

The Feminisation of the Church (I)

By Andrew McColl, 2/4/2013

Introduction:

In the Church, few things happen in a hurry. They can take decades, even centuries to come to fruition. And in this case, the feminisation of the Church has been going on for many hundreds of years.

Where did it all begin? In the garden, when the serpent said to Eve, "...you will be like God, knowing good and evil" (Gen.3:5). Because the devil is a liar, he doesn't always confront head-on with temptation. Rather, one common tactic is to question, confuse or compromise. He said to Eve, "has God said?" (Gen.3:1). This question launched the original, failed search for self-identification and spirituality apart from God and His Word: a disaster.

In making man, God also defined him. Gen.1:26-28 (which applies to both men and women) shows this for us. And when He made woman, she also was defined by God, for God said of the man, "...I will make him a helper suitable for him" (Gen.2:18). Significantly, one of the foundations of modern feminism is the rejection of this ideal.

A number of things have led to the feminisation of the Church in the modern era. Here are some of them:

- 1) A re-appraisal of the role of women in the church, which is heavily influenced by feminism and political correctness in the broader society.
- 2) A belief that females may be somehow more spiritual than males, and can be independent of them.
- 3) A blurring in the church of the Biblical roles of men and women, so that male leadership in the church is being significantly compromised.
- 3) The failure of men to accept leadership within the church, reflected in such areas as the enforcement of church discipline.
- 5) An unwillingness or reluctance to openly declare theological doctrines that are known to offend some people, such as: a) The six-day creation, b) God's law, justice and judgment, c) God's pre-destination, election to salvation and damnation.
- 6) A turning away from the historical theological fundamentals, in pursuit of some current fad.
- 7) A deliberate attempt in the Church to cultivate the interest and support of women, beyond the point of sound theology and practice.
- 8) The selection of hymns and other music within the Church written by women, reflecting a romantic rather than a Biblical view of godliness. Some of these are "Tis so Sweet to Trust in

Jesus,” “Sweet Holy Spirit” and much more. (Have you ever found a verse in the Bible, referring to Jesus or the Holy Spirit as “sweet?”)

I am indebted to Leon Podles for much of the background for this work. (See www.podles.org/churchimpotent.htm. Individual quotes will be noted below).

If you want to open the door to theological heresy and doctrinal confusion, a good place to start is by elevating one sex above the other. Women are not innately better than men, or vice versa. We are all fallen people, and fallenness affects the sexes differently, because the sexes were different in the first place.

But consider this:

Why are women more religious than men? Alberione has the answer: “She is more understanding in things of the heart, she is more spiritual than man. More humble, more tender, and consequently, more religious than man, she is more inclined to prayer, to charity, and to hope. More than man, woman feels the need for pure love; her love, less egoistic, is unselfish and prone to sacrifice.” Religion is, in Alberione’s estimation, primarily an affair of the heart. Hence, to be religious, one has to be feminine.¹

This is nothing else but pious sounding religious deception. If “to be religious, one has to be feminine,” what is to be said to the 50% of the population that are not female? In the nineteenth century, Sarah J. Hale went so far as to claim that women are not as fallen as men:

He is naturally selfish in his affections; and selfishness is the sin of depravity. But woman was not thus cast down.” Women preserve an unselfish affection and love which men have lost. They are therefore God’s chosen instruments. For Hale, “the Christian and the feminine are one.” Men are wicked, women are good, and that is why “more than three-fourths of the professed followers of Christ are women.” Christians are followers of a male, but one who had no earthly father, and got his human nature entirely from a woman. Therefore, Jesus’ “human soul, derived from a woman, trained by a woman, was most truly womanly in its characteristics.” His closest disciples were either women or like women, such as “the faithful, gentle, loving, womanlike John” (for so the image of the Son of Thunder has become in the Church).²

You don’t have to be a theologian to figure out that Hale’s message is a load of nonsense. How anybody can really believe that Jesus’ human soul was “truly womanly,” or that John was “womanlike” is beyond me. But that is what parts of the church have tacitly accepted now for hundreds of years, and it’s not improving.

