*Colonists overthrew the*
>>*king and all his "authorities that exist [which] have been established*
>>*by God."*
>
> *God used the colonists to replace one government with another of His*
> *choosing.*

And the proof for this is...? Right. I remember the party line now. That it succeeded means that it was what God wanted. Right. Circular logic. It's true because it's true. Good thinking.

>>*This is wonderful, just terrific. <LOL> Like I said in*
>>*another post, *everything* confirms your "discernment" of truth.*
>
> *And so you bear witness to the infinite power of the truth.*

<LOL> And you don't seem able to bear witness to the telling and truthful power of sarcasm that points out precisely the opposite.

>>>>*if need be.*
>>>
>>>*Yes, God is in control past, present, and future. We call that*
>>>**forever*.*
>>
>><LOL> *And we call not answering the question *evasion*.*
>
> *Your "if need be" was not a question, fyi.*

Nice snip job, shitskull. First you break up the sentence and then you eliminate part of it and then you act like that's all that was written. Can you not even act honest, even though it's obvious that it's merely acting?

>>*So God shot*
>>*all those redcoats and Hessians?*
>
> *See above.*
>
>>*God convened the continental*
>>*congress?*
>
> *"for there is no authority except that which God has established"*

So when people decide they don't like the government and they successfully overthrow the "authority... which God has established" it means that they were supposed to. Gotcha.

>>God made them all do what they did but they were exercising
>>free will. Got it. <LOL>
>
> He is omnipotent. For the Creator of the universe, directing the
> course of history without taking away the free will of individuals is
> a trivial undertaking.

Not even God can reconcile mutually exclusive terms. Either actions were directed or the people had free will. I can accept either one (since there's no proof for either, they're unarguable) but both cannot co-exist simultaneously.

>>>>Conscience
>>>>means that we shouldn't have rebelled against God's emissaries on
>>>>earth – the duly appointed authorities?
>>>>
>>>>Not individually.

It's individuals who combine to form new governments. It's individuals who form armies. It's individuals who comprise the authorities that God has ordained to be the powers.

>>>However, the establishment of new governments
>>>happens all the time with God's blessing even here in the U.S. We
>>>call it elections, Bob.
>>
>>Bwah. Like an armed insurrection is the same sort of thing that an
>>election is. Could you be sillier in your efforts to force the round
>>peg of nonsense into a square hole of unsupportable condition?
>
> Sorry the truth seems silly to you.

The truth isn't silly. What you've written here is. Elections and violent overthrow of governments are equivalent exercises, according to your distortion. Elections don't establish new *governments*, they establish new *administrators* of the existing government.

>>>And, we vote in good conscience. And, yes, God
>>>controls the elections as we witnessed 4 years ago when President
>>>George Bush was elected.
>>
>><LOL> And everybody who had nothing to say about what they did were
>>all exercising free will.
>
> It was there choice to say nothing.

<LOL> God controlled them to say nothing but they had free will. This is glorious...

>>God *CONTROLS* the elections.
>

> *Glad you agree.*

<LOL> See why everybody knows you to be a fraud?

>>*So if we as a people decided to overthrow the government of George*

>>*Bush, it would be ok because that, too is God's plan even though he*

>>*has said not to do it.*

>

> *If it were not God's will, it wouldn't happen no matter how hard*

> *people try.*

>

>>*Gotcha. God can contradict himself*

>

> *He could but He doesn't.*

So it's not ok to resist authorities but if you do, and it works, then it was ok to resist authority. No contradiction there, huh Sparky...? Sounds like Machiavelli, not God. Sun Tsu, not Jesus.

>>*but the*

>>*bible's still accurate in every word, in every idea, in every*

>>*expression.*

>

> *The Holy Bible remains truthful.*

Gee, that doesn't seem to actually address the issue. Is the bible accurate in every expression?

>>*Gotcha.*

>

> *Yes, it remains my choice to also be truthful.*

As if...

>>>>*If that was a gross wrong – essentially a sin – wouldn't it mean that*

>>>>*you have to reject the fruits of that wrong or be guilty of that same*

>>>>*sin yourself?*

>>>

>>>*Your initial premise is in error.*

>>

>>*Not my premise.*

>

> *It was your initial premise that the actions of the Founding Fathers*

> *of the U.S. were a gross wrong. Again, your initial premise is in*

> *error.*

Not a bit of it. I asked a series of questions based on Romans 13.

Here's one: "So... the revolution that established the USA was a wrong thing?" See, question based on your lengthy posting of ROMans 13. Not a premise. Seeking clarification.

According to you that's what must be obeyed except if you successfully overthrow the authorities, then it's ok not to follow the rules. Like "Thou shalt not kill...unless you get away with it.

>>It's from your quotation of Romans 13. Says you have
>>to submit to social authority, ecclesiastical authority, patriarchal
>>authority, governmental authority ... **all* authority. Says you can't*
>>subvert their authority. *Pretty clear about it, too.*
>
> *Again what applies to an individual does not apply to a group*
> *(Founding Fathers).*

How silly. I shouldn't kill anyone, but if I get some friends together, it's ok to go kill people? The commandments only apply if I'm alone, but if I'm in a group I don't have to observe them?

So groups aren't comprised of individuals? Each person's conscience (see Romans 13) shouldn't guide them any longer when they're in a group?

>>>>Just seeing if you can make this into another "Chung's always right" post.
>>>
>>>You seem to confuse me with God who is the source of the spiritual
>>>gift of truth discernment that He has bestowed on me.
>>
>>Nah.
>
> *It is what it seems.*

It seems that way because you have the terrible flaw of the ones who deny the apparent. You couldn't discern truth if it bit you in the ass but are so hysterically convinced that you can in your drunk-on-yourself delusion that it is simply impossible for you to entertain thoughts that you haven't dreamt up from your chemically imbalanced frenzies. It "seems" any way that will give you a point in your tarnished need to vanquish anyone who spots your oh-so-frequent howlers.

