

Greetings,

Elswhere on the board a brother recently wrote along lines of the ministry being regular people "not the icons that they were built up to be."

This keyed a memory and I would appreciate feedback.

As I recall....

- * Bro freeman died in Dec '84

- * In Sept/Oct? of '84 he had a message wherein he came against "weapons of death"

- * HEF-> "As to weapons of death I do not know why you would have them in your house"

- * This put an end to using those weapons to hunt deer in hunting season.

- * Talk was that several 5-fold were really having a tough time dealing with giving up hunting

- * Bruce Kinsey was one of these brothers who had a hard time giving up hunting.

After HEF died I thought at that time that HEF had used the "weapons of death" issue to be "the last straw" for Kinsey and to cause Kinsey to leave the church.

Sort of a church politics manipulation of Kinsey since the hunting prohibition was short lived and not Scriptural ... and was a "hot button" for Kinsey.

Also at that time, if anything happened to HEF, Bruce Kinsey was the likely replacement for HEF as the most respected leader of the whole group - was respected in the Word, popular, and a son-in-law.

So if HEF anticipated his own death, prolonged physical trial unable to get to church, or his incarceration in the upcoming (Jan/Feb '85) court trial ... HEF might have wanted to cause Kinsey to leave the church so Kinsey would not have become the replacement leader.

Apparently HEF/Kinsey had had some prior discussions in disagreement on misc topics.

So . . .
Did anyone else smell church politics back then?

=====
=====
=====

PS.

I heard much later that Kinsey was ethical in leaving the group. Told the Lafayette church what he was doing in leaving. Said come back here to the regular meeting next week and he would arrange a teacher from Faith Assembly to replace himself. That he would hold his own meetings elsewhere. That the people should pray and decide for themselves to attend his (Kinsey) meeting or not.

.... a far cry from the character assassination of Kinsey that rippled through the various churches.

=====
=====
=====

PSS.

Strengths and faults all included . . . Bruce Kinsey was a really good guy.

Much agape love/condolences to Kathy.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [james](#) on Sun, 24 Oct 2010 18:37:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey jman,

Good to hear from you, I'd like to give my view on what happened as best I can remember. Oh, first let me say that I agree that Bruce was a good guy, I really liked him.

First as to the politics of FA and Bro. Freeman possibly forcing Bruce's hand with his own future in question; I don't have any reason to think that, not now or then...but I wasn't there, I was on the outside looking in. But I think HEF would have just named Jack Farrell or Steve Hill his successor, he never seemed shy about doing what he thought was right.

On to the weapons of mass destruction... I mean "weapons of death". You might be right about that specific quote being in the fall of '84, but hunting and weapons had been mentioned as early as the fall of '82. As I recall HEF mentioned in a teaching that he wondered about the mindset of an overcomer who was believing God to be part of God's end-time army of deliverers, how one would confess to wanting to 'set the groaning creation free', would go around 'killing' God's creation. I remember fasting and praying about it then because I was a serious hunter(Bruce and I had talked about hunting, and some brothers from Indiana had come to Alabama and deer hunted with me.)

I prayed and asked The Holy Spirit to give me the right attitude and to remove from me anything that would hinder me from total obedience to His leading. Almost overnight the desire to hunt and kill left me(and you'd have had to have known me then to fully understand, I didn't do anything half way, I had a new CJ5 Jeep, a travel trailer, did all my own reloading, had dozens of expensive guns, bows, ect. I would take off 3-4 weeks during hunting season <self-employed> and hunt.) and while I still have a great love for the outdoors, I haven't killed an animal on purpose since 1982. I destroyed my guns and haven't owned a firearm since(I'm not saying anything about anyone owning guns, I'm only speaking of what I did). But I understood the point Bro. Freeman was making about weapons of death, and still believe that a Christian has no business carrying a

weapon.

Did some brothers have trouble with those teachings? Yes, for sure, I knew several who continued to hunt and have guns. I have no problem with a person hunting or having a gun to keep around the house to plink cans with or chase off critters, but shooting another human being (even in self-defense) is in disobedience to Jesus' teaching on nonresistance.

I think a person has to be willing to yield to The Holy Spirit and allow God to work in our hearts whatever is necessary; for me I chose to allow Him to change my heart. I haven't regretted it for one second; I have some fond memories of camping and hunting, mostly the fellowship with hunting buddies and enjoying God's creation, but hunting 'big deer' to hang on the wall, I don't miss.

Just my experience, no judgment concerning those who don't agree with me...enjoy the venison.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [Mark L](#) on Sun, 24 Oct 2010 20:24:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OK James. It sounds like you were very good at hunting deer so maybe the solution here is . . . you go do the hunting and I will humble myself and eat it for you. You know me. Anything to help out a bro.

Very interesting question re: the politics. What I remember was the issue BK left over was blue jeans. HEF wanted everyone to dress properly in public and especially word ministers. I don't think the exact issue really matters though.

I think to my mind what settles the issue was subsequent events. As I recall Bk after leaving left off walking with the Lord too. To even going back to a heathen lifestyle. He then returned to the Lord around 95 after someone shot a few shells from a rifle into his house. To me the fact that he walked away from the Lord would settle who was right and who was wrong. That's not meant as criticism btw

As far as HEF goes in a way I'm really thankful we have the benefit of 25 yrs of hindsight. We can see him as being human rather than getting pronouncements from on high. Something I was really guilty of. I would be surprised though if it was in his mind about succession. There would have been other ways to deal with it.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey

Posted by [sparkles](#) on Sun, 24 Oct 2010 23:20:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello Jman,

I believe there was much more going on with Bruce than any of us realized. I am sure it was not any one issue, and especially not a "political" one so Bruce would not lead Faith Assembly. There were other men at FA who could have taken over, and I am certain Brother Freeman would not have removed Bruce just so he wouldn't lead the church. I don't believe we will ever know all of what happened, not does it really matter.

As far as Brother Freeman anticipating his own death or not making it to FA to preach, I am certain he believed he would be in the pulpit the next time he was to preach after his vacation. God had always been faithful to heal him and as far as I know he never missed a service he was to preach at, even when he was going through a trial with his heart.

Bruce was a blessing and now is with Jesus. I use to be on Bruce's automatics and was very blessed with what the Lord gave him to share. One of the best teachings I heard of Bruces was: What to do with a second chance. Like Bruce said in his message, what you do with a second, or third, or fourth or whatever number chance God gives, is you take it. If I remember correctly Bruce used the example of someone who attached helium filled balloons to a chair he was sitting in, and then had someone release the chair from that which was holding it down. Well, the man went much higher than he thought, but somehow he survived. Bruce shared this story and he how this man was given a second chance because he could have very easily been killed. And what this man did was take his second chance.

There are things that could be shared about some who were at FA, but it isn't important anymore, Bruce is gone, Brother Freeman is gone as are others. If it was me I wouldn't want my husbands, or fathers, or grandfathers or brother-in-laws name brought up in a bad way for all to see on the internet. At some point people need to either contact others one on one, or just forget those things that are behind and press on. Where are we today in our walk with the Lord, and what we were convicted to walk in 30 years ago are we still doing it? God hasn't changed, but many have. And I am saying what we were convicted to walk in from the Lord. There have been many who have gone back from true convictions from Jesus, and now just make excuses or try to blame others. That sure won't fly with the Lord, not for me and not for anyone else. We need to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling. And also to bear one anothers burdens.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [GWB](#) on Sun, 24 Oct 2010 23:28:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The politics mentioned sounds like a lot of manipulation and wavering from a man who taught, walked, lived, ate, and breathed faith. I can't imagine HEF even going there. He was too much of a straight shooter. Just MO.

As far as Bruce goes...I think we would have to ask him for the exact reasons, and he is with Jesus now.

Bruce did his job well and now there are thousands of people all over the world with the Word of Faith in their hearts. My understanding of the purpose of the Charismatic School was to prepare Overcomers for end-time ministry who would be disbursed to the four corners of the earth.

As always, we never knew/know how God will do things.

IMHO, the big picture is this: If we truly believe we are in the end-times, are we ready to rumble? Do we have these questions settled in our hearts, for ourselves, so that we are not hindered in anyway? I know that I am believing for a quick work in myself.

No criticism intended...just my opinion.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [David Coleman](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2010 15:19:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The Lord has dealt with me on this subject here specifically. First have to have a answer to a question.

Not able to remember the ethics tape taught by HEF, but it has reference to hunting. That you should buy meat as much as needed but he also added that if you hunt the policy is kill and eat. Never to just kill only for sport.

In Christian liberty we are free to have a gun, but if we feel we would misuse it we should get rid of it. Personally the only reason I have no guns is because though free to have them, don't like to hunt. Just sensitive to the thing. It's hard to kill a fish but am learning to eat my own and not just store bought.

For extra thought like to shoot targets with bow and arrows, but very careful no one is in harms way. It is neat to use any thing with a projectile which knocks a target thing down. Perhaps any thing good we do speaking of conscience-- to be skilful and enjoy our lives is good for our personal being.

We must always choose that which doesn't hinder our testimony also.

If it was taught to be ethically okay to hunt if you kill and eat-- then it is hard to see why there was a issue.

I remember testimony by BK that his guns were stolen but the Lord caused his faith to be manifested and they were returned.

As said earlier the Lord has revealed something but need this question answered first. thanks.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [GWB](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2010 16:12:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What is your question?

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2010 17:42:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Brodave9, I am not totally clear what question you raise but from your post I think the question might be . . .

"Did HEF teach it was OK to hunt for food but not OK to hunt for fun?"

In response to that question . . .

I am 100% sure of what HEF taught that last fall before his death in December and how it was understood by the people and how it challenged many of the 5-fold to give up hunting. This is all accurate as I described it at the top of this thread in the first post. Even the quotes above are very close to word for word.

