

**Stand Here Fathers**  
**A Presentation to Lutherans Concerned Association**  
**By Rev. Paul R. Harris**  
**January 17, 2017**

“Most historians now accept that he [Luther] never brandished his hammer...”<sup>1</sup> I never heard that before I read it this past year in a book review. I suspect the closer we get to 31 October 2017 the more we will hear of these challenges to the history passed down to us. To my knowledge, no one debates Luther saying before Charles V “Here I stand.” People debate how loudly he said it or if he said more, but the fact that he said these three words seems secure. For now.<sup>2</sup>

It is also *not* debatable where Luther stood on the Order of Creation. As far as I know, ours is the only catechism, ancient or modern, that specifies it is the *head* of the house that is to teach his children the faith. Likewise, Luther specifically says in our Large Catechism that even in secular matters the father is the teacher. “Where a *father* is unable alone to educate his rebellious and irritable child, he uses a schoolmaster to teach the child” (LC, I, 141, *A Reader’s Edition*).

Confessional Lutherans have always been forthright in marking out where they stand. At least we were up till circa 1940. Then we began to wobble, and we are wobbling still when it comes to the Order of Creation. Our trumpet is giving an uncertain sound particularly when it comes to the roles of men and women in society, and uncertainty in this area reflects uncertainty in the most basic unit of society, the home. When there is uncertainty about how men and women are to relate, there is uncertainty about what it means to be a man and therefore a father. So, whether or not Luther said, “Here I stand” in a squeak or a roar, I wish to state today if not loudly at least clearly where fathers are to stand.

The importance of the role of fathers is recognized in Scripture, taught in the church fathers, and even acknowledged by the secular world. While all of these recognize the

importance of fathers in society, the secular world denies there is a divine order to creation.

Though wrong on so many levels, the 1972 theme song for “All in the Family” did acknowledge the male-female polarity evident at one time throughout society was slipping away. There was a time when “girls were girls and men were men.” It would not have been insulting but spot-on had the lyrics read “And you knew where you were then/ *Women were women*, and men were men.” Another way of saying it would be “you knew where you *stood*.”

“Where everything used to be ordered male-female according to the divinely-ordered masculine-feminine polarity<sup>3</sup>, now everything is ordered by group consensus, scientific efficiency, psychological models, or personal preferences. No one is sure what men or women are supposed to do, everyone tries to behave as a ‘person’.”<sup>4</sup> But God did not create personhood apart from masculinity and femininity. This polarity was found at the moment of creation. Genesis 1:27 says, “And God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created *him*; male and female He created *them*.” Out of one lump God created two and because they were originally one God says they are irresistibly drawn to one another as opposite poles of a magnet are.<sup>5</sup> Because she is taken out of man, *for this reason*, a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife.

This polarity runs throughout God’s creation not only in the realm of the visible but the invisible. Angels are referred to only with masculine pronouns and the only two names we have in Scripture, Michael and Gabriel, are male names. Even in heaven this polarity is not lost. When our Lord says that in the resurrection people neither marry nor are given in marriage but are like the angels (Matthew 22:30), Jesus doesn’t say they are neither male nor female. You don’t lose your personhood at death or in the resurrection, and your personhood is attached to your being either male or female. Even the Persons of the Godhead are referred to with masculine pronouns. Yes,

## Stand Here Fathers, Harris

they are likened to a mother hen gathering her chicks, a woman giving birth, a woman looking for a lost coin, but they are never called or invoked as ‘mother.’”

The Scriptures testify to the Order of Creation and to the importance of men being men and of fathers in particular. First, to the point of men being men: When there is trouble in Paradise, the Lord comes looking for Adam. Genesis 3:9 tells us the Lord called to the man, “Where are you [singular]?” He holds him responsible. Even after the Fall, God still expects men to be men. In Isaiah 3:12 the Lord considers it just as reprehensible for a woman to rule over His people as to have infants as their oppressors. Do you think this is because Israel was a theocracy, not only State but Church? No, in Israel the king had no priestly, churchly duties. It was an objective shame for women to rule over men in the Old Testament even as 800 years later Paul will say women are not only not to teach men, they are not to exercise authority over them either. In Jeremiah 51:30 the Lord says of the fierce Babylonian warriors, “The mighty men of Babylon have ceased fighting. They stay in their strongholds; their strength is exhausted, they are *becoming women*.” Finally, Paul closes his first letter to the troubled Corinthians with these words, “Be on the alert, stand firm in the faith, *act like men*, be strong.” He doesn’t say act like men and women or act like people but act like *men*. Either God is a sexist or there are profound, objective differences between men and women, and you need not apologize or even explain when you exhort men to be men. And for fathers to be fathers they must first be men.

The great tragedy for a family in Scripture is not for children to be *orphaned* but *fatherless*. The Hebrew word *yathowm*, often rendered by modern translations as ‘orphan’ is by the KJV translated 41/42 times ‘fatherless’. The NASB uses both ‘fatherless’ and ‘orphan’, but often when translating ‘orphan’ they put ‘fatherless’ in the margin. However, they never put ‘orphan’ in the margin when translating ‘fatherless.’ The focus on fathers continues in New

## Stand Here Fathers, Harris

Testament times. The ministry of the latter-day Elijah would be specifically about fathers. The Lord's last word for 400 years is: "He will restore the hearts of the fathers to their children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the land with a curse."

Finally, fatherhood is the most overlooked divine qualification for a man to be a pastor. "He must be one who manages his own household well, keeping his children under control with all dignity. (but if a man does not know how to manage his own household, how will he take care of the church of God?)" (1 Timothy 3: 4-5). He must be a faithful, capable father. However, "manage" is too weak of a role for a father. The KJV 'rule' is better but "lead" is probably best. But translation is not the issue; behavior is. The misbehavior of pastor's kids among us is infamous. And that indicates a failure in fatherhood.

When Patsy Leppien, the main author of *What's Going on Among the Lutherans?* was touring the Midwest promoting her book, she stayed in homes of many Lutheran pastors. She was shocked to find that when it came to leading family devotions the majority were led by the pastor's wife, not the pastor. If pastors aren't godly fathers in their own homes, they will have little hope of leading others to becoming men or fathers. Small wonder that when the latter-day Elijah came with his message about fatherhood his first cry was, "Repent!"

