

Pretty Pastors?

by Terry Ross

Contents

Severing The Connection With God	7
More Than Meets The Eye	15
Are Men And Women Equal?	25
Keeping A Proper Perspective	32
God*s Word Never Changes, But The Church Manual	41
Christian Women A Valuable Asset	50
Divinely Different	59
Authority — God*s Or Man*s?	65

Acknowledgements

THIS volume is dedicated especially to my many sisters who are faithfully serving the Lord; who have dedicated their lives to follow Him whereso-ever He leadeth; who understand the counsel that the Lord has left to them on this topic or are honestly searching for truth that they may continue to please their Lord and Savior.

I would also like to dedicate this book to the two “Cathy’s” in my life. First of all to my very own Cathy, my wife, who is and has been a wonderful mate and inspiration to me as I have watched and learned from her in her own dedication to serving Jesus. She is an honest student and eager to know the counsel of her Heavenly Father that she may continually grow according to His will not her own. I am truly blessed to have her as my wife and friend.

Secondly the “other Cathy” in my life was the late Kathy Ross, my father’s deceased wife and my step-mother. Cathy and I learned many things about the precious Jesus from Kathy and we believe that she is what we would term a “true Christian” — she knew the Author of the Book. She was taken from us while the family was on a walk one evening by a tragic accident, and Cathy and I look forward to the day of our reunion. In the spirit of her service and to the memory of her self-denial we dedicate

these pages.

This book and the work I do reflects a philosophy that has its roots in my father, Edward E. Ross. Many years ago he instilled in me this principle: “If God is calling you to a work — then do it! Do not wait for man*s approval.”

Pretty Pastors? is a work based around that philosophy. My father wrote a tract on women*s ordination many years ago, and that tract was a springboard for this book. *Pretty Pastors?* has incorporated much of my father*s original tract, and for that, I give special acknowledgment.

Severing The Connection With God

THE subject of whether or not women should be ordained is one that has in recent years sparked much controversy. The sad thing is that it's really not due to the counsel that the Lord has left to us as a people, but rather because of an insensitivity to it, and a leaning to follow those who have not the truth as it is in Jesus.

In the *Adventist Review*, October 5, 1978, results of a survey were published which dealt with the ordaining of women to leadership capacity. The survey was an attempt to find out how the Adventist community felt about the subject. "Responses came from 427 male church members, 579 female church members, 1,006 total. Respondents represent all States except Hawaii, Vermont, and Wyoming, and 21 countries outside of the United States were heard from." (p. 18).

To the question — "should women be ordained as 'deacons and elders?'" a total of 517 responded. Four hundred and one, or 77.6%, said no, while only 116, or 22.4%, said yes. To the question "should women 'be ordained as ministers?'" 394, or 82%, answered no, while only 86, or 18%, said yes. That means that a solid majority (77%-82%) did not think that women should be ordained as deacons, elders, or ministers.

In light of the above survey done by the Seventh-day Adventist organization, there must follow some honest questions. Why was the survey taken in the first place? Was it to find out what the true feelings of the constituency were, and if so, then why is the ordaining of women being "forced" upon us if the survey meant anything to those giving it? In view of what has happened in the church since the survey, can it be rightfully asked if the survey was taken to test the "temperature"

of the people to see how hard it might be to get women ordained in the church?

If we claim to use the Bible as our source book, then where is the substantiation for ordaining women to leadership positions? Where in the Bible is any statement that gives us a clear green light to go ahead with this program even though the Biblical history clearly shows the opposite? The reason that the “scholars” of the church haven’t produced such an inspired statement is because there isn’t one!

This matter of ordaining women isn’t anything new in our church. As a matter of fact it was considered over 100 years ago in the General Conference meeting of December 5, 1881. At that meeting the subject of ordaining women to the ministry was “referred to the General Conference Committee,” where it died. (RH 12/20/1881, p. 8).

So why has the present pushing of ordaining women entered into the organization, and why at present do we have several women who have already been ordained as deacons, elders, or pastors? Sad to say, it’s because we are trying to fit in with the popular opinions of fallen Protestantism. Because the mainline churches of the world have adopted this anti-Biblical policy, and because we don’t want to distance ourselves from these churches but rather want to be accepted as “one of the gang”, we are once again following Babylon in this practice.

In so doing, we continue to make the grave mistake that Ancient Israel made when they tried to be like the rest of the nations around them. The Lord finally left them to their own demise and told others to leave them alone. Because we want to be accepted by the evangelicals today, we are sinfully following the same course as did the Jews. Christianity Today, 2/20/1981, p. 4, has stated that the “leadership of women” is a “controversy that deeply troubles and sharply divides the evangelical church.”

Of course one can readily see as well that much pressure has come in from that portion of society and the church community that has sympathies favoring the women's rights movement. This movement started some time ago, but we have seen it in earnest since the late sixties. Women activists have pushed and pressured many groups into giving women that which they deserve, and that has bled over into the churches as well. Although some good may have come from this movement, much evil has attended it also, and the Bible makes it clear in the very first book that a chain of command was given by God Himself, and left to all who are interested in following His plan, not man's.

Sister White knew that God had left a chain of command in the home and in the church, and responded to the same problem of the women's rights movement that is causing much trouble in the church today. The Lord had her write in 1864 and again in 1867: "Those who feel called out to join the movement in favor of woman's rights . . . might as well sever all connection with the third angel's message. The spirit which attends the one cannot be in harmony with the other. The Scriptures are plain upon the relations and rights of men and women." (1T 421 & 457).

One can see by the above statement how the Lord feels about the subject and plainly says that the spirit of the women's rights movement is from the spirit of the devil. Those who feel called to promote this movement are in direct opposition to the three angels' messages, and hence the true message of the Seventh-day Adventist church. The enemy of all souls is trying to destroy the chain of command that the Lord has laid down, in an attempt to destroy the family and the church.

Even if we refuse as Adventists to recognize this movement for what it is, the Lord will help others to and will have them cry out. Dr. Robert P. Odenwald warned in his book of 1965 entitled *The Disappearing Sexes*, p. 170-172: "Yet one can say

with confidence that unless a vigorous effort is made by parents, educators and perhaps most of all by those in control of the opinion-forming apparatus of the modern world, we will continue moving toward a one-sex society, one in which the male might almost as well have been born a female, and vice versa. The movement toward sexual neutrality has become so pronounced in recent years that I can see no evidence of a reversal, on the contrary. For instance, under the impetus of equal rights legislation, there are no longer jobs that can be considered the exclusive province of the male or the female. . . . This trend toward neutrality of the sexes is taking place at a time when evidence is mounting that many of the most serious ills of society stem specifically from the lack of a clear distinction.”

There are several women who have led out in the “Women’s Rights” or “Equal Rights” or “Women’s Liberation” movement as it has been called, but I only want to mention a couple and give the essence of their thoughts. Betty Friedan, one of the “leading ladies” in this movement, authored the book *The Feminine Mystique*, and founded the National Organization for Women. Later she went on to say “that she is now willing to include the fight for lesbian rights in the women’s movement.” (Christian Be Watchful, p. 20).

Ms. Betty Friedan, who has been quoted in *Newsweek*, 7/6/81 on page 50, and found in the book *Christian Be Watchful*, pp. 7-8, “denounced religion in the name of the ‘scientific method.’ . . . The Humanist Manifesto. . . asserts the supremacy of human reason and science over religious faith and the authority of the Bible.” “Here are some quotes . . . from Humanist Manifesto II. . . ‘. . . Humanists still believe that traditional theism. . . is an unproved and outmoded faith. Salvationism. . . still appears as harmful, diverting people with false hopes of heaven hereafter. Reasonable minds look to other means for survival’ (from the preface, p. 13). ‘We find insufficient evidence for belief in the existence of a

supernatural. . . . No deity will save us; we must save ourselves' (p. 16).”

Kate Millett, an American feminist who lived in Japan in 1961 and while there met a sculptor by the name of Fumio Yoshimura, has also made her mark in the movement. After living in Japan for two years the couple moved to New York and “she lived with Fumio for a year, and ‘for what it’s worth, being committed to each other and loving each other, we were already married. It’s not the state’s business.’ But when the state sent Fumio deportation papers in 1965, ‘we went to City Hall.’

“ ‘She was a . . . liberal when I met her,’ Yoshimura says. But in the winter of 1964-1965, Kate Millett attended a lecture series that was to make an extraordinary difference in her life. The lectures were titled ‘Are Women Emancipated?’ Kate thought, ‘this is going to be one of those put-down sort of things, but maybe they’ll take my point of view. All my life, guys said I was neurotic. I didn’t accept my femininity, they said.

“ ‘At the next to the last lecture, I got all het up. Afterward, a girl came up to me and said, “You look kinda interested in this; did you know there are civil rights for women?” And I thought like wow, this is for me.’ Kate attended her first official Women’s Liberation meeting soon afterward.” The book, *Sexual Politics*, written by Kate Millett was published in 1970. (Time, 8/31/70, p. 19).

Speaking of her book the Reader’s Digest had this to say: “Kate Millett’s *Sexual Politics*, a powerful and coherent attack on the family.” (The Reader’s Digest, January, 1973, p. 109, in the article “The War On The American Family.”).

One who chooses to take a look through Ms. Millet’s *Sexual Politics* will quickly find her anti-Christian views. On page 62 she says “A sexual revolution would require, perhaps first of all,

an end of traditional sexual inhibitions and taboos, particularly those that most threaten patriarchal monogamous marriage: homosexuality, illegitimacy, adolescent pre- and extra-marital sexuality. . . .

“Primarily, however, a sexual revolution would bring the institution of patriarchy [society in which males are dominate] to an end, abolishing both the ideology of male supremacy and the traditional socialization by which it is upheld in matters of status, role, and temperament. . . .

“The abolition of sex role and the complete economic independence of women would undermine both its (the patriarchal proprietary family) authority and its financial structure. An important corollary would be the end of the present chattel status and denial of rights to minors. The collective professionalization (and consequent improvement) of the care of the young, also involved, would further undermine family structure while contributing to the freedom of women. Marriage might generally be replaced by voluntary association, if such is desired.” (Sexual Politics, p.62).

It was further noted in Time magazine in 1970 that the “Women’s Liberation movement seek[s] nationwide abortion reform — ideally, free abortions on demand. They desire round-the-clock, state-supported child-care centers. . . .

“In her book, Millett . . . argues that it [patriarchy] provides our ‘fundamental concept of power.’ Women are helpless, in other words, because men control the basic mechanisms of society. Her solution is drastic: demolish the patriarchal system. . . ‘There is no way out but to rebel’. . . . Her target is the patriarchy. . . .

“The family, Millett says, is patriarchy’s chief institution and cell for sexist brainwashing. . . Male power is enforced by the man’s position as head of the household. . . Within the

family, gender roles are ideologically reinforced. Girls, for instance, are taught to cook and sew passively, in imitation of their mothers; boys are encouraged to be aggressive in imitation of their fathers. Biologically, she argues, there is little real difference between the sexes, beyond the specific genital characteristics. . .

“Only briefly does Millett speculate on precisely what sort of society might be produced by the successful sexual revolution for which she calls. She expects integration of the separate male and female human subcultures, accompanied by ‘a permissive single standard of sexual freedom . . . uncorrupted by the crass and exploitative economic bases of traditional sexual alliances.’ She adds that an end to patriarchy would probably destroy the family as it is known today; the institution of marriage would wither away as well.” (Time, 8/31/70, pp. 16, 19-20).

Certainly we can not only see the results of all this “wonderful” insight in today’s modern world, but we can “feel” its grip in the church. The enemy of all souls is surely behind this movement and is running havoc with the family unit in the church, where the divorce rate is virtually the same as in the world.

“Women’s libber” Gloria Steinem, one of the co-founders of Ms. magazine, was quoted in Time magazine: “In Women’s Lib Utopia, there will be free access to good jobs — and decent pay for the bad ones women have been performing all along, including housework. . . .

