

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

Chapter 1 : Biblical Thinking Students: On the Pragmatism Worldview

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

The tender minded tend to be idealistic, optimistic and religious, while the tough minded are normally materialist, pessimistic and irreligious. But this has not weakened religious belief. People need a philosophy that is both empiricist in its adherence to facts yet finds room for religious belief. For James, then, Pragmatism is important because it offers a way of overcoming the dilemma, a way of seeing that, for example, science, morality and religion are not in competition. To attain perfect clearness in our thoughts of an object, then, we need only consider what conceivable effects of a practical kind the object may involve—“what sensations we are to expect from it, and what reactions we must prepare. This human witness tries to get sight of the squirrel by moving rapidly round the tree, but no matter how fast he goes, the squirrel moves as fast in the opposite direction, and always keeps the tree between himself and the man, so that never a glimpse of him is caught. The resultant metaphysical problem now is this: Does the man go round the squirrel or not? Pragmatic clarification disambiguates the question, and once that is done, all dispute comes to an end. So James offers his pragmatism as a technique for clarifying concepts and hypotheses. He proposed that if we do this, metaphysical disputes that appear to be irresolvable will be dissolved. When philosophers suppose that free will and determinism are in conflict, James responds that once we compare the practical consequences of determinism being true with the practical consequences of our possessing freedom of the will, we find that there is no conflict. As James admitted, he explained the pragmatic method through examples rather than by giving a detailed analysis of what it involves. He made no claim to originality: Peirce and James participated in these discussions along with some other philosophers and philosophically inclined lawyers. As we have already noted, Peirce developed these ideas in his publications from the s. As we shall see there were differences in how they understood the method and in their views of how it was to be applied. Later thinkers, for example John Dewey and C. Lewis, developed pragmatism further. This was tied to the study of the normative standards we should adopt when carrying out inquiries, when trying to find things out. Sections 2 and 3 will be concerned, primarily, with pragmatism in the narrow sense. Then, in section 4, we shall explore some of the views that are associated with pragmatism in the wider sense. The pragmatist maxim As we have seen, the pragmatist maxim is a distinctive rule or method for becoming reflectively clear about the contents of concepts and hypotheses: This raises some questions. What sort of thing does it recognize as a practical consequence of some theory or claim? Second, what use does such a maxim have? Why do we need it? And third, what reason is there for thinking that the pragmatist maxim is correct? Consider what effects, which might conceivably have practical bearings, we conceive the object of our conception to have. Then, our conception of those effects is the whole of our conception of the object. For all his loyalty to it, Peirce acknowledged that this formulation was vague: The principle has a verificationist character: This is clear from his later formulations, for example: The entire intellectual purport of any symbol consists in the total of all general modes of rational conduct which, conditionally upon all the possible different circumstances and desires, would ensue upon the acceptance of the symbol. We become clearer about the concept hard, for example, by identifying how there can be conceivable circumstances in which we have desires that would call for different patterns of action if some object were hard from those it would call for if the object were not hard. If I want to break a window by throwing something through it, then I need an object which is hard, not one which is soft. It is important that, as Peirce hints here, the consequences we are concerned with are general ones: Sometimes he writes as if the practical consequences of a proposition can simply be effects upon the believer: Peirce sees uses for his maxim which extend beyond those that James had in mind. He insisted that it was a logical principle and it was defended as an important component of the method of science, his favoured

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

method for carrying out inquiries. This is reflected in the applications of the maxim that we find in his writings. First, he used it to clarify hard concepts that had a role in scientific reasoning: We shall discuss his view of truth below. It also had a role in scientific testing. The pragmatist clarification of a scientific hypothesis, for example, provides us with just the information we need for testing it empirically. In later work, Peirce insisted that the maxim revealed all the information that was need for theory testing and evaluation EP2: The pragmatist clarification revealed all the information we would need for testing hypotheses and theories empirically. As Peirce described contemporary versions of this distinction, the highest grade of clarity, distinctness is obtained when we can analyze a concept for example into its elements by providing a verbal definition. This was provided by applying the pragmatist maxim. As well as treating the pragmatist maxim as part of a constructive account of the norms that govern inquiry, Peirce, like James, gave it a negative role. A more vivid non-logical example of using the concept to undermine spurious metaphysical ideas was in showing that the Catholic understanding of transubstantiation was empty and incoherent EP1: Here another difference between James and Peirce emerges. James made no concerted attempt to show or prove that the principle of pragmatism was correct. In his lectures, he put it into practice, solving problems about squirrels, telling us the meaning of truth, explaining how we can understand propositions about human freedom or about religious matters. But in the end, inspired by these applications, we are encouraged to adopt the maxim and see how well things work out when we do so. Since Peirce presented the maxim as part of the method of science, as a logical or, perhaps better, methodological principle, he thought that it was important to argue for it. Indeed, after , he devoted much of his energy to showing that the maxim could receive a mathematical proof. He used several strategies for this. In , he relied upon the idea that beliefs are habits of action: Applying the pragmatist maxim to the clarification of a proposition, he argued, involved describing the habits of action we would acquire if we believed it EP1: In the lectures on pragmatism which he delivered at Harvard in , he adopted a different strategy. He offered a detailed account of the cognitive activities we carried out when we used the method of science: His strategy then was to argue that the pragmatist clarifications brought to the surface all the information that was required for responsible abductive reasoning, and that our use of inductive and deductive arguments made no use of conceptual resources that could show that pragmatism was mistaken. Although he remained optimistic of success in this, he was never satisfied with his results. Pragmatist theories of truth These differences in motivation become clearest when we consider how both Peirce and James applied their pragmatist maxims to the clarification of the concept of truth. It possesses a form of unreflective clarity: It is at this stage that the concept of truth enters the discussion: So we have to turn to his remarks about truth to see how the kind of mind-independence captured in the abstract definition of reality is to be understood from a pragmatist perspective. This reflects a law which is evident from scientific experience: So with all scientific research. Different minds may set out with the most antagonistic views, but the progress of investigation carries them by a force outside of themselves to one and the same conclusion. This activity of thought by which we are carried, not where we wish, but to a foreordained goal, is like the operation of destiny. No modification of the point of view taken, no selection of other facts for study, no natural bent of mind even, can enable a man to escape the predestinate opinion. The opinion which is fated to be ultimately agreed to by all who investigate, is what we mean by the truth, and the object represented in this opinion is the real. That is the way I would explain reality. These thoughts, however, have been caused by sensations, and those sensations are constrained by something out of the mind. This thing out of the mind, which directly influences sensation, and through sensation thought, because it is out of the mind, is independent of how we think it, and is, in short, the real. It is explained in terms of this fated agreement of convergence through the process of inquiry rather than in terms of an independent cause of our sensations. It articulates a metaphysical picture that all pragmatists tried to combat. See Misak , 69f where Cheryl Misak emphasises that Peirce does not offer a traditional analysis of truth. Rather, he provides an account of some of the relations between the concepts of truth, belief, and inquiry, She describes this as a naturalistic understanding of truth, and calls it an anthropological account of how the concept is used. And his writings on this topic rapidly became notorious.