Our church fathers testify to the importance of the Order of Creation in general and fathers in particular. Pastor Heath Curtis in a 2007 article in the Lutheran journal *Logia* succinctly summarized what 16<sup>th</sup> century Lutherans concluded about the Order of Creation:

1. the subordination of women to men began at creation;
2. this law of subordination applies to all cultures and all times;
3. this law extends over home, state, and church;
4. no human being can abrogate this law without sin;
5. woman is still the good creation of God and she possesses the full rights of the heirs of Christ.<sup>6</sup>

## Stand Here Fathers, Harris

He goes on to point out the 1985 *CTCR* document *Women in the Church* gave up the third point, i.e. that the Order of Creation applies in the state or society at large. This is also the conclusion of Evangelicals today and of liberal Lutherans since 1969, right before the latter embraced the ordination of women. President J.A.O. Preus made this connection in June of 1970. In a statement in response to the LCA resolving to ordain women which was done by substituting the word “person” for the word “man” in constitutions and bylaws, Preus said, “I just feel that the Biblical orders [*sic*] of creation differ between men and women, which has been the chief argument against this.”<sup>7</sup>

What did our church fathers prior to Luther teach about the Order of Creation? While not a father of the church per say, the first century Philo testifies to Jewish thought on this matter. The two areas in which the Law is transmitted are the synagogue and home. The man is the point of contact between these two areas because neither women, children, nor slaves were members of the synagogue. So, it was the duty of the head of the house to instruct the members of the household.<sup>8</sup>

The fifth century Augustine in commenting on Colossians says, “Nor can it be doubted that it is more consonant with the order of nature that men should bear the rule over women than women over men. It is with this principle in view that the apostle says, ‘The head of the woman is the man’; and, ‘Wives submit yourselves to your own husbands.’”<sup>9</sup>

The late sixth century Gregory the Great is no less clear, and it’s as if he is writing for our times.

Duly representative order is regularly preferred to absolute egalitarian fantasies: ‘That creation cannot be governed, or live, in a state of absolute equality, we are taught by the examples of the heavenly hosts, since, there being angels and also archangels, it is manifest that they are not equal, but in power and rank, as you know, one differs from another. If then among these who are without sin there is

evidently this distinction, who of men can refuse to submit himself willingly to this order of things which he knows that even angels obey?”<sup>10</sup>

It is not surprising that men of faith through the centuries have been concerned about the Order of Creation, men being men, and fatherhood. What is surprising is the extent the world understands the importance of this. Aristotle said, “Again, the male is by nature superior, and the female inferior; and the one rules, and the other is ruled; this principle, of necessity, extends to all mankind.”<sup>11</sup> Bolder still are these words: “The rule of the household is a monarchy, for every house is under one head.”<sup>12</sup>

The war on fatherhood began in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, reached a fevered pitch in the 20<sup>th</sup>, and now in the 21<sup>st</sup> has all but written the role out of the world’s stage. The 19<sup>th</sup> century put men/fathers outside, beyond, or above the church and it became the domain of women and what the world considered weak men; the 20<sup>th</sup> century went from fathers who knew best, to bigots who domineered all their family, to buffoons who ruined their families and were anything but a family guy. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century the role of father is optional.

This didn’t happen without a struggle. From dissonant places in the 20<sup>th</sup> century we were warned. Feminist leader, Gloria Steinman, said ““Most American children suffer from too much mother and too little father.””<sup>13</sup> Humorist Erma Bombeck said, “When I was a little kid, a father was like the light in the refrigerator. Every house had one, but no one really knew what either of them did once the door was shut...”<sup>14</sup> Anthropologist Margaret Mead said the recurrent problem of civilization has always been to define the male role. The female role did not need defining; it was outlined by biology.<sup>15</sup> Until modern times Christians would have unashamedly said that God had outlined male roles too by biology. Already in 1968 when homosexuality let alone transgenderism was not accepted Mead said, “The worry that boys will not grow up to be men is

much more widespread than the worry that the girls will not grow up to be women...” The latter fear is almost non-existent.<sup>16</sup>

The obfuscating and eventual loss of the male role and therefore of fatherhood has a long history. We see it in Eden where Adam followed Eve into sin; in Abraham who listened to his wife wrongly and then didn't listen rightly; in the wisest man in the world foolishly following his wives into idolatry; in the “mama's boys” of James and John, and finally in the church at Thyatira tolerating Jezebel who called herself a prophetess. But manhood and fatherhood weathered these storms and survived. The Renaissance and then the Enlightenment chipped away major pieces of the Biblical foundation of fatherhood. But it took the grand hubris of the 19<sup>th</sup> century to be so bold as to put them outside of the church.

According to a 20<sup>th</sup> century historian, in 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> childrearing literature the father is depicted as an important figure in rearing children as well as the ultimate authority in family matters. Most literature was in fact directed towards fathers. By the 18<sup>th</sup> century mothers were being seen as the primary rearers of children, but anxiety was expressed about it. By the early 19<sup>th</sup> century the mother was frankly and with no reservations identified as the prime rearer of children.<sup>17</sup> It was only in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century that mothers formally took over the task of conducting family prayers.<sup>18</sup> A 20<sup>th</sup> century sociologist agrees: “The ground work for the 20<sup>th</sup> century fatherless home was set. By the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century for the first time it was socially and morally acceptable for men not to be involved with their families.”<sup>19</sup>

Grave concerns and real fears were expressed historically about the end result. The 18<sup>th</sup> century political philosopher Rousseau feared “masculine domineering, immodest women; he saw the fall of civilization in the rule of increasingly masculine women over increasingly feminine men.”<sup>20</sup> The 20<sup>th</sup> century psychiatrist, Joshua Bierer, made a survey in 1964 and he

judged the women to be at fault for the men being “lily-livered sissies.” In 1982, he changed his mind. “Before, I thought that the women wanted to rule the country. I changed that opinion. Women are compelled to take over, not fighting to take over.... It’s still the fatherless society. The husbands are not husbands. All the women are crying out for a strong man and he’s just not there.”<sup>21</sup>

The cascading effects of the fatherless home and the male-less society are shown in a 2010 video documentary entitled “Father Figure – A Video Documentary about Fatherlessness.” Here are a few quotes from the transcript of the 99-minute documentary:

Every society that wants to remain civilized has got to persuade its young men to become fathers and providers for families. Otherwise you have female-headed households which produce  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the prison population. And most runaways, most dope addicts, most of the real losers come from female-headed households.... The male role is the weak link in the family. The human male is an interloper in the area of reproduction. Society doesn’t have to provide children with mothers, biology does that, but society has got to provide them with fathers,<sup>22</sup> and our society is kicking fathers out of 60 percent of their homes.... Most fatherless children do not become educational failures, but most educational failures are fatherless children. Most rapists...[m]ost gang members...[m]ost child molesters and abusers. Most unwed parents are fatherless children. Society has got to be based on the general case. In the general case, a fatherless child is far more likely to be a troublemaker.... [F]rom 1932 to 1957, black students led all other students in academic standing in the city of Los Angeles. We are including wealthy whites, we are including the Asian population, we’re including the Latino population.... We have found from 1967 to the present that motherhood and mothers have been in charge of the American-African household in Los Angeles. To wit, today the black child’s academic standard is below everyone in the state. [Despite these undeniable facts,] [t]he image of father has gone from father knows best to fathers molest.... If you look at the statistics, even the media reports, you will note the people that are beating, abusing, and molesting children are almost always not fathers. They are boyfriends and stepfathers.<sup>23</sup>

The facts in this documentary are well known to researchers and probably even to casual observers. Every big-name assassin or serial killer has two things in common. They are male and they grew up with no fathers in their daily lives.<sup>24</sup> According to a 1979 study by the National Institute for Mental Health, poverty is not as important a factor in juvenile delinquency as the

