

Biblical Gender Roles – Part 5

James Smyda

June 11, 2016

Good afternoon everyone. I hope you're all having an uplifting Sabbath wherever you are hearing this today.

Brethren, for the last several months, we have been working our way through a multiple part series on the subject of Biblical gender roles. Today I'd like to pick up with the next installment on this series. The title is:

Biblical Gender Roles – Part 5

In the last two installments, we focused specifically on the role of men. Today we will address the role of women.

As I mentioned previously in this series, gender roles today in our current culture are in absolute confusion. One of the primary reasons is that our culture has been dominated by the feminist movement for the last forty to fifty years. This is a movement whose standard objective has been to remove Biblical gender roles from our culture. They see it as inherently evil and oppressive. Basically they've gone about doing this, as I mentioned, with kind of a two-pronged approach. One is basically teaching the idea that masculinity is inherently pathological. Therefore, men need to be feminized for the safety of mankind. They've also then taught that being in a feminine role for women is inherently oppressive and leads to victimization. Therefore, women need to do the opposite as well and take on a more masculine role and compete with men to avoid victimization.

What this has done is basically result in a narrative that we often see in our culture today, particularly through our entertainment system. We see this all the time when we turn on the TV set. It's basically a narrative that can be summed up with a phrase: Man = bad, and women=good. In most of the TV programs the husband and father is shown as a bumbling idiot who messes everything up. He's not only stupid and incompetent, but men are the perpetrators of evil. However, women are often portrayed as smart and competent, but when it comes to the subject of evil, they're just the victims. The whole underlying belief of this narrative is basically the idea that evil exists in the world because of toxic masculinity. That basically means that men are perpetrators of evil; women are, therefore, the victims and they are by definition immune to evil.

A heretical view of human nature is being taught constantly in our culture. When you look at the subject of Biblical gender roles, one of the common themes you see in terms of marriage and the role that God gives for wives, is following the leadership of their husbands. In other words, submitting to male leadership.

Well, if you buy into this narrative of man=bad, woman=good, this idea seems utterly absurd. What you're basically saying then is that the good gender (women) need to submit and follow the leadership of the bad gender, being men. That seems utterly ridiculous.

To look at the role of women, we first of all need to realize how brain washed our culture is in this particular idea. We need to realize how much this has skewed our perceptions and even culturally blinded us to the reality that women have human nature as well and they have the same evil hearts as men, coming from the same spiritual sources and have those same influences. We first need to see through this and how this has affected our perceptions so we can have an accurate look at the subject of Biblical roles.

As I mentioned, the whole concept that is put across in our current culture today in terms of a theory of human nature is that evil exists because of toxic masculinity. This has caused, you might say, a cultural blindness oftentimes in terms of how we look at these issues. Oftentimes we are not even acknowledging the reality of evil when it is perpetrated by women.

Let me give you some examples of this. There are more examples that I have time to cover today, but we will cover one of the most blatant examples. If you've paid attention in our culture over the last decade or two, if you've watched shows like Dateline, 20/20, or documentaries and things of that nature, you've probably seen the focus that oftentimes gets covered on the issue of deadbeat dads. That is a legitimate problem in our society, but we often see that on these news specials. They will interview children who were abandoned by their fathers because this term "deadbeat dad" oftentimes is used to refer to an individual who is actively involved in the sex that creates pregnancy. However, when it comes time to be responsible for the children created as a result of this, they are A.W.O.L. They are nowhere to be found when it comes time to be financially, physically and emotionally responsible for the results of their actions. They are totally irresponsible at that point. That's why they are referred to as deadbeats. You'll see news programs interview the children that were abandoned, especially as they've grown into adulthood. They tell what their life was like, how this affected them, and you will see firsthand the pain that these problems caused.

You will also see it looked at from a systemic point of view. What I mean by that is looking more at the statistics of how the lives turned out of the children who were abandoned, who didn't have a father figure in their lives and the social problems that come about as a result of that.

I'm not denying the reality of any of this type of problem, but when you see this focused on, you can easily wonder why this problem is so one sided. What you will see is a focus on these irresponsible men and then you get a picture of the women involved. They are, more or less, responsible. They're picking up the pieces behind the man who abandoned them and taking care of their children. You kind of scratch your head and

wonder why some men are so irresponsible. But the women, in general, are being responsible. Why is it so one sided? Well, it isn't.

Think about it like this. I'm not denying the reality of this problem in any way, but when you see these news specials, there is a reason why they are interviewing the victims of the deadbeat dad's behavior. You're seeing the statistics on how their lives turned out and the social problems this resulted in. That's because the victims of the deadbeat dad's behavior lived to tell the story. You can interview them because they grew up. They actually became adults and you saw the results of their lives.

Women in America who want to behave similarly, who want to be actively and enthusiastically involved in the sexual part that creates these children, but they want to wash their hands of all responsibility of being a parent. They have an option that men don't in America. It's called abortion.

What is happening is these women can just choose to go to an abortion doctor, what I think is more accurately described as a contract killer, because they are the equivalent of a Mafia hit man who is hired to kill someone to get them out of the way, someone considered as an inconvenience or a threat. That is basically what is happening. A woman can go to an abortion doctor and have the doctor murder the baby, because it is murder. Let's just call it what it is. Then what happens is that child quietly goes away because they are not around anymore to tell their story. You can't interview them on 20/20 and find out how this affected their lives. They didn't get to have a life because they are dead.

It's very important to realize when you look at the subject of abortion, that we have not only culturally but have legally defined the subject of abortion as a women's rights issue. That's how you always hear it referred to in terms of choice. It's her body, her choice and her rights. That's not only how it is culturally defined, that's how it's legally defined. Literally the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled it unconstitutional for the father to have any rights whatsoever in terms of this subject. In other words, if the dad disagrees with his baby being murdered, there is absolutely nothing he can do about it. He is powerless to take any action to stop this.

