

# NAC Vision

## Strategy Point 5

### Discussion Questions:

What are some things that you learned or that stuck out to you from this study?

Strategy Point 5: “We will emphasize trust above suspicion.

- What do you think of this strategy point? Do you agree/disagree? Why?

By nature do you have a propensity towards trust of others or suspicion? Why do you think that this is the case? Do you feel that it is a function of your upbringing or just the way God made you?

(Point 1, Point 2ai, 2bi) – In the process of responding to suspicion we must look back and evaluate whether our fears are rational or irrational. If they are irrational, then we must replace our suspicion with trust. We must always avoid preemptively acting on a suspicion without credible proof.

- What is something that makes you feel suspicious right now? (Ex: facemasks and gathering restrictions as a permanent attack on personal liberty, election fraud, etc.) – *Avoid getting into a debate over these issues. The purpose of this question is only to bring to mind something that makes people feel suspicious so that these feelings can be processed.*
- Regarding what makes you feel suspicious, which is more true of you? 1) Do you refuse to accept it without absolute proof of its validity? Or 2) Do you look hard for anything (regardless of the source) that might confirm what you already suspect is happening?
- In your opinion, is the unwillingness to accept a suspicion without credible evidence to support it noble behavior or is it gullible? Why?
- Presumed innocence until proven guilty is a foundational American principle that is supported by The Bill of Rights. This principle is firmly adhered to in our courts. Do you agree with this principle? Do you consider it to accurately reflect biblical principles? How well do you practice this principle in your daily lives? Which is more true of you? 1) Do you assume people are guilty based upon your “gut feeling?” Or 2) Do you absolutely refuse to condemn someone in your thoughts without credible proof?

(Point 2aii, 2bii) – There are times where credible evidence will exist to support our suspicions. But even in these cases there is a right and a wrong way to respond.

- Throughout the past two decades many known terrorists with real plans to hurt our country have been apprehended. Despite their clear guilt do these people have human rights (should they be entitled to fair and humane treatment such as a trial before an unbiased jury, food, shelter, medical attention, etc) as much as any other human being? Why or why not?
- During the war on terror torture (or “enhanced interrogation techniques”) was used on certain prisoners to gain intelligence for the ongoing effort. In your opinion was this justifiable? Or was this a violation of basic human rights which everyone has, convicted terrorist or not? Does the existence of clear and proven evil intent vindicate the use of such measures on our fellow man?