

General Topics :: "End of the Spear" Steve Saint Speaks

**"End of the Spear" Steve Saint Speaks - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/2/1 9:40**

Received the following from Randy Alcorns ministry the other day and thought it better to separate it from the thread ([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic\\_id9056&forum48&post\\_id&refreshGo](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id9056&forum48&post_id&refreshGo)) End of the Spear and draw attention to it in isolation.

*"Randy asked me to send this request to you for prayer regarding the End of the Spear movie and the Chad Allen controversy. Many of you are no doubt aware of the controversy that surrounds the End of the Spear movie and the actor who plays Nate Saint, Chad Allen, who is a homosexual activist. Randy has found himself on the inside of this controversy talking with the principle parties involved on both sides of the issue. He was reluctant to get involved but because of the substantial amount of misinformation that is being passed around he felt he needed to address it. After long interactions with the primary parties related to this controversy (including hours of phone conversations and dozens of emails) he has put together a comprehensive response.*

*He's asking that you would pray for Mart Green and Steve Saint and their families who have suffered incredible pain from the misinformation that has been dispersed over the internet. Prayer is also needed for Jason Janz who has been involved in the center of the controversy. Please also pray for Chad Allen and his exposure to the gospel through acting in this movie and for the many nonbelievers who will be attending the movie because of Chad Allen's role.*

*To get a clear picture of what is involved, you can read the following two articles that are now posted at our website:"*

*Randy Alcorn's response to the End of the Spear and Chad Allen Controversy: [http://www.epm.org/articles/end\\_spear\\_response.html](http://www.epm.org/articles/end_spear_response.html)*

*Mart Green (head of Every Tribe Entertainment, producer of End of the Spear) & Steve Saint answer questions: [www.epm.org/articles/end\\_spear\\_chad\\_allen.html](http://www.epm.org/articles/end_spear_chad_allen.html)*

Think it was a noble thing of Randy to get down into the muck and mire here, despite everything. I do hope this might serve as a future warning about jumping to conclusions and taking positions.

**Re: "End of the Spear" Steve Saint Speaks - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/1 10:42**

brethren

The Lord is certainly not ignorant of Chad Allen and his lifestyle and yet it was so that he played this part in the movie. if the Lord had wanted it any other way, it would have been so. it seems to me that this is a lesson for us to keep from running our mouths sometimes and to let God check us. i've not seen very many discussions get as emotionally charged as ones to do with homosexuality. it seems to me adultery and fornication are by far more rampant sins in the church which have done far more damage to families, congregations and indeed our witness and yet i've yet to see us on these boards get riled up about any of these things. i'm in no way condoning this sin because God doesn't condone it. yet there is much else the Lord doesn't condone which we don't pay much attention to.

i guess we all have aired how we feel, now let's seek the Lord earnestly on what to do.

Lord forgive us of our pride and compel us to repent. :cry:

**Re:, on: 2006/2/1 11:34**

Quote:

-----if the Lord had wanted it any other way, it would have been so.

-----

Hey Ironman... I cant go along with your reasoning on this point. (The rest of what you wrote is subjective opinion, and I dont necessarily disagree or agree)... but anyway... God promised Abraham a son with his wife. Abraham took it upon hi

himself to help the Lord out, and did things his way. The result?? Terrorism, high gas prices, threats of war, Islam, etc. If Abraham had trusted the Lord to fulfill his promise then Isaac would have been the (only) son God wanted Abraham to have, and world history would have turned out completely different. But instead, Abraham chose to help fulfill God's promise by way of adultery, and having an illegitimate son. And we are all living with the results of that decision today.

Remember 9/11?

Of course a movie is not earth shattering like Abraham's goof was... but the point is the same. MAN messes up, not God. And God does not always intervene to make sure we don't mess things up. Sometimes he allows us to mess things up, and then makes us live with the consequences.

Love ya, bro...

Krispy

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2006/2/1 11:46

Quote:  
-----but anyway... God promised Abraham a son with his wife. Abraham took it upon himself to help the Lord out, and did things his way. The result?? Terrorism, high gas prices, threats of war, Islam, etc. If Abraham had trusted the Lord to fulfill his promise then Isaac would have been the son God wanted Abraham and his wife to have, and world history would have turned out completely different.  
-----

Do you realize that you are posting this from such a close minded commercialism American point of view!!! what in the world does Abraham have to do at all with the material success of America?? is America the "chosen people" now? Think outside the box (the American box) that is. The world **does not** revolve around America. I am saying this not disliking America but wanting to show the truth of the matter.

I think Ironman has a valid point, but does not say that homosexuality is not a sin, it is a grievous sin actually and a depravity of Human nature that wants to rebel against God. I personally think that Christians can do without the "end of the spear" why do we NEED it? when has the church been so desperate to guard and maintain our slice of the world? we are called to forsake it. I am tired of blockbuster Christian movies.. We need the power of the Holy Spirit .. we need apostolic success.