So understand when you look at this problem of abortion, who is killing all these babies? It's the mothers, because they are the only ones who have the legal rights on this subject.

Now let's get a concept of the magnitude of this problem. I'm going to give you some rough numbers here just to get a concept of this issue. If you look at live births in America in a year's time, according to the U.S. Center for Disease Control, America typically averages between 3-1/2 and 4 million. These are rough numbers. These are children not killed through abortion.

Abortion numbers, if you include those as well, depending on whose numbers you look at and how accurate is their reporting, it's typically around a million or 1-1/2 million at

the most. Let's put these together just to do some rough estimates. That means you are talking about five million pregnancies in a year's time in the U.S. If a million to 1-1/2 million of those get murdered through abortion, we're talking about at least twenty to twenty-five percent of babies that could be born every year but are murdered by their moms, the only one who had any legal rights whatsoever on the subject.

So you have to understand that we don't just have a deadbeat dad problem, we have a homicidal mom problem. We have all these moms murdering their children.

Look at how we see it culturally differently. You see, with deadbeat dads, first of all we universally condemn their behavior and we at least attempt as a society to hold them accountable for their actions. If the mom wants to pursue him for child support, to try to push him to be responsible, she can work with the Attorney General's Office who will pursue him and even garnish his wages. That's even legal in places like Texas where bill collectors can't even garnish your wages, but the Attorney General's Office can if child support is involved. If a deadbeat dad fights the Attorney General's Office enough, he can wind up incarcerated and put in prison for this. This is a legitimate problem and we have way too much of it, but as a society we condemn them and we at least attempt to hold them accountable for their actions.

Compare that to how we look at the subject of abortion. The homicidal moms, as a culture, we don't even view their behavior as being wrong. We consider it a fundamental right of her choice. We write laws to totally protect her from even the father having a say in the matter, and we will even financially subsidize the crime through federal tax dollars. You've heard of Planned Parenthood. They have been on the news quite a bit. They are primarily an abortion clinic. One of the things you've probably heard is that a great deal of their funding comes from federal tax dollars. They are actually funded by our government to perpetrate these crimes. Think about the disparity in how we look at the subject. Not only is abortion considered a fundamental right, you oftentimes even hear women being characterized as heroes for doing it, because she is an empowered woman exercising her right to choose. But a dad who wants to behave the same way is considered a deadbeat who is irresponsible.

In our culture today, sometimes you will even see women wearing a t-shirt, proudly proclaiming "I had an abortion;" or walking in a feminist demonstration holding a sign proclaiming "I had an abortion." Have you ever seen a man in our culture walking around wearing a t-shirt or holding a sign proudly proclaiming, "I'm a deadbeat dad?" Would you ever see that? No, because we condemn men for doing that. We try to hold them accountable. Women are viewed as heroes for doing that very thing. We are culturally blind to even acknowledging that women are capable of the same evil as men. We have so internalized this idea of woman as a victim that we often just excuse their responsibility. You don't even see what's right in front of our face of what is taking place here. It's important to realize that. You often hear woman synonymized with victim. You constantly hear in our culture that women always get the short end of the stick, they're always persecuted and put down. But think about the reality of this. We have elevated a woman's choice, what affects her life, literally to the point that children can

be murdered and discarded if it will negatively affect her life. We basically make laws where a man has no rights to even speak, as his child is murdered, if it's going to inflict upon a woman's rights. We have elevated women's choices above everything. That's what we've really done.

Realize that it isn't just this particular subject where we are culturally blind concerning the reality that women have the same evil human nature as men. This also affects our criminal justice system. If you honestly look at this subject, often women receive a slap on the wrist for committing the same crime than a man would do. To back this up, let me share an article that I pulled off of the University of Michigan School of Laws website. It was posted on November 16, 2012. The title of the article is: Professor Starrs' Research Shows Large Unexplained Gender Disparities in Federal Criminal Cases. I'm going to read the first paragraph. The whole article is much longer. This gives you a sense of where I'm going with this.

If you're a criminal defendant, it may help a lot to be a woman. At least that's what Professor Sonja Starrs' research on federal criminal cases suggests. Professor Starrs' recent paper estimating gender disparities in federal criminal cases looks closely at a large data set of federal cases and reveals some significant findings. After controlling for the arrest offense, criminal history and other prior characteristics, men receive 63 per cent longer sentences on average than women do. Women are twice as likely to avoid incarceration if convicted.

It's not just one anecdotal story here or there, it's a systemic issue. Just to give you an example of this, you've probably heard the name Mary Kay Letourneau. This story was famous about twenty years ago, in the late nineties. She was a 34-year-old school teacher who initiated a sexual relationship with a twelve-year-old student. Keep also in mind that she was married at the time this happened and she had kids about the age of this boy as well. She became pregnant as a result of the sexual relationship. She does get caught for this and prosecuted, but for the statutory rape of a twelve year-old, she gets a six-year sentence in prison and three months of it are suspended. She spent three months behind bars and then she was released. Of course there's a stipulation that she has no contact with the boy, but literally in a matter of weeks after she is released, she is caught again with the young boy. She became pregnant again. They wound up having two daughters as a result of all of this. She is actually given a real sentence the second time. She was then sentenced to seven years in prison.

Realize if this was a man, a 34-year-old man that preyed on a twelve-year-old girl. He would be seen as a predator and child molester and would be locked up. I remember back when this story first hit the news, this story was being discussed on daytime talk shows. What appalled me at the time were the discussions along the lines of: Could they have really been in love? Could it have been a real relationship? These were discussions you would never see if it was a 34-year-old man with a twelve-year old girl. In that situation he is a child molester. Lock him up and throw away the key.

There's this inability to admit that when a 34-year-old woman preys upon a 12-year-old boy, she is just as much a child molester as a 34-year-old man who preys on a 12-year-old girl.