Did HEF ever say "OK for food but not for sport" in any other message?

Maybe he did in previous messages. If so this would point to a change of nuance in his last months which raises the question of "politics in play?"

But it definitely played out in the months immediately preceding his death as I wrote it in the first post.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [james](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2010 21:52:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It seems to me that this should be a 'NON-ISSUE ', especially by now.(the 'to hunt' or 'not to hunt' question)

I am certain that he didn't care for hunting...but remember, he only liked home cooked, from scratch, foods.(I do too, but so what? it's just personal preferences...he didn't like shrimp either, said they looked like grub worms...)

If we haven't learned by now to discern right from wrong in matters as simple as this, God help us. I sure don't have the authority or liberty to tell anyone what to do, but if a person lives a lifestyle where they live off the land(harvesting their own meat) I can't see anywhere in scripture that forbids it.

I really believe(again just my opinion) the point he was trying to make centered around what he believed God was desiring to work in HIS people as we learned to WALK in the principles given us through teachings like 'Deeper Life in The Spirit'. I still agree with that line of thought, overcomers, being used by God to set free this groaning creation, will be instruments of LIFE, not death...

But again, "There IS therefore NOW no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." ~ Romans 8:1

Concerning the 'Politics of FA'...no longer interested.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [GWB](#) on Mon, 20 Dec 2010 02:15:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Concerning the 'Politics of FA'...no longer interested."

I have to agree with that as well. IMO, Dr. Freeman did not have to manipulate through the Word of God to get his way doing anything....he would have just said what was on his mind...like he always did.

As I recall, Bro. Bruce went hunting , enjoyed hunting , cut his finger going wild boar hunting and believed for it to stop bleeding, and had no condemnation doing so (hunting).

I am doing the best I can to walk in what the Holy Spirit tells me to do. I believe Bruce did too. I think that is the whole point...IMO.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [David Coleman](#) on Mon, 20 Dec 2010 15:01:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Does that mean that when HEF taught on hunting and the 5-fold were challenged to give up hunting that they thought he was telling them to give up hunting, or that they should follow ethical guidelines and only kill to eat only.

The reason this question arises is only those who attended know the answer. It is not my purpose to raise any questions concerning mistakes made in understanding ethical qualifications. It is of utmost importance to deal with issues where Satan has a foothold.

What the Lord has revealed to me is extremely important concerning this issue. The investigation of the question is to find out if a mistake has been made. Then it can be repaired. You wouldn't believe what happens when mistakes are made and not corrected.

It is clear that the message on the tape was kill and eat but not for sport. So it appears that somebody may have misunderstood and legislated no hunting allowed. Just wanted to see if the not allowed happened because we lost a great man of God in ther event. BK had a lot of enfluence outside of faith Assembly and was a tremendous teacher. I knew he had the anointing.

Also it is not our calling to criticise but to heal wounds and right noe there are wounds to be healed, That is to be taken as love not rebuke. Still desiring to reveal what the Lord showed in the Spirit. God bless all my friends in Christ, amen.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 20 Dec 2010 16:10:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Whenever you have Christian Ethics taught there's always the probability that legalism will follow. This issue was no different from any of the other areas that fall under the ethical category.

People who worked in the recreational industry were constantly harangued about installing sewer lines in the motor homes... an ethical question was almost always reduced to an ethical mandate.

After the ethical question concerning hunting had been considered there was a pronouncement that while no one 'wanted' to legislate anything, it was highly unlikely that an 'overcomer' (one who was presumably going to play a part in setting creation free from bondage) would participate in killing that same creation.

Logical arguments gave way to untenable positions that we could continue to eat our t-bone steaks as long as we didn't participate in the killing of the creatures.

1 Timothy 4:3 saved us from becoming vegetarians.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [GWB](#) on Mon, 20 Dec 2010 16:17:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"1 Timothy 4:3 kept us from becoming vegetarians."

Your entire post was very well said. Thanks moulder!

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [james](#) on Mon, 20 Dec 2010 18:35:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

moulder wrote on Mon, 20 December 2010 10:10 After the ethical question concerning hunting had been considered there was a pronouncement that while no one 'wanted' to legislate anything, it was highly unlikely that an 'overcomer' (one who was presumably going to play a part in setting creation free from bondage) would participate in killing that same creation.

That's my distinct memory of the crux of the matter...But like I mentioned, for people who 'live off the land'(as I did when growing up...we grew most of our food, both meat and vegetables, and the cows and pigs just don't jump into freezer bags and climb into the freezer, something happened in between...we had to kill them.) the truth of the matter is that every piece of meat we eat has to be killed...REALITY, whether it's done by us or the meat processors.

I quit hunting...I didn't lose touch with reality, if I found myself in a position where I needed food and nothing was available besides an animal...end of story, dead animal. But maybe God will never allow that situation to occur, maybe He'll feed with manna from heaven.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [David Coleman](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2010 14:00:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi thanks James it is appreciated for your answer. You have given the answer to the question in a way that tells what is needed to know.

That is because you are saying we can under the right circumstances. Though I have never shot anything, it is still possible to do so.

It cannot be always possible for different brethren to see things the same way at the moment until they personally have the Lord's revelation to the heart. Even in ethics as we learn to separate from the world. We are so used to things. Once we get the revelation in the heart there's no more question.

Some have even gone back to Christmas celebration. No names here. One minister says it's okay to tithe and borrow. It is more than a teaching that is needed but also the rev. to the heart by the Holy Spirit.

Some out of fear of being accepted by the body, had to do something to not be rejected. I'm not sure that when a word went out of the pulpit it was expected to be instantly applied but it was sometimes seen to be that way in a sort of you got to approach. Yes we have to obey the light but it must be understood in the heart.

The one time there in the N.T. the fellow was required to sell all then follow Jesus. He couldn't do it he had great inheritance. He was really to get the rev. that giving to the poor (which takes time) would be his sowing good seed of righteousness and then he would be following Jesus by actions and not just words of mouth.

It is easy for those who have the light to say don't do something than for those who don't. They

must give up something.

They may have light also , that is I am free to have my hunting , but must not kill for sport.

There are those in a Assembly who feel that if they obey the word taught they will have approval. Sometimes that is to discard for any of those feelings that they will be rejected if they don't. The opposite of rejection is need of approval.

Even at this time it is difficult to find a Assembly that is labeled walking in all truth. If one is exed from a Assembly they will say where can we go. They are forced to obey or get out.

That is not the way taught in Corinthians. It should be that a body would never want to lose a member and so they would pray for them that God would reveal things to their heart.

Evidences of this issue is we want only so and so to teach.

So if so and so wants to do anything contrary no one will listen to them. (speaking of 2 people here.)

There is nothing wrong with this post for it is simular to the things Paul dealt with in the N.T. writings.

May it be understood that there will be Assemblies who are seeking to obey God and difficulties arise. The Israelites were used as examples that we should not follow their ways. That was for benefit and not to make Israel look bad. For Israel must be viewed with great hopes of recovery.

Extra---if you study the context of the word creation where it says groaning you will find it is animals and humans. All will be at peace one day and no more accidental misunderstandings about ethics. It may be added that if I should do anything that would cause my brother to stumble I will leave it alone. My freedom is not a licence to do any harm.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2010 16:43:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi,

Some things to throw into the mix in remembering how we reacted to various teaching topics back in the day.

We had an extremely strong assumption that we had anointed teachers (Bro. Freeman in the lead) who had very accurate Holy Spirit led teachings. So it was no small thing to disagree with the pulpit from which the assumption was that God was teaching us as the

elite end time group with the deeper, true message that no one else had.

We also had a strong awareness of demon spirit activity trying to come against our successful Christian walk. When someone deviated from the teachings he/she was thought to be deceived, at least temporarily, by a demon.

This made for an incredible conformity pressure far beyond mere peer pressure such as seen in a high school.

To link these ideas to the hunting topic . . .

When the hunting things were said by Bro. Freeman - as I mentioned in the first post of this thread - there was incredible pressure to agree and conform. Especially a 5-fold minister had even more pressure to conform.

If Bro Freeman went to the point of saying something like "As to weapons of death I do not know why you would have them in your house" over the pulpit then it was given the assumption of being from God. And if you did not agree/conform then you were "missing God."

So it is understandable how Bro. Freeman's words rippled through the people even to the point of considering never eating meat.

And we can understand the tremendous vise squeezing the 5-fold if they either disagreed w/r "weapons of death" and/or really, really liked hunting.

My 2 cents w/r the hunting topic.

It is not a topic worth even studying out to a conclusion until we work through the much weightier issues of our need for anointing.

Please note that my original post at the top was about church politics and hunting was merely the topic Bro. Freeman used back then - the topic of his that made me wonder about politics.

Jman

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [james](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2010 19:00:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Jman,

First let me say that when I stated in an above post that I was no longer interested in FA politics, I wasn't trying to disrespect your question and post. I am learning how to be more tactful and also am aware that we all deal with things in different ways and at different times. Personally, I have dealt with most of the negative issues associated with FA long ago.(and believe me, I understand about 'peer pressure', both being under it as well as exerting it upon others.) Have I arrived yet? I think the answer to that is obvious, but I have, by God's GRACE, sought to correct wrong mindsets and legalistic attitudes(and of course, that is an ongoing process).

As Dave just said, things that would cause a brother to stumble, I'll strive to leave alone...though I might have liberty in Christ to do myself. I'm sure that I wrestled with the right attitude towards brethren who didn't 'see the light' about hunting...back then. But, like I said, FOR ME, the horse is dead so I have no reason to continue beating it.