“Schools and universities will help to break down traditional sex roles, even when parents will not. . . .

“Free nurseries, school lunches, family cafeterias built into every housing complex, . . . and more responsibility by the entire community for the children. . . For parents of very young

children, however, a special job category, created by Government and unions, would allow such parents a shorter work day.

“The revolution would not take away the option of being a housewife. A woman who prefers to be her husband’s housekeeper and/or hostess would receive a percentage of his pay determined by the domestic relations courts. If divorced, she might be eligible for a pension fund, and for a job-training allowance. Or a divorce could be treated the same way that the dissolution of a business partnership is now. . . .

“What will exist is a variety of alternative life-styles. Since the population explosion dictates that child-bearing be kept to a minimum, parents-and-children will be only one of many ‘families’: couples, age groups, working groups, mixed communes, blood-related clans, class groups, creative groups. Single women will have the right to stay single without ridicule, without the attitudes now betrayed by ‘spinster’ and ‘bachelor.’ Lesbians or homosexuals will no longer be denied legally binding marriages, complete with mutual-support agreements and inheritance rights. . .

“RELIGION. Protestant women are already becoming ordained ministers. . . . In the future, the church will become an area of equal participation by women. . . Full participation of women in ecclesiastical life might involve certain changes in theology, such as, for instance, a radical redefinition of sin.

“LITERARY PROBLEMS. Revised sex roles will outdate more children’s books than civil rights ever did. . . Free legal abortions and free birth control will force writers to give up pregnancy as the *deus ex machina*. . . .

“FASHION. Dress will be more androgynous [unisexual], with class symbols becoming more important than sexual ones.” (Gloria Steinem, *Time*, 8/31/70, pp. 22,25).

More Than Meets The Eye

THERE is far more to the “Women’s Rights Movement” than one may at first think. Not only do these people want a complete change in government, but they would like to totally abolish true Christianity and do away with God. Gloria Steinem is anything but shy about her intentions: “Overthrowing capitalism is too small for us. We must overthrow the whole [curse word] patriarchy! . . . For the sake of those who wish to live in equal partnership, we have to abolish and reform the institution of marriage. . . . By the year 2000 we will, I hope, raise our children to believe in human potential, NOT GOD. . . . We must understand that what we are attempting is a revolution, not a public relations movement.” (Christian Be Watchful, pp. 10, 12, 22).

“We [Women’s Libbers] urge the NCC [National Council of Churches] to . . . take the lead in uniting women of all denominations and religious groups to work together to support efforts to recognize the right of women to be ordained in religious bodies where that right is still denied. . . . In light of the enslavement of body and mind which the church historically has imposed on women, we DEMAND that the seminaries immediately stop and repudiate their propagation of sexist, male theologians and other staff in all departments, [and] actively recruit, enroll, financially aid and seek equal placement for women theological students.” (National Organization for Women’s booklet *Revolution: Tomorrow is NOW*, pp. 17,18).

In the early 70’s some of our sisters were apparently listening to the voices of these anti-Christian feminists and asserting their own ‘rights’ in their local churches. In a large

SDA church near the General Conference headquarters, one SDA sister told her Pastor that she wanted to become part of his pastoral staff. What was her reason? “It must have been because I’d been hearing and reading about women in the ministry in other denominations. To me it seemed feasible for our church as well.” The Pastor “took the request to the conference committee” where it “was resoundingly defeated.” (Insight, 1/3/78, p. 9).

Sadly that incident wasn’t the end of the subject however. The above mentioned sister wasn’t the only one listening to these daughters of deception. As has become an all too familiar scenario in our organization, the leaders started to allow the influence of the world to sway their thinking. They started considering the subject of the ordination of women. The sister previously mentioned was thus ordained as a local elder on 5/26/73, and the conference committee voted her in as an “associate pastor” effective 9/1/73. Later she became the “pastor” of an SDA church in Maryland. (Insight, 1/3/78, p. 9; Insight, 9/23/80, p. 3).

Being ever so careful not to alarm the constituency, but apparently preparing it to receive the ordination of women in the SDA organization, “the 1977 Annual Council . . . [created]the position of associate in pastoral care, a median position between that of Bible instructor and pastoral intern. Women in this position are eligible for scholarships funded equally by the General Conference, their union, and their local conference, just as their male counterparts are funded. The 1978 Annual Council went a step further and opened up pastoral internships to women. . . . Women are now serving the church as ministers under the titles of associate in pastoral care, licensed or credentialed missionary, and, in the case of a growing number, locally ordained elder.” (Insight, 9/23/80, p. 4).

In 1977, when President of the General Conference, Robert H. Pierson, conceded that: “Currently, we find no inspired evidence supporting the ordination of women to the gospel ministry.” [We now have several ordained women serving in the capacity of “pastor”, “associate pastor”, or “associate in pastoral care.” Mark my words friends, the next step is not far off. Many at the General Conference level will take a supporting role in the ordination of women to the Priesthood!] — (quotation from: Pacific Union Recorder, 10/24/77, p. 3).

In our world of “women’s rights” we will undoubtedly continue to hear the cry of “unfair!” I fear that we have already gone too far in this matter of ordaining women. Because of the compromise of the majority of our leaders they have opened up a problem creating ill that God never intended this church to suffer. Far better that we would have had to go to court once (maybe all the way to the Supreme Court) and let the Lord vindicate His Word, than to open up a Pandora’s box that will create untold problems.

These compromises of the leaders will once again prove to be very costly and embarrassing to the organization. It will continue to weaken the confidence of many who are honest in heart and committed to following the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy counsel. Because of the lack of proper leadership many more women will now covet the positions that God has not given them to have, and if they don’t get their way we have opened ourselves to many lawsuits that will prove costly and an abuse of God’s money in defending cases that should have never come to court.

To demonstrate the point allow me to share a portion of an article written in Christianity Today (a non-SDA magazine) dated 11/20/81, p. 69: “a graduate of. . . Andrews University. . . has filed a discrimination suit against the [SDA] church. The

graduate is a woman . . . and a . . . clinical psychologist . . . [She] says she applied for positions at two Maryland churches and was turned down. She believes she was turned down because she is a woman. . . . The suit [was] filed in federal court in Baltimore. . . . The SDA church does not ordain women, but . . . [she] was not trying to be ordained. She applied for positions as an associate pastor and an intern in pastoral care. A number of women hold such positions in the denomination.”

Even though at the time of this writing the SDA organization is becoming more and more involved in the courts of this land by initiating lawsuits against fellow Christians, the Bible condemns such actions and asks this question: “When any of you has a grievance against another, aren’t you ashamed to bring the matter to be settled before a pagan court instead of before the Church?” “If one of you has a dispute with a fellow Christian, how dare he [she] go before heathen judges instead of letting God’s people settle the matter?” (1 Corinthians 6:1 JBP, GNB).

“Christians should not appeal to civil tribunals to settle differences that may arise among church members. Such differences should be settled among themselves, or by the church. . . . Even though injustice may have been done, the follower of the meek and lowly Jesus will suffer himself to be defrauded rather than open before the world the sins of his brethren in the church. Lawsuits between brethren are a reproach to the cause of truth. Christians who go to law with one another expose the church to the ridicule of her enemies and cause the powers of darkness to triumph. They are wounding Christ afresh and putting Him to open shame. By ignoring the authority of the church, they show contempt for God, who gave to the church its authority.” (AA 305-6).

The point is obvious! Can we as members of the SDA church

and foremost followers of Jesus, have confidence in leadership and women “pastors” who claim to teach us to follow the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy, while at the same time they reject them by disobeying the very counsel to be found therein?

The historic Seventh-day Adventist, while believing that the inspiration of the Spirit of Prophecy is the same as is found in the Bible, agrees that the Bible is the final word in God’s direction for His people. The true and the faithful also believe that as both are faithfully studied to know the will of God, that there will be seen a beautiful harmony in the principles of living between the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. Ellen White herself plainly states in many places that the Bible is the only final Word of God, and nothing should or can take its place.

The SDA leaders have said: “We do not regard them [SOP] in the same sense as the Holy Scriptures, which stand alone and unique as the standard by which all other writings must be judged. . . . We test the writings of Ellen G. White by the Bible, but in no sense do we test the Bible by her writings. . . . We have never considered Ellen G. White to be in the same category as the writers of the canon of Scripture. . . . We base our teachings on the Scriptures, the only foundation of all true Christian doctrine. . . . Briefly then, this is the Adventist understanding of Ellen G. White’s writings. They have been for a hundred years, to use her own expression, ‘a lesser light’ leading sincere men and women to ‘the greater light.’ “ (Questions on Doctrine, 1957 ed., pp. 89-96).

“SDA’s accept the Bible and the Bible only as the Christian’s rule of faith and practice, and believe it to be in its entirety the true, reliable, and authoritative word of God in the language of men . . . and . . . affirm that the canonical Scriptures constitute the norm by which all other prophetic messages are to be tested. . . . SDA’s accept Ellen G. White’s writings as

representing the work of the prophetic gift, but not as taking the place of the Bible or as constituting an addition to it.” (SDA Encyclopedia, 1976 ed., p. 1413).

“Little heed is given to the Bible, and the Lord has given a lesser light to lead men and women to the greater light.” (CM 125).

“The Word of God is to be our guide. . . The Testimonies are not by any means to take the place of the Word. They are to bring you to that neglected Word.” “The Testimonies were not given to take the place of the Bible.” “The testimonies of Sister White should not be carried to the front. God’s Word is the unerring standard. The Testimonies are not to take the place of the Word. . . Let all prove their positions from the Scriptures and substantiate every point they claim as truth from the revealed Word of God. . . . Our position and faith is in the Bible. And never do we want any soul to bring in the Testimonies ahead of the Bible.” (1901 General Conference Bulletin, p. 25; 5T 663; EV 256).

“I recommend to you, dear reader, the Word of God as the rule of your faith and practice. By that Word we are to be judged.” “The Bible . . . is an infallible guide under all circumstances, even to the end of the journey of life.” “The Bible is a perfect guide.” “The Holy Scriptures are the perfect standard of truth.” “The Word of God is solid rock, and we may plant our feet securely upon it.” (EW 78; 5T 264; 6T 355; Ed 17; 7BC 952).

“In the Bible we have the unerring counsel of God.” “The Bible . . . teaches the whole will of God concerning the sons and daughters of Adam. It is the rule of life. . . In the Bible every duty is made plain.” “The follower of Christ . . . is to regard the Bible as the voice of God speaking directly to him.”

“Brethren, cling to your Bible, . . . and obey the Word.” “The Bible and the Bible only is to be our creed.” (4T 441; 8T 157; AA 474-5; 1SM 18, 416).

“As the Spirit of God becomes better known, the Bible will be accepted as the only foundation of faith.” (8T 192-3).

“In His word, God has committed to men the knowledge necessary for salvation. The Holy Scriptures are to be accepted as an authoritative, infallible revelation of His will. They are the standard of character, the revealer of doctrines, and the test of experience. . . . The Spirit was not given — nor can it ever be bestowed — to supersede the Bible; for the Scriptures explicitly state that the word of God is the standard by which all teaching and experience must be tested. . . . True Christianity receives the word of God as the great treasure-house of inspired truth, and the test of all inspiration. . . . There is need of a return to the great Protestant principle, — the Bible, and the Bible only, as the rule of faith and duty. . . . The people of God are directed to the Scriptures as their safeguard against the influence of false teachers. . . . God will have a people upon the earth to maintain the Bible, and the Bible only, as the standard of any doctrine of precept. We should demand a plain ‘Thus saith the Lord’ in its support.” (GC 7, 193, 204-5, 593, 595).

“The Bible is our rule of faith and doctrine. . . . Do not advocate theories or tests that Christ has never mentioned, and that have no foundation in the Bible. . . . Let us go to the word of God for guidance. Let us seek for a ‘Thus saith the Lord.’ “ (GW 249, 309, 310).

