

When We Disagree

By Doy Moyer

- 1. Be generous.** Assume the best first. Don't assign evil motives to other parties. They may have intended something else. Let the principles of love guide our discussions (1 Cor.13).
- 2. Be respectful.** Don't begin a response by insulting and insinuating that the other parties are intellectually deficient. Just address the issue without resorting to ad hominem attacks. Kindness and respectfulness should mark all conversations.
- 3. Be willing.** It's possible that we misunderstood something. Be willing to discuss and foster good communication through definition and clarification.
- 4. Be open.** It's possible that we are wrong ourselves and haven't thought something through. Consider the other position and make sure that we understand it before rejecting it outright. If we are still sure that we disagree, then proceed with the other principles still in mind.
- 5. Be direct.** Being generous and kind does not mean that we have to beat around the bush when we address

the issue. State clearly the objection and the reasons for the disagreement.

- 6. Be honorable.** We all make honest mistakes in our reasoning and conclusions, but if we purposefully twist or distort something in order to win an argument, we have crossed over into dishonesty. This is never honorable or right.
- 7. Be committed.** First, be committed to the Lord and His truth. Then be committed to the well-being of others. Winning an argument is pointless just for its own sake.
- 8. Be logical.** It is one matter to just state, "I disagree," or to just state a contrary proposition. It is another matter to state the disagreement along with reasons. Learn how to make actual arguments. If we want others to consider our positions, we need to be able to give the "because" for our positions. If we can't state the "because," then we don't have adequate grounds for actual discussion.

Classes This Week

**Sunday 5:15 PM
Kids Class at the Building**

Brad Marshall (Allie Hosey's Cousin)	Jesse Godwin (Troy's father and Mac's grandfather)	Frank Hand (Laura Humphrey's dad)	Louise Pack (Anna and Christopher's grandmother)
Gloria Detmer and Carol Dickerson (Toni Herd's Sisters)	Don Lanier (Father of Greg Lanier)	David Hartsell (Holly and Brad's Father)	Wanda Price (Ada Owen's sister)
Betty Mcareavey (Mary Ann Roberts' mom)	Audrey Barnett (Joanetta's sister-in-law)	Betty Bradford	Hazel Gilliland (Toni's relatives)
Tom Davis (Walker Davis' Uncle)	Joy Powell (Tori Luther's grandmother)	Danny Weldon (Rusty Weldon's brother)	William Smith (Ken Sullivan's brother)
Gerald White (Christopher, Anna and Wesley's Father)	William Herd	Rebecca Davis (Chuck Hahn's Niece)	Ray Humphrey (Seth's dad)
John M. Rhodes and Bonnie Rhodes Kirkley (Toni Herd's family)	Joe Perkins (Scott Perkin's Dad)	Aubrey Meeks (Toni Herd's Nephew)	Eleanor McKay (friend of Erica)

November Birthdays

- 2-Debbi Coleman
- 6-Troy Godwin
- 6-Bridgette Borden
- 7-Amy Godwin
- 8-Ashley Miller
- 9-Darla Hahn
- 9-Casie Spencer
- 11-Andrew Hahn
- 12-Randal Porterfield
- 13-Toni Herd
- 13-Emerson Daniels
- 13-Dylan Bartlett
- 13-Ronaldo Henriquez
- 15-Jon Hornback
- 16-Nicole Pender
- 16-Victoria Dunaway
- 16-Alexander Dunaway
- 23-Mary Ann Roberts
- 24-John Burns
- 25-Olyvia Winslett
- 25-Silas Weldon
- 27-Scott Fowler
- 28-Will Harris
- 30-David Simpson

News and Notes

- ☒ - Esther Biddle came home this week and has begun physical therapy.
- ☒ - We rejoice that Alex Nguyen was baptized into Christ last Sunday night!
- ☒ - Please remember the family of Eleanor McKay who passed away recently after battling leukemia.
- ☒ - Please pray for William Herd's dad, Charles, who is serious condition in California.
- ☒ - Please remember Katie Jasper's grandfather, Randy Jasper, in your prayers. He had a heart attack this week and received a stent and is now at home.
- ☒ - Please remember Betty Bradford in your prayers as she struggles with her health.
- ☒ - Please pray for Gerald "Brub" Coleman, Jon's dad, who will have corrective bladder surgery on Tuesday.
- ☒ - The flower fund low. See Mary Ann Roberts to make a contribution.
- ☒ - We are thankful that Jon Coleman's dad came home this week from a successful surgery!
- ☒ - Gerald White continues to make progress at home!