All this will have to change. The Church will have to abandon the false doctrines of feminism and embrace the truth in all areas. It will mean repentance, and a turning to Biblical truth. And

¹ Leon Podles, “The Church Impotent: The Feminisation of the Church,” 1999, p.32.

²Podles, p.33.

not just women. Men will have to turn to the Lord too, accepting the responsibilities of leadership and government in the family and church we have ignored, which have contributed to this mess.

Are you ready?

The Feminisation of the Church (II)

By Andrew McColl, 16/4/2013

*For as long as churches have existed, they have been the targets of self-conscious revolutionaries who seek to infiltrate, lead people astray, and undermine the churches' very existence... They have their own agendas.*³

There is always a cohort of people who rejoice when God's rules for life are compromised in a way that accommodates them in their sinfulness. They think they benefit. In the short-term, they often seem to be right, just as the murderers of Jesus Christ seemed to have benefitted when they'd successfully orchestrated His execution. But when people breach God's rules, at some point He will judge. As Rushdoony said,

*The Temple was the house of God, His appointed dwelling place. God speaks throughout the Old Testament of the tabernacle and the Temple as "My house." Our Lord in Matthew 16:18 speaks of "My church." As against this, in Matthew 23:38, our Lord refers to the Temple as "your house." When the sanctuary or church becomes man's, it is doomed, because God will move against it. At the beginning and at the end of His ministry, our Lord cleansed the Temple (Mat.21:12-13). He cleansed it because it was properly His house, required to serve Him and not itself. The Temple's rejection of an inner cleansing slated it for judgment.*⁴

This is the peril that people enter into when they choose to compromise Biblical patterns. They convince themselves, "It's OK to do this. Around here, we do what we want."

Not only do they offend God, but they offend those who are the most faithful to God; those who are more likely to leave when compromises are accepted.

In the context of the feminisation of the Church, what does this mean?

*Women have been brainwashed to usurp the male role and abandon the female. The resulting conflict and confusion leads to a breakdown of marriage and family. This produces dysfunctional people who are obsessed with sex and look to the corporate media and state for values and direction.*⁵

Now some have quoted the verse, "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" (Gal.3:28), suggesting that gender differences are now irrelevant. They are irrelevant, insofar as our standing before God is concerned. But the doctrine of any Biblical subject is ALL that the Bible teaches on a subject.

³ Gary North, "The Threat to Your Wallet of the new Social Gospel," 28/3/2013.

⁴ Rousas Rushdoony, "The Gospel of John," 2000, p.23.

⁵ Dr Henry Makow, "When Love is a One Night Stand," 2004.

As Don Basham wisely explained over thirty years ago in relation to men, women are redemptively equal, but functionally different. When the Church implicitly or explicitly permits the distinctions between the sexes to be blurred or even attempts to eliminate them, it is effectively saying, “It doesn’t matter.” But if it doesn’t matter, why did God make us so different in the first place, and why did He specifically make reference to these differences, and the roles of men and women, in scripture? (See Numbers 30; Deut.22:5; I Cor.11:1-15; I Tim.2:9-3:13)

*The Church must develop a right understanding of the meanings of masculinity and femininity, an understanding that is consistent with human realities and with the data of Scripture.*⁶

Let’s be specific: feminism is a subtle form of humanism, and its roots are in paganism. The fact that some women in churches have partially or wholeheartedly supported feminism doesn’t make it any better. Nearly thirty years ago, Mary Pride noted that

“Role obliteration is the coming thing in evangelical, and even fundamentalist churches. If women can’t be women, by golly they will be men! All because two or more generations have grown up and married without ever hearing that the Bible teaches a distinct role for women which is *different* from that of a man and just as *important*.”⁷

Pride goes on to quote from William Gurnall, a Puritan preacher who wrote “The Christian in Complete Armour.” Gurnall taught that

It should be the care of every Christian, to stand orderly in the particular place wherein God hath set him...The Christian may be considered as related to a threefold society—church, commonwealth, and family... The welfare of these societies consisteth in the order that is kept—when every wheel moves in its place without clashing, when every one contributes by performing the duty of his place to the benefit of the whole society...