“ ‘Thus saith the Lord’ is not to be set aside for Thus saith the church or the state. . . . We are to receive God’s word as supreme authority.” (6T 402).

It's plain to see, that according to the writings of Ellen G. White no other works are to supersede or take the place of the Word of God. The Bible is the last say where the Lord has made plain His revealed will for man.

It's rather subtle how the enemy uses the "progressive evolvment" of modern thinking to bend and twist the written word of God, that is centuries old and has stood the test of many societies. Some, of late, have made the argument for ordaining women into the ministry that Genesis 3:16 was not a curse because of sin, but rather an announcement from an all knowing God of what would take place in the future as a natural result of sin; That man would dominate the woman and abuse their "equal" positions because sin had entered the world.

Using these premises for a basis of argumentation, the scenario goes on to explain that as we try to lessen the effects of sin in our world, such as using pain-killers for pain or air-conditioning to stave off the heat during work, then we should also try to do away with the man being the head of the household, which is considered by these folks to be another result of sin.

Of course there is nothing wrong with trying to lessen the pain of sin in our world. To relieve discomfort or to make things less painful is something to be desired. However, we can not remove the plain intention and commands of the Lord whether they are in the area of work, childbirth, or the role relationship that God has said is to be the way of life until Jesus returns. To demonstrate the point, let's take a look at Genesis 3:16 and the verses that surround it.

"And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat. And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because

thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception, in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. And unto Adam he said, Because thou has hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return.” (Genesis 3:14-19).

In this curse pronounced by God because of sin, not as an effect of sin, the serpent was to crawl on its belly. There was enmity placed between the woman’s seed and that of Satan’s. The woman, during childbirth, would experience much pain. The ground would not easily and abundantly give food as it had in Eden, and also it would produce thorns and thistles, something not known in Eden. Man would earn a living by the ‘sweat of his brow,’ and labor in sadness all the days of his life, no longer having the perfect joy of his former Eden home.

Now here’s the point and honest question. Has God removed any of the above curses that were placed upon mankind and the earth since sin has entered the world? If so, which ones are they? Have women stopped (by the removal of the curse) having labor pains during childbirth? Has the serpent stopped crawling on its belly? Has the enmity between God’s people and Satan’s been removed? How about the thorns and the thistles, are they gone? Does man now enjoy, once again, the full and constant

joy he knew in Eden? Has he stopped returning to dust, at death? Of course not!

There are many who argue that man in fact doesn't return to dust, but lives on. Those of us who take the Bible for what it says, however, realize that these people do not want to die or face the consequences of their sins so they misuse the Bible and twist what it plainly says, to preach a lie. And unfortunately, friends that is exactly what is happening with those who are either women's libbers or who are in sympathy with the movement, for whatever reason.

The real problem that needs to be addressed is the abusive role that some men have taken over their wives, which is just as un-Biblical as that of ordaining women. The New Testament writers plainly urge husbands to honor and love their wives as Christ loves the church. To be oppressive and to 'lord it over' the wife is improper and out of counsel with Bible teaching, but this in no way negates the role relationship that God has set forth. God has placed the man to be the head of the household. He then counseled him how to properly hold that position. He has set similar guidelines for the woman as well, and it must be said that if these guidelines were followed by both parties, as God intended, there would be far less evils in the SDA organization and families today.

Are Men And Women Equal?

THERE is a familiar argument that has been set forth (misusing the Spirit of Prophecy) to uphold the assassination of the male headship role: Adam and Eve were created equal, but because of sin she was lowered in position a little and placed in subjection to her husband. Now “the very essence of the gospel is restoration,” thus “the wife is to stand by the side of the husband as his equal” in the family. (DA 824; EV 494). Now since the family is like a little church, doesn’t it stand to reason that the gospel should restore to women the right to be a part of the leadership and be ordained to the Priesthood or Ministry as their male counterparts?

Once again I appeal to your good scholarship by asking this question. How can a woman be RESTORED to an ordained leadership role in the church when she was never in that position in the first place!?

To say that the Bible or the Spirit of Prophecy says or implies that men and women are equal in all respects is another abuse of inspiration and is not honest scholarship. In fact, for the most part, it is only those who want to be someone or something that God did not intend them to be, that present the argument otherwise. The Bible, the Spirit of Prophecy, and most in the world readily acknowledge and admit that women and men are not equal.

“Adam . . . was more than twice as tall as men now living upon the earth, and was well proportioned.” “Eve was somewhat less in stature.” “Her head reached a little above his shoulders.”

(SR 21; PP 45; SR 21).

“They [women] are physically smaller and weaker than their male counterparts,” and “extensive research has established that most women are endowed with substantially less physical strength and endurance than most of their male counterparts.” (U.S. News & World Report, 6/5/78, p. 35; 3/3/80, p. 30).

“After years of studies, the Pentagon has declared that women have only 55 per cent the muscle strength and 67 per cent the endurance of men. Men have more upper-body strength, and can better withstand temperature extremes, Army tests have found. On average, women are shorter, lighter and slower Because of the physiological differences, the military has been forced to change some of its standards for women. The Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, for example, had to allow women one extra minute for the 2-mile run or risk failing 81 per cent of its female cadets. At West Point, women do flexed arm hangs instead of chin-ups, take karate instead of boxing, and shoulder 8-pound M-16 rifles instead of M-14s. At Fort Jackson, women do only 18, not 35, push-ups in 2 minutes, and need not qualify on the rifle range. At Parris Island, S.C., the Marine Corps’ boot camp, women are excluded altogether from infantry field training and the grueling obstacle courses. . . . James Webb . . . and others think that changing standards for women has given them a false sense of physical accomplishment. ‘You can take football and modify the rules so women can play,’ he says. ‘That’s fine — until they face the Dallas Cowboys and get slaughtered.’ “ (Newsweek, 2/18/80, p. 36).

“Muscle Vs. Fat: A man’s biggest advantage is his muscle mass. Puberty stokes male bodies with the hormone testosterone, which adds bulk to muscles. A girl’s puberty brings her an increase in fat, which shapes her figure but makes

for excess baggage on an athlete. When growing ends, an average man is 40 per cent muscle and 15 per cent fat; a woman, 23 per cent muscle, 25 per cent fat Men have larger hearts and lungs and more hemoglobin in their blood, which enables them to pump oxygen to their muscles more efficiently than women can. . . . Although highly conditioned women can achieve pound-for-pound parity with men in leg strength, their upper-body power is usually only one-half to two-thirds that of an equally well-conditioned male athlete.” (Newsweek, 5/18/81, p. 75, pp. 72-83).

Even though things keep changing in the military, as well as in all areas of society because of the tremendous pressure that women are placing on them, on 6/25/81 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled 6 to 3 that women could not be drafted into the Armed Forces and in effect agreed that “men and women are simply not equal in the eyes of the military.” (Newsweek, 7/16/81, p. 64).

Those who feel called to do so can argue that men and women are equal, however, they go against the inspired Word when doing so for God declares in 1 Peter 3:7: “Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, . . .” or weaker sex as in other translations.

Let’s take a look at the Lord’s counsel in the Spirit of Prophecy on this matter of the proper chain of command or equality in running the home or family unit. As we shall see, the male is to be the head of the family, just like Christ is the Head of the spiritual family or the church.

“Adam was crowned king in Eden. To him was given dominion over every living thing that God had created. . . . He made Adam the rightful sovereign over all the works of His

hands.” “Adam . . . stood as king, and . . . all nature acknowledged his rule.” “Adam was lord in his beautiful domain.” (1 BC 1082; Ed 26; 3T 153).

“In the beginning the head of each family was considered ruler and priest of his own household.” (SR 50).

“Paul the apostle, writing to the Ephesians Christians, declares that the Lord has constituted the husband the head of the wife, to be her protector, the house-band, . . . even as Christ is the head of the church. . . . Therefore he says, ‘As the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything.’” (MB 64).

“Give careful study to the following instruction: ‘Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church. . . . Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing.’ [Ephesians 5:22-24] And the Lord said, ‘. . . thy husband . . . shall rule over thee.’ [Genesis 3:16].

“In the creation God had made her the equal of Adam. . . ; but sin had brought discord, and now their union could be maintained and harmony preserved only by submission on the part of the one or the other. Eve had been the first in transgression; and she had fallen into temptation by separating from her companion, contrary to the divine direction. It was by her solicitation that Adam sinned, and she was now placed in subjection to her husband. [Compare with PP 58 and 3T 484]. . .

“The Bible plainly states that the husband is the head of the family. ‘Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands.’ . . . ;

for the husband is to stand as the head of the household. . . .

“His name, ‘house-band,’ is the true definition of husband. . . . The husband and father is the head of the household. . . . All members of the family center in the father. He is the lawmaker, . . . the priest of the household The father represents the divine Lawgiver in his family. . . . He must not, on any point, yield up his parental authority. . . . The father is to stand at the head of his family. . . .

“The Lord has constituted the husband the head of the wife to be her protector; he is the house-band of the family, . . . even as Christ is the head of the church.” (AH 114-5, 119, 211, 212, 213, 215).

“The husband is the head of the family, as Christ is the head of the church. . . . It is the duty of the wife to yield her wishes and will to her husband. Both should be yielding, but the Word of God gives preference to the judgment of the husband. And it will not detract from the dignity of the wife to yield to him whom she has chosen to be her counselor, adviser, and protector. The husband should maintain his position in his family with all meekness, yet with decision. . . .

“The requirements of the husband may sometimes seem unreasonable to the wife, when if she should calmly, candidly take the second view of the matter, in as favorable a light for him as possible, she would see that to yield her own way and submit to his judgment, even if it conflicted with her own feelings, would save them both from unhappiness and would give them great victory over the temptations of Satan.” (1T 307-9).

“It was God’s plan for the members of the family to be associated in work and study, in worship and recreation, the

father as priest of his household, and both father and mother as teachers and companions of their children.” (Ed 250-1).

“By divine direction the tribe of Levi was set apart for the service of the sanctuary. In the earliest times every man was the priest of his own household. In the days of Abraham the priesthood was regarded as the birthright of the eldest son. Now, instead of the first-born of all Israel, the Lord accepted the tribe of Levi for the work of the sanctuary. . . . The priesthood, however, was restricted to the family of Aaron. Aaron and his sons alone [not daughters] were permitted to minister before the Lord; . . .” (PP 350).

“In early times the father was the ruler and priest of his own family. . . His descendants were taught to look up to him as their head, in both religious and secular matters.” (PP 141).

“The husband and father is the head of the household . . . , the lawmaker of the household,” and “the father, who is the priest of his household, should conduct the morning and evening worship.” (MH 390; CG 521). “Let the father, as priest of the household, lay upon the altar of God the morning and evening sacrifice, while the wife and children unite in prayer and praise.” (PP 144).

“In every family there should be a fixed time for morning and evening worship.” “Morning and evening the father, as priest of the household, should confess to God the sins committed by himself and his children through the day. . . . This rule of action, zealously carried out by the father when he is present, or by the mother when he is absent, will result in blessings to the family.” (7T 43; 2T 701).

“It should be the special object of the heads of the family [“united rulers of the home kingdom” CT 128] to make the hour

of worship intensely interesting.” (7T 43).

“Faithfully do your duty in the home, the father as a priest of the household, the mother as a home missionary.” “God has assigned woman her mission; and if she . . . makes a heaven of her home, faithfully and lovingly performing her duties to her husband and children, continually seeking to let a holy light shine from her useful, pure, and virtuous life to brighten all around her, she is doing the work left her of the Master. . . . These women who are . . . aiding their husbands to bear their burdens, and training their children for God, are missionaries in the highest sense.” (7T 67; 2T 465-5).

