

COMPROMISE vs. FLEXIBILITY

Daniel reflects the difference between flexibility and compromise. There were four distinct areas of the Jew's lifestyle Nebuchadnezzar invaded and set out to restructure in an attempt to steal their identity away from them. Identity theft Babylonian style. Three of them Daniel agreed to, however. But one was non-negotiable. In the spirit of flexibility, he agreed to these three areas:

- 1) Name change
- 2) Re-education
- 3) Language change

But one area was non-negotiable:

- 4) Diet change

Why? Because of the four areas, only one area was a violation of the Mosaic Jewish law. For Daniel to partake in the king's diet, it would've been a blatant compromise. The Law prohibited God's people from eating meat sacrificed to

idols or any other gods. The violation of biblical principles to appease a cultural mood or trend is never being flexible; it is compromise.

Of all the four areas for Daniel to consider changing, a diet would've been the easiest to change. It is the most comfortable and most convenient route to choose. But Daniel was purposed, determined, or dogmatic, that he would not defile himself with the portion of the king's meat.

The church today cannot bow to the idols, or the gods, to the trends, to the fashions, to the attitudes, of society just to blend or fit in. We cannot sacrifice our heritage, our identity, our inheritance just to appease a carnal and sensual, godless generation that has drifted from moral living. We are the Church built upon an unmovable and unshakable rock, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against us.

Bill Pitman