

REFLECTION & DISCUSSION QUESTIONS & ANSWERS UNIT 6:

- 1) Do you agree or disagree with the statement that Secular Combatants and Christian Combatants are more alike than they are different in terms of how they approach the interface of psychology and theology. Why or why not? Do you think members of the secular and sacred against models would be likely to engage each other in genuine dialogue? Why or why not?

Answer: I agree with the statement because they share the assumption that faith and reason can not be in agreement as a result share the same conclusion.

Do you think members of the secular and sacred against models would be likely to engage each other in genuine dialogue? Why or why not? I do not think they are to engage in dialogue. They would only make their point without compromise. Secular would argue that psychological health is incompatible with religious practice and sacred would argue that only Christians can fully understand the soul and only Scripture can provide the true remedy to the human condition.

- 2) How are Rebuilders different from, and similar to, Colonialists?

Answer: Colonists and rebuilders are similar in that they use the Scripture, Christian history, and theology yet rebuilders hold a higher regard for modern psychology. Whereas Colonists see it as foreign and are extremely cautious of it. Colonists use psychology to benefit their belief system, meaning if it does not fit with their beliefs it is not considered, whereas Rebuilders feel psychology belongs to the Creator and has only been overrun by those who do not acknowledge the savior. Both Rebuilders & Colonists agree that Scripture is front and center, yet within psychology they differ. The Colonists pick what they want leaving out what they feel doesn't line up with their beliefs while the Rebuilders try to integrate the two, being open to psychology, but holding true to their beliefs in the Creator.

- 3) How is the spy different from and similar to the colonists?

Answer: Spies use Christianity as so the Colonist, but are also open to non-Christian religions considering both to be psychological phenomena. Spies feel that religion could help or harm whereas Colonists see Christian religion as of utmost importance, only drawing from psychology what lines up with their belief. Spies are psychologists who seek to identify religious elements that have psychological benefits. Colonists however are not engaged in the field of psychology and are not psychologists. The Colonist

model holds true to their belief in Scripture and does not practice incorporating other religions into their model and psychology should be put under the authority of theology. Although the Spies model approaches religion as helpful, it does not make Christianity front and center as the Colonists. Spies only use religion as a tool for healing, they do not apply it as a foundational piece of their presentation.

- 4) Summarize the argument of the christian combatants version of the enemies model. Other than presuppositional concerns, what factors might encourage a committed christian to be opposed to psychology?

Answer: Secular combatants and Christian combatants are more alike than they are different in terms of how they approach psychology and or theology. Secular Combatants reject the views of Christianity, while Christian Combatants are suspicious of human reason and their aim is to protect religious authority and religious pronouncements against corruption by human reason. Christian Combatants see psychology as an enemy, one area they feel this way on is, psychotherapy, which is viewed as incompatible and unnecessary for Christians. Christian Combatants feel that those who rely on psychology for help are denying the dependence on God and that only Scripture can provide the true remedy to the human condition.

- 5) In your education and your personal experiences, how have you encountered the different versions of the enemies model?

Answer: Summary of the enemies model is psychology and theology are separate entities that are directly opposed to each other. Christian combatants are those that hold the Christian worldview but don't see any value in psychology, where secular combatants hold a psychological worldview but don't view Christianity as having any value. Christian combatants hold value but view God's Word to a higher value. The secular combatants only see value in the natural world, in God's Works but don't acknowledge it as created by God. Christian combatants: they hold value in Scripture and the study of finding theological truth; weaknesses. Secular combatants: hold value in reason and, and to find truth within the natural world. With myself being a Christian/Pastor, I see both needed but must stand on the word of God. Persons always try to excuse or condone their lives by escaping the word of God and its consequences. I see it all the time, yet the word of God always wins.

- 6) As you reflect on the nally case, what concerns do you have about it's potential implications for freedom of religion? Do you think that there should be a legal standard to evaluate the competence of pastoral counseling? Why or why not?

Answer: With myself being a senior Pastor, and the case being denied multiple times, GCC won by following the bible way and what the word of God says. This goes with discussing Christian Combatants. No, I don't think there should be a legal standard to evaluate the competence of pastoral counseling. Pastoral counseling should be in line with the word of God, its truths and the Pastor's transparency with the individual. Encouraging one to live and Pray God's strength to endure and win.