

**General Topics :: Nothing Left To Do But Refuse To Obey****Nothing Left To Do But Refuse To Obey - posted by dolfan (), on: 2015/1/24 14:58**

<https://someonehastosay.wordpress.com/2015/01/24/nothing-left-to-do-but-refuse-to-obey/>

Federal court strikes down same sex marriage ban in Alabama.

A call to respond biblically and radically so.

Re: Nothing Left To Do But Refuse To Obey, on: 2015/1/24 17:41

"Branches of government have usurped the power of God".

I couldn't disagree with that statement more than the entire debate of gay/marriage.

I recently heard a nice discussion on this topic via Shane Claiborne, Greg Boyd, and Chuck Colson on 'On Being'.

Link:
<http://www.onbeing.org/program/monastic-revolution/feature/room-chuck-colson-greg-boyd-and-shane-claiborne/522>

Where Shaine compared church and the state issues to mixing ice cream (the church) and poop (the state). Mixing the two together might not make the poop more unappealing but it really does mess up the ice cream.

I encourage you to stop looking at politics. Seriously. Look to Jesus and His teachings in the gospel.

Dominionism and this idea that 'we care what the government thinks about x, y, and z' is *not* gospel.

We as a church need to be undefiled and stop trying to marry the government. In persecution or in freedom, we are to focus ourselves on the lover of our souls, Jesus.

The moment that our government does something that we don't like or approve of, does that stop us from being a Christian? I sure hope not.

How are we cleaning the church? How are we following the gospel? We aren't called to clean the world and it's limited government/rules.

Please, I urge you, and all brethren avoid these issues. Focus on yourselves and being the hands and feet of Jesus. (You fed me when I was hungry, gave me something to drink, etc)

Finally, if you really can't avoid the "soon coming destruction of America ". Remember, God withheld His destruction to many places, for the sake of the elect (Abraham's request to God). Or He warned the righteous to leave (i.e. Lot, Noah, etc). And sometimes He even was turned to when warned (Nineveh).

Re: Had there been 10 righteous in Sodom... - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2015/1/24 22:40

Politics is the soup we live in, whether we like it or not. Western democracies elect their leaders, and live with the consequences of those corporate decisions. When unrighteous men compete with righteous men and convince enough people that their snake oil will be good for them, all live with the result.

But when righteous men and women raise a clear voice of reason and proclaim the virtues of a moral society, righteous men can win the mantle of governance. Politics is the game of getting a good message to a majority of voters, and a game worth playing. To me it is a dimension of the Christian gospel because the principalities and powers against whom we fight are driven by the dark forces of Hell to suppress and destroy both the gospel and those who proclaim it.

We are in a fight, the armor and the weapons of Ephesians six are for every believer- though way too few put them on and live them out.

To be blunt, those who think they can withdraw from the political battle and cuddle with Christ on the sidelines are deluded. They are not armor wearers, not obedient, and will be slaughtered in the fray- all the while weakening the power of those who do stand to fight in the evil day.

He does not call us to win, but He does call us to fight.

(The old soldier in me gets his hackles up over this very quickly. I have no interest in living under ungodly tyranny.)

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2015/1/24 23:17

Sidewalk

With all respect you already live in ungodly tyranny and it will only become more of both.

I am firmly convinced that Christians do not belong in politics. I do not even vote. The early church fathers were so minded, as it happens.

Politics is Mammon with guns. Serve it and we doom our own hope.

There is no battle to win, no ground to gain versus the world system. It is devoted to destruction, and as such a thing it corrupts absolutely the people of God.

Re: , on: 2015/1/24 23:22

Jesus does NOT call us to fight to write laws or enforce laws of the land.

He says 'don't be like the gentiles who LORD it over people'.

Writing a law on the books, that someone doesn't like...sounds a lot like lording (forcing) it over someone.

I'd propose to you that Jesus didn't come to enforce the law but instead to show us that God/rain showers on the righteous and the unrighteous.

Quote:

-----I have no interest in living under ungodly tyranny.

Well sir, Jesus said, those who live by the sword, will die by it. If that's your choice, sad but that's not the model of Jesus nor the early church. Jesus came to show us the weapons we have 'are not of this world'. How did Jesus react when wicked Rome was crucifying Him? He let it happen. How about the early church? Again, non-violent unto martyrdom.

The Church, should never take up the sword, literally. Never. Nor should the Church force others to adhere to its beliefs.

I propose to you. Revival wasn't started because we enforced moral laws on the land but instead, people chose to turn to God. They were persuaded by itinerant preachers, although I'd disagree with their methods (of old time revival preachers), but I can't disagree with their results. People CHOSE to turn to God.

Government, will not, cannot, bring God's kingdom down on earth. Individuals should be encouraged and reasoned with, and loved on to hopefully be persuaded to turn to the living God whom is quick to forgive.

We must guard against this desire to control other people's behaviors. God isn't mocked. We don't need laws on the books for God to punish someone. God doesn't need help enforcing His way.

If I could say it another way, we can't control our spouses. We can't force them to love us. We can't demand they do anything. We can try. We can abuse. But that will NEVER create what we really want in our hearts. Real, true mutual love.

General Topics :: Nothing Left To Do But Refuse To Obey

Our responsibility is to love, not control. When we love our spouses, they are more encouraged to respond in love, than they would by force. Let's do our part and ignore laws of the land because our salvation isn't in a law, it's in the person and work of Jesus Christ. :)

P.S. Thank you dolfan. I was going to make that point too but...got side tracked by sidewalk. :)

Re: , on: 2015/1/24 23:32

I say this speaks more eloquently than I could.

Quote:
-----Our faith, our discipleship is political. But it's very peculiar in how it's political. It spins the whole power paradigm on its head. The language that riddles all throughout the gospels that Jesus uses is political language. "Kingdom" is the same that's used for Empire. "Lord", "Savior" all of those words were. There was already a "lord" and "savior" in Rome. And it wasn't Jesus. In a sense, to call Jesus Lord 2000 years ago is as radical as it would be to say Jesus is my commander in chief, today. And what does that mean and say to us? So we need to renounce that theology, wherever it pops up. I often quote George Bush (Jr?) on Ellis Island, "that the ideals of America are the light of the world and the darkness will not overcome it." It's bad theology. Barack Obama on the David Letterman show this past year (2007) said "America is the last best hope for the planet." That would raise a big flag on our radar too. That we actually found the hope of the world, that we found the light of the world and it shines much brighter than a candidate or a party or even America. So, we should be very careful of that misplaced hope.