It is so amazing how God works, just this morning I spent over 3 hours witnessing to a Jewish man and we probably spent an hour talking about 'hunting'...right or wrong? For food, versus for sport. I gave my testimony of what and how God had dealt with me 28 years ago concerning hunting, guns, nonresistance, and Christian ethics and the practical way I've learned to apply these principles to day to day life. (Yeah, I had to maneuver the minefields of 'the Rabbi said' or 'tradition tells us', but in the end he was receptive)

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2010 22:17:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

James,

Thanks for posting. I did not focus on your "not interested" comment when posting my last post. All the talk on the hunting tangent reminded me of how pressurized it was in the past.

Nor do I feel any pressure to conform anymore.

So if I post something and you want to embrace the topic or dismiss it I totally respect you either way. Actually I appreciate that you regularly post.

You would be amazed at how many legitimate topics I have no interest in at this current time.

Jman

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [David Coleman](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 14:16:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

To wishing34 God bless you. Sincerely--

You may not know that your involved in this issue by divine appointment. So are the rest of us. First by including James we have a simular testimony. 2 individuals just appeared in my life. One is a political man. the other a man opening a gunshop. Both of these are being deeply moved by my ministering to them.

When God wants to deal with a issue he is very serious about it. When saints of the body of Christ come together and are being drawn into a certain topic, they have to discern that God is leading them so they need not be concerned about liking a topic or not.

It is difficult for some when they don't know what's going on but if they are yielded they will come out in the end with joyful hearts. For me I see the whole picture.

God is dealing with James because he is not disinterested just that he is gently flowing along with this thing. (post) now he is getting confirmations. Sometimes the biggest blessings come out of the strangest places.

I love wishings post this time because he is getting right to the point. Now we can begin to reveal what the Lord is showing.

To give a analogy when a person shoots a shotgun he doesn't always think about the bullet leaving a spray which can hit other objects. A few months ago while standing in the kitchen I was brought in the Spirit into a vision. While in that, I began to travail in the Spirit. That means God was praying through me. It was concerning different people who were hurt by the situation of misunderstanding concerning the insident which occured back then.

It is obvious that demons played a big role in hurting many people which is under the topic of trying to abort the manchild.

The manchild must forgive and move on. As a army heals wounded soldiers in battle this is God's desire.

unfortunately it is not always possible to communicate but only by letter, for I would love to be with saints if could be. So the forum is a wonderful means of doing this.

As said before Moses was a wonderful man and his mistake of smiting the rock made me no less respectful for him. On his part he paid great price, that is sad. So is the same if one anointed man touches another, even though it be a accident the one who touches the other has to pay a price , this is sad also but still I respect him because of all the good he has done in my life. But in our time and case we must move on and continue to cherish the things that were give through any man of God because they were really given by the Holy Spirit through the man or men.

That is the point we must see, not looking at the outward situation and forgetting where Jesus work comes into sight. in simple terms--- the word , the vessel, the mistake of the vessel and then throwing away the word that came from the vessel, which really came from God. God bless and may his love be shed abroad in your hearts by the Holy Spirit. Rom. 5:5

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [james](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 15:40:26 GMT

brodav9 wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010 08:16

When God wants to deal with a issue he is very serious about it. When saints of the body of Christ come together and are being drawn into a certain topic, they have to discern that God is leading them so they need not be concerned about liking a topic or not.

OK, I'll take it by faith that this will minister to someone reading who is still confussed or uncertain concerning this topic.

It is difficult for some when they don't know what's going on but if they are yielded they will come out in the end with joyful hearts. For me I see the whole picture.

I thought I did, but maybe there's more to it than I realize.

God is dealing with James because he is not disinterested just that he is gently flowing along with this thing. (post) now he is getting confirmations. Sometimes the biggest blessings come out of the strangest places.

"...gently flowing along with this thing..." I'm not aware that God is dealing with me and don't quite 'get' what the confirmation is...? But we'll see where it leads, as I've said previously, it's been a dead issue for me from the start, once I've settled something from God in my heart. But am more than willing to share my testimony and experiences if they'll help another brother in coming to a place of understanding and peace.

unfortunately it is not always possible to communicate but only by letter, for I would love to be with saints if could be. So the forum is a wonderful means of doing this.

I live within 35-40 miles of you, I would love to get together sometime.

That is the point we must see, not looking at the outward situation and forgetting where Jesus work comes into sight. in simple terms--- the word , the vessel, the mistake of the vessel and then throwing away the word that came from the vessel, which really came from God.

I posted on this same thought three years ago in message #1704 under Introductions and General..."Opps, there went the baby..."

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 20:29:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Brodave,

Thanks for posting.

I am jumbled up trying to understand what you just wrote.

Could you please re-post your ideas in an outline form?
Then it will be in a logical order.

Plus you said above you had something shown to you by God - on the hunting topic I think.
I've read what you posted and I am unclear what you are saying that God showed you. Please write this in one or two sentences so I can grasp it.
I've had trouble gleaning it out of your post as a whole.

Thanks

Jman

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [David Coleman](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 14:08:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi brethren, through your replies it is seen that you need clarity. Guess I speak better than write. my apologies. You know when it is said (be with you in last post)---anything that is said there may be a question asked until full understanding is acquired. May add I don't know how to take phrases out of post to repeat them I think they call them quotes.

For James I thought he was confirming when he said he talked with a Jewish man about guns for a hour. Whatm may be assumption on my part is that saints may not understand about predestinated confirmations. I apologise for assuming this is known. Also God leads people differently.

No offense to anyone who doesn't have same leading. Just to add here that what I mean here is a good example of HEF. He would be in a motel and look at the wallpaper and it confirmed that he was in the right place. The paper I believe was seen in a vision or something like that.

Jeff B. would have a vision of the front door of a church and then when he saw that door when visiting a church confirmed that he was speaking in the right place. Said all this to say that the events in saints lives, though not always understood are things they are showing them. My discernment is perhaps different than others. I see and hear God all the time--- desire to get better.

It is my desire now to speak in a few sentences a clear picture for your asking.

1. what is the purpose and goal of the post
 - a. To answer the question are we allowed to hunt if it is to eat and not just to kill for sport.
 - b. to find out why there was a division over the issue in BK term of ministry.
2. Why do we want to find out this information
 - a. because if we have understanding of the situation, it could deter it from happening again. (being positive here)
 - b. because it can bring healing to members of the body of Christ.
 - c. because it will cause the Holy Spirit's work to not be thrown in the trash due to mistakes made.
it will bring understanding that great men of God make mistakes, but the work that they have done preceding the mistake should result in a respect for their hard labors. (Moses example)
 - d. to make clear to many who have turned against the teachings, that they were given by God using a human vessel.
3. the shotgun example
 - a. some people get hurt by mistakes of others.
 - b. The person most hurt would be a family member.
4. was there a mistake??
 - a. the question was answered among brethren. They see that
 1. they should consider whether to have guns or not
 2. that they don't see it wrong to kill to eat but not for sport.
 3. that convictions may vary. The result of our convictions should never put a stumbling block in another saints way.
 4. we cannot force another to make a decision without allowing them to seek the Lord and move in that direction.
 - (5.) no one is exempt from touching the Lord's anointed. Even if it is by our thinking okay to do

so. The result (could) be to cause them to fall. Actually though there is no reason to fall.

6. it was hopeful that this number 5 statement was clear in the other posts so when it is read it, will be sure that it is not just opinion that the anointed was touched or not.

God will still use a man of God --- Moses did bring the Israelites to Canaan, he just didn't go in himself.

5. what is the point??

1. Other individuals were hurt by(the mistake) more than we can possibly know. apologies are due by those who still have a legalistic stand that it is not okay to have a gun or hunt. For that is a breach on the freedom in Christ, to have the liberty to have convictions on beliefs that one may have until receiving the rev. from the Holy Spirit to do other wise.

I still hold the conviction ---Mine--- my freedom is not to put stumble blocks in others paths. Also that my conviction is that a brother in error is still to be first helped if possible, before setting a separation. Also that by the grace of God will not touch God's anointed. That respect for the good teachings of God remain in my heart and I will appreciate those who taught them. --- extra--- helping others--even who I do not know, is part of my co--mission. Especially those of the household of God.

Hope the readers enjoy my convictions, that's all they are .
any questions no problem your servant .

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [David Coleman](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 14:25:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

PS--- Hope this answers the question concerning the character assassination of BK. Though I'm not sure of any other problems as to whether there aren't any, (meaning is the hunting question the only reason for the assassination?) I don't know if he made any mistakes in ministry. I know that he didn't make a mistake concerning the hunting issue. It appears that if he was assassinated people owe his wife and others an apology. This PS is an additional response to the last post.

That is what the Lord has shown me. apologies are due.*****

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [GWB](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 15:36:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"it will bring understanding that great men of God make mistakes, but the work that they have done preceding the mistake should result in a respect for their hard labors. (Moses example)"

We all make mistakes. The fruit of Bro. Kinseys's teachings is that there are people all over the world with the Word of Faith in their hearts. Also, who knows what is deep within our spirits that was deposited there through the Holy Spirit by Bruce that we draw upon today?

Did Bro. Bruce backslide? Who knows and who cares. I did and I am glad that He has drawn me back to Him through His grace and love. If Bruce did backslide in any way, I am glad He drew him back to Him as well. I have, even as of late, known the rejection of God's people due to mistakes I made years ago. God help us when we can't restore people after blowing it! Isn't condemnation the opposite of what overcomers are to bring to a "groaning creation?" Especially if that creation should be one of us! May God smite elitism among us so that we are able to "stoop" down and help someone or even believe the best after people are gone and have no voice.

It has always bothered me when negative things are said without proper grace and mercy applied. Family members come here for healing, out of curiosity, to gain knowledge or memories of their loved ones, maybe even to determine if they should continue in the walk. What we say on OO will always have an impact in some form. We should work very hard that the impact is to draw people closer to Jesus.

