



**News and Current Events :: Question for you all**

**Question for you all - posted by elias7291 (), on: 2012/4/30 17:11**

Beloved,

I just read an article on CNN that describes how columnist and gay rights activist Dan Savage called the Bible "B.....S..." (please excuse me brother greg if that particular reference is inappropriate. please do feel to remove it if you feel its a violation) when speaking on gay issues at a local high school.

This prompted several students at the high school who were present during the speech (the article doesn't mention if the students were Christian or not) walk out and Savage further attacked them after they had stepped aside.

My question is: is it better to just stay put or does one walk out if our precious faith is insulted? For one thing we are called to defend the faith in a loving manner but in another sense we can see the example of Christ who said nothing when He was being accused during His trial. What do you all think?

Personally I'm leaning more towards staying put and showing humility and letting God be God.

All the Blessings,

Elias

**Re: Question for you all, on: 2012/4/30 17:27**

"Personally I'm leaning more towards staying put and showing humility and letting God be God."

I think you are leaning in the right direction unless your faith is weak then i would get out of dodge!

**Re: Question for you all - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2012/4/30 18:03**

Hi elias7291,

After reading an article about this event, I realized that it probably would not have been "news" if these students didn't walk out.

These students were upset BECAUSE of the vicious attacks by a man who was ironically "preaching" about "tolerance" to their fellow students. Yet, it seems that Christianity is "open game" for individuals like this because of its incompatibility with their views on morality. Christ truly is a "stumbling block" to those in this world who want to push their own morality on others and even make it the law of the land.

They simultaneously demonstrate their hypocrisy when they bitterly accuse others (like Christians) of doing the very same thing that they hope to accomplish -- defining and legislating what is "moral" and "just."

In this case, the speaker proved (once again) that the "new morality" and "justice" of the age is meant to redefine the concept of "tolerance." They are literally calling something "good" that is not "good" and then hurling insults at anyone who does not accept a particular lifestyle.

I think that it is possible to do both (stay put and walk out). I don't think that any of those who walked out of the meeting were demonstrating a lack of humility. Moses was a humble guy (Numbers 12:3)...but he didn't condone sin either.

I suspect that John Baptist was humble guy too -- but that didn't stop him from pointing out the unlawfulness of a king taking his brother's wife. Of course, John paid for it with imprisonment and, ultimately, his life (Mark 6:14-29).

Those who walked out did not react with sinful behavior. They were simply pointing out to something that was not right. Paul did this by invoking his Roman citizenship when he was stretched out to be beaten (Acts 22:22-29).

Interestingly, I think that there is an important notion that is often overlooked in Acts chapter 23.

When Paul was being judged by members of the Sanhedrin, Ananias ordered that Paul be struck in the mouth (verse 2). Paul's response? It wasn't silence. In Acts 23:3, Paul's response was rather pointed: "God shall smite thee, thou white d wall: for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?"

However, someone pointed out that Paul had "revilist" (or "insulted") the high priest. At this point, the high priest was NOT a Christian or spiritual leader. He was the leader of a religious group that rejected the truth. Paul composed himself and actually APOLOGIZED. He said, "I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest: for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people" (Acts 23:5).

I think that this is quite telling.

The Apostle Paul responded to a physical attack. When he found out who it was that ordered the attack (the "ruler" of a people), he apologized for that response (even though there was much truth in what he said). He then injected a bit of "organizational chaos" by subtly pointing out the hypocrisy of two opposing groups -- Sadducees and Pharisees -- who were united in their persecution of Paul (Acts 23:6-7).

So, it is possible that a response can be both candid and abrasive and still fit within the constraints of the humility of believers. However, we should refrain from attacking or insulting the "ruler" of a people. Of course, this also might be worth consideration for those who might speak evil (even if they feel that they are telling the truth) of other "rulers" too.

In this case, the speaker is NOT a "ruler." He is simply a homosexual activist who goes around the country speaking about "tolerance" while simultaneously complaining about Christians, the Bible and any person who doesn't accept his own views on sexuality and other social considerations.