## Stand Here Fathers, Harris

absence of a competent and loving father is.<sup>25</sup> But for there to be fathers there have to be men, not homosexual, bisexual, or transsexual males. Margaret Mead concluded after observing primitive cultures: “Women, it is true, make human beings, but only men can make men.”<sup>26</sup> “The degree of the father’s active, involved affection toward his children is the most important factor related to normal heterosexual role development in his child,”<sup>27</sup> so say two Evangelical theologians. Psychiatrist Ross Campbell agrees. In “all his reading and experience he has never known of one sexually disoriented person who had a warm, loving, and affectionate father.”<sup>28</sup>

The Order of Creation, particularly the relationship between the sexes is a nucleus issue. Erwin Chargaff commenting on two other nucleus issues says that when you tamper with them you set-off chain reactions of untold, unintended, and unimagined consequences. He said, “My life has been marked by two immense and fateful scientific discoveries: the splitting of the atom, the recognition of the chemistry of heredity and its subsequent manipulation. It is the mistreatment of a nucleus that, in both instances, lies at the basis: the nucleus of the atom, and the nucleus of the cell. In both instances, do I have the feeling that science has transgressed a barrier that should have remained inviolate.”<sup>29</sup>

We have transgressed a barrier that should have remained inviolate. And not just weak fathers and fatherless families has been the result but hypersexuality, homosexuality, transsexuality, and the devolution of society. We have been led down this path by poor theology following fallen philosophy. A fraternal, egalitarian society was the holy grail of the historical materialism of the 18<sup>th</sup> century Enlightenment. The official doctrine of historical materialism as expressed by Friedrich Engels traces societies development as starting with a matriarchate, passing through the reprehensible patriarchate till it reaches the fraternal state of society under ultimate communism. A 1986 Roman Catholic theologian says that even in theological circles

slogans like “from matriarchy through patriarchy to fraternity” have been received with sympathy.<sup>30</sup> This priest goes on to explain there never was such a thing as a matriarchy. Uwe Wesel concluded in 1980 that it was a modern myth. The well-known sociologist Rene Konig said that the remnants of this theory are found “now only...in political journalism and vulgar Marxism.”<sup>31</sup>

However, the drive to androgyny didn't start with atheistic communism. It was in ancient paganism. Cybele is depicted having male characteristics; Zeus is shown with six breasts; Aphrodite with a beard. Dionysus, god of wine, is particularly effeminate. Even Heracles repeatedly appears as a transvestite. “All in all, androgyny is a widespread ideal goal.”<sup>32</sup> Having reached androgyny, we haven't reached an ideal goal but an end. G. K. Chesterton comments, “When all are sexless there will be equality. There will be no women and no men. There will be but a fraternity, free and equal. The only consoling thought is that it will endure but for one generation.”<sup>33</sup> Of course, everyone from feminists to liberal churchmen think we are progressing, but in point of fact the more primitive a society the more lacking are the differences between the sexes. The more civilized the more pronounced the differences.<sup>34</sup>

However, sexless sameness is still called progress even in the face of as hypersexuality which leads to homosexuality which leads to transsexuality. When no polarity between male and female is recognized in so many areas, the differences between the sexes is “concentrated into an exaggerated concern with genital sexuality.”<sup>35</sup> At the same time as this exaggeration of genital sexuality happens the sexual desires become less sure and there is a boom in homosexuality.<sup>36</sup> It takes time for homosexuality to be accepted alongside of heterosexuality, but once that boundary is transgressed the waypoint of transsexuality is very nearby.

As of this writing, transgenderism is classified by the American College of Pediatricians as a mental illness, even as homosexuality was for all until 1973 by the American Psychiatric Association. Even though this pediatrician's group "has warned legislators and educators that conditioning children to accept transgenderism as normal is child abuse; even though Dr. Paul McHugh, psychiatrist-in-chief at John Hopkins Hospital<sup>37</sup> halted sex-reassignment surgeries because it was "'unusual and radical treatment' for 'mental disorders'",<sup>38</sup> there is no sign of halting this juggernaut. Indeed, the American Psychiatric Association in the 2013 edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Psychiatric Disorders* removed "Gender Identity Disorder" and replaced it with "Gender Dysphoria." One professor of psychiatry says, "The movement's philosophical foundation qualifies it as a popular delusion similar to the multiple-personality craze, and the widespread 'satanic ritual abuse' and 'recovered memory' hysterias of the 1980s and 90s."<sup>39</sup> Because it has the force of law behind it, there is little hope of stopping it though it might burn itself out the way other popular delusions have historically done.<sup>40</sup>

The magnitude of what has happened with the legalization of gay marriage and women in combat cannot be overstated. We have done what Alexis de Tocqueville, a mid-19<sup>th</sup> century French diplomat, political scientist, and historian said could never be done. He quotes an Englishman saying, "'It is a fundamental principle with the English lawyers, that Parliament can do everything except make a woman a man, or a man a woman.'"<sup>41</sup> What we have "done" is reached totalitarianism. A late 20<sup>th</sup> century French medievalists warned that the temptation to totalitarianism "consists in wanting to reduce all individuals to one scheme only, since the only sort of equality it accepts is that of uniformity."<sup>42</sup> And the one that all will be reduced to is the male. This, the Frenchman concludes, will leave women inevitably being failed men.<sup>43</sup> Alexis de Tocqueville, said that in his day this was already happening:

There are people in Europe who, confounding together the different characteristics of the sexes, would make man and woman into beings not only equal but alike. They would give to both the same functions, impose on both the same duties, and grant to both the same rights; they would mix them in all things – their occupations, their pleasures, their business. It may readily be conceived that by thus attempting to make one sex equal to the other, both are degraded, and from so preposterous a medley of the works of nature nothing could ever result but weak men and disorderly women.<sup>44</sup>

No, something worse can result. Men have a God-given vocation to protect women, not to subject them, not to compete with them, not to lord it over them, but to protect them. You see this in the fact that in Scripture only the men are counted for war. Nehemiah 4:13-14 records the exhortation of the people to fight for their brothers, homes, wives, and children, but there is no mention of fighting for husbands or fathers. Joseph is told to protect Mary. Ephesians 5 tells husbands to lay down their lives for their wife.<sup>45</sup> Chesterton thought the struggle between men and women as to who could be the best tinkers, tailors, or soldiers “is very likely indeed to result in a subordination of women infinitely more gross and heartless than that which has disgraced the world up to now.”<sup>46</sup>

Men are free now to subordinate women beneath themselves. When the Senate made an official inquiry into the sinking of the *Titanic*, a ship’s officer was asked why they discriminated and got women and children off first. Was it the captain’s rule or the rule of the sea? The ship’s officer replied that it was the rule of human nature.<sup>47</sup> Contrast this remark from 1912 with a 1992 Pittsburg newspaper survey that found only 35% of men would give way to women and children.<sup>48</sup> This unbiblical and unnatural subordinating of women puts men out of reach of the influence of women. Anthropological studies show: “Women are always dependent in one way or another, on the leadership of men; but men, without the intuition and assistance of women, are only half human.”<sup>49</sup> Half humans are all monster. St. Ambrose said the same in a positive way.