“Let woman realize the sacredness of her work and. . . take up her life mission. Let her educate her children for usefulness in this world and for a fitness for the better world. . . . Her great work is to make her life a living example which she would wish her children to copy.” “The mother’s . . . first duty is to her children, to so mold their characters that they may be happy in this life and secure the future, immortal life. . . . God has given the mother, in the education of their children, a responsibility paramount to everything else,” for “there is no other work that can equal this. To a very great extent the mother holds in her own hands the destiny of her children,” so her “first great business of . . . life is to be a missionary at home.” (3T 565-6; WM 158; PP 244; 4T 138).

“The mother who trains her children for Christ is as truly working for God as is the minister in the pulpit,” in fact “she exercises in her home a power more decisive than the minister in the desk, or even the king upon his throne.” (PK 219, compare COL 359 and 2 BC 1009).

Keeping A Proper Perspective

QUITE a few feminists (and now quite a few ministers under the same pressure, who ought to know better) are misusing the scriptures and trying to “prove” their position of ordaining women to the ministry. However, not only does this not prove their argument but it displeases our Lord and proves to be nothing more than poor scholarship. These folks (some of them at the General Conference level) are using Galatians 3:28 which says “there is neither male nor female . . . in Christ Jesus,” to “prove” that the ordination of women is now Biblical. This is the same type of argumentation and abuse of scripture used to “prove” that we can eat all things that God has created by using Acts, chapter 10.

“And he [Peter] became very hungry, and would have eaten: but while they made ready, he fell into a trance, And saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth: Wherein were all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air. And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill, and eat. But Peter said, Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean. And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common.” (Acts 10: 10-15).

There are many who use the above scripture to “prove” that God said in the New Testament that it is alright now to eat anything you want because He has made all things clean to eat. But this is not so! And it demonstrates how many use the Bible to continue in sin by twisting that which God has never said. By taking these verses totally out of context, these people make

God say something that goes absolutely contrary to what is written elsewhere in the Bible, and Satan just loves this unsanctified type of scholarship.

Going on in Acts 10 we can discover the context of the dream that Peter had and thereby maintain the continuity of Bible harmony.

“While Peter thought on the vision, the Spirit said unto him, Behold, three men seek thee. Arise therefore, doubting nothing: for I have sent them And he said unto them, Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation; BUT GOD HATH SHEWED ME THAT I SHOULD NOT CALL ANY MAN COMMON OR UNCLEAN.” (Acts 10: 20, 28).

So you see the Bible plainly states that the context of the vision wasn't food at all! It had absolutely nothing to do with eating! It had everything to do with Peter's (a Jew) association with those of another nation (or race). You see, it was unlawful for a Jew to mingle with any other race and so God gave Peter a vision telling him that his work would include more than just the Jewish race and that He (God) had sent these three men to him.

Using the same poor and twisted scholarship and depending on the masses to just take their word for it, those who use Galatians 3:28 to “prove” anything about the validity of ordaining women simply expose themselves as Jesus exposed the Pharisees of old when He said: “Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God.” (Matthew 22:29).

Galatians 3 has absolutely NOTHING to do with the “right” for a women to be ordained into leadership positions. It has everything to do with inheriting the Land of Promise that God

promised to Abraham and his seed. No one is left out who loves the Lord enough to put his total trust and faith in his promises and “do the works of Abraham” thus acting out that faith. In the sense that all are equal in the salvation process Galatians chapter 3 demonstrates that God’s love extends to every soul. His promise to Abraham and his seed is for all, no matter what their background, race, or gender. In God’s plan to save “there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.” Verse 29 simply and plainly shows the context: “And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.”

The Spirit of Prophecy brings this out very clearly, and we who love it’s truths would expect it to. To deviate just a moment please allow me to give thanks to our Heavenly Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit for giving this church the precious gift of the Spirit of Prophecy. What an extraordinary and precious gift! I plead with all our brothers and sisters to use this gift to know what God requires of us before it is forever too late!

Staying with Galatians 3 just for another moment we find a further explanation in Patriarchs and Prophets page 170. “. . . The gift to Abraham and his seed included not merely the land of Canaan, but the whole earth. So says the apostle, ‘The promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.’ Romans 4:13. And the Bible plainly teaches that the promises made to Abraham are to be fulfilled through Christ. All that are Christ’s are ‘Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise’ —heirs to ‘an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away’ — the earth freed from the curse of sin. Galatians 3:29; 1 Peter 1:4.”

There are at least a couple of statements in the Spirit of Prophecy that are being misused, however well intentioned it

might be, and it may be good for us to take a look at them. “The tithe is . . . for . . . the support of the ministers,” “the tithe should go to those who labor in word and doctrine, be they men or women.” (9T 249; Ev 492).

According to the 1976 Annual Council of the Executive Committee of the General Conference: “The counsel is clear that those who engage in soul-winning activities are to be supported from tithe, [with or without ordination] be they men or women: . . . ‘Those who work earnestly and unselfishly, be they men or women, bring sheaves to the Master. . . . The tithe should go to those who labor in word and doctrine, be they men or women.’

“From the following statement . . . those who teach the Bible in our schools, Bible instructors, should be remunerated from tithe, be they men or women; ‘Our conferences . . . should give the schools a most hearty and intelligent support. Light has been plainly given that those who minister in our schools, teaching the word of God, explaining the Scriptures, educating the students in the things of God, should be supported by the tithe money.’

“Accordingly, . . . tithe funds may be allocated by official action of the church for the support of those within our school system who serve directly in educating and instructing in the things of God. Such persons, be they men or women, ordained or unordained, sustain a clear relationship to the work of the preaching of the gospel . . . and . . . [can] be paid wholly or partially from tithe funds.

“Church school teachers, whose primary function is to train and hold the youth under their charge in the Advent message, spend much of their time in teaching the Bible and the Bible principles to their students. They not only teach the Bible formally in the Bible classes with Bible textbooks, they also

conduct school worships, sponsor and conduct MV programs and classes, plan and coordinate Weeks of Prayer. They spend much of their time in counseling and in individual instruction where students' moral and spiritual values are being molded for eternity. In view of these facts, conference subsidies to our church schools up to a total of 30 per cent of the church school teacher's support can properly be paid out of tithe funds. Bible teachers in our academies and colleges can also be remunerated from the tithe. Because of their special soul-winning activities, . . . dormitory deans of men and women, as well as school principals, can also be classed as supporters of the ministerial function of soul saving." (R&H, 12/16/76, p. 11).

So based on the article in the Review, church leaders recognize that some positions that have nothing to do with ordination, can be supported in part or in whole from the tithe funds. The Spirit of Prophecy brings this out by stating: "The tithe . . . should be faithfully brought into the Lord's treasury for the support of ministers and missionaries who are opening the Scriptures to the people and working from house to house." And "institutions that are God's instruments to carry forward His work on the earth must be sustained. Churches . . . , schools . . . , and publishing houses . . . should be sustained by tithes and liberal offerings." "There are exceptional cases, where poverty is so deep that in order to secure the humblest place of worship, it may be necessary to appropriate the tithes." (9T 52; 4T 464; Ms 24, 1897, as quoted in R&H, 12/16/76, p. 10).

The 1976 Annual Council voted to accept the following guidelines:

"4. The tithe may be utilized to sustain other personnel in a supportive role who directly relate to the work of soul-winning agencies, whether directed by the General Conference, the division, the union or the local field. Included with such personnel are departmental directors and their related

personnel who are engaged in evangelistic and spiritual ministries.

“5. The tithe may be utilized for operating expenses of conferences and of supportive facilities used by the personnel outlined above.

“6. The tithe may be utilized to pay the salaries and allowances of all other persons holding current ministerial credentials or licenses.

“7. The tithe is considered to be an appropriate source of subsidy for the conference portion of the literature evangelists’ benefit fund.

“8. The tithe may be utilized for conference and mission operating subsidies to such programs as youth camps and camp meetings as supportive roles to the evangelistic thrust of the church. . . .

“10. Tithe funds may be used in pioneer or impoverished situations where there is little or no local financial base for the work. . . .

“12. Tithe funds may be used for the purchase of evangelistic equipment and conference equipment. . . .

“Our use of tithe is based on provision made for the support of the Levitical priesthood. Not only were the priests who functioned in the actual temple services supported from the tithe, but all from the tribe of Levi who acted in supporting roles.” (R&H, 12/16/76. pp. 9-10).

Although I cannot endorse the broad application the Conference has voted to place on the use of tithe because I believe it goes against the counsel of the Lord, based on the Review & Herald article and the Spirit of Prophecy statements quoted above, tithes may be used for persons and purposes other than ordained ministers. So as far as support is concerned, as long as an individual meets the above criteria he or she needn't be ordained. The counsel shows that if they work in a supportive role or directly in the Lord's vineyard, e they ordained or not — be they men or women, they can be supported from tithe funds.

It is crystal clear that the Old Testament priesthood and the sanctuary services were assigned to men only, from the tribe of Levi and this by the direction given to Moses by God (Jesus). This same Jesus came to this earth and hand picked the disciples (save one). Jesus, however wasn't from the tribe of Levi but from Judah, so if there had been a change in the gender selection this would have been the time to demonstrate it. He could have chose women if He had wanted to change the system previously given. It was demonstrated that the Levites were no longer the exclusive sanctuary servants or pastors. Certainly this would have been an opportune time with ladies around such as those who were following Jesus at the time. It would have been very difficult to find anyone, man or woman, more dedicated to Jesus than Mary Magdalene, for instance, or Mary the sister of Martha and Lazarus.

The selection of men only in both priesthoods, in the Old and New

Testaments, on both sides of the cross, shows plainly God's consistent plan and His will in this matter.

Another text that has been searched out to "sustain" the argument for ordaining women is that of Romans 16:1 which speaks of sister Pheobe as a "servant" which is derived from the

Greek word diakonos which is also used for the word “deacons” in 1 Tim. 3:8,12; so that must mean that Pheobe is a “deacon” of the church and thus a church officer.

But that argument at best is weak because diakonos is not always used as a technical term for a “deacon” or “minister” in the New Testament. Its basic meaning is “servant” and is used that way in texts such as Matthew 23:11; Mark 9:35; John 2:5, 9; 12:26, and also the text in question Romans 16:1.

Paul goes on in verse 2 to say about Pheobe: “That ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you: for she hath been a succorer of many, and of myself also.” Paul was saying to the people that Pheobe had been a servant of hospitality to many including himself and was encouraging them to give her a hand.

Sister White comments on a similar situation about the widow of Zarephath found in 1 Kings 17:12-15. These verses are right in line with the correct point of hospitality. Spirit of Prophecy remains consistent as it comments on the kindness of this widow to Elijah. “Brethren and sisters, invite to your homes those who are in need of entertainment and kindly attention . . . and show them genuine Christian hospitality. . . . In the providence of God we are associated with those who are inexperienced, with many who need pity and compassion. They need succor, for they are weak.” (6T 343-8).

Not only is Spirit of Prophecy right on target in its correct application, but an article found in Christianity Today magazine, 2/20/81, pp. 18-20 brings out the same point. Quoting Dr. George Knight, as referring to Pheobe a succorer in Romans 16:2, he states: “An appeal to the usage of the feminine word prostatis . . . is often made to attempt to establish Phoebe as a leader in the congregation. The argument often proceeds from

this word to a verb with the same root (proistemi) and the similar masculine noun (prostates). It usually insists that since the masculine noun and the verb are directly associated with leadership, the feminine noun must be also. As a matter of fact, New Testament Greek lexicons and classical Greek lexicons consistently indicate that this is not the case, and that the feminine noun indicates one who is a ‘helper’ or ‘patroness’ but not a leader . . . , ‘one who cared for the affairs of others by aiding them with her resources.’ “

In harmony with the last sentence above, the Greek word prostatis in Romans 16:2 is translated “helper” in NASB, RSV, ASV, and “good friend” in NEB, GNB. “Pheobe,” says the SDA Bible Dictionary, p. 881, “is described as having been a . . . prostatis . . . of many in her home church.” Prostatis means ‘patroness,’ ‘protectoress.’ So based on the analysis of the study above Pheobe would have held the position of what is now termed ‘deaconess.’

