The reaction at Piedmont Hill High has been intense. Some are supportive, but many object (what do you expect from worldly-minded people?). Here is a summary of the negative reactions:

- 1. The uniforms are expensive (after all, they cost \$300 and now the girls are being told they can't wear them!).
- 2. They are being unfair. The girls are made to feel like outcasts (since they still wear them at the games).
- 3. It's hot (95 degrees). (Weather dictated modesty!)

Sounds a lot like what some Christians say when the immodesty of cheerleading outfits worn by their daughters is pointed out. Instead of repentance, preachers have been pressured to "move on" (even fired) when they preach the truth on such immodesty. This ought not to be so! We cannot let the world set the standard of modesty. The world tolerates what God says is sin (1 Jno. 2:15-17; Eph. 5:6-11). Don't be worldly!

-- Editor's Note: Our Arkansas Weekly article this week is titled "Lessons From The Flood (2): A Record of Human History." Even in a generally conservative area like ours, there is a generation growing up that is skeptical about the Bible. This article reminds the reader that the Bible is a record of genuine human history. Find the article along with someone to give it to or a community bulletin board to "tack" it to.

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

Evangelists:
David Halbrook 569-4491
Lenoard Westbrook 612-8409

The Exhorter

Acts 11:23 Exhorted them all... cleave unto the Lord Church of Christ--Quail Valley October 2, 2011

WWW.QVCOC.COM

TILL TERRIBLE ILLNESS DO WE PART

Jarrod Jacobs (www.southside-churchofchrist.com/publish/publish.htm)

In yet another attack against God's will for marriage and its permanency, Pat Robertson, host of "The 700 Club," has emerged to said that a person whose spouse has Alzheimer's disease could divorce the ailing spouse and find someone else. This statement was broadcast on his television show on Tuesday, September 13, 2011. He included the caveat that the divorcing spouse ought to provide for "custodial care" for the ill spouse, but otherwise, the person, according to Robertson, would be justified in divorcing the spouse and marrying another.

Robertson's co-host on the show asked him such questions as: "What about 'for better or for worse?' and, 'in sickness and in health'?" She went on to say, "If you respect that vow, you say 'til death do us part'." Robertson's response was: "This is a kind of death." According to Robertson, since the ailing person is enduring a "kind of death" in losing cognitive function, then this justifies the healthier person's decision to divorce and find a similarly healthy mate! How horrible! In addition to Robertson's statement being completely anti-Scriptural (Matt. 5:32, 19:9; Rom. 7:2-3; etc.), it is also unethical, reprehensible, irresponsible, and just down-right mean to entertain thoughts that when a spouse gets "too sick", then the healthy spouse would have God's sanction to divorce and find someone else!

Based on Robertson's reasoning, wouldn't the person who has a spouse dying of terminal cancer also be justified in divorcing and marrying someone healthier? So long as "custodial care" was provided, of course! After all, the ravages one suffers as terminal cancer spreads through the body is a "kind of death," too! What about lung diseases, heart diseases, bone diseases, etc.? Actually, once we are born we begin to die (Gen. 3:17-19; Ecc. 9:5; Heb. 9:27; Ecc. 12:7). Therefore, are we not all suffering a "kind of death" as we move toward our "eternal home" daily (Ecc. 12:5)? Based upon Pat's reasoning, I wonder why Mrs. Robertson would want to stay married to Pat at all when she can simply provide for his "custodial care" and find a healthier spouse?

I am glad to see many in our country outraged by Robertson's words. I was sorry though, that people spoke in outrage merely from the standpoint of feelings, rather than Scripture. This is because much of our population is ignorant of God's words (Hos. 4:6), and ignorant of the fact that it is God who instituted marriage in the first place!

What, then, has God said concerning marriage and its permanency? May spouses divorce when bad problems come, such as one spouse gets an incurable disease? Let us note that God spoke about marriage in both the Old and New Testaments. He said

"Then the LORD God said, "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a helper fit for him So the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and while he slept took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh. And the rib that the LORD God had taken from the man he made into a woman and brought her to the man. Then the man said, "This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh" (Gen. 2:18-24).