Re: "End of the Spear" Steve Saint Speaks, on: 2006/2/1 11:50

Hi Krispy,

How can you possibly hold Abraham solely responsible for that list of pains? Adam, *surely*, had more to do with it?

What's more, the love of God is such He sent the second Adam, to bring the first Adam back into fellowship with Him.

I've lived with the consequences of my actions, and it isn't easy, but, it was *there* that God proved Himself to me **more** than any other - His compassion for me, and His Fatherhood towards me. I would never have known how deep He can reach, if He had not let me fall so low.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/2/1 12:05

My favorite part of the one article is where it quotes Paul in Philippians that says whether the gospel is preached in pretense or sincerity, he will rejoice that the gospel is preached.

I saw this movie Friday night with my fiancée, and boy, must I say I was delighted to do so. The movie had such a powerful demonstration of the self-giving sacrificial love of Christ and forgiveness. It had my fiancée and I crying pretty good. Especially powerful was the martyrdom scene. The movie has encouraged me to go deeper in my walk with Christ, grown my heart for world missions, and makes me want to read the book, The Gates of Splendor, as well as see the actual documentary behind the movie.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/2/1 12:16**

Quote:  
-----  
when has the church been so desperate to guard and maintain our slice of the world? we are called to forsake it. I am tired of blockbuster Christian movies.. We need the power of the Holy Spirit .. we need apostolic success.  
-----

Who said by defending this movie we are guarding our slice of the world? Why do you equate making a Christian movie with worldliness? Movies in themselves are not worldly. Seeing a movie based on the Gates of Splendor is no different than reading the Gates of Splendor. They are simply two different forms of media. Or what about the rather famous documentary that we have of the Welsh Revival? Should we do away with that as well? It was quite powerful from what I recall.

The apostolic power of the Holy Spirit is behind this movie in that He inspired the missionaries on which this movie was based. I know I found myself being questioned by the Holy Spirit as I watched the martyrdom scene, and asking myself, could I give my life in such a selfless way, to see the souls of an unwanted and despised group of people saved, knowing that within my short contact of them, I might be killed, and never have significant chance to share the gospel with them?

**Re:, on: 2006/2/1 13:40**

Wait wait wait... what happened to asking people to clarify their statements before jumping all over them??

I can not even fathom how you got America involved in this. You conveniently misunderstood my point entirely. My point was that the ripples of Abraham's disobedience is felt today. God had a plan, and Abraham circumvented that plan... and we are still feeling the effects of it today. Especially in ISRAEL.

I only mentioned gas prices because the Arabs control the world's economy. I mentioned Terrorism with ISRAEL in mind because 95% of the terrorism in the world happens in ISRAEL!! That's the result of the disobedience of ABRAHAM.

I swear, it's amazing how people misinterpret what others are saying on here. I know I am guilty of it as well... but gee-whiz people!

Before you scold me, ask me if perhaps you're misunderstanding me, or if perhaps I wasn't clear enough.

I think IRONMAN's comment that "if God wanted it another way it would have happened" comment is not necessarily correct. It's actually a neo-Calvinistic statement. It denies man's "freewill".

It's amazing how one post can be understood 20 different ways from upside down.

Does clarify it for everyone? Am I "outside the box" now? (I always was)

Krispy

**Ishmael - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/2/1 14:09**

Quote:  
-----If Abraham had trusted the Lord to fulfill his promise then Isaac would have been the (only) son God wanted Abraham to have, and world history would have turned out completely different  
-----

Krispy, did God not miraculously spare Ishmael's life in the desert when he was dying of thirst?  
Diane

**Neo-calvanism etc - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/1 14:13**

bro Krispy

i think this issue should be discussed elsewhere so that the theme of this thread isn't lost. we can talk privately if you wish but i'll start another thread on this perhaps.

love you too bro

**Re: Ishmael, on: 2006/2/1 14:14**

Quote:

-----Krispy, did God not miraculously spare Ishmael's life in the desert when he was dying of thirst?

Diane

God did not intend for Abraham to father Ishmael. That is my point. Had Abraham trusted God instead of sinning against God Ishmael would never have been born. That is my point. God has a plan, but He allows us free-will to either carry out His plans in faith... or not trust Him and mess it up.

I only use Abraham as an example of God not intervening to impose His plans on us. Can God turn our mistakes around? Of course... but His perfect plan can still be pre-empted by our disobedience.

And I believe it applies to this movie as IRONMAN addressed it.

That is my point.

Krispy

**Re: Neo-calvanism etc, on: 2006/2/1 14:17**

Quote:

-----i think this issue should be discussed elsewhere so that the theme of this thread isn't lost. we can talk privately if you wish but i'll start another thread on this perhaps.