Somehow we have this cultural blindness where we want to spin it and make it more innocent and less evil when a woman does it. We can't admit that women have the same evil human nature. I can give you a lot more examples than we have time for. You will see this throughout our culture. We have so synonymized woman with victim that we have trouble admitting that women have the same evil human nature as men.

This concept has even bled its way into the Church of God. Let me give you a graphic example of that. Within the past year, I personally heard a sermon given by a Church of God elder from another organization. He's been a career minister since the days of Worldwide. He has kids my age and I've met them. He was giving a sermon addressing Proverbs 5, 6 and 7. If you're familiar with those chapters, the vast majority of Proverbs 5, 6 and 7, except for a part of chapter 6, is primarily warnings to young men to avoid immoral women. It talks about adultery and the ruin this can do to your life if you get sucked in by an immoral woman. It's a graphic warning that obviously portrays the women involved as sexual predators. It basically says that if you see her, you just run in the other direction. Don't toy with this and don't let yourself get sucked in. She can reduce you to a crust of bread and ruin your life. This minister was talking about this and was pondering this, and I staunchly disagree with the conclusions he came to. He said that he was puzzled as to why God would refer to women like this. Why would God characterize a woman as a predator, because when there are problems with sexual behavior, it's pretty much always the man that creates the problem and why would He refer to a woman like that? He actually said that in a sermon. I heard it. He decided that God didn't really mean it like that. He was just personifying the problem of sexual immorality as a woman, because Proverbs does sometimes personify things in that aspect. So he decided that's what it was really about, because God wouldn't say that about a woman.

I staunchly disagree with that, because if you honestly read those chapters and the graphic warnings that are given, it's obvious that He is referring to it like that. My point is that this illustrates how we have created a cultural blindness where we just can't admit that when women commit evil, it's just as evil as when a man does it. We get the idea in our head that it's really just men that do all this, but women aren't like that.

Let's test this idea. He inferred that women are not sexual predators, it's just the men. Let's test that from a source that no one can argue with.

Turn to Genesis 39. You're probably familiar with the story of Joseph. He brags about his dreams in front of his brothers. That wasn't wise. They end up throwing him into a well and later sold him into slavery. When he is at Potiphar's house, he is actually a slave. He is owned by Potiphar and his wife. Keep that in mind as we go through this story. He is in a vulnerable situation because he is their property.

Genesis 39:7. *And it came to pass after these things that his master's wife cast longing eyes on Joseph, and she said, "Lie with me."*

8) *But he refused and said to his master's wife, "Look, my master does not know what is with me in the house, and he has committed all that he has to my hand.*

9) *There is no one greater in this house than I, nor has he kept back anything from me but you, because you are his wife. How then can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?"*

10) *So it was, as she spoke to Joseph day by day, that he did not heed her, to lie with her or to be with her.*

11) *But it happened about this time, when Joseph went into the house to do his work, and none of the men of the house was inside,*

12) *that she caught him by his garment, saying, "Lie with me." But he left his garment in her hand, and fled and ran outside.*

13) *And so it was, when she saw that he had left his garment in her hand and fled outside,*

14) *that she called to the men of her house and spoke to them, saying, "See, he has brought in to us a Hebrew to mock us. He came in to me to lie with me, and I cried out with a loud voice.*

15) *And it happened, when he heard that I lifted my voice and cried out, that he left his garment with me, and fled and went outside."*

16) *So she kept his garment with her until his master came home.*

17) *Then she spoke to him with words like these, saying, "The Hebrew servant whom you brought to us came in to me to mock me;*

18) *so it happened, as I lifted my voice and cried out, that he left his garment with me and fled outside."*

19) *So it was, when his master heard the words which his wife spoke to him, saying, "Your servant did to me after this manner," that his anger was aroused.*

20) *Then Joseph's master took him and put him into the prison, a place where the king's prisoners were confined. And he was there in the prison. (NKJV)*

Notice what we have here. This, you might say, is a stereotypical scenario of what we today call sexual harassment. The way you often see this portrayed on television and the movies, it's the other way around. It's the man who is the perpetrator. He is in a powerful position, perhaps the owner of a company or manager. He has a young lady working for him. She may be a young attractive girl, perhaps a single mom in a vulnerable situation, has limited job skills and desperately needs this job. He uses his power to coerce her into sexual activity. If she resists, he then uses the power he has over her to persecute her and make her life miserable. That's often how you see it.

Notice that this is the exact same scenario with Potiphar's wife and Joseph with the exact same details. It's just being perpetrated by a woman. She is in the powerful position and he is a slave. He doesn't even have the option to resign from the job because he doesn't want to put up with her behavior. He is owned by them and there's not much he can do about this. Even when he doesn't go along, she then persecutes him. Notice also how quickly she goes from an aggressive perpetrator to characterizing herself as an oppressed victim.

In our culture today, if you pay attention to how we often portray the role of women, you will see this illogical dichotomy that is often put across. What I mean by that is when the subject being addressed is on the positive end, it's a benefit, a perk or a right of privilege, something positive that one would want. What you often hear is that these are strong, independent powerful women capable of doing anything a man can do, only better. Often that's how you will hear it stated.

Change the subject to where we are talking about accountability for bad choices, particularly those with very negative consequences; or if we're talking about accountability for perpetrating evil or even acknowledging the fact that women are capable of doing evil and have the same evil heart that men do, often you will hear that the strong, independent and powerful becomes fragile, helpless victim. So suddenly that's being excused.