- Shane Claiborne at Vanderbilt University, Oct 2 2008

Re: Nothing Left To Do But Refuse To Obey - posted by Lysa (), on: 2015/1/25 8:15

In the last 7 years, I'm sure you guys have noticed it to but instead of becoming a humbled nation crying out to God, the Christians have chosen Republicanism as their hope. I do not think that we should believe that our hope is wrapped up in a "Republican" package. And I blame THAT on the leaders of the organized churches.

But I do believe it is our right to vote as citizens of the United States and I do vote. I do not think that we are to stay completely out of the political arena but that's just me.

But I digress! :) Changing the legal status of homosexuality isn't going to be done in the courts, it seems that it is but we know this to be a 'spiritual battle' not a court battle! Setting them free is going to be done on our knees, praying for our homosexual friends, not writing them off as condemned and bound for hell.

Jesus had compassion on them and healed them ALL, I'm sure there were a few homosexuals in there that got set free. Praise the Lord!

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2015/1/25 9:18

Lysa, praying for them is our only option, and I agree with you on that. Our love will not free them. Our empty gospel will not. We must seek God urgently to intervene in their lives and bring them to repentance.

In Psalm 107, the Psalmist says "Let the redeemed of the Lord say so..." whom He has gathered from every direction. Over a few stanzas he writes of those "wheres" of sin and pride God calls them from. He writes in one that God calls them from the foolish afflictions brought about by their own iniquities. At the end of that stanza, they are "tell of His deed in songs of joy."

That alone is the only hope of the homosexual, and ironically, the hope of the political.

Re: Of course it's messy! - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2015/1/25 15:03

We have danced around this fire before, and it is unlikely we will change each other's minds on this. Many Christians have chosen a pacifist world view to shape their thinking, just as it has been noted that some Christians have embraced the Republican party. Neither is a boat without holes.

I do not make excuses for the Vietnam war, and I could give a lengthy dialog on the errors of all that. But I did go, as a conscientious objector medic, and served for a year with an infantry unit killing and being killed. I go to the Wall in Washington DC and cannot keep from weeping at panel 27E when I look at the names there. This is a part of me that cannot

go away.

But to say I live by the sword is ludicrous. Living by the sword means using deadly force to get the things a person craves in life. Spare me, this does not apply.

I maintain that political activism, even in a worldly system, is a form of self defense. You have probably seen the quote, "All that evil needs to succeed is for good men to do nothing."

The evidence is there. America is under the rule of a man whose major qualification for office is his skin color. With a murky past and a guiding philosophy of Marxist Islam, an overwhelming number of professing Christians don't care, didn't vote, and willingly comply. They rejected the likes of Mike Huckabee, Michelle Bachman, and Duncan Hunter- all qualified candidates with strong Christian foundation.

I must go back to Ephesians 6 and the call to recognize both the nature of the enemy and the command to take up the armor and the weapon. The story of Elisha in II Kings 6 is an excellent illustration of the whole point.

Elisha wore a girdle of truth and a breastplate of righteousness. His feet were shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace, his head was protected by a helmet of salvation, his arm held a shield of faith- and his mouth wielded a mighty sword of the Spirit. Read it for yourself of course, but here is the story:

The king of Syria sent raiding parties regularly to plunder the children of Israel, to take what they wished and hurt who they would. (They lived by the sword...). But there was a problem, the Israelites were way more prepared for the incursions than they should have and the king feared there was a traitor in his camp. But no, it was told to him that the man of God was able to listen in to whatever the king might whisper.

OK, they needed to capture and destroy the man of God so learning that he was in Dothan, a large raiding party was sent there to get him. When by morning light Elisha's servant saw the hostile multitude, he was terrified while Elisha remained calm. By the word from his mouth, wielding the sword of the Spirit, the young man's eyes were opened to see the greater host of heavenly defenders that gave Elisha such confidence.

But it got even better. Wielding that same sword, he blinded the eyes of the Syrians, and told them they needed to go to another place to catch the "Man of God" they were seeking. Like dumb sheep they followed Elisha as he led them right to where the Israelite king and the army had them completely outnumbered. Another swish of Elisha's "sword" and the raider's eyes are opened to see that they are in deep excrement.

When the king of Israel asks Elisha if he should just kill them right here, Elisha swings that Spirit sword again.

"Had you captured these men with your normal weapons, you would not thus kill them. So here is what you are to do, feed them a great feast and send them back to their master!"

When the men returned from their adventure, the King of Syria was shaken. He no longer sent raiders against Israel.

Elisha was first of all a man of God, completely prepared to wade into the grit and grime of local politics, winning a great victory for God and the prospects for peace. He did not run off somewhere to pray, he put himself and his praying heart right out there on the front line.

I like this. I would rather live like Elisha than stand in the shadows believing that whatever happens must be the will of God.

Re: Political soup - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2015/1/25 16:00

I understand the idea of political passivity because it properly emphasizes two truths. First, the Gospel has supernatural power to change lives and therefore cultures. Second, no one can be pleasing to God through mere moral legislation. Because of these truths some Christians then think that political involvement is a waste of time. I would disagree that it is a waste.

I believe that it is our first responsibility to obey the Great Commission but it is not our only responsibility. To ignore our responsibility to morally instruct people based on the authority of the Bible simply because it is labeled "politics", is negligence. When a culture only does "what is right in his own eyes" then it will soon be in deep darkness and Christians will not be able to lead quiet and peaceful lives in godliness and the gospel will not go forth in peace.

In Christ,

Re: , on: 2015/1/25 17:32

Quote:
-----Lysa said: In the last 7 years, I'm sure you guys have noticed it to but instead of becoming a humbled nation crying out to God, the Christian's have chosen Republicanism as their hope. I do not think that we should believe that our hope is wrapped up in a "Republican" package. And I blame THAT on the leaders of the organized churches.