No, it wasn't my intention to veer off the road. My original post was in keeping, the misunderstandings kinda veered it off.

If we're all clear on my point (agree or disagree) we can get back to topic, perhaps?

Krispy

**Re: It's not off topic - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/2/1 14:20**

Quote:

-----Had Abraham trusted God instead of sinning against God Ishmael would never have been born. That is my point.

But God DID intervene by sparing Ishmael's life. And that says something about God's nature. And that DOES speak to the very issue under discussion, does it not?

God has always been a master at turning things upside down - pouring out mercy exactly where it shouldn't go.

We're in the mess we are in because of unbelief, not because of those "illegitimate" sinners across the ocean. God promises to protect those who trust in him, and no foe need be feared.

Diane

Re:, on: 2006/2/1 14:38

Quote:

-----God has always been a master at turning things upsidedown - pouring out mercy exactly where it shouldn't go.

Thats exactly what I said, Diane, but thanx for reaffirming it. :-)

Quote:

-----We're in the mess we are in because of unbelief, not because of those "illegitimate" sinners across the ocean. God promises to protect those who trust in him, and no foe need be feared.

Yea, but again, I was not addressing America. I was addressing the "Arabs against the World" mentality that they have over there. The fighting between the Jew and the Arab. I've been there, I've seen it. I've been shot at over there. It's a very real hatred that started with Abraham's disobedience.

To bring it back on topic... my point with all of this is... the statement that if God had a better plan He would have implemented it is not accurate. And I believe God had a better plan the The End Of The Spear.

Krispy

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/1 15:13

bro Krispy

ok, i got the other thread going, Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac etc. in the lounge.

as it pertains to the movie let everyone seek the Lord's counsel on what to do be it see it, pray for those in it, examine ourselves or whatever the Lord would have us do.

Quote:

-----To bring it back on topic... my point with all of this is... the statement that if God had a better plan He would have implemented it is not accurate. And I believe God had a better plan the The End Of The Spear.

does anything happen outside the will of God? is the Lord not sovereign over all that whatever He intends can be usurped by our own will? are we not subject to His sovereign will even in our own free will?

hey maybe i didn't need to start a whole new thread or did i? :-? this issue of the Lord's sovereignty is kinda what i want to get into on the other thread.

Re: Excellent articles - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/2/1 15:51

All that I can say in response to the article is "Wow! I had no idea!"

There is a lot to read, but it is worth it. I was very humbled when I read Steve Saint's own testimony - his dream, and how God convicted his heart of the need to shed his fear of man, and accept his sovereignty. There can be no disputing that God clearly directed this movie (behind the "scenes")

As I read I was convicted of my own sins. You see, in the previous thread on this topic I had judged the ETE falsely - assuming that they used the controversy to make money. That was not the case at all.

The overall message to me: Do not make judgments or assumptions on something you know nothing about.

Thank you Mike for posting this.

Diane

Re:, on: 2006/2/1 16:09

I read the article too...

What are we to think of Steve Saint's dream? It is simple. God would **never** act contrary to His own Scriptures. That would be the penultimate confusion. If God does not act strictly in accordance with His own revelation, it would be impossible to know anything for certain. This is not to "put God in a box." It is rather to honor God by taking Him at His Word.

What does the Scripture say on this issue? It **forbids** Christians to yoke together with unbelievers (2 Cor. 6:14) and it requires Christians to "have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them" (Eph. 5:11), to turn away from those who have a form of godliness but deny the power thereof (2 Tim. 3:5), and not to keep company with "any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner" (1 Cor. 5:11).

That is clear enough. God does love men and has provided salvation in such a manner that "whosoever will" can repent and trust Jesus Christ and be saved. But God's love for sinners and His desire that all be saved is an entirely different issue than the one at hand, which is whether or not Christians should yoke together with a homosexual activist who has blasphemed the name of Jesus Christ in movies and plays (Corpus Christi) and whether they should promote him in the role of a martyred missionary that did not believe in the homosexual agenda.

In further justification of his support for the homosexual activist in the role of his father, Steve Saint said, "God works in mysterious ways, his wonders to perform." This is Hollywood's favorite Bible verse and has been quoted in countless movies, but of course it is **nowhere in the Bible!**

Thus, Steve Saint is following a dream and an extra-scriptural religious saying in plain contradiction to the Bible.

I respect Steve Saint, however he is just as capable of being completely wrong as any of the rest of us. And in this instance... I believe he is.

Krispy

Re: EotS - Steve Saint thread, on: 2006/2/1 20:20

Quote:  
-----In further justification of his support for the homosexual activist in the role of his father, Steve Saint said, "God works in mysterious ways, his wonders to perform." This is Hollywood's favorite Bible verse and has been quoted in countless movies, but of course it is nowhere in the Bible!