Let me give you an example. As I mentioned before when we were talking about abortion, that we have defined this subject not only culturally but legally as a women's rights issue. In the U.S. today, the only person who has any legal authority whose opinion even matters on the subject of abortion is the mom. Nobody else counts. A number of times even when you discuss the accountability for the ugly reality of abortion, I've heard "Well you know, if the men in these girls' lives were just more supportive to them, they wouldn't have to make the unfortunate choice to have an abortion." Turn that around. Would we ever justify deadbeat dads with the same logic and say, "If the women in their lives were more supportive, they wouldn't have to make the unfortunate choice of abandoning their children." Would anyone even make that argument, let alone accept it? You can't suddenly jump from when there is a positive side of being strong, independent and powerful and capable to take on anything, and suddenly when it gets to being accountable for bad choices go, "Oh, down trodden and innocent victim who has to be protected." You can't logically be both. That doesn't pass the common sense test. That is a cherry picked view of reality to try to jump between those two. As a friend of mine put it, "If you pick up a stick, you pick up both sides of the stick." You get both ends. You can't just selectively say, "I want the perks, but you keep the downside." It doesn't work like that. You get it all as a package.

Notice also that one of the things Potiphar's wife did is make a false rape claim. She accused Joseph of that and he went to prison. One of the reasons I point that out is if you've ever challenged some of the rape statistics or claims of rape in our current society, it's often put across: "How dare you! Women would never lie about that." I realize that can be a very difficult subject and a traumatizing situation if a woman has been on the receiving end of that, to go through the legal process. But if you're going to jump in the other ditch and say you should never question anything, what you're saying is, "Women don't have deceitful human nature. They would never lie about anything. If that word is involved, it's always the truth." That is denying what the Bible teaches us about human nature.

Also, as I mention about rape and sexual assault, today we have synonymized that subject with the phrase “violence against women.” The very phrase tells you it only goes in one direction; men are the perpetrators and women are the victims. It never happens the other way around.

Let’s challenge that idea from a source that no one can question. Turn to Genesis, chapter 19. Let’s see if sexual assault is only violence against women and is never perpetrated by women. I’m sure you’ve heard the story of Lot and his family in Sodom, when the angels came and wanted to extract them from the city because God was going to destroy it. Lot, his wife and his two daughters wind up fleeing the city after the angels kind of pushed them along. Lot’s wife turned and looked behind them which they were told specifically not to do, so she is turned into a pillar of salt. So then it’s just Lot and his two daughters that survive the experience and start a life outside of Sodom. Let’s pick up the story as to what happens next in verse 30.

Genesis 19:30. *Then Lot went up out of Zoar and dwelt in the mountains, and his two daughters were with him; for he was afraid to dwell in Zoar. And he and his two daughters dwelt in a cave.*

31) *Now the firstborn said to the younger, “Our father is old, and there is no man on the earth to come in to us as is the custom of all the earth.*

32) *Come, let us make our father drink wine, and we will lie with him, that we may preserve the lineage of our father.”*

33) *So they made their father drink wine that night. And the firstborn went in and lay with her father, and he did not know when she lay down or when she arose. (NKJV)*

Now take note of that. He is so drunk he doesn’t know when she arrives or when she leaves. He is too out of it to consent. This isn’t a situation where he had a few too many drinks and he is still making conscious decisions, but bad decisions because it’s under the influence of alcohol. That’s not the case. Our modern day equivalent would be giving someone Rohypnol and then taking advantage of them when they are too out of it to defend themselves. That is exactly what is happening here.

Now turn to verse 34.

34) *It happened on the next day that the firstborn said to the younger, “Indeed I lay with my father last night; let us make him drink wine tonight also, and you go in and lie with him, that we may preserve the lineage of our father.”*

35) *Then they made their father drink wine that night also. And the younger arose and lay with him, and he did not know when she lay down or when she arose.*

36) *Thus both the daughters of Lot were with child by their father. (NKJV)*

Here we have two counts of predatory rape perpetrated by women. It’s not just violence against women. Women can perpetrate the same thing.

Let me address an argument. I've even heard this in the Church of God as I was growing up. When this story would be referred to, they would try to kind of justify or spin this a little more positively by using this argument. They say, "Well, you have to understand that these girls thought that they were the only ones that had survived and they needed to repopulate the earth, so that was their motivation, and it's not as bad as it seems." Okay, if you're willing to make that argument, turn it around and see how you feel. Just for argument's sake, turn the situation around and let's assume that it's Lot who decides ... "Well, we're the only ones that are still around, and we need to repopulate the earth and have more children. I know my daughters won't voluntarily have sex with me, so I'll just get them so drunk they don't know what's going on, and when they're too out of it they don't know what's happening, I'll just forcibly rape them." He would perpetrate that twice. Do you feel the same way to justify that or are you more likely offended and appalled at the very idea of trying to justify and put a good face on several counts of predatory rape when a man perpetrates it?

If you feel that way when a man does it, why is it any different when a woman perpetrates it? Why is it any less evil or somehow more innocent when a woman commits the same crime? It isn't. We have synonymized woman with victim so much in our culture, that we have become culturally blind to holding women accountable for their actions or sometimes even acknowledging the fact that women have the same evil human nature as men.

Remember the underlying idea behind this feminist narrative of man=bad and woman=good is that evil exists because of toxic masculinity. That not only justifies the whole logic of having to feminize men for the safety of mankind, it by definition means that women are immune. That is not only wrong, it is absolute heresy.

Turn to Jeremiah, chapter 17. We're going to cover a familiar human nature scripture here. Let's first of all start with what the Bible tells us is the reason evil exists in the world. Let's understand that it's everybody, not just half the population.

Jeremiah 17:9. *"The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it?"*

10) I, the LORD, search the heart, I test the mind, even to give every man according to his ways, according to the fruit of his doings. (NKJV)

This tells us why evil exists in the world, because we are inherently evil as human beings. Because of Satan's influence, we have evil hearts and we're motivated by selfishness, lust and greed and violence and all manner of carnal thoughts and behaviors. This is what Satan's influence does to us if we don't constantly fight it. It comments here that this is the heart of man. Realize he's referring to mankind. He's not saying, "Well, it's just those toxic masculine men that have that problem. Women are sugar and spice and everything nice. They don't have evil hearts."

Paul tells us in great detail and he's very clear about the fact that there are no exceptions to this rule. This is all of us. It's across the board. We all have the same evil heart that creates the same evil.

