
Subject: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jisamazed](#) on Mon, 14 Apr 2008 03:54:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Note: This could have gone into the "rant and rave" section, but I think that it is more appropriate in the doctrine section. This issue is one of my pet peeves with the teaching of HEF and FA in general. I look forward to reading people's responses to it.

Random House defines "denomination" this way:

1. a name or designation, esp. one for a class of things 2. a class or kind of persons or things having a specific name 3. a religious group, usually including many local churches 4. the act of naming or designating a person or thing (5. etc...)

History:

The church in America and many other places around the world was in rough shape in the 60's. Many different protestant groups had taken a defensive posture and become so fearful of anything that smacked of compromise that they could not grow and learn and be open to the moving of the Holy Spirit. There were plenty of exceptions, and there were always a few offensive-minded congregations in every evangelical denomination who rose above the status quo of the time. Some Pentecostal churches shined as lights, but even many of them were burdened by legalism, hidden immorality or showiness. Then the Lord sent a move of the Spirit so powerful that we still experience it today. The charismatic movement brought new life to a struggling church, and much angst and controversy with it as well. A lot of people got kicked out of churches or left because they wanted to function in the Holy Spirit rather than dead traditions. The people in the new churches often referred to the old churches as "denominational" because many such churches seemed to be bound by their denominational rules and traditions. Eventually, any church that was not charismatic or independent was called "denominational". The reasoning was that we don't need to form these interchurch organizations that stifle growth and revival. We are supposed to be autonomous in ourselves.

However, as has happened throughout Protestant history over the past 400 years, the independent churches and groups of churches became a denomination of sorts of their own. They might not have become an organization of churches, but their elitism and "more spiritual than thou" mentality reflected the churches that they came from. This problem has occurred many, many times in church history, and Faith Assembly is but one example. Even Augustine of Hippo in the 4th century complained of all the different groups of churches that claimed to be the purest, each one believing that the others were somehow less pure than they.

FA was a denomination of sorts:

Each "denomination" has a distinctive set of doctrines and practices that defines it and sets it

apart from other churches or groups of churches. Faith Assembly was no different. FA teachers planted other churches in North America and regularly taught in those churches. Usually, the teacher from FA carried greater authority in the church than any local leadership, if there was any. Worship structures were usually similar to that of FA, with music, utterance gifts and teaching from the pulpit, in that order. Tape racks made HEF's and others' sermon readily available. Church discipline was used to weed out those who would not follow the program. There was a suspicion of other churches, and denominations were often mocked. If you wanted a FA-type congregation to believe you, all you had to do was say, "The denominational churches believe such and such... we don't believe that. We believe the opposite." People did not want to do what the "Babylonish denominational system" did.

The Hypocrisy of it all:

Meanwhile, the Lord was moving mightily in some "denominational" churches, filling people with the Holy Spirit, giving them a hunger and thirst for Him, bringing them into balance. People were healed and delivered and set free from bondages. Their theology became more Christ-centered, as did their lives. However, the FA-churches were so afraid of violating their traditions or HEF's teaching (which somehow became synonymous with the Word of God) that every move of God in the mid to late 80's was met with opposition from the "deeper life brothers" (Tom Hamilton's term). The Lord brought people a fresh understanding of grace through Jerry Ervin, and he got kicked out. The Lord implored people to humble themselves and admit their extremes through Steve Hill, and people hollered that he was somehow compromising the "end-time message of faith", whatever that is. In our church in GR, a couple of women were despised because they wore jeans to a roller-skating party. Whenever change comes to a denomination, there are always people who don't want to change, no matter how Biblical the change is. Jesus said to the pharisees, "... you nullify the word of God for the sake of your tradition." In this case, it was the FA tradition. Thus, the hardliners who claimed to be faithful to "the message" actually became denominational pharisees. I can say that because I was one of them for a while, somewhat. I hope that the people I hurt can forgive me.

Appropriate terminology:

It is inaccurate to say, "the denominational view" or "the denominational way". There is not one "denominational" way of doing things. There is a huge diversity among protestant denominations, and none of them believe exactly the same things. Some don't believe anything. Some of them are wonderful, spirit-filled congregations who operate in the power and authority of the name of Jesus. On the other hand, I can think of some independent, nondenominational, charismatic churches that are bound by their own pride. They are so impressed by their break from the status quo that they have developed their own status quo, freely assuming the worst of other believers and churches. If you don't believe that it still happens, just read some of the posts on this forum.

Instead of referring to all non-charismatic churches as denominational, make a difference between those that are Christ-centered and Bible-based, and those that are not. Those are the true churches, and we can learn from them and have fellowship with them.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [sparkles](#) on Mon, 14 Apr 2008 15:01:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I guess if you want to call Faith Assembly a denomination that is fine, because really, who cares? The word of God was taught there, the worship was wonderful and the fellowship outstanding! The pastor loved his flock, (in spite of what you may think) and taught what he believed the Lord wanted him to. It was a balanced message that exposed sin in peoples lives, taught us how to recognize errors and deceptions, taught us to be humble and walk in holiness and a multitude of other things. Contrary to what you think, people did not have an elitist mentality, that is a term people have said since Brother Freeman died. Actually quite the contrary. Faith Assembly workers had some of the best reputations for being hard workers and nice people. Now, that is not to say there weren't proud people there, as every church has them. It is called human nature, you know, people not being mature. I have run across them in denominational churches also. Unfortunately you did not get out of Faith Assembly what I did, and as you can see with different posts others did also. You were a part of the Grand Rapids meeting, and as I have said before, that was no Faith Assembly. We did have many wonderful teachers come up and sacrifice their time to bring us the word of God, and for that I am thankful. The worship there would rival Faith Assembly and the people were very Christlike people.

Maybe you could let me know some of these churches that are going deeper with Lord and not falling for all the errors and deceptions out there. I have many friends that have left Sunshine Community Church because of the errors and deceptions that have crept in there. One friend spoke with an elder there and commented on how they were not getting fed and the response they got was feed yourself. They also inquired about if someone got healed when there was a word of knowledge for a healing of some sort. The response they got was that it didn't matter, all that mattered was that this person was ministered to. Maybe God doesn't heal by words of knowledge, but the only important thing is if someone comes up front so they can be ministered to. If people didn't go along with what some of the power ladies and ministers in the church were promoting they were shunned and criticized. Sounds familiar doesn't it? I could write pages on the deceptions in this church now, but I won't.

As far as church discipline being used to weed out the people who would not follow the program you are wrong here also. The purpose of church discipline was to see the person restored to the Lord and to the church. Because Brother Freeman did this behind closed doors, (which I am assuming your church does also) much of what was said never got out. I know people personally from Faith Assembly that were disciplined and they spoke of the kindness Brother Freeman showed them. Jae, I think your blindness to what Faith Assembly was about is really showing here. Oh I expect the typical response that I don't see what went on, but I was there much more

than you, and saw things that went on. Was Faith Assembly perfect? Of course not, no church is, but there was a deeper word taught there. If people didn't like it, all they had to do was leave. Unless you were a child, you were free to go anytime you wanted, which many did, as they do in all churches. And please, spare me the typical response of fear, everyone is responsible for themselves and needs to quit blaming others.

And according to you it isn't okay to say what a denominational church believed and that Faith Assembly believed the opposite. Maybe because unlike many churches today, every word of doctrine wasn't promoted like in today's churches. Instead of seeking the Lord for themselves they have to do Alpha, have the 40 Days of Purpose (which is nothing more than a huge marketing ploy), follow Willow Creek, have their 12 step programs, use books to preach from, instead of giving the church fresh bread.

Criticize Faith Assembly and Brother Freeman all you want, but like at your mother's church, we are willing to wait and see who is right in the end. Ten years ago I shared with my friends at Sunshine they were going down the path of deception and now it has happened. I would say the same to you Jae, I am willing to wait and see if the message the Lord gave Brother Freeman was true, which I believe it was, or if what you believe and promote is true. I guess time will tell. And as you can see, the message of faith works because it is based on the word of God and all the promises the Lord gave us to simply believe.

As far as the women who wore jeans to a skating party being despised, I find this hard to believe. Despise is a very strong word and I do not believe people from the Grand Rapids meeting "despised" them. Maybe you did, but I do not believe others did. Maybe some didn't agree with them, but despise? No, I don't believe it!

You say Steve wanted people to humble themselves and admit their extremes, but because of this he was compromising the "end time message of faith whatever that it." The end time message of faith is call the Word of God to be believed and lived. To trust Jesus with every area of your life and to glorify God in all you do, think and say (this is where confessing the word and what we are believing for comes in.) And I guess since we are in the end times you could call it the end time message of faith. If you follow what Steve got into after he left you might see where he was wrong. He was involved in the false revival out of Pensacola, Florida. The same false revival came up to First Assembly in Grand Rapids, but that is another story. Maybe Steve's discernment wasn't quite right when he said what he did. As far as Jerry is concerned I refuse to say what went on there because I am not lead to share some things for the world to hear. I think some things and some peoples names are better left off blogs like this as it could cause hurts that I would hope you wouldn't want to do.

The very thing you accuse Brother Freeman of, you do. You say he made fun of things, well you are doing the exact same thing. You say it is to correct things, well that is what he did. The difference is he was right. Give me the "faith message" anytime, compared to the compromising "if it be thy will" message. In the end we will see who is right.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination

Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 14 Apr 2008 15:30:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wow.

Thanks Sageshroomer for articulating so well what some of us would like to be able to say.

Different people got different things from FA... for some it has culminated in a bitter spirit that never misses an opportunity to slam both the message and the messenger, for others the message has provided a foundation that has enabled us to move positively through the maze of conflicting messages that constantly bombard our minds. Not only that, we were given the tools to move forward, utilizing what we learned (both the mistakes, and the victories,) for the purpose of overcoming in our present situations.

Is that elitism? I don't know... but I do know that I wouldn't trade my years at FA for anything!

But you said it much better!

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jisamazed](#) on Tue, 15 Apr 2008 03:07:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sue, it would be tempting to try to address your statements one by one, but that would be too tedious and you probably would not get the point, anyway. Plenty of people who went to Faith Assembly and related churches have same perception that I do. Many of them are more harsh than I. I try to chew the meat and spit out the bones. I don't think that you are able to identify the bones. I affirm the truth that we received there and acknowledge that HEF was anointed by the Lord earlier in his ministry. He definitely took a change in direction for the worse as time went on.

It is odd that you attack my parents' church for some reason and make sweeping comments about 40 Days of Purpose or Willow Creek. Totally irrelevant. You don't get it, do you? That's the very spirit that I am trying to expose here. But if you listen to enough of HEF's tapes, you will think that way.

At my parents' church, people do not let their babies die because the pastor taught that doctors

are occultic.

I weary of hearing that HEF was loving in person even though he was harsh from the pulpit. If there is any place that a person should show love, it is from the pulpit. Mercy and truth have kissed each other. They do not preclude each other. As angry as Paul was with the Corinthians, he still came to them with gentleness and meekness. HEF was sometimes harsh and mean from the pulpit and seemed to enjoy slamming people. Once he referred to a couple that left his church as having "scrambled eggs for brains" (in Little Foxes that Spoil the Vines, I think). There was no love expressed. No tears. No life.

I would not be compelled to point out HEF's problems if I did not perceive the spirit of idolatry toward him that still persists, and the lack of willingness to admit that he strayed from the Word.

All you have to do is read some of the stories on the Tomax site to see that church discipline was abused at Faith Assembly. I was present when Bruce Kinsey was "disfellowshipped" from the church in 1984. HEF said, "...he (Bruce) told me, the pastor, that I needed deliverance. Pray for his salvation." Pray for his salvation? As if Bruce's salvation depended on his relationship with Hobart or the faith message or the church rather than his relationship with Christ. The church continued his practice of excommunication for the next 9 years as way to purge people who were not with the program.

The point of my original post on this thread is that we should quit lumping churches under the "denominational" label and try to have fellowship with anyone who is in Christ. If we can be quick to forgive HEF's mistakes, we should be quick to forgive those of other brothers and sisters and not write them off the way that you have.

In the end, we all need Jesus, and we all need forgiveness, and those who are His at His coming will all be together worshipping Him for eternity, and all of this nonsense will be forgotten.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Tue, 15 Apr 2008 05:59:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

When people say Faith Assembly had a deeper word consider this:

Yes they did compared to most Churches of its era and even of today. But compared to the actual

doctrine taught by JESUS and the Apostles it still had a ways to grow into foundation doctrine.

The way I see it the area they went beyond other Trinitarian Charismatic groups is they did baptize in Jesus name and teach the head covering. The worship was heavenly to say the least.

It stands out to this day perhaps not so much for how close to perfection it came but because it was so much more of a light than so many other groups.

Bro Freeman was right that the huge majority of Churches do almost more harm than good. Wishing it were not so, Michael

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JRS](#) on Tue, 15 Apr 2008 17:24:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't remember how many times I have heard that statement that FA had a "Deeper Word". It might be interesting to list off what was taught and examine the origins of it. I do not think there was anything new that Bro Freeman brought forth in content as much as in the way one should perceive it. He expressed a strength and reverence towards the written Word of God that still I haven't found an equal today.

In the natural we all know the saying "There are 2 things you should never discuss with others, religion and politics. It always bothered me as to why this is so true. I see why this is and this is something we should all keep in mind here.

Politics: It is based on peoples opinions and functions on perception.

Religion: Because it has changed from the Living organism to an organization that also functions on the perceptions of individuals.

Bro Freeman taught the importance and put the focus on the Word of God that is lacking (non existent) today. If doctrine is to be discussed, one must relate to and hold to the Word as having the final say. BF stressed on taking the Word for what it says. Head covering, foot washing, Baptism in Jesus name, to name a few. He did do something more than that. He added and taught the use of logic in scripture I haven't really heard about since then. That is if God has promised it, that settles it. He saw that if we look on salvation in this manner then who are we not to look on ALL scripture the same. Instead the Pharisees of our time (denominational church) focus on scriptures they like and fail to even acknowledge others unless they are forced to and they usually explain them away. That is the very reason I asked in the last thread I posted in, is James 5:14&15 a promise or is it not. If it isn't then why bother. If it is then it holds the same weight as any of the promises for salvation. (This is the understanding Bro Freeman focused on) Also if it is a promise then for someone to not receive it they are not in FAITH and what ever is not of Faith IS Sin. Rom 14:23 This reasoning is what BF brought forth "The absolute of scripture. I can speak for myself" That if I come across any scripture that contradicts, is different or in any

shape or from changes my understanding, I know that something MUST change and it will not be the WORD. If God gives us a promise or practice in scripture then who are we to reject it or attempt to explain it away? The reasoning one could use here to state it stronger or more to the point â€œ It is one thing for an individual have an issue in understanding a scripture (promise, truth), yet that is completely opposite if one should reject the passage and attempt to explain it away. It can be said that they are no different in the rejection of the WORD as the Pharisees in the NT.

I see the denominational church as being one who has experienced the transfiguration (a truth seen or revelation) and has built their alter right there with the result being death as a living, body. They are set in what they believe and one can define them by what they believe and practice. I look at the term denominational as a mind-set. It is an organization that is set in there ways and have no intention of breaking with it.

Bro Freeman was part of and promoted the faith message along with Hagin and the rest of the faith camp until he saw the truth on JDS. One could say that he did teach a stronger message and more direct than anyone else, do to the understanding he had and the logic he used.

They all say we need Jesus and many agree on being Born Again. Yet they fail to embrace anything past that.

Why is it that there is always a - line in the sand â€œ that restricts the growth of individuals that they will not embrace the entire Word of GOD?

Not understanding it is one thing and I believe God understands this and allows one to grow. Yet, not accepting it/making attempts to explain the Word away is no different than the Pharisees Jesus himself stood against 2000 years ago. Is not this out right rejection of Jesus???? Even though they call Him Lord??

My understanding of Denominational would not be the same as the definition supplied. It could be applied to 1 church group as well as to a group of churches.

The whole protestant movement began with Martin Luther, salvation by faith. The catholic church rejected that. Lutherans became set in their ways and rejected further change â€œ and so forth. The rest is history. Even since the 70â€™s groups have broken off of others and make there stand, failing to see any other understanding to continue on deeper with the Lord. We are to judge everything using the WORD and if it based in the WORD then who are we to reject it???? Are we not setting ourselves up to be no different then the Pharisees at the time of Jesus, rejecting the Lord himself????

One might ask â€œ Can we have fellowship with other believers in Christ who choose to reject parts of scripture â€œ maybe, but I think one will find that the fellowship will be very shallow and limited â€œ Unless you fellowship only on the things of this world.

To call FA a denomination â€“ I would say YES. The growth stopped and they where very elite in their attitude towards others when it came to spiritual things and yes before 1984 this was true. A great example of that is the attitude of â€“ Well time will tell. There is truth to that, but as believers we SHOULD be able to discuss and evaluate ALL things to the WORD. Not to argue or debate over what the Word has to say, but to realize that the truth will always win out and we must be open to the possibility that we could be wrong in our beliefs. We should in no why consider changing or conforming our beliefs according to the results we experience in this world. Yet if the experiences do not eventually conform to the Word it just could be time to start looking at the donkey that might have spoken in the past.

Many of the Denominational churches talk about Godâ€™s Love ect. Ect â€“ They talk about and none dare to attempt to experience it. Marshmellow churches I believe it is stated in another thread. Where does one draw the line â€“ having a form of Godliness and denying the power.

We are talking about the God that spoke this universe into existence. He gave everyone of us the breath of life. He knows the hairs of our head and has names for all the stars in the sky. It was before the foundation of the world that he ordained today to take place. What a privilege we all have to be able to see the work he has, is and preparing to do. It is through the written WORD he has chosen to reveal himself.

Who are we to deny any part of the Word.

If you study history, the church in particular, one can see how God has been slowly revealing himself. Step by step â€“ line upon line. The biggest problem seems to be that man builds the alter unto God for what he has received and consequently cannot leave it to move on. Here in the DENOMINATIONAL mind-set.

JRS

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jjsamazed](#) on Thu, 17 Apr 2008 03:14:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Some of you guys really need to get out more. You need more exposure to other Christian ministries and churches. There are plenty of churches and Christians who are not satisfied with camping out on Born Again Hill. They hunger and thirst for more of Jesus, and they walk by faith.

They pour out their lives to bless others and present the gospel. Yet you make these sweeping comments like, "Most churches today don't preach the whole word" and the like. The ignorance of such statements is appalling.

Worldwide, the majority of true churches are suffering in one way or another because they put their trust in Christ (not because they preach that doctors are occult and let their children die). How can we write off these suffering churches as being shallow and apostate? Even in our materialistic American culture, there are plenty of churches that shine and love the word of God and are willing to suffer for it.

Hobart Freeman did not teach the full counsel of God nearly as much as he claimed. Sometimes he outright distorted the scriptures. Yet you claim he taught a "deeper word".

I am personally acquainted with a number of pastors and teachers who love the word of God and are willing to do whatever the Lord tells them to. They don't go about it with the same "we're better than them" mentality that I see on this forum. I resent that people call them shallow or marshmallow simply because they don't teach what Hobart Freeman did or belong to a denomination.

In 1970 Mr. Freeman gave a message at the Pentecostal Lighthouse called, "Christ's Mission is Our Commission." It was my favorite tape by him when I was a teenager. It was, and still is, a foundational teaching for me. He pointed out that our purpose as individuals and as a church is not to advance our churches or get focused on our own uniqueness. We are here to advance the kingdom of God on earth. That is the big picture. The kingdom is a big river, and the various churches are simply streams that feed into it. We must be kingdom-minded and seek to subject every part of our lives to His kingship. It is much bigger than our little corner of the earth. I really wish that HEF had stuck with that vision. FA would have been much more healthy when he died. In fact, he might even still be living today, because he might not have gone toxic had he not been so isolated from other Christian groups.

The kingdom of God is much bigger than any of us understand. He loves all of those who are truly His, which includes millions and millions of people. It is still a minority in this world, but much bigger than some posters on this forum seem to comprehend. He is advancing His kingdom, and the few Faith Assembly churches were but a small fraction of it. After He comes, when we look back on all of church history, Faith Assembly will look like a small, dysfunctional dot on the screen. It will be known as "the church that could have done much more for the kingdom" had it not become so sick.

Become kingdom-minded, and stop saying, "All the denominational churches nowadays are marshmallow." Don't you see? FA was denominational! The sweeping statements about other churches are so ignorant and proud. Some are shallow, some are not. Take the time to make a difference between them, and love all who call upon the name of the Lord. If you love the Lord

and want Him to use you with power, you will love his people without making sweeping negative comments about them.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Thu, 17 Apr 2008 03:24:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Michael the disciple said, "The way I see it the area they went beyond other Trinitarian Charismatic groups is they did baptize in Jesus name and teach the head covering."

Michael, some of the most religious, bound people I have ever met are oneness Pentecostals. It is sad. The health of a church has nothing to do with the formula it uses when baptizing or whether or not the ladies wear a head covering. Those are fringe compared to weightier matters. Minor on minors, major on majors. You are muddying the discussion when you bring in your oneness ideas. They have nothing to do with the topic at hand. It is better if you keep those ideas in the threads that you started that deal specifically with them. I will weigh in on those eventually. One of HEF's strengths was his systematic theology, and I believe that you are way off theologically.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Thu, 17 Apr 2008 06:55:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jismazed wrote on Wed, 16 April 2008 22:24 Michael the disciple said, "The way I see it the area they went beyond other Trinitarian Charismatic groups is they did baptize in Jesus name and teach the head covering."