Thus, Steve Saint is following a dream and an extra-scriptural religious saying in plain contradiction to the Bible.

-----  
Krispy,

I don't know if you did a search for the exact words you quote from Steve Saint, but there most definitely are many references to wonders, and the *meaning* (of God's 'mysterious ways') is very clearly sketched there using slightly different words. For instance, Job said (9:10)

Which doeth great things past finding out; yea, and wonders without number.

and

Psalms 106:7

Our fathers understood not thy wonders in Egypt; they remembered not the multitude of thy mercies; but provoked at thee in the sea, at the Red sea.

I've stayed with the KJV, because the sentence you quote is from a hymn, written in the era when it was the version mainly available, and that's why such a phrase has passed into common English usage.

**God moves in a mysterious way**

**His wonders to perform;**

He plants His footsteps in the sea  
And rides upon the storm.

Deep in unfathomable mines  
Of never failing skill  
He treasures up His bright designs  
And works His sovereign will.

Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take;  
The clouds ye so much dread  
Are big with mercy and shall break  
In blessings on your head.

Judge not the Lord by feeble sense,  
But trust Him for His grace;  
Behind a frowning providence  
He hides a smiling face.

His purposes will ripen fast,  
Unfolding every hour;  
The bud may have a bitter taste,  
But sweet will be the flower.

Blind unbelief is sure to err  
And scan His work in vain;  
God is His own interpreter,  
And He will make it plain.

*William Cowper 1731 - 1800*

Interesting that this hymn specifically mentions God's sovereign will. 'He plants his footstep in the sea and rides upon the storm' are thoughts also in Psalms.

Therefore, I think you're taking a huge amount upon yourself, to suggest that Steve Saint was not hearing from God when he made the decisions he did concerning the making of a film about his father.

Another thing to remember is how very young the children were when their fathers died, and the effect of the bereavement on them, as well as any natural desire to bring the truth of history outworked (before video cameras were invented) to the understanding of a completely new generation.

**Re: EotS - Steve Saint thread, on: 2006/2/1 20:45**

Krispy, you also said (p1 of this thread)

Quote:

-----If Abraham had trusted the Lord to fulfill his promise then Isaac would have been the (only) son God wanted Abraham to have, and world history would have turned out completely different.

Did you know about Abraham's concubines?

Genesis 25:5, 6

And Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac. But unto the sons of the concubines, which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts, and sent them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived, eastward, unto the east country.

One of the points of discussion during the unfolding story in Genesis, is that Abraham and Sarah did not know whether either of them could have children. The outcome of Abraham and Hagar was proof that Abraham at least, was fertile. Th



The Bible refers to Sarah as barren (Gen 11:30), but of course, *they didn't know that*, while they were living through it. Can you imagine what a huge comfort it was to Abraham to realise the only reason he had not had children, was his wife's barrenness? This immediately shifted the focus on to whether God could over-rule Sarah's condition.

Genesis 20:17, 18

So Abraham prayed unto God: and God healed Abimelech, and his wife, and his maidservants; and they bare children. For the LORD had fast closed up all the wombs of the house of Abimelech, because of Sarah Abraham's wife.

So, Abraham's prayer life was nothing diminished for calling on his primary relationship to Sarah, namely, that they were very closely related, apart from marriage.

The other thing bothering me about what you said about Abraham, is, God called him His friend **and imputed to him righteousness** for his faith.

Are we not obliged to accept **God's** assessment of Abraham's character?

..... In that He has called **us** 'friends', He has proved in our generation what kind of taste He has in friends..... You want a grumble about that?

#### Re: Peter's dream - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/2/1 21:28

Quote:

-----Thus, Steve Saint is following a dream and an extra-scriptural religious saying in plain contradiction to the Bible.  
-----

If we did not carefully examine other surrounding facts and Steve's testimony, we could possibly arrive at this conclusion .

Steve was not eager to accept the actor. It felt wrong, but it was also unethical to break a contract. The dream exposed the real motive of his reluctance - it was the fear of backlash.

This reminds me of God's request to Peter in the dream of the sheet and unclean animals. The dream helped Peter accept God's purposes - to have mercy to the Gentiles - something which to a Jew seemed totally against Torah Law.

It seems clear to me that Steve is not equally yoked with the world in this issue. His heart remains reserved for God, and I sense no compromise in his testimony.

It is also worth considering how those who opposed reacted - hardly Christlike, and hardly in a manner which would bring conviction to sinners (rather it would turn them away)

If this is indeed a divine appointment, we will see God's hand in it. (unless we're like the Pharisees who rejected many of the miraculous things Christ did.)

Diane

#### Re: End of the Spear - posted by TaKa (), on: 2006/2/1 22:51

I have been personally blessed by this movie because I read *Through Gates of Splendor* and *The Journals of Jim Elliot* years ago and they have remained two of my favorite books. I'm reading *End of the Spear* by Steve Saint now.