## Stand Here Fathers, Harris

What God had made was only called “very good” *after* the creation of woman. “Without woman, then, man receives no praise; it is in woman that he is praised.”<sup>50</sup> I think this is the sense of Paul’s statement that “woman is the glory of man” (1 Cor. 11:7).

When we ignore, change, or mutate the nucleus issue of the Order of Creation not only do we disfigure creation in church, home, and society, we insult the Creator. C. S. Lewis likens doing this to taking “the living and sensitive figures that God has painted on the canvas of our nature and shift them about as if they were mere geometrical figures.”<sup>51</sup> 1960’s German scholar, Helmet Thielicke, who holds the antithesis of my position on the Order of Creation’s applicability to society, nevertheless, warns against violating that Order. Although he holds and provides the theological ethic for Liberal Lutheranism’s acceptance of abortion, he uses the runaway numbers of abortions in Russia to show what happens when you violate the Order of Creation. In Russia from 1917-1956 abortion was the primary means of birth control. He says the devastating results that followed “point to the fact that when the order of creation is violated the punishment comes in an actual judgement in history.”<sup>52</sup> This is similar to what Franz Pieper said about the acceptance of women’s suffrage in 1913. He opposed it as “‘contrary to the natural order,’ warning that ‘wherever this order is perverted, His punishments are sure to follow.’”<sup>53</sup>

A computer programmer in my congregation uses a story about Ragu spaghetti sauce to encourage programmers not to make small, what they think to be harmless, changes. The makers of Ragu woke up one day to the fact that their sauce tasted horrible, and they had no idea why. It turned out that over years small changes were made to the recipe by various individuals each thinking it to be for the good, but the cumulative changes produced a bad product.

Confessional Lutherans, particularly in the LCMS, have been making small changes here and there. In 1969, women could be given the vote in congregations. No big deal; they had been

voting in society since 1920. Then came the acolytes, the readers, the ushers, and now Communion distributors. These also were no big deal. We were just getting women more involved in church as if they hadn't been the most involved since Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna, and other women travelled with Jesus and supported His ministry out of their own pockets (Luke 8:1-3).<sup>54</sup> We opened these roles to women as if ignorant of how the Anglicans got to women priests. "An important forward-pushing role seems to have been played by the frequent use of women assistants, lectors and acolytes, as well as by the training of the two sexes in common theological seminaries."<sup>55</sup> The proponents of women pastors in 1968 knew what the opponents don't still today: Such a historic shift can't be done all at once. A modest starting point was girl acolytes and female pastoral assistants with clerical duties. Female deacons were regarded as an especially promising entrance door.<sup>56</sup>

The Missouri Synod's sea change occurred in 2004 in a convention resolution and an essay in *Concordia Theological Quarterly*<sup>57</sup>. We agreed with the conservative Evangelicals. The Order of Creation wasn't creation wide. It applied to the pastoral office, maybe even in all of the church but probably only specifically to the pastoral office, and it applied in the home, but it did *not* apply to society. We weren't fundamentalist Christians with long-skirted wives and long-bearded husbands. We weren't Muslim extremists imposing our own brand of sharia law on society. But the question before confessional Lutherans is framed by a conservative Evangelical: "Is it possible to nibble away [and make no mistakes we have taken huge bites] at the putative edges [we are at the very nucleus] of the apostolic word about the sexes that was thought to be valid and authoritative for centuries without creating an appetite in some for larger and larger bites?"<sup>58</sup> Though this Evangelical excludes society from the Order of Creation, he agrees that we are fiddling with a nucleus issue: "And when we begin to dislike the very idea of authority

and submission – not distortions and abuses but *the very idea* – we are tampering with something very deep. We are beginning to dislike God Himself.”<sup>59</sup>

The assertion that God’s Order of Creation has a threshold, i.e. it stops at the door of home and church has been in Rome since Thomas Aquinas. He said that in the worldly sphere a woman can function quite well as a ruler, but not in priestly, spiritual matters.<sup>60</sup> The most conservative 21<sup>st</sup> century Evangelical protestants agree.<sup>61</sup> Some are polite in their position. Wayne Grudem says, “The positive examples of women involved in civil leadership over nations other than Israel (such as Esther and the Queen of Sheba) should prevent us from arguing that it is wrong for women to hold a governing office.”<sup>62</sup> Others pillory and distort the historic position of Missouri, Luther, and the church fathers. Robert Yarbrough says, “Moreover, there is no support in the Bible for the lamentable triumphalist tendency of some (usually male) conservative Protestants to assume that women, not only in the church but in society generally, should be content to submit to men, to suffer gladly as their coffee-making secretaries toiling under glass ceilings, and to put up with sexist jokes, stereotypes, and other harassment.”<sup>63</sup>

Lutherans have been distancing themselves from the position that an Order of Creation applies to *all* of creation since the 1950’s. As with all departures from the truth it begins with a wobble. Fritz Zerbst argues in a 1955 CPH book that what is said to husband and wives is valid also in regard to the relation between the sexes in general. Fine. But then he adds this caveat: “no mention is or can be made outside of the marriage relationship.” He goes on to wobble the other direction: “the basic institution of marriage and the family nevertheless casts its light upon the general relation of the sexes to each other.”<sup>64</sup> He believes there is a time limit to the Order of Creation. It ceases when Christ hands over the kingdom to the Father after He has destroyed all, dominion, authority, and power (I Cor. 15:24). I disagree. The things being destroyed are the evil

angels that rebelled. However, my real problem is how he uses his supposed time limit. “An overestimation of these orders, should therefore, be avoided, and we may properly speak of them as ‘intermediary orders.’”<sup>65</sup> Zerbst made little headway with his arguments then, but now he is gaining traction among younger pastors who can’t bear the radical disconnect on this issue between Church and Society.

The real father of the threshold argument among Lutherans is Helmut Thielicke and his third volume on theological ethics published in 1964 entitled *Sex*. The arguments he uses against the Order of Creation not applying to society are the same ones he uses to tolerate if not accept homosexuality and abortion. Also, note that his arguments were embraced by the LCA at the time and now by the ELCA to justify their positions on those issues.

He starts where Zerbst did but with more force. “The statement that the man is the head of the woman – which has reference only to the *married* women...contains no sociological statement concerning the status of woman...”<sup>66</sup> He then says the Lutheran doctrine of the Fall over against that of Rome does not enable us to apply the Order of Creation all across creation. Catholicism reduces the Fall to an injury on nature which otherwise remains intact. This makes possible a certain analogy and continuity between the original creation and a partially fallen world. The Reformation has a different doctrine. The Fall was so complete that the only measures God provides are ones to preserve this fallen world and they are marriage and family. But they are not orders of creation but orders of necessity.<sup>67</sup> The Order of Creation would be a standard for Lutherans if we didn’t view the incursion of sin as radically as we do. It broke the continuity between the original creation and our fallen world. He says “in certain borderline cases” it is impossible to put your finger directly on the claim of the Order of Creation. Abortion is specifically being discussed here.<sup>68</sup>

Go to the ELCA's website. You will read this same argument in regard to not only abortion but homosexuality. You will also find the next Thieliicke argument: "it is always the concrete situation of the person involved that renders difficult the full enforcement of the order of creation and brings it about that a person is unable to live in this aeon 'in the name' of the order of creation but, faced with its claim, can only live 'in the name' of the forgiving *patience* of God."<sup>69</sup> Here Thieliicke is specifically talking about birth control, but this argument is used to accept abortion, homosexuals, transsexuals, cohabitators, and anyone else who contrary to Paul in I Corinthians 6 is deceiving themselves thinking the forgiving patience of God can cause them to inherit God's kingdom while embracing their sin.