Michael, some of the most religious, bound people I have ever met are oneness Pentecostals. It is sad. The health of a church has nothing to do with the formula it uses when baptizing or whether or not the ladies wear a head covering. Those are fringe compared to weightier matters. Minor on minors, major on majors. You are muddying the discussion when you bring in your oneness ideas. They have nothing to do with the topic at hand. It is better if you keep those ideas in the threads that you started that deal specifically with them. I will weigh in on those eventually. One of HEF's strengths was his systematic theology, and I believe that you are way off theologically.

Are you insinuating Hobart Freeman did NOT baptize in Jesus name? He did NOT teach the headcovering? To call these great truths "minors" is typical of what he may have called "marshmellow theology"

While it may be true many Oneness Pentecostals are what one might call legalistic (Faith

Assembly was called that) it does not to me detract from the soundness of the One God message.

I thought it relevant to the topic because to me Faith Assembly's denomination came up short of true foundation doctrine. Some think they went to far. I say not far enough.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [sparkles](#) on Thu, 17 Apr 2008 19:34:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jae said a few things that I would like to respond to:

Quote:Sue, it would be tempting to try to address your statements one by one, but that would be too tedious and you probably would not get the point, anyway. Plenty of people who went to Faith Assembly and related churches have same perception that I do. Many of them are more harsh than I. I try to chew the meat and spit out the bones. I don't think that you are able to identify the bones. I affirm the truth that we received there and acknowledge that HEF was anointed by the Lord earlier in his ministry. He definitely took a change in direction for the worse as time went on.

Well Jae, you are probably right that I would not get your point anyways. To tell you the truth I do not base what I believe on your perception or others, but on what the Word of God says. And if people are harsh then I am sorry for them that they continue to hold onto bitterness and resentment. Blaming others for ones failures goes all the way back to the garden of Eden when everyone tried to blame someone else. Let's try to get past that and take some responsibility for ourselves. And I may not be able to identify the bones in your opinion, but I am able to eat meat without bones, such as a nice Filet Mignon which is not served with bones. I also enjoy milk with my meals. Milk and meat, sounds good to me!
And I also don't base what I believe because you affirm or reject something. I was taught to base what I believe on God's word, not someones opinion, especially when they are critical.

Quote:It is odd that you attack my parents' church for some reason and make sweeping comments about 40 Days of Purpose or Willow Creek. Totally irrelevant. You don't get it, do you? That's the very spirit that I am trying to expose here. But if you listen to enough of HEF's tapes, you will think that way.

Why would that be odd? And yes it is relevant in my opinion. We were talking about denominations and I was commenting on how I was willing to see who is right in the end. I used your parents church of an example of how 10 years ago I shared with some friends of the path their church was taking. Maybe you don't get it Jae, as your parents church is going deeper and deeper into deception and errors with this false apostolic, drumming, rock music so loud you need

ear plugs, false personal prophecies, one pastor was sprinkling holy water, theophostics and inner healing, compromise, following Willow Creek and Rick Warren. Want me to go on? Rick Warren is into marketing the church to make it bigger, or you could call it "Consumer Christianity" as T.A. McMahan wrote about. He was very influenced by a man named Peter Drucker. Willow Creek is into the same things. It is the road to Rome and a one world church.

Richard Foster wrote Celebration of Discipline and his book introduced Catholic and occult meditative techniques to christians. Eugene Peterson wrote the popular paraphrased Bible called "The Message," which is quoted numerous times in Rich Warrens book, Forty Days of Purpose. This book is full of wrong paraphrases. Maybe you ought to find a little time to search out what some of these people are saying and believing. A couple good web sites would be: discernment-ministries.org and herescope.blogspot.com. You could also do a web search for Roger Oakland who has studied these people extensively and the way the promote the Emergent Church.

Quote:At my parents' church, people do not let their babies die because the pastor taught that doctors are occultic.

I am very sorry for all the people who have died at Faith Assembly, but people die at the hands of doctors constantly, as my friends mother did. First they gave her some medicine which wrecked her kidney's so she had to be on dialysis and then a few months later they gave her a new drug which caused her to go into a coma and die.

I am thankful for all the people doctors help, because they have helped my niece who has Asthma, but the point is Jae, Jesus has a better way. What will you do when you take the mark of the beast or no medical help? And don't be deceived to think God will be obligated to help you then.

Quote:I would not be compelled to point out HEF's problems if I did not perceive the spirit of idolatry toward him that still persists, and the lack of willingness to admit that he strayed from the Word.

Just because you perceive something doesn't mean it is correct. Try to perceive the deception's going on today and share them to help the body of Christ.

Quote:All you have to do is read some of the stories on the Tomax site to see that church discipline was abused at Faith Assembly. I was present when Bruce Kinsey was "disfellowshipped" from the church in 1984. HEF said, "...he (Bruce) told me, the pastor, that I needed deliverance. Pray for his salvation." Pray for his salvation? As if Bruce's salvation depended on his relationship with Hobart or the faith message or the church rather than his relationship with Christ. The church continued his practice of excommunication for the next 9 years as way to purge people who were not with the program.

Been reading Tomax site for over a year and I am well aware of some of the things people have said, but don't leave out the posts of people who were extremely blessed by the message of

Brother Freeman and others. As far as Bruce is concerned I would say you are showing your pride and arrogance thinking you know everything that went on when Brother Freeman didn't even say that much so as not to make it a show. You have no idea what went on behind closed doors so stop already with your twisting of things said.

Quote:The point of my original post on this thread is that we should quit lumping churches under the "denominational" label and try to have fellowship with anyone who is in Christ. If we can be quick to forgive HEF's mistakes, we should be quick to forgive those of other brothers and sisters and not write them off the way that you have.

Aren't you being quite judgmental of me here, Jae? So do you know my heart also as you pretend to know everyone else's? I did not know I have written people off just because I do not agree with them. You are wrong here in your judgment of me.

Quote:In the end, we all need Jesus, and we all need forgiveness, and those who are His at His coming will all be together worshipping Him for eternity, and all of this nonsense will be forgotten. If it is such nonsense then why don't you just leave it alone.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Fri, 18 Apr 2008 02:48:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Talk about bait and switch.

Sometimes it takes a while for people to gain some insight into their deception. I can see that some of you are not ready yet to admit HEF's errors and problems. No matter how much someone refutes his errors, you will still defend them and think that you see it in the Word.

Later in his ministry, Hobart Freeman taught very little of the Word. He would preach for an hour and a half and quote scripture once or twice at the most. He did little genuine expository teaching. If you can find one tape of his from 1981-84 that really expounded scripture throughout the entire sermon, send it to me and I will listen to it.

I have already pointed out some ways that he did not rightly divide the word of truth.

You don't believe that he had any bones in his teaching? You don't believe he ever preached error? That is naive and borders on delusional.

I hear people from all denominational stripes who believe that their pastor or denomination preaches the Word, and complain about all the compromisers out there. Some Pentecostals,

Baptists, 7th Day Adventists, Charismatics, a number of cults all claim to preach the strong word, and they don't know anyone else who is doing so. All of them have different hang-ups and emphases and reasons why no one is preaching the Word like them. It gets to be wearisome.

If you want to overlook Hobart Freeman's errors, you need to do the same for the other ministries that you bash.

Judge a ministry by its fruit. HEF's does not look good. He left a legacy of bondage, legalism, people letting themselves or their children die unnecessarily, pride, fear, disillusioned Christians and churches. Some good fruit might include a healthy theology that was needed in the charismatic world, a love for scripture, willingness to obey the truth regardless of culture's expectations and a genuine, unshowy way of worshipping the Lord. And yet a good tree cannot produce bad fruit, nor a bad tree good fruit. So which was he?

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Fri, 18 Apr 2008 03:26:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

(not because they preach that doctors are occult and let their children die)
Hombre said in reference to the above quote, "2. ...that statement is totally offensive, ignorant and misleading re: what Hobart taught."

What is offensive is the fact that people did die unnecessarily, and yet some still justify HEF's extreme teaching or deny that he taught it. Just admit that he blew it and move on.

Hobart Freeman said in the Deeper Deliverance and Discernment series, "Take yourself through deliverance if you ever walked into a doctor's office." He stated in Comfort for Troubled Times, "No one has been disciplined, yet, for going to a doctor." Yet? What does he mean by "yet"? He often referred to going to doctors as "going to the arm of the flesh". And, of course, those who go to the arm of the flesh are cursed. He taught that since the Greek word "pharmakaia" meant sorcery, therefore pharmaceuticals were a form of sorcery (no honest Greek scholar or NT historian would ever agree with him). People let themselves or their children die because they were afraid that accessing medical science was sin. Make no mistake about it, they based that idea on Hobart Freeman's teaching. HEF could not have made it any more clearer than he did that he thought that doctors were occultic and that it was unbelief to employ their help for healing. We know the tragic result of that mentality was death, depression and incredible suffering for those who lost loved ones. I can't imagine what they went through, or the guilt that they lived with because of their choices.

For those of you who experienced such a loss, I pray that you find the healing of your spirit, forgiveness and hope in the Lord Jesus. You don't need to labor under the yoke of Hobart

Freeman's teaching anymore. Find a congregation that loves one another because they love Jesus, and sit under a pastor who can help you to understand the word of God and undo the twisting that you got under "the faith message" regarding medical science. Ignore those on this web site or elsewhere who want to perpetuate the bondage. Forgive them. They do not know what they are doing.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JRS](#) on Fri, 18 Apr 2008 12:58:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree with what you are saying, this is because of the experiences I have gone through. Yet I disagree with the conclusion you are reaching. In other words "I acknowledge the impetus for the conclusions you bring forth, yet when it comes to me basing my understanding of spiritual truths on the foundation your providing" I cannot.

I agree with what you are saying in the FA was a denomination and yet not totally. It was not a denomination unto itself. I hold that the Charismatic movement, as most of us know it, was NOT of GOD.

Please, correct me if I'm wrong here. The spiritual trend of the 60s & 70s was elevating the WORD and a focus on the WORD. I don't know how many times I heard this repeated? "Prove All Things with the Word of God. If any attempted to believe the whole counsel of God and take that statement to heart and question something, they were usually not looked upon to highly. They were usually confronted with the ideas of "How dare you to come against God's anointed, or Who are you to question the leadership that has been established in the church, and so forth. Sound familiar???? Borderline cultic tendencies I would say.

One thing that I am thankful for FA and the teachings is the understanding and application of reasoning to the scriptures.

Applying that to this situation "

I must quote jigsawed here "The kingdom of God is much bigger than any of us understand. SO, So, TRUE.

In this scenario there can be 2 things that could be true.

1.-What the individual is asking or pointing out or just commenting on, is error and is wrong. Then what is the problem with answering it and allowing truth to stand out? Or aren't we stable enough in the truth of what we believe to know that there is Nothing that can stand against it???

Should we ask the question “ Where is our Faith???

2.-The other side of the coin is that what is being bought up is truth and the understanding that has been bought forth is not correct. This is something one should rejoice over. That God in His mercy and Grace who loves you and desires to correct you from your errors. Or are we so fearful that by us being proven wrong that it would downgrade our image (authority)?? We speak the language of Deeper life “ The question is “ Are we willing to LIVE it?? “ Not if one thinks of himself more highly than he ought to.

There is nobody living who has or can have a corner on the WORD. We are seeking GOD, The Creator of All things, and we are no more than earthly vessels whom HE has chosen and how soon we forget that.

FA is a denomination in that it could be defined as to what they believed and taught. It also fell into the mind-set that they had formulated what to believe and were above any correction or alternative understanding at all. Why many had a difficult time addressing issues back then was a couple of reasons.

-How any questioning of the truth was viewed.

-The teachings of the Charismatic movement and FA had bought us out of Babylon “ yes the denominational church. We didn’t question it because if we were right, in our questioning, then where would we have turned “ back to the denominational church???? Example I ran into “ Proverbs 6:2 “ This in NO way pertains to Positive confession “ Must be understood with verse 1.

The framework of thinking in FA and in all denominational churches is the same. The only difference is that FA took a stand for the truth they knew and others have decided to live in Pluralism. Take note the change in the Catholic and Lutheran churches today as to when they 1st split. The Catholics today agree that salvation is by faith/grace “ any will tell you that, yet they will not turn from the works they have and are required to do for salvation. So I MUST hold to my understanding of the WORD and say they are lost in their deception. The Catholics are not unique here. They speak one thing and do (believe) another. Boy does that sound ring a bell???

To say that FA and their understanding is free from error is way off base and they are deceived, blinded. It seemed that in the later years the exposition on the Word was not there. I always thought it as humorous that it was said about the denominational churches that one would hear John 3:16 every message. It sure did seem that in the later years that the messages would always refer back to Mk 11:24. I asked what the difference was???

Denominational churches “ seems like the issue is “ Can we really use this as a term to encompass all other besides ourselves??? Yes and NO

Characteristics “

1. Can be defined by what they believe.(teach)
2. They are set in their understanding of what they believe and are not open if a scripture should outwardly contradict them. In other words " something HAS to change, Their understanding or a verse in scripture.
3. Scripture does equates The denominational system with Babylon. " It's identity with the world. Rev. 17

JRS

1 Cor. 1:27-29

27But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty;

28And base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are:

29That no flesh should glory in his presence.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [sparkles](#) on Fri, 18 Apr 2008 18:35:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

again refuting Jae's comments:

Quote:Sometimes it takes a while for people to gain some insight into their deception. I can see that some of you are not ready yet to admit HEF's errors and problems. No matter how much someone refutes his errors, you will still defend them and think that you see it in the Word. It has not taken me long to have the insight to see the deception you are trying to bring forth. Just because someone does not agree with you about Brother Freeman you have a fit. I do not base what I believe on what you say! And I was wondering who died and made you judge, jury and executioner? There is nothing anyone can say to you without you constantly criticizing Brother Freeman. Your purpose on this site is not one of discussion, but one where you think you have the right to correct everyones thinking.

Quote:Later in his ministry, Hobart Freeman taught very little of the Word. He would preach for an hour and a half and quote scripture once or twice at the most. He did little genuine expository teaching. If you can find one tape of his from 1981-84 that really expounded scripture throughout the entire sermon, send it to me and I will listen to it.

Wouldn't waste your time to have you listen to someone you hate so much.

Quote:I have already pointed out some ways that he did not rightly divide the word of truth. In your opinion. Maybe you ought to let others make their own decisions instead of trying to control them.

Quote:

You don't believe that he had any bones in his teaching? You don't believe he ever preached error? That is naive and borders on delusional.

What I believe is between me and the Lord, I do not have to answer to you. And how Christlike and manifesting the fruits of the spirit that you are suppose to have, to say it is naive and borders on delusional. Maybe when Brother Freeman preached some of us did not take it as the letter of the law, but saw the principle behind what was spoken.

Quote:I hear people from all denominational stripes who believe that their pastor or denomination preaches the Word, and complain about all the compromisers out there. Some Pentecostals, Baptists, 7th Day Adventists, Charismatics, a number of cults all claim to preach the strong word, and they don't know anyone else who is doing so. All of them have different hang-ups and emphases and reasons why no one is preaching the Word like them. It gets to be wearisome. What gets wearisome is your constant holier than thou, critical attitude.

Quote:If you want to overlook Hobart Freeman's errors, you need to do the same for the other ministries that you bash.

I do not bash, thank you very much.

Quote:Judge a ministry by its fruit. HEF's does not look good. He left a legacy of bondage, legalism, people letting themselves or their children die unecessarily, pride, fear, disillusioned Christians and churches. Some good fruit might include a healthy theology that was needed in the charismatic world, a love for scripture, willingness to obey the truth regardless of culture's expectations and a genuine, unshowy way of worshipping the Lord. And yet a good tree cannot produce bad fruit, nor a bad tree good fruit. So which was he?

Brother Freeman was certainly a man of God who preached the word. People I know who are walking according to the Word of God are bringing forth good fruit and proving that faith in Jesus Christ and all the promises is true.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [sparkles](#) on Fri, 18 Apr 2008 19:15:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:What is offensive is the fact that people did die unecessarily, and yet some still justify HEF's extreme teaching or deny that he taught it. Just admit that he blew it and move on.

People die everyday at the hands of doctors, and that is not to even mention all the sicknesses and diseased they get. Jesus teachings were pretty extreme also, as was Paul's.

Quote:He taught that since the Greek word "pharmakaia" meant sorcery, therefore pharmaceuticals were a form of sorcery (no honest Greek scholar or NT historian would ever

agree with him).

My father was a pharmacist and I would read his drug magazines and maybe you ought to study what is behind these drugs before you throw out what has been said. Every drug out there has side effects that can have horrible consequences. The drug industry is a billion dollar a year business. Doctors prescribe certain drugs because they get paid by the pharmaceutical industry. Recently doctors were given \$100 per patient if they would take their patients off a name brand drug to give them a generic. If people don't have the money for their drugs many of them die. And if you for one second think it matters to the drug industry you are wrong. How many can't buy food because of the prices of the drugs they need? Thank God Jesus wasn't like that. Every service at Faith Assembly people would stand up and glorify God in sharing about how they were healed. Are people forgetting about all the miracles and healings? If you read in the Bible it speaks of how when Jesus healed someone people glorified God.

Quote: Find a congregation that loves one another because they love Jesus, and sit under a pastor who can help you to understand the word of God and undo the twisting that you got under "the faith message" regarding medical science. Ignore those on this web site or elsewhere who want to perpetuate the bondage. Forgive them. They do not know what they are doing. I am sure people can look on every corner to find some one who does not preach the faith. As for as your Ignore comment, that is rude and inconsiderate and controlling and shows just how prideful and arrogant you are in what you say. You insult and slander the people who are in charge here and some of the others who have been a part of this site from the beginning. It is not bondage to trust Jesus Christ for healing, but rather liberty and freedom. And really Jae, don't you think a person would rather trust Jesus for their healing than have to go to someone else. And with saying that I have no problem with someone who wants to go to a doctor.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Fri, 18 Apr 2008 22:44:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre said, "Hobarts' message WAS and still IS the message of the Bible, yours is a message of delusional brotherhood for the sake of unity."

It is time to stop beating a dead horse. Hobart did not preach the word very well later in his ministry. We have to agree to disagree on that one.

There is a balance between false unity of the ecumenical movement, which focuses on unifying organizations, and that of the true unity of the spirit, which we have with all of those who are born again in Jesus.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jisamazed](#) on Sat, 19 Apr 2008 00:05:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sue, I think that you need a vacation. You are taking this forum way too seriously. I enjoy discussing these matters with people who disagree with me, because I don't learn anything from people I already agree with. Sparks fly sometimes when iron sharpens iron. However, this has become no longer a discussion between brothers and sisters who want to understand the "faith movement", but rather a barrage of accusations about me being controlling and the like. God's people are supposed to discuss the Word in love, albeit we should call it like we see it as well.

This is apparently a highly emotionally charged topic for you, and you might not be able to discuss it rationally until your anger subsides.

I still like the discussion. It is good for people to now have the kind of dialogue that we should have been able to have 25 years ago. I like this forum, and I don't think that I have disrespected Moulder or anyone else, although some of my posts have a bite to them. Almost everyone on this site has some strong opinions. We debate with the understanding that God Himself is the ultimate truth, and He will reveal all things for what they are in the end. We will still spend eternity together with Him.

We might just need to agree to disagree and move on to another topic. We have work to do in the kingdom of God, and it is much more important than trying to defend or expose Hobart Freeman's teaching. I've said my peace, and I will let others judge whether my position or yours makes sense and is scriptural.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JWBTL](#) on Sat, 19 Apr 2008 01:44:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jisamazed: You are so right ! Guilty as charged !

Bro Freeman did emphasize FAITH !
I, am sooooo glad he did.

Smith Wigglesworth did too !
What about John G Lake ? He did also !
What about Abraham, was Faith important to him or to God ?

Rom 4:16 Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the
end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that

only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all,

Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace

Seems to me that Faith is an issue here !?

Rom 4:19 And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb:

And being not weak in faith

I wonder if these are the footstep we should be walking in ? v-12

I think the problem lies in Rom 4:21.
That some are not fully persuaded:

Rom 4:21 And being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [grandom](#) on Sat, 19 Apr 2008 13:07:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

With all the discussion about whether FA was a denomination and did Dr. Freeman get off in error etc. I would like to ponder, What did those of us that heard the word do with it in our lives. Much has been made about divine healing and going to Drs. Dr Freeman taught on many subjects. For instance divorce and remarriage. How many that heard this plain teaching that God hates divorce went ahead and divorced. Oh I'm sure they justified it in some way.

I know he also taught from Romans to owe no man anything and yet I wonder how many bought homes, cars or you name it by way of the arm of the flesh. Oh my is there more then one way to apply that passage?