Gentiles were unclean to Jews but not to Paul and if I read my Bible correctly the two cities that were destroyed by fire were not destroyed because of homosexuality but because of laziness, gluttony and lack of care for the poor.

Jesus told the religious leaders of his day that prostitutes would enter the kingdom of heaven before they would.

If God can use a donkey, can He not use a gay actor? Maybe God is working in his life through this to expose him to the gospel so that he can be saved.



Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/1 22:55

bro Krispy

not sure if i should put this on the other thread but, according to the O.T. ravens were not to be eaten and were considered unclean so the Jews were to have no contact with them right?

in Lev 11

**13 And these are they which ye shall have in abomination among the fowls; they shall not be eaten, they are an abomination: the eagle, and the ossifrage, and the ospray, 14 And the vulture, and the kite after his kind; 15 Every raven after his kind; 16 And the owl, and the night hawk, and the cuckow, and the hawk after his kind, 17 And the little owl, and the cormorant, and the great owl, 18 And the swan, and the pelican, and the gier eagle, 19 And the stork, the heron after her kind, and the lapwing, and the bat.**

but the Lord uses ravens to feed Elijah here in 1 kings 17

**3 Get thee hence, and turn thee eastward, and hide thyself by the brook Cherith, that is before Jordan. 4 And it shall be, that thou shalt drink of the brook; and I have commanded the ravens to feed thee there. 5 So he went and did according unto the word of the LORD: for he went and dwelt by the brook Cherith, that is before Jordan. 6 And the ravens brought him bread and flesh in the morning, and bread and flesh in the evening; and he drank of the brook. 7 And it came to pass after F115 a while, that the brook dried up, because there had been no rain in the land.**

and also contact with dead bodies is forbidden by God as it leads to uncleanness, there is however a cleansing process though. check numbers 19

**11 He that toucheth the dead body of any man F45 shall be unclean seven days. 12 He shall purify himself with it on the third day, and on the seventh day he shall be clean: but if he purify not himself the third day, then the seventh day he shall not be clean. 13 Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the LORD; and that soul shall be cut off from Israel: because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him, he shall be unclean; his uncleanness is yet upon him. 14 This is the law, when a man dieth in a tent: all that come into the tent, and all that is in the tent, shall be unclean seven days. 15 And every open vessel, which hath no covering bound upon it, is unclean.**

also Jews were not to have contact with gentiles either yet the Lord sent Elijah to a gentile woman for 3 yrs after which when her son died he laid on him 3 times and the child was raised from the dead. what does that mean? the Lord is free even to go against what He says, it's His prerogative, He's God and He can do that. check out Art Katz's text sermon on Elijah the prophet of restoration. it's deep bro and he does a better job of explaining that than i can.

God bless

Re:, on: 2006/2/2 8:21

Quote:  
-----Steve was not eager to accept the actor. It felt wrong, but it was also unethical to break a contract. The dream exposed the real motive of his reluctance - it was the fear of backlash.  
-----

It is far better to go back on one's word, when such a word was given improperly, than to go against God's Word. Proverbs 6:1-5 says that if a person has made a foolish agreement, he should waste no time in extracting himself from that situation.

**General Topics :: "End of the Spear" Steve Saint Speaks**

"My son, if thou be surety for thy friend, if thou hast stricken thy hand with a stranger, thou art snared with the words of thy mouth, thou art taken with the words of thy mouth. Do this now, my son, and deliver thyself, when thou art come into the hand of thy friend; go, humble thyself, and make sure thy friend. Give not sleep to thine eyes, nor slumber to thine eyelids."

Allen even offered to back out of the agreement.

By the way, it is truly astonishing, almost to the point of disbelief, that experienced movie men would be so ignorant of Allen's very public homosexual image. Bill Ewing, the producer of "End of the Spear," is the former senior vice-president of production at Sony and has overseen 125 films, including Men in Black II and Spider-Man. Even Steve Saint said, "I could not imagine how something like this could slip through a professional screening process." Indeed.

People have stated that they have been blessed by this movie, and no doubt the movie is inspiring... but what do we mean when we say we've "been blessed"? I suspect the movie touched an emotional chord with people, but emotionalism is not "blessing".

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2006/2/2 8:34**

Quote:  
-----It seems clear to me that Steve is not equally yoked with the world in this issue. His heart remains reserved for God, and I sense no compromise in his testimony.  
-----

I love ya, Diane... but I just can't wrap my brain around that one.

Quote:  
-----It is also worth considering how those who opposed reacted - hardly Christlike, and hardly in a manner which would bring conviction to sinners (rather it would turn them away)  
-----

That doesn't change the truth, or make something right or wrong. There is a saying on this board: You can be totally right, but totally wrong. I certainly do not agree with the people who have sent Steve Saint hate mail... but I do not disagree with what they are upset about. They are right, but they are wrong in how they handled it.