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

They are characteristically lively, offering contrasting formulations, engaging slogans, and intriguing claims which often seem to fly in the face of common sense. We can best summarize his view through his own words: The true is the name of whatever proves itself to be good in the way of belief, and good, too, for definite assignable reasons. Expedient in almost any fashion; and expedient in the long run and on the whole, of course. Ideas are become true just in so far as they help us to get into satisfactory relations with other parts of our experience. This suggests that a belief can be made true by the fact that holding it contributes to our happiness and fulfilment. This is unfair; at best, James is committed to the claim that the happiness that belief in Santa Claus provides is truth-relevant. It is easy to see that, unless it is somehow insulated from the broader effects of acting upon it, belief in Santa Claus could lead to a host of experiential surprises and disappointments. The pragmatist tradition So far, we have concentrated on the pragmatist maxim, the rule for clarifying ideas that, for both Peirce and James, was the core of pragmatism. When we think of pragmatism as a philosophical tradition rather than as a maxim or principle, we can identify a set of philosophical views and attitudes which are characteristic of pragmatism, and which can lead us to identify as pragmatists many philosophers who are somewhat sceptical about the maxim and its applications. Some of these views may be closely related to the maxim and its defence, but we shall now explore them rather as distinctive characteristics of the pragmatist tradition. Like some other philosophers, the pragmatists saw themselves as providing a return to common sense and the facts of experience and, thus, as rejecting a flawed philosophical heritage which had distorted the work of earlier thinkers. In each case, Descartes self-consciously made a break with the scholastic tradition, and, in each case, the outlook that he rejected turns out to be the outlook of the successful sciences and to provide the perspective required for contemporary philosophy. We are to try to doubt propositions and we should retain them only if they are absolutely certain and we are unable to doubt them. The test of certainty, as Peirce next points out, lies in the individual consciousness: And the examination of our beliefs is guided by reflection on hypothetical possibilities: See Hookway , chapters 2,3.

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

Chapter 2 : The Biblical World View of the 2

Christian Books & Bibles Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App. Then you can start reading Kindle books on your smartphone, tablet, or computer - no Kindle device required.

James has been important to me. In fact, James is on the cover of one of my books. William James is one of the founders of American pragmatism. And in a post in I made the argument that progressive Christianity--the emerging church movement was my focus at the time--should jettison its dance with post-modernity and embrace the epistemology of American pragmatism. As an epistemological home, pragmatism is a much better fit for progressive and "emergent" Christianity. And while a reflection about the emerging church movement might seem a bit dated, I think these reflections are still very relevant to progressive Christianity. Here is how I made the argument back then: One of the distinctives of the emerging church conversation, and progressive Christianity generally, is an emphasis on orthopraxy over orthodoxy. That is, right living orthopraxy is considered to be more or equally important than believing the right things orthodoxy. One of the Five Streams is that the emerging church is praxis-oriented: At its core, the emerging movement is an attempt to fashion a new ecclesiology doctrine of the church. Its distinctive emphases can be seen in its worship, its concern with orthopraxy, and its missional orientation. Again, this praxis-orientation elevates orthopraxy to the same level of importance as orthodoxy: A notable emphasis of the emerging movement is orthopraxy, that is, right living. The contention is that how a person lives is more important than what he or she believes. Many will immediately claim that we need both or that orthopraxy flows from orthodoxy. Most in the emerging movement agree we need both, but they contest the second claim: Experience does not prove that those who believe the right things live the right way. No matter how much sense the traditional connection makes, it does not necessarily work itself out in practice. Public scandals in the church--along with those not made public--prove this point time and again. Here is an emerging, provocative way of saying it: But the focus is shifted. Gibbs and Bolger define emerging churches as those who practice "the way of Jesus" in the postmodern era. Jesus declared that we will be judged according to how we treat the least of these Matt. In addition, every judgment scene in the Bible is portrayed as a judgment based on works; no judgment scene looks like a theological articulation test. Peter Rollins in his book *How Not to Speak of God*, a book that shaped the emerging church conversation and still articulates what many progressive Christians believe, goes a bit further than what is described above by McKnight. Specifically, Rollins defines truth as a soteriological event. Here John equates the existence of religious knowledge with the act of love. Knowledge of God the Truth as a set of propositions is utterly absent; instead he claims that those who exhibit a genuine love know God, regardless of their religious system, while those who do not love cannot know God, again regardless of their religious system. Truth is thus understood as a soteriological event. What Rollins is claiming here is fairly radical. And I agree with him. Loving orthopraxy saves us. Or, rather, believing in Jesus orthodoxy is to live like Jesus orthopraxy. In the formulation of St. Whoever does not love does not know. A way to summarize all this is to say that truth and its consequences are impossible to separate. More strongly, in some contexts truth is determined by the consequences. Now what I find interesting about all this, and this is my point, is that many progressive Christians are simply articulating the views of William James and the American pragmatists. The ultimate test for us of what a truth means is the conduct it dictates or inspires. More from William James: How will the truth be realized? What experiences will be different from those which would obtain if the belief were false? Here religious knowledge is not something that it opposed to love, nor secondary to it; rather, the only religious knowledge worth anything is love. God is not revealed via our words but rather via the life of the transformed individual. Compare that statement from Rollins with this from William James: The very meaning of the conception of God lies in the differences which must be made in our experience. All that to say, I think progressive Christianity has tended to ground its epistemology in the