How many more teachings should we go into that few have probably remained true too. We are all responsible for what we have heard. We can criticize Fa and the teachings

but the fact remains that truth was taught. But like any other denomination we picked and chose what applied to us and what we should obey. The word say this is the way walk ye in it. Man choose to do what seems right in his own eyes.

Jesus said in Mat 7:14 Strait is the gate and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life and few there be that find it. Finally Rev 21:7 He that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I will be his God, and he shall be my son.

So you see brothers and sisters, Dr Freeman faces the greater judgement of that as a teacher but we are responsible for what we have heard and obeyed or disobeyed as the case may be.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JRS](#) on Sat, 19 Apr 2008 14:03:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jisamazed wrote on Fri, 18 April 2008 17:44 However, this has become no longer a discussion between brothers and sisters who want to understand the "faith movement", but rather a barrage of accusations about me being controlling and the like. God's people are supposed to discuss the Word in love, albeit we should call it like we see it as well.

Yes " " "God's people are supposed to discuss the Word in love, albeit we should call it like we see it as well." • Your statement here is SO true. Yet to be able to have a discussion of such magnitude, along with it the whole focus of the NT is reveled. MOTIVE - Have to agree with Hombre here.

Hombre wrote on Fri, 18 April 2008 08:52 yours is a message of delusional brotherhood for the sake of unity.

Your error and the rest of them have been around for millenia now.

It appears the focus is to discredit FA and elevating the Denominational way of thinking. " " "OK- Your OK " We "re all OK, because we believe in Jesus, Jesus is Love so let us love one another.. " • What an offence this must be to our KING and LORD Jesus. This is a deception that he permeated Christianity in the last 40 years. Marshmellow Christianity. ---- LUKEWARM Christianity!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Being a loving Christian or being a Christian that conforms for the sake of unity is as different as night is to Day. This can and does pose a problem for many and their understanding of Jesus. Yet

it is what can be found in scripture. We are the Light of the world, We are in the world but not of the world, We are salt, Many are called "few are chosen, Be ye separate" for we serve a HOLY GOD.

jisamazed wrote on Fri, 18 April 2008 17:44Hombre said, "Hobarts' message WAS and still IS the message of the Bible, yours is a message of delusional brotherhood for the sake of unity."

It is time to stop beating a dead horse. Hobart did not preach the word very well later in his ministry. We have to agree to disagree on that one.

There is a balance between false unity of the ecumenical movement, which focuses on unifying organizations, and that of the true unity of the spirit, which we have with all of those who are born again in Jesus.

Yes it is time to stop beating a dead horse.

You talk about true unity of the spirit " Being born again is only the beginning, the unity is bought about be the renewing of ones mind by the Word.

I was led to salvation " through the WORD. Not what man thought or understood. It had always been in scripture yet very few chose to embrace it as THE WORD OF GOD.

If we are to embrace this "true spirit of unity" as you stated it. Then what are we to do with the teaching (examples) of the OT that Bro Freeman labored to bring forth? Israel was called out " chosen of God " to be separate " to be GOD's people. Yet they chose to conform and identify with the world around them. The rest is history.

JRS

John 15:19

If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JRS](#) on Sat, 19 Apr 2008 15:36:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

grandom wrote on Sat, 19 April 2008 08:07

So you see brothers and sisters, Dr Freeman faces the greater judgement of that as a teacher but we are responsible for what we have heard and obeyed or disobeyed as the case may be.

Well stated.

I think the desire of many is to be right with the Lord. The issues enter when one does find error in some teachings and consequently begins to question all the teachings. This should not be an issue if one is going to remain faithful to the Word and rightly discern it.

grandom wrote on Sat, 19 April 2008 08:07

I know he also taught from Romans to owe no man anything and yet I wonder how many bought homes, cars or you name it by way of the arm of the flesh. Oh my is there more than one way to apply that passage?

How many more teachings should we go into that few have probably remained true too.

Need to comment here " we might want to start another category here.

Some might find this comment as being a little offensive " This is a great example of using a scripture to formulate a PET doctrine.

What Paul is expounding on here is the teaching of Jesus " render to Caesar what is Caesar's. In other words PAY THE AUTHORITIES. It is error to add to it " to borrow is sin. I could go on with examples " leases, having bills paid in advance, where are we to draw the line???

This is an excellent principal for a believer to follow and I think there much that can be drawn from it. Proverbs speaks to that.

To pull it out and use it as a doctrine against borrowing is adding to the meaning of what is being addressed here.

If we are to understand it as " against any borrowing at all " Should we judge Paul as sinning when he said he would take on any debt, and repay it, of Onesimus????? Philemon :18 & 19.

JRS

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [grandom](#) on Sat, 19 Apr 2008 19:58:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JRS wrote on Sat, 19 April 2008 10:36grandom wrote on Sat, 19 April 2008 08:07

So you see brothers and sisters,Dr Freeman faces the greater judgement of that as a teacher but we are responsible for what we have heard and obeyed or disobeyed as the case may be.

Well stated.

I think the desire of many is to be right with the Lord. The issues enter when one does find error in some teachings and consequently begins to question all the teachings. This should not be an issue if one is going to remain faithful to the Word and rightly discern it.

grandom wrote on Sat, 19 April 2008 08:07

I know he also taught from Romans to owe no man anything and yet I wonder how many bought homes, cars or you name it by way of the arm of the flesh. Oh my is there more then one way to apply that passage?

How many more teachings should we go into that few have probably remained true too.

Need to comment here â€œ we might want to start another category here.

Some might find this comment as being a little offensive â€œ This is a great example of using a scripture to formulate a PET doctrine.

What Paul is expounding on here is the teaching of Jesus â€œ render to Caesar what is Caesarâ€™s. In other words PAY THE AUTHORITIES. It is error to add to it â€œ to borrow is sin. I could go on with examples â€œ leases, having bills paid in advance, where are we to draw the line???

This is an excellent principal for a believer to follow and I think there much that can be drawn from it. Proverbs speaks to that.

To pull it out and use it as a doctrine against borrowing is adding to the meaning of what is being addressed here.

If we are to understand it as â€œ against any borrowing at all â€œ Should we judge Paul as sinning when he said he would take on any debt, and repay it, of Onesimus????? Philemon :18 & 19.

JRS

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [grandom](#) on Sun, 20 Apr 2008 11:41:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks for your reply JRS.
I wish I could figure out the quote thingy but since I`m old and not to swift I have to cut and paste.
You said
Some might find this comment as being a little offensive â€œ This is a great example of using a scripture to formulate a PET doctrine.

I dont know as this is a pet doctrine of mine. I have experienced great blessings by adherein to it and in my unsaved life many bad experiences by not obeying it. Twice in Deuteronomy it says dont borrow and proverbs says the borrower is servant to the lender. Your right the Bible is negative to being in debt and oweing. That may or may not be a basis for doctrine but for me it works and each has to determine if I should go against what the word seems to hold in a negative light.

I appreciate you brother and we should examine teaching we receive. The Holy Spirit is still the best teacher.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JRS](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2008 02:08:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey â€œ Believe me when I say â€œYour not alone in what you said about being swift around a computer. I have a grandson that seems to run rings around me. Cut & Paste â€œ works for me too.

I appreciate you too brother and all who post here. I know I have found this site to be a blessing.

I wanted a preference the statement as being offensive, as it might offend some as a direct insult towards Bro Freeman. My intention is no way to discredit Bro Freeman. I highly respect him as a person and I am very thankful for his teachings that he brought forth.

This I completely agree with you.

grandom wrote on Sun, 20 April 2008 06:41

I have experienced great blessings by adherein to it and in my unsaved life many bad experiences by not obeying it. Twice in Deuteronomy it says dont borrow and proverbs says the borrower is servant to the lender. Your right the Bible is negative to being in debt and oweing. That may or may not be a basis for doctrine but for me it works and each has to determine if I should go against what the word seems to hold in a negative light.

The Wisdom that scripture teaches concerning the area of debt and borrowing is very much in the negative and there are great blessings to be had in adhering to it.

As it was taught " Going in debt is SIN " for one is leaning on the arm of the flesh and there for not standing in faith = SIN.

With the above understanding, the ONLY result is bondage.

Some would argue against that statement with say " it brings the freedom to believe God for our needs.

The same is being said and the result is the same. The brother sitting next to you chooses not to believe = they are not in faith = they are in SIN. Let's stay on this train of thought " if the brother is in sin then is he overcoming in his life? If he is Not overcoming then can we have fellowship with him? And so forth the reasoning goes on. And on. The little foxes do spoil the vine.

I ask this question from a practical position. What is the difference in buying a house (mortgage) to being in a lease agreement (whether written or verbal) and renting. The argument is that one is actually borrowing money and the other is only owing for an agreed upon time frame. Either one you would have to draw the conclusion that it is sin by taking the verse as it was taught. One is still bound buy the agreement, month to month or say up to 30 years.

I refer to it as a "œpet doctrine" because of how I heard it taught and then on a number of occasions of how it would be referred to. It was used to imply that others were in sin and thus lesser Christians. I know the bondage teachings as this created and the damage it has caused.

When I first heard such a teaching it was overwhelming and we all received it with such joy and thankfulness. Without question we were privileged to be receiving the indebt truths that have always been in scripture and no one else teaches or even acknowledges. To question the teaching at the time " would be considered as not receiving the word with a joyful heart, ect.

This happens to be one of the teachings that a question always remained yet I really couldn't explain it and be settled. Yet I could say I really question how one derived from scripture the cut and dry idea that owing =sin.

I came across a teaching that really hit home and bought an understanding that I feel why

scripture speaks to this area.

1. God scripture in the area for being in debt and owing others for a reason. There is too much written to ignore it.
2. one has to take all that scripture says.
3. We are saved and Baptised with the Holy Spirit and should be lead by the Spirit. Our BEST teacher. 1st questioned one should ask themselves " Why are they in or going into debt. Our MOTIVES.

The conclusion here as I see it " To be in debt is not =sin. The teaching is real and should stand as it is written " owe no man anything " Not that it is sin, but that it hinders the Freedom God that he has given to us and Desires for each of us to come into the fullness of.

JRS

Proverbs 27:17

Iron sharpeneth iron; so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2008 02:27:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JRS said, "It appears the focus is to discredit FA and elevating the Denominational way of thinking. "œl™m OK- Your OK " We™re all OK, because we believe in Jesus, Jesus is Love so let us love one another..• What an offence this must be to our KING and LORD Jesus. This is a deception that he permeated Christianity in the last 40 years. Marshmellow Christianity. ---- LUKEWARM Christianity!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

JRS, I never endorsed the 'I'm OK, you're OK' way of thinking. There is no spiritual unity between believers and nonbelievers, and unity is not organizational in nature. That kind of unity isn't really unity, anyway, because there is nothing for them to be unified about. Plenty of denominational churches do not support the false unity, either. Some do. However, HEF went the opposite extreme and isolated himself from other believers and said little about the unity that we have with them in Christ. The emphasis in the epistles is on the local church, because most of them were written to local churches or pastors. However, Jesus prayed, "My prayer is not for them alone. I pray also for those who will believe in me through their message, that all of them may be one, Father, just as you are in me and I am in you...I have given them the glory that you gave me, that they may be one as we are one: I in them and you in me." (John 17:20-23). True unity is in Christ by the Holy Spirit. Malcolm Webber pointed out that the only way that God's people have unity is by the Holy Spirit. If you pursue a compromising model (ecumenical movement), you have just that-- compromise. If you pursue the conformity model (such as Roman Catholicism in the

middle ages) you have little freedom of thought and cannot be open to learn more from the Word. If you have the local-only model, you have isolation from other Christians who could give healthy input into your church's life. However, it is not "your church come" that we are to pray, but rather, "your kingdom come". We are to be kingdom-minded. Instead of having an "us versus them" mentality toward our brothers and sisters in Christ, we are to treat one another with humility, affirming our common faith in the Lord who bought us before we try to correct one another. "Honor all people. LOVE THE BROTHERHOOD. Fear God. Honor the King" (1 Peter 2:17). What is the brotherhood? It is not just local. Peter wrote this letter to a number of churches, not just one.

By the way, JRS, I specifically used the term "unity of the spirit" on purpose rather than "spirit of unity". HEF himself made a distinction between the two phrases, and I agree with him on that matter. That is the distinction that I have been trying to express here, but you seem to be jumping to the conclusion that I am endorsing a false unity, which I am not. Avoiding false unity does not mean avoiding true unity in Christ.

HEF taught that a "spirit of unity" is wrong, and rightly so, but he did not teach the "unity of the spirit" side of it very well later in his ministry, nor did he live it. Hombre, you were not taught as well as you thought. Sadly, HEF's imbalance led to isolation from other believers and true churches, and that was his downfall.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2008 02:56:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JRS, good post on the indebtedness matter. It always helps to read the context of a statement to understand the author's intent. Scripture was not originally divided into verses, so it is best to read several verses at a time. Romans 13:6-9 - "This is also why you pay taxes, for the authorities are God's servants, who give their full time to governing. Give everyone what you owe him: If you owe taxes, pay taxes; if revenue, then revenue; if respect, then respect; if honor, then honor; do not owe any anything, except to love one another, for he who loves his fellow man has fulfilled the law." The point was that people need to conduct their business with integrity, paying appropriate taxes, wages to their employees, respecting respectable persons, etc... Don't get into debt over any of these matters. However, you always owe each other a love of debt. You can never pay that one off, because you are obligated to do so for the rest of your life. It's the greatest commandment. Thus is the tone and intent of the passage. If a person did not pay debts in those days, he could spend time in jail for the rest of his life or be sold into slavery. It was that risky. Nowadays, there are few legal penalties for not paying debts until someone gets into bankruptcy.

There are plenty of natural consequences, as we see in the economy today. It is a huge freedom to not be in debt.

Christians should try to stay out of debt as much as possible. We must be content with what we have and trust the Lord to supply our needs. Dave Ramsey has gained a huge following by simply applying the Biblical teaching on debt. However, this passage and others are not intended to be a legalistic, "never take out a mortgage" kind of rule. There may be circumstances in which it is appropriate, and we need to pray about what the Lord might have us to do in those circumstances.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jisamazed](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2008 03:12:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JWBTI said, "Jisamazed: You are so right ! Guilty as charged !

Bro Freeman did emphasize FAITH !
I, am sooooo glad he did.

Smith Wigglesworth did too !
What about John G Lake ? He did also !
What about Abraham, was Faith important to him or to God ?"

Emphasizing faith in God is one thing. Any Christian needs to recognize that it is impossible to please God without it, and everything that we do and believe to be true starts with faith. However, HEF seemed to teach a passive faith, especially in regards to healing. Faith works by love, and without works it is dead. Passive faith is dead faith. If we take action because we believe, it is evidence that our faith is alive. Faith in the twisted way that Hobart Freeman taught it was too passive, hence the "doctors = unbelief" mentality, and the tragedy that accompanied it.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JRS](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2008 12:43:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jisamazed â€“ maybe we are jumping to conclusions here. Maybe the issue really is a lack of understanding of what you are actually saying.

If you would answer a few questions for me to define it better.

What you are saying " FA or any other local body should not look to themselves as being exclusive, - and they should

1. Freely fellowship, no matter the Denomination as long as they acknowledge Jesus in there lives. " Attend their church.
2. Or we are to seek out fellowship with individuals from other denominations (same condition as above) and we should be able to have fellowship over spiritual matters.
3. Or #2 above and we should converse and fellowship with them on " their level and be loving towards them.

Or if there is another scenario, please explain and help me understand here.

JRS

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [sparkles](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2008 13:20:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Jae,

You said you think I need a vacation, and I couldn't agree more, except my mother broke her leg/hip and I can't get away right now because I am taking care of her.

As far as not being able to talk about this topic rationally until my anger subsides, again I disagree with you. I have a very critical family member and I hate it when someone is constantly trying to criticize and defame someone as you do Dr. Freeman, so I am sure my disgust with your criticism comes out in how I have said things. Every chance you get, you try to get a dig in about what you think about Brother Freeman. The man wasn't perfect as his critics make him out to be. I have commented to a friend that it is interesting how people that hate Brother Freeman are the ones who took what he said on par with scripture. Some people did not do this, therefore they checked out what he said in the Word of God and base their faith on the promises, which Brother Freeman constantly exhorted the church to do. Brother Freeman said not to take anything he said, wrote, or prophecies at Faith Assembly on par with scripture, as they most certainly were not.

People who believe in divine healing base their beliefs on the multitude of promises in the Bible. And as Brother Freeman taught there are conditions to meet, such as if you don't take care of the temple, your body, God is not obligated to heal you even if you claimed it. If you listen to all

Brother Freeman said and not just pick out a phrase here and there, then you would see it is a balanced message. I think where some of the problems come in is where people took what he said in a legalistic way, which many did not. You see this in all churches, not just Faith Assembly. Like one minister(not Dr. Freeman) said once: "We're all little Jews and Catholics at heart and just want a set of rules to follow." This is where many were wrong, in taking what he said as a rule, and not a principle. Jae, not everyone did this. It would be nice if you would discuss the issues with the Word, instead of trying to criticize Faith Assembly and Brother Freeman every chance you get.

As far as the passive faith comment, Brother Freeman taught to act on your faith, as I would not call that passive faith. Faith has corresponding actions. One time I saw you criticized Brother Freeman for talking about his radio with tubes, and said it was pride that he talked about that. I personally found it interesting as it brought back alot of memories. Now, if Brother Freeman would talk about all the money he gave away or the ways he would bless people you would also call it pride and boasting. You can't have it both ways. Brother Freeman taught the church to be generous and to give and to minister to each other and do good to all men.

We certainly disagree on Brother Freeman and Faith Assembly, but as I have told a friend of mine, Jae loves the Lord and I do appreciate you as a brother in Christ. Hopefully someday there will be another fellowship and I will have the opportunity to see you again.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2008 18:09:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JRS wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 07:43jismazed â€œ maybe we are jumping to conclusions here. Maybe the issue really is a lack of understanding of what you are actually saying.

If you would answer a few questions for me to define it better.
What you are saying â€œ FA or any other local body should not look to themselves as being exclusive, - and they should

1. Freely fellowship, no matter the Denomination as long as they acknowledge Jesus in there lives. â€œ Attend their church.
2. Or we are to seek out fellowship with individuals from other denominations (same condition as above) and we should be able to have fellowship over spiritual matters.
3. Or #2 above and we should converse and fellowship with them on â€œ their level and be loving towards them.

Or if there is another scenario, please explain and help me understand here.

JRS

I'm not sure of the difference between #1 and #2, but #1 sounds pretty close to what I'm saying. Fellowship is not something we do as much as it is something that we already have with other believers in Christ. I John 1:5-7 says, "This is the message we have heard from him and declare to you: God is light; in him there is no darkness at all. If we claim to have fellowship with him yet walk in the darkness, we lie and do not live by the truth. But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus, his Son, purifies us from all sin." Based on how John continued that theme in chapter 2, vs.9-11, I can safely say that "one another" is referring to us believers. We have fellowship with everyone who is walking in the light of Christ, and we have fellowship with God. In Christ no person is above another so as to exclude fellowship. Therefore, it does not matter what organization or denomination the believer is a part of. We can learn from them and they from us. I like to see churches of different traditions interacting, working together to proclaim the gospel or serve the poor. They tend to learn from each other and demonstrate the kingdom of God that way. I'm not talking about doctrinally liberal churches that do not believe that the Bible is God's word or that Jesus is God and the only way to heaven. I mean those who are truly His, who walk in the light of Christ. There is no reason to believe that "we" are better than "they". In Christ, there is no we and they.

The discipline of disfellowshipping a person should only happen when the wrongdoer is unrepentant about sin that severely affects other believers. Sexual immorality, theft, murder, occultic practices, heresy, etc... Such a person demonstrates the likelihood that he or she has never really been regenerated, or at least has severely backslidden. Not the abuse of it that you saw at FA.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JRS](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2008 22:50:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jisamazed,

The difference between #1 & #2 is what I was thinking would be #1 as is stated and #2 would pertain to fellowship outside of the church.

I say Amen to the scriptures you posted.

jisamazed wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 13:09

We have fellowship with everyone who is walking in the light of Christ, and we have fellowship with God.

I see a qualification here "æwith everyone who is walking in the light of Christ"• I would say this needs to be defined then.

jisamazed wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 13:09

In Christ no person is above another so as to exclude fellowship. Therefore, it does not matter what organization or denomination the believer is a part of. We can learn from them and they from us.

I ask for you to define the qualification in the verse because it seems to be very pertinent to the conclusion and understanding you have come to.

I have a couple of more questions hopefully you"™ll be willing to answer.

What is the purpose of man?

How do you view scripture?

Is it God"™s Word?

How are we to apply it?

Church discipline " What happened at FA happened " right or wrong " I wasn"™t directly part of it and to go by 2nd or 3rd had info, not going there. Have a question here though " Have you or do you know anyone who has experienced church discipline in any of the denominational churches??

JRS

Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JWBTI](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 02:12:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jisamazed wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 13:09

In Christ no person is above another so as to exclude fellowship. Therefore, it does not matter what organization or denomination the believer is a part of. We can learn from them and they from us.