Turn to Romans, chapter 3. This is another human nature scripture.

Romans 3:9. *What then? Are we better than they? Not at all. For we have previously charged both Jews and Greeks that they are all under sin.*

10) *As it is written: "There is none righteous, no, not one;*

11) *there is none who understands; there is none who seeks after God.*

12) *They have all turned aside; they have together become unprofitable; there is none who does good, no, not one."*

13) *"Their throat is an open tomb; with their tongues they have practiced deceit"; "the poison of asps is under their lips";*

14) *"whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness."*

15) *"Their feet are swift to shed blood;*

16) *destruction and misery are in their ways;*

17) *and the way of peace they have not known."*

18) *"There is no fear of God before their eyes." (NKJV)*

Notice how many times he specifically states there are no exceptions. This is everybody. This is all of mankind that has these issues. When we read these human nature scriptures, realize we can't put an asterisk next to it and say, "We're only talking about half the population. It's just those evil men that do that. Women would never do that. They would never commit domestic violence. They would never abandon their children. They would never be sexual predators and molest young boys. They would never commit rape. Those are just evil things that men do. Women are sweet and they're always the victim."

No, that's not how it works. Don't get me wrong. Women can be victimized by men, but men can be victimized by women too. We both have the same evil heart, and we have to face that reality if we're going to look at this subject honestly and get rid of this constant narrative that tells us, "Well, it's just men that are bad, while women are sugar and spice and everything nice," No, women have the same evil human nature that men do. We all have it and that's what we all have to repent of. We'd have a very skewed system if women would have a leg up on salvation, because they would have less to overcome if that were the case. That's the absurdity of this whole idea.

If we don't logically think through this, we start internalizing this idea that women are always the victims. The domestic violence statistics demonstrate a lot of that. If you look at honest studies, they show that both are very prone to violence in striking each other. However, there's a common cultural belief today that it's only men who are the perpetrators. The thinking is that women would never strike out in violence. In other words, they are not motivated by selfishness and greed and vanity and violence like men are. What you're saying is they are immune to human nature. It's not just wrong,

it's absolute heresy. You have to realize that this is a lie that we've been told again and again for decades.

To illustrate the power of this, I'd like to share a quote from Joseph Goebbels. He was Hitler's propaganda minister. He was responsible for propaganda for the Third Reich under Hitler. If you Google his name, you will see a lot of his quotes about propaganda and how it's used. One of his famous quotes is: "A lie told once remains a lie, but a lie told a thousand times becomes the truth." In other words, in our perceptions, if we keep hearing a lie told again and again, we think of it as truth. Well this is a lie; this man=bad and woman=good, and it's a lie that's been told thousands and thousands of times for decades. Just turn on your television and you'll be barraged with it. You're going to see the husband and father as a bumbling idiot. He's completely incompetent while the wife has to basically help him across the street because he's too stupid to even do that. You'll see that women are noble and always the innocent victim when it comes to evil. They are smart and competent and men are stupid. You constantly see that.

The reason I emphasize all of this is when you look at the subject of Biblical gender roles, what this narrative teaches us is that men are bad and stupid and the perpetrators of evil and women are smart and capable and wonderfully good hearted. Then you look at the Biblical instruction, particularly of the roles within marriage. We're going to see that the subject of submission within marriage is a very strong theme throughout the New Testament. Our culture basically programs us to look at that subject and think it's absurd, because what God is saying then is that the good gender (women) should follow the leadership and submit to the authority of the bad gender (men). That's nuts! Who would do that? It's completely illogical. So we immediately want to reject that because we think that God is this archaic sexist from the stone age who just needs to get enlightened with our more educated culture today and realize reality. It makes you want to respond in that way when you look at the subject.

This has gotten so ingrained in our culture today that even mentioning the word "submission" will get hackles up because we have digested this culture. Think of that the other way before we go down this road. What would we think in our culture if a minister gave a sermon about husbands loving their wives? It was a common reaction for men to think, "I can't believe he's going to talk about this archaic sexist idea about having to love your wives. Shouldn't he get in the 21st century and realize we don't have to do that anymore?" It sounds ridiculous, doesn't it? Today if you talk about the roles that are put across for women, immediately we think it to be ridiculous. That concept has been abused and I talked about that last time. One of the reasons for that is we have internalized this whole idea of man=bad and woman=good. Once you internalize that concept, what the Bible teaches about the subject sounds absurd. If you look at the subject of Biblical gender roles as the instructions to women, one of the big themes you're going to see throughout the New Testament is the subject of submission. I know that's a politically incorrect subject today, but I'll just put this across jokingly. In preparing for this sermon, I've listened to a number of messages by different individuals. There was one preacher talking about Biblical gender roles, and he put it across like

this: “Keep in mind folks that I didn’t write the mail. I’m just delivering it.” He was basically delivering God’s instructions.

If you look at the subject of submission, you will find this addressed in at least six different books in the New Testament and at least seven different chapters and by at least two authors. If God covers something that many times in that many books, He obviously thought it was important, and He obviously thought it was fundamental to the success of marriage and society. Therefore, it is obviously something we should cover.

We’re not going to review every one of the six different books that I mentioned, but there are three books that are “go to” chapters on the subjects of marriage and gender roles. Let’s start in Ephesians, chapter 5. We’ll have to summarize some of these because we covered them last time. This is true of Ephesians 5 and Colossians 3 and even 1 Peter 3, that in all cases they address the instructions to wives and husbands. Not only do they use similar content, they all follow the same format. You see the role of the wife addressed first and then the role of the husband. The first subject addressed in terms of the wife is always the subject of submission. In Colossians, for example, that’s the only subject mentioned. You’ll see in 1 Peter, there’s more points than that addressed, but that’s the first subject and kind of the main theme.

Ephesians 5:22. *Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord.*

23) For the husband is head of the wife, as also Christ is head of the church; and He is the Savior of the body.