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

wrong place. By their fruits you will know them. And so says the American pragmatists. This entry was posted by Richard Beck. I believe it points directly to one of the illusions that Evangelical Christianity has comforted itself with, but is now being sliced to ribbons. And that illusion is the comforting lie when a Christian who has been caught in one scandal or another that says, "This is a weakness for me. Or, for the abusive church member who bullies others into submission. But, "the world", as others are referred to by evangelicals, are getting wise to such. So what is the answer? Of course, we all know, the challenge is reconciling how we are supposed to live with how we actually live. That was exactly what Paul was alluding to in Romans chapter 7 when he wrote that he did not do what he knows he should do, but does the very things he hates. And the answer is not as simple, as some would like to believe, "Well, ALL we have to do is get the timber out of our own eyes, then we can point to the splinters in the eyes of others". Because, even if we can pull a timber or two out of our own, it still leaves splinters. Paul reminds us that all the commandments are summed up in "Love one another", understanding that the using and the inflicting of pain on another, either through power, sex, etc, is the sin of not loving the person. However, the other part of this great responsibility, of living, is the showing and the giving of mercy; to not let ourselves be fooled by the lie that says, "My sin is just a small raindrop being carried along against my will by the storm of immorality across our land; its the others who have caused the storm". It is, in fact, to face the most humbling truth that makes us turn to God and to "the world" and whisper, "Please forgive me"; and that is the truth that real mercy is understanding that we are called upon by Christ to show and give more than we can ever reserve for ourselves. Jesse on Thursday, May 22, said: I love William James! Whitehead and process thought is hugely indebted to James who, as process people claim, was definitely a process thinker, especially when he describes reality as not things but "things in the making. It could be said James was doing a process-based pragmatist metaphysics. The nexus you Richard identify between postmodernism, pragmatism, and American Christianity is huge. It is the epistemology that allows Christ followers to operate in a post-modern world. Atheist philosopher Richard Rorty identified the source of american post-modernism as simply being pragmatism restated. Many early holiness theologians were educated at universities where pragmatists were influential faculty and William James had a documented personal and intellectual relationship with Hannah Whitall Smith an influential 19th century holiness author. James taught her children at Harvard and in private correspondence I believe called her the "mother of pragmatism. Pierce as significant for his recent book. R Vogel on Thursday, May 22, said: I realize I enjoy your posts so much more than typical theological posts because your thoughts are so often grounded in the actual understanding of the human animal through your background in psychology rather than theoretical speculations. It has been fun to watch the atheistic philosophers react to the recent comments by Neil de Grasse about philosophy as he is leveling the same criticism at their discipline that is at the core of his objection to religion, and I think it is a pragmatic criticism Your post does bring up something interesting that I have batted around for quite some time regarding belief and causality. In the tug-of-war between praxy and doxy I wonder if beliefs are really the ultimate cause of anything - as you mentioned the examples are too numerous to count of people who profess a belief that is nowhere to be found in their actual actions. Is the corollary true?

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

Chapter 3 : Pragmatism - Wikipedia

Editorial team. General Editors: David Bourget (Western Ontario) David Chalmers (ANU, NYU) Area Editors: David Bourget Gwen Bradford.

Nature the universe or cosmos consists only of natural elements, that is, of spatiotemporal physical substance— mass — energy. Non-physical or quasi-physical substance , such as information , ideas , values , logic , mathematics , intellect , and other emergent phenomena , either supervene upon the physical or can be reduced to a physical account; Nature operates by the laws of physics and in principle, can be explained and understood by science and philosophy; The supernatural does not exist, i. Naturalism is therefore a metaphysical philosophy opposed primarily by Biblical creationism". Danto states that Naturalism, in recent usage, is a species of philosophical monism according to which whatever exists or happens is natural in the sense of being susceptible to explanation through methods which, although paradigmatically exemplified in the natural sciences, are continuous from domain to domain of objects and events. Hence, naturalism is polemically defined as repudiating the view that there exists or could exist any entities which lie, in principle, beyond the scope of scientific explanation. These assumptions—a paradigm—comprise a collection of beliefs, values and techniques that are held by a given scientific community, which legitimize their systems and set the limitations to their investigation. These assumptions are justified partly by their adherence to the types of occurrence of which we are directly conscious, and partly by their success in representing the observed facts with a certain generality, devoid of ad hoc suppositions. The scientific method is to be used to investigate all reality, including the human spirit: Nevertheless its very existence is assumed. As infants we made this assumption unconsciously. People are happy to make this assumption that adds meaning to our sensations and feelings, than live with solipsism. For the most part, science is the discovering and explaining of the external world. The benefit of SRS is that the investigator is guaranteed to choose a sample that represents the population that ensures statistically valid conclusions. Metaphysical naturalism Metaphysical naturalism, also called "ontological naturalism" and "philosophical naturalism", is a philosophical worldview and belief system that holds that there is nothing but natural elements, principles, and relations of the kind studied by the natural sciences , i. Methodological naturalism, on the other hand, refers exclusively to the methodology of science, for which metaphysical naturalism provides only one possible ontological foundation. Broadly, the corresponding theological perspective is religious naturalism or spiritual naturalism. More specifically, metaphysical naturalism rejects the supernatural concepts and explanations that are part of many religions. Alternatives to natural selection Methodological naturalism concerns itself with methods of learning what nature is. These methods are useful in the evaluation of claims about existence and knowledge and in identifying causal mechanisms responsible for the emergence of physical phenomena. It attempts to explain and test scientific endeavors, hypotheses, and events with reference to natural causes and events. This second sense of the term "naturalism" seeks to provide a framework within which to conduct the scientific study of the laws of nature. Methodological naturalism is a way of acquiring knowledge. It is a distinct system of thought concerned with a cognitive approach to reality, and is thus a philosophy of knowledge. Studies by sociologist Elaine Ecklund suggest that religious scientists in practice apply methodological naturalism. They report that their religious beliefs affect the way they think about the implications - often moral - of their work, but not the way they practice science. Pennock wrote using the term "methodological naturalism" to clarify that the scientific method confines itself to natural explanations without assuming the existence or non-existence of the supernatural, and is not based on dogmatic metaphysical naturalism as claimed by creationists and proponents of intelligent design , in particular by Phillip E. While supernatural explanations may be important and have merit, they are not part of science. Plantinga argues that together, naturalism and evolution provide an insurmountable "defeater for the belief that our cognitive faculties are reliable", i. My claim was that naturalism and contemporary evolutionary theory are at serious odds with one another - and