Krispy

**Re: To Krispy - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/2/2 9:08**

Quote:  
----- love ya, Diane... but I just can't wrap my brain around that one.  
-----

I love you too, Krispy. I praise God for someone like you who keeps me examining what I believe!

This may rattle your brain, but it's where I'm at now:

I grew up in a setting where whatever we did externally was the only thing that counted. The hidden things of our hearts were never considered. We were taught that going to movies was bad, (period!)... being involved in the ministerial was bad, doing anything with other churches was bad, etc.

Now, I see a degree of truth in all of that. However the real concern was to APPEAR clean and polished. It was assumed that any involvement in these things would be an indication that we AGREED with them.

we were never taught about issues of the heart. And so, while many of us where careful to live a pure outer life, our hearts still craved the things of this world. So we would make such comments as this: " Well, maybe a little bit is okay, just not alot." We had so many crazy legalistic discussion about the "grey" area, that it makes my head spin to think about it. We were really trying to find the place where we could satisfy God, and also with a clear conscience keep our affections in this world.

Well, God got a hold of me and convicted me of trying to have the best of both worlds. Really I was not sold out to God at all. I was trying to run my own life. He worked in me (through pain and tears) to shake out my legalistic self-righteousness. Then he put me on a path that led me to learn to love and trust him instead of all these things in the world, including myself.

It is far to long a story to write here. But the end product is, I can now take part in various things in this world, while my true citizenship is in God's kingdom. I do not ever need to watch TV, or have a nice house, or go to parties. But sometime s God calls me and leads me in those directions because it is in those settings that he wants me to be a light. He also has important truths to teach me (I don't just go to church to learn about God)

God has called me to be yoked with him - to love him, and seek and follow his will. That is a heart predisposition. If that makes no sense, I can understand. Somehow, I'm sure it wouldn't have made sense to me back then.  
Diane

**Re:, on: 2006/2/2 9:46**

Diane,

I agree completely with your post. That was what the guilt of the Pharisees was. They looked very religious on the exterior, but obviously their hearts were full of sin... including murder. We must be very careful to avoid that... and it's easy to slip into.

I was listening to a sermon yesterday on purity and holiness, and while I agree with what you're saying, we can not ignore God's Word when it exhorts us to "be ye separate". This does not mean that we never have any contact with the world. If we did that we would never reach the world with the gospel.

Going to the movie theater is not a sin. But seeing "American Pie" is. A Christian has no business spending their time and money watching a movie filled with smut & blasphemy. But is there anything wrong with seeing "National Treasure"? I don't think there is. No sex, no cussing, great plot. I took my kids to see it.

But Steve Saint and Every Tribe were unequally yoked together with a homosexual activist in making a movie that was intended to inspire and represent Godly men who gave their lives to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ. And that was wrong, no matter what the results.

The end never justify the means.

Krispy

**Re: obey God - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/2/2 10:02**

Quote:

-----The end never justify the means.  
-----

True, we cannot justify our sins by coming up with a noble end.

However, Try telling God that. His means seem very questionable many times. He works through sinners many times, don't you think?

So the issue is: Has man disobeyed God or has God called man to obey him?  
The articles seem to reveal the answer. Do we have a right to dispute that?

Diane

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/2/2 10:09

Diane;

Quote:

-----The overall message to me: Do not make judgments or assumptions on something you know nothing about.

Which was the whole point of bringing it forth, to get the perspective from his point of standing.

To be in his shoes and to hear it from himself. Had a hunch that this was the case. I agree Diane and was humbled as well.

Quote:

-----What are we to think of Steve Saint's dream? It is simple. God would never act contrary to His own Scriptures. That would be the penultimate confusion. If God does not act strictly in accordance with His own revelation, it would be impossible to know anything for certain. This is not to "put God in a box." It is rather to honor God by taking Him at His Word.

It is not simple, that is the whole point, it is rather difficult and messy and muddy. Don't misunderstand, just as was rightly pointed out by Randy and even by yourself, the issues of the situation don't go away or are ignored but think you are pushing the wrong sentiment by way of using those scriptures, that is going too far, just as this is;

Quote:

-----In further justification of his support for the homosexual activist in the role of his father, Steve Saint said, "God works in mysterious ways, his wonders to perform." This is Hollywood's favorite Bible verse and has been quoted in countless movies, but of course it is nowhere in the Bible!