Amen to your insight. Amen. I think knowledge is power and your recognition of it is a solid reason to rejoice.

Sidewalk, I thank you for your service for the nation of USA. But I'd be much more thankful for you to be sacrificial lover like Jesus, to serve the kingdom with sermon on the mount living.

But...since your opinion seems to be popular among American Christians, may I petition you, point by point? Without strife? I understand what I'm urging. I understand it's gravity. It's insane. But it's the reign and rule of our King, Jesus, based on His actual teachings.

Quote:
-----Sidewalk said: But to say I live by the sword is ludicrous. Living by the sword means using deadly force to get the things a person craves in life. Spare me, this does not apply.

I disagree. It does apply. Why? because the scriptures fit, not your perspective that 'a person craves in life' but instead scriptures fit your view that a sword is permissive, when defending self or country.

Quote:
-----Matthew 26:52-53 "When Jesus said to him, "Put your sword back into its place; for all those who take up the sword shall perish by the sword. "Or do you think that I cannot appeal to My Father, and He will at once put at My disposal more than twelve legions of angels?"

Jesus wanted Peter to have the sword, to fulfill scripture (Luke 22:36-37). But...as we read in Matt. 26:52-53, Jesus obviously didn't intend for Peter to swing it. Jesus spoke against it.

Quote:
-----Sidewalk said: I would rather live like Elisha than stand in the shadows believing that whatever happens must be the will of God.

Okay. I like your example. But to assume I would 'stand in the shadows believing that whatever happens must be the will of God' is where I'd have to say NO to.

I believe in activism. Dr. MLKjr and Gandhi style though. We should STAND up for our beliefs and raise war with mindse

ts and injustices in the world.

I don't think it's sin to vote. I'm not anti-government. But the moment we assert our moral code over someone else's is the moment our is in jeopardy.

Greg Boyd has made some points that I'd like to repeat. If the church cares about life, why is it when a baby is born out of wedlock that the church doesn't have a lot of resources to nurture that life? If we care about marriages, why aren't we doing more to celebrate that and encourage the good marriages?

I think, we, as a church, need to rise up. Celebrate our uniqueness. 1 man, 1 woman shouldn't be viewed as a chore of a moral law obeyed and punished if it's not followed. Marriage should be the witness to the world that God loves the world.

If we had NO LAW, regardless of country, Christians, whom really follow Sermon on the Mount and Jesus' lifestyle, should be envied, IMHO. We had this joy, that is Christ. We don't need to steal because He meets our needs. We don't need to have sex early because He will provide our spouse or a way out. We don't need to enact revenge or protect ourselves because He owns a cattle on 1000 hills and is my cloud by day and fire by night.

P.S. I might not be totally organized. But I tried. I look forward to this discussion.

Re: - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2015/1/25 17:35

Thank you, Ron- well said.

It is quite evident from the scriptures and the reading of history that the early church, along with the rest of the entire world, had no paradigm for a society living with elected leaders. No one in the bible ever voted.

A great tectonic shift in human governance hit with the publication of Lex Rex by (Christian) Samuel Rutherford. In this work he destroyed the notion of the divine right of kings to set law arbitrarily, and declared that Law is the real king. We stern civilization with equal justice under law, private property, and personal freedom sprang from that brilliant interjection- Rutherford putting God's thinking as an overlay on human government.

I groan that so many think they are serving God by putting in an hour in a pew on Sunday, then living as an obscure minion on the entire rest of the week!

Re: Pursuing righteousness on behalf of the unrighteous - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2015/1/25 18:01

LMH, rest assured that I have read many times the sermon on the mount and while it is not proper for me to boast, I can give you names and emails of persons you could contact to see whether my money and mouth are in the same place. I am determined as my hero Ezra, to study the law of God, to practice it, and to teach it. I have nothing better in my schedule to do.

The difference between offensive violence and defensive violence is purely the attitude of one's heart, but you must know that the two first rules of fighting are these: The aggressor sets the rules, and the defense needs overwhelming force. But in just watching the conflict it is hard to tell the difference. But when a righteous defense is successfully mounted, as soon as the aggressor is vanquished the fight is over. As in my example from Elisha's story, there was no need to kill the Syrians because the threat was passed and it was time for mercy and rebuilding.

History will long remember that following the defeats of Hitler and Japan in WWII the United States did not subdue and punish those countries but invested heavily in their reconstruction. I might be so bold as to suggest it was the lingerings of our Christian heritage that demanded that. I feel an obligation to the sacrifices of those who fought back then to work today toward electing leaders who might continue that kind of political virtue.

Righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a reproach on any people.

Still wondering what might have happened to Sodom if ten righteous had been found within her?

Re: Pursuing righteousness on behalf of the unrighteous. - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2015/1/25 18:05

Duplicate- oops.

Re: , on: 2015/1/26 11:57

Quote:
-----InTheLight (Ron) wrote: Because of these truths some Christians then think that political involvement is a waste of time. I would disagree that it is a waste.

Quote:
-----InTheLight (Ron) wrote: To ignore our responsibility to morally instruct people based on the authority of the Bible simply because it is labeled "politics", is negligence.

I quoted both of these back to back because...I believe the battle isn't won with law. As Paul puts it, "No, a true Jew is one whose heart is right with God. And true circumcision is not merely obeying the letter of the law; rather, it is a change of heart produced by the Spirit. And a person with a changed heart seeks praise from God, not from people." (Rom 2:29; NLT)

And

"For no one can ever be made right with God by doing what the law commands. The law simply shows us how sinful we are." (Rom. 3:20; NLT)

And all throughout the Letter to the Romans Paul makes the case of faith and grace. That freedom and grace is better than a law.

I propose to you, Christian laws enforced by the government don't make Christians. It's the person of Jesus that does.

The moment we believe that law, within the government, or for that matter ANY law, could convert someone, is the moment we go back to the Old Covenant. But...I implore you, that there is a better way. That way of living your life like Christ and telling others of the glorious riches found in Him.

Quote:
-----Sidewalk (Tom C.) wrote: I groan that so many think they are serving God by putting in an hour in a pew on Sunday, then living as an obscure minion the entire rest of the week!