In the SDA Church Manual, 1963 edition, (pp. 87-8), and 1976 edition (p.95), and in the 1986 edition (p. 64) we read: “Deaconesses were included in the official staff of the early Christian churches (Rom. 16:1, 2). Pheobe was a servant — servant in this instance meaning ‘deaconess’ — of the church at Cenchrea. Other references indicate that women served in the early church as deaconesses. There is no record, however, that these women were ordained; hence the practice of ordaining deaconesses is not followed by the Seventh-day Adventist Church.”

God's Word Never Changes, But The Church Manual

IN the 1990 edition of the SDA Manual, things have been changed. Whether this is preparatory for adopting the ordination of women I cannot say but time will tell.

“Deaconesses were included in the official staff of the early Christian churches. ‘I commend to you our sister Phoebe, a deaconess of the church at Cenchrea, that you may receive her in the Lord as befits the saints, and help her in whatever she may require from you, for she has been a helper of many and of myself as well’ (Romans 16:1, 2, RSV).”

Notice that the explanation of Phoebe as a “servant” is omitted and nothing is said about the non-ordination of deaconesses. In the light of what’s going on today in the organization it is becoming easier and easier to conclude that we are being slowly but consistently prepared to accept the theories of man instead of the Lord.

Also, the greatest weight to the treatment of deacons in the New Testament is found in 1 Timothy 3:8-13. Those verses set the deacons apart as being positively male, men not women, thus separating or distinguishing women FROM deacons, and does NOT apply the term diakonos to women in the technical sense. That’s why so many translations have NOT used “deacon” in Romans 16:1. They are aware that the more accurate Pauline usage in 1 Timothy 3:8-13 does not apply the term in a technical way to women.

When the ordination of deacons was to take place, the

apostles, guided by the Holy Spirit, chose only men (see Acts 6 :2-6). Spirit of Prophecy comments on this with: “In the days of the theocracy. . . , ‘Moses chose able MEN out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens’. . . Exodus 18:19-26. Later, when choosing 70 elders to share with him the responsibilities of leadership, Moses was careful to select, as his helpers, MEN possessing dignity, sound judgment, and experience. . .

“The same principles . . . that were to guide the rulers among God’s people in the time of Moses. . . were also to be followed by those given the oversight of the newly organized church of God in the gospel dispensation. In the work of setting things in order in all the churches, and ordaining suitable MEN to act as officers, the apostles held to the high standards of leadership outlined in the Old Testament Scriptures.” “Summoning a meeting of the believers, the apostles were led by the Holy Spirit . . . and . . . said, ‘look ye out among you seven MEN’. . . This advice was followed and by prayer and the laying on of hands, seven chosen MEN were solemnly set apart for their duties as deacons. . . These officers gave careful consideration to individual needs as well as to the general financial interests of the church, and . . . they were fully qualified to instruct others in the truth. . .

“The organization of the church at Jerusalem was to serve as a model for the organization of churches in every other place. . . ; and the deacons were to be ‘MEN of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom.’ These MEN were to take their position unitedly on the side of right and to maintain it with firmness and decision. Thus they would have a uniting influence upon the entire flock.” (AA 92-5, 89-91).

In 1 Timothy 3:11 women are mentioned. What about them? Did they make up a group of official leaders in the church,

whether ordained or not? The King James Version uses the word ‘wives,’ with other translations saying in the footnotes “deaconesses” and some showing the word “women.” The SDA Bible Commentary on page 300 uses the Greek word “gunaikes, ‘women,’ or ‘wives.’ It is impossible to determine conclusively whether Paul is speaking of deaconesses or of deacons’ wives.” “Wives” seems to be the more likely, since verse 11 is in the middle of the verses that list qualifications for deacons. In any case the women did help in the broad ministry of the church, though not as Deacons or Elders nor in the present-day sense of Pastors. Rather they served in an important supportive role to help the gospel field advance its work. (see Mark 15:40-41; Luke 2:36-38; 23:49,55; 24:10; John 4:28-30, 39-42; Acts 9:36; 16:13-15, etc).

What about Priscilla? The Scriptures indicates that Aquila and Priscilla were quite knowledgeable and talented, being listed as “helpers” of Paul. The Spirit of Prophecy says they were “a Christian man and woman whose humble employment was that of tentmaking;” although earnest and dedicated nonetheless unordained laypeople who “were not called to give their whole time to the ministry of the gospel.” (6 BC 1062-3; AA 243, 355). The SDA church says that “the couple . . . must have been extremely valuable lay workers in the Christian churches to which they belonged.” (SDA Bible Dictionary pp. 64-5). This of course means that they weren’t ordained but rather like many in the church today that serve the Lord in a lay ministry capacity and although very valuable to the advancement of the gospel they are not ordained as leaders in the church.

But wasn’t “Junia” in Romans 16:7 an apostle? To some this may seem a contradiction or indication that at least one woman served in an ordained capacity, but further investigation clears this up. “This may be the name of either a man or a woman,” because the form in this verse could come either from a

feminine name, Junia, or from a masculine name, Junais — (much like my own name of Terry.) “The context suggests [this person] . . . was a man, hence should be called by the masculine name Junias, as in the RSV [and NASB, NIV, ASV, NEB].” (6 BC 650; SDA Bible Dictionary, p. 634). Also the phrase “of note among the apostles” may as accurately be translated “well-known to the apostles,” or as 6 BC 650 puts it: “well known by the apostles,” or the TLB: “respected by the apostles.” Romans 16:7, then, does not support ordination of women to leadership positions in the church.

Many have tried to use the situation of Ellen White’s special call of the Lord to give “license” to the ordination of women, so let’s take a look. It is true that she was called and blessed of the Lord with the gift of Prophecy (after He had offered it to two men — who rejected it!), and she served her Lord and church well, giving to many instruction and encouragement for years. Her work was more than that of a prophetess and she, after the death of her husband (James White) in 1881, was granted a salary equivalent to that paid an officer of the General Conference.

While she received a license to preach, and her name appeared on ministerial lists, she was not “ordained” to the Gospel Ministry. “She did not hold office either in a local church or in any conference, including the General Conference. She attended the sessions as a delegate. . . She was not a member of conference committees or of boards of church-owned institutions.” (SDA Encyclopedia, 1976 edition, p. 1592).

Another talented and licensed but unordained woman (a lady dentist) was mentioned by Ellen White in a letter to Sister Ings: “Sister Caro not only does her business, but she has a ministerial license [Sister Caro is listed in the SDA Yearbook for 1894, p. 7, as ministerial “licentiate”] and bears many

burdens in their church at Napier [New Zealand]. She speaks to the people, is intelligent and every way capable. She supports her three sons — two in Battle Creek, and one in England who is studying law. . . Sister Caro takes in a great deal of money, but nothing expended in luxuries. She is supporting young men in the Bible School at Melbourne, besides some in America. The Lord blesses this noble, unselfish woman.” (9MR 25).

Even with a “license,” neither Sister White nor Sister Caro was Biblically eligible to be ordained into the Ordained Gospel Ministry, because this Ministry is Biblically restricted to males. This is why we will not find that Sister White ever had men “lay hands” on her for ordination. This would have been incorrect and therefore was not done. Hers was a special work and not to be used for an example of ordaining women in the Gospel Ministry, which is not Biblical.

However, some in our church would try to get women into the Ordained Gospel Ministry by putting together various Spirit of Prophecy statements, such as: “Women should be educated in medical missionary lines. . . Holy and devout persons, both men and women, are wanted now to go forth as medical missionaries.” “The work of the true medical missionary is largely a spiritual work. It includes prayer and the laying on of hands; he therefore should be as sacredly set apart for his work as is the minister of the gospel. Those who are selected to act the part of missionary physicians, are to be set apart as such.” (MM 246, 250: Ev 546).

These people who are desperately looking for a ‘legitimate’ way to ordain women conclude, if we are to ordain medical missionaries and doctors into the Ministry, and we have women in both fields, then we should ordain women as well as men, lest we discriminate!

Spirit of Prophecy says itself that if we look hard enough

for something that we wish to believe, even though it's not there we will find it and we must be very careful not to twist inspiration to make it say that which it does not say. Remember that true inspiration agrees with itself, and it does not contradict itself, and it is consistent. Let's take a closer look at Evangelism 546, used above. "The work of the true medical missionary . . . includes prayer and the laying on of hands [the "laying on of hands" is on patients and/or students, thus is not always associated with ordination]; he [male] therefore should be as sacredly set apart for his work as is the minister [not as the minister, but as is the minister] of the gospel. Those who are selected to act the part of missionary physicians, are to be set apart as such." [To be "devoted" or "consecrated" as such, to be "set apart" does not necessarily mean "ordained to the Gospel Ministry" — the word "ordained" is not even in this Spirit of Prophecy statement]. Going further, "This will strengthen them against the temptation to withdraw from the sanitarium work [which is medical work, not the Ministry] to engage in private practice. No selfish motive should be allowed to draw the worker from his post of duty."

The "laying on of hands" or "setting one apart" does not always mean that one is ordained in the sense of, to the Gospel Ministry. One can be set apart for the work of the gospel ministry without being an official minister or placed in an official leadership position. Let me demonstrate this with my own experience of many years ago. I had taken the training for the work of Literature Evangelist in the Kansas Conference. At a special meeting, along with several others I was "ordained" to that work by the "laying on of hands" during the ceremony, which was very solemn. We all understood, however, that even though the Spirit of Prophecy plainly states that the work of the Literature Evangelist is as important as that of the Gospel Minister, that we were not being ordained to that official capacity nor would we be recognized as Ministers (Pastors) in the church.

Another example is that of Samuel who at a very young age was “set apart” by his mother. She gave him to the Lord to be used in His service. Although Samuel went on to become a Prophet of God, certainly we can readily see that although “set apart” while very young (just a boy), he was not at that time “ordained” to the position of Gospel Minister. Many parents “set apart” their children and “the laying on of hands” takes place at these baby/child dedications, but obviously they are not “ordained” as Gospel Ministers. One can be set apart, even for the work of the gospel ministry, including having “the laying on of hands” without becoming a Gospel Minister.

So the above Ellen G. White statement gives neither permission or authorization for the ordination of women into the Gospel Ministry! In fact, where can be found any Spirit of Prophecy statement that clearly and unambiguously authorizes women for the Ordained Gospel Ministry?

We need to be very careful about putting together statements or parts of statements, and make very sure that by doing so we haven’t arrived at an unwarranted conclusion: “Judas . . . went off and hanged himself.” “You go . . . and do the same.” (Matthew 27:5 and Luke 10:37 GNB). — VERY DANGEROUS!

Every true Christian has been called out of the world, set apart, ordained by God to serve and minister to others. We are all ordained ministers in that sense, called to a royal priesthood. The Spirit of Prophecy agrees that “the members of God’s church . . . are to minister to those in need of help, bringing to sinners a knowledge of the Saviour’s love.” “If we have fellowship with God, we are His ministers, though we may never preach to a congregation. We are workers together with God.” (AA 109-10; 6T 13). But to take these statements to support, or understanding them to mean that we all should be

ordained as Gospel Ministers would be pure foolishness and a gross misuse of inspiration!

In the *Adventist Review* of 3/5/81 (p.14) and again 12/10/81 (p.12) an advertisement reads, in part: “There are many kinds of ministers at Florida Hospital. . . Employees throughout the hospital . . . 3,500 employees.” The picture in this ad shows a few of the “ministers” around the patient’s hospital bed: three women (a housekeeper, auxilian, and nurse) and four men (seemingly an admitting clerk, dietitian, chaplain, and surgeon.)

Spirit of Prophecy acknowledges these people by stating that “every worker in our sanitariums should regard himself as Christ’s minister,” “every soul is to minister. . . Ministry means not only the study of books and preaching. It means service.” “To reach the people, wherever they are, and whatever their position or condition, and to help them in every way possible, — this is true ministry.” (MM 196; 4BC 1159; MH 156).