Brother Jae,

I have in the years after FA, have been in a number of different Fellowships an or Denominational Churches seeking fellowship & teaching. Things go pretty well until ya start sharing what God is doing in your life. After a couple of healing testimonies an of financial blessings everyone stops talking to you, nobody wants to hang out with ya.....I have been asked a number of times, to please refrain from sharing healing testimonies, cause it was offending some members . They did not want my Fellowship ! where was the Brotherly Love.....? Oh, before you go there.....There was nothing said pro or con ref: Medical Science, just the Blessings of the Lord. Just recently I was rebuffed by an Elder cause I paid cash for a \$ 16,000.00 car.....should have bought an old clunker to make my 90 mi trip to work & home every day.....He won't hang out with me either...I have found one truth over the years.....If God is moving in your life, most Church people don't want you around...you make them nervous!

Ref the Passive Faith ? Not sure about the Term: (Passive)

I love God an I know He Loves me and therefore when I have need of HealingHE Heals me ! Hey, if it works why going anywhere else ? Ya can't get that with Master Card or Visa !

So..... what is Passive about that ?

Blessing in Jesus Name

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JWBTI](#) on Wed, 23 Apr 2008 00:24:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre: Ref

1. The borrowing issue.
 Good thoughts on that issue.
2. This stupid healing issue that refuses to die.

I say Amen to this issue....Amen.....Amen & Amen !
...do I have agreement on this...Yes from me Brother.....Thank you !

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JRS](#) on Wed, 23 Apr 2008 12:11:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I hear what you are saying Hombre & JW.

These issues only appear because of how they were taught in the past, as absolutes.
Please correct me if Iâ€™m wrong here.
They were taught as -----

Borrowing = SIN

Going to Doctors at all = SIN

And even the use of bandagesâ€™ = SIN

The real issue as I see it is that the way I (and many who read this) was taught, I couldnâ€™t really say that I wasnâ€™t having questions with my conscience and personally â€œ there is NO humanistic form of reasoning that could explain it.
These were both taught as absolutes from scripture.

You might argue to just go ahead and do it and some might just do that. Yet can they really say that they do not have some question about it possibly being sin????

Jim

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [william](#) on Wed, 23 Apr 2008 15:54:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre: Quote:Secondly, yes, I am disagreeing with the past stance of FA and HEF (gasp!) that these 2 issues constitute SIN.

I agree with you on this with the following caveats: Our problem was not with the truth that healing is in the atonement, and the promise of provision without debt, but the legislative spin with which we carried out our own convictions. I think that is what you end up concluding in your note.

If I could make a somewhat weak analogy with the concept of eating meat sacrificed to idols.

Paul, to my mind, makes the case that nothing should be done based upon pressure from without, but what we do should be based strictly upon our own faith in God.

When others *do* things, based on some logical extrapolation (e.g. that we were "supposed" to be giants of faith), and base what they do upon other's expectations of what it means to be in faith, and not do it proportional to their faith, problems arise.

The problem of "doing" things without first having faith in the heart results in sin, and maybe, just as much "œsin" as someone who knows right from wrong and chooses the wrong.

If a person believes (has faith in his heart) that God does not want them to seek medical attention (or go into debt) and then ends up doing those things, he sins... right?

If the same person puts pressure on another individual to do those things he has a conviction about but not shared by the other, he sins... right?

Now we can talk all day about the objective revelation and how the Word means what it says, but unless a person embraces it for themselves, it is futile to make them walk in it. (I believe this was the central problem we had, and to some degree still have.)

And no, I'm not saying that we all shouldn't be at the same place in our faith (what is good for one, is good for all!) but the fact remains, we are not.

I've been interrupted ten times, but I hope I'm making a little sense here?

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [william](#) on Wed, 23 Apr 2008 21:24:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I did say it was a weak analogy <grin>.

The point is that it is just as much of a sin for someone to try the faith route without faith, (or at the very least he may end up perishing for his weak conscience sake) as it is for one in the faith to go the other way. Remember, not all have faith!

Now if it were all just a black or white issue like committing adultery and not committing adultery

we wouldn't hesitate to call it sin when one committed adultery, (and those who do not we would call super-elite Christians! but I digress...)

But I find it difficult to make a blanket statement about those who, for whatever reason, don't choose to take advantage of God's provision for healing, by stating categorically that they are in sin.

I know you want to keep it simple, but it does get complicated when one takes the position that drugs and doctors are evil. Actually, as I think about it, it is simpler to take that position, because to seek help from an evil source is clearly sin.

That is, and always has been the heart of the issue. It was to the point that FA'ers would rather die (even when they knew they didn't have the faith), than to seek things from an evil source.

If it were not for that very issue, we might have allowed others to grow into the knowledge of healing in the atonement, while maintaining a friendly relationship with the druggist. To reference my analogy again, we would have allowed those who didn't want to eat the sacrificed meat, room to do so. But alas, it was not to be!

Quote: So then, am I to believe that if one thinks that medicine is evil, then one is sinning, but if one thinks that medicine is good, then one is not sinning?

I can't answer the last part of the question, but the first part is exactly what occurred in our minds.

My mindset at the time was: to seek help from an evil source was to bring into question my salvation. I don't think I was the only one who thought that way.

Which brings me to something you said earlier:

Quote: So then, in conclusion I think we should really not be legislating peoples' behavior toward these two issues, but rather attempting to increase their/our faith, through the understanding of Gods' good will toward us, not through the fear of consequences in these areas.

All well and good unless you believe that drugs=evil. Until this is answered satisfactorily there won't be much solved concerning the issue.

I agree with your statement btw, (concerning not legislating other's behavior), but I'm still not able to say with certainty that drugs are neutral, neither good(from God) or evil/Satanic. Paradoxically I have gotten to the point where I can leave the decisions that others make in this area, between them and God.

Quote: although, when I did, I preferred Borkum Riff.

If you smoked Borkim Riff, I understand why you no longer smoke a pipe. You should try some of

the latakia-laced English blendsâ€¦ now that is a powerful drug!

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 01:07:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JRS said, "I see a qualification here â€œ with everyone who is walking in the light of Christâ€• I would say this needs to be defined then."

We are either in Christ's light or we are not. We are either born again, or we are not. If we are, we are in Christ's light, and we have fellowship one with another, and His blood washes our sins. If our sins are washed by His blood, we are in His light. He is talking about saved people here, not those who have more knowledge (or think they do) than others.

JRS asked, "What is the purpose of man?"

How do you view scripture?
Is it Godâ€™s Word?
How are we to apply it?

Church discipline â€œ What happened at FA happened â€œ right or wrong â€œ I wasnâ€™t directly part of it and to go by 2nd or 3rd had info, not going there. Have a question here though â€œ Have you or do you know anyone who has experienced church discipline in any of the denominational churches??"

1. What is the purpose of man? Revelation 4:11 says for the glory of God. If you want a technical answer, the Westminster Confession says, 'To glorify God and enjoy Him forever', which is a Biblical statement.

2. How do you view scripture? All scripture is God-breathed, and useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness. I don't think any of our current texts (Textus Receptus, Westcott and Hort, Nestle-Aland, etc...) are exact replicas of the original, God-breathed documents, but I do believe that such replicas are existant and that possibly someone will find them someday. We probably have some of them already. I don't buy the "King James only" nonsense.

Scripture is both human and divine in the same way that Jesus is both human and divine. It is

fully divine in every aspect, and fully written by human vessels through whom God breathed His word. It is the verbal-plenary view that HEF and most other evangelicals taught.

3. Is it God's word? Absolutely. See #2 above.

4. How are we to apply it? We are to try as best as possible to determine the intent of the human author for each passage, then take the truth that is taught and bring it into our contemporary situation. To us these things were written, per I Cor 10:6. For example, "Greet one another with a holy kiss" means to respect and receive one another, even if it is a person such as Timothy who comes bringing the word from a much different culture. The truth of greeting and receiving each other fully applies to our culture by a handshake, welcoming conversation and trading shots (just kidding), even if we do not express that acceptance by a holy kiss the way that Mediterranean culture did in that time.

5. Church discipline? Yes, I have seen it applied very well in some "denominational" churches. The intent was to restore the person and help them to get back on their feet. Excommunication was rarely or never used, and it did not need to be, because healthy church discipline was applied early in the situation effectively. Jay Adams has an excellent book on church discipline. Wayne Grudem has a helpful section on it in his Systematic Theology.

Some "denominational" churches were way ahead of FA in some areas such as this.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jjsamazed](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 02:44:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I need to take advantage of the opportunity to state that I probably agree with Hombre and Moulder more than I disagree with them on the peer pressure/medical science matter. Miracles happen! Based on your posts, it sounds like you emphasize the need to trust the Lord, but you don't buy the medicine-and-doctors=sin idea.

However, I am more affirming of medical science as just that, a science. Science is a way of learning about the Lord's creation, and mankind has benefited enormously from it. It is the glory of God to conceal a matter; to search out a matter is the glory of kings (Proverbs 25:2). The study of the human body is included. Much human suffering has been relieved by medical science, although it is flawed, just like every other thing that humans do. I do not see a contradiction between science and faith, although false science tries to undermine faith. Ultimately, everything we do and believe starts with faith in something, but I digress.

I have a good friend who is a retired physician. He is filled with the Holy Spirit and a wonderful Christian brother. He has gone overseas to bring medical help to third-world countries, and has

worked among migrant workers, a neglected population. He also prays for the sick for healing whenever he gets the chance, and acknowledges that healing comes from the Lord, and that we have the privilege of looking to Him. I have a hard time believing that we should take ourselves through deliverance every time we walked through the office of someone like him.

I know that there are doctors who are involved in the occult. One such doctor tried to treat me once when I was a teenager, and I refused. However, there are mechanics and builders and teachers and even a few preachers who are involved in the occult. Their profession does not make them occult, their involvement with it does. There are godly doctors and ungodly, godly engineers and ungodly, godly machinists and ungodly.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jisamazed](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 02:58:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JWBTI said, "I have in the years after FA, have been in a number of different Fellowships and Denominational Churches seeking fellowship & teaching. Things go pretty well until ya start sharing what God is doing in your life. After a couple of healing testimonies and of financial blessings everyone stops talking to you, nobody wants to hang out with ya.....I have been asked a number of times, to please refrain from sharing healing testimonies, cause it was offending some members. They did not want my Fellowship! where was the Brotherly Love.....? Oh, before you go there.....There was nothing said pro or con ref: Medical Science, just the Blessings of the Lord. Just recently I was rebuffed by an Elder cause I paid cash for a \$ 16,000.00 car.....should have bought an old clunker to make my 90 mi trip to work & home every day.....He won't hang out with me either...I have found one truth over the years.....If God is moving in your life, most Church people don't want you around...you make them nervous!"

JWBTI, your experience has been much different than mine. When I talk about how the Lord has provided for my healing or supplied all my needs in spite of my income, other believers (and even a few nonbelievers) are often amazed and give glory to God. I generally wait until it is appropriate to the conversation before I bring it up. There are many other good things to talk about with people, and if they don't share my joy in what God has done, I don't really care. I care more about the person than about whether or not they like my testimonies. You have to develop relationships and be patient with people. To label them "denominational" or "religious" is errant and unkind and pretends that we don't have weak areas. No, I'm not saying that you are doing that, but that mentality was prevalent in the old days. We all have our own strengths and weaknesses, and we are no better than our brothers and sisters in Christ anywhere.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [william](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 03:33:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre wrote on Wed, 23 April 2008 17:20moulder wrote on Wed, 23 April 2008 16:24 I find it difficult to make a blanket statement about those who, for whatever reason, don't choose to take advantage of God's provision for healing, by stating categorically that they are in sin.

William, you are no Jack Kennedy HEF.

What did I do? I ran the whole thing through a spell checker so I wouldn't get caught by the spelling nazi! And I can spell tom-a-toe.

I think you are having way too much fun since you figured out how to use the strike-out feature.

Quote:

I am not saying that doctors and medicine=evil/sin, I am saying that it is far better to me anyway, to simply recognize them as a less than perfect source than God, and that is why the woman with the issue was not healed, nor was Asa. In contrast however, what does that say about our friends, acquaintances, loved ones etc., who have died 'trusting God' who could have lived had they taken advantage of certain remedies which medical science considers to be very simple?

This may be the shade of difference between us... I view the healing message as God's way, not merely a better way. To me the alternative is, by contrast, "not God's way".

Quote:Here is an interesting thought: if it is sin to kill (including suicide) is it then sin to allow oneself to die, knowing full well that a vaccine could save and prolong your life?

I guess this is one of those times where ignorance is bliss... I don't really have any confidence that a vaccine can save or prolong my life.

Perhaps I'm being a bit too open here, especially since you don't seem like the Dr Phil type, but I'll proceed with caution... I would find it extremely difficult to take a vaccine, knowing what I know (or at least what I *think* I know). How many times did I use I in that sentence? Introspection, get outta here!

That's as deep as I'm going to get Dr Hombre, at least at this couch session...

I'm already bracing myself lest Jae is so amazed that he feels compelled to take over the shock treatments.

Quote:I am assuming that we are believing that God is totally in control and that when ity is time for someone to go, nothing is going to help them. Are we to assume then that it is possible to

override the will of God with reference to prolonging ones' life?

...and is that what people do when their medical treatment is successful, or is God simply being merciful and overlooking their 'transgression'?

...and also, does that mean that those who believe that God is in full control of our destiny and very survival/existence are in fact sinning by their attempt to thwart Gods' will concerning their own demise by using medicine/doctors?

.....just asking....

If you are asking me, I would answer no to the first question, I don't know, to the second, and yes to the last. Having answered yes to the last question, I will equivocate a bit by saying that those who fall into that category, are usually not cognizant of the implications in such a way as to think that they are attempting to "thwart" God's will. Unfortunately, or fortunately, if you hail from regions beyond my perspective, the question has never been raised in their minds.

Quote:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rpoEmlxUPeQ>

Stop it man, you are blowing my mind!!!!!!!!!!!!

Quote:

moulder wrote on Wed, 23 April 2008 16:24

Hombre: So then, am I to believe that if one thinks that medicine is evil, then one is sinning, but if one thinks that medicine is good, then one is not sinning?

I can't answer the last part of the question, but the first part is exactly what occurred in our minds.

My mindset at the time was: to seek help from an evil source was to bring into question my salvation. I don't think I was the only one who thought that way.

Well, all I can say is that I never saw it that way. I saw it the way I'm describing it, however, I saw that we were being led to believe that 'overcomers' would never fall prey to using the arm of the flesh....and as such, if some did, they were definitely NOT 'overcomers'.

Did you ever listen to that message from the OT theology series concerning drugs? That

message was the watershed event that started the whole drugs=evil mindset. At least it was my mindset. Maybe others didn't see it that way... anyone else following this thread want to chime in?

Quote:

Furthermore, it is difficult for me to condemn medicine, which has saved so many lives, including my own long before I was saved. In fact, were it not for penicillin, I would surely have died, and never lived long enough to come to the knowledge of Jesus Christ.

Wow, you sound certain... I guess it must be so! <grin>

Quote:That brings to mind the fact that this idea depends upon who is looking at it, and how. If one is of the mindset that doctors and medicine are from God, then one can give thanks for them, and not be in the least bit perturbed by this issue. If one believes that they are evil, then the issue is over too. The only ones with a real problem are those who can't make up their minds one way or another...and that is not a really comfortable place to be.

Amen to that!

Quote:So basically what you're saying is that you have a laissez-faire spiritual mentality in these areas?

What do you want me to do, take advantage of the situation and become a non-using pusher?

Jerking people out of the fire hasn't exactly worked very well... so, unless you've got some other suggestions, I'm going to leave the matter between labor and management.

Put that in your ecclesiastical pipe and smoke it! <grin>

Quote:Here is a good question.

Is it better to live or to die?

To live, of course. But you may need to die before you can really live.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination

Sageshroomer wrote on Mon, 21 April 2008 08:20HI Jae,
You said you think I need a vacation, and I couldn't agree more, except my mother broke her leg/hip and I can't get away right now because I am taking care of her.
Sorry to hear that. I hope she recovers quickly.

As far as not being able to talk about this topic rationally until my anger subsides, again I disagree with you. I have a very critical family member and I hate it when someone is constantly trying to criticize and defame someone as you do Dr. Freeman, so I am sure my disgust with your criticism comes out in how I have said things. Every chance you get, you try to get a dig in about what you think about Brother Freeman. I have a reason for pointing out HEF's errors and problems. I perceive that many people look to him as a gold standard of Bible teaching, and I think that is unhealthy. He was not as right as is perceived, and toward the end of his life he hurt a lot of people because of his imbalances. If you are not able to recognize those imbalances, you are vulnerable to them yourself. I have also affirmed the areas in which I believe HEF to be right. However, you say only negative things about the likes of Rick Warren or the Pensacola Revival, and nothing good at all. A critical spirit only states the bad and not the good. True discernment will hold fast to what is good and abstain from every form of evil as scripture tells us to. The man wasn't perfect as his critics make him out to be. Give the same grace to Rick Warren, Sue. I have commented to a friend that it is interesting how people that hate Brother Freeman are the ones who took what he said on par with scripture. Not me. I never got that extreme, although I did immerse myself in his teaching for a while. Some people did not do this, therefore they checked out what he said in the Word of God and base their faith on the promises, which Brother Freeman constantly exhorted the church to do. Brother Freeman said not to take anything he said, wrote, or prophecies at Faith Assembly on par with scripture, as they most certainly were not. However, he was quite defensive when people tried to bring correction. He might have received a few minor corrections, but most of the time toward the end of his life he did not listen to attempts by people to correct him, and as a result he continued in his errors.

People who believe in divine healing base their beliefs on the multitude of promises in the Bible. I believe in divine healing. I just don't believe what HEF added to that teaching, esp. regarding medical science or that God HAS to heal us if all conditions are met and we have faith. And as Brother Freeman taught there are conditions to meet, such as if you don't take care of the temple, your body, God is not obligated to heal you even if you claimed it. If you listen to all Brother Freeman said and not just pick out a phrase here and there, then you would see it is a balanced message. I did listen to all he said, believe me. And it was not balanced. People did not just take it that way, he taught it that way. All he had to do was make the same statement you made-- "People can go to doctors if they want to..." He did not do so, and instead labored the anti-medical science idea, and disaster happened as a result. I think where some of the problems come in is where people took what he said in a legalistic way, which many did not. You see this in all churches, not just Faith Assembly. Like one minister(not Dr. Freeman) said once: "We're all little Jews and Catholics at heart and just want a set of rules to follow." This is where many were

wrong, in taking what he said as a rule, and not a principle. Jae, not everyone did this. It would be nice if you would discuss the issues with the Word, instead of trying to criticize Faith Assembly and Brother Freeman every chance you get. I love to discuss scripture and have done so on this web site. Doing so will automatically cause people to question whether or not HEF really taught the full counsel of God like he claimed. As far as the passive faith comment, Brother Freeman taught to act on your faith, as I would not call that passive faith. Faith has corresponding actions. I would say that would include accessing medical help when appropriate. Passivity does nothing when one is bleeding to death or has a broken bone that could easily be set by a doctor.

One time I saw you criticized Brother Freeman for talking about his radio with tubes, and said it was pride that he talked about that. I personally found it interesting as it brought back alot of memories. Now, if Brother Freeman would talk about all the money he gave away or the ways he would bless people you would also call it pride and boasting. You can't have it both ways. Brother Freeman taught the church to be generous and to give and to minister to each other and do good to all men. I hope that he was a giver. That would help me to see him in a different light. But the radio thing was still boasting. It was not necessary in that sermon. We certainly disagree on Brother Freeman and Faith Assembly, but as I have told a friend of mine, Jae loves the Lord and I do appreciate you as a brother in Christ. That is a kind thing to say and I can affirm the same for you. Hopefully someday there will be another fellowship and I will have the opportunity to see you again. I know that you mean that as a compliment, and thank you.

However, the idea of another fellowship like that is absolutely repulsive to me. I would never go back to that bondage. The Lord had a reason for putting us under that teaching for a while, and he mercifully brought us out of it. We are to go forward in our walk with Christ, not backward. I am thankful for the good that I received, but in the name of the Lord Jesus I reject the error. Reading some of the posts here reminds me of the bondage I used to be in. It is nice to be free.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 04:30:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Moulder said, "I'm already bracing myself lest Jae is so amazed that he feels compelled to take over the shock treatments."
[/quote]

That one went over my head. I missed where the shock treatments come in. Maybe you mean that we are shocked by the love of God?

However, yes, I am amazed frequently. I find that amazement at the love of God occurs often

when I am being filled with the Holy Spirit in a fresh way. Amazed that He loves us in spite of the fact that we don't deserve it, because our sins have offended Him in all His holiness. Amazed at who He is, what He has done for us, that He would love us enough to be tortured to death to pay for our sins. And He proved it by rising from the dead.

I hope that in the midst of all this debate we can still remind ourselves everyday of how amazing the Lord is, and stand in awe of Him.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [sparkles](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 15:56:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Jae,

I should have been more specific when I said maybe there will be another fellowship where I can see you again. I meant a fellowship like at Chips house. I enjoyed seeing people I had not seen for years. It brought back many good memories for me, although I am not sure everyone felt that way.