I may not agree with your other points but this point I wholeheartedly agree. We as a Church should walk as a bride of Christ 24/7, not only when it's convenient.

Quote:
-----Sidewalk (Tom C.) wrote: The difference between offensive violence and defensive violence is purely the attitude of one's heart

To repeat my other point, Jesus wouldn't agree with your point according to Matthew 26:52-53. Peter used the sword as a defensive. The scripture applies to defensive 'violence' and how we, as believers, are to respond.

Quote:

-----Sidewalk (Tom C.) wrote: History will long remember that following the defeats of Hitler and Japan in WWII the United States did not subdue and punish those countries but invested heavily in their reconstruction.

History. Hmm. Sounds like your cares and concerns are for this world. The only history that matters is the history that God writes. The Lamb's book of life and the other books that He records. You may say that the Allies against Hitler and Japan were 'God writing history' but...Jesus showed us to NOT call fire down from heaven. Or...to apply this to even the situation of WWII....

Quote:

-----Luke 9:52-56

And he sent messengers before his face: and going, they entered into a city of the Samaritans, to prepare for him. And they received him not, because his face was of one going to Jerusalem. And when his disciples, James and John, had seen this, they said: Lord, will you that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them? And turning, he rebuked them, saying: you know not of what spirit you are. The Son of man came not to destroy souls, but to save. And they went into another town.

To repeat.

The Son of man came not to destroy souls, but to save.

To repeat, and to hopefully emphasize.

The Son of man came not to destroy souls, but to save.

I implore you brethren. Cast aside the weapons (laws and guns) of this world. And grab ahold to the all powerful King and Ruler of our hearts. He and He alone can true a heart of stone into flesh. He and He alone can forgive the impending destruction that the sinners of this world are sowing. Let's look to the King, act like the son's of the King, and maybe one day we will reign like Him.

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2015/1/26 12:54

As usual, love soaks our discussion as it should.

I lovingly agree to disagree in part with my brother, Sidewalk, about political involvement. I see the strength of his arguments and his dedication to the truth of the gospel. So, to that extent, I lovingly refuse to disagree but to rather agree with his heart for Christ.

My point in the post was less about political involvement and more about the church's surrender of biblical marriage on its own turf. About 11 years ago I prepared an outline of what I planned to write as a legal article and Christian argument about the inevitability of our courts coming to recognize homosexual marriage. That outline never developed into an article, but I have gone back to it a few times to simply nod on each point that the courts consistently and nearly unanimously have checked off as reasons for their decisions. This was never not going to happen.

Meanwhile, the rhetoric of opposition from Christians was mainly political rather than Constitutional. Let me say that again. Christian rhetoric opposing gay marriage has almost always been political rather than Constitutional. And, frankly, it has been weak because as "equal rights" jurisprudence has developed, no one who understands the law ever seriously believed that the courts would not eventually come to the point where they are today.

In light of weak rhetoric at a table (political) that we never had a chance at in the first place, the rank and file "conservative Christian" voter simply amen-ed the rhetoric as if preaching to the choir was enough to win the legal fight. And, when the whole thing began to unravel in the courts, the reaction was shock, then defiance and anger, and we have now come to what is more or less the acceptance stage.

We never grieved, though. The church has never grieved itself about its own sinful refusal to heed the Word of God about marriage. We allowed political and legal proxies do our fighting for us in what has always and only been (truthfully) a spiritual battle. If we were unwilling to look at ourselves as the perpetrators and accomplices of a low view of marriage in society generally, are we any more likely to view ourselves as culpable now that the proxies have failed to carry the da

y? No, we're not.

Here's what you can expect. Pouting, resignation and accommodation. Pouting that the world has done this without taking responsibility. Then, resignation that this is just the way things are. Then, accommodation. This has begun in many pockets. The church will ultimately redefine marriage to meet the culture's definition of it, and we will sanctify it as "illumination".

My challenge in the post is simply this: confess and repent. Confess our sin about marriage. Confess our sins in our marriages and our divorces and our remarriages. Confess our full on refusal to see what marriage really is from the perspective of Scripture, and our marring of the image of God that He intended to be shown to the world through the marital bond. Ask God to forgive us. Plead with Him to speak to the church about how to go forward in obedience to what has already been revealed in the pages of Scripture. This will require real revival in the hearts of men, women and young people too. Refuse to continue our sin. Refuse to acknowledge the new legal parameters of marriage and refuse to allow any authority or influence besides Scripture and the local church to inform us of what marriage is and is not. This has far reaching implications.

May I give an example of this? I practice law. I do divorces. If a person comes to me about divorce, I find out what their religious beliefs are. I ask probing questions about their lifestyles to determine if they are living for Christ. If they do and if they maintain that their spouse does, I do not do the divorce without insisting on counseling. Sometimes (rarely) this has worked and couples reconciled. Other times I lose the job and they get another lawyer. Yet, if I determine they have a false profession by their lifestyle or no profession of faith in Christ, I will proceed based on my own understanding that if both are unbelievers or only one is, and either of them refuses to remain with the spouse, the unbeliever is not to be judged (as an outsider to the faith anyway) and the believer is not under bondage if the unbelieving spouse leaves. If the spouse who sees me is a believer and the "other side" is an unbelieving spouse, we walk through the reasons for it; most of the time, there is an unfaithful spouse on the other side, sadly. Not always. Sometimes it is a question of the well being of the children of the couple.

I admit imperfect judgment about these things.

But, my point in elaborating on that is that there IS a biblically acceptable reason for divorce. I can refuse who I do not want to represent for these reasons, and have.

Yet, if gay marriage is made legal and a homosexual spouse approaches me to represent him/her in a divorce, I will not. WHY NOT?! (I know you wonder that!) Because they are not married in the first place before God. If I represent anyone in a homosexual divorce, I approve the notion of a marriage in the first place. The law may recognize it. God does not. You can't divorce what was never married.