"And Pharisees came up to him and tested him by asking, 'Is it lawful to divorce one's wife for any cause?' He answered, 'Have you not read that he who created them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, 'Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh? So they are no longer two but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let not man separate'" (Matt. 19:3-6; Mk. 10:7-9).

"For a married woman is bound by law to her husband while he lives, but if her husband dies she is released from the law of marriage. Accordingly, she will be called an adulteress if she lives with another man while her husband is alive. But if her husband dies, she is free from that law, and if she marries another man she is not an adulteress" (Rom. 7:2-3).

A cursory reading of these texts shows us that God's will for marriage and Pat Robertson's will are diametrically opposed! In truth, when hard times come to a marriage (and they will), THIS is the time that we ought to turn to God and lean upon Him all the more (I Pet. 5:7)!

It is difficult to imagine all the emotion one feels when a spouse has contracted a fatal disease, or a disease from which there is no cure like Alzheimer's. However, one who knows the Lord's will (Rom. 7:2-3) and one who loves his spouse as himself (Eph. 5:28-29; Titus 2:4), would not think of abandoning his life-long love, partner in life, and parent of the children, etc., at this time in life when the need is the greatest! Truly, let us "love thy neighbor as thyself"! This, the "second commandment", applies in the home as well as among strangers (Matt. 22:39)! Can we think of any greater expression of such love than when we see the healthier spouse caring for the ill spouse in those final years? What selfishness it displays when people are encouraged to divorce a life-long spouse when the problems of life are the greatest! Shame on us!

What makes this worse is to learn that Pat's view is not unique. In fact, a man named Stephen Gola wrote a book entitled: <u>Divorce Hope</u> wherein he encourages people to get out of what he calls "bad marriages" in order to find "good marriages." He suggests that there is such a thing as doing the right thing for "too long" and that God supports your divorce even if the church does not! What convoluted thinking is this? Please go back and read what the

Bible reveals concerning marriage and its permanency. This is yet another occasion where man's thinking is diametrically opposed to God's thinking! In the long ago, Isaiah recorded the following words from God: "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, declares the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts" (Isa. 55:8-9). The apostle Paul said a similar thing to the Corinthians when he wrote by inspiration: "For the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men. For consider your calling, brothers: not many of you were wise according to worldly standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth. But God chose what is foolish in the world to shame the wise; God chose what is weak in the world to shame the strong; God chose what is low and despised in the world, even things that are not, to bring to nothing things that are, so that no human being might boast in the presence of God" (I Cor. 1:25-29).

The home and family are the very foundation of a society. With the current onslaught against the home being waged through "shack-ups" and through folks justifying sodomite marriages; Pat Robertson has done no favors to those of us who love the Lord's will! Let us awake from sleep and be active in teaching our children and grandchildren God's will for marriage. Let us be active by also LIVING it in front of them! (Eph. 5:22-33)

CHEERLEADERS TOLD TO COVER UP

Joe R. Price (The Spirit's Sword – Sept. 25, 2011)

"Gimme an R, gimme an I, gimme an S, gimme a Q, gimme a U, gimme an E -- what does it spell? RISQUÉ!"

I doubt you'll hear that cheer at high school football games this fall. But, the cheerleaders at Piedmont Hills High School, San Jose, CA are being told they cannot wear their cheerleading outfits to school. If they do, they must wear sweat pants under them. The school's administration is cracking down on miniskirts worn by students ("Miniskirt ban at San Jose school also applies to cheerleader uniforms," MercuryNews.com)

We applaud this effort at modesty, even though its view of modesty is not up to biblical standards. Since the skirts are too risqué for the classroom, why are they acceptable before a crowd of people at the football game on Friday night? Additionally, Principal Traci Williams said if the uniforms were mid-thigh "this wouldn't be an issue." (Ibid) We disagree. Scripture teaches that exposing the thigh reveals one's nakedness; a shameful and immodest display (Isa. 47:2-3; Exo. 28:42). Girls (women), mid-thigh skirts/shorts are immodest (1 Tim. 2:9-10). Guys, ditto for bear chests and your shorts. (continued on back page)