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

this despite the fact that the latter is ordinarily thought to be one of the main pillars supporting the edifice of the former. Of course I am not attacking the theory of evolution, or anything in that neighborhood; I am instead attacking the conjunction of naturalism with the view that human beings have evolved in that way. I see no similar problems with the conjunction of theism and the idea that human beings have evolved in the way contemporary evolutionary science suggests. More particularly, I argued that the conjunction of naturalism with the belief that we human beings have evolved in conformity with current evolutionary doctrine Pennock[edit] Robert T. Pennock contends [36] that as supernatural agents and powers "are above and beyond the natural world and its agents and powers" and "are not constrained by natural laws", only logical impossibilities constrain what a supernatural agent could not do. As the supernatural is necessarily a mystery to us, it can provide no grounds on which to judge scientific models. But by definition we have no control over supernatural entities or forces. As a practical consideration, the rejection of supernatural explanations would merely be pragmatic, thus it would nonetheless be possible, for an ontological supernaturalist to espouse and practice methodological naturalism. For example, scientists may believe in God while practicing methodological naturalism in their scientific work. This position does not preclude knowledge that is somehow connected to the supernatural. Generally however, anything that can be scientifically examined and explained would not be supernatural, simply by definition. Quine[edit] Main article: Quine describes naturalism as the position that there is no higher tribunal for truth than natural science itself. In his view, there is no better method than the scientific method for judging the claims of science, and there is neither any need nor any place for a "first philosophy", such as abstract metaphysics or epistemology , that could stand behind and justify science or the scientific method. Therefore, philosophy should feel free to make use of the findings of scientists in its own pursuit, while also feeling free to offer criticism when those claims are ungrounded, confused, or inconsistent. Instead, it simply holds that science is the best way to explore the processes of the universe and that those processes are what modern science is striving to understand. However, this Quinean Replacement Naturalism finds relatively few supporters among philosophers. He rejected it based on his general critique of induction see problem of induction , yet acknowledged its utility as means for inventing conjectures. A naturalistic methodology sometimes called an "inductive theory of science" has its value, no doubt I reject the naturalistic view: Its upholders fail to notice that whenever they believe to have discovered a fact, they have only proposed a convention. Hence the convention is liable to turn into a dogma. This criticism of the naturalistic view applies not only to its criterion of meaning, but also to its idea of science, and consequently to its idea of empirical method. Popper instead proposed that science should adopt a methodology based on falsifiability for demarcation , because no number of experiments can ever prove a theory, but a single experiment can contradict one. Popper holds that scientific theories are characterized by falsifiability.

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

Chapter 4 : AFA Store - Personhood: A Pragmatic Guide to Pro-life Victory Book

*A progressive world view for pragmatic Christians [Joseph T. Culliton] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

I had three thousand out in 20 minutes. He was questioned, jailed and later released on bail. Whatcott faces a hearing on Sept. He has also lost his job as a result of the criminal charge. While some have found the hate crimes charge to be of concern, others have similarly raised questions over the manner in which Whatcott sought to do evangelism. I believe the operation only succeeded because of His help to enable us to accomplish this goal. And Whatcott was still sued and arrested and charged with a hate crime. The word of the cross is still foolishness to those perishing 1 Cor. Paul said he is not ashamed of the gospel, and it showed in his life. He was beaten with rods, lashed with whips, stoned at least once. They were thrown into arenas and mauled by wild beasts. They were covered with pitch and set on fire. They were crushed by giant weights. They had their tongues yanked out of their mouths. They watched as their children were dashed against rocks. They spent decades in rat-infested dungeons. Because the gospel was enough! Enough with the zombie suits and the ballets and the barbecues. Go and preach the gospel! Go and die for the sake of the gospel! Go and lose your job for the sake of the gospel! Dear Reader, has ChristianNews. For many years now, the Lord has seen fit to use this small news outlet as a strong influential resource in keeping Christians informed on current events from a Biblical worldview. If you have benefited from our news coverage, would you please prayerfully consider becoming a Christian News supporter by clicking here to make a one-time or monthly donation to help keep the truth widely and freely published and distributed? May Christ continue to be exalted through this work! We welcome readers to comment on stories, but we will not tolerate remarks containing profanity, vulgarity, violence, blasphemy, all caps or any discourteous behavior. Thank you for your cooperation in maintaining a respectful public environment where readers can engage in reasonable discussion about matters affecting our nation and our world.

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

Chapter 5 : Progressivism - Worldview Leadership Institute

John Dewey is considered both the father of progressive (socialist) education and the father of pragmatism, which can be stated in essence as "if it works-it's good." I have found that many Christians prefer to take a pragmatic approach to life, business, church, family, economics, politics and more.

Bush leadership styles and to mask his ideological past and his current presidential policies. One must also question whether any notion of basing U. For all those who praise Mr. Obama for his pragmatism, it begs the question, at what price pragmatic? If we in fact conclude that Mr. Are Americans left with a President that either affronts the U. Not an attractive set of questions for Americas to answer. A president who will bridge the ideological gaps of left and right and then forge a road towards American success. Christopher Hayes , in a Dec. Obama as an admirable pragmatic populist progressive thinker. Jarrett can sum up their views in Mr. He really wants to get things done". Get things done, indeed. Get things done by any means necessary, pragmatic or otherwise and damn the U. Constitution, but as a tool for his means. President Obama has also not been shy about cloaking his ideological worldview penchants in the name of pragmatism. Norman Ornstein, no less of the American Enterprise Institute, has penned two articles claiming President Obama is a pragmatic leader. Ornstein states the following, "This president is a mainstream, pragmatic moderate, operating in the center of American politics; center-left, perhaps, but not left of center. Pragmatism is commonly understood as a practical approach to problems and affairs; however its roots run much deeper. Pragmatism is a philosophical movement, developed in the United States, which holds that both the meaning and the truth of any idea is a function of its practical outcome. Pragmatists claim that an ideology or proposition is true if it works satisfactorily, that the meaning of a proposition is to be found in the practical consequences of accepting it, and that unpractical ideas are to be rejected. Fundamental to pragmatism is a strong anti-absolutism and a philosophy of mutable truth and ideas that are true insofar as they are useful in a specific situation; what works today in one case may not work tomorrow in another case. Ethical ideas are accepted as long as they continue to work. The standard of moral truth is expediency. A Story of Ideas in America" they all believed that, " It was the children Dewey targeted as the means by which to obtain his desire. Dewey dismissed as irrelevant the teaching of fundamental knowledge such as reading, writing, math, and science. Both the educator and the students are to be flexible and tentative. His purpose of a school was to foster social consciousness. The school would be an embryonic socialist community in which the progress of the student could only be justified by his relation to the group. John Dewey wanted government to take over all education via government schools. Dewey advocated a relativistic truth and moral values are not absolute but are relative to the persons or groups holding them , secularized form of altruism that calls for sacrificing oneself to attain the ends of the People. In this view society, rather than the individual, passes moral judgment. Social policies are measured by their consequences instead of by abstract principles of what is right or just. This Manifesto, authored primarily by educators at the University of Chicago and Columbia University, was a total and complete abdication of theism--God does not exist! A socialized and cooperative economic order must be established to the end that the equitable distribution of the means of life be possible. The goal of humanism is a free and universal society in which people voluntarily and intelligently cooperate for the common good. Humanists demand a shared life in a shared world. One only needs to review his remarks prior to his ascent to the presidency. In some ways we still suffer from that. Obama writes on p. Under the Darwinian imperative of pragmatism, we must be prepared to discard our old ideas as readily as we discard our old tools. President Obama brings home his Deweyian worldview beliefs when he made his Berlin Wall anniversary speech on July 24, In his speech he said the following, "the walls between the countries with the most and those with the least cannot stand â€ the walls between â€ natives and immigrants These now are the walls that we must tear down. We know they have fallen before. After centuries of strife, the people of Europe have formed a Union of promise and prosperity. Hayes, Ornstein et alia pragmatism defense is all fatally flawed. As a law professor Obama was