Just last night, I talked with a sister from FA. I had no idea that she is just now dealing with many issues regarding FA. I personally have been through good and bad things from the fall out of FA. I said it last night and I will say it again, I would go through it all over again for what I have gained from the Word that came forth from FA. We agreed that we are both thankful for it regardless of the struggles since FA.

Someone once said on OO that we got so much in such a short period of time. Of course some things were not right in the body itself...we were/are human. If anything, I hope we have learned how to apply grace and love to each other with whatever arises. And yes, people were hurt too. Again, we were/are human.

I am reading a book by a dear brother, who was part of FA, who has been ministering about love. In reading the book, I have often wondered if his passion for having love in the Body of Christ is due to the lack of love we all had at FA. It is an awesome book and it truly has ministered to me in many ways. God help anyone who might mock a brother for ministering on the need for love in the Body of Christ. I would love for them to show up on OO and to speak with them and tell them that their very attitude shows how much love is needed to balance out the message of Faith that we were given.

In the foreward of the book, it says, "It is good to remember that we were created for Someone rather than something. We are loved for who we are instead of what we do." I have been guilty of religiously walking in works of being an overcomer and forgot Who I was walking with. That is just me and I am not pointing fingers. I am sharing in hopes that possibly no one else makes the same mistakes I have made in this particular area.

I appreciate OO and all who share. I hope we can continue "to give each other a break" so that we can all learn how to go on and be what we all desire to be; like Jesus.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 15:49:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Brodave,

Thanks for posting.

It is very helpful to understand your message
when you use outline form - much better for me anyway.

Please pray about using outlines even more.

Thanks

Jman

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [james](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 16:08:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, I for one have a better understanding of what you were saying. I also understand about the difficulty of communicating in this medium, it is very easy to misunderstand a person without being

able to communicate in person.

And now that you point it out, I suppose the fact that the Jewish man brought up hunting and killing for sport and I had the opportunity to share with him right while we were in the middle of discussing it on the forum would be a way of God confirming it to me. I guess it would be presumptuous of me to think that every thing I do I'm being lead of The Lord to do it; because I know I miss the mark more than I want to admit to myself...but God's Word does say that the steps of a righteous man are ordered of The Lord, so when something like that occurs I just believe it was God directing it.(same thing,just different ways of viewing it) So, yes, it was God confirming to me that what I was sharing was truth.

Also you laid out your preception of the topic much clearer, thanks.

One other thing, before you joined this forum, a few years ago leading up to Bruce's passing, we had a thread on him that was many pages long with hundreds of responses and there were statments made that were negative and could have fallen under character assasination.(this thread was removed out of respect for Kathy and his children) I do recall Jman stating that he liked Bruce, calling him a really good guy(I concured) and he sent out "much Agape love/condolences to Kathy."

I can see the benefit in discussing things that have brought people into bondage or caused pain and long term problems in fellow believers lives, obviously everyones experience varied, I just guess I wrongly assumed that 25 years were enough time to get it figured out. But that was insensitive of me, I think it reflects some of the negative results of being isolated from others of like background, we tend to think everyone deals with things at the same pace and grow at the same speed...not so.

I did communicate with Kathy after Bruce's death and relayed to her my respect and fondness for Bruce and how what he'd taught had blessed me. I didn't apologize to her, I had nothing to apologize for except maybe I could have offered an apology on behalf of those who spoke evil of him, but I didn't feel lead to do that.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [william](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 16:42:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'll echo the appreciation expressed for the outline form, brodav!

Concerning the hunting issue... (and I'm with James when he said this issue should have been settled long ago); you keep making a distinction between hunting for sport and hunting for food. Now I understand why the distinction was made back then and why it became such a big issue

but I do not understand how this issue and others like it do not fall under the category of shepherd-ship?

Remember the shepherd-ship movement? You had ministers telling people what they could and could not do--sell their house, marry, etc., etc., and you had followers who blindly followed that rot.

If there is a difference, and you have prophetic insight, please enlighten me.

I'm not a hunter, but if I wanted to hunt I would not fall into condemnation if I didn't eat everything I shot.

Again, could someone show me the difference between this and shepherd-ship?

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [james](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 20:29:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

moulder wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 10:42:I'll echo the appreciation expressed for the outline form, brodav!

Concerning the hunting issue... (and I'm with James when he said this issue should have been settled long ago); you keep making a distinction between hunting for sport and hunting for food. Now I understand why the distinction was made back then and why it became such a big issue but I do not understand how this issue and others like it do not fall under the category of shepherd-ship?

Ok, Ok, you drew me back in (maybe the 'dead horse' isn't dead yet...) I believe The Holy Spirit was using Brother Freeman to teach 'some' of us (me, for sure) that it's our motives that's important. Not really sure why it became such a big issue unless it was just flesh rebelling. If it was continually hammered down as 'law' and people were made accountable to him if they disobeyed, then that does sound like shepherd-ship. Not being there I had/have no discernment of attitudes of the brethren. Down in Clanton we had some who continued to hunt and some who stopped. Some did so out of obedience to what they believed The Holy Spirit to be showing them(me) and others out of fear of peer pressure.

Remember the shepherd-ship movement? You had ministers telling people what they could and could not do--sell their house, marry, etc., etc., and you had followers who blindly followed that rot.

If there is a difference, and you have prophetic insight, please enlighten me.

I'm not a hunter, but if I wanted to hunt I would not fall into condemnation if I didn't eat everything I shot.

I'm assuming here you're refering to shooting vermin/varmints, not just shooting a deer and leaving it to rot.(maybe you meant give the meat to someone else who needed it...I did this many times) I do believe killing for sport alone isn't the right reason...imo Even dove hunting where there are hundreds of birds and shooting them is a challenge, I think they should be eaten. btw: There is more to it than just 'for food' or 'for sport'. It becomes an obsession and a matter of pride with some people, trying to kill 'trophy' animals(guilty).

Again, could someone show me the difference between this and shepherd-ship?

Could 'this' be the difference? I just gave my opinion, it was only my opinion, what someone does with it is entirely up to them...it won't change my opinion of them whatsoever, verus this, if I find one of you hunts and don't eat the meat, I'm gonna delete all your posts. To me, that would be the difference, one is a person sharing their convictions and how and what The Lord has done in their live; and the other is a person making laws and enforcing 'their' will upon others.

Did that happen at FA? I honestly don't know...But I'm not aware of it still going on...are you?

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [william](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 21:05:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:If it was continually hammered down as 'law' and people were made accountable to him if they disobeyed, then that does sound like shepherd-ship.

What difference would it make whether or not you had the law/accountability thing going on, if the end result was the same as what you had in the shepherd-ship movement-- it walked, talked, and

smelled, like shepherd-ship-- then it can be easily compared to shepherd-ship, right?

Concerning the extent of the thing, I can assure you that you all down in B'ham, got a much greater dose of shepherd-ship than anyone got at FA. So, if you didn't see that in B'ham then it is probably an illusion of my own mind! <grin>

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [william](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 21:27:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Could 'this' be the difference? I just gave my opinion, it was only my opinion, what someone does with it is entirely up to them...it won't change my opinion of them whatsoever, verus this, if I find one of you hunts and don't eat the meat, I'm gonna delete all your posts. To me, that would be the difference, one is a person sharing their convictions and how and what The Lord has done in their live; and the other is a person making laws and enforcing 'their' will upon others.

Did that happen at FA? I honestly don't know...But I'm not aware of it still going on...are you?

James, the difference is, and it is pretty major, you aren't standing behind the pulpit making these observations, and even if you were, I would hope that you would make clear distinctions between your opinion and the word of God you would be bringing us.

We moved to Indiana to hear the word of God and be a part of a group of believers that were sold-out to Jesus Christ, a group, we were told, that was going to be used mightily in this end-time, and when we got to the meetings we hung on every word.

- 1) Because we didn't know any better.
- 2) Because we assumed that everything was the word of God.
- 3) Conformity to "the word" was expected.
- 4) No one who didn't conform would have lasted very long, in this-- the end-time-move-of-God-in-the-earth-today-- body of believers.

We've gone over and over the "how much was peer-pressure/how much was pulpit" routine, and I don't want to separate the two right now mainly because it would have been hard for either to exist without the other, but what did happen, comes about as close to shepherd-ship in the way it played out as the real-shepherd-ship movement did in the way it played out. Think about it... both movements have similar legacies IN SOME RESPECTS--NOT ALL!

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [james](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 21:43:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

moulder wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 15:05Quote:If it was continually hammered down as 'law' and people were made accountable to him if they disobeyed, then that does sound like shepherd-ship.

What difference would it make whether or not you had the law/accountability thing going on, if the end result was the same as what you had in the shepherd-ship movement-- it walked, talked, and smelled, like shepherd-ship-- then it can be easily compared to shepherd-ship, right?

Not much.....right.

Concerning the extent of the thing, I can assure you that you all down in B'ham, got a much greater dose of shepherd-ship than anyone got at FA. So, if you didn't see that in B'ham then it is probably an illusion of my own mind! <grin>

I guess you're refering to the pastor there, remember I was in the Clanton Body and only 'regularly' attended B'ham's monthly meetings when Jim was still living in Indiana.(I did go there for about 6 months at the conclusion of the Clanton assembly after they moved down here) He must have treated me differently than the 'regulars'..although there were some pretty strong things that one could interpret as legalistic and controlling.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [james](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 22:21:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

moulder wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 15:27

James, the difference is, and it is pretty major, you aren't standing behind the pulpit making these observations, and even if you were, I would hope that you would make clear distinctions between your opinion and the word of God you would be bringing us.