The Auburn Beacon

A weekly publication of the University church of Christ in Auburn, Alabama



Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father in heaven. (Matthew 5:16)

Volume 7, Issue 3

November 22, 2015

Postfixed Divorces

By Edward O. Bragwell, Sr.

Thoughts to Ponder

"And I say to you, whoever divorces his wife, except for sexual immorality, and marries another, commits adultery; and whoever marries her who is divorced commits adultery."
(Matthew 19:9)

In grammar, a postfix (or suffix) is "a sound, syllable, or syllables added at the end of a word or word base to change its meaning, give it grammatical function, or form a new word" (Webster's New World Dictionary).

It occurs to me that postfixing (to fix after) is what some are do accounts of their divorces. Often there is the account given at the time of the divorce and then a postfixed one given at the time of remarriage. The story is now fixed, after the fact, to include scriptural grounds for divorce. Why? Because the scriptural reason is now far more important than it was at the time of the divorce.

A person is in a difficult marriage. Things have gotten so bad that divorce seems to be the only way out. The person is so disgusted and hurt by this marriage that he or she just wants out. To find another mate? Never! He has had it with this marriage. He has had it with marriage —period. The quicker he can end this misery the better. So, he gets the divorce, using the easiest provable grounds he can find that the state will accept (which is almost any reason or no reason) to

But, remember the Lord knows the real facts. He will not be mocked. His memory does not become fuzzy with time nor biased by desire.

get the divorce over with. He is fed up with this intolerable situation.

Had the person's spouse committed fornication? He says he (or she) really doesn't know and moreover it really doesn't matter —because he is going to get the divorce anyway. But, what if he should change his mind later and decide to remarry? He assures us that this is not going to happen. But it does!

Years ago, I was riding a bus to a meeting in Georgetown, Kentucky. A young lady with two small children boarded the bus at Louisville and took a seat directly behind me. Just outside of Louisville a man

(Continued on page 2)

Elders
Walker Davis
(334) 703-0050
Larry Rouse
(334) 734-2133

SCHEDULE OF SERVICES Sunday

Bible Class9:30 AM
Worship10:20 AM
Evening Worship 6:00 PM

Wednesday

Bible Classes.....7:00 PM

E-Mail:
larryrouse@aubeacon.com

Larry Rouse
Evangelist and Editor

Find us on the Internet: www.auchurch.com and www.aubeacon.com

(Continued from page 1)

boarded and sat down just across the aisle from the young lady. She was in a talkative mood. She began telling the story of her life. She had just gotten a divorce and was on the way back to her parents. She was disgusted with men in general. If she could just make it to her parents, she would make it just fine, without ever looking at a man as long as she lived. This kind of talk went on for several minutes. Finally, the man across the aisle began talking with her. He did not have a wife and needed one. By the time we stopped in Frankfort the young lady had been talked into getting off the bus there with her new friend with the view of giving further consideration to their possible marriage. How quickly the mind changes.

While that young lady's case may be an extreme example, it illustrates how easily minds are sometimes changed. We know of several cases where divorced people have adamantly affirmed that they would never want another spouse, but have changed their minds with the passing of time — some within a few weeks, some within a few months, and others within a few years. They meet the new love of their lives and would like for their new marriage to be scriptural and accepted by faithful brethren. So, now the "postfixing" begins.

Maybe they did have scriptural ground for divorce after all. So, they begin the quest for evidence by recalling things that happened before their divorce that seems now to point to the unfaithfulness of the ex-spouse. Why did they not bring these things up before? Could it be that they were so bent on getting out of the marriage they simply overlooked them? Or, could it be that they are now more concerned about the divorce's being scriptural than they were at the time? Or, could it be that, with the passing of time and the increased desire to have the right to another spouse, the facts(?) that were fuzzy at the time have become clearer as the desire to remarry has become stronger? At any rate, they are now convinced that they did have scriptural grounds after all, but because of the pressure at the time of the divorce they did not use them. They can now marry their new love convinced that they are alright and that good

brethren will accept the facts(?) as they are now being presented.