The real force of his argument, however, is not the forgiving patience of God, but the foolhardiness of directly applying the Order of Creation to anything in this fallen world. Remember Thieliicke preserves marriage and family only under the rubric of the order of necessity. He labels directly applying the Order of Creation under the conditions of this fallen world one of the absolute worst things a Confessional Lutheran knows. It is fanatical; it is *schwärmerisch*.<sup>70</sup> Confessional Lutherans run from enthusiasm like their hair is on fire.

Now we come to the sea change at the 2004 convention. If you doubt such a radical change has occurred read the Reverend Doctor Ken Schurb's article "The Service of Women in Congregational Offices, 1969 to 2007" published in the Fall 2009 *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*. The 2004 synodical Convention accepted the conclusions of an earlier CTCR study but not the study itself. The conclusions were that women can serve as presidents and elders and chairmen as long as these roles were not self-identified (I use this language so you can recognize the lineage of our reasoning on this subject.) as involving the distinctive functions of the pastoral office. This resolution was preceded in date but may not have been by publication of an article

that justifies the sea change. The entire January 2004 issue was devoted to an essay by the Reverend Doctor Nathan Jastram entitled “Man as Male and Female: Created in the Image of God.”

In this essay, you hear the echoes of the wobbling Zerbst, the conservative Evangelicals and the liberal Thielicke. Jastram says, “It is not clear whether it is necessary to preserve distinctions between the sexes in exercising authority over society at large. Since there are no biblical statements that directly teach that women should not rule in society, it is best to speak with caution. Luther’s categorical rejection of female rulers in society was undoubtedly influenced by social conditions of his day, and it would be hard to prove his assertion, without explicit confirmation from God, that ‘never has there been divine permission for a woman to rule.’”<sup>71</sup>

Jastram is echoing the 21<sup>st</sup> century CTCR’s repeated refrain that when we don’t have an explicit ‘thus says the Lord’ we can’t speak definitively. As the Reverend Doctor Robert Preus says several times in his *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, legitimate deductions from Scripture have the same force as explicit words. Furthermore, this new position by the CTCR and Jastram is the same old position of the old American Lutheran Church. The Central Regional Conference of the Northern Illinois District (LCMS) submitted a doctrinal resolution to the 1944 synodical convention quoting a 1942 American Lutheran Church article. “When the Lutheran Church, which adheres to the *Sola Scriptura* principle, uses the word doctrine with reference to its own teachings, it can mean only a restatement of what is clearly (or expressly) taught in the Scriptures, a teaching for whose every part there is a plain ‘Thus saith the Lord’ ...granting doctrinal status only to restatements of what is expressly taught in the Bible.”<sup>72</sup>

Jastram not only invokes “the Bible isn’t clear on this” but he invokes the spirit of the age. “Changing social conditions have made it necessary for theologians to reexamine these teachings, and it is no longer as clear as it once seemed that such an application [the Order of Creation applying to society] is proper.”<sup>73</sup> By his own admission changing social conditions drive his theology. This is refreshing. Had the 1969 synodical convention, meeting at the absolute apogee of the feminist movement in America, admitted that changing social conditions and not Scripture had driven their decision to grant women the right to vote, we would see how weak the argument was. “Changing social conditions” is the argument the homosexual, and now the transsexual community, use to defend gay marriage, pastors, and parenting. Historically, changing social conditions caused us to change our teachings on the Boy Scouts and the military chaplaincy<sup>74</sup>, and in the 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries changing social conditions have caused us to do the same on living together, divorce, and civil prayer services.<sup>75</sup> When will it stop? It won’t because social conditions never stop changing.

Does the Order of Creation extend to society? If it’s a genuine order of *creation*, then it does. If it doesn’t it’s an order of the Home and Church but not Creation. Scripture calls on men to protect and care for woman and children (Deuteronomy 25: 5-10, Isaiah 1:15-17; Jeremiah 22: 2-3). Does this only apply in the realm of Church and Home? Isn’t it much more needed in Creation? In 1 Corinthians 11:3 the Order of Creation is specifically given, “But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.” We saw how Thielicke stated this referenced married women only, and you see modern translations taking this tack by translating instead of ‘woman’ ‘wife’. It’s true *γυνή* can be translated either way. However, Tertullian rejected the idea that Paul was only referring to married women, saying, “If man is the head of woman, then especially also of the virgin, who is

Stand Here Fathers, Harris

the future married woman.”<sup>76</sup> But the real issue is Christ the head only of married women? Is God the head of Christ only in Church and Home but not State too?

I cited Wayne Grudem earlier arguing that positive examples of women civil leaders in the Bible should prevent us from arguing that it is wrong for women to govern today. The homosexual community, likewise, has argued that positive examples of homosexual relations today should prevent us from applying what Scripture says about the negative examples in Scripture. The passages in Scripture are against *violent* homosexual acts not against the positive, nurturing gay relationships we have today. Likewise, the transsexual who is at peace with his or her new sexuality is positive proof that should prevent us from arguing against transsexualism.

Although Thielicke does much to argue against the Order of Creation, he maintains that it remains in force despite the attacks of men on it. He illustrates this by referring to the atheists. By denying the existence of God they don't annul His existence. God remains God whether He is recognized or denied. Refusal to accept the Order of Creation, even I would add the way Thielicke himself does, does not cancel its existence or its claims on us.<sup>77</sup>

Many argue against the Order of Creation based on the Order of the Fall. Some say it was a result of the Fall though this can be disproved by appealing to Genesis 2 and the creation of woman from the man who was made first. It can be disproved by appealing to Paul's argument against women teaching *or* having authority over a man. He begins with the fact Adam was created first then Eve, and only then moves on to the Fall. The Fall doesn't alter the Order of Creation. Women still bear children after the Fall, but now it is with travail and pain. Men still till the soil but now with the sweat of their brow. Man is still the head of woman but now the body desires the place of the head and the head seeks to tyrannize the body (Genesis 3:16) but the Order goes on.