What I had at Faith Assembly and the Grand Rapids meeting was not repulsive or bondage to me, rather very liberating and freeing of the things and ways of the world. To know that I don't have to be like the world, speak like the world or do the things the world does is wonderful! I can enjoy life and enjoy the Lord.

And just for the record, I am believing for something better than Faith Assembly as the Lord has better for me. Now I was extremely blessed there but I don't see that I have to stop at what I had there, but can have the best God has for me now!

All this talk about healing has again confirmed to me that I need to base what I believe on God's word, not man's word(whether it be Brother Freeman, you or anybody else.)

Now with saying that I was reading a book about Smith Wigglesworth called "The Secret of His Power." Many of us have heard of Smith, and in his book he said something that I think is quite interesting in light of all the discussion about medical science and healing: Wigglesworth commented on how the ministry of healing would become more difficult. He felt there were too many remedies that people put their trust in, (and how much more today are there.) He felt that the time would come where it will be hard to get anyone to believe at all, and that we are such a drug-conscious society that alot of times the pill bottle is more important that the anointing bottle. This is so true. Brother Freeman once said that people grow in their faith, whether it is healing or other things, and that when he heard that God heals today he didn't run and throw out his heart medicine, until he had the faith in his heart to do so. One other thing about Smith was that he developed his relationship with Jesus over the years, and in that time he faced not only physical trials, but also persecution by other so-called Christians. They didn't have the confidence in Jesus

Smith had.

I guess I would say, Jae, be careful that you don't take on the roll of Job's friends and discourage people from trusting Jesus for their healing. In your zeal to discredit Brother Freeman you may be discouraging saints in different area's of their lives. We are to encourage each other in the faith, and healing is certainly a part of the gospel of Jesus.

And in saying that let me also say healing is not an issue of whether one is saved or not.

Healing by God is taught from Genesis to Revelation and that cannot be debated. If you want to go to the doctor that is between you and the Lord, but you should also give those who choose to trust Jesus totally for their healing the same freedom.

When you look at some of the people running for president they are making a big deal about Medical Science and Health Care. Why? Because I believe it will be one big issue that Anti-christ will use to come on the scene, as well as the financial problems there will be, and the apostate compromising church. Time is short and we need to get an unshakeable faith in Jesus Christ and ALL his promises and provisions to protect and keep us in the days and years(if the Lord tarries) ahead. Matt. 25:1-13

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JRS](#) on Thu, 24 Apr 2008 23:55:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre and moulder bring up some interesting points, and it very much seems to be that we are saying the same thing only from different perspectives.

Moulder said - My mindset at the time was: to seek help from an evil source was to bring into question my salvation. I don't think I was the only one who thought that way.

You were not the only one â€œ That is how it was taught!!!

The issue as I see it is that it both of these were taught as absolutes and scripture never does that. It is and always has been by manâ€™s reasoning and what seems to be manâ€™s need for self justification (might not be the best way to put it). Or shall one say manâ€™s view of himself to set standards so he can measure and verify that he is succeeding in his walk with the Lord. We set formulaâ€™s, concepts, ideas, and practices in the natural for us to attain. We lean on our natural understanding to set the guard rails on the narrow and straight way we desire to walk on.

Both of these are excellent concepts in scripture and because of the extent they were focused on

they became doctrine.

The focus should have been the understanding as to why they were given to us in scripture, instead of the catch all conclusion "they are sin."

Jesus set us free from the bondage of sin "not to bring us back into bondage" If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye are free indeed.

I ask the question then - Where is your Faith?

Going to Doctors "must not be sin" otherwise it would have been addressed in scripture. Yet to stay in that line of thinking brings the conclusion that it is OK ALL the time thus negating the promise we do have in James and the truth that God can heal this body no matter what the circumstances are. We are blessed to have Faith that we have the Promise of the Holy Spirit to guide, teach, lead, comfort, ect. The real concern of any believer is to be walking in the freedom we are promised to be able to hear that still small voice. This is why these issues as these still arise in discussions.

To describe it in a nut shell "we were taught and settled with them. Things fell apart and many have gone back to what we began with and started judging everything that we were and are confronted with. We were graciously bought out of Babylon "the denominational church- and that left many with the situation of where are we to go???"

Some gave up and blamed God "How could he allow such deception? They asked.

Others just put things aside and into situations that did not challenge them at all or limited amounts.

And some completely labeled FA and Bro Freeman as a cult, ect and through the baby out with the bath water.

Still others attempted to maintain they walk they were part of and saw some blessings yet not as it was proclaimed and to a certain extent just kinda drifted away, still coveting in their hearts the Joy and blessings the Word and the Spirit of God had brought forth at one time. Knowing that Jesus started the work and shall finish that which He has begun. Yet questions still pop up in their conscience "In the desire to be in fellowship with the Lord.

It's little foxes such as these that keep rising there heads up that will continually hinder believers until they have the answer from God himself. "HIS WORD.

We were created in the image of GOD and he gave us a mind to use and to reason with. We error when we begin to reason, adding or omitting, to the Word.

Any reasoning that departs from the Word in any way must be bought into subjection to the Word Of God.

As it has been said before in other posts here. One should strive to be led be the Holy Spirit.

I ask the question "Is there anything, in the flesh that we can do to please God???" NO!

In the past we felt as though we were pleasing God by what we DIDN'T do. It was a focus on the outward "dress, zippers, shoes, glasses, doctors, debt, I'm sure the list could go on.

Then arises the question " If one is focusing on the outward how can they truly say they are dead to self???"

The real issue is the MOTIVE for all that we do " God looks on the hearts. If we feel we are pleasing to God because of what we don't do " Isn't this an indication that one is NOT dead to self and is no more than a vain attempt to glorify God by focusing on one standing with him instead of ENJOYING his presence and using Their FAITH and allowing the Holy Spirit to fulfill the ministry He was sent to us for?

Jim

Gal 4:9 But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JRS](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2008 01:43:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jae,

Thank you for taking the time to answer as you did.

I asked the questions to see if you still held the WORD in the standing to have the last say over any situation. For that is what it all comes down to. Correct me if I am wrong here. In your reply, #2 in particular it would seem as though you are leaving room for scripture to be in error. So if one doesn't like what it says " they throw it out. It doesn't really apply.

jisamazed wrote on Wed, 23 April 2008 20:07

2. How do you view scripture? All scripture is God-breathed, and useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness. I don't think any of our current texts (Textus Receptus, Westcott and Hort, Nestle-Aland, etc...) are exact replicas of the original, God-breathed documents, but I do believe that such replicas exist and that possibly someone will find them someday. We probably have some of them already. I don't buy the "King James only" nonsense.

Scripture is both human and divine in the same way that Jesus is both human and divine. It is fully divine in every aspect, and fully written by human vessels through whom God breathed His word. It is the verbal-plenary view that HEF and most other evangelicals taught.

jisamazed wrote on Wed, 23 April 2008 20:07 JRS said, "I see a qualification here "with everyone who is walking in the light of Christ" I would say this needs to be defined then."

We are either in Christ's light or we are not. We are either born again, or we are not. If we are, we are in Christ's light, and we have fellowship one with another, and His blood washes our sins. If our sins are washed by His blood, we are in His light. He is talking about saved people here, not those who have more knowledge (or think they do) than others.

Some "denominational" churches were way ahead of FA in some areas such as this.

JWBTI - I can really appreciate what you posted and it is so true.

Jea, It sure does seem as though you have an ax to grind about FA and Bro Freeman. You certainly do not miss a chance to drive a nail. The problem is with all the nails you are throwing you fail to actually see how precious much of the teaching was. The foundations it set that cannot be altered because they are based on God's Word. Yes there was error and for what ever reasons we may possibly never know.

The error I see that you are proposing here I find no difference.

You say that we should put off the negative outlook on the Denominational church and have fellowship with them. If this is what God is calling you to do then PTL, but to persuade others when it is direct contradiction to the WORD.

You mentioned that HEF did not teach unity of Spirit, Yet I think if you would research that out, he did and did it well.

Romans 12:2 And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

One's mind is only renewed through the WORD.

John 6:63 It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.

Phil 2:2 Fulfill ye my joy, that ye be likeminded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind.

Eph 4:3 Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

John 6:63 It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.

The unity you seek can only come from unity through the WORD. Apart from that it is no more

than a false unity.

2 Thess 1:8 In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ:

What are we to do with this verse? It seems to be rather specific "the ones that know not God (unbelievers) " That obey not the gospel (believers)

Jim

2 Thess 1: 10-12

10 When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day.

11 Wherefore also we pray always for you, that our God would count you worthy of this calling, and fulfil all the good pleasure of his goodness, and the work of faith with power:

12 That the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified in you, and ye in him, according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jjsamazed](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2008 02:37:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JRS said, "In your reply, #2 in particular it would seem as though you are leaving room for scripture to be in error."

Are you kidding? How did you arrive at that conclusion? I could not have made it any clearer that ALL scripture is God-breathed. When I say that scripture is fully divine, yet fully written by man, that is the basic, orthodox view of scripture espoused by most true Christians, including HEF. The fact that there was a human element in scripture does not mean that it has any error. The Bible in its original manuscripts is inerrant. Period. The Lord used human vessels to bring it about. OT writers wrote the histories of the Kings. David wrote songs. Prophets spoke from God to the people verbally. Gospel writers described the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. Paul wrote letters to dear friends. The Lord used all of these people and means to breath out his word to us. I never said that scripture could be in error and have NEVER believed that. I have dedicated myself to studying it because it is God's word through and through.

I'm just not sure which of the manuscripts that we know about are the original ones. HEF and Jim B used to tout the Textus Receptus, but I don't think that it is the exact replica of the originals anymore like I used to. I prefer to look at the Nestle-Aland text when I consult the Greek, but it is

not perfect either. (For those of you who have no idea what I'm talking about, don't worry about it, you don't need to know. It's a Geek, I mean Greek, thing).

The error I see that you are proposing here I find no difference. You say that we should put off the negative outlook on the Denominational church and have fellowship with them. If this is what God is calling you to do then PTL, but to persuade others when it is direct contradiction to the WORD.

JRS, how is it a direct contradiction to the Word to fellowship with other brothers and sisters in Christ? In regards to His relationship to them and our relationship to them, God does not care if their church belongs to a denomination. Our place in Christ rests in Christ alone, not in whether or not their church is part of an organization. Otherwise, people could not have fellowship with anyone who still goes to a FA church. This is the whole point I am trying to make with this thread. We are not better than any other brother, nor are we above fellowshipping with him, just because of the church that he goes to.

I believe strongly that HEF would never have gotten into the problems that you have mentioned had he not isolated himself from other churches and Christians whom he thought were less than him.

Jea, It sure does seem as though you have an ax to grind about FA and Bro Freeman. You certainly do not miss a chance to drive a nail. The problem is with all the nails you are throwing you fail to actually see how precious much of the teaching was. The foundations it set that cannot be altered because they are based is God's Word. Yes there was error and for what ever reasons we may possibly never know.

No, I affirm the truth that I received from FA and HEF, and have done so in several differnt posts on this forum. Personally, I think that Jim Brennehan did a better job of expounding scripture than HEF did, but I realized that he learned from him. I don't reject any foundational teaching. I believe that HEF was anointed as a theology teacher, and he did a good job at it. Foundational theology is important. However, even HEF moved away from some of that theology (such as eternal security) later in his life.

The unity you seek can only come from unity through the WORD. Apart from that it is no more than a false unity.

The unity that I seek comes by the Holy Spirit like scripture says-- "endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." It comes in Christ, per John 17:21. And, yes, scripture guides us to make sure the unity is in truth as well. If we refuse to recognize the fellowship that we have with a brother because he does not line up with everything we believe he should be doing, we miss the point. If that is the case, no one should fellowship with anyone else, because we all have areas in which we don't line up with scripture. We are still growing. Whether or not a Christian or church is

a part of denomination has nothing to do with it. Whether or not they are truly in Christ has everything to do with it.

2 Thess 1:8 In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ:

What are we to do with this verse? It seems to be rather specific "the ones that know not God (unbelievers) " That obey not the gospel (believers)

Agreed. I'm not sure why you thought that I would have an issue with that verse. I believe that those in Christ will spend eternity with Him, and those who are not in Christ will spend eternity away from Him, in everlasting fire (the tense in this verse is present, meaning an ongoing destruction and fire, not a temporary one). Hence I disagree with the Michael the Disciple poster who advances the doctrine of annihilation. It simply is not scriptural.

Either I am not making myself clear, or you are jumping to conclusions about my theology. I believe strongly in the power of the good news, in heaven and hell, and that Jesus is the only way to the Father. No compromise. Also, most "denominational" believers with whom I fellowship do not compromise those matters. We have fellowship with them. Those who do not believe the central truths of Christianity are likely not really saved to begin with.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jksamazed](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2008 21:09:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Good post, Hombre. I would add that many religious groups have done so over the centuries, and FA is but one example. They had their own unspoken rules and unhealthy peer pressure, but many other churches have done the same in their own way. That not only includes some Christian groups, but also false religions. Look at radical Islam. A woman was beaten to death in Kabul a couple of years ago because her bare arm showed while she was driving. The same mentality could be applied to communist states or the workplace culture in some businesses in America. The lesson to be learned is that people will resort to that kind of bondage if they are not filled with the Holy Spirit and guarding their heart frequently. Even a church that preaches against legalism and conformity can still become that way. Pride and fear are the source of it. Paul and Peter addressed this problem in their letters because even the early church had to be warned against going to either extreme.

For 2,000 years believers have wrestled with how to be holy and faithful to scripture without being legalistic. Few have found the perfect balance. What we do know is that it won't happen without having a heart to do the will of God. "Sacrifices and offerings you did not desire (legalism). Rather, I come to do your will, Oh God. Your law is written on my heart." We must have a passionate love

for the Lord if we are to rise above either permissiveness or legalism. Otherwise, our motivation will be wrong when we read scripture, and we will have a difficult time knowing the will of God or walking in it without being filled with the Holy Spirit.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JRS](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2008 12:13:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jae, I had to ask. I've been cornered before from this very same wording, or at least close to it, in it they heavily lean on the idea "written by man" or "we do not actually have the originals" you can take it from there. As far as I'm concerned, when someone has a loophole so scripture can be explained away, there is no discussion.

I must say this that the premise for your argument is valid and I do agree with you. Yet I do not agree with the conclusion you are drawing as to rectify it. I find too many times in scripture about the differences of light and darkness. It defines what light is and what Spirit is. Even towards ones you are calling as saved there seems to be other conditions they are not fulfilling " thus passages like II Thess -. And the passage " many are called, few are chosen -. There can be only one conclusion drawn that many can call upon the Lord and his name and without the work of the Holy Spirit it is no more than another form of WORKS.

Hombre wrote on Fri, 25 April 2008 09:55

This is a hard balance, to be sure, and I think that the ONLY way to achieve it is by following the leading of the Holy Spirit....which ironically, seemed to be what Hobart was always pushing...to know the voice of the Lord for yourself...and to that end I cannot, nor will not blame him or the rest of the ministry for the legalism that ensued, for if people had followed that advice, and used their copious notes to enable their personal relationship with the Lord, perhaps it wouldn't have come to the end it did....

Like your post Hombre and yours that followed Jae.

Got to run today " not a lot of time, I what to leave you with a question. I started asking this years back. Because of the mentality that has been set and the examples we always seem to follow (no how much we desired to be separate form the denominational church).

Is our concept of church itself correct???? Or because of our preconceived notions we hold onto, resulting in fostering the issues we are discussing???

Jim

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Sun, 27 Apr 2008 23:34:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I will answer your post item by item in this case because I perceive that we are having a constructive discussion.

1. Jae, I had to ask. I've been cornered before from this very same wording, or at least close to it, in it they heavily lean on the idea "written by man" or "we do not actually have the originals" you can take it from there. As far as I'm concerned, when someone has a loophole so scripture can be explained away, there is no discussion.

There is no loophole in the doctrine of inerrancy that I have explained above. Scripture is completely divine and completely human, just as Christ is completely divine and completely human (any variation in either direction in the doctrine of Christ is heresy). Because scripture is completely divine, it can have no error. Not one jot or tittle will pass from it. The original words still exist in writing today, but I don't think any one text captures the original. I suspect it is a combination of Nestle/Aland and TR. That's only the NT. The OT is more certain. However, even the few differences between NT texts are minimal and do not have any bearing on any crucial passages in scripture. Some early church fathers attest to the end of Mark 16, so that is not an issue in my mind. There is no loophole and no way to diminish the absolute, God-breathed nature of scripture. We can have confidence that what God has spoken has been preserved to us for the past 2,000 years.

2. I must say this that the premise for your argument is valid and I do agree with you. Yet I do not agree with the conclusion you are drawing as to rectify it. I find too many times in scripture about the differences of light and darkness. It defines what light is and what Spirit is. Even towards ones you are calling as saved there seems to be other conditions they are not fulfilling " thus passages like II Thess -. And the passage " many are called, few are chosen -. There can be only one conclusion drawn that many can call upon the Lord and his name and without the work of the Holy Spirit it is no more than another form of WORKS.

I'm not sure why you have an issue with my conclusion that we have fellowship with all other true believers in Christ. Of course we do. We automatically do. It is not something that we make happen, it is something that we already have. This is not about trying to have fellowship with unbelievers. This is about sharing Christ in koinonia with all who call upon His name from a pure heart. You are not superior to other Christians, and neither am I. Hombre might be. (just kidding, couldn't resist). Does the Lord consider your church to be superior to another church that loves Him dearly but does not have certain teaching? Maybe they have strengths that yours does not

have, and vice-versa. There is no basis for avoiding them. You have to develop a relationship with them, and they might receive some correction from your church, and vice-versa. There might be some churches that are more pure than others, but that is all the more reason to fellowship with TRUE believers in those churches, so we can bring truth and life into them. False churches are a different animal, detached from Christ. Even then, we can try to bring the good news to them like Wigglesworth did.

Any sweeping statements that you say about "denominations" could be said about some people at FA. Any praise you give to FA could be said about some "denominational" and charismatic churches. My original premise in this thread was the FA was basically just another denomination, and HEF was its founder.

I am strongly convinced, with passion, that HEF and FA would not have become so sick had they not isolated themselves from other ministries and churches the way they did. If he had allowed more ministries to speak into his life and bring correction, perhaps not so many tragedies would have occurred. Conversely, he might have had more positive input into other churches and groups.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Mon, 28 Apr 2008 05:23:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi James,

You said:

Foundational theology is important. However, even HEF moved away from some of that theology (such as eternal security) later in his life.

I never knew this. I discussed the issue of eternal security on this board and I dont remember anyone saying Bro Freeman renounced it. What tape can that be found on?

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Thu, 01 May 2008 03:24:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Michael the Disciple said, "Foundational theology is important. However, even HEF moved away

from some of that theology (such as eternal security) later in his life.

I never knew this. I discussed the issue of eternal security on this board and I dont remember anyone saying Bro Freeman renounced it. What tape can that be found on?"

Michael, I need to clarify the difference between HEF's formal, systematic theology, which he expressed in his theology class, and his informal, mundane theology, which he taught every week. There was some disconnectness between the two, especially later in his ministry. Formally, he taught the historical Reformed position on eternal security in his class. The born-again believer is changed forever and belongs to God eternally, and will not turn his back on God. However, HEF's informal theology expressed a more Arminian view, that a true believer can lose his salvation by turning his back on God. For example, he said at least once, "You might even lose your salvation if you go to the arm of the flesh (which we all know means, 'use medical science or doctors for healing')." He talked a lot about losing one's salvation in the last 5 years of his ministry. No one who really believes in eternal security would use that term (including the writers of scripture- it cannot be found in the Bible). He also used phrases such as "make it into heaven" or "make it into the kingdom", which are contrary to his formal teaching on salvation by grace. Justification by grace was a doctrine that identified him as not being Roman Catholic, and most of the time that he referred to it he was trying to refute Catholicism. However, in his everyday theology, he seemed to imply a faith-and-works salvation later in his life.

I have a hard time believing that HEF really believed in eternal security in the last years of his life based on the statements he made. He never formally renounced it. He simply preached the opposite of eternal security as demonstrated by the above comments and many, many others. I take theology very seriously and pondered this issue for a long time before coming to this conclusion. In most other areas of theology, he was very solid and did not change. However, eternal security, the primacy of grace, his ecclesiology and eschatology all seemed to change by the end of his life.

I am no expert on his theology, and if someone can provide some patterns of his teaching later in his life to the contrary, please mention them. I don't think that he stated that Christians are eternally secure even once in his last 4-5 years, but if someone has evidence contrariwise, let me know.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jjsamazed](#) on Thu, 01 May 2008 03:56:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JRS said, "Is our concept of church itself correct???? Or because of our preconceived notions we hold onto, resulting in fostering the issues we are discussing????"

Jim, when I look at scripture I see a basic concept of the church, with a lot of flexibility as to how it plays out. For example, Paul emphasized the need for churches to be autonomous and indigenous-- that is, it should be people and pastored by those who live in the geographical area where the church was located. Church itself was simply a group of 'called out ones': ekklesia. It is a community of believers that functioned like a human body. It was certainly much more than a teaching center, so in that regards, yes, I would say that HEF got it wrong in that regards. The group in GR of which I was a part had some understanding of community, but we were severely dysfunctional in other ways. In America in general I think we don't understand community very well, but I won't go there right now.