But, alas, the scripture still reads, "But I say to you that whoever divorces his wife for any reason except sexual immorality causes her to commit adultery; and whoever marries a woman who is divorced commits adultery." (Matt. 5:32 NKJV). "And I say to you whoever divorces his wife, except for sexual immorality, and marries another commits adultery..." (Matt. 19:9 NKJV). My friend, sexual immorality has to be the reason for the divorce - not an afterthought to justify another marriage.

The person who has "postfixed" his divorce story might or might not have found the scriptural reason for divorce had he or she investigated enough at the time. But he did not. He was only interested in getting out of an undesirable marriage. The fact is: he divorced his spouse for reason(s) other than fornication (sexual immorality). Whether or not the divorced partner was guilty of fornication at the time or prior to the divorce is not really germane to the question at this late date. The fact remains the spouse was not divorced for that reason. The spouse was divorced for a reason other than fornication. Fornication, among other things, may have even been suspected at the time — but it was not the reason for the divorce action.

It is dangerous to re-write a divorce story to fit the present need and desire for a scriptural marriage. Like necessity, desire is the mother of inventions. A desire to remarry that was not present at the time of divorce can easily cause one to rearrange the facts(?) to justify the present situation.

One may come to believe his revised version. The brethren may accept it. But, remember the Lord knows the real facts. He will not be mocked. His memory does not become fuzzy with time nor biased by desire.

Again, if you are divorced and want to remarry. The only way that you can do it within the bounds of scriptural authority is for fornication (sexual immorality) to have been the reason (at the time) that you divorced your former spouse — assuming that the one you want to marry now has a scriptural right to marry.



What Is Wrong With Debating?

By Aubrey Belue

That is a question I have heard "debated" for as long as I have tried to preach the gospel. Besides the obvious, that it has a "bad name" among many brethren today, what is different from "contending," "arguing" and "disputing" — all of which are scriptural descriptions of appropriate interaction (when called for) between those who profess to share a "love of the truth"?

But after all is said and done, if we DON'T advance "sound doctrine" both "in season and out of season" by all the means assigned to us, we leave a "gap in the wall", and the devil will surely find it!

only when such circumstances develop that a person's potential for either good or bad spirit is exposed — **1 Cor 11:19**

Does it cast the "church of Christ" in a bad light? Brethren, that "train has done left the station"! Back as far as the New Testament, Christians were considered a "sect" and were universally stigmatized for

"turning the world upside down".

Is it too confrontational? (It is hard to imagine being more "confrontational" than the spirit which is demanded when there are those "whose mouths must be stopped" because they are "vain talkers and deceivers" who "teach things they ought not" -- **Titus 1:9-11**)

Does it polarize the two "sides"? (How is that not a good thing, at least in the sense of clarifying the contrast between "light and darkness"; "Christ and Belial"; "righteousness and unrighteousness"? Scripturally, there ARE "two sides" and God (at least) wants no confusion between the two. We certainly don't want to be seen as "standing on the other side"!)

Does it "bring out the carnal spirit"? (I submit, you cannot "bring out" anything that is not already there! Is this not a reaction those who do not want the truth have to it when challenged with it? What was different regarding the message. or even the manner of delivery, which was delivered on Pentecost (**Acts 2**) from that given by Stephen to his audience (**Acts 7**)?—conversely, often it is

I have been trying to preach and defend gospel truth for 65 years, and have not yet found a way to "contend" without contending; to "argue" without arguing, and "dispute" without disputing! Without doubt, belligerence, haughtiness, or mean spiritedness happen — and leave a bad taste in our mouths.

But after all is said and done, if we DON'T advance "sound doctrine" both "in season and out of season" by all the means assigned to us, we leave a "gap in the wall", and the devil will surely find it!

I'll tell you one thing debating does do — drawing up a precise difference between opposing views, and being held to a common standard of proof will make it harder for the "slick willies" among us to talk themselves out of the spiritual holes they have dug for themselves and the brethren! — and that might help explain why it is not their favorite thing.