The argument that the Order of Redemption cancels out both the Order of Creation and that of the Fall falls flat based on their proof passage, Galatians 3:28. “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free man, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.” After Paul wrote these divinely revealed words both Jews and Greeks, slave and free remained, and women were women and men were men. It was the second century heretic Marcion, as far as I know, who first played off the Order of Creation against the Order of Redemption.<sup>78</sup>

When we refuse to recognize there is a divine order to creation we don’t know where we belong. We stutter when we try to talk about the roles of men or women. One can’t say what the Marine Corps proudly used to: “We’re looking for a few good men.” Or what the Air Force still proclaims in huge granite letters at the entrance to the cadet living area: “Bring Me Men.” And make no mistake it is not the feminine side of the Order that disquiets people but the masculine side, the only side that can produce fathers. C. S. Lewis says “the masculine none of us can escape. What is above and beyond all things is so masculine that we are feminine in relation to it. You had better agree with your adversary quickly.”<sup>79</sup> Yes, “The ultimate purpose of the differentiation of the sexes is to point beyond itself to the relations God-creation and Christ-Church.”<sup>80</sup>

Catholic authoress Taylor Caldwell observed that “feminine nations and feminine men inevitably die or are destroyed by a masculine people.”<sup>81</sup> You cannot have a masculine people without masculine fathers. Masculine fathers are not being produced by churches today, particularly not by the warm-fuzzy contemporary worship ones. The ancient secular historian Herodotus recounts Croesus instructions to Cyrus as to how to keep the Lydians loyal and prevent any danger from them in the future. “I suggest you put a veto upon their possession of

Stand Here Fathers, Harris

arms. Make them wear tunics under their cloaks, and high boots, and then to teach their sons to play the zither and harp, and to start shop keeping. If you do that my lord, you will soon see them turn into women instead of men and there will not be any more danger of their rebelling against you.”<sup>82</sup>

Men, future fathers and fathers, are disappearing from the pews. In 1952 surveys said males made up 47% of those attending service. By 1986 it was 40%. In 1992 it was 43%. In 1996 worship services were only 28% male.<sup>83</sup> I think this is in part because of the feminization of worship and leadership. A tyrannical state opposes fatherhood and churches that promotes it. If the authority of the father is done away with, it is quickly transferred to the all-powerful state. When the power of fatherhood is not exercised – and it won't be if deprived of its legitimacy – in place of individual, accountable power comes institutional, anonymous, unaccountable powers and forces.<sup>84</sup>

Fathers, in this year celebrating the famous words “Here I stand,” stand in the place God has put you within the Order He created.

S.D.G

### **Appendix 1 – Women Suffrage**

We have treated this subject as a “Seinfeld” episode treated the issue of homosexuality back when it was still permissible to cast aspersions on it. In that episode, the repeated line after professing not to be a homosexual is “Not that there’s anything wrong with that.” And those words said overly emphatically tell you there is definitely something still wrong with it. In 1969 congregations were *allowed* to have women’s suffrage in their Voters Assemblies. By now most

do. I can only think of 6 congregations in the Texas District that don't, and we hear "not that there is anything wrong with women not voting."

Congregations without women voting are getting in the way of the "women can do and be anything they want" lie that is told and retold till all but only hardened misogynist believe it. The following story illustrates the problem with the lie that women can do and be anything. A woman had just returned from her National Organization of Women meeting. Her five-year-old daughter told her she wanted to be a nurse when she grew up. The mother with much indignation explained that just because you're a girl doesn't mean you have to settle for being a nurse. The mother told her she could be a surgeon, a lawyer, a banker, even the President. "You can be anything," the mother exclaimed! The girl asks, "Can I really be anything?" Yes, her mother assured her, she could. "All right," she said, "I'll be a horse."<sup>85</sup>

Nobody can be or do anything they want. I will never be able to dunk a basketball or fly an F-18. My height prevents one and my eyesight the other. Men will never be able to naturally gestate or give birth to a child and women are not able spiritually to be pastors. The reasons for my inability to be a mother are manifestly physical. The reasons a woman cannot be a pastor aren't manifestly physical but spiritual, and here I refer only to the fact that the source of all true spiritually, the Holy Spirit, plainly forbids it. Not that women are somehow more spiritually deficient than men.

But the argument is that being a voter is not about being a pastor. It's either about being represented properly – an appeal to the spirit of democracy - or it is about serving – an appeal to stewardship. The Voters Assembly is *not* a representative assembly. It is a responsible and ruling one. The buck stops there. Those who wish to re-define voting to be merely polling could do that by changing their constitutions and bylaws to plainly say that the Voters Assembly is *not* the

ruling assembly. This will not be done because of our understanding of Church and Ministry, and the sanctity of democracy in America.

However, if we emphasize that being a member of the Voters Assembly is not about *ruling* but *servicing*, we are giving women a backhanded compliment. They are fit for membership in the Voters because they have a greater capacity for serving.<sup>86</sup> Men can have the highest office in the church; women can have every single one below that.<sup>87</sup> They may serve men by accepting responsibility in the Voters Assembly, by lighting the candles, reading the lessons, ushering the people, and distributing Communion.

You have to redefine voting to not be an expression of rule, and that is virtually impossible to do in a republic like the United States that is fast moving toward the pure democracy our forefathers feared and the internet makes a possibility. When the Voters Assembly on behalf of the church elects the pastor, as is the case in the Waltherian system, all rule is vested and exercised by them. The 1955 book *The Office of Women* which I took to task for wobbling on the Order of Creation was nevertheless clear on this score. Zerbst says, “Therefore, Paul strives to set forth clearly that wherever the authority to rule the congregation is conferred upon woman, there the subordination of woman is nullified.”<sup>88</sup> If women have the authority to elect a pastor then Aristotle’s observation applies: “But what difference does it make whether women rule, or the rulers [the pastors elected] are ruled by women? The result is the same.”<sup>89</sup> And so does this observation by Chrysostom, “The divine law indeed has excluded women from the ministry, but they endeavor to thrust themselves into it; and since they can affect nothing of themselves, they do all through the agency of others; and they have become invested with so much power they can appoint or reject priests at their will.”<sup>90</sup> The hand that rocks the cradle can rock not just the world but the church.

## Appendix 2 – The Same Old Shibboleths

Whenever women pastoring, voting, ruling, or leading is brought up the same old shibboleths are. What about Deborah? Wasn't Paul simply reflecting the view of his time – after all we have our own theologians saying that Luther was in this regard? Besides didn't Paul have a problem with women?

In Herod's temple, women were excluded from the Court of the Men. This wasn't how it was in the tabernacle or Solomon's temple. This shows that this bit of misogyny was Jewish not Christian. The Jews in fact had a prayer in which an Israelite praises God for not having created him a Gentile or a woman or ignorant. The pagans were no better. A prayer attributed to Socrates has him saying he is glad to be alive not as an animal but a human, not as a woman but as a man, not as a barbarian but a Greek.<sup>91</sup>

In first century Rome, behavior of a women in public, especially in the cities, more and more was like that of men. Her daily life and presence at every type of function was not distinguishable from that of men. She went on visits; attended receptions, theater, concerts, travelled on summer trips without her husband going as far as Egypt without him sometimes. She had conferences with the overseer of her own estate and discussions with her lawyer were all done exactly as a man. "Thus, in the environment of early Christianity, emancipation was taken even further in some respects than it is today, which means that the widespread characterization of late antiquity as 'patriarchal' has to be questioned."<sup>92</sup> Late antiquity was already contrary to the Biblical Order of Creation.