Two obvious opposing responses to that: 1. Divorcing would potentially put them in a position of repentance before remaining as a homosexual. Perhaps, but "marriage" or no, they are promiscuous in any event. Marriage nor marriage dissolution will not keep them from sexual relationships with same-sex or opposite-sex partners not married to them. If they can repent at all, it is no barrier to divorce one whose eyes have been opened to the truth; the homosexual who converts while "married" can simply go through the legal motions for divorce. This will be very rare, perhaps non-existent. 2. You are violating their civil rights. And, I say, so be it. Their civil rights never trump the commandment of God.

This is a question I'm prepared to deal with. But, watch and see whether the culture at large will not jump on someone who doesn't toe the line of the law on it when Christians follow the kind of thing I've outlined. It will be short-lived, though, because not many will resist. It stands to present as a temporary curiosity rather than a real, deep Holy Ghost laying down of our lives to stand on the Word of God.

We are all going to have to deal with this issue sooner or later. Having surrendered so much truth to conventionality of society and culture, we have not much left to stand on unless we repent.

Re: Nothing Left To Do But Refuse To Obey - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2015/1/26 13:19

In looking at this homosexual issue, coupled with the rights of people to refuse to accommodate them, my mind goes back to the abortion issue.

We all know the long and hard fight many have engaged in hoping to limit, outlaw this awful procedure in our land. As one who has worked in the pro-life ministry for 15 years I learned a few things. One - this fight will never be won in the courts or in the legislature. If one looks at the stats for those who have abortions you will find a lot of religious folks having them, even people who at one time were adamantly against it. (Stats won't tell you that - you have to work where the rubber meets the road to learn about this.)

The issue is sin. That is all. For many it includes immorality, others abandonment or refusal by the dads to accept the responsibility to his wife. Simple. If the people who call themselves Christians would repent of ALL sin, there would be much fewer abortions - so few it would not be a profitable business.

How many pastors are willing to cleanse their 'temple' of all immorality? Might find himself being excommunicated?? or at least his secretary...

The problem and the solution resides in the heart of man and his willingness to repent and forsake sin. Laws/legislation can never succeed in accomplishing this.

Having said all this how do I regard the political activism of the pro-life lobby? It may work to keep this issue alive in the minds of people given to relativism...dunno. Or, at least it may shine a light onto an issue that will trigger the conscience of an person who does not know the LORD.

In any case, I see the homosexual issue as one that is characterized by what Paul describes in Romans 1:18-32:

18 For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who suppress the truth in unrighteousness,

19 because that which is known about God is evident within them; for God made it evident to them.

20 For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes, His eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made, so that they are without excuse.

21 For even though they knew God, they did not honor Him as God or give thanks, but they became futile in their speculations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

22 Professing to be wise, they became fools,

23 and exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for an image in the form of corruptible man and of birds and four-footed animals and crawling creatures.

24 Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them.

25 For they exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen.

26 For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural,

27 and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error.

28 And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper,

29 being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malice; they are gossi

ps,
30 slanderers, haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents,

31 without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful;

32 and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them.

I see no difference between the homosexual issue and the abortion issue.

In brief, these are people who have spurned the call of God on their lives so he gave them over to perversion. Now one can see, understand the status of churches who embrace this perversion - they are not Jesus' church. In my mind I see the modern, popular church hopeless. Wish I would be wrong...

My understanding, perspective.

Sandra Miller

EDITED

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2015/1/26 18:44

Quote:
-----I quoted both of these back to back because...I believe the battle isn't won with law.

LMH, I think we can all agree that the battle is not won with moral legislation and I stated that that is true in my first post in this thread if you care to reread it.

However, this does not mean that there is no responsibility on our part concerning instructing others from the Bible, even in the "political" arena. The Gospel is not communicated in a political and cultural vacuum.

In Christ,

Re: - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2015/1/27 1:04

Dolfan, you are going to be so sued when you refuse to help homosexuals get their divorces! Just as you so eloquently explained the progression of the law, and just as cake decorators, private venue owners, and soon preachers will be forced to violate conscience to give these people what they demand, can Christian lawyers escape?

Homosexuality and abortion are abominations causing desolation, no wonder they are the sins on steroids, the darlings of Satan's master plan.

LoveMeekHope, please re-read my point on the events surrounding the response of the United States following WWII with Germany and Japan. The point had nothing to do with caring about the world, but rather the unique difference in the way a nation rooted in Christian values was able to make decisions of mercy and love for its now vanquished enemies. Hitherto, and despite the plea from some for scorched earth, it had always been common for the victor in war to utterly annihilate the hated loser. My point was simply that because of our Christian traditions we did not do that. We could have, we chose mercy instead.

Admittedly, those values are seriously eroded today- we don't even remember how to win a war in the first place!

As to other points and Peter's sword, I will refrain from controversial argument. I do agree that Jesus needed to nip in the bud any notion held by Peter or the other disciples that they were about to embark on a military or governmental mission to proclaim the gospel. It was not a sword based endeavor.

General Topics :: Nothing Left To Do But Refuse To Obey

Re: , on: 2015/1/27 12:19

There are many 'branches' of these issues I could go down (based on your responses) but I hope by choosing this one branch it can all bring unity.

Quote:

-----ginnyrose (Sandra) wrote: The issue is sin. That is all.

Quote:

-----ginnyrose (Sandra) wrote: The problem and the solution resides in the heart of man and his willingness to repent and forsake sin. Laws/legislation can never succeed in accomplishing this.

Quote:

-----Dolfan (Tim) said: Confess our sins in our marriages and our divorces and our remarriages. Confess our full on refusal to see what marriage really is from the perspective of Scripture, and our marring of the image of God that He intended to be shown to the world through the marital bond. Ask God to forgive us. Plead with Him to speak to the church about how to go forward in obedience to what has already been revealed in the pages of Scripture. This will require real revival in the hearts of men, women and young people too.

These three quotes, to me, sums up the entire issue and it's solution. We, as believers, should lead the way. In our own hearts and lives. I try. I struggle. I fail. But I still strive for God's better way. I ask for repentance when I screw up. Sometimes things bubble up in me that I never thought were there. I believe legislation is utterly powerless in 'training', in addition how can we 'train' the unbelievers when we can't even keep the church clean by the blood of the lamb (priests molesting children, pastors cheating on their spouses, swindlers, etc). May God cleanse us of our sin. Let the Church shine as a great example. Let the unbelievers turn away from their wicked ways and obtain a new heart from the Lord.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2015/1/27 14:29

Dolfan--

In your view what would a Christians "repentance" or "confession" of their divorces and remarriages look like?