That is not a bible verse by the way. And seems you are here twisting intent with justification and support. It was acknowledged that this could have been handled differently and that all the other items *should* have, *could* have been caught before hand. What would you say to the issue that was brought forth over the dilemma he faced upon finding these things out and whether to call or not call a press conference? The things he had to wrestle with, whichever way he chose after the fact he could not win. Yours, mine all of our opinions are worthless. We can sit here with the pro's and con's of the matter and still completely miss the point, that he found himself in a great dilemma and is now also finding that he can be beat up by both 'sides', precisely where I am finding this creeping into the lives of saints in a wrong manner and the expressions that come forth out of our own hearts. We like to think we have all the easy answers to these kinds of things when we haven't even experienced them as the ones that are in these kinds of situations, but to assuage the difficulty of the dilemma will give our 'positions' our 'support' in a easy black and white construct.

There is a tension in this walk, to know things, to understand a situation from afar, to know all the issues and still refuse a splitting off into either/or and giving our worthless opinion on matters when we do not have all the facts on. Just as surely this will be misunderstood and maybe that is the point. To suffer even that. The problem is in trying to put oneself into his shoes. It is partially an impossibility and for some even to attempt to see it from that perspective is too much to even ask for, because our opinion of how things ought to have been done even with the rightness of what that entails still doesn't allow for an appreciation of the difficulty. I don't think one can get there fully without having been in the situation in time and space, all the peripheral things going on ... to climb inside his head and suffer the things he had to suffer and deal with. I thought he expressed them well enough, he wasn't blinded to the situation at all, he knew the issues once they were presented and the dilemma he was in and what to do? Pray and then do what he felt the Lord would have him to do.

Trying to extract a bottom line out of all this is just as difficult. To hear all the extremes from giving license to liberty, support and/or justification ... the only reason to even bring this forth in the first place was an attempt to get us to look at our own reactions and our own selves and just how bound up we can be in our opinions.

It seems we can forget that a great deal of this life is in suffering of all sorts and kinds, not 'always' as in up on the surface but underneath it all, for we should just as well have a measure of great joy. Maybe the tension I speak of is just this;

2Co 4:10 Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body.

Think there is a great lesson out of all this if we could just enter into it.

**Re:, on: 2006/2/2 10:11**

Quote:

-----So the issue is: Has man disobeyed God or has God called man to obey him?  
-----

God did not call these folks to be unequally yoked together with an unbeliever in order to advance the kingdom. If He did ... then He went against His very Word, and can not be trusted in any of His Word.

Quote:

-----The articles seem to reveal the answer. Do we have a right to dispute that?  
-----

I dont put much stock in dreams when they are in contradiction to the Word of God. People like Benny Hinn have conditioned much of the church to not question anyone who has a so-called "dream" or "vision". The article didnt do anything except raise even more suspicions in my mind.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/2/2 11:36**

Even if the directors and such were guilty of committing some sort of sin in the production of the movie, does that in and of itself make the end product sinful?

What of books you and I read every day? Do you doubt for one second that some people involved in the production of some books we read, Christian ones at that, are possible unregenerate? Does that make the book sinful?

Consider the country you live and and support with the payment of your taxes was one founded on the grounds of outright rebellion against England.

Do we divorce ourselves from this country being that the means that brought the end result of this country's formation was grounded in absolute sinful activity?

Does it bother you if a church puts on a Christmas play, and perhaps many of the young children involved in the play are perhaps unregenerate as it is? Do we boycott such plays because of this? If not for young children who are sinful, why with a Christian movie?

**Re:, on: 2006/2/2 11:47**

Quote:

-----Even if the directors and such were guilty of committing some sort of sin in the production of the movie, does that in and of itself make the end product sinful?  
-----

I dont think the discussion has ever been about whether the end product is bad, or if it would be sinful to see it. At least it hasnt been for me.

I did mention that I probably wont let my kids see it because I dont want them to think that it's ok to be unequally yoked as these folks were with Chad Allen. I still stand by that.

However, to financially support could send the wrong message to the folks who produced it...

Krispy

**Where is the line? - posted by ccchhhrrriiss () , on: 2006/2/2 12:54**

Hello...!

I was never able to watch the film in my town -- because the local cinema didn't include the film in their lineup. I looked up the film's box office tally, and thus far, it obviously hasn't been seen by many people. Still, I may travel to Corpus Christi, Texas (about an hour north from my school) and watch it there.

I also feel that it is regrettable that the producers chose a homosexual activist to portray such an important role in this film. This seems to be the practice in nearly all "christian" films. I don't know if the filmmakers do this because they feel that they are getting the "best" actors for the role, in an attempt to increase the box office draw, or both.

Quote:

-----I did mention that I probably won't let my kids see it because I don't want them to think that it's ok to be unequally yoked as these folks were with Chad Allen. I still stand by that.

However, to financially support could send the wrong message to the folks who produced it...

-----  
Do we apply this same standard to the restaurants in which we eat, the stores and products that we buy, the internet service providers, the newspapers, the "christian" book and music sellers, etc...? Many of these businesses have sinful men and women working for them. The sporting events that we watch are often sponsored by the hellish alcohol industry, and produced by men of questionable lifestyles and habits. The sneakers and clothing that we purchase are often made in godless nations with quasi-slave labor. If we use this mentality for making purchases, will we also stop driving automobiles if they are made in Japan (or even by non-christian mechanics)?