Thank God I wasn't, because I would probably have made the same mistakes they made...We've had 25 years to look back and reflect and discern issues. But today? YES, I MOST DEFINITELY would endeavor to make sure people understood that there is a VAST difference between God's Holy Word and my personal preferences or opinions. But that's because we've learned (from FA) just how easily people can get hurt when they don't make the distinction.

We moved to Indiana to hear the word of God and be a part of a group of believers that were sold-out to Jesus Christ, a group, we were told, that was going to be used mightily in this end-time, and when we got to the meetings we hung on every word.

- 1) Because we didn't know any better.
- 2) Because we assumed that everything was the word of God.
- 3) Conformity to "the word" was expected.
- 4) No one who didn't conform would have lasted very long, in this-- the end-time-move-of-God-in-the-earth-today-- body of believers.

We've gone over and over the "how much was peer-pressure/how much was pulpit" routine, and I don't want to separate the two right now mainly because it would have been hard for either to exist without the other, but what did happen, comes about as close to shepherd-ship in the way it played out as the real-shepherd-ship movement did in the way it played out. Think about it... both movements have similar legacies IN SOME RESPECTS--NOT ALL!

OK, I take your word for that being your experience(and many others), we were young and zealous for The Lord, and God in His Wisdom, saw fit to take Brother Freeman(maybe very much like the account of Moses and the Hebrews he lead out of Egypt...both not being allow to see the end results due to something God told them to do and they disobeyed?)

I do know this, here we are today, what have we learned? And what is our focus now? There was a purpose in what we was taught and now is the time to 'put it all together' (so to speak) and move forward...cause the time of coming of The Lord is MUCH closer than when we first believed, and we'll be of no use to this 'end-time restoration of The Kingdom of God' if we've got our minds filled with the baggage of the past.

So, let us throw off every weight that would easily beset, and run the race that's set before us...I once had a vision of two runners in a foot race and the race included 'hurtles' that both runners had to jump every few yards. One runner who was leading the race, as the finish line approached, looked back and fell over the last hurdle allowing the other runner to win the race. I've never forgotten this, and I believe it's as valid a warning/exhortation/encouragment today as it was in

1984 when I received it. We need to look forward and stay focused, if there are things that need to be dealt with from the past...OK, let's deal with it, confess, ask forgiveness, repent, turn, pray, encourage, deliver... and get back in relationship WITH JESUS.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [william](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 23:21:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:I do know this, here we are today, what have we learned? And what is our focus now? There was a purpose in what we was taught and now is the time to 'put it all together' (so to speak) and move forward...cause the time of coming of The Lord is MUCH closer than when we first believed, and we'll be of no use to this 'end-time restoration of The Kingdom of God' if we've got our minds filled with the baggage of the past.

Yes, I agree... and don't get me wrong-- I fully see the irony of me comparing some of our experiences with the shepherd-ship movement AND the fact that everything I learned about shepherd-ship came from the ministry at FA!

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [David Coleman](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 06:58:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You all have been so exciting. Love you all. James post shows he is very understanding. His points are very true. Gwb is got good points. The direction of the response is really going in a good direction.

If I may say, are we really sure about the shepherdship thing?
From my understanding, it appears one way but is really another. I'll explain, Shepherdship is taking away your goods and completely controlling your life. The situation seems to be about FA a

little more like being pushy. It is one thing to say we obey all the truth, then someone disagrees.

Methinks that what the word of God is saying about being one mind, and agreement can be necessary to make the presentation of a body who is in one mind and one accord. It is important that the mind referred to is the mind of Christ. That means we can't do it in the flesh.

1. How can we approach a biblical standard.
 - a. over a period of time
 - b. mutual consent
 - c. in prayer we seek the Lord so no one could be confused about the will of God on the matter.
2. can we be in one mind when having a different one?
 - a. yes-- different cultural background
 - b. one eats with the left hand the other with the right.
3. what is one mind?
only one answer--- the mind of the Lord.
4. can problems be resolved?
 - a. only by patience
 - b. some things are obvious
 - c. a manifestation of righteousness in individuals shall always cause them to seek the Lord speedily.
 - d. a humility of heart and a fear of God.
5. it is always understood that those who are divisive cannot remain. I repeat if they are divisive. One issue is not divisive unless a manifestation of rebellion.

By accident went to a Shepherdship meeting and it was by no means like you think. The people were walking around like the living dead. There was a strong spirit in each person, being they were deceived. They would not receive truth of the word they said things like Joshua didn't use faith to cause the sun to stand still. Have seen manifestation of rebellion in some that refuse to listen and laugh at truth as though you are a nut.

I see what happened at FA as a mistake. By mistake I mean a wrong conception of requirements to line up with an ethical standard. As being an example what I just said I cannot expect an agreement on my statements, they are something to be prayed over. Any minister should feel more comfortable with his people knowing they were doing things from the heart.

Fornication is a whole new topic. That must be dealt with-- even allowing for repentance. You know --- the one about turn over to Satan to save him.

Good question--- wasn't a certain man telling the truth when he gave tremendous testimonies of

his manifestations of faith. Not everyone can have a heart attack and stand right up and continue to preach. I will personally admit that sometimes my faith seems to come short. But I never confess it won't come or manifest. The Holy Spirit always helps me. The inner dealings begin to say, hold on don't be discouraged and so forth.

What I'm saying is a person of faith has difficulties no matter how great their faith is. Also if they miss the mark they may also be missing the conditions which faith requires. Or even made a great mistake somewhere that must be cleared up by the Lord.

Once again you all are a blessing. Notice how differently I spoke to wishing34 instead of saying what was said to the others He received a different communication. He was being thanked also by adding a outline which was to make him happy.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 12:56:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Outline actually did make me happy.

Jman

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 16:12:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I never before heard it analogized to shepherdship although I see the comparison - our people used to feel compelled to obey whatever was preached by Bro. Freeman even though we could see at the time that it was not yet in their hearts.

I remember it called legalism.

Might we infer the following from I and II Corinthians ? . . .
(I really mean "Might" like I am asking a question)

Assumed:

That the church in Corinth had a pastor.
That they also had teachers.

But it was Paul the apostle (not the local teachers) that set them
in order by saying God's will in many topics (in I and II Corinthians)

Possibly many of the topics that Paul dealt with in I and II Corinthians
were "hot button", difficult topics to the Corinthians believers - similar to
how hunting, TV, and woman's pants were to us.

Can we infer that it is the role of the apostle to be the first to teach
the church w/r "hot button", controversial, difficult to receive topics?
And that the pastors and teachers would teach only the
established (ie: Biblically clear) doctrines.

This being because the apostle is in a special place in the church
having been validated to the church via the "signs of an apostle."
If the apostle goes into error his validating signs stop or worse - chastisement
is sent upon him.

<<<< By the way this us how it worked in the past - all
the teachers would wait and let Bro. Freeman be the first
the break new ground w/r doctrine - but he was not an apostle >>>>

Concept: Apostle sets the churches in order w/r "new" doctrines and new applications
of Bible principles . . . and pastors and teachers teach the clear, established
Bible doctrines being careful not to overstep and take on the apostle's role.

If this is correct then we in all the churches made a mistake to see our teachers and
pastors as authorized by God to apply the Bible principles very far beyond the simple

clear Bible applications.

Without any apostles in our midst men moved (unavoidably "moved in the flesh") to fulfill the anointing of the missing apostle - but without that anointing or calling.

Catch22:

Even if the above happens to be right we cannot implement it into our theology because assigning such limitations on the pastors and teachers is not explicit in the Bible therefore no one outside of God through an apostle can define such a new doctrine.

Jman

PS.

Even setting all the above aside.

Say the teachers have (from God) a lot of latitude to apply the Bible principles in a wide ranging way.

Once hunting (or whatever topic) became a controversy our apostle could have come in and clarified the topic to everyone's satisfaction . . . and possibly then had a stern talk with an offending teacher.

PSS.

As we look back and analyze what was wrong in our past churches we must include the "missing apostle" in our analysis.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [james](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 18:55:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

wishing34 wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 10:12I never before heard it analogized to shepherdship although I see the comparison - our people used to feel compelled to obey whatever was preached by Bro. Freeman even though we could see at the time that it was not yet in their hearts.

I remember it called legalism.

Having mulled over it for a while and going back and reading what other opinions<on the net> were of the Shepherdship/Discipleship Movement, I'd have to go along with Jman in saying that it (to me) resembled legalism more so than shepherdship. Although, like William points out, there are similarities in what went on that overlap into both errors.

As for the topic of 'women wearing pants', to me the much bigger problem(and it goes on today even more than then) is 'women wearing THE pants'...That'd include in the home and in the church as well as society. But we don't need to let the worms out of 'that' can...

I'd say Jman, that what you have presented concerning in need for ALL the 5-fold ministry offices (Apostle) would have benefited FA and Co. greatly in keeping things in check.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [william](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 19:23:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't disagree about the apostle stuff, Jman, but I think that I'm looking at this from a different perspective than you guys. I don't think it is the business of a minister to tell anyone whether or not they can or cannot do something that lies in the area of Christian liberty.

If someone wants to work at a TV factory, then it is between him and the Lord. If someone wants to work for animal control (which would involve killing animals--and not for food-- I presume) then let them work. I'm certainly not understanding the difference James made concerning varmints and bambies and I don't think the ministry can make such distinctions either-- which highlights the point-- God ordained ministry should not be delving into areas that would have been more

appropriate in the OT dispensation under Moses (I'm not even sure that it would have even worked in his case!)

Look at it this way Jman, HEF taught us the bible like no other and I think that most of us here are very appreciative of that teaching, I know I am, but trouble was always a-brewing whenever he got into areas that were not bible issues.