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

known as a pragmatic when it came to interpreting the Constitution. He utilized the Constitution simply as a tool to find the sweet spot on how to level-set societal needs, avoiding any high theory when it came to Constitutional interpretation. Obama as a minimalist skeptical of court-led efforts at social change and a structuralist interested in how the law metes out power in society. And more than anything else, he is a pragmatist who urged those around him to be more keenly attuned to the real-life impact of decisions. This may be his distinguishing quality as a legal thinker: Obama rarely spoke of his own views, students say they sensed his disdain for formalism, the idea “often espoused by Justices Scalia and Clarence Thomas, but sometimes by liberals as well” that law can be decided independent of the political and social context in which it is applied. His pragmatic encroachments on the Constitution to advance his worldview is unprecedented. To date thirteen states have challenged ObamaCare as unconstitutional. President Obama now has almost three dozen of these policy analysts working in the White House. In the past, Congress has created about a dozen offices for the president with the top position held by a Senate-confirmed presidential appointee. Obama has tripled this number and none of his new czars have been confirmed by the Senate. This is beyond any constitutional executive powers; this is legislating by presidential fiat. Article 2, Section 2 of the Constitution says: The heart of his philosophy is not pragmatism. That is simply a means to an end to create a worldview of collectivism. The Constitution is merely a tool for Mr. Obama to apply pragmatic thought to achieve his worldview. He will employ pragmatic theory to advance his worldview regardless of how much it infringes on the tenants of the U. Ideology and pragmatism, by nature, are mutually exclusive. The President has managed to convince his loyalists that he is, as Mr. A neat trick that our President has been able to pull on willing believers, until one peels back the many layers of the Obama onion. So who is President Barack Hussein Obama? A Deweyian social pragmatist. A Humanist Manifesto devotee? Unfortunately, all of the above. He is a tsunami of ideologies, theories, manifestos and deconstructionism culminating in a mindset to transform the U. Collectivism achieved through statism, socialism or any other political philosophy sans capitalism, the one philosophy that flies in the face of mediocrity. A president is expected to worship at the Constitutional altar. President Obama treats it like an old machete to cleave through his version of societal injustices towards his collectivist worldview. Change by any means pragmatically necessary to meet his collectivist worldview. A presidency that is a cautionary tale for all current and future Americans.

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

Chapter 6 : Three Christian Views of Creation - FAQ

A processive world view for pragmatic Christians 2 copies A Processive World View for Pragmatic Christians 1 copy Non-violence, central to Christian spirituality: perspectives from 1 copy.

George Berkeley for his project to eliminate all unclear concepts from philosophy Peirce 8: Relevant discussion may be found on the talk page. Please do not remove this message until conditions to do so are met. February Learn how and when to remove this template message A few of the various but often interrelated positions characteristic of philosophers working from a pragmatist approach include: Coherentists hold that justification is solely a function of some relationship between beliefs, none of which are privileged beliefs in the way maintained by foundationalist theories of justification. Not to be confused with pragmatics , a sub-field of linguistics with no relation to philosophical pragmatism. Additionally, forms of empiricism , fallibilism , verificationism , and a Quinean naturalist metaphilosophy are all commonly elements of pragmatist philosophies. Many pragmatists are epistemological relativists and see this to be an important facet of their pragmatism, but this is controversial and other pragmatists argue such relativism to be seriously misguided e. Hilary Putnam , Susan Haack. Anti-reification of concepts and theories[edit] Dewey, in *The Quest For Certainty*, criticized what he called "the philosophical fallacy": This causes metaphysical and conceptual confusion. Various examples are the " ultimate Being " of Hegelian philosophers, the belief in a " realm of value ", the idea that logic, because it is an abstraction from concrete thought, has nothing to do with the act of concrete thinking, and so on. Hildebrand sums up the problem: They argued that idealist and realist philosophy had a tendency to present human knowledge as something beyond what science could grasp. They held that these philosophies then resorted either to a phenomenology inspired by Kant or to correspondence theories of knowledge and truth. Pragmatism instead tries to explain the relation between knower and known. In , [16] C. Peirce argued that there is no power of intuition in the sense of a cognition unconditioned by inference, and no power of introspection, intuitive or otherwise, and that awareness of an internal world is by hypothetical inference from external facts. Introspection and intuition were staple philosophical tools at least since Descartes. He argued that there is no absolutely first cognition in a cognitive process; such a process has its beginning but can always be analyzed into finer cognitive stages. That which we call introspection does not give privileged access to knowledge about the mindâ€”the self is a concept that is derived from our interaction with the external world and not the other way around De Waal , pp. At the same time he held persistently that pragmatism and epistemology in general could not be derived from principles of psychology understood as a special science: Richard Rorty expanded on these and other arguments in *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* in which he criticized attempts by many philosophers of science to carve out a space for epistemology that is entirely unrelated toâ€”and sometimes thought of as superior toâ€”the empirical sciences. Quine, instrumental in bringing naturalized epistemology back into favor with his essay *Epistemology Naturalized* Quine , also criticized "traditional" epistemology and its "Cartesian dream" of absolute certainty. The dream, he argued, was impossible in practice as well as misguided in theory, because it separates epistemology from scientific inquiry. Hilary Putnam asserts that the combination of antiskepticism and fallibilism is a central feature of pragmatism. Reconciliation of anti-skepticism and fallibilism[edit] Hilary Putnam has suggested that the reconciliation of anti-skepticism [19] and fallibilism is the central goal of American pragmatism. Genuine doubt irritates and inhibits, in the sense that belief is that upon which one is prepared to act. Inquiry is then the rationally self-controlled process of attempting to return to a settled state of belief about the matter. Note that anti-skepticism is a reaction to modern academic skepticism in the wake of Descartes. The pragmatist insistence that all knowledge is tentative is quite congenial to the older skeptical tradition. Pragmatist theory of truth and epistemology[edit] Main article: Pragmatic theory of truth Pragmatism was not the first to apply evolution to theories of knowledge: Here knowledge and action are portrayed as two separate spheres with an absolute or transcendental truth above and beyond any sort of inquiry organisms used to cope with life.