Regarding Matthew 28:19 and Mark 16:15, Spirit of Prophecy states “Christ gave the commission to His disciples..’Go ye therefore, and teach all nations,.” “‘Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature’ . . . is Christ’s command to His followers. NOT THAT ALL ARE CALLED TO BE MINISTERS OR MISSIONARIES IN THE ORDINARY SENSE OF THE TERM; but all may be workers with Him in giving the ‘glad tidings’ to their fellow men. To all, great or small, learned or ignorant, old or young, the command is given.” “The Saviour’s commission to the disciples . . . includes all believers in Christ to the end of time. . . All fellow men. . . Ministry does not consist alone in preaching. [The gospel commission is given to] Those ministers who relieve the sick and suffering, helping the needy, speaking words of comfort to the desponding and those of little faith.” (DA 818; Ed 264; DA 822).

In this sense we all are called to the gospel ministry and are to minister to others until the end of time. Andrews University Professor Gottfried Oosterwal says, “Anyone who joins the church . . . enlists himself as a minister and missionary of the gospel. Everyone who through baptism has tasted the goodness of the Lord is added to the church as a living stone and becomes a member of the holy priesthood . . . (see 1 Peter 2:3-10). . . Everyone who by baptism joins the church is thereby pledged to become a missionary of Jesus Christ — a co-worker in His ministry of salvation unto all the world.” Rex Edwards of Columbia Union College agrees: “All baptized Christians are ministers. . . , the Biblical teaching is that Christians ARE ministers. . . When Christians discover that they are ministers , . . ministry begins with the person, not the job.” (Ministry Magazine, February 1980 pp. 7; 8-9).

Though women are an important part of the ministry or priesthood as wives and mothers, counselors, teachers, Bible instructors, medical personnel, etc., they are NOT Scripturally eligible for the Ordained Gospel Ministry; in fact, are barred from it (1 Timothy 2:11-12; 3:2,12; Titus 1:5-6; Ephesians 5:22-24; 1 Corinthians 14:34; 11:3).

Christian Women A Valuable Asset

ONE of the many areas that women can be and are very valuable is in the area of counseling other women. Many women take their private problems to the Pastor (male) and this can and often does cause undue friction in the church. Many men (and rightfully so) become upset when their wives share intimate details to another man, their pastor. On the other hand, women become upset when their husbands share with other women those things that are delicate in their marriage arrangement. This is why it is advisable that women talk to women and men to men in some of these areas. The Spirit of Prophecy gives good counsel in this regard by stating: “when a woman relates her family troubles, or complains of her husband and breaks down the wall erected to preserve the sanctity of the marriage relation. . . If a woman comes to a Christian brother with a tale of her woes, her disappointments and trials, he should ever advise her, if she must confide her troubles to someone, to select sisters for her confidants, and then there will be no appearance of evil whereby the cause of God may suffer reproach.” (2T 306).

“When a woman is in trouble, let her take her trouble to women. If this woman who has come to you had cause of complaint against her husband, she should take her trouble to some other woman who can, if necessary, talk with you [in this case a Conference president] in regard to it, without any appearance of evil.” (Ev 460-1, section entitled: “Need for Women Counselors”).

There are many ways that the women in the church can and have been a valuable asset to the cause of God. Although not authorizing women as Ordained Ministers, Spirit of Prophecy states that “wives of the ministers should help their husbands in

their labors”: (1T 139) and that a “woman, if she wisely improves her time and her faculties, relying upon God for wisdom and strength, may stand on an equality with her husband as adviser, counselor, companion, and co-worker,” (Ev 467, section entitled “The Bible Instructor,” pointing out “the personal worker formerly known as ‘Bible worker’,” say the compilers on p. 456).

“There are women who should labor in the gospel ministry. In many respects they would do more good than the ministers who neglect to visit the flock of God.” — (paragraph entitled “Husband and Wife in a United Work — Ev 472). And on page 491: “When it is possible, let the minister and his wife go forth together. The wife can often labor by the side of her husband, accomplishing a noble work. She can visit the homes of the people and help the women in these families in a way that her husband cannot. . . We need workers to labor in connection with their husbands, and should encourage those who wish to engage in this line of missionary effort.”

“If a minister’s wife accompanies her husband in his travels, she should not go for her own special enjoyment, to visit, and to be waited upon, but to labor with him. She should have a united interest with him to do good. She should be willing to accompany her husband, if home cares do not hinder, and she should aid him in his efforts to save souls. . . If she possesses the spirit of self-sacrifice and has a love for souls, she can with him do almost an equal amount of good. . . She should work earnestly, faithfully, and unitedly with her husband to save souls.” (1T 452).

“The minister is paid for his work, and this is well. And if the Lord gives the wife as well as the husband the burden of labor, and she devotes her time and strength to visiting from family to family and opening the Scriptures to them although THE HANDS OF ORDINATION HAVE NOT BEEN LAID UPON HER, she is accomplishing a work that is IN THE LINE

OF MINISTRY. Then should her labors be counted as naught?

“Injustice has sometimes been done to women who labor just as devotedly as their husbands, and who are recognized by God as being necessary to the work of the ministry. The method of paying men-laborers, and not paying their wives who share their labors with them, is a plan not according to the Lord’s order, and if carried out in our conferences, is liable to discourage our sisters from qualifying themselves for the work they should engage in. God is a God of justice, and if the ministers receive a salary for their work, their wives, who devote themselves just as disinterestedly to the work, should be paid in addition to the wages their husbands receive, even though they may not ask for this.

“Seventh-day Adventists are not in any way to belittle woman’s work. If a woman puts her housework in the hands of a faithful, prudent helper, and leaves her children in good care, while she engages in the work, the conference should have wisdom to understand the justice of her receiving wages.” (GW 452-3).

However those women (and men helping them) who are trying to push and shove their way into the ministry of the church by threats and “discrimination” lawsuits, forcing their way into ordination, are not to be praised or admired. Their non-submissive, rebellious spirit and work grieves the Spirit of God and rather than help, hinders the progress of His work!

The Spirit of Prophecy notes that “the Master calls for gospel workers. Who will respond? Not all who enter the army are to be generals, captains, sergeants, or even corporals. Not all have the care and responsibility of leaders. There is hard work of other kinds to be done. Some must dig trenches and build fortifications; some are to stand as sentinels, some to carry messages. While there are but few officers, it requires

many soldiers to form the rank and file of the army; and yet its success depends upon the fidelity of every soldier. One man's COWARDICE OR TREACHERY MAY BRING DISASTER UPON THE ENTIRE ARMY." (R&H 5/23/12. Compare with 5T 394-5).

Much more good could be done by those who are pushing for the unauthorized, unbiblical, ordination of women if they would trust in God, lay down their pride and work in the capacity that God has placed them in, following His plan. For example: "In Finland two women evangelists have brought more than 1,000 people into the church and have raised up a number of church congregations, but because they are not ordained they cannot baptize those whom they have won to Christ." (Pacific Union Recorder, 11/12/73, p. 8).

Let me ask you this — Who in the kingdom of God is greater? Women who work for the Lord in this manner, following Him as He has directed, or those women who work against God and His plans to follow an agenda of their own?

Some have said that if they have the ability to win souls they should have the privilege and authority to baptize them as well. The overwhelming majority who work in the Lord's vineyard however are lay people who bring people to the foot of the cross and prepare them for baptism. Thus the argument using God's own Word against itself to try and set up that which God forbids is not only invalid but the same type of work that Satan did when he tempted Christ by using only a portion of the Scriptures. It seems fruitless and less than wise to misuse God's Word here on earth in order to gain a position among men while making the possibility very real by doing so, of losing one's position in heaven, eternally!

Before her death my step-mother, Kathryn Mae Ross (a true Christian woman) wrote to the White Estate asking about the ordination of women. W. P. Bradley, Chairman of the Board of

Trustees had this to say by return letter: "Thank you very much for your recent letter in which you ask for statements from the pen of Ellen G. White on the issue of ordaining women into the priesthood. **THERE ARE NO SUCH STATEMENTS ANYWHERE IN HER WRITINGS.** So it is perfectly simple to respond to your request by saying that we **HAVE NOTHING TO SEND YOU.** The only place in which Ellen White has ever touched on the ordination of women is found in the column of the Review and Herald, July 9, 1895, in which there is one paragraph in which Ellen White speaks of the laying on of hands for women whose lives are dedicated to welfare work. I think you will see as you read this that **SHE IS NOT REFERRING TO ORDINATION OF WOMEN TO THE GOSPEL MINISTRY** in the ordinary sense of the word. Now . . . I can assure you that there is **NOTHING ELSE FROM THE PEN OF ELLEN WHITE ON THIS SUBJECT.**"

Review & Herald 7/9/1895 says that "the minister" is male and that "women who are . . . appointed . . . and . . . set apart" are subject to him: "God . . . has not left the spiritual interests of the church wholly in the hands of the minister. . . The minister and the church-members are to unite as one person in laboring for the upbuilding and prosperity of the church. . . Ministers should take the officers and members of the church into their confidence, and teach them how to labor for the Master. . . Why not put them to work visiting the sick and assisting in other ways, and thus keep the church in a workable condition? All would thus be kept in close touch with the minister's plans, so that he could call for their assistance at any moment, and they would be able to labor intelligently with him. . .

"Many individuals might be laboring in towns and cities, visiting from house to house, becoming acquainted with families, entering into their social life, dining at their tables, entering into conversation by their firesides, dropping the precious seeds of truth all along the line. . .

“Women who are willing to consecrate some of their time to the service of the Lord should be APPOINTED TO VISIT THE SICK, LOOK AFTER THE YOUNG, AND MINISTER TO THE NECESSITIES OF THE POOR. THEY SHOULD BE SET APART TO THIS WORK BY PRAYER AND LAYING ON OF HANDS. In some cases they will need to counsel with the church officers or the minister; but if they are devoted women, maintaining a vital connection with God, they will be a power for good in the church.” — (It is estimated that Ellen G. White wrote over 100,000 pages according to the SDA Encyclopedia, 1976 p. 1592. This amounted to 25,000,000 words, yet this is the only reference to ordaining women — and even this reference is NOT to the Ordained Gospel Ministry! Thus, in her 69 years as an inspired author with thousands of pages and literally millions of words written, although she had ample opportunity to plainly endorse and authorize the ordaining of women to the Ordained Gospel Ministry, SHE NEVER DID, NOT EVEN ONE TIME!

So a woman is very useful and valuable in many fields of labor including that of “Bible Worker” or the “canvassing work”, while not being ordained as a Gospel Minister, they can likewise be “in the ministry.”

If being “in the ministry” means being an Ordained Gospel Minister then certainly that would pertain to everyone who is in the Gospel Ministry. Anyone who is working in God’s vineyard then would have the authorization to be ordained, and of course this is not correct.

Let me illustrate this further: although in marriage both the man and woman are involved, only the woman is the wife and only the man is the husband. While both may be parents and involved in the work of child-rearing, only the man is the father and only the woman is the mother. Thus both men and women may be involved in the work of the gospel but only the men are to be

ordained while the women have other roles to fill.

The Spirit of Prophecy is not burdened with trying to get women into the position of Ordained Pastor but rather young men and women into the various fields of soul-saving activities and missionary efforts as their main goal in life.

God wants to finish this work on earth and He wishes to do it through those who will dedicate themselves to His service. “. . . it was as a means ordained of God to educate young men and women for the various departments of missionary labor that colleges were established among us.” “We need well-disciplined, cultivated young men and women in our schools, in our sanitariums, in the medical missionary work, in the offices of publication, in the conferences of different states, and in the field at large.” (5T 390; 6T 206).

“Our schools have been established by the Lord, and if they are conducted in harmony with His purpose, the youth sent to them will quickly be prepared to engage in various lines of missionary work. Some will be trained to enter the field as missionary nurses, some as canvassers, some as evangelists, some as teachers, and some as gospel ministers.” (Ev 23-4).