In ancient Greece and Rome women's position in regard to property rights was equal to that of men. In the middle and upper classes, the same was true in regard to occupations. There were female goldsmiths, medical doctors, and estate owners. In Rome, we hear of female bosses

## Stand Here Fathers, Harris

in some manual trades and shipyards. In matters of marriage and divorce both sexes were practically independent. Still in Greece women were excluded from public affairs and were considered inferior beings. Plato believed that the man who failed in this life was reborn a woman and then an animal. The emancipation of women from the domestic sphere came with the Roman empire and so was there in New Testament times.<sup>93</sup>

In almost all ways women shared equal rights with men and were initiated into all the mysteries of their religion. They often performed the religious ceremonies in the cults of Cybele, Attis, and Dionysus. In the last “all distinctions between men and women, adults and children, freemen and slaves were broken down.” In the cult of Isis there were numerous priestesses. In one famous hymn to her it was said, “You have given women the same power as men.”<sup>94</sup> Thus Paul’s words to Timothy and to Corinth were counter-culture on several levels. You might say they were out of this world, and being from the realm of the Holy Spirit, they were.

Over the decades, I have answered hundreds of times the argument that if Deborah did it so can you. Already in the 4<sup>th</sup> century appeals were made concerning the daughters of Philip, Anna, Miriam, Deborah, and Huldah. Origen countered that these women never spoke in public in the presence of men. Origen doesn’t reject every sort of teaching by women but only public official teaching through which women assume superiority over men.<sup>95</sup>

That’s the argument from the Roman Catholic side. The Evangelical Protestant argument is: Deborah is not found in a passage about leadership in the New Testament church but in the Old Testament at a time when many unusual events occurred among God’s people, events the Bible doesn’t intend us to imitate, i.e. Samson and Jephthah. Miriam and Huldah had some sort of prophetic gifts but they occur in contexts that clearly affirm male leadership, and they are not in contexts dealing with who is to govern or teach in the church. Priscilla speaks to Apollos yet

the passage doesn't discuss governing or teaching in the assembly but is a private conversation. Phoebe does carry Paul's letter but the passage about it doesn't deal with teaching or governing in the church either. Philip's daughters prophesied and it seems women prophesied in the Corinthian church but this isn't governing or teaching either. "So where is there any example of women doing what egalitarians claim they should be able to do, that is, exercising governing or teaching authority over an assembled church? There is no example at all in the entire Bible."<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Stanford, Peter, 14 August 2016, Review of *A Little History of Religion* by Richard Holloway. Retrieved from [www.theguardian.com](http://www.theguardian.com).

<sup>2</sup>It would seem that my "For now" was almost 30 years too late. Dr. Richard Strickert sent this to me. "In the English translation of his book, [Luther: Man Between God and the Devil](#) (English edition, Yale, 1989, p. 39), Heiko Oberman gives this version of Luther's speech:

*"Unless I am convinced by the testimony of the Holy Scriptures or by evident reason-for I can believe neither pope nor councils alone, as it is clear that they have erred repeatedly and contradicted themselves-I consider myself convicted by the testimony of Holy Scripture, which is my basis; my conscience is captive to the Word of God. Thus I cannot and will not recant, because acting against one's conscience is neither safe nor sound. God help me. Amen."* ... However, on p. 40, Heiko Oberman notes: *"In the Bishop's Court in Worms sat the whole of Germany [thanks to the media of the time, the pamphlets and private letters written for publication], not just the emperor and the imperial estates. In fact, the nation heard the final impressive statement that can be found only in the published version of Luther's confession: 'Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise. God help me. Amen.'"*

<sup>3</sup>Electricians, mechanics, and plumbers still use male-female terminology in their trade, and there would be chaos in these fields if these terms suddenly became arbitrary.

<sup>4</sup>Harris, P.R., *Why is Feminism So Hard to Resist?*. Bynum, TX: Repristination Press, 1997, 61.

<sup>5</sup>The male-female polarity is subtler than most realize. In studying the physical movements of men and women it has been found that male movement consists of countless endings. There is a beat-like form to them. The movements of females are endlessly continuous. There is a rhythmical form of movement. Hauke, M., *Women in the Priesthood?*. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1988, 89. The millennials and the technologically savvy will recognize that what is being described is that men are digital and women are analog. In the same way that light can be composed of both waves and particles, so mankind can be both digital and analog. However, the distinction in humanity speaks to how we learn, how we think, how we relate to others and how we use technology.

<sup>6</sup>Curtis, H., "The Order of Creation, the Role of Women, and the Missouri Synod". *Logia*, Trinity, 2007, 8.

<sup>7</sup>Lutherans Okay Lady Ministers. (1970, June 30). *The Austin American Statesmen*, n. pag.

<sup>8</sup>Crouch, J. E., *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972, 82.

<sup>9</sup>As quoted in Gorday, P.J., *Colossians, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture*, IX. Downer Grove, IL: IVP, 50-51.

<sup>10</sup>Letters, LIV, NPNF 2, XII, 183.

<sup>11</sup>*Politics*, I, V, 8.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, VII, 11.

<sup>13</sup>As quoted by Hardenbrook, W. M., *Missing from Action*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 137.

<sup>14</sup>Bombeck, E., "Daddy Doll Under the Bed," *Reader's Digest*, June 1985, 49-50.

<sup>15</sup>By Friedan, B., *The Feminist Mystique*. New York: Dell, 1983, 142.

<sup>16</sup>Mead, Margaret, *Male and Female: A Study of the Sexes in a Changing World*. New York: Dell, 1968, 123.

<sup>17</sup>Degler, C. N., *At Odds – Women and the Family in American from the Revolution to the Present*. New York: Oxford, 1980, 73

<sup>18</sup>Douglas, A., *The Feminization of American Culture*. New York: Macmillan, 1977, 75