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

Pragmatism challenges this idealism by providing an "ecological" account of knowledge: Real and true are functional labels in inquiry and cannot be understood outside of this context. It is not realist in a traditionally robust sense of realism what Hilary Putnam would later call metaphysical realism , but it is realist in how it acknowledges an external world which must be dealt with. It is high time to urge the use of a little imagination in philosophy. The unwillingness of some of our critics to read any but the silliest of possible meanings into our statements is as discreditable to their imaginations as anything I know in recent philosophic history. Schiller says the truth is that which "works. Dewey says truth is what gives "satisfaction"! He is treated as one who believes in calling everything true which, if it were true, would be pleasant. See Dewey for a "FAQ. Is a belief valid when it represents reality? Copying is one and only one genuine mode of knowing, James , p. Are beliefs dispositions which qualify as true or false depending on how helpful they prove in inquiry and in action? Is it only in the struggle of intelligent organisms with the surrounding environment that beliefs acquire meaning? Does a belief only become true when it succeeds in this struggle? In Pragmatism nothing practical or useful is held to be necessarily true , nor is anything which helps to survive merely in the short term. In other fields of philosophy[edit] While pragmatism started out simply as a criterion of meaning, it quickly expanded to become a full-fledged epistemology with wide-ranging implications for the entire philosophical field. Pragmatists who work in these fields share a common inspiration, but their work is diverse and there are no received views. Philosophy of science[edit] In the philosophy of science, instrumentalism is the view that concepts and theories are merely useful instruments and progress in science cannot be couched in terms of concepts and theories somehow mirroring reality. Instrumentalist philosophers often define scientific progress as nothing more than an improvement in explaining and predicting phenomena. Instrumentalism does not state that truth does not matter, but rather provides a specific answer to the question of what truth and falsity mean and how they function in science. Outline of a Theory of Knowledge was that science does not merely provide a copy of reality but must work with conceptual systems and that those are chosen for pragmatic reasons, that is, because they aid inquiry. Lewis is sometimes called a proponent of conceptual pragmatism because of this. Morris and Rudolf Carnap. The influence of pragmatism on these writers is mostly limited to the incorporation of the pragmatic maxim into their epistemology. Pragmatists with a broader conception of the movement do not often refer to them. The other is reductionism, the theory that each meaningful statement gets its meaning from some logical construction of terms which refers exclusively to immediate experience. Logic[edit] Later in his life Schiller became famous for his attacks on logic in his textbook, Formal Logic. Schiller sought to undermine the very possibility of formal logic, by showing that words only had meaning when used in context. In this sequel, Logic for Use, Schiller attempted to construct a new logic to replace the formal logic that he had criticized in Formal Logic. What he offers is something philosophers would recognize today as a logic covering the context of discovery and the hypothetico-deductive method. Schiller dismissed the possibility of formal logic, most pragmatists are critical rather of its pretension to ultimate validity and see logic as one logical tool among othersâ€”or perhaps, considering the multitude of formal logics, one set of tools among others. This is the view of C. Peirce developed multiple methods for doing formal logic. Metaphysics[edit] James and Dewey were empirical thinkers in the most straightforward fashion: They were dissatisfied with ordinary empiricism because in the tradition dating from Hume, empiricists had a tendency to think of experience as nothing more than individual sensations. To the pragmatists, this went against the spirit of empiricism: Pragmatism is sometimes called American Pragmatism because so many of its proponents were and are Americans. William James gives an interesting example of this philosophical shortcoming: The two were supposed, he said, to have so little to do with each other, that you could not possibly occupy your mind with them at the same time. The world of concrete personal experiences to which the street belongs is multitudinous beyond imagination, tangled, muddy, painful and perplexed. The world to which your philosophy-professor introduces you is simple, clean and noble. The contradictions of real life are absent from it. In it, Schiller argues for a middle ground between materialism and absolute metaphysics. These opposites are comparable to what William James called tough-minded empiricism and tender-minded rationalism.