“The sons and daughters of God are called to be missionaries. . . The Lord calls upon our youth to labor as canvassers and evangelists, to do house-to-house work in places that have not yet heard the truth. . . The Lord calls upon those connected with our sanitariums, publishing houses, and schools to teach the youth to do evangelistic work. Our time and energy must not be so largely employed in establishing sanitariums, food stores, and restaurants that other lines of work will be neglected. Young men and young women who should be engaged in the ministry, in Bible work, and in the canvassing work should not be bound down to mechanical employment.

“The youth should be encouraged to attend our training-schools for Christian workers, which should become more and more like the schools of the prophets. These institutions have been established by the Lord, and if they are conducted in harmony with His purpose, the youth sent to them will be prepared quickly to engage in various lines of missionary work. Some will be trained to enter the field as missionary nurses, some as canvassers, and some as gospel missionaries. . .

“Many young men and women now engaged in secular labor will feel stirred to give themselves to the service of God, to become channels of light. Some will feel a burden to enter the canvassing field, and will become able evangelists. Let these be given an opportunity to obtain an education for the work of God. . .

“‘Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature,’ is Christ’s command to his followers. Not that all are called to be ministers or missionaries in the ordinary sense of the term; but all may be workers with him in giving the ‘glad tidings’ to their fellow men. To all, great or small, learned or ignorant, old or young, the command is given. . .

“All who engage in ministry are God’s helping hand.” (R&H 5/16/12).

Some might try to use the statements made in R&H 1/15/01 (and 6T 322) against the Bible but this would be a misuse of inspiration. “It is the accompaniment of the Holy Spirit of God that prepares workers, both men and women, to become pastors to the flock of God.”

To take the sentence above alone it may at first seem to imply that women can become pastors (ordained pastors). But it should be noted that in this particular article, which deals with “Canvassers as Gospel Evangelists” [and 6T 321-5, “The

Canvasser a Gospel Worker”], the terms “pastor” and “teacher” and “shepherd” are equated and used in a general sense. The Spirit of Prophecy is being consistent with itself and the Bible in this passage for the use of the term “pastor” does not include in this situation a concept of the ordained pulpit ministry, but rather deals with certain opportunities afforded to canvassers.

The article reads: “CANVASSERS [known as Literature Evangelists today] AS GOSPEL EVANGELISTS. . . The intelligent, God-fearing, truth-loving canvasser should be respected; for he occupies a position equal to that of the gospel minister. . . All who wish an opportunity for true ministry . . . will find in the canvassing work opportunities to speak upon many things pertaining to the future immortal life. . . It is the accompaniment of the Holy Spirit of God that prepares workers, both men and women, to become pastors to the flock of God. . . In the Scriptures the faithful teacher is represented as a shepherd of the flock of God. . . , and the canvassing work is to be part both of the medical missionary work and of the ministry. To those who are engaged in this work, I would say: As you visit the people, tell them you are a gospel evangelist [‘a gospel worker’ — 6T 323]. . . Canvassers . . . should be educated in regard to the simple methods of hygienic treatment. Thus they may work as medical missionaries, ministering to the souls and bodies of the suffering.” (R&H 1/15/01).

So once again we are all to minister to some extent to others, be a pastor, shepherd, teacher, gospel worker, or medical missionary to those in need. But to pluck the term pastor out of the above statement and try to make it mean an “Ordained Pastor” would be equivalent to plucking out the term faithful teacher and making them an “Ordained Pastor” as well, and that’s not what the above passage is stating.

Divinely Different

DOES the gender really matter when occupying the station of an Ordained Minister? Well to be honest, it really doesn't matter to me at all. Well, I should say except that it does matter to God and that is the only reason it matters to me. It's kind of like the story of Cain and Abel. Personally I doubt if Abel could have cared less what Cain sacrificed to the Lord upon the altar. But Abel recognized that it wasn't a matter of private interpretation or a plan that was left up to the whims of man. It was God's plan and He, not any man, had set forth the proper order of the program. This is what mattered to Abel and why he was concerned for his brother. You know the rest of the story and you realize who received the blessing, and so did Cain. We may not see the importance in any particular directive that comes from God at the time, but that's what faith and submission to our Lord are all about, and those who will be at last in the Kingdom will know why it's important to follow Him all the way. So if God has made gender an issue in the plan of the Ordained Ministry, then no matter how man tries to change what God has set forth, we will be judged accordingly just as Cain and Abel were.

Both in the Old Testament and the New Testament gender is important according to God: "The apostles must now take an important step in the perfecting of gospel order in the church. .

..

"Summoning a meeting of the believers, the apostles were led by the Holy Spirit to outline a plan for the better organization of all

the working forces of the church. . . ‘Wherefore, brethren,’ they said, ‘look ye out among you seven men . . . whom we may appoint over the business’. . . This advice was followed, and by prayer and the laying on of hands, seven chosen men were solemnly set apart for their duties as deacons. . . The fact that these brethren had been ordained for the special work of looking after the needs of the poor, did not exclude them from teaching the faith. On the contrary, they were fully qualified to instruct others in the truth, and they engaged in the work with great earnestness and success. . .

“The organization of the church at Jerusalem was to serve as a model for the organization of churches in every other place. . .” (AA 88-91). The apostle Paul writes, in Titus 1:5-6, “set in order . . . and ordain elders in every city, . . . the HUSBAND OF ONE WIFE.” (5T 617). An elder, or bishop, or pastor-teacher, and also a deacon, must be the ‘husband’ so the church leader is to be male, not female! (1 Timothy 3:2, 12; 2:12).

“In the work of setting things in order in all the churches, and ordaining suitable men to act as officers, the apostles held to the high standards of leadership outlined in the Old Testament Scriptures.” (AA 95). This chapter in Acts of the Apostles repeatedly emphasizes “men” as leaders and elders and deacons. Also see PP 312,374,380-1, and Exodus 18:21, 25; Numbers 11:16, 24; Deuteronomy 1:15. “Christ . . . has ordained that there should be a SUCCESSION OF MEN who derive authority from the first teachers of the faith. . . Ministers who are truly Christ’s representatives will be men of prayer.” (4T 529).

Many make the argument (especially now in the days of the “Women’s Rights Movement”) that men and women are equal and that God created them that way. Now I realize that I’m

stepping on sensitive ground, and no matter what is said someone will cry unfair or male chauvinist, but truth is truth and if we are to serve God properly we must be willing to speak it even if we are maligned, ourselves. My motivation is straight forward and honest. I do not wish to offend anyone but I have had enough experience to know that truth offends most people, not because of the one who is speaking (although that may be the case at times) but rather because people simply don't want to fit into God's plan, but want God to fit into theirs. But this is a fatal mistake and if we truly have a love for the Lord, His truth and His people, we must be willing to step forward and speak in clear tones.

The simple fact is that man and woman were not created the same or for the same functions. This does not mean in the sense of personality that man and woman are not equal, but they are very different, created for different roles. God knew all things past, and future during the week of creation and although you will notice that He created both genders of the animals at the same time He purposely chose to make man first and woman second when creating human beings. This was not by accident but by divine design giving the priority to the man. This does not indicate that Eve was an inferior creation but rather a different intent in the design of mankind. Eve was purposely created to "compliment" Adam and to be his "other half." In God's ideal plan man and woman were made for each other as two halves of one foreordained whole, "one flesh", not identical, but complementary halves that together make a perfect whole — equal personalities with different capacities and responsibilities, each fulfilling a distinctive role: the man fulfilling his role as the head and father of the household, and the woman fulfilling her mission as "help meet" and mother. Thus, both are equal in value, for life as we know it would be impossible without both halves. This was God's pre-creation

purpose before it became muddled with the social or cultural conditions of sinful, rebellious humans that are trying to destroy that which God had ordained before the foundations of the earth was laid.

I must touch gently and briefly on the real problem as I see it in

this push to ordain women to the position of “Ordained Minister.”

One thing that both sexes are very capable of is pride. I know we don’t like to hear about it too much because it touches all of us, be we men or women. In our society we have been pelted with “success” seminars and “do your own thing” themes and “macho” attitudes that have vastly affected both sexes. I am absolutely convinced that if we would all lay our pride on the altar of sacrifice and allow the Lord to run the program, determining to be submissive to His directives, we would be enormously happier in the positions God has designed us to fulfill. I realize that someone out there at this point will yell “sure Terry, you are a man, so it makes it easier for you to swallow what you are saying.” In this case I will admit that this person (male or female) would be at least partially correct; but I have many times had to swallow my own pride, and I am not immune from the hurt that the process of submission brings. To me, however, this is an indicator that the work of my salvation and character perfection is not over. When I no longer have trouble with my pride and I’m perfectly happy submitting to God’s plan whatever it may be, THEN the work that

Jesus has started will be accomplished. We must not, nor can we afford to “change” truth in order to feed or satisfy our own egos. To do this is to eternally lose that which God has prepared for those who gain the understanding of properly serving Him, who gave Himself for us. I am confident that those men and women who are honestly seeking God’s plan for them will

understand what I'm trying to share, for the Holy Spirit will guide each one into all truth and if we obey the Lord we shall KNOW the doctrine.

The apostle Paul is very straight forward about the roles of men and women and the pre-eminence of man so far as headship is concerned. His application of Genesis 2:21-23 is given in 1 Corinthians 11: 8-9: "For the man is not of the woman, but the woman is of the man; neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." This understanding is in support of his earlier statement in verse 3 covering headship. ". . . the head of every man is Christ: and the head of woman is the man and the head of Christ is God."

Let's remember that the subject matter is not ones origin, but headship, and is here referring to the proper roles of man and woman in the marriage. The woman is to be submissive and the man is to be her leader, with Christ as his leader. Likewise, the reference to the relationship of God the Father, to Christ His incarnate Son concerns relationship, not origin of being.

Here we have the most perfect example to encourage women and provide them with a model. In the marriage arrangement and church order, women are to submit to the headship of men. The example? Jesus in His humanity has submitted to God as His head! Paul in his discourse to the relation of God the Father and His Son, Jesus, does not regard the fact of Christ's sonship and incarnation as implying inferiority for the Son, Jesus Christ. In fact the Bible clearly states that Christ thought it not robbery to be EQUAL WITH GOD. That Christ submits as incarnate Son does not mean that He is inferior to God, except physically, nor does it cast any doubt about His deity. Likewise, woman in a submissive role to

man does not make her inferior or mean that her humanity as an image-bearer is in doubt or threatened. Submission does not prove

inferiority or deny equality! (An elected person acting as the “chairman” of the Board may not be superior to those who have elected him — but he is elected to take the lead while all others are submissive to the position he is filling. The position doesn’t make him greater but to serve as first among equals.)

Be it known that many men today are abusing the positions that God has given them to fill, but that hasn’t changed the order of things. Only God can do that and He hasn’t. So if a man will be submissive to God’s lead and a woman submissive to a Godly man’s lead, then God’s plan for present humanity can be perfectly carried out. With that in mind the running of the church is based on the exact principles of the family. If there is trouble in the church you can know for certain that there is trouble in the family. This is the very reason why the enemy of all souls has run absolute riot with the family, and the very reason we are having so much trouble in the “church.” Whether folks want to admit it or not, this trouble in the family and the thrust of “Women’s Rights” is a direct attack on the family and the “church” at the same time, by the devil himself.

Authority — God's Or Man's?

IT is obvious and important to know that the Biblical order of things, the principle that God has chosen to operate by, is the same for the church family as for the home family unit. The man is to be the head, leader, or priest/pastor of both. Paul establishes the principle of headship for man in 1 Corinthians 11 and prohibits a woman speaking in church, according to chapter 14:34-35. This does not include praying or prophesying for he indicates in chapter 11:5 that it's wrong if done improperly, bringing one to the conclusion that the opposite is true as well. Rather, Paul's instruction lines up with teaching as paralleled in 1 Timothy 2:11-13, which does not permit a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man. As the principles for the operation of the church and marriage are the same, they stand or fall together, thus prohibiting woman in either from headship. The principles of teaching and what constitutes proper authority in the church corporate must be the permanent and universal instruction from the Word of God. Paul indicates in 1 Corinthians 14 that what he is teaching is the commandment of God (verse 37) and is to be observed in the churches (see verse 34; compare verse 33).