Let's keep it to divorces on improper grounds.

Let's even use a specific example: husband 1 and wife 1 get divorced due to irreconcilable differences. Husband 1 and wife 1 both remarry Christian spouses.

Husband 1 and wife 1 want to repent and confess their improper divorce (although they love their current spouse and have no desire to reconcile.

What would confession/repentance look like?

Just posing this question to flesh out what you are saying.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2015/1/27 14:51

Todd, seems to me the question you are posing should be dealt with on another thread because it will get long and distract from the OP issue.

But I do wonder how Tim will deal with the issue once a homo couple comes to him and wants him to handle their divorce. I suspect the only way he could get out of it is to not handle divorce cases at all.

What say Tim?

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2015/1/27 17:18

TMK and ginnyrose --- Y'all don't make it easy on anybody do you? :)

Okay, Ginnyrose to answer first your question. All I know is this. The State and the Lord have very different definitions of "marriage". Until the State calls them something different, unions licensed and sanctioned by the State that are called marriage impinge on the authority of God to say what marriage is. My first and only allegiance is to Him. So, I won't validate homosexual marriage by representing or advising in a homosexual divorce.

If the states would do "the right thing" -- as right as human government can get, which is not right but we'll use that word -- they would completely remove themselves from "marriage" and call unions licensed and sanctioned by the State by another name. Maybe everybody is, in the eyes of government, "civilly united" or some such. I don't care if they say people are bluetick hounded as long as they don't impinge on what God says marriage is. And, if they are concerned about 'whose' God and 'what' definition of God, they can avoid the whole controversy by being perfectly secular and calling unions "civil unions". That way the state can say my wife and I are in a "civil union" instead of a marriage. Suits me, and puts the onus on the church to lead people into what marriage is.

Would I represent homosexuals in a civil union dissolution? Yes, ma'am I would if they paid me. I've represented homosexuals in landlord tenant disputes and criminal cases, so the state's dissolution of a legally created contractual arrangement is no different. The matter would be purely for what it is -- a matter of the world. Unless they repent and get saved anyway, their status as united under law or disunited under law is irrelevant. We share the highways with them and none of us are going to hell for yielding the right of way to one of them; it isn't like we've shared communion with them and washed their feet by doing so.

Now, onto TMK's question. It is valid. Am I insisting that repentance means reconciliation of couple #1 as --- couple #1. No, not as you've outlined the hypothetical.

By the situation you've outlined, I think the answer is built into the question. They already repented and confessed their improper divorce. I might add that they should ask forgiveness for remarrying under these circumstances where no sexual sin by either spouse lead to the divorce. Given the bible's clear limitation of divorce to sexual immorality by one spouse as an opening to remarriage, the couple each ignored that limitation and did what they wanted instead, remarrying (even if to a Christian in both cases). Real sorrow about having gone farther than the Word says to go should sink in somewhere. A regret at having gone farther than the Word should move a true lover of Jesus to rely on His mercy for that sin; whereas, a failure to see that as regrettable and sinful could cheapen the bond of the remarriage in the eyes of the non-regretting remarried spouse.

So, as I understand Scripture, that's what it might look like in that instance. It would also include a liberal forgiveness for all wrongs. It might ideally include such forgiveness by one spouse that he/she approaches the other and says, "Because I wronged you and God by not loving you as He does, and because I now DO love you as He does by His grace to me that opens my eyes to Him in truth, I ask you to forgive me and whether you do or not, I forgive you of any hidden regret you may have but never be comfortable sharing. You have not wronged me as far as I am concerned, no matter what happened, and you are loved by Jesus." Something along those lines.

There are many instances where sin follows into a remarriage and it isn't as neat as this would be. You've kept it very simple, though and made it easier to answer.

Could a reconciliation of the originally divorced couple ever be proper in a case where both remarried? Many would say yes. My honest conviction and understanding of Scripture is "no". Deut. 24:1-4 and Jeremiah 3:1. Even 1 Cor. 7:10, 11 anticipates that if there is a reconciliation after divorce that no remarriage intervened the divorce and reconciliation.

I know a lady who was faithful to her husband more than maybe any of us would be. He divorced her for another woman, married that woman and was married to her for 10 years. The lady I know believed her remarriage would be adultery. She prayed for her "husband" to be saved and to be reconciled to her. After 10 years, he divorced wife #2 and went back to wife #1 and remarried her. Later, he committed adultery with a young woman of another race and they had an out of wedlock child together. The lady I know forgave him, accepted the child into HER home and helped raise the child. Husband later died. She be a door mat or maybe a pillar of faith. I think mostly the latter. But, if I apply Deut. 24:1-4 principally, I'm wrong. He died an unbeliever as far as I know.

Things get complicated. Mercy triumphs judgment in uncertain matters. Sometimes, what seems clear is not. Sin cloud

s even the simplest things. I pray that I'm right and not only sincere, but this is how I would answer the question, TMK.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2015/1/27 17:33

I appreciate your answer and I am in agreement.

If the stats are right and about 50% of Christians are divorced (and probably remarried) it is a hot button issue for sure.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2015/1/27 20:03

I guess a good question might be, is God confined to scripture alone, as we are? We are confined to scripture, and we try our best to read and interpret or understand it, so our minds are limited to scripture alone. I personally think God can do as he pleases "beyond scripture" God is above all things, beneath all things, outside of all things and inside of all things. God is above, but He's not pushed up. He's beneath, but He's not pressed down. He's outside, but He's not excluded. He's inside, but He's not confined, God is above all things presiding, beneath all things sustaining, outside of all things embracing and inside of all things filling. That is the immanence of God. This is why we should not worry too much about things, God can still work miracles, and yes were supposed to obey man's laws, but God doesn't have to obey anyone, he could blink his eye and cause every Homosexual on earth to become heterosexuals in a moment. God is Omnipotent, Omnipresent, Omniscient, He is all-powerful, all-present, and all-knowing. There is nothing the flesh has that's more powerful than Prayer, we should stay in Prayer, that God will send us a miracle and change the minds of our Government, back to the morals this country was built on, one nation under God.