24) Therefore, just as the church is subject to Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything. (NKJV)

I’m not going to take the time to read through scriptures in Colossians and 1 Peter because we covered that last time. Take note of the fact that not only do they use similar content in the other two chapters, it’s the same format. I’ll cover in a minute why that could be the case, why he would address the subject of submission right at the beginning every time he’s talking about it.

Let’s address another common misunderstanding of this section in Ephesians. In verse 21, prior to what we just read, it says:

21) submitting to one another in the fear of God. (NKJV)

Often the idea gets put across, because of this particular scripture, that submission in marriage is just a mutual thing. In other words, there is no issue of headship or leader of the family. It’s both submitting one to another, so it’s all just about equality and there is no structure of leadership within it. First of all, if that’s the case, then Paul stating in verse 21, making that statement, and then in verses 23 and 24, directly contradicting what he just said. Not only that, he would be contradicting himself in Colossians 3, 1 Corinthians 11 and 14 as well as 1 Timothy 2. That’s problematic to have that explanation. So what is he saying in this particular scripture? To understand that, we

need to understand the full context around this statement. We need to understand what leads up to it and what comes after it. Start in verse 18.

18) And do not be drunk with wine, in which is dissipation; but be filled with the Spirit, (NKJV)

If you notice the next three verses are going to give you three different examples of how you can be filled with the spirit. What we're going to notice is the third example then has three contexts in which it applies. If you understand that whole structure, you get the picture of what he is really saying. In verse 19, this is the first example of how to be filled with the spirit.

19) speaking to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord, (NKJV)

In verse 20 we have the second example.

20) giving thanks always for all things to God the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, (NKJV)

In verse 21 we have the third example.

21) submitting to one another in the fear of God. (NKJV)

This pattern of three continues going forward if you keep in mind the entire context that comes after this. One of the keys here is, don't get fooled by the chapter break, between chapter 5 and 6. Remember, when Paul wrote this letter, he didn't break it into chapters and verses. That was done much later. He's referring to submitting one to another. Three different contexts of submission are covered right after this. What often happens is we read the rest of chapter 5, just referring to marriage and will apply that statement only to talking about marriage.

If you continue in the beginning of chapter 6, this is easy to see. If you have a New King James translation of the Bible that has the subheadings, it's easy to see this. Starting in verse 22 through the rest of chapter 5 is referring to roles in marriage. If you refer to chapter 6 starting in verse 1 through 4, it's referring to children and parents. Children are being commanded to submit to their parents. Then in verses 5 through 9, it's referring to slaves and masters, because in the first century, slavery was a common concept. That's why it's addressed a lot in the New Testament because they had slaves and slave owners coming to church together.

What you have is three different types of submissions, because slaves are told to submit to their masters. You have three different contexts in which it would apply. Now try to apply that mutual concept to the other two contexts. Would anyone want to argue that regarding children and parents, well that's mutual submission with each other. Parents submit to the kids just like the kids submit to them. No. No one is going to

argue that. Can you make a mutual concept out of slaves and masters? No, because we're still talking about a position of authority. He is referring to all three of these together. To clearly understand when he says, "submitting one to another" what that would mean, I'll give you an easy example to show you how this applies.

Remember in the first century church they had slave owners and slaves coming to church together, sometimes in the same congregation. Imagine you have a married couple and they happen to be slaves and they have children and they also have a slave owner. All of these are being called into the church and they are all attending together. Submission applies in numerous ways throughout this scenario and sometimes one individual is on multiple sides of the equation, because you have the children told that they need to submit to their parents as the authority over them. Then you have mom and dad. The mom is not only a mom; she is a wife. She has children being told to submit to her as a parent. She is being told to submit to her husband as the head of the family. Well, the husband is in the same situation. He has children and a wife, so as a dad and a husband, he has children and a wife told to submit to him, but he is a slave and has a slave owner. He has them submitting to him and he has to submit to his owner who is over him. This is what he is talking about when he says, "submitting one to another." It's appropriate as to your situation.

Every time this subject is brought up, the subject of submission is the first to be addressed. If you take Ephesians 5, Colossians 3 and 1 Peter 3, you have not only three different books, you have two different authors. They all cover similar material and the exact same format and the first thing they address when they talk about the subject is the issue of wives submitting to their husbands. Why would that be the case? There has to be a logic to this.

As we covered last time, God is specific in commanding the husband in how to fulfill his role in leadership. This is not to be an authoritarian, harsh type of leadership. This is supposed to be servant leadership. This is to be done with love and understanding as a gentle leader of a family. That can be a very difficult thing to fulfill if you're trying to gently lead someone who is taking the attitude of ... "Nobody tells me what to do. I don't submit to anyone. I am empowered and equal." If that's what you're dealing with, this can be difficult.

Let me give you a severe example of this particular subject. I think this will get the point across. I think everyone would agree that obviously the quintessential example, you might say, of lovingkindness and servant leadership would be Jesus Christ. I think everyone would easily agree with that. He is also the author and orchestrator of the day of the Lord. So the same individual who is obviously very kind and loving, as we would say in today's terminology, He is the poster child example for carrying out the harsh, brutal events in the history of mankind. Why? Because the people He is dealing with are so hardened and so unwilling to submit to authority, they would rather die a horrible death than to submit to an authority over them. Think of it. The two witnesses are on the scene for multiple years, and even after they're killed, the three angels come and warn. What is the constant message? Turn away from the beast, repent of your sins,

submit your God and it will save your life. What do we see constantly throughout the book of Revelation? All the survivors refuse to submit to God, continue in their sins, blaspheming against God. It's a constant theme. Even when Christ and the first fruits come down to the Mount of Olives, what do they do? "Let's gather all of our armaments together and fight them to the death." All they had to do is submit to their authority and life would go much easier for them. They are repeatedly told that. They would rather die horrible deaths than to have anyone be in authority over them.