Someone will probably say at this point that "1 Corinthians 14:34-35 prohibits women only from disturbing the peace of the service by outbursts or loud disturbances, speaking across the aisle to their husbands, but it doesn't silence all women for all times or doesn't restrict orderly preaching." Though it is true that the word "speak" sometimes means chatter, the Greek word here is *laleo* and is also translated "speak" regarding Paul's own preaching in this same letter (2:6, 7, 13). It would

be difficult to prove that it means anything other than speak in 14:34-35. (As shown above, however, this does not prohibit prophesying as Ellen G. White did, according to 11:5.)

Others may say that “well, Paul’s teaching is simply reflecting the male dominate society that he lived in and should not be taken

as inspired of God.” Or that “Paul wrote for those of his day and women at that time weren’t qualified to preach as they are today.

But we college-trained women today are ready and qualified!” How many times have we heard the same things about the teachings of Ellen White. When she sets forth a principle we don’t particularly care for or is in the way of our personal plan, then the statement is made, “that was for her day.” What is really being said, however, is that this portion of Scripture, the Word of God, is wrong in what it teaches. It would also indicate (because the principles for the marriage arraignment and the church are the same) that all the instruction for marriage was for Paul’s day as well and the Bible teaching is wrong on that point as well. Too many times I have watched those who take this train of reasoning with something that they would rather not come into line with, and sooner or later they fall away completely, usually taking many down with them. There are those even not of our faith that recognize the principles that Paul has shared as being from God and applicable to the end of time as we know it on earth.

Dr. Charles C. Ryrie, Chairman of the Department of Systematic Theology at Dallas Theological Seminary, believes we should accept this part of the Bible, too: “The New Testament places the responsibility for leadership in the local church on men, not women. The New Testament called its first

echelon of leaders elders; the second, deacons. But both groups were composed of men only. This is rather obvious, since one of the qualifications for both the elder and deacon is to be the husband of one wife (1 Timothy 3:2, 12).

“Some churches today have both elders and deacons, some only deacons, some stewards, some an executive board. But whatever label is put on these leaders, the New Testament says they should be men. This strongly suggests that to ordain women as pastors, elders, or deacons is inappropriate. . .

“In 1 Timothy 2 Paul gives guidelines for public worship. Concerning prayer in the church, he directs the men (the Greek word in verse 8 means ‘males’) to lead. He writes concerning the deportment of women, concluding that they are not permitted ‘to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man but to be in silence’ (verse 12). This prohibition can hardly be cultural since it is rooted in creation. Anyway, who could infallibly select which parts of 1 Timothy 2 apply today if the whole passage does not?. . .

“Even though the New Testament evidence seems to prohibit the ordination of women, this does not mean they have no ministry in the church.

“First, women can teach. Indeed, the older women are commanded to teach younger women (Titus 2:4-5). Apparently this may be done in church or in homes, but it is restricted to a segregated audience. Such teaching, especially when done in the church, would have to be under the direction to the male leadership, and it should never conflict with a woman’s responsibilities to her family.

“What about single women ministering in para-church

organizations? The Bible does not speak directly to such situations. The single woman has time to devote to the Lord's work, and many have done so with great benefit to the Body of Christ. However, the principles of male leadership and restriction on ministry to a mixed audience cannot be ignored.

“Second, God gives women spiritual gifts. So often it is said that if a woman has gifts from God to pastor or teach, then what right has anyone to restrict her use of them? This kind of reasoning obscures the meaning of a spiritual gift and confuses the gift with where it is exercised. God gives women as well as men spiritual gifts. But the same God who gives gifts also directs WHERE and HOW they are to be used.

“A woman may even have the gift of pastor! This is the ability to shepherd people, and it can be used in the home, in the Christian school, in a Bible class. It can be used with children, young people . . . Hopefully, a dean of women in a Christian school would have the gift of pastor. How appropriate for a mother to use that gift with her children. Older women, teaching younger women according to Titus 2:4-5, could well exercise that gift on their flock.

“The gift must be distinguished from the place of ministry, from the age group on whom it is used, and even from our modern-day ecclesiastical organizational structure which usually equates the gift of pastor with the pastorate. Recognizing that the same God who gives gifts also directs where they should be used, I feel that a woman who has the gift of pastor is restricted from using that gift in what we call today the pastorate. . . It is . . . clear that women were not given leadership roles in the early church.” (Dr. Charles C. Ryrie, Moody magazine, December 1977, pp. 42-3, 50-1).

Dr. George W. Knight III, Professor of New Testament at Covenant Theological Seminary, puts it this way: “I believe the New Testament makes a . . . declaration [that] . . . women are not to lead and teach either the church corporate or men in the church (1 Timothy 2:11-14; 1 Corinthians 14:35). . . .

“The New Testament seems to forbid ‘a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man; (1 Timothy 2:12 NASB) in the life of the church. When Paul says, ‘I do not permit’, he issues as much of an imperative as one can have in the first person singular, ‘I’ form. Also, the present tense does not mean he limits the prohibition to that time only. Rather, it indicates the kind of action, so he means ‘I am continually not permitting.’ Further, the [Greek] word translated ‘permit’ . . . is quite strong as used in the Greek world, and in the New Testament. Paul employs it in 1 Corinthians 14:34 and 16:7. It is especially strong with the negative.

“The phrase ‘exercise authority’ [1 Timothy 2:12 NASB; ‘usurp authority’ — KJV] is sometimes wrongly interpreted to mean ‘domineer.’ Some argue, therefore, that such action is not forbidden to women only; it would be inappropriate for any Christian to act domineeringly toward another person. When we examine the word, however, we find it will not permit this stronger and universally objectionable meaning.

“The Greek word *authenteo*, rendered ‘exercise authority,’ occurs only here in the New Testament. . . I conclude that its meaning here is ‘to have authority’ or ‘to exercise authority’ in a positive or neutral sense, and that the meanings ‘domineer’ or ‘to bring pressure in a sexual sense’ are inappropriate and especially in 1 Timothy 2:12.

“The context of 1 Timothy 2:11-12 bears this out. The

words and concepts used in verse 12 are the converse of verse 11 and flow out of it; learn (verse 11) but do not teach a man (verse 12); learn with submissiveness (verse 11) but do not exercise authority (verse 12) over a man. Both the teaching and the exercising of authority that Paul does not allow relate to men in the church corporate, because ‘a man’ is the object of both verbs.

“This follows not only from the context, in which Paul is addressing the question from the male/female relationship exclusively. It is also evident from parallel passages where Paul, who does not contradict himself, permits women to teach other women (Titus 2:3-5). The prohibition of 1 Timothy 2:12 is made in connection with general instructions for order in the church. Compare chapter 2 in its entirety and then chapter 3, especially verse 15 [NASB]: ‘I write so that you may know how one ought to conduct himself in the household of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and support of the truth’.

..

“Finally, some may object that this denies freedom to God’s Spirit to impart gifts to women. . . But . . . may not the gifts be used both in marriage and the church in a way that does not violate the principle of male headship? In Titus 2, for instance, Paul urges some women to teach other women and exercise leadership with them. In 1 Timothy 2:12 he prohibits women only from teaching men and the church corporate, not from the act of teaching itself.” (Dr. George Knight, Christianity Today, 2/20/81, pp. 16, 19).

So we conclude that it is inappropriate for a woman to “run” the church as also it would be for her to “run” the marriage. While

I believe that the gifts from God, given to Christian women

should
be shared and gladly received by the congregation, (that
includes
the men), the FINAL decision of the church, (as in the
marriage),
is to be made by the man.

According to the Bible account, Paul has made it clear that the operation of the marriage institution and the church corporate are to be at the headship of God-fearing men, not women. Because this principle of His direction is being challenged strongly today in our society, we are seeing and having more and more trouble. Many questions are raised that we should never have to deal with if we followed God's plan and not our own, such as: Since God clearly states that "the head of the woman is man (1 Corinthians 11:3) and "the husband is the head of the wife" (Ephesians 5:23) and the Elder/Pastor/Bishop/Overseer of each church must be a male (1 Timothy 3:2; Titus 1:5-7), who would be the head of a woman Pastor's family? And when she and her husband arrive at the church building on Sabbath morning, who would be the higher authority there: if she is the head and priest of the family in church, who is the head and priest at home and in other places?

Who are the children of that family (and other families that look on) going to think is the higher authority — the man or the woman, the husband or the wife, the father or the mother?

Another interesting question will be brought to light all too quickly between the woman Pastor and her layman husband — if they find themselves in disagreement (such as if he has to move for business reasons or perhaps a move that would place her at a church that doesn't need another Pastor or doesn't want a women Pastor), which one is the higher authority and more

responsible to God and the family?

Is a woman Pastor to be in submission to her husband or does he have no more authority than the other members of the church? How do you think this woman Pastor is going to influence other women members of her congregation in this matter about being submissive to their husbands?

The simple fact of all this is that the “Women’s Rights” movement is responsible for all this push to disregard the plain instruction of God and have their own way. As I think about all the trouble this movement has caused (fully believing that humans beings are equals irrespective of gender but different and that God has made them that way on purpose) my mind immediately thinks of another “Woman’s Libber” that lived many years ago.

The people of God and His church were in a very similar crisis at that time as it finds itself in today, and at that time they were more interested in what the rest of the world thought than God did.

The church was in deep trouble and the Lord was highly displeased, to say the least. He sent a prophet named Elijah to give them one last chance to make up their mind who they were going to serve: Him or this “Woman’s Libber.” Her name of course was Jezebel and after the showdown was over God had her literally fed to the dogs.

During the parallel of the above story it is clearly demonstrated how God views men who are “weaklings” in the faith, allowing these “Women Libber’s” to rule over His people. Because Herod allowed a woman to rule over him he took the life of an

innocent prophet of God, and we are told that he died a horrible death because of it. John the Baptist was faithful in his discourse of how God wanted His church run and he was not afraid (even unto death) to speak the plain testimony.

I do not believe that John the Baptist was what we would call today a male chauvinist nor do I believe that Elijah was either (remember how he tenderly cared for the widow's needs and later brought her only son back to life, and how she had provided him a loft to stay in). But these men of God would not be deterred from their mission and they set things straight, and both had trouble with strong women who were not interested in their God but were only interested in their own agendas.

God's people find themselves in a most similar crisis today and much of it is for the same reasons. We have become so much like the worldlings around us that we have allowed them to influence our thinking, make decisions of how our (God's) church should operate, and now we are suffering the same problems they have always had!

I pray that I am not misunderstood here (but I also realize, that at least in the end, the majority will be against me) however, it is only those who follow God's plan that will be with Him in the end.

We can play politics with humans all we wish, we can gain the praise of men and women. We can be in "popular" demand. But soon enough all (the faithful and the unfaithful) will see and KNOW that God is the ruler and judge. Soon enough probation will be closed and then all these human games will be seen in their true light. All the popularity in the world will be realized for what it really is — a way to feed the pride of humanity to its own destruction.

Quite frankly I do not expect the majority of professed Adventists will listen to me or the others who are desperately pleading with a people who are bent on serving Mammon. I can say securely for myself and them that our hearts are breaking for what is going on in this beloved movement. But having said that I do believe that the honest in heart; those men and women who are truly seeking to know and do the will of God, will search out and understand why this small contribution was made. It is to my Lord and those whom eventually I hope to be part of my eternal family that this book is dedicated. Now is the time to press together in truth! For the second coming is soon, even at the door!

Harvestime Books Resource Library

<http://www.remnant-prophecy.com>

<http://www.Harvestimebooks.com>

<http://www.bible-sabbath.com>