*A person then stands orderly in his place when he doth these three things—First. When he understands the peculiar duty of his place and relation...Second. When knowing the duty of our place, we conscientiously attend to it...Third. We...keep the bounds of our place and calling.*⁸

In the Church, we have some repenting and some withdrawing to do. We must move away from feminism, and from the feminisation of men. The saying that “boys will be boys,” is a realistic commentary on males. Not everything boys and men will want to do is right, for we are all affected by sinfulness. But men and women’s differences of attitude and behaviour are much more than culturally taught; they are an aspect of how we were made by the Creator.

Many women today think, “If I’m a helper, I’m inferior.” That is a mistake. In the Body of Christ no one is superior or inferior to anyone else. Each of us is given a

⁶ Leon Podles, “The Church Impotent: the Feminisation of the Church,” 1999, p.208.

⁷ Mary Pride, “The Way Home,” 1985, p.xiii.

⁸ Quoted in Pride, p.132-133.

place and function. What God requires of us is faithfulness in the particular place and function He has assigned us.

In John 14:16-17 Jesus speaks of the provision He will make for His disciples after He leaves them: "I will pray the Father, and He will give you another Helper...the Spirit of Truth." So Jesus describes the Holy Spirit as Helper, but does that mean the Holy Spirit is inferior? On the contrary, He is God! In the same way, a wife who fulfils her God-given role as helper, is in no way inferior on that account.⁹

We must note this fact:

If women do not fulfil their God-given calling, it leaves a void in the fibre of society which nothing else can fill. Ruth Prince

The obsessions with "equality" and womens' careers that have been spawned by feminism has commonly been to the detriment of family, because a woman who is normally in the home will bring something to that home, that won't be there if she is normally absent at work.

Does this mean that wives should never be working outside the home? No. Because of the many different circumstances that make up family situations, it is most unfair and excessively rigid to preclude a woman working. There has to be a harmonious working together of husband and wife under God, for His glory.

Are women equal to men? Are Jews equal to gentiles? Are blacks equal to Italians, Irish, Polish and other white people? The answer is probably a big fat no, and the pretence or assumption that we are equal – or should be equal – is foolhardy and creates mischief.¹⁰

The role of women is laid out in a number of passages, such as Proverbs 31. In the New Testament, Paul teaches that

older women likewise are to be reverent in their behaviour, not malicious gossips nor enslaved to much wine, teaching what is good, so that they may encourage the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, to be sensible, pure, workers at home, kind, being subject to their own husbands, so that the word of God will not be dishonoured (Tit.2:4-5)

The genders are to complement each other, especially in marriage. But to try and suggest that gender differences don't matter is to implicitly suggest that God's differentiation of the sexes was a mistake, and that we can somehow come up with a better way of doing things than God.

Conclusion:

The feminisation of the Church began hundreds of years ago. It has never furthered the glory of God, and has detracted from the Church's authority and strength.

⁹ Derek Prince, "Husbands and Fathers," 2000, p.35.

¹⁰ Walter Williams, "Are We Equal?" www.lewrockwell.com, 26/3/2013.

The Bible never teaches that men are superior to women. But women have a different role to play in the family, where they are to be a “helper” to their husband (Gen.2:18), and the Bible teaches that in the Church they aren’t to be given an authoritative role teaching or having authority over men (I Tim.3:11-15).

The sooner we regain a proper understanding in the Church of the differing roles of men and women according to the Bible, and we act on it, the healthier Christian families will be, and the greater will be the Church’s authority and influence in the world.

The Feminisation of the Church (III)

By Andrew McColl, 23/4/2013

Churches that can preach the Gospel without the modifications that make it easy and bourgeois have a great advantage in reaching men. The rawer fundamentalist churches and the more traditional revivalist churches reach