I realize this is a severe example and no, I'm not advocating that husbands take a day of the Lord approach in leading their families. Let's be very clear about that. I'm just illustrating this from the standpoint of realizing that if you're trying to lead someone in a gentle fashion whose attitude is to fight constantly and battle for the leadership position, that can become very difficult if not impossible if you've got someone who is constantly fighting them.

Think about what this would do to a marriage. If you have a situation where the husband is trying to lead in that regard and faces the point of view of, "No one tells me what to do. I don't submit to anybody," and the wife constantly battles him, one of two things is going to play out. You're either going to have two people that are constantly butting heads as he's trying to lead and she fights everything he does, you're going to have constant conflict. Either that or you're going to have some version of role reversal. If he starts submitting to her for the sake of having peace, that may help them get along, but it will dysfunction the marriage.

Here's one of the things that often happens. The feminist movement constantly tells women that it's victimization if they submit to any kind of authority over them and they should fight their husbands for the power of running the family. What they forget to tell them is that they are still wired mentally and psychologically as women. Here's what I mean by that. God created us emotionally and psychologically to fulfill the roles that He describes in the Bible. He created women to be naturally attracted to strong masculine men, and He created men to be attracted to feminine women. What often happens, and I've seen this a number of times, is that the woman will fight with a man because no one tells them what to do when they want to have their way. But they don't respect a man they can step over and easily push around. They think that he's not much of a man so she's not attracted to him anymore because it has sabotaged their relationship. Well, the same thing is happening on the other side. Regardless of what ideology he has been indoctrinated to he is naturally wired emotionally and psychologically to be attracted to femininity. If a woman is constantly fighting him and taking a masculine role, then he is less attracted to her. This starts to sabotage the relationship. It can mess up the dynamics of their relationship with one another. This can sabotage their relationship and make things go awry in their interactions with each other.

As I explained last time in part 4, the instructions that God gives the husband and wife, both speak to the fundamental emotional needs of the spouse. That's why husbands are continually told to love their wives and dwell with understanding. Feeling loved and

understood is very important to a woman. That's why God puts a big focus on those things.

A man's primary emotional need is respect. Young men you will often see interacting, especially in urban culture; when one is upset with the other, they say, "He dissed me." He disrespected me is what they're saying. It shows how fundamental it is to a man's psyche to have respect. Think about how these two interact with each other. If a man is not showing love and understanding to his wife, the more he is unloving and unkind to her, she will want to be less respectful to him. The more disrespectful she is to him, the more he is naturally motivated to be unloving and unkind to her, and it tears them apart.

Whereas if he is actively showing love and understanding to her, she is much more motivated to be respectful to him, and if she's showing more respect to him, he is more motivated to be loving and kind and understanding to her and it pulls them together. If you end up with a role reversal and she is constantly fighting him on everything, the last thing he is feeling is respect. Again, that is his primary emotional need. Being a carnal human being, he will be less inclined to be loving and understanding to her and this pulls them apart rather than building up the marriage.

We've got to understand that God is not an archaic sexist from the stone age who is not enlightened in our 21st century. We are the idiots who are out of line with what He has designed. He designed men and women; He designed marriage. He knew what He was doing. When we get in line with His instructions, things work better and everyone's needs are met better. He's not out of touch, we are. When we reject His instructions, we end up paying the consequences.

Why would He do this? Turn to 1 Timothy, chapter 2. Why did God establish this structure within marriage? He is often viewed as this archaic sexist from the stone age who just needs to be enlightened to understand modern culture. We've talked about this scripture previously. The primary subject being address is Paul explaining why women are not included in the New Testament ministry of the church. If you read beyond chapter 2 and the beginning of chapter 3, you can clearly see that because the qualifications for the ministry is the subject addressed. He mentions here:

1 Timothy 2:11. *Let a woman learn in silence with all submission.*

12) And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence. (NKJV)

In the next two verses he gives a rationale as to why this is. I realize we are about to get incredibly politically incorrect, but keep in mind, I didn't write the mail. I just delivered it. He gives two reasons for this. One is in verse 13.

13) For Adam was formed first, then Eve. (NKJV)

He's referring to kind of the headship relationship that he talks about in 1 Corinthians 11. In verse 14, he then gives a stronger rationale as to why this is the case.

14) And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression. (NKJV)

What is he getting at there? He's saying that when Satan approached them, he played upon both of their weaknesses. He actually was able to deceive Eve. Adam was foolish and he went along with it. Neither one of them was righteous in this. They both messed up. But what is he getting at specifically using this as the rationale for this thing? Well, Eve was deceived.

To explain this, a couple of years ago Rick Railston gave a multiple-part sermon series on the subject of marriage. One of the points he made is that when God created man and woman, He gave some of His qualities to the man and some of His qualities to the woman. The point is that nobody got the whole package. We both got our own strengths and weaknesses and different parts of God's character. That is why we complement each other. He also commented that, generally speaking, men think and women feel. It doesn't mean that men don't have emotions and don't have hearts and that women don't have brains and don't think. His point was that men tend to be driven by analytical logic, and as a result, you tend to miss the sensitive and nurturing side of things. Women tend to be more focused on feelings. They're more nurturing and caring and compassionate and not as driven by analytical logic. That's why we complement each other.

Realize that the way Satan deceived Eve is that he manipulated her emotions. He basically convinced her that she was being oppressed, she is a victim, she is being cheated out of equality and, "Here, eat this fruit. It's empowering." He was able to manipulate her emotions.

Generally speaking, and this is true of human beings across the board, individuals who are more driven by emotion are easier to manipulate. It's easier to get them to make decisions with emotion, and they'll turn around and reverse engineer a logic to convince themselves that they made a logical and rational conclusion when in reality they made an emotional conclusion and then reverse engineered the logic to do it.

Men can be guilty of that as well. But the point is, women in general can be more inclined towards emotion. That's why they are more susceptible to that. We both have our weaknesses. That is one of theirs.