Theological teaching is one thing, then there is the area of Christian ethics, in this arena you have got to let people hear the word, assimilate the word and then work it out in their own lives or you've got nothing but outward conformity to things that ARE NEVER PRESENTED AS LAW. Otherwise you've got what we had back then, people who were conforming to the outward standards, thinking they were doing God's will, (and in some cases dying) all the while believing that they were 'doing' righteousness. Afterward they either bitterly turned away from 'the faith once delivered to the saints' OR they claimed it was a 'Job's trial'.

And on top of all that you've got ministers trying to legislate issues like tee shirts, shoes, glasses, and hunting??? Give me a break!

Fast forward 20 or so years and those authoritarian wannabes are nowhere to be found-- and here WE are still arguing about the merits of whether or not it is a sin to kill a mouse???? (A little hyperbole for emphasis!<grin>)

If we are loving God with our whole hearts and showing that love to those around us then I think it can safely be said that we are 'doing' all we can do for the kingdom and ultimately we will see the good fruit of our labor. If we say we are loving God and at the same time find ourselves beating up on the hired servants (acting like authoritarian shepherds), we may find ourselves looking back in twenty years with regret.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [Mark L](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 19:46:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't think it is the business of a minister to tell anyone whether or not they can or cannot do something that lies in the area of Christian liberty.

I would really agree with that. Unless something is really out of line. Another reason would be that once you start then where or when do you stop.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [william](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 19:47:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

james wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 12:55wishing34 wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 10:12I never before heard it analogized to shepherdship although I see the comparison - our people used to feel compelled to obey whatever was preached by Bro. Freeman even though we could see at the time that it was not yet in their hearts.

I remember it called legalism.

Having mulled over it for a while and going back and reading what other opinions<on the net> were of the Shepherdship/Discipleship Movement, I'd have to go along with Jman in saying that it (to me) resembled legalism more so than shepherdship. Although, like William points out, there are similarities in what went on that overlap into both errors.

As for the topic of 'women wearing pants', to me the much bigger problem(and it goes on today even more than then) is 'women wearing THE pants'...That'd include in the home and in the church as well as society. But we don't need to let the worms out of 'that' can...

I'd say Jman, that what you have presented concerning in need for ALL the 5-fold ministry offices (Apostle) would have benefited FA and Co. greatly in keeping things in check.

I should clarify... I don't think that we were shepherd-ship, only that in certain areas the shepherd-ship tendency prevailed.

Legalism is one thing, but when you've got authority figures that propagate that legalism under the threat of 'missing out on the end-time movement of God in the earth' and in some cases going even so far as to suggest that a person's salvation was at stake, (because they didn't see it the same way as the minister) then I think it goes far beyond legalism.

You had married couples (and here is an example for you brodav, you no doubt saw this in B'ham) coming into the body who in their former lives were divorced from their first spouse, actually divorcing again so as to comply with the 'teaching' proffered by these men. IF THAT ISN'T SHEPHERD-SHIP I DON'T KNOW WHAT IS.

I've got people in my own family who were shunned in the B'ham body because of this very issue. They are not over such treatment--to this very day.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [james](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 21:37:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

moulder wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 13:23 I'm certainly not understanding the difference James made concerning varmints and bambies and I don't think the ministry can make such distinctions either-- which highlights the point-- God ordained ministry should not be delving into areas that would have been more appropriate in the OT dispensation under Moses (I'm not even sure that it would have even worked in his case!)

Alright, please allow me to present my position about varmints versus killing game and leaving it to rot. (although, I'm sitting here shaking my head in amazement, cause I had NO IDEA these things were still an issue with any of you guys.) OK, a fellow has some cows in the pasture, coyotes are killing the calves and chasing the herd around. The fellow (well, beings how he has this big ranch maybe I should call him a 'dude'<laughing>) shoots the coyote and hangs it in a tree to help dissuade the other coyotes from coming back in the pasture. The coyote isn't a food source so I see no ethical reason for not killing it. Same with a coon/fox/opossum in the hen house...they're varmints, not edible. Whereas a deer/turkey/moose/elk ect. are a source of food and to just kill them for no other purpose than 'sport' or for the heck of it without harvesting the meat violates the ethics of a true hunter as well as christian ethics...In MY Humble Opinion

BUT, as we all know, I am NOT a God ordained minister and I am NOT pushing my convictions on anyone. I personally haven't killed a varmint or anything else since 1982, but like I stated earlier in trying to share my thoughts, if I was hungry and needed food and the situation was such that the only way was to kill it...I'd have absolutely no problem doing it, plus dressing it out.

And if a Christian can put down cats and dogs for a living without it violating their consciences, that's their business. imo

btw: It is OK to kill a gray or brown mouse...no white ones.

I don't have any exposed nerves in these discussions, so maybe I'll just ease back a bit and let ya'll hash out whatever ya feel needs to be dealt with. Having not been part of FA 'proper' maybe I got over or wasn't hurt as bad as some. Or maybe then again I am not aware of it. I do state my convictions pretty boldly, but I only have one purpose in being on this forum and that's to share

what God gives me and learn from others...and believe me, I've learn a lot and been strengthened here over the last 3 years.

Lord Bless...

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [william](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 22:38:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

james wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 15:37 Alright, please allow me to present my position about varmints versus killing game and leaving it to rot. (although, I'm sitting here shaking my head in amazement, cause I had NO IDEA these things were still an issue with any of you guys.) OK, a fellow has some cows in the pasture, coyotes are killing the calves and chasing the herd around. The fellow (well, beings how he has this big ranch maybe I should call him a 'dude' <laughing>) shoots the coyote and hangs it in a tree to help dissuade the other coyotes from coming back in the pasture. The coyote isn't a food source so I see no ethical reason for not killing it. Same with a coon/fox/opossum in the hen house...they're varmints, not edible. Whereas a deer/turkey/moose/elk ect. are a source of food and to just kill them for no other purpose than 'sport' or for the heck of it without harvesting the meat violates the ethics of a true hunter as well as christian ethics...In MY Humble Opinion

I'm laughing too James, especially about your distinction between varmints and cows... Someone needs to call up Jim Trout and tell him that he didn't need to feel compelled to eat those things that you are describing as varmints--coons & possums!

Sides, if coon hunting is an honorable sport for us up & overcomers, let's you & me go a'coon hunting tonite! Be careful tho... you accidentally shoot my dog I ain't a'going to let you eat ole Redbone... even if you do feel morally obliged! <grin>

Really though, I haven't given this subject any thought for many years; it is a dead issue for me too with the exception of its value in showing how ridiculous it is for men-- who may otherwise be called of God to minister His Word-- to be dictating (from the PULPIT) whether or not a woman should be carrying a purse with long straps because he thought the long straps too closely resembled those carried by prostitutes! (I kid you not!)

Anyway, I'm going to see if I can find a couple of Jerry Clower's tapes in lieu of the coon hunt tonight... it's getting a bit chilly here, and until we can settle on whether or not we can sip on some of that instant heat, I'm staying inside!

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [james](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 23:12:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

moulder wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 16:38

I'm laughing too James, especially about your distinction between varmints and cows... Someone needs to call up Jim Trout and tell him that he didn't need to feel compelled to eat those things that you are describing as varmints--coons & possums!

Jim Trout, now that name brings back great memories, Jim came down and hunted with me a few times...What a humble solid brother. Yep, he'd eat bout anything; but to be honest, so have I, back in my youth.(my dad was raised in the depression era and they were poor before it hit, he believed in teaching me how to survive off the land and a solid work ethic...I'm thankful)

Sides, if coon huntin is an honorable sport for us up & overcomers, let's you & me go a'coon hunting tonite! Be careful tho... you accidentally shoot my dog I ain't a'going to let you eat ole Redbone... even if you do feel morally obliged! <grin>

I gotta admit, I still carry a bit of a grudge against that ole fat man in red, and if 'em we were to run across him tonight and I had a gun...I'd solve the 'problem with christmas'...course I'd eat Rudolph. HO, HO, HO...

Really though, I haven't given this subject any thought for many years; it is a dead issue for me too with the exception of its value in showing how ridiculous it is for men-- who may otherwise be called of God to minister His Word-- to be dictating (from the PULPIT) whether or not a woman should be carrying a purse with long straps because he thought the long straps too closely resembled those carried by prostitutes! (I kid you not!)

I'll leave that one alone...

Anyway, I'm going to see if I can find a couple of Jerry Clower's tapes in lieu of the coon hunt tonight... it's getting a bit chilly here, and until we can settle on whether or not we can sip on some of that instant heat, I'm staying inside!

Down here in de 'heart of dixie' the instant heat many SIP on, is called Jim Beam.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey

Before I can make a bold statement the question would have to be answered, was FA established by a Apostle? If not then there would be no FA.

But at the same time the signs of the Assembly, Apostolic anointing were evident. Such as gifts , Revelation. etc.

One point to bring out is that a Apostle and Prophet establis Apostolic authority. HEF was to a hidden degree seen to be a Prophet. No man could do the great things he did without a anointing.

Meaning out of the will of God. His demonstration of the Spirit was his badge of authority showing he was going in God's direction. No one could do these things except God be with him.

Remember the story of the policeman who said will you please slow down. If he had no authority the person would just keep on driving crazy. That was a good teaching. All bible teaching must come forth with authority. I personally recognise that a truth taught from the word of God is to be obeyed.

Please take a moment to reflect on the baby died issue. What a tremendous pressure a minister is under when he teaches have the baby at home, and then the person didn't have the faith.

As we all know the results were disasterous. I saw personally the handcuffs on the great man of God. It wasn't his fault, he was trying to get his people to seek the Lord (on a serious level) before things like that happened.

It really seems that what was legalism in appearance was actually a authoritative means of getting people to respond before problems could arise. It also appears that that mindset could have caused others to misunderstand and become legalistic.