- 
- <sup>19</sup> Fuchs, Lawrence as quoted by Piper, J and Grudem, W in *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*. Wheaton: Good News, 1991, 379.
- <sup>20</sup> Durant, W & A, *Rousseau and Revolution*. New York: MJF Books, 1986, 43.
- <sup>21</sup> By Green, M. P., *Illustrations for Biblical Preaching*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989, 146.
- <sup>22</sup> Fifteen years before this video David Blankenhorn made this same argument in his book *Fatherless America: Confronting Our Most Urgent Social Problem*.
- <sup>23</sup> Szabo, N, <http://www.fatherfigurevideo.com>
- <sup>24</sup> Hardenbrook, 90.
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid., 114.
- <sup>26</sup> As quoted by Friedan, B., *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Dell, 1963/1983, 141.
- <sup>27</sup> Piper and Grudem, 303.
- <sup>28</sup> In Smalley, G., *The Key to Your Child's Heart*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984, 24.
- <sup>29</sup> Salyer, J. D., "Where the Demons Dwell: The Antichrist Right," *Chronicles*, August 2010, 20.
- <sup>30</sup> Hauke, M., *Women in the Priesthood?*. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1988, 100.
- <sup>31</sup> Ibid., 103.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid., 161.
- <sup>33</sup> Chesterton, G. K., *Brave New Family*. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1990, 101.
- <sup>34</sup> Hauke, 107
- <sup>35</sup> Mead, M in Ibid., 98.
- <sup>36</sup> Ibid., 40.
- <sup>37</sup> He did this in 1979. Cheaney, J.B. "Knowing what we don't know". *World*, October 1, 2016, 14.
- <sup>38</sup> Paprocki, T. J., "Bathrooms Now Legislated? Who Knew?," *Catholic Times*, May 15, 2016, n. pag.
- <sup>39</sup> Corradi, R. B. "Psychiatry Professor: 'Transgenderism' is Mass Hysteria Similar to 1980s-Era Junk Science." [Thefederalist.com/2016/11/17](http://Thefederalist.com/2016/11/17)
- <sup>40</sup> Ibid., 9
- <sup>41</sup> De Tocqueville, A., *Democracy in American*, vol. 2, New York: Vintage Classics, 1990, 355.
- <sup>42</sup> Pernoud, R., *Women in the Days of the Cathedrals*, trans. A. Cote-Harriss. San Francisco, Ignatius, 1998, 250.
- <sup>43</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>44</sup> Tocqueville, 211.
- <sup>45</sup> Grudem, W., *Evangelical Feminism & Biblical Truth*. Sisters, Oregon: Multnomah, 2004, 44.
- <sup>46</sup> Chesterton, G. K., 121.
- <sup>47</sup> In point of fact, it was "a law of the sea" dating to 1852. Here is the background information: The HMS *Birkenhead* in 1852 sunk off Cape Town. Here the "age-old" law of women and children first was first used. It's known as the "Birkenhead drill." Schoolboys all over England knew the "Birkenhead drill" from Kipling's line "stand and be still to the Birken'ead drill" (Wilson, Francis, *How to Survive the Titanic*. New York, HarperCollins (2011), 73). Seven women and 13 children were rowed away to safety. To ensure that after the Captain gave the order for all to abandon ship the rush of men toward the three lifeboats would not swamp the women and children, LTC Seton, the soldiers' commanding officer, drew his sword and ordered his men to stand fast, and these untested soldiers did not move even when the ship split in two. Of the 634 people on board only 193 were saved. From [www.historic.uk.com/CultureUK/Women-Children-First/](http://www.historic.uk.com/CultureUK/Women-Children-First/). PRH – The line is from Kipling's poem "Solider an' Sailor Too". The full line is "'But to stand and be still to the Birken'ead drill is a damn tough bullet to chew.'"
- <sup>48</sup> Harris, 57.
- <sup>49</sup> Hauke, 115.
- <sup>50</sup> Ibid., 430.
- <sup>51</sup> Ibid., 193
- <sup>52</sup> Thielicke, H., *Theological Ethics*, Vol. 3, *Sex*, trans. Doberstein, J. W. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964, 231.
- <sup>53</sup> Braun, Mark E., *A Tale of Two Synods*. Milwaukee: Northwestern, 2003, 22.
- <sup>54</sup> When the CTCR came out with its *Women in the Church*, I wrote and said from my perspective there is no problem with women in the church. The problem has always been with men in the church. A popular slogan in circa 1907 LCMS supports my point: "Bring the men back into the church." Graebner, Alan, *Uncertain Saints*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press (1975), 20.
- <sup>55</sup> Hauke, 49, fn. 15.
- <sup>56</sup> Ibid., 62.
- <sup>57</sup> Jastram, N., "Man as Male and Female: Created in the Image of God," *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, Vol. 68:1, January 2004, pp. 5-96.

<sup>58</sup> Yarbrough, R. W., as quoted by Grudem, W. 286.

<sup>59</sup> Grudem, 48

<sup>60</sup> Hauke, 449.

<sup>61</sup> Grudem, 518-520.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 140.

<sup>63</sup> Yarbrough, R.W., *I Suffer Not a Woman: A Review Essay*, by Grudem, 656.

<sup>64</sup> Zerbst, F, *The Office of Woman in the Church: A Study in Practical Theology*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1955, 111.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 74.

<sup>66</sup> Thielicke, 11.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 236.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 240.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., Italics original, 203.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., 235.

<sup>71</sup> Jastram, 75.

<sup>72</sup> “Doctrinal Resolutions of the LCMS 1929-2004,” 69.

<sup>73</sup> Jastram, 76.

<sup>74</sup> In the panel discussion that followed this was challenged. The Reverend Doctor Daniel Gard, a retired Naval Reserve chaplain, said that from the Civil War on the LCMS has always had chaplains. This is true, but it has been controversial from the WW I till now. Here is what Mark E. Braun asserts in his 2003 book *A Tale of Two Synods*: “Despite these instances of past chaplaincy service, the Missouri and Wisconsin synods both officially opposed involvement in the government’s military chaplaincy program during World War I.” This quote is from page 76. If you read pages 74-93 you will see how our position evolved or devolved, depending on your position, but it most certainly *did* change. In the panel discussion, I expressed my ambivalence on this particular issue. I served as an Army Reserve chaplain for 12 years. In order to do this, you have to agree to do memorial services for fallen comrades with all faith groups. These are viewed by the LCMS as functions of command (the military) and not as functions of the church. These, however, are the very civil religious prayer services that we oppose, and rightly so, outside the military. I participated in such memorial services during and after the First Gulf War as an Army Reserve chaplain. Where does my ambivalence come in then? If any of my sons were in the military I would want them to have access to a faithful confessional Lutheran pastor. However, I resigned my commission in 1995 because I was not allowed to do my annual training at Fort Polk unless I agreed to do a unionistic – actually syncretistic - service. My only point in the paper, however, is that the LCMS has historically changed her positions according to the prevailing view of society, see footnote below, and we have done so in regard to the Order of Creation and we are on the trajectory to do so on women pastors and eventually on LGBTQ issues.

<sup>75</sup> These changes are usually in response to a laity who finds themselves increasingly at odds with the society around them. “Put in another way, synodical spokesmen somewhat hesitantly followed their laity-but lagged at a distance. “Then, in time, some older church men changed their minds, and new leaders emerged to approach things from a different perspective. The result was usually a theology or a ‘theologization’ depending on one’s perspective, of moderate lay practice. In the twentieth century, this happened repeatedly on one question after another in lay life.” Graebner, Alan, *Uncertain Saints*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press (1975), 117-118.

<sup>76</sup> In Zerbst, 87.

<sup>77</sup> Thielicke, 114.

<sup>78</sup> Hauke, 350.

<sup>79</sup> Lewis, C. S., *That Hideous Strength*. New York: Scribner, 1945, 315-316.

<sup>80</sup> Hauke, 481.

<sup>81</sup> Caldwell, T., *Dear and Glorious Physician*. San Francisco: Ignatius, 2008, 397.

<sup>82</sup> *Herodotus*, I, 155, 62-63.

<sup>83</sup> Grudem, 378.

<sup>84</sup> Hauke, 227.

<sup>85</sup> Green, 308.

<sup>86</sup> Hauke, 261.

<sup>87</sup> Hauke, 424-5.

<sup>88</sup> Zerbst. 120.

<sup>89</sup> *Politics*, 2, IX, 46.

<sup>90</sup> “On the Priesthood,” NPNF, IX, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988, 49

<sup>91</sup> Hauke, 346.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 342.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., 340-341.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., 343-344.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 410.

<sup>96</sup> Grudem, 365.