Men and women are wired differently. If you're going to make one the leader of directing the other, you're going to be better off going with the one inclined with logic. They will make the better decisions.

I know that I'm in the realm of being politically incorrect, but look at the whole subject of political correctness today and what that has done to our culture. The basic logic behind political correctness can be summed up in a sentence; feelings are more important than facts. That's the whole logic behind it. You may be absolutely in the truth, able to prove everything you're saying and may be taking it from God's word and

speaking against sin that hurts and destroys peoples' lives, but you may hurt somebodies' feelings so you can't say that. That's what happens when emotion takes over your culture, when everything is run by those types of values. That's the road it takes us down. I'm not trying to say that women are more evil than men. We both have our strengths and weaknesses, but my point is that God created these separate roles for us for very logical reasons. He's not an evil sexist that wanted to oppress anyone. He brought this together for the good of everyone, for a system that would work each other out, because men need women too, just like He told Adam, "It's not good for man to be alone." Men who don't have women in their lives tend to get insensitive and be brutes, because women tend to soften men. Again, we complement each other.

My point is that this logic is rejected because we want to basically characterize God as this out of touch sexist rather than know that He is the all wise, all knowing God who designed marriage and designed men and women and knew what would work and make everyone happy and make for good families. He knew what He was doing.

What does submission look like? Turn to Matthew 26. It's often a misunderstood subject. Often when you bring up this subject, the immediate thought is, "You're saying that women shouldn't have an opinion and they don't have a voice and think for themselves. They're just robots that get pushed around. That's not the case at all, because keep in mind in 1 Corinthians, chapter 11 in the first couple verses. The structure is explained that God the Father is the head of Christ, Christ is the head of man, and man is the head of woman. If we look at the headship relationship between God the Father and Christ when He was a human being, we can get a good idea of what submission looks like because He is interacting with His head. This is Christ at the very end of His life and He knows what He is about to face. Keep in mind that He inspired Isaiah what to write, so He knows in graphic detail what is about to happen to Him.

Matthew 26:36. *Then Jesus came with them to a place called Gethsemane, and said to the disciples, "Sit here while I go and pray over there."*

37) And He took with Him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and He began to be sorrowful and deeply distressed.

38) Then He said to them, "My soul is exceedingly sorrowful, even to death. Stay here and watch with Me."

39) He went a little farther and fell on His face, and prayed, saying, "O My Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from Me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as You will."

40) Then He came to the disciples and found them sleeping, and said to Peter, "What! Could you not watch with Me one hour?"

41) Watch and pray, lest you enter into temptation. The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak."

42) Again, a second time, He went away and prayed, saying, "O My Father, if this cup cannot pass away from Me unless I drink it, Your will be done."

43) And He came and found them asleep again, for their eyes were heavy.

44) So He left them, went away again, and prayed the third time, saying the same words. (NKJV)

I want you to notice that Christ is interacting with His head, God the Father. He has a difference of opinion. He's thinking for Himself. He is stating His opinion. He's going to the Father and saying, "Is there a Plan B? because I'm not liking this crucified idea." He knows in graphic detail how that's going to look because He told Isaiah what to record. He was thinking: "I really want some other option." He states His opinion. He pleads His case passionately three different times. He definitely speaks His mind. He definitely speaks for Himself, but notice along the way, He is also submitting to His head, because He respectfully does it. He expresses His opinion, but then He said, "Okay, if You, being my head, decide differently, I'm going to submit to that and follow it." It doesn't mean that because there is a submission relationship that the person submitting doesn't get an opinion, doesn't get to think for themselves and is just an oppressed robot who never gets to state what they think. That's not the case at all, but neither is submission what I like to call a liberal's view of tolerance.

If you think about those in our culture today who are from a politically liberal point of view, you often hear them talk about the concept of tolerance, how we need to be so tolerant of others. Then watch what happens when someone disagrees with them. What you often find is they don't have any tolerance at all. Here's how the logic works for them: "Yes, I'm very tolerant, but anyone who significantly disagrees with me, well they're advocating hate and I don't have to tolerate hate." Then that becomes the excuse of, "I don't have to do that."

Sometimes submission is viewed like that as well from the point of view of kind of like this: "Well, I submit to my husband as long as I agree 100% with his decisions." If you agree 100%, you don't have to submit. It's just like you don't have to tolerate somebody who agrees with everything that you do. You tolerate somebody when they disagree with your point of view, and you're respecting their right to disagree. Well, submission is a similar thing. If Christ used the definition of a liberal's view of tolerance and apply that to submission, do you know what would be the result? We wouldn't have a savior. He had to be crucified and go through all this to be the savior of all mankind. We know for a fact that He was appealing to the Father saying, "I don't like this crucifying idea. Can we find some other way?" But no, He said, "I will submit. Father is the authority over me. He has the authority to do this and I will defer to His opinion." That's what submission looks like.

Also keep in mind, as I mentioned last time, there are limits to this concept. In Christ's situation, His head is the Father who is perfect and has authority over everything. Human beings can overstep their bounds of authority. We covered that last time. When that's the case, when it's way outside the boundaries and they're asking you to disobey God, then you're back to Peter's example of obeying God rather than man. There are limits to that concept.

What we will do next time is pick up more on the role of women and cover some other factors that we didn't have time for today. I spent a lot of time on this particular subject because, again, it's been such a maligned subject in our current culture today, and we have been deeply brainwashed as a culture to completely reject the whole concept and treat it as archaic, outdated and sexist. In reality, God is not an archaic sexist. He is a very wise individual who created men and women wired the way that we are, and He knows what creates good marriages. That's why He teaches this subject.

We need to understand the wisdom in why He did this and realize how to utilize this within families. It is fundamental to their success. Next time we will pick up on the role of women and address a number of things that we didn't have a chance to cover today.

As I've ended most of these series, I'll just say, tune in next time for Biblical Gender Roles – Part 6.