My personal hopes of this whole looking back is that people will stay with the teachings that are profitable and meeting the requirements of the Lord ---not just a man-- But God's standards of righteousness. Overcomers are required to meet those standards whether something went wrong or not. Time is so short we don't have time to go hunting but proclaiming the gospel of the kingdom--- didn't say here you can't go hunting. We all have time to seek the Lord as to what he wants for us, and that is still under the free choice act.

Some will bare fruit 30 fold, 60, 100. but in Jn. 15:1-7 may all fruit we bring forth be from him, as the rest will be burned.

Matt. 7:22-23 here we have those who professed to do good works and yet Jesus says I don't know you. If we do the good things required of us we will have the Lord's words thou good and faithful servant enter into the joy of the Lord.

??? do we have to be a good and faithful servant to enter the joy of the Lord, or can we just be lip confessors that we are just born again. This question for the most part must cause us to say I need to meet all requirements of righteousness. That can be confused for legalism, especially in view that the Lord could come tomorrow night. But the decisions we make to do quickly what we have to do must be done from the heart. We must allow others space to respond, that can cause mistakes in handling the situation properly. The cost of being a minister is tremendous--could go to jail for others mistakes, a true sign that strong prayers and supplications be made for all your members.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 25 Dec 2010 15:36:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Please take a moment to reflect on the baby died issue. What a tremendous pressure a minister is under when he teaches have the baby at home, and then the person didn't have the faith.

Okay, I've reflected on it.

Now the only question I have for you is this: IS THIS WHAT YOU THINK A MINISTER SHOULD BE TEACHING?

William

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Sat, 25 Dec 2010 16:17:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Brodave wrote . . .

Quote:was FA established by a Apostle? If not then there would be no FA.

Brodave, who was the apostle that you think established Faith Assembly?
What were his "signs of an apostle" ?

Please be careful to not "dumb down" the meaning of "apostle" or else you will end up accepting the alleged apostles all over modern Christendom.

Jman

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [james](#) on Sun, 26 Dec 2010 17:45:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't remember Bro. Freeman ever professing to be an Apostle. I believe his calling and anointing was as a teacher...
He did prophesy, but I don't recall him claiming he was a prophet.(others may have thought he was)I do believe many things he prophesied have come to pass.

Before I get asked to list which prophecies that he gave have come to pass...I'll clarify my statement by saying many of the admonitions, exhortations, warnings, encouragements, he gave concerning getting The Word into our hearts, learning to walk by faith, and what would happen in the future to people who didn't. I see this all around today, people who once said "Lord. we'll follow you wheresoever you lead"; "A-men, Praise The Lord for opening our eyes to truth"; and confessed Ps. 91 as their 'assurance'; and God as their healer and deliverer, are nowhere to be found...well, maybe down at the local First_____Church, right back into what they once sought deliverance from. He said those who didn't get faith into their hearts and didn't embrace, from the HEART, the message of The Cross(crucified life/set apart unto Jesus) would run right back Babylon when the time of trial and testing comes. How accurate was that? Spot on, I'd say.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Sun, 26 Dec 2010 18:35:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I remember it that Bro. Freeman said he was a 5-fold teacher and 5-fold pastor.

Jman

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [David Coleman](#) on Tue, 28 Dec 2010 01:13:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I made a statement that you all misunderstood. As before this can happen as communication is difficult.

The reason Apostle was mentioned, was I thought it was said that a Apostle must be the one who established doctrine or something like that. The reply was that being it understood that a Apostle establishes a Assembly, and that faith Assembly seems to have been established by HEF, It would seem that it was not neccessary , for the words of HEF doctrinally were sufficient.

To clarify--- Dr. F. was enough authority for his doctrines. He always said he was led of the Spirit in all of his studies. All members had no question about this.

As concerning the baby issue, it is only one aspect of many choices which one who walks by faith will make. It is to be of great help to all members, to renounce all ties with medical science, that is the title of the message. The body of the message is to review all the diffewrent avenues one must avoid concerning medical science.

Many messages of seperation from the world were designed to make it easy for saints to make choices in their lives. Sometimes a message didn't apply-- at least not right away. For example a message about God's requirements may not profit one who is single until they one day may marry. It was still good to know even if it could be used to help others as we are all called teachers, though not the 5-fold teacher.

By the way the only reason to bring up the baby issue was to show that there can be a tremendous load on the body even persecution, because some wallydaggles in desiding to take a step of faith. That can put pressure on a minister to get a little firm in his convictions. There is no problems so big until one seeks the Lord.

Small statements like Shepherdship, and legalism when used without a gentle well spoken and thought of statement can easily be misinterpreted to be saying FA was a cult. Even what is written here can be easily taken wrong.

To be clear FA was not a cult
not a Shepherdship movement
not a legalistic ministry

And like it says concerning issues that should not be taken to court but settled among brethren privately.

We all have to pray about our views of FA, and see if we are on God's side or not, for we would not want to touch the Lord's anointed, even when he is gone on to where he cannot speak himself.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Tue, 28 Dec 2010 03:01:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Brodav - Please pray about your attitude towards
the "Wallydaggles" who lost loved ones in "faith-tragedies."

They were living the Word the best they knew how.
Many were as sincere as you or I back then.

There are profound questions that we, the F.A. diaspora, still
cannot answer about those deaths.

It is not for sure that all blame lies upon the families
that experienced the tragedies.

Someday we might find out that little or zero blame belongs upon them.

Jman

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [william](#) on Tue, 28 Dec 2010 05:01:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

wishing34 wrote on Mon, 27 December 2010 21:01Brodav - Please pray about your attitude towards the "Wallydaggles" who lost loved ones in "faith-tragedies."

They were living the Word the best they knew how.
Many were as sincere as you or I back then.

There are profound questions that we, the F.A. diaspora, still cannot answer about those deaths.

It is not for sure that all blame lies upon the families that experienced the tragedies.

Someday we might find out that little or zero blame belongs upon them.

Jman

Hear, hear!

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [GWB](#) on Tue, 28 Dec 2010 06:00:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't know if this input will matter or not, but I will share what is on my heart. This struck a chord in me as to what happened with some of the sisters who lost a dear child.

Upon returning to the meeting at FA years ago, I could tell it was very awkward for one of the sisters who had just lost a newborn. I approached her in the nursery and said, "I know you were faithful." With tears in her eyes, she grabbed me, hugged me, and said, "Amen, yes I was!" I sat down with her and held her. Other sisters were quick to come and minister as well.

I will never forget that moment. At the time, she chose to continue to believe even though she had just lost her baby. Also, she believed she had given it her all in believing in the situation.

This, to me, seems relevant to the times of FA. However, I just talked with another sister the other night and she said the same thing after all of these years about the loss of her dear child some

twenty-five years ago. I reminded her that some of her statements, that seemed so simple, took years of theology and trials to be able to say such things. She laughed and agreed.

Both of these dear sisters did/have not questioned God about the loss of their children. As far as I can see, they both are still walking by faith and believing God for some very serious things.

I guess my observation has been that death, when believing, is not always failure. These are not easy things to answer, or to express, and I don't think they can be neatly summed up...IMHO.

If so, one could say that Dr. Freeman's death was failure in some way...and I don't believe that. I believe he died believing and that God had a bigger plan. I believe He still has a much bigger and more wonderful plan than we can know, at least for now.

I know that many will be able to shoot holes in what I just shared if they feel that faith is a neat formula. In any case, both of the sister's faithfulness, in the face of death, is an awesome blessing to me. I think we need this kind of "blind" faith today for persecution and for what is ahead.

I believe that we will not always understand exactly the way God moves when we believe by faith. The most important thing is to simply believe regardless, and allow Him to move and use us even when we don't "get it" or comprehend what He is doing. In my terms, I call it "flying by the seat of your pants." I know that in some cases in my life, I will only understand in eternity as to why some things have happened in my life. I know, for sure, that He is in control...that is all that matters.

"When I return, will I find faith?"

I don't think that I am as eloquent, as some, when it comes to expressing myself. I hope, in some way, that this testimony will minister to others as it has to me all of these years.

I believe that faith goes beyond the receiving realm in this lifetime. I believe that He delights in the kind of faith where questions are everywhere, but we still choose to trust.

I know that most here at OO have heard all of this before. If anything, I pray everyday personally for this kind of faith and for His body of believers.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [william](#) on Tue, 28 Dec 2010 06:19:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, I believe you are right.

I guess that there may have been some at FA that were there for reasons other than discipleship, but I personally didn't know them.

It seemed to me that we all had a common goal and many sacrificed dearly to be there and while it has been said that sincerity doesn't count for much because of the possibility of being sincerely wrong, I do think that the sincerity of our fellow brothers and sisters--when it came to serving God-- will not be forgotten by our great Saviour Jesus Christ!

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [james](#) on Tue, 28 Dec 2010 12:18:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gillyann,

Thanks for sharing what is in your heart, I admire your courage. Eloquence isn't what Jesus desires, He's seeking those who will simply believe and follow, yes even in the face of death.

I want to say that even today we see through a glass, darkly; but one day face to face with JESUS, we only know in part today, but then we'll know even as we're known...FAITH is following even when we don't understand...

How will people know we are HIS disciples? By our intellect? Our eloquence? Our ability to quote scripture? By always having to be right even at the cost of throwing others under the bus? NO...By this shall all men know we're HIS disciples, by our LOVE one for another.

We MUST have faith, but without love our faith is dead. Remember Jesus said this...if we can't love each other whom we can 'see', it's self deception to think we truly love God Whom we can't. When we love Him, we will trust Him.

"but the greatest of these is love."

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey

Just wanted all to know, that the last thing in the world that I would do is criticise others who come up slower than others.

The general statement wally gaggers is easily applied to where it fits, but we can never really know who one of those are. Not that it doesn't come out in those who depart the faith.