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

Schiller contends on the one hand that mechanistic naturalism cannot make sense of the "higher" aspects of our world. These include freewill, consciousness, purpose, universals and some would add God. On the other hand, abstract metaphysics cannot make sense of the "lower" aspects of our world. While Schiller is vague about the exact sort of middle ground he is trying to establish, he suggests that metaphysics is a tool that can aid inquiry, but that it is valuable only insofar as it does help in explanation. In the second half of the twentieth century, Stephen Toulmin argued that the need to distinguish between reality and appearance only arises within an explanatory scheme and therefore that there is no point in asking what "ultimate reality" consists of. More recently, a similar idea has been suggested by the postanalytic philosopher Daniel Dennett, who argues that anyone who wants to understand the world has to acknowledge both the "syntactical" aspects of reality. These questions feature prominently in current debates about the relationship between religion and science, where it is often assumed that "most pragmatists would disagree" that science degrades everything that is meaningful into "merely" physical phenomena. Philosophy of mind [edit] Both John Dewey in *Experience and Nature* and half a century later Richard Rorty in his *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* argued that much of the debate about the relation of the mind to the body results from conceptual confusions. They argue instead that there is no need to posit the mind or mindstuff as an ontological category. Pragmatists disagree over whether philosophers ought to adopt a quietist or a naturalist stance toward the mind-body problem. Pragmatic ethics Pragmatism sees no fundamental difference between practical and theoretical reason, nor any ontological difference between facts and values. Both facts and values have cognitive content: Pragmatist ethics is broadly humanist because it sees no ultimate test of morality beyond what matters for us as humans. Good values are those for which we have good reasons, viz. The pragmatist formulation pre-dates those of other philosophers who have stressed important similarities between values and facts such as Jerome Schneewind and John Searle. William James tried to show the meaningfulness of some kinds of spirituality but, like other pragmatists, did not see religion as the basis of meaning or morality. On its own terms it argues that ethics always involves a certain degree of trust or faith and that we cannot always wait for adequate proof when making moral decisions. Moral questions immediately present themselves as questions whose solution cannot wait for sensible proof. A moral question is a question not of what sensibly exists, but of what is good, or would be good if it did exist. Wherever a desired result is achieved by the co-operation of many independent persons, its existence as a fact is a pure consequence of the precursive faith in one another of those immediately concerned. A government, an army, a commercial system, a ship, a college, an athletic team, all exist on this condition, without which not only is nothing achieved, but nothing is even attempted.

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

Chapter 7 : A Conservative Proposal with a Progressive Soul [3of3] | Hacking Christianity

But the progressive worldview's virtuous violence takes a different form: that of the pseudoppressed battling their pseudoppressors. The more extreme Progressive Crusaders may use progressively-virtuous violence in their battle against their perceived oppressors.

Pragmatism has its merits, but today it is undermining authentic Christianity and our call to biblical faithfulness. In the quest for more nickels and noses, many church leaders lean more toward political correctness, cultural relevance, image promotion and the notion that size equals success in the eyes of God. Charismatic sideshows parade preachers of imbalanced material prosperity, self-promotion and embarrassing flashy lifestyles, which both the world and the younger generation see through as hype. I read of one church that advertises, "Express worship, 45 minutes, guaranteed! Pretentious and unnecessary labeling with prestigious titles is also present. Some churches hire public relations firms to gain greater visibility. I saw a recent full-page ad portraying the "new face of ministry" with such superlatives as "powerful He was in transition and shared with me some insights regarding biblical and traditional models of the church. He gave me permission to use them but I want to credit him as they are adapted in the following paragraphs. An organization much like a club, or an organism-the living body of Christ? The people or the ascended Christ? A constitution or the whole Word of God? Attenders at a weekly service, or brothers and sisters who are part of a real spiritual family? Mere spectators or true participants? Democracy or theocracy God directly leading through the Word and the Holy Spirit? Recruit a professional for a job or recognize God-given, called ministers? Preach sermons and conduct services, or glorify God by equipping people to fulfill their ministry? Church building at stated times, or church facility, homes and in the marketplace all the time? Attract people with whatever works, or glorify God by fully obeying His Word? Buildings, bucks, bodies and breaking attendance records, or follow the biblical pattern to build up the body and reach the world with the gospel? What the people want, or what God declares and the people need? Get converts addition or make disciples multiplication? Whatever makes people feel good and keep coming back, or hearing and applying the current Word from God? Highlighting a one-man ministry, or a team approach drawing upon apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers? Minister hired to do a job, or a team of leaders with one senior who seek God and lead the flock as Scripture directs? Subtly control the church and keep leaders in line, or handle the practical needs of the church so ministers can "give themselves to the ministry of the Word and prayer"? Human ingenuity, marketing techniques and available funds obtained through pleading, pressure and projection of guilt, or teaching stewardship principles and trusting God to provide for legitimate needs? Given to anyone willing, or called, anointed, godly, faithful and proven servants? Conditional acceptance or unconditional acceptance? A church that has a reputation for being alive but is really dead Rev. As Jesus assessed the seven churches in the book of Revelation, how would He assess your local church? What is your assessment? What is God currently saying to you as He endeavors to awaken His church and restore it as a bride adorned for her soon-coming King? The ways of God are becoming so clear and so simple, only the obedient will follow. He was in a season of transition and shared with me some observations on traditional versus biblical church models. I was inspired by the material and later included it in my book Reckless Abandon. He said I could have the permission to use it and I credit Him for these insights that I have adapted for today. Larry Tomczak is a best-selling author and cultural commentator with over 40 years of trusted ministry experience. His passion is to bring perspective, analysis and insight from a biblical worldview.

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

Chapter 8 : TONY JONES ARGUES FOR OPEN MARRIAGE AND POLYAMORY : Apprising Ministries

And in a post in I made the argument that progressive Christianity--the emerging church movement was my focus at the time--should jettison its dance with post-modernity and embrace the epistemology of American pragmatism.