If this is the standard by which we judge "where our money goes" or our "participation" with this world -- don't you think that we are becoming a little like the "amish?" Yes, I believe that we are to separate ourselves from this world -- but not in a *physical* sense.

I don't mean to sound like I am defending this film. Nor do I want to sound like I am condoning anything in the entertainment industry. I'm not. And I definitely do not want to sound like I am being "soft on sin." Sin is always disgusting in the sight of God. But God has placed each of us in our own communities in this time of history.

I do believe that worldliness has crept into the Church over the last couple of decades. I would never attend a church where the pastor is practicing gross sin like homosexuality or adultery. However, I attend classes at a University that are often led by godless men and women. I eat at restaurants where I do not know the spiritual condition of the servers, cooks or owners. I drive a Ford Escape that was built by individuals that may not know Christ -- and by a company that sponsors some very questionable events.

Where is the line drawn between "worldliness" and "godliness?"

:~)

**Re: Where is the line?, on: 2006/2/2 13:21**

There is a difference between shopping at Walmart, and yoking together with unbelievers in the name of God.

And if I know a store, restaurant, etc openly supports a cause that I consider sinful or wrong, I make a conscience effort to make sure they don't get my money. I'm sure I'm not batting a thousand on that... but I do the best I can.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by crsschk () , on: 2006/2/2 15:46**

Chris, did you happen to read the article(s)?

Krispy, have you ever done a study on being unequally yoked? It's not pointed nor have I delved completely into it. What I do recall from past reading and listening is that it would be a bit beyond this particular situation.

**Re: - posted by nacl (), on: 2006/2/2 15:53**

Quote:

-----  
sermonindex wrote:

Quote:

-----... I personally think that Christians can do without the "end of the spear" why do we NEED it? when has the church been so desperate to guard and maintain our slice of the world? we are called to forsake it. I am tired of blockbuster Christian movies.. We need the power of the Holy Spirit .. we need apostolic success.  
-----

I (little though I be) have to agree on many levels with brother Greg here.

I will not go so far as to say that movies are inherently sinful. But why do we Christians continue to see them? Why do we spend **God's** money on them. Last time I went to the theater, it cost \$6 per ticket.

Don't we watch movies, Christian or not, in order to have an emotional experience? I've been there. It's a powerful attraction. But for a child of God, is an emotional experience good enough? Those who enjoy true intimacy with the Lord will look upon such feelings as undeserving of their attention. When we experience revival, we will not need or even want such base experiences. (note: I do not count myself to be one of these people yet)

And back to the issue of money: how much money did it cost to make End of the Spear? And how much money will Christian people spend in going to see it? I am not talking about bringing an unbeliever for the purpose of using the movie as an opportunity to evangelize (though we it is sad that we would need a movie to proclaim the gospel). I am speaking of going to have a "good time" or whatever. There are parts of the body of Christ worldwide who lack food, clean water, clothes, etc., and we American Christians spend untold millions on entertaining ourselves with things like Christian movies. We are not suffering with our brothers (1 Cor.12:26), we aren't bearing their infirmities (Rom.15:1, Gal.6:2), but pleasing ourselves (Rom.15:1). We are not loving our neighbors as ourselves (Mark 12:31, Jam.3:15-16).

Maybe we should reexamine our motives in times like these, myself included....

Humbly,  
D.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/2/2 16:24**

My fiancé and I went to see End of the Spear not for an emotional experience or for sheer entertainment, we went to ultimately be edified. I received a bit of edification from it, not bad for \$6. Cheaper than buying the book that it was based on to top it off, and shipped to me. To top it off, half the proceeds go to helping the tribal community they evangelized.

Jesus said the weightier matters of the law are justice, mercy, and faithfulness. I fear some of us reject this movie because perhaps we lack a little mercy.

**Re:, on: 2006/2/2 16:34**

Quote:

-----Krispy, have you ever done a study on being unequally yoked? It's not pointed nor have I delved completely into it. What I do recall from past reading and listening is that it would be a bit beyond this particular situation.  
-----

Actually I've studied and taught on it a number of times. I think what we're really getting down to here is subjective opinion.

If a sound technician on the crew was gay and struggling with it, that may not be such a big deal...and who would have known about it? But to select a high profile gay activist who is proud of his sin to be the shining star of the end product definitely falls under the category of unequally yoked. Chad Allen will be the "face" of this movie.

And I still can't get past my own opinion that this was done for the sake of the controversy. What better way to generate publicity?

I give you all my word on this... when it comes out on DVD and I can find someone to loan it to me (in other words: free) I will watch it. Don't want anyone thinking I'm afraid to see it.

Krispy