

## ***KILLING TRUTH***

*David Halbrook*

Bill O'Reilly, a TV host who offers his opinions about news, has written a few books on historical characters who were killed. One is titled Killing Lincoln and another is Killing Jesus. On 12-20-2013, his show could have been titled "Killing Truth." Mr. O'Reilly rebuked Phil Robertson (Duck Commander) for identifying homosexuality as a sin (Mr. Robertson identified adultery, stealing, and drunkenness as sin also). Mr. O'Reilly said that Christians who are like Jesus cannot identify others as sinners or their actions as sin.

The truth is that Jesus identified sinners and sin. He taught that adultery, fornication (which includes homosexuality), and theft are evil things and told one group that their worship was vain (Mk. 7:21-23, 6-7). He trained the apostles to teach people to leave their sins (Lk. 24:47). Peter told husbands that God would not hear their prayers if they mistreated their wives because God is against evildoers (1 Pet. 3:7, 12). Would you tell anyone these things? Jesus did. What would you do if someone said these things to you?

Speaking the truth in love includes identifying sin in self and others (Eph. 4:15). Don't "kill" the truth, obey it! Can we help you learn and obey the truth?

Editor's Note: The subject of this article is probably familiar to several people you know. Find this article in *Arkansas Weekly* and help others to do the same.

### **Simple opportunities to teach the lost and assist each other.**

Pray for: Janice White, The Ledgerwoods, Samuel Southall, and others with ongoing trials, our brethren who are travelling, and new Christians among us.

Will you help with the signboard out front or offer an idea of how to use it?

*We assemble each Sunday at 10AM, 10:45AM, 5PM & Wednesday at 7PM*

Church of Christ—Quail Valley  
4104 E. Harrison St.  
Batesville, AR 72501  
Office- (870) 793-6700

Evangelist:  
David Halbrook 569-4491

# The Exhorter

Acts 11:23 *Exhorted them all... cleave unto the Lord*

Church of Christ--Quail Valley

January 12, 2014

[WWW.QVCOC.COM](http://WWW.QVCOC.COM)

## ***INCONSISTENCY OF ATHEISM: MORAL LAW***

*Luther Blackmon*

I have asked atheists why they consider it more immoral to kill a man than to kill a rat. After all, man is just animal matter, an improved monkey or a glorified ape. If he is not a direct "ascendant" of the rat, he is at least a cousin, according to atheistic evolution.

James Bales, in debate with a Mr. Teller, atheist, asked him what objection he could register if the citizens of that town should want to lynch him. He answered, "It would be unpleasant." I would think so. But if 100 men found it pleasant to hang Mr. Teller, he should not complain because 100 to 1 are pretty good odds.

That's real democracy at work. If there is no God, then there is no such thing as "right" or "wrong" except as men decide it, and what better way to decide what is best and pleasant than on a democratic basis? Of course, our civil laws protect men like Mr. Teller. But these civil laws are based on the "moral" law which was taken from the Bible. They were enacted by men who believe that the Bible came from God.

On the platform of atheistic evolution, who can say that Hitler did "wrong" when he butchered millions of Jews, and tried, by purging the weak and by selective breeding, to produce a nation of super-men? He was the strongest and his crowd the biggest in Germany at that time.

We destroy our dogs when they get old and sick. We ship our old horses off to make glue, fertilizer and dog-food. Why not take our old people, when they are no longer useful, and destroy them? Why not destroy a child who had the misfortune to be born deformed as we would a deformed puppy?

I challenge the atheistic evolutionist, every inch of him, from dandruff to bunion, whether he is illiterate or has a string of degrees as long as a well rope, to affirm that this would be "wrong" if the most of the people wanted it this way and made it law. It

is safe enough for the atheist to teach his theories in a country where the law-making bodies ignore his theories when they enact laws. He will be safe enough as long as he is protected by laws which were enacted by men who believe in the God he denies. But if the law-makers ever start acting like they believe the theories of atheistic evolution, lookout!  
(*Truth Magazine*, XVIII:28, p. 2 May 16, 1974)

---

***TWO QUESTIONS RELATED TO:  
MAY A SPOUSE WHO COMMITS ADULTERY  
MARRY ANOTHER?***

*David Halbrook*

{I have recently been asked these two questions. Let us all *rightly divide the word of truth* so that we may *understand the will of the Lord* 2 Tim. 2:15; Eph. 5:17}

1. Does Jesus only speak of the husband putting away the wife? May a wife ever leave, or send away, the husband?

This question may arise because if we only read Matthew's record of Jesus' teachings. The book of Matthew was primarily written to Jews, whose divine laws and human traditions regarding divorce were different for men and women. The book of Mark was written to a Gentile audience who commonly saw husbands leave wives and wives leave husbands. Mark's record will answer this question "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery against her. And if a woman divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery" (Mk. 10:11-12). Jesus' laws of marriage apply equally to male and female.

2. In Matthew 5:32 and 19:9, Jesus' statement "except for sexual immorality" obviously permits the original husband who has not committed sexual immorality to remarry if his wife commits sexual immorality. Does this exception also apply to the end of these verses, also permitting the woman, though guilty of sexual immorality, to marry another man?

There are two ways of answering this question.

The first is based in the rules of language (grammar). Since Jesus spoke in language that conformed to grammar, this is legitimate. Both statements of Jesus in Matthew are "complex sentences" (meaning the sentence is composed of several independent clauses. I'm sorry if I've lost you there but this is the nature of language and grammar. Please don't take my word for it and don't ignore it—learn for yourself.

Any English or grammar teacher should be able to explain this if you have questions). Because each clause is independent, it does not rely (depend) on the other clauses to express its complete thought. So, we are not free to borrow words or a meaning from one clause and drop it in into another clause (for they are "independent clauses"). So, what is said of the spouse in the first part of these verses does not automatically apply to the spouse in the second part of these verses. When no sexual immorality has occurred, Jesus addresses both spouses independently and says they both commit adultery if they marry another person. When sexual immorality has occurred, Jesus only gives the spouse who did not commit sexual immorality permission to marry again if he leaves, or sends away, his spouse for sexual immorality.

The second answer completely relies on the first answer. If the first point is not true, I would not try to prove this point in this second way. It only strengthens the first point. If, in a marriage where one spouse has committed sexual immorality, both spouses are permitted to leave each other and marry someone else, this ends up encouraging sexual immorality. If we can agree that Jesus has forbidden remarriage in the absence of sexual immorality, then this point should be clear. If two spouses are not happy because, in typical American style, they have "irreconcilable differences" then they must remain together, according to Jesus. The more they sin against each other, the more miserable they become yet neither can leave or remarry and still please God! However, if sexual immorality permits both spouses to remarry, then sexual immorality becomes a "loophole" to end an unhappy marriage. All that has to happen for those with "irreconcilable differences" is for one of them to sin by committing sexual immorality, then they can both remarry—a twisted earthly reward for sin! Thus, the deterrent to committing sexual immorality is somewhat weakened.

In 1 Corinthians 6:18, Paul says "Flee sexual immorality. Every sin that a man does is outside the body, but he who commits sexual immorality sins against his own body." While all sins have the same spiritual consequences between us and God, Paul says that sexual immorality is more serious in some physical ways, involving "his own body" in a way that other sins do not. This being so, Jesus' teaching about sexual immorality in marriage (wherein two people are obligated to be sexually faithful) is consistent with the nature of sexual immorality. The seriousness of the consequence is consistent with the seriousness of the sin.