Re: - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2015/1/27 22:14

Awesome answer, Tim! Glad you are the lawyer and not me!

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2015/2/4 16:02

Interesting day. Weirdly so.

In the past 24 hours, the same sex marriage issue has dropped into my lap, sometimes out of the blue.

First, at lunch with my good friend, an unbeliever, yesterday. I'd mentioned to him, talking about news and stuff and not really giving it much thought about a deeper discussion with him, that the federal judge who ruled last week that Alabama's law on the matter was unconstitutional had refused to push her ruling's effective date back, making gay marriage legal in Alabama as of 2/9/15.

He asked why it hurt anyone for gays to marry. I got an opportunity to make the biblical case for him (actually, things I've posted here before -- http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id=53485&forum=35&start=20&viewmode=flat&order=1 --) and to restate that hell awaits the disobedient to the gospel. Now, he respectfully disagreed, and I did with him, and we're friends anyway. Yet, I've been deliberate with him in the past in my appeals with the gospel and for him to believe on Christ and come to Him. He asked me what if my daughter turned out to be gay. And he didn't do it in a snarky way or anything -- he was curious how I would react to it. I said I'd love her and I would be devastated by it. I said, "You know, we teach her now. She listens. We talk. I am in her ear all the time. And, I pray for her all the time. It could still happen. But, I'd stay in her ear and on my knees if she came home one day and said, 'I'm gay.'" I said, "You and I didn't have to grow up with this being open and approved in our culture. She is and will. It is a real battle, and even churches are caving on it because they don't really know Jesus. But, I can tell you that I'd love my daughter, I'd remain close to her as I could, and I'd never quit telling her that nor the truth." He said, complimenting, "Well, I didn't think you'd be mean or anything. You've never struck me as the type." :) And, we went on to other things.

THEN, last night an 18 year old kid from church had posted on Facebook that he was against gay marriage. I don't do Facebook, but my wife does. She showed it to me this morning before leaving for work. I read the responses and it boiled down to "you're mean!" and "I support you, Paul. Stand for truth." Which, you know, is nice and all except Paul doesn't know WHY he believes it which was evident in his beaten-down, timid response (and, he's a timid guy anyway), "I won't judge you and you don't judge me." That was his defense. My wife responded in a way that encouraged him to get into the Word and pray. Then, she brought the thing to me and said, "He's been in this church (our local church) all of his life, and THIS is all he's got to stand against this with. That's pathetic." And, she was right.

So, I found the stuff I'd posted here (!) and copied into an email and edited it for him as just --- something --- to try and equip the guy with.

THEN, I was at the courthouse checking on some things. The court clerk was behind the counter giving some instructions to the employees about --- you guessed it --- gay divorces. The county next door already has one trying to be filed. He was telling them how to try and navigate through it with the court system software not being programmed to have two husbands or two wives in a divorce filing. I eavesdropped and continued what I was doing. Then, a moment later, two of the employees came up to me and said, "So. What are you gonna do? Are you going to do gay divorces?" Which stunned me because what I posted on here last week was not something they would've known.

I said to them what I've said here. No, I won't, because to do so acknowledges a homosexual marriage, and as a Christian who really believes the word of God, I won't acknowledge it or validate it by representing anyone in a divorce, and if they want to take my law license I'll sell hot dogs out of the back of a pickup truck if I have to.

One of them smiled and asked me that wonderful question -- why. So, standing in the middle of the circuit clerk's office, I got to explain why. :) And, I said, "These are the last days. You think about it. If Satan is going to mar the image of God in the world, he almost HAS to do this. He almost HAS to promote the destruction of biblical marriage in society. The homosexuals will not even accept calling all marriages -- heterosexual even -- "civil unions" and letting things be equal that way because they want the word "marriage" to apply to them because Satan aims to deface the image of God in the world. This is nothing more than a thumb in the eye to the church by Satan. This is way more than legal, this is spiritual."

And, they smiled and walked away.

So, I don't know where this is all going, but it has been quite a day on this front.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2015/2/4 17:36

Interesting post, Tim. Good thing you wrote this because I misunderstood your reply to my question I posted earlier.

I still think you would do better by NOT handling divorces at all. Laying aside the Biblical teachings about divorce - you and I will disagree on that - who benefits from divorce? Be practical: the children are hurt, there is pain all around except for the one cheating on the spouse. Oh, I know, the stories that appear to justify it...heard them all. There are no winners except for the lawyers that handle these cases, maybe?! Make ya mad? :-/. Listen, how you can defend the plaintiff in such cases?

Oh, well...too complex a question, I assume....don't want a lawyer to defend his position using legalese, boring us stiff...

Appreciate your posts, anyways. I know you are interested in serving the LORD. I hope you will not take this as an attack on your person or belief. We are all growing and are at different stages in our growth in our walk with the LORD.

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2015/2/4 20:04

Quote:

-----Interesting post, Tim. Good thing you wrote this because I misunderstood your reply to my question I posted earlier.

I still think you would do better by NOT handling divorces at all. Laying aside the Biblical teachings about divorce - you and I will disagree on that - who benefits from divorce? Be practical: the children are hurt, there is pain all around except for the one cheating on the spouse. Oh, I know, the stories that appear to justify it...heard them all. There are no winners except for the lawyers that handle these cases, maybe?! Make ya mad? :-/. Listen, how you can defend the plaintiff in such cases?

Oh, well...too complex a question, I assume....don't want a lawyer to defend his position using legalese, boring us stiff...

Appreciate your posts, anyways. I know you are interested in serving the LORD. I hope you will not take this as an attack on your person or belief. We are all growing and are at different stages in our growth in our walk with the LORD.

Ginnyrose,

No offense taken. I have wrestled with circumstances in some cases. I will tell you, too, that many times--most--the spouses I tend to represent are either so hard at each other's throats that if they do have kids together the kids are not in t

he line of fire with the parents apart, OR one parent has already so distanced themselves from the other parent and the kids that the divorce is only a piece of paper formalizing what has been going on for a long time already, OR the child/children are not the kids of both parties and one or both of the parties are just living like H E double hockey sticks.