Summary Principles The following are summaries of the discussion that follows. These statements involve nuances that are more fully discussed in the text. The concept of truth and many Biblical concepts is not well understood today because of a lack of attention to definitions that is found generally among pastors, teachers, and laymen alike. Philosophers throughout all history have sought for an objective standard for truth. Getting away from subjectivity in truth has always been the great dilemma. But, God has solved that problem for Christians: Every Bible verse, for example, John 3: Truth is a Person or Persons Trinity who knows everything in the universe and its relationship to everything else. Again, one of the great issues of truth throughout history has been the relationship of the subjective with the objective. In Christianity, we have that beautifully joined. God is fully objective totally impartial in His understanding while being a Person subjective. Truth is the 66 books of the Protestant Bible. Any claim that God has spoken truth to mankind in any other way or by additional content is heresy Revelation No one can tell the whole truth except God. Man can know the truth of the Bible. It is truth, not analogy. In every way that the Bible has been tested honestly and fairly, for example, archeology and evolutionary science, the Bible has been shown to be true. Christians deny the Word of God and its power by their actions. While God promises that the Bible has everything for life and godliness in every area of knowledge, too many Christians virtually ignore its knowledge outside of personal salvation. They are the same for God. In matters of truth and Scripture, he must give even more diligence, since these matters involve issues of eternity. However, a Biblical worldview is the most pragmatic system possible for mankind. The Pragmatic Test of Truth Virtually all Christians need to wrestle with the concept of truth, relative to the Bible and to a determination of truth outside the Bible. Certainly, the concept of truth should be discussed more in churches with practical application. The words to use are subject to debate, but efforts at this nomenclature is imperative to giving the Bible the authority that Christians and the world needs. Thus, only God can know truth. Faith has several definitions, and therefore, is misunderstood by most Christians. A corollary of 19 is that what one will accept as true is pre-determined by what one is willing to accept as true. This is subjective or personal truth. The only objective truth is the Protestant Bible. Logic has nothing to say about the truth of the propositions that are reasoned from, only the process by which conclusions are reached. Conclusions reasoned logically from truth are truth, also. But, propositions of falsehood which follow logical reasoning are still falsehoods. An enemy of God and His justice has no right to the truth from those who represent God and oppose this enemy. By most standards relative to such things, I am a layman. As a layman, I wish to have things simplified. As a scholar, I wish to have things coherent. That is, I wish that all parts are consistent with the whole. Coherency requires knowing and using precise definitions. Now, certainly, I find great thoughts from the many Christian thinkers that I have read. I marvel at the influence that Christianity might have in the culture of ideas on this one principle alone. From the renowned Bible teachers and preachers to the professionals physicians, Ph. For more, see Hermeneutics. Christ, as the sum total of knowledge. Christ, as the omniscient One that He is. Surely, as Christ is all these things, His people ought to be diligent students of words and language, not intellectual first-graders! We have much to say about this, but it is hard to explain because you are slow to learn. You need milk, not solid food! Anyone who lives on milk, being still an infant, is not acquainted with the teaching about righteousness. But solid food is for the mature, who by constant use have trained themselves to distinguish good from evil Hebrews 5: Oh, we know the Bible. Seminaries and libraries have thousands of volumes written by theologians from all ages from Augustine of Hippo to John Calvin to J. There is some great teaching there. Teaching from which I have benefited greatly. But, in every age and among almost all theologians, there is a lack of definitions, especially precise and coherent definitions. Do you know that there are at least four different uses of the word faith in the New Testament? Do

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

you know a Biblical definition of love? Do you know a Biblical definition of peace? For our purposes here, do you know both a biblical and secular definition of truth? Christianity is in the ghetto in the United States, intellectually. If we do not rise to the occasion, Christians may be in the ghetto literally. And, that occasion, in my opinion, is one that requires a precise understanding of both philosophical and Biblical knowledge. I simply want John 3: How does one understand John 3: How many gods are worshipped on this planet? For the true God, there are hundreds of names and characteristics of God throughout the Bible. What is Biblical love? Do you know that you cannot know the love of God in its fullness, if you do not know the Law of God Romans Is a gift that I help purchase or assist in its giving, truly a gift. Truth is the most important issue below that individual man or mankind itself faces. If truth does not exist, nothing else matters. If truth does not exist, anyone can do whatever they want and never be criticized by anyone else. I would have you make a list from or or or however long your list is, but I challenge you to make a list. As you do so, you will find that it is not so simple after all. What did the thief on the cross know? For surely, he was with Christ that day in heaven. Why will the humanist vigorously deny it and work to persecute Christians? Perhaps, there is no way to make John 3: Perhaps, one might understand the Trinity and the cataclysmic destruction that resulted from sin with a little more contemplation of the words of John 3: I will not deny that hundreds of thousands have been saved through this simple verse and through a simple gospel. And, that no Christian can understand John 3: And, finally, how can a Christian ever be satisfied with a stagnant knowledge of God and His salvation? Some dilettantes deny that Jesus ever answered this question because He did not answer Pilate when he posed the question. However, Jesus answered it on many other occasions. I have cited one above. He will glorify Me, for He will take of what is Mine and declare it to you John All true Christians believe that Jesus is the truth. So, philosophically, how do we understand and apply Jesus or the Trinity as the truth? Just this, truth becomes a Person or Persons - the Trinity. So, our first principle of truth is that truth is ultimately subjective -- that it is determined by a Person or Persons. The Trinity also answers another ethical dilemma, the problem of the one, the few, and the many. Righteousness for one requires righteousness for all. Or, what is right for one person is right for all people. Or, what is right for the individual is right for the family is right for a group is right for a city is right for a nation is right for the world.! But, that issue is for another time and place. Truth, then, is what God knows of an object or person. Truth is "reality" or Reality. But, we are not God, so what can we know of His mind.

DOWNLOAD PDF PROGRESSIVE WORLD VIEW FOR PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANS

Chapter 9 : Naturalism (philosophy) - Wikipedia

I also know that, for the first time in my life I've met Christians who are in "open" marriages or are practicing polyamory and I'm committed that my theological/ethical response to them be both Christian and pragmatic/realistic.

Part One focused on its role against the anonymous schismatic Part Two focused on its possibly congregationalist tendencies. All conservatism begins with loss These little griefs are what build a conservative temperament. They interrupt our story; and our story is what makes sense of our lives. So we resist the interruption; and when we resist it, we are conservatives. Page 10 The proposal, as written, allows conservatives to retain their story while just changing the chapters a bit. Conservatives lose very little. Conservative pastors would not be forced to do weddings, and conservative churches would be highly unlikely to get openly gay clergy. There is no loss to the local congregation or pastor from this proposal. Over time, however, they would experience loss. Just as more churches every year accept female clergy, more churches every year would sign on to allow same-gender weddings, and more and more annual conferences would allow LGBT clergy. However, the proposal also has a progressive soul. If conservatives begin with loss, progressives begin with a sense of justice. To seek a just framework for God, Church, Society, and Family is to be a progressive. To live beyond our Traditional understandings of humanity, God, and Creation in order to effect that more just framework. And yet at its core is a sense that our current ecclesiology is not just. It allows them to be in ministry with their context and forces areas who are not progressive to have the conversation. All too often the Church is a tail light in its surrounding culture. Women would get full voting abilities in America a full 36 years before they received the same consideration in the Methodist Church. Segregation was outlawed in , 14 years before the Central Jurisdiction would be abolished in the Methodist Church. To us at Hacking Christianity? We are better together, and something tells me, God is not through with a United Methodist Church, if we keep more good ideas like this coming. Schism , UMC Rev. Jeremy Smith is a United Methodist clergyperson who blogs about faith, young clergy issues, technology, internet theory, and geeky topics. Click here to learn more. You may reprint without permission but with attribution.