>>Just watching you play your zany Emmet Kelly-like flummery games
>>with words and ideas that **always** "prove" your viewpoint. Trust me, I
>>don't confuse you with God, any rational being, anyone who understands
>>the concept of love or who is really a Christian. And I can only
>>imagine the situation where I ever will.
>
> *It would seem that you are overusing your imagination.*

<LOL> Sure. Andrew. It more seems that your desperation to try to "win" again is propelling you to yet more excesses of intellectual absurdity and greater departures from healthy rationality.

>>>>Whirl, dervish...
>>>>

>>> *Why whirl when one is able to discern the truth?*

>>

>> *Why, indeed...*

>

> *And so there is no whirling here except by you.*

<G> Can't you do any better than IKYABWAI? You grow more lame with each passing blusterfest. I'm just asking questions and pointing out logical absurdities. You're the one fashioning these jury-rigged philosophies and jerry-built scaffolds of bizarre interpretation.

>> *Bwah. Poor Andrew has so much invested in his delusional, panicky need*

>> *to be absolutely right that he can't see how silly it all looks. He*

>> *was asked to offer some biblical substantiation about his "gift" and*

>> *cited one sentence that mentioned discerning the truth about a*

>> *specific situation, and the web site of another wacko who actually*

>> *painted a bad picture of people like Andrew who claim to have the gift*

>> *and merely use it to battle others. So much for biblical support for*

>> *his "gift."*

>

> *Again, sorry the truth bothers you.*

What truth is it exactly that "bothers" me? The fact that there's no substantiation for your clearly inoperative "gift?" The fact that you post a blunder and assert it's the truth? The fact that you can't even consider the likelihood of error? Those are truths, Andrew. Not your boastful self-worship that God has singled you out for exalted positions. Only a braggart speaks of himself as you do. Particularly when there's no support or proof for the bragging.

>> *No evidence for this "gift" beyond Chung's insistence that he has it.*

>

> *Except for the truth which you are unable to discern.*

<LOL> Right. Chung offers two URL's for this "gift", neither of which offers even the slightest scintilla of support and yet still claims it, even in the face of so many proven mistakes and misunderstandings.

> *I am as*

> *motivated to prove to you that I possess God's spiritual gift of truth*

> *discernment as the seeing would be motivated to prove their vision to*

> *the blind.*

Funny that God doesn't mention it anywhere in the bible as a gift. You and your fellow wackos invented it and claim it, free-standing, with nothing to prove, document, demonstrate or otherwise support your empty claims for it.

Check out this search of the King James bible. <<http://tinyurl.com/5dtgd>>
Says the words don't appear there anywhere.

"Bible Word Search

Christ Notes

Home | Bible Search | Bible Commentary | Wallpaper

Search Again: Preferences | Advanced Search

We had some trouble with your search:

- * Unfortunately, we were not able to find any verses that matched your search for truth discernment in the Bible (King James Version). Please use some of the following suggestions to refine your search:
- o Check your spelling.
- o Try other keywords. For example, instead of charity try love.
- o Use fewer keywords. For example, instead of surely goodness and love will follow me try goodness love.
- o Remove common words and only use keywords or words that are unique to the verse you are looking for. For example, instead of For he is the living God and he endures forever use living God forever.
- o Use the Advanced Bible Search to increase the power of your Bible search.

Copyright 2001–2004 ChristNotes.org."

So I tried it for other bible translations and none had it.

Here's a page that includes the words "discern" and discernment" repeatedly. But it, too, doesn't offer a definition like Chung's. For a real aluminum–helmet view, have a read. It actually funny.
<<http://www.fourwinds10.com/phb/whatis.htm>> Written by a Patrick H. Bellringer, and I think he is.

"Discernment" as used in most writings by rational people refers to being discriminating and asking for more than just face value. It doesn't mean that you can read a sentence on a monitor screen and *know* more stuff not remotely referenced. It means most people form opinions based on text contents, tone, style, apparent veracity levels, substantiation of information, flexibility of the writer's opinion when given new information, acceptance of responsibility for the words used and lots of other factors, most very subtle.

All the many times you've insisted that you see truth and others do not, come up short when stacked against things like your forcible insistence about caloric content in bread and potatoes. In how many calories get used in what sorts of activities. And, one of my favorites, when you said I never quoted the bible and we found a couple posts where I did *and* you responded to them. Your "truth" about Everest climbers and their diets were demolished by *Everest climbers* but you still insist on your having the truth about it. They go on and on and you're so crippled by what you think you know that the obvious error cannot be allowed to stand, your actions say.

>>>And the manifold errors he's made rather conclusively demonstrate that
>>>his "gift" is yet another bit of funhouse–mirror self–worship.

>

> *You seem to be confusing God's gift of truth discernment with God's
> quality of perfection.*

Nah. You're the one who claims to have this "truth discernment" yet show repeatedly that, in fact, you don't. You're the one who *never* admits error, even when it's brought to you. You're the one whose pattern of operation is to insist that you're right. Always. Never in error. *You're* the one who's insisting on your perfection. You accept no one's word yet expect to be believed. As you sow, so shall you reap, Sparky. It's happening.

> *Hardly unexpected from someone who seems to be
> confusing His servant with God Himself.*

<LOLOL> The funniest one yet. I show repeatedly what a quack you are, how wrong you are in so many subject areas, how deceitful you are, what a fraud you are, how you weasel out of directness, and you think I'm confusing you with God? Could this be another example of your "truth discernment" in action? Wanna think about that for a minute...?

Bob