Based on my understanding of NT history, some of the churches were quite different from each other. Some met in houses, some in synagogues, others in large buildings. Most were in houses at the time, although the houses of wealthy people were large and were structured to accommodate hundreds of people in some cases. Some, such as in Ephesus, were actually a conglomeration of several congregations in the city. When Paul wrote to the Ephesians, it wasn't just one congregation. It was a group of them that still fellowshiped together as one whenever they could. Smaller churches together equalled "the church at Ephesus." Other churches, such as that in Thessalonika, were single congregations. Different churches faced different issues and required different interventions. Some needed a strong apostolic presence to come in to town and address serious problems. Others were able to solve their own problems without that kind of input. Most of the people could not read, so they would rely on the leader of the church to do so. They would hear the scripture read, and then discuss it. Some were racially mixed together, others were homogeneous (everyone was alike). Many of them included slaves, who often became leaders in the church, causing some awkwardness (Philemon/Onesimus?).

When I hear people say, "the early church did thus and so", I wonder if they are aware that the early church was diverse, and many congregations did things differently from each other. It is better to say, "Some early churches did thus and so." There was the core apostolic teaching as expressed in the scriptures, of course. That was a unifying element. But there was some freeplay regarding church structure, depending on the needs of the church.

To make a long answer short, I think that HEF's teaching on the church had some accurate insights, but was incomplete. There is a sense of a worldwide brotherhood of believers that can be called "ekklesia", or church. The called out ones. The local church should be autonomous, and I agree with him on that matter. But man-made labels and categories (such as "denominations" or "we are spirit-filled and they are not") are a hindrance to God's plans on earth if they divide His children and keep them away from each other unnecessarily. He wants all of us to be one, not just a local assembly (John 17:21).

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination

Quote: Isamazed

I have a hard time believing that HEF really believed in eternal security in the last years of his life based on the statements he made. He never formally renounced it. He simply preached the opposite of eternal security as demonstrated by the above comments and many, many others. I take theology very seriously and pondered this issue for a long time before coming to this conclusion. In most other areas of theology, he was very solid and did not change. However, eternal security, the primacy of grace, his ecclesiology and eschatology all seemed to change by the end of his life.

I started listening to HEF in 1980 I believe. It was at least 3 years before I had an inkling he believed in once saved always saved. At first I did not believe it. A Faith Assembly satellite Church Pastored by Russell Tardo was the way I found out.

My wife talked to Russell who told her he was OSAS. I don't think I would have believed it but he said HE had taught it at Faith Assembly himself.

Yet after visiting Faith Assembly some 8 or 10 times and listening to around 100 tapes I had not picked up on it. Predestination/election yes but I never connected that to OSAS with him. In particular the tape called "The Potter And The Clay" he indicated you could have been predestined for salvation but if you turned God would make ANOTHER VESSEL out of you unto destruction.

Another issue he seemed to be contradictory imo was water baptism. On one hand he taught there was no difference between a Christian and a disciple rightly so. He taught the absolutes of discipleship in a very convincing way.

Then in Apostolic baptism in Jesus name he taught on one hand it was NOT essential to salvation. On the other he taught you could not really be a disciple unless you were baptized in Jesus name.

The same thing concerning the Spirit baptism. On one hand he said it was subsequent to salvation. On the other he said the Lord spoke to him concerning the baptism from James "as the body without the spirit is dead" and stopped.

You mentioned his eschatology seemed to change. Can you give an example of that? I know he taught the first fruits Manchild rapture at one time. Did he change?

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [william](#) on Thu, 01 May 2008 15:09:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre: Quote:One can find the answer to the question of what HEF taught and believed with reference to OSAS in the Biblical Theology series....and it is basically what I've paraphrased. I don't believe that he ever altered that view...but that he began to push the Hebrews 12 side of it more toward the end...perhaps he saw all those who were only there for the show.

I think he did.

I started to respond directly to Michael's and Jae's post, but you pretty much summed it up rightly.

For some reason you guys (Jae and Michael) saw contradictions when I didn't. Sure, there were things that contained seeming contradictions, but no more than what we see in the Bible (as Hombre has pointed out.) I believe that the balance we were taught concerning God's predestination and man's responsibility was exactly that, a good balance.

The Bible teaches both and if we assume that it is absolute truth (I do) then one might perceive that the teaching had "changed" if you only heard him admonishing us concerning our responsibilities, or vice-versa.

Go back and listen to the series in Hebrews if you want to hear the balance. This series was pre-1976, and was either slightly before the biblical theology series or at least contemporary with it. (I think!) You will find exactly the same balance taught at the end of his ministry.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [william](#) on Thu, 01 May 2008 17:51:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jisamazed: Quote:To make a long answer short, I think that HEF's teaching on the church had some accurate insights, but was incomplete. There is a sense of a worldwide brotherhood of believers that can be called "ekklesia", or church. The called out ones. The local church should be autonomous, and I agree with him on that matter. But man-made labels and categories (such as "denominations" or "we are spirit-filled and they are not") are a hindrance to God's plans on earth if they divide His children and keep them away from each other unnecessarily. He wants all of us

to be one, not just a local assembly (John 17:21).

No one seems to be arguing that what we got was "complete". I know that there may be some, mostly isolated, individuals that are stuck in the mid-eighties, but this isn't the case with most of us. It has been twenty years for crying out loud! FA wasn't like some council that closed the canon on revealed truth! Look no further than the current FA and you'll see an evolving assembly that doesn't see the need for conformity to the old FA days. Even in an ideal situation we would expect growth, or a continued building upon the foundations and shell once started. No one would consider a complete rewrite of the original blueprints if the basic plan was sound. People change, culture changes... we might even need that extra bedroom addition to accommodate new members, but if the foundation is sure, we would not bulldoze it all down.

Having said that, I will agree that FA wasn't the perfect idealistic standard to end all standards, but it was the best that I've seen, or have seen since. Which is why I'm not the demolition expert that you seem to want to be. The house might not be what we envisioned back then, but I see no need to completely start from scratch. Even those mislaid rafters can be used if we are of a mind to straighten them up!

In keeping with the building analogy I see that there was a bit of wood hay and stubble that needs to be replaced with more durable material, but that is a far cry from tearing everything down and starting over. I hope that doesn't mis-categorize your position, but that is my perception of what you seem to be trying to do.

Speaking of perceptions, I just interrupted this note to read capturedbygrace's post in her application thread, and she seems to be one who has suffered much as a result of her FA experience, and to my mind at least, seems to have an attitude that all of these things have worked together to produce good in her life. Now maybe it is just a semantic difference between your position and hers, but it seems to me that those experiences have not made her bitter. She doesn't seem to be blaming the message or the messenger, even though I'm sure that both the message and the messenger played a huge part in her experiences. You may or may not have experienced trials that can be compared to hers, but if your life hasn't included the depths of despair that can be seen in her experience, why does it seem that your words would be more appropriate coming from her lips?

I say all of the above with the full knowledge that I may be way off base in the way I am reading your posts... perhaps it can be chalked up to the way different personality types choose to express themselves... idunno.

Btw, I agree with you concerning your assessment of the flexibility that each local church has, with reference to how it deals with its problems.

Blessings,

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jisamazed](#) on Sat, 03 May 2008 04:07:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Moulder and Hombre, I will try to respond to your posts together with only one of mine for the sake of brevity.

1. Regarding the balance between the preservation of the saints and our responsibility to endure: Yes, HEF taught the balance in his theology series, and apparently in the Hebrew series, according to Moulder. In fact, the theology series is where I first learned to embrace that kind of paradox in scripture. HEF taught it well at that time. God is absolutely sovereign, but man is free to choose. They are equally true. Other theologians have also taught the paradox. But HEF clearly taught eternal security. Those who are truly regenerated will persevere to the end. My concern is that he neglected to teach the eternally secure side later in his life, and his emphasis on the responsibility of the believer essentially amounted to eternal insecurity.

This not just doctrinal pickiness. It has very real implications for the flock. If a pastor teaches eternal insecurity, many of the sheep will feel eternally insecure. A lot of sincere, genuine saints who sat under that message would struggle in an unhealthy way with condemnation, wondering if they are saved, works mentality, etc... because of the lack of understanding of grace and God's preservation of them. Telling people that they might "lose their salvation" if they do such and such simply is not compatible with eternal security. That statement is not part of the paradox. It is altogether a contradiction and is unhealthy.

2. Moulder said, "Having said that, I will agree that FA wasn't the perfect idealistic standard to end all standards, but it was the best that I've seen, or have seen since. Which is why I'm not the demolition expert that you seem to want to be. The house might not be what we envisioned back then, but I see no need to completely start from scratch. Even those mislaid rafters can be used if we are of a mind to straighten them up!"

Moulder, I like the building analogy, and I agree that we can straighten some mislaid rafters. I am not attempting in any way to destroy sound building structure. Quite the opposite. My concern is that if we do not recognize HEF's errors or wrong attitudes for what they were, we are vulnerable to repeat them. We start to build a house on poor structure. It is one thing to say that he made some mistakes. It is another to state what the mistakes were and how those mistakes affected people. We disagree sometimes on what the mistakes were, but if we see it a certain way, we need to be free to call it and let others comment, which is all I'm trying to do. I thought that was what we were supposed to do in this forum.

3. Moulder said, "Speaking of perceptions, I just interrupted this note to read capturedbygrace's post in her application thread, and she seems to be one who has suffered much as a result of her FA experience, and to my mind at least, seems to have an attitude that all of these things have worked together to produce good in her life. Now maybe it is just a semantic difference between your position and hers, but it seems to me that those experiences have not made her bitter. She doesn't seem to be blaming the message or the messenger, even though I'm sure that both the message and the messenger played a huge part in her experiences. You may or may not have experienced trials that can be compared to hers, but if your life hasn't included the depths of despair that can be seen in her experience, why does it seem that your words would be more appropriate coming from her lips?"

Bitterness is an ugly thing, and I check myself frequently to see if I have let any creep in. I do not believe that I have. I am able to affirm what I believe HEF got right and did well. Prove all things, hold fast to what is good, abstain from any form of evil. A critical or bitter spirit only looks at the bad, not the good, the bones and not the meat. I have attempted to acknowledge both.

I am alarmed, however, at what I perceive to be Freemanism still at work. Freemanism doesn't claim HEF to be perfect. It does elevate him above other teachers of the word as if he has so much more truth and authority than Chuck Swindoll, Jack Hayford, John MacArthur, Wayne Grudem or many others (I'm not interested in hearing about their errors here because that is beside the point). No man is perfect, therefore all are susceptible to preaching error from time to time. Teachers need other teachers to keep them in check. I point out HEF's problems because it is important to see that he preached and did things unscripturally just as much as any other man of God. In fact, his later problems had much more dire consequences than the other men I have mentioned.

I realize that in the process of taking HEF off the pedestal, it seems that I am bashing him. I accept the risk of being misunderstood. It will make some people mad, especially those who have not yet come to grips with the reality and severity of his problems. It made me mad when others confronted me with his problems a few years ago, but that is what helped me to get honest about the whole thing. I had to wrestle with the discrepancy between what I saw in scripture and what HEF and others taught at times. And I could no longer ignore the red flags that went up in me when he made certain statements or exhibited certain attitudes.

The attitude of superiority toward other believers is my greatest concern for this current group of posters. I believe that HEF had it and passed it on to those he taught. I see the same attitude sometimes in this forum. Hombre, to be honest, some of your statements and your signature smack of "superior attitude" to me. The Lord knows your heart and I don't, but you don't seem to try to hide your attitude much.

If I am missing it, I trust the Lord will correct me as he has promised. But I hope that you guys can give me a little bit of credit here. I have put a lot of prayer, thought, study and agony into this

matter over the years. That doesn't mean I am right, but don't assume that I make these statements flippantly or bitterly.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Sat, 03 May 2008 06:25:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:I am alarmed, however, at what I perceive to be Freemanism still at work. Freemanism doesn't claim HEF to be perfect. It does elevate him above other teachers of the word as if he has so much more truth and authority than Chuck Swindoll, Jack Hayford, John MacArthur, Wayne Grudem or many others (I'm not interested in hearing about their errors here because that is beside the point).

Well I do recognize the first two names you mention. Since you dont want to hear about their errors suffice it to say I believe HEF was a shining light in comparison.

Yet Bro. Freeman did fall short of the true doctrine of the Apostles.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 03 May 2008 11:29:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:jisamazed: I see the same attitude sometimes in this forum. Hombre, to be honest, some of your statements and your signature smack of "superior attitude" to me.

What? You dont't like his tagline??? It's only one of the best taglines...eeever!!!

If he falls away I've got first dibs on it.

moulder

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Sun, 04 May 2008 02:14:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Michael the Disciple said, "Well I do recognize the first two names you mention. Since you dont want to hear about their errors suffice it to say I believe HEF was a shining light in comparison.

Yet Bro. Freeman did fall short of the true doctrine of the Apostles."

Michael, in light of your own theological problems, which I know you don't believe you have, you are not really in a position to critique those men objectively. I would rather listen teachers like them who have some humility than teachers without those errors who are prideful and still have errors of their own. Humility is just as important as truth for a man of God. A man who is in error but humble will learn and come to the truth. A man who speaks the truth, or at least claims to do so, but has no humility cannot be corrected. God resists the proud, but gives grace to the humble.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Sun, 04 May 2008 02:36:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre said, "I don't think I'm superior to anything or anybody, but I seem to possess this sort of recognition of things that are stupid, and when I point them out to others, sometimes those who are stupid become offended."

Fair enough. But if you dish it out, you have to be able to take it.

".....I'd also like to add that my personality is not for sale or being offered up at this time for imprisonment within the narrow confines of what any particular person deems to be politically correct, genteel or polite. I do not posses the sort of hospitality of my Southern brothers, I am raw, unplugged and best with those who have no stomach for facades."

Sure, be yourself. Raw and unplugged is fine if it is seasoned with grace. I don't like facades, either, which is why I'm straightforward about my concerns. But a fool says everything that is on his mind, whereas a wise man ponders before he answers.

Often, the insults and "raw" language (calling people stupid) become a substitute for genuine scriptural inquiry and reasonable thinking. Anyone can be opinionated. In the words of Wayne Kirkpatrick, "Truth is more than an imposing point of view."

"...and BTW...the Lord does know my heart, and He knows that this is all in good humor.....unlike

some who don't read me correctly....."

Maybe you're right. Maybe I'm taking this thread too seriously and need to lighten up. I have to have a sense of humor, being the father of 4 daughters 9-15 years old. Humor is a universal language. After all, when the chips are down, the buffalo is empty.

Besides, nothing you can say can bother me. I used to teach middle school. I have skin thicker than Donald Trump's hairpiece.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Sun, 04 May 2008 14:04:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Jisamazed

Michael, in light of your own theological problems, which I know you don't believe you have, you are not really in a position to critique those men objectively. I would rather listen teachers like them who have some humility than teachers without those errors who are prideful and still have errors of their own. Humility is just as important as truth for a man of God. A man who is in error but humble will learn and come to the truth. A man who speaks the truth, or at least claims to do so, but has no humility cannot be corrected. God resists the proud, but gives grace to the humble.

I have not noticed you making any attempt to show me something that is Biblically more accurate than what I believe. Humility includes the ability to change. I am willing to do so and have done so over the years. If your beliefs are not important enough for you to express and defend yet you are willing to condemn me what can I say? If mine are heresy and yours are truth that should stick out like a sore thumb.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jisamazed](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 03:30:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre said, "...are you inferring that I am a fool?"

...well, of course you are, I would have to be stupid myself to not see that. But go on, let's see if you can become the subject of your own brand of medicine."

No, actually I was just quoting that scripture because it seemed relevant to the discussion. Jesus told us firmly that to call a brother a fool (rebellious person) is to be in danger of hell fire. Therefore, I don't call you a fool in any serious sense. But don't be a fool in any other sense, either, except a fool for Christ (which does not include calling people names).

"Wow, that was quick. Let's see, first you inferred that I was a fool, and now you're telling me that calling people names is a substitute for genuine scriptural authority, which you seem to be quite adept at using for the purpose of belittling others yourself. I beg your pardon. We are to never use God's holy Scripture to belittle others. Expose their errors or attitudes, yes, but never belittle. If I have done so I will repent. I don't think that I have.

...perhaps it's time that you review Matthew 7:3-5. Done. It is an important and convicting passage, and my whole point in this thread was that FA and HEF did a lot of judging of "denominations" without recognizing their own faults. Therefore, there is no basis for the attitude of superiority from any of us. Matthew 7:1-5 is what I've been trying to relate in the first place.

..may I add conversely: 'although an imposing view may be substituted for truth, truth is by its very nature, imposing'." True, but it is also freeing. The truth sets free. However, humans use it to bind by mixing it with opinions or outright error.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [DeWayne](#) on Tue, 13 May 2008 16:59:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Amazed at who He is, what He has done for us, that He would love us enough to be tortured to death to pay for our sins"

And He paid for our healings, not to be drugged and killed by medical mistakes, like the 140,000 heart attacks linked to Vioxx.

DeWayne

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination

I don't see how pointing out these mens serious errors you think it isn't important. When men who call themselves preachers of the word blatantly tell people the gifts of the Holy Spirit are not for today, and tell people praying in tongues is not for today, they are robbing the body of Christ of some things that Jesus felt was quite important, such as to be endued with power from on high when the Holy Spirit would come. Acts 1:4-8. Now not all the men you mentioned hold to this, but at least a couple of them do. I don't see how they have received any correction from other christians in this area and humbled themselves to receive the Baptism in the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues.

To call some of the posters on this sight Freemanites is a joke. Obviously by some of their remarks you can see they aren't, if you weren't so blinded by your hatred of Brother Freeman and Faith Assembly. Not one person on this site comes across as a Freemanite. Some people do not have to take Dr. Freeman off the pedestal, because he is not on a pedestal.

I don't see very many ministers today warning the sheep of the errors that have come upon us. It has been the frog in the water with the shallow, compromising churches of today. Because Dr. Freeman tried to preach holiness and separation from the ways of this world he is criticized. For example, the shoes with the stripes, painter pants, and bomber jackets. There happened to be an article written in a major news magazine saying exactly what Dr. Freeman taught: this was the dress of the homosexuals, so they would recognize each other. I suppose today a minister would be scared to warn the flock of dressing like sodomites. I must say I have only been in one church where the women dressed modestly enough where I could take someone I know (a family member) with extreme lust problems without him lusting in his mind. Why aren't the preachers of today telling the women to stop dressing like prostitutes, and telling the men to respect the house of God and stop wearing their shorts and sandals to church! People have more respect for the Oval Office than they do the house of God. The church is becoming nothing more than a social club where everyone can do what ever they want and instead of talking about the word taught, they talk about what program they watched on TV. My father was of the same generation of Brother Freeman and until the day he died, he never wore a pair of blue jeans in public. Even when he was sick with cancer my mother would help him change into a nice pair of pants. So criticize Brother Freeman all you want for having told people to look respectable when they went out in public, since they represented Jesus Christ.

And where are the shepherds who are sounding the trumpet of the deceptions out there? Maybe since we don't want to offend someone we can just be quiet. When you look around all you see is compromising ministers who are afraid to warn the house of God of the errors out there. Instead they have every wind of doctrine in their libraries. The Emergent Church movement is growing bigger every day, but who is sounding the trumpet? We have ministers, such as Rick Warren, Bill Hybels, Richard Foster, John Arnott, Mike Bickle, Rick Joyner and many others who have brought serious errors and deceptions in the church, not to mention the false Apostolic/Prophetic

movement. There are people who have to watch such things as the "Wild at Heart" video to teach men how to be men by watching "R" rated movies. Whatever happened to teaching men to men by the preaching of the Word? Everybody has to do the 40 Days of Purpose or Alpha or some other book study in their churches. Again, there seems to be a lack of anointed, fresh bread teaching today.

There are a few ministers out there today who are sounding the trumpet, although it is hard to find them. Like one minister I heard say recently: God does not wink at unbelief. And one other thing he said was: It is dishonest if we Pastors do not warn you of what is to come. There is coming a one world government and one world religious system and if people aren't discerning they will follow people like Rick Warren right into it.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Thu, 15 May 2008 04:03:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I can see that you are still in need of that vacation.

What you wrote is really convoluted on a number of levels. I am concerned that you are showing signs of irrational thinking. I value your freedom to give input, but you seem to have some sort of obsession with attacking others while trying to defend HEF at all costs. Yes, I would call that Freemanism.

I have stated my agreement with HEF on several different teachings of his whenever the opportunity has arisen. I have stated what I believe was helpful about his ministry, especially in the earlier years of it. I try to take the good with the bad. However, you have NEVER said anything good about the likes of Rick Warren or John Elderidge. Not once. Such is characteristic of a critical spirit and false discernment.