Personally I have sat in the hospital beside a person who chose to go to the Dr. and was there to encourage them. In my thinking a person is in a warfare that was a little difficult for them. Every person has a reason for why they do what they do.

Everyone can always say it was the grace of God alone that caused a manifestation of faith.

Have had experiences myself where tried to bring a person out of the wheel chair and they said they believed but they had to sit back down. It must have been a great disapointment to them as well as I. God moves when he choses and he alone knows the heart

The revelation of the fear of God that Has been brought my way is that there's plenty of grace but at the same time not forever. That means when the Lord returns will there be faith in the earth. As a example we all have to be overcomers. That is sobering. We have to be without spot, wrinkle or blemish.

He isn't expecting to return to deliver us from demons or heal our body, that is our responsibility. In actuality we must be found fulfilling the great comission. Only the Holy Spirit can make a analysis of us and reveal it. That way like David said(search my heart and see if there be any wicked way in me. It is difficult to discern ourselves.

Heard this in sermon be hard on self and gentle on others---love that. The goal is that being we have and are learning so many things may they end up as righteous activity in our lives.

The understanding that the Lord has given me is many of his sheep do not know why they learned Theology or doctrine. This is a aside statement from the rest of the post. It is not for criticism only to let you know he has revealed this. The main reason is because he continues to teach by the Spirit, and has never ceased dealing with his flock.

There is the direction to move in. Where is the Lord taking us---if he choses to use a man so be it. If not he will tell us.

The Spirit is not confusion, he will reveal his will. We must walk in the light he has given and of coarse not reject it. Todays times some will only obey God. That won't work-- he uses 5-fold ministry.

It was important to understand that one must be set in a body. If he says leave you may. that

helped denominational thinking where one can just leave when they please when they pick or chose what to obey or not. That is not easy to swallow until one has decided that they must hear God's Spirit. For the most part people become spectators and don't participate. It can be difficult to hear God at times so we understand some just sit.

I'm just as guilty of this in the past. Should have been more led by the Spirit to function. I still believe it is God's heart that a people will come together for the purpose of manifesting the manifold wisdom of God. FA was a good example of this operation.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [David Coleman](#) on Thu, 30 Dec 2010 14:36:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What a joyful morning because the Lord's mercies are new and fresh every morning.

The Lord is faithful this morning, and has revealed something marvelous which follows the posts to this point.

While outside in the dark this morning, while walking the dog, was looking up at the sky. The clouds were completely covering the sky, but 2 things were poking through. The crescent moon and a star. That's something to see, all clouds and the 2 luminaries seen through it.

The question came to me what do you see? I answered what I saw. Then it came what was supposed to see. Do you see a bow and arrow? Studied it and yes saw it. The moon was in the bow position and the star at the left of it was the tip of the arrow.

What a neat understanding. That's all got till the Lord had led to this scripture. 1Sam.2:4 the bows of the mighty men are broken, and they that stumbled are girded with strength.

2 things here:

1. the word stumbled. Through weakness of legs esp. the ankle, to fall or faint, cast down.
 2. the word gird. to bind up. in a positive sense.
 3. The scriptures reveal that the gates of hades shall not prevail against the church.
- why is that? One reason is because we are supplied with sufficient supply of grace and mercy.

2nd thing.

What is the strength?

That the Lord will deliver us from stumbling and restore us by his grace. Thereby the bows of the enemy are broken.

Mercy allows us to get back up and ask for God to help us if we stumbled or fell. Like the fire

darts mentioned concerning the armor of God, Our faith shall quench them. The Lord will strengthen us. The joy of the Lord is our strength.

Joy is knowing we are forgiven for stumbling through things to difficult for us. Just like Peter who was sinking, Jesus reached down and lifted Peter up. That by the way was the arm of God pulling him up. It is a arm of power and strength. It is the arm of commitment to help his beloved sheep who are having a difficult time. Truly the heavens declare the glory of God. love to you.

1Sam. 2:9 Do you see the relation here about the gates of hades not prevailing. v.8 The creation idea expresses just how much power God has, and yet his power is infinite, that's why he says in Isaiah, the nations are a drop in the bucket. His power has no limits.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [outofaith](#) on Wed, 09 Feb 2011 02:16:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

When I finally left FA in 1987, a friend and I went to see Bruce and we had all kinds of questions for him--as you can well imagine. Up until this point we had been told to not speak to him or anyone else who had left FA--for fear of getting that same demon of unbelief.

Well, we asked him why he left and he said it was when Dr. Freeman started teaching on the Deeper Deliverance--and took the whole body through deliverance one night--and the teachings had gotten so far out in left field, that he could not agree with it. He said he stood in the back of the building that night Freeman preached this message, and Bruce said he just shook his head, thinking "this is too far."

In other words, Bruce said, in the end, it was over the deeper deliverance. If I thought harder, I could probably come up with more detail about what he said, but that's what I remember. And I also remember thinking at the time how wise Bruce was--that he saw it clearly before we did.

It seems like he said he thought Dr. Freeman was trying so hard to figure out why so many had died, and came up with the concept that we all needed to go through this deeper deliverance.

Well, it didn't help in my case, because I lost a baby after the so called dd.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [wishing34](#) on Thu, 10 Feb 2011 00:56:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Could anyone please refresh my memory
w/r what topics were part of deeper deliverance?

thanks.

Jman

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [GWB](#) on Thu, 10 Feb 2011 04:16:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In the Faith Publications catalog under Deeper Deliverance and Discernment (Series O-261) there are 12 teachings:

1. The Work of Demons of Flesh? The Fear of God or a Spirit of Fear?
 2. Discerning and Dealing with Multiple Personalities, No. 1
 3. Discerning and Dealing with Multiple Personalities, No. 2
 4. Trying Lying Spirits and Discerning Deceiving Demons
 5. Testing the Talk, Proving the Prophecies, Discerning the Dreams
 6. The Devices of Satan and the Depths of Satan
 7. The Seven-headed Serpent; Closing Open Doors to Medical Science
 8. Closing Open Doors
 9. Deliverance from the Effects of Our Past
 10. Deliverance from Deceptions, No. 1
 11. Deliverance from Deceptions, No. 2
 12. Deliverance from Deceptions, No. 3
-

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [GWB](#) on Thu, 10 Feb 2011 04:32:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Outofaith: "Well, it didn't help in my case, because I lost a baby after the so called dd."

Outofaith, I am so very sorry for the loss of your dear baby. So many of us here at OO are searching for answers for those who were hurt or had bad experiences. We are also searching and reviewing why those things happened for ourselves.

Many have different opinions. The main thing is that we have learned here at OO is that mercy and grace towards those who were hurt go a long way as we pray for God to heal your heart for your loss.

I just want to gently encourage you to not throw everything out that we learned at FA. At one time I did. God put me in a life and death position concerning spells and curses from Satanists in my area. I found myself falling back on so much of what I learned at FA to defeat Satan and his cohorts in the situation. I rely on the teachings daily as He protects my family and ministers to those bound by Satanism.

We are all here to listen and learn from each other whether we agree or agree to disagree.

I respect your honesty and position. I hope we hear more from you, on any topic, in the future.

Subject: Re: Church politics ? Bruce Kinsey
Posted by [David Coleman](#) on Thu, 10 Feb 2011 14:46:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Two of many things being learned in the faith walk.

1. respect for authority.
2. discernment.

Yesterday a girl learned a hard lesson. She picked up her bottle of pills at the Pharmacy. She brought them home and without reading the label took them. (reminds of the statement--no warning on the label) The Pharmacy gave her the wrong pills. Discernment is a very valuable tool to protect us.

Obedying authority is also valuable. The issue is bigger than just one situation. It cannot be counted on ten fingers how many times it has been heard by many people who say--"I was a Christian but now I'm a mormon or some other religion.

1Tim. 4:1 says that there are seducing spirits and doctrines of demons. 1,000s of people who were legitimate Christians now believe Jesus died a sinner. That is why we must be discerning and obey authority. Even the president of the U.S.A. gets the hand clap if all agree and booo if they don't. He is still our president. We are taught to pray for and respect him. How much more they of the household of God . it says they are worthy of double honor. 1Tim. 5:17

One of the biggest way to discern is by the help of the Holy Spirit. then we can use a little thinking

on our part. That is limited of course, but we can look at a thing in a opposite way. In this case --should I have gone to visit someone? should I reject the deliverance message? Was there maybe another reason why I lost something dear to me.

We may sometimes be making a wrong confession about something. When anything happens in life that we didn't cause it can be said by us all things work together for good. The story of Job shows the loss of things. But when his faith was matured he received twice as much before. He maintained a praise and good attitude, though he did have his faith tested.

Deliverance is not for just casting out demons. It is for the glory of God to remove those dark things that are in our lives driving us to do dark things. We aren't free from things from the past though we are free by faith. Faith includes our control of ourselves so that we assist God in our becoming righteous to his standard of holiness. We sometimes don't take serious that we can acquire new demons. We are in a battle continually. Warfare is a ongoing thing and that happens in a Assembly that is in active moving towards God's will plans and purpose to challenge the powers of darkness.

Hab. 3:17-18 is a real example of warfare. Faith is a real despised message and the devil will try to convince us we don't have it. So by praising God we maintain that attitude of faith until it does manifest. praise is a manifest of our hope in God. We wouldn't praise if we didn't hope. Heb. 11:1 faith is the substance of things hoped. praise is the confidence that we have that hope of faith. It will have to manifest the answer of receiving the promise claimed.

The trials are to bring the opposite of joy. Then comes heaviness and lack of confidence. By praising and thanking--in truthfulness, we maintain a confident faith. All the message posted here is love not rebuke. If you forget all else please remember the last paragraph.