It is very unusual to have a couple with kids who are just broken and breaking apart. Those cases are so much harder to wrap your head around. They are also the ones where I work harder to put the spouse who sees me in touch with a Christian marriage counselor, and there is a very good one locally.

Most of the time, though, what I get are very young people who married quickly, one of them bolts, they drag feet on divorcing hoping the other one goes first, they have no kids and no assets, and they have both moved onto other sleeping buddies.

I do very little contested divorce work. Most of mine is uncontested and I like it because it is quick, little drama, and I get paid a lot quicker. Just being honest.

I think we probably are closer than you think on agreeing about biblical divorce. But, nonetheless, I don't justify it. I do not enjoy it. But, the ones that I personally see are not the ones where kids are usually hurt in the divorce. I am not softening anything, but only telling you what my work usually is. There are exceptions, to be sure, but thankfully uncommon in my own practice.

Re: , on: 2015/2/5 0:30

Tim, I really enjoyed your post on 2015/2/4 14:02. You shed a lot of light into your situation and what you are wrestling with.

I'm certain I disagree with most here about gay marriages, I think the world can do what the world wants to do, I'm all for it (freedom of choice, and that choice of being unified sexually/lifestyle with another of same sex). Heck, I will even vote that way.

But aside from my personal view, I have a personal question for you Tim.

If obedience to the Lord looks like NOT doing gay divorces. What will your next profession be? Or are you able to change the kind of law practice you have?

I have a lot of family members in the legal field, most deal with personal injury and some corporate legal stuff. All I know is their degree in law was tremendously expensive plus their lifestyles are fairly lavish, compared to the common man. With my understanding of typical finances, I find it very difficult for them to change mid-career.

How will you deal change because it's inevitable (imho)? Will you be able to change your emphasis/practice? How long will that take? If you changed careers, how will you manage that?

I'm fairly curious now.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2015/2/5 7:14

I posted this also on the other thread about immorality in the church, but I think it is also relevant here.

Jesus said this to the church at Thyatira.....

"Nevertheless I have a few things against you, because you allow that woman Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess, to teach and seduce My servants to commit sexual immorality and eat things sacrificed to idols."

Jesus said he has things against those in the church, NOT because they are practicing immorality, but because they ALLOW others to teach it is OK.

I would be very concerned that any would put themselves in a position of conflict with the Lord Jesus Christ, where He is against you because you would agree with or even vote for this type of freedom! You have much more to lose here than

earthly riches or lifestyle, you are in danger of losing your soul.

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2015/2/5 7:37

LMH, my practice is primarily criminal defense.

I want to go to the first part of what you said.

"I think the world can do what the world wants to do." That would be philosophical, but really it is not. People are going to do what they want. That is our great problem. We want. We want to do what want to do (lust of the flesh), we want to have what we want to have (lust of the eyes) and we want to be what we want to be (pride of life). These things are of the world, indeed.

"I'm all for it." Not sure what you mean. "For" as in in favor of? "For" as in "let it be"? Either way, there is an implicit risk of error. I understand the "let it be" impulse since we are not called to prevent the order of this age from doing what it does, but we are called to sound the gospel to them. That does not include political activity as a means of advancing the gospel; in fact, politics can only corrupt it. But, there is a fatalism in "let it be" that is opposed to the gospel, and the gospel itself demands of us who believe that we stand in the middle of a lost world and say "Repent and obey the gospel of Christ." Of course, if your "for" means "in favor of" we are in a whole different arena and I would say to you, you know... "Repent."

Re: , on: 2015/2/5 13:38

Thanks for your response Tim but I think my questions were missed. Let me repeat them, I'd be interested in seeing your responses to these.

Quote:
-----How will you deal change because it's inevitable (imho)? Will you be able to change you emphasis/practice? How long will that take?
? If you changed careers, how will you manage that?

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2015/2/5 15:10

LMH

I have already stated how I will deal with it if I have to. I won't do a homosexual divorce. I could quit doing divorces altogether, and my practice is primarily criminal defense, as I said. If I had to change careers? Do not know. We'll see, won't we? I can run a soft drink route, run a convenience store, deliver furniture and appliances and run a rent to own store. 30 years ago I sold car parts. I can do something.

I know a lawyer who got disbarred and convicted for stealing, and wound up deboning chickens in a poultry plant. I know another one who got disbarred after he hooked up with a client who was a ...ummmm.....dancer and got hooked on crack cocaine and lost his whole family. He is working somewhere.

Or, maybe I wind up in a cell. It has happened to better people than me.

Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2015/2/6 5:16

Dolfan been reading your stories with interest... Why don't you go work for the christian legal centre rather than wait to get de-barred.

<http://www.christianconcern.com/christian-legal-centre>.

I plan to go and visit with them, to find the best way to set up a "church/christian organisation" in legal manner that will best defend it from interference from government bodies. Don't like the idea of charity status as I think it may open the door for unwanted interference from the government bodies that control charities.

<http://www.christianconcern.com/sites/default/files/equalityprovision%20of%20service-proof.pdf>

Edit - Dolfan got you mixed up with Heydave... however there must be an American equivalent to the Christian legal center...

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2015/2/6 12:04

There are a few. ACLJ. Christian Law Center. Alliance Defending Freedom. Others.

None have offices in my neck of the woods. I live in north Alabama and plan on being here I guess.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2015/2/8 15:39

Tim, you could do elder law - society is crowded with ageing baby boomers...:-) Not much money in it? Maybe if you decided a Chrysler would suffice instead of...

This leads me to an issue I was discussing with another sister. We were talking about ministries owning/operating thrift stores to finance their operations. Many of them sell items we would not buy or use ourselves - talking about clothing.

I asked this lady, how would you feel if we were to sell tobacco at our store? What is the difference?

Get my point? Yet, one must be fully persuaded in his own mind....Romans 14:5.

God bless.

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2015/2/8 17:57

Ginny

I do a little elder law too.

I drive a 2005 Vibe with 290000 miles on it.

My life is the opposite of extravagant. :)

Not sure I get the point on the thrift store and tobacco.