I enjoyed Richard Foster's book "Celebration of Discipline". I can dismiss the weird prayer techniques and affirm the good teaching he gave on the spiritual disciplines without getting fearful that he might be some sort of New Age teacher. His approach to prayer is no weirder than hitting people when praying for them. I am reading Rick Warren's book, "The Purpose Driven Church", right now. He is not the compromiser and salesman that his critics make him out to be. He actually has a pretty strong word and some encouraging faith testimonies. He just knows how to talk to people at their level. Sure, he could emphasize prayer and the spiritual gifts more than he does. So could a lot of people. Mike Bickel is a man of prayer. He has helped to stand against the homosexual spirits and promiscuous spirits attacking the church. He has provoked many people to seek the Lord with all their hearts without compromise. I'm not sure what you consider to be serious error, but none of the men you mentioned (although I'm not sure about John Arnott- I

know little about him) teach anything that keep people from being saved. They don't teach heresy about who God is, who Jesus is or how Jesus redeemed us. They call people to faith and repentance. They don't tell people that they might lose their salvation if they go to the arm of the flesh (go to doctors). Some of them are further along than others in their understanding of the Word, but none of them teach deadly error that I know of.

There are plenty of men of God who expose the error of the emerging church and other errors. They might not all write books about them, but they are faithful to the word of God, and when the error comes up they address it. You really need to get out more.

If you look in the context of my statement, I said that I did not want to discuss those men's errors at the time because it would distract from the point I was trying to make. I knew that if I even mentioned a preacher's name, someone would pick at him and get off topic. Therefore I made the statement about not discussing their errors at this time. The distraction happened, anyway, because of that mentality that looks for anything that seems bad and picks at people.

Regarding the statements about "sodomite clothes" and dressing formally at church, that is a classic example of what happens when a preacher mixes his opinion with the word of God. HEF had no business adding his opinion and then calling it the Word. He should have perceived that the younger generation shows respect differently than his generation, and there are different cultural understandings regarding what is formal or informal than there were 50 years ago. There are plenty of churches in which women dress modestly, but there might always be visitors or young Christians who don't know better yet.

Regarding prophecy, hold fast to what is good, and abstain from any form of evil, as the Scripture says.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [sparkles](#) on Fri, 16 May 2008 16:00:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I am sure that with your little sarcastic remarks, name calling and insinuations you make, you must have gotten from John Eldridge and his Wild at Heart video, with his blessings on watching R rated movies to learn how to be men, because you sure didn't get it from the Holy Spirit. It's certainly one thing to disagree with someone, but I think the name calling and demeaning someone is not exactly Christlike.

I just don't see how agreeing with Dr. Freeman is "defending him at all costs." If I wanted to do that I would certainly quote him more, but I have not done that, but just so you can again say I am a Freemanite: I believe that man taught the word of God, not only in his early ministry but at the

end of his ministry.

I did not know that I needed to say something nice about someone before I say they teach error and deception, so let me say that Rich Warren has said some good things in his book right along with compromise and error. Any man who says he is a minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and uses a paraphrase such as "The Message" like Rick Warren does, must not have any discernment and is only trying to use a version to get his agenda across. And I would highly suggest you do a little research on his church growth movement and associations he has with some Emergent church leaders and even New Age people as well as the business marketing guru, Peter Drucker. His wife is speaking at an Emergent Church conference, so maybe he is more Emergent than you would like to admit.

In these last days there will be many false prophets and apostles out there deceiving multitudes, and I must say we are certainly seeing that happen right before our eyes. These people have an agenda, and they have new definitions for old biblical terms. Since I do not have a church to go to right now I must do whatever the Lord has me do to not fall for all the deception that is out there and to rely on Jesus to preserve me.

There are plenty of men of God who expose the error of the emerging church and other errors. They might not all write books about them, but they are faithful to the word of God, and when the error comes up they address it. You really need to get out more. Could you please name 5 churches here in Grand Rapids that are preaching the whole council of God, not having their rock and roll, ear blasting music, preaching on holiness, warning the sheep of the errors, preaching faith, preaching the Baptism in the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues, not having every wind of doctrine in their library? I would like to visit such a church, but have not found any in GR yet. And I would also suggest you get out more and maybe your eyes would be opened to how hard it really is to find a message of the crucified life and holiness and preaching on the blood of Jesus and death to self and preaching against sin. After all we don't want to offend those who give money, do we?

The distraction happened, anyway, because of that mentality that looks for anything that seems bad and picks at people. Thank God Paul and other ministers didn't have this mentality or error would never be exposed.

Regarding the statements about "sodomite clothes" and dressing formally at church, that is a classic example of what happens when a preacher mixes his opinion with the word of God. HEF had no business adding his opinion and then calling it the Word. He should have perceived that the younger generation shows respect differently than his generation, and there are different cultural understandings regarding what is formal or informal than there were 50 years ago. There are plenty of churches in which women dress modestly, but there might always be visitors or young Christians who don't know better yet. Dr. Freeman had every right to preach against worldly dress. You are sounding quite Emergent with your statements about different cultures and

time. Holiness is holiness, and it doesn't matter what age it is. When a man at Sunshine church had to look away from the stage when someone was singing because they were so seductively dressed I think something is horribly wrong. Too bad the preachers of today are so cowardly and afraid to offend some paying member because their women are dressed like whores. I kinda think that when Peter and Paul and the other disciples and apostles preached they shared what they felt was his opinion. I don't think they just stood up there and read the Old Testament, but rather expounded on how to apply the words of Jesus in their life. Besides the bible does talk about modest dress and holiness. Like I said, people have more respect for the Oval Office than they do the house of God.

I guess after all, we can all do whatever we feel is right in our own eyes because we are free, no legalism for us!

Regarding prophecy, hold fast to what is good, and abstain from any form of evil, as the Scripture says.

I also have the right and responsibility to judge people on what they teach and promote.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JRS](#) on Sun, 18 May 2008 14:34:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I find it interesting on how the denominational church "system" has been entrenched in the whole concept of what we see as Christianity today. Interesting and vexing at the same time.

Well Said Hombre --- whole lot of contradiction â€œ now that is an understatement and I think there is more truth in it that we realize!!!!

Hombre wrote on Thu, 01 May 2008 09:22

To go on from this point, which is where I want to head, is the idea that we (speaking generally of Christianity) tend to take certain pet aspects from the OT and turn them into NT law...whether it is this issue of dressing or tithes or serving in the military and having national patriotism or whatever...and at the same time preaching this freedom from 'The Law' and the dispensation of grace.

That is a whole lot of contradiction to me.

Many sum up the gospel with this small phrase: Thou shalt love the Lord your God w/all your heart, mind soul & strength and love thy neighbor as thy self ? We should all just "love" one another "

How could that possibly be good news, when in reality that would be bad news!! These verses are summing up the law not the gospel. No one can fulfill the works of the law except Jesus! Eternal salvation happens in a completely different way than by weighing out our deeds. The record of our bad deeds, including our defective good deeds, as well as the just penalties we deserve, must be cancelled rather than balanced out.

What can wash away my sin ? Nothing but the blood of Jesus !

Hombre wrote on Thu, 01 May 2008 09:22

Either we are free, and able to make correct judgments ourselves, living by the principles that Christ laid down, or we are not and need a set of rules to live by.

Which is it?

What a better way to be deceived and Miss the leading (voice) of the Spirit than to be constantly pounded by the donâ€™ts of the flesh.

Hombre wrote on Thu, 01 May 2008 09:22

Christians shouldn't belittle other Christians who are attempting to bring forth the truth, against the grain of the institutionalized religion. The entire purpose of this forum is to allow us (former FAers') to begin to separate what IS Biblical truth from what was merely personal opinion and/or legalism, and to once again grow and stretch toward the high calling that we have. Whether I or we (any of us) have these supernatural manifestations working in our lives is really beside the point of my little rant...what is important to me however, is that we don't DENY the fact that they ARE written. What else is important, as I reiterate, is that we attempt to find out WHY, instead of dismissing certain scriptures because they are difficult.

The denominational church has had 1 goal and 1 goal only since the end of what we would consider the NT church. That is to suppress the ministry (work) of the Holy Spirit.

capturedbygrace wrote on Tue, 13 May 2008 13:43

I realize not everyone is called to do as I do--however, I believe God is wanting us all to be very careful how and where we speak. This is His work. He (not me) is going to build His church--I just get to fit in where and how and when He says. I do believe things are changing. I do believe God is reaching in and giving revelation to a minister here and there. I do believe He is also giving them not only a hatred of religion, but a hatred of pride. I also believe God is raising up people outside the system, humble, bold people who are filled with God's vision, His heart, His Spirit and

His words.--I think it is not all going to look like I think it will, and if I'm not careful, I could miss what God is doing right under my nose...

Amen cbgrace " I agree with what you said here with the exception of 1 thing. God giving his revelation to a minister. " I do not mean anything towards you, this is exactly the mentality that is promoted though out the Denom system. A hold out from OT days and directly maintained in the catholic church. The mentality that God is special and it takes special individuals to hear from HIM. It's like they miss the Whole purpose and understanding of salvation and the relationship we all have individually with our Lord. Some have a revelation or a supernatural manifestation and resulting in others wanting to idealize them as special. We are quick to draw a conclusion that " God is working though them so we should follow them. We look on these individuals as being spiritual and having something that we feel as though we do not have. THE HOLY SPIRIT " been there done that and NOT returning. The same Spirit has been given to all of us and is working the same. It takes EFFORT or better yet FAITH on ones part (which it seems like many are doing again) to seek the Lord individually. It takes FAITH to believe that GOD is working in or lives and it takes FAITH to be the evidence of our standing with GOD and that he sent his SPIRIT to fulfill HIS will in our lives.

I remember when I was 1st saved and baptized in the Holy Spirit. It first began with tongues. I remember thinking how easy that was " only believe!! And along with that no one needed to pound on me to define sin in my life. The Holy Spirit was working to fulfill HIS ministry. Then the excitement and privilege to sit under the teaching of the WORD for scripture states " my people perish for lack of knowledge " and that eternal life is MUCH more than being "Born Again" " John 17:3.

Then the seeking for the leading of the Holy Spirit, which had actually been placed second because of the focus on the WORD, being mixed with rational thinking in comparison to this world.

In the flesh we have learned to well to pattern ourselves off of others experiences. We look at individuals and judge the success in their lives and desire the same. These individuals though very sincere desire for others to experience what they have. Consequently they teach "principals" that the Holy Spirit has graciously revealed to them that results in bondage/legalisms to others.

It was defined that this verse means No " TV, this verse defines ones dress, because of this verse it defines the shoes to wear. " ALL ONE BIG SMOKE SCREEN that diminished the voice of the HOLY SPIRIT in ones life and quenches the JOY of the LORD " Our strength.

What gives an individual (or church) the right to impose Do's and Don'ts on

individuals???? The argument comes up â€œ How are they to Know? The real question is WHERE IS YOUR FAITH? Is not your life to be a living testimony? Did Jesus have to live among us to fulfill all things? No â€œ He lived among us to set an example of how we are to live. He did not come to condemn the world. He sent the Holy Spirit for that!!! How quick we are to take the place of the Holy Spirit in pointing out faults and sin. Yes God is a Holy God and he requires His people to be HOLY. Yet he knows us better than we can imagine and sent His own Spirit to be our comforter.

It is His church and it is His work that He is going to fulfill!!! How quick we are to lean to our own understanding and in all sincerity we attempt to help. Are we not stepping in and restricting the ministry of the Holy Spirit? It will all be done in His timing and by His Grace on individuals lives.

We talk of bringing all things into a balance. Is it really a balance we are experiencing or is it no more than hearing that still small of the Spirit? We have been beat up with the legalisms and all the negativisms of â€œ NO Doctors â€œ Specific dress â€œ Education â€œ Debt â€œ Media â€œ I could go on, that they have become the focus. Are these things sin? They can be, yet it is NOT an absolute! I think we give Satan way TOO much credit. He did not create these things â€œ HE CANâ€™T â€œ God did â€œ Satan has perverted them as he has all of creation. We are in the world yet commanded not to be OF the world.

The whole Denom system is so rooted in the worldly mind-set that to shed light on it and fully understand itâ€™s consequences is mind boggling. One of the primary results it has accomplished is the quenching of the Holy Spirit in individuals lives. Members have the mind-set that we have a worldly leader to lead and teach (doesnâ€™t matter if you classify as 5-fold or not) and it devolves into a spectators affair.

I pose a question here â€œ If an individual feels led to do something that someone else feels they have a deeper knowledge of as sin, should it be voiced? By voicing it and it being reasoning of the scriptures (head knowledge) and not the leading of the Holy Spirit, is this no less than blasphemy of the Spirit???? Iâ€™m not referring to someone sinning against what is written! But the interpretation of what some feels a scripture is referring to!

I find it amazing how the structure of the denominational system has been maintained throughout the history of the NT church with the exception of the 1st century. It is no more than OT structure with a new turn for the modern age! They pray â€œOur Father in Heavenâ€• a mentality that He is out of reach to the individual. The system permeates the Charismatic movement and even â€œWORD and FAITHâ€• messages. Some see the error and behold another deception â€œ the Prophetic movement.

Where is Your Faith??? In the works that one does or in the True and Living God???

Hombre wrote on Thu, 01 May 2008 09:22

Either we are free, and able to make correct judgments ourselves, living by the principles that Christ laid down, or we are not and need a set of rules to live by.

Which is it?

JRS

I would that ye all spake with tongues but rather that ye prophesied: for greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret, that the church may receive edifying.

And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jjsamazed](#) on Sun, 18 May 2008 19:31:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sue, it's not worth it to argue at this point. We've been here before, done that, sounds like a broken record. Every time I try to show some way that HEF went wrong, you send out a post attacking various ministries and me and making unjustified sweeping statements about people and churches. It is difficult to have an intelligent dialogue on the matter when that happens. I know that you are doing what you believe is best, but it is difficult to dialogue when you come at things the way you do. If you look for error and evil you will certainly find it. Likewise with truth and goodness.

However, let me make it clear under no uncertain terms that I have no truck with the emerging church movement or mentality. I have never negated any commands of scripture by stating that it is "just for that culture." Nothing new about that error. My statements about HEF's teaching on dress and the like were meant to convey that it was unreasonable for him to expect the 80's generation to have the same approach to formal attire that the 50's generation had. The 80's generation was more casual, but in our mind (I am part of the 80's generation) casual does not mean disrespectful. I think the formality of previous generations produced a starchiness that inhibited people from flowing in the Holy Spirit. I'm glad that I can be more informal when worshipping with the saints than when going to the White House. It is hard to dance in the spirit for very long in a suit and tie, especially on a humid day. I'm glad that my daughters are not discouraged by legalism about formal dress at church so that they can focus on the more important matters. Modesty is the principle taught in scripture, not formality, and they are aware of that.

I did not mean for my remarks to be demeaning. I am genuinely concerned about your mental health, as well as that of all the others who have the same mindset. However, I will try to not go

there again as I can see that it is not helpful in this context.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Sun, 18 May 2008 19:59:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JRS, Hombre and c-grace, for 2,000 years believers have been trying to thrash out this issue. Many sincere followers of Jesus have labored to walk in grace while expressing their faith through works, as James teaches. We acknowledge that it is only by God's unmerited favor that we can even be saved, that He took the initiative to shed His own blood for us and He took the initiative to regenerate us. It is all by grace, as the scripture says. The question is, "How do we then live? Once we have been transformed by the Holy Spirit, how do we live out our lives? Jim Brenneman said it well-- "Works do not produce salvation, salvation produces works." I don't know if that is original with him, but it is Biblical. Hombre, when I quote the scriptures that tell us to love the Lord with all our heart and our neighbor as ourselves, I am talking about how we live our lives. I am not talking about how we obtain salvation. We don't obtain it. Jesus did. But the way we live according to His word is summed up under those two commandments. We cannot even come close to doing so without being born again first. Once we are, we have the power to do so, and as time goes on we grow in both faith and love.

On a more negative note, I am concerned that so many posters here are still using the term "denominational" to refer to lukewarm churches. That's an outdated term and is not very helpful. It blurs the issue. There are plenty of churches that are part of denominations that have been filled with the Holy Spirit and are wonderful examples of what a church can be. On the other hand, I can think of a number of "faith" churches that were a really bad example. Bickering, fearful, legalistic, elitist, no concern for the lost, etc... It is not about being a part of a denomination, although sometimes a denom can get in the way for some churches. Some churches are lukewarm, some are not. Some churches need to remove themselves from apostate denominations.

Every time in history a group of Christians has tried to extract themselves from "the system" they created a system of their own. When you talk about denominations, in a sense you are including the Faith Assembly denomination. That was one of the points of my original post in this thread.

You might want to find a more accurate term than "denominational". "Lukewarm" or "institutional" might be better. The important thing is that you don't convey this attitude of "all other churches are bad except my kind". That only feeds the problem, not helps it.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [sparkles](#) on Mon, 19 May 2008 00:53:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I am genuinely concerned about your mental health, as well as that of all the others who have the same mindset.

I would say it is comments like the above is what I am saying about you being demeaning.

There are ways to phrase things without putting someone down. I did not question your mental state, but rather wondered about your discernment about some people in the religious world. My mental state is fine, I just wish there were more discerning ministers out there. I am concerned for all the people following all the compromise and deception out there. I have friends who have been deeply hurt by their past churches who are going the easy way, and the way of the false apostolic and prophetic. Brother Freeman spoke about this 30 years ago and Dave Wilkerson is warning his church about such things now.

He is teaching some wonderful messages on faith, and how God hates unbelief. In these wicked days of unbelief, God is looking for faith. I am just listening to a message by him called "Moving your Mountain." And the mountain he is speaking about is the mountain of unbelief.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [JRS](#) on Tue, 20 May 2008 15:55:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Amen Hombre â€œ Well said!

Hombre wrote on Tue, 20 May 2008 09:47
...the problem as I see it Jiz, is this:

There IS NO church right now 'of my kind'.

The closest thing to 'it' was FA, and though we disagree on a few issues, we both agree that FA bound themselves up with suffocating legalism, which eventually killed the goose.

What I would like, and I'm sure we all would, is a church that teaches sound Biblical doctrine/theology yet allows the Spirit to move. The problems are also, as I see it, the same problems that HEF faced:

1. The need to educate people sufficiently in theology so that they don't come in prophesying through the wrong spirit, etc., and embracing one error after another.

Just speculating in what the early Church was like.

Praise, worship and the gifts â€œ and along with it â€œ teaching & reading from the OT only, proving how it was all previously written and fulfilled in Jesus. Giving testimony of the LIFE of Jesus and how we are to pattern our lives after HIM and NOT manâ€™s ideas. I would have a

hard time believing he taught anything that could be implied as a rule or regulation, for it would result in works.

He taught that everything should be done in order in the church at Corinth, yet he in NO way imposed an order. Interesting â€“ He exposed the confusion and allowed the Holy Spirit to bring the order!!!!

JRS

Maybe it is a utopia that is patterned â€“ Be ye perfect as your Father in Heaven is Perfect.

Man Canâ€™t â€“ God Can.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [DeWayne](#) on Wed, 21 May 2008 01:13:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jisamazed wrote on Sun, 18 May 2008 14:59

Every time in history a group of Christians has tried to extract themselves from "the system" they created a system of their own. When you talk about denominations, in a sense you are including the Faith Assembly denomination. That was one of the points of my original post in this thread.

In a sense? Yes, nonsense.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [DeWayne](#) on Wed, 21 May 2008 01:19:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jisamazed wrote on Sun, 18 May 2008 14:31

I did not mean for my remarks to be demeaning. I am genuinely concerned about your mental health, as well as that of all the others who have the same mindset. However, I will try to not go there again as I can see that it is not helpful in this context.

In other words, anyone who believes God's promises is mentally ill. You did not mean for your remarks to be demeaning? It's really difficult to take you seriously. Why did you ever go to FA? You should have stayed in the system. You would have been better off.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Wed, 21 May 2008 02:47:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sageshroomer said, "There are ways to phrase things without putting someone down. I did not question your mental state, but rather wondered about your discernment about some people in the religious world. My mental state is fine, I just wish there were more discerning ministers out there. I've been around long enough to recognize misguided "discernment." I used to do that myself. Every time I would walk in a church or read an article I would immediately pick apart what I thought was error and analyze it and be suspicious of any manifestation of the Spirit that seemed unusual. True discernment about error is absolutely essential for a church. However, false discernment that makes sweeping statements and writes off a teacher for one error is harmful to the body of Christ. In doing so, you miss a lot of truth that some of these men and movement have to offer.

I am concerned for all the people following all the compromise and deception out there. I have friends who have been deeply hurt by their past churches who are going the easy way, and the way of the false apostolic and prophetic. Following Jesus is never easy, especially because He often surprises us in the places that we need to go if we are obey His leading. He does not like it when we try to put Him in a box. Brother Freeman spoke about this 30 years ago and Dave Wilkerson is warning his church about such things now. He is teaching some wonderful messages on faith, and how God hates unbelief. In these wicked days of unbelief, God is looking for faith. I am just listening to a message by him called "Moving your Mountain." And the mountain he is speaking about is the mountain of unbelief."

Yes, I have a high esteem for David Wilkerson, too. I still receive his newsletter and sermons. He tries to maintain unity with all those who call upon the Lord with a pure heart, regardless of denomination. He certainly does not reject them as "denominational". He was a Pentecostal pastor himself for years (Assemblies of God), and he still maintains a good relationship with that denomination. He does not isolate himself, and he would be the first to tell you that you need to join a church. He speaks strongly about the charismatic itch, and he needs to do so, but I disagree with some of his comments about the "prophetic" movement. I see a lot of holiness coming from some prophetic churches, and they are not as loopy goopy as they are made out to be. Some are false, some are not.

Moulder suggested that someone start a separate thread on recent charismatic movements so that we can discuss them intelligently. Maybe I will take the initiative. I want to see this one to the end, first.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination

Hombre wrote on Tue, 20 May 2008 09:47jismazed wrote on Sun, 18 May 2008 14:59....The important thing is that you don't convey this attitude of "all other churches are bad except my kind". That only feeds the problem, not helps it.

...the problem as I see it Jiz, is this:

There IS NO church right now 'of my kind'.

The closest thing to 'it' was FA, and though we disagree on a few issues, we both agree that FA bound themselves up with suffocating legalism, which eventually killed the goose.

What I would like, and I'm sure we all would, is a church that teaches sound Biblical doctrine/theology yet allows the Spirit to move. The problems are also, as I see it, the same problems that HEF faced:

1. The need to educate people sufficiently in theology so that they don't come in prophesying through the wrong spirit, etc., and embracing one error after another.
2. How to establish reasonable order without it becoming legalistic.

Of course, we would need a congregation filled with people who aren't narrow minded in the wrong way and able to embrace the idea that God is bigger than their idea of Him, and accept the fact that perhaps they can learn a thing or two if they would start looking at what the Bible says and doesn't say, versus what they have been taught that the Bible says.

Hombre, I could not agree more with the need for Spirit-filled churches that hold to sound teaching and practice. There is a book by Douglas Banister called, "The Word and Power Church" (Zondervan, 1999). In it he talks about the need for churches to have both of these qualities in order to be strong, well-balanced and effective in advancing the kingdom of God. He was an Evangelical Free pastor (Chuck Swindoll's denomination) who was wonderfully baptized in the Spirit. He and his church strive for that balance. Many such traditional churches have had the same experience. We don't hear a lot about them because they are not very visible. Many of them are not big, don't have popular newsletters and do not draw a lot of attention to themselves. I have met many people from various churches who have that balance to one degree or another. They are growing in their faith and understanding, just as we are, and they are becoming more like Jesus. At the same time, many charismatics are starting to understand the need for good, scholarly teaching.

I hesitate to recommend any specific churches because I know that it is easy to judge them for

their denominational label or the movement of which they have been a part. For example, if I were to say, "Try Living Faith Fellowship", it would be easy to dismiss it because you already know some things about it and might not be able to approach it objectively.

I would recommend the writings of Wayne Grudem for a good understanding of how to approach the matter. He seems to have wrestled with the same thing at one time in his life. I think that his Systematic Theology is the best one out there, and I have read quite a few. In it he addresses the questions that you have raised.

You have to seek in order to find. Visit some churches and sit under their word for a while to get an idea of whether or not they have that balance. They might have it to varying degrees or emphasize one side or another, but we are all growing, aren't we? Find out if that balance of Word and Spirit are important to them. If so, you both value the same thing.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jsamazed](#) on Wed, 21 May 2008 03:20:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DeWayne wrote on Tue, 20 May 2008 20:19jsamazed wrote on Sun, 18 May 2008 14:31

I did not mean for my remarks to be demeaning. I am genuinely concerned about your mental health, as well as that of all the others who have the same mindset. However, I will try to not go there again as I can see that it is not helpful in this context.

In other words, anyone who believes God's promises is mentally ill. You did not mean for your remarks to be demeaning? It's really difficult to take you seriously. Why did you ever go to FA? You should have stayed in the system. You would have been better off.

My statement had nothing to do with whether or not someone believes God's promises. I don't know where you got that from.

I have a few clients whose thinking is in a loop. They are not able to reason themselves out of their delusions, no matter what evidence to the contrary. They have an inability to see both sides of an issue or weigh all of the evidence. When I meet with them, it reminds me of the way that many of us thought back in the early and mid eighties. There was so much fear of deception that it was almost an obsession. A few posts on this forum express the same thought process. It is unhealthy. It has nothing to do with believing God's promises. May we all believe His promises every day. They are "Yes" and "Amen". They are meant to be a source of joy and basis for faith, not a bondage or a formula.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [DeWayne](#) on Wed, 21 May 2008 05:11:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jisamazed wrote on Tue, 20 May 2008 22:20DeWayne wrote on Tue, 20 May 2008
20:19jisamazed wrote on Sun, 18 May 2008 14:31

I did not mean for my remarks to be demeaning. I am genuinely concerned about your mental health, as well as that of all the others who have the same mindset. However, I will try to not go there again as I can see that it is not helpful in this context.

In other words, anyone who believes God's promises is mentally ill. You did not mean for your remarks to be demeaning? It's really difficult to take you seriously. Why did you ever go to FA? You should have stayed in the system. You would have been better off.

My statement had nothing to do with whether or not someone believes God's promises. I don't know where you got that from.

I have a few clients whose thinking is in a loop. They are not able to reason themselves out of their delusions, no matter what evidence to the contrary. They have an inability to see both sides of an issue or weigh all of the evidence. When I meet with them, it reminds me of the way that many of us thought back in the early and mid eighties. There was so much fear of deception that it was almost an obsession. A few posts on this forum express the same thought process. It is unhealthy. It has nothing to do with believing God's promises. May we all believe His promises every day. They are "Yes" and "Amen". They are meant to be a source of joy and basis for faith, not a bondage or a formula.

So when God said "I am the Lord that healeth thee", you say no thanks God, I'd rather trust in man's great wisdom?

DeWayne

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jisamazed](#) on Sun, 25 May 2008 03:50:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That might be good methodology for car shopping, and certainly what you're suggesting has an element of truth in it, however, been there, done that and I can assure you that HEF was right about something else:

'People don't leave religion, they leave 'The Faith'. There are plenty of people in traditional churches as well as charismatic fellowships who are in the faith, because they are in Christ. HEF's

statement was the kind that put people in fear about leaving FA and made them insecure about their salvation. He seemed to imply that "the faith" was the same as "his teaching about faith".

...and IMO, attempting to bring the message of faith into a dead system, is much akin to attempting to persuade Pharaoh to chisel off his pyramid hieroglyphs in favor of the 10 commandments. But Hombre, you seem to assume that any church that is in a denomination is dead. Quite the opposite. I've seen many denominational churches that are more alive than many "faith" groups I know about. It's not about what label a church has, it is about how much they are in Christ and how much the presence of the Holy Spirit is there. And you won't know until you visit and fellowship with them.

..it ain't a gonna happen.

...that is unless of course one is somehow spirited into the midst and given power to do that.....I speak of Joseph.....errrrr..... 'Sir William'. I'm all for it. Followers of Jesus need to teach each other and learn from each other. Hopefully it can be done without the "listen to me because I'm superior to you" mentality. Ministry means to serve, and ministry of the Word means that we serve people by teaching the Word.

...so then I'll revise that last statement, it can happen.

...ALL things are possible.

Consider this:

...'ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.' ~ Jude 3

We of all people ought to understand that verse. 'The Faith' has been lost for several thousand years now, except in isolated blips here and there through time. I strongly disagree. When you look at the martyrs throughout church history, including those who are being persecuted as you read this post, how can you say that? Many believers around the world understand that to die is gain, because they know they could be killed any time simply because they confess Jesus as Lord. The millions who have been killed, maimed, fired, exiled or humiliated for the Lord might not follow HEF's 5 steps of faith for healing, but they understand faith more than any of us in our comfortable Christianity in America. Christianity ought to be attempting to recover that lost information, not swaddling itself through the comfort that institutions can bring (most genuine Christians I know are doing so, all of them at different levels of knowledge and practice). IMO, HEF and FA attempted to do just that, and in my life has come closer than anything else I've experienced to touching the divine. Dude, I was drawn to the same passion for the truth when I was a teenager. That is why I sat under that teaching for 12 years. It was much to my dismay when I discovered that HEF's teaching was not as faithful to scripture as I first thought it was, especially later in his life.

A friend of mine compares being ' institutionalized ' to Psalm 137:

'.....By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down, yea, we wept, when we remembered Zion. We hanged our harps upon the willows in the midst thereof. For there they that carried us away captive required of us a song; and they that wasted us required of us mirth, saying, Sing us one of the songs of Zion. How shall we sing the LORD's song in a strange land? If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning.....'

This verse could apply to any religious captivity. FA brought a few people under captivity as well, and it is nice to be back to the promised land. So do I.... insert weeping emoticon HERE:_____

There is also one other problem which I have already noted of late, and that is the need for one to be sufficiently grounded in the Word, in order to recognize error and avoid being caught up in it like the rest who aren't rooted sufficiently. It is one thing to be genuinely rooted in the Word, and it is another to think that you are.

I don't think that I really need to go into it, but I'll leave it with one example anyway. Good idea. Examples are helpful.

Consider those who sat at FA for years, supposedly soaking up the water and digesting the meat....and now, these same sit under 'balanced' ministries and have become confused enough to attempt to convince us, even here, that healing through Medical Science is synonymous with Divine Healing. If you are implying that I said that, then you are twisting my words. Scripture does not speak directly to the medical science question, whether for or against it. Using the Asa passage to insist that God never uses medical science is twisting scripture. My emphasis from the beginning has been, "What does scripture really say? Does it really say what HEF implied it said, or was he wrong sometimes?" He sometimes quoted "Confessions of a Medical Heretic" more than scripture in some of his messages. Was he really preaching the Word in those later years?

We may not have all the answers, but we don't go about deceiving people by altering the Word of God through human reasonings. Amen. However, I think that FA and HEF did that very thing some times. It was just a different human reasoning than what you might hear in some other churches.

...and that is precisely what happens, little by little, as one sits under a ministry that has commitments that extend beyond the preaching of the Word. You mean like a commitment to keep people from accessing doctors and lawyers or to get insurance as if those were the Lord's top priority?

...before one knows it, they are participating in everything from passing buckets to helping organize revivals. Those must be horrible sins. I can't imagine how anyone who does such things could really be saved. All this time, I thought that the Lord had the power to move among people

in spite of their shortcomings.

...sorry, but that ain't the way God works, and one has to be strong enough to resist getting caught up in it all....not to mention creating new friendships and having the old peer pressure bearing down to participate....that is just a little much for my taste, and besides that raises the question:

...WHY would one be doing something that vexes oneself? All is vanity, a vexation of spirit ("chasing after the wind" is an alternative translation). If you love your brothers who are bound by a religious spirit, it won't be so vexing to share some life with them.

Hombre, freely you have received, freely give. If you have been given life-giving truth that draws you to Jesus and empowers you to live by the Holy Spirit, you need to share it with others instead of criticizing them. Learn from them at the same time. You need to remind yourself that the ground is still level at the foot of the cross, no matter how much more knowledge you have (or think you have).

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Sun, 25 May 2008 04:11:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DeWayne wrote on Wed, 21 May 2008 00:11jismazed wrote on Tue, 20 May 2008 22:20DeWayne wrote on Tue, 20 May 2008 20:19jismazed wrote on Sun, 18 May 2008 14:31

I did not mean for my remarks to be demeaning. I am genuinely concerned about your mental health, as well as that of all the others who have the same mindset. However, I will try to not go there again as I can see that it is not helpful in this context.

In other words, anyone who believes God's promises is mentally ill. You did not mean for your remarks to be demeaning? It's really difficult to take you seriously. Why did you ever go to FA? You should have stayed in the system. You would have been better off.

My statement had nothing to do with whether or not someone believes God's promises. I don't know where you got that from.

I have a few clients whose thinking is in a loop. They are not able to reason themselves out of their delusions, no matter what evidence to the contrary. They have an inability to see both sides of an issue or weigh all of the evidence. When I meet with them, it reminds me of the way that many of us thought back in the early and mid eighties. There was so much fear of deception that it was almost an obsession. A few posts on this forum express the same thought process. It is unhealthy. It has nothing to do with believing God's promises. May we all believe His promises every day. They are "Yes" and "Amen". They are meant to be a source of joy and basis for faith,

not a bondage or a formula.

So when God said "I am the Lord that healeth thee", you say no thanks God, I'd rather trust in man's great wisdom?

DeWayne

Actually, I ask the Lord to fulfill that particular promise some times when I pray for healing for myself or others. Sometimes it is a different promise. If I ask the Lord to heal me or my children, I ask Him what He wants me to do about it. I commit myself to doing whatever He wants. If I believe that He wants me to get the help of a doctor, I do it. If not, I don't. If I do get care from a doctor, I pray for him or her and ask the Lord to make the treatment effective. I trust that He gives us wisdom and leads us in these matters. He is the healer, and I will follow His leading. Whether or not I'm healed, though important, is secondary to being faithful to Him, even if I am not healed. It's not about whether or not I use medical science, it is about whether or not I will look to Him as my healer.

Sometimes I do what is contrary to what the doctor says, not because I think medical science is bad, but because I disagree with that particular doctor or practice. For example, I delayed getting my children immunized until they were 4-5 years old because I don't believe that the body of an infant or toddler can handle so many of those shots, some of which still contain formaldehyde or mercury. They were required by the school in order for them to enroll, so I had it done. I was not fearful about it, and I know that for some diseases immunizations are safe and effective. For others they might not be. Freedom in Christ allows us to make those kinds of choices without feeling condemned. Even if I was wrong about the shot matter (although I've done my homework), it is not the end of the world, and it should not be made into a major issue. Big deal. There are much more important matters to focus on. The Lord will honor our faith either way.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [DeWayne](#) on Mon, 26 May 2008 06:47:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jisamazed wrote on Sat, 24 May 2008 23:11DeWayne wrote on Wed, 21 May 2008
00:11jisamazed wrote on Tue, 20 May 2008 22:20DeWayne wrote on Tue, 20 May 2008
20:19jisamazed wrote on Sun, 18 May 2008 14:31

I did not mean for my remarks to be demeaning. I am genuinely concerned about your mental health, as well as that of all the others who have the same mindset. However, I will try to not go there again as I can see that it is not helpful in this context.

In other words, anyone who believes God's promises is mentally ill. You did not mean for your remarks to be demeaning? It's really difficult to take you seriously. Why did you ever go to FA?

You should have stayed in the system. You would have been better off.

My statement had nothing to do with whether or not someone believes God's promises. I don't know where you got that from.

I have a few clients whose thinking is in a loop. They are not able to reason themselves out of their delusions, no matter what evidence to the contrary. They have an inability to see both sides of an issue or weigh all of the evidence. When I meet with them, it reminds me of the way that many of us thought back in the early and mid eighties. There was so much fear of deception that it was almost an obsession. A few posts on this forum express the same thought process. It is unhealthy. It has nothing to do with believing God's promises. May we all believe His promises every day. They are "Yes" and "Amen". They are meant to be a source of joy and basis for faith, not a bondage or a formula.

So when God said "I am the Lord that healeth thee", you say no thanks God, I'd rather trust in man's great wisdom?

DeWayne

Actually, I ask the Lord to fulfill that particular promise some times when I pray for healing for myself or others. Sometimes it is a different promise. If I ask the Lord to heal me or my children, I ask Him what He wants me to do about it. I commit myself to doing whatever He wants. If I believe that He wants me to get the help of a doctor, I do it. If not, I don't. If I do get care from a doctor, I pray for him or her and ask the Lord to make the treatment effective. I trust that He gives us wisdom and leads us in these matters. He is the healer, and I will follow His leading. Whether or not I'm healed, though important, is secondary to being faithful to Him, even if I am not healed. It's not about whether or not I use medical science, it is about whether or not I will look to Him as my healer.

Sometimes I do what is contrary to what the doctor says, not because I think medical science is bad, but because I disagree with that particular doctor or practice. For example, I delayed getting my children immunized until they were 4-5 years old because I don't believe that the body of an infant or toddler can handle so many of those shots, some of which still contain formaldehyde or mercury. They were required by the school in order for them to enroll, so I had it done. I was not fearful about it, and I know that for some diseases immunizations are safe and effective. For others they might not be. Freedom in Christ allows us to make those kinds of choices without feeling condemned. Even if I was wrong about the shot matter (although I've done my homework), it is not the end of the world, and it should not be made into a major issue. Big deal. There are much more important matters to focus on. The Lord will honor our faith either way.

If you want to go to doctors you should, for sure. But you are deceived.

DeWayne

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [DeWayne](#) on Mon, 26 May 2008 07:21:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Actually I shouldn't have said "you should". Millions of deaths caused by doctors is a warning to anyone who is listening.

DeWayne

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [capturedbygrace](#) on Tue, 27 May 2008 19:32:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JRS said: I agree...with the exception of 1 thing. God giving his revelation to a minister. " I do not mean anything towards you, this is exactly the mentality that is promoted though out the Denom system. One clarification--By that I meant there is a wonder going on! Even a minister or two who have been born and bred in the system are really called of God and don't know it--these are the ones who are beginning to see what their calling is all about--not overpowering the flock, but empowering it! The pastor I'm with is having revelation from God as to why the body is not growing, and by that I mean maturing in God. He is being given revelation as to what is supposed to be happening to the body of Christ (and what do I think that is? all you said, JRS!). He said within the last six months, "I don't even know what a pastor is anymore." Wonderful!!!

I agree it is sin to use the Word or "leadership" or any gift or gift ministry (prophetic) to stifle our hearing the Holy Spirit for ourselves. Let me say, I have been ministered to by prophetic words--but I don't have "itching ears"--they have been very specific words, but they have always helped confirm the course I heard from God Himself--they don't absolve me from my responsibilities.

You said, The whole Denom system is so rooted in the worldly mind-set that to shed light on it and fully understand it's consequences is mind boggling. One of the primary results it has accomplished is the quenching of the Holy Spirit in individuals lives. Yes, and anyone with that mindset will use or receive any gift wrongly, and that will quench the Holy Spirit. I dare say I am still being delivered out of that mentality--by God's mercy I pray no gift or anything else I receive be used to serve any system--only Him and His purposes!

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jisamazed](#) on Thu, 29 May 2008 17:08:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre, you've slipped. For a while you seemed to be making a genuine attempt to dialogue intelligently. You've slipped back into ad hominem arguments, meaning you attack the person rather than addressing their ideas or arguments. You either are not able or not willing to understand my position and seem to attack positions that I don't hold. It's too bad, because I would really like to have a good discussion on scripture related to these issues without all the drama and venom. I know, I was a bit sarcastic in that last post. I'm sorry for the tone of it. I must have struck a nerve, because I now have two nicknames, Dathan and Snake. Dude, that's a bit over the top. I stand before the Lord on that one. My conscience is clear before Him.

Don't worry, I'm used to it. That happens quite a bit when mingling with former "faith camp" people. I have given it sometimes, so I should expect to receive it. "Dathan" and "Snake", however, is crossing the line into calling your brother a fool. It is much more effective to take a scripture and expound on it rather than prooftext.

BTW, I did listen to HEF's theology series as a teenager and it was excellent. I have affirmed the quality of his theology over and over. I just wish that he had stuck with teaching theology instead of trying to pastor the flock. He admitted at one point that his ultimate calling was not to pastor, and I wonder if his problems occurred because he got away from his calling.

I have learned over the years not to question other people's motivations if I don't know their heart. You would do well to learn the same thing. Assuming things about people brings about confusion and complicates the discussion unnecessarily.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [jisamazed](#) on Sat, 31 May 2008 23:05:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Flee the evil desires of youth, and pursue righteousness, faith, love and peace, along with those who call on the Lord out of a pure heart. Don't have anything to do with foolish and stupid arguments, because you know they produce quarrels. And the Lord's servant must not quarrel; instead, he must be kind to everyone, able to teach, not resentful." I Timothy 2:22-24

I have made the mistake previously of getting sucked into quarrels. I am determined not to make that mistake again.

I think this thread has run its course. If others want to add something, so be it, but I don't find this conversation very productive anymore. It's time to discuss some scriptures.

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [Wilber Evans](#) on Mon, 02 Jun 2008 13:04:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre,

As you said, you are truly an "ass". It's a wonder that Molder still lets you on this forum.

"By their fruits".

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 02 Jun 2008 19:36:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:1. Either you think he's an ass too,

I just want to say that I have one... but I don't think it is so large (proportionally speaking) that it should predominate my other great features and certainly not large enough to necessitate a handle (or avatar) change nor heavy enough to warrant throwing my weight around.

I do have a problem if the intention is to divide and conquer...

I'm still trying to figure out why someone wants to attack the homey that was added to the forum? (...and who decided to add homie to this discussion anyway?)

To quote the famous American Rodney King: "...can't we all just get along?", and then the wisdom of the anonymous guy who stood up and announced: "Gentlemen, there are ladies present!"

More to say, but wifey just arrived with the groceries... (I'll let you know if the food forces me to modify any of my earlier statements).
"I got to run!"

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: The Faith Assembly Denomination
Posted by [james](#) on Mon, 02 Jun 2008 21:42:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Moulder...it's SOO good to hear from you, thought you'd maybe taken a Sabbatical. Please do something with Hombre,we can't control him, maybe take a couple links outta his chain. Sorry to hear about your church problems... and people wonder why the world is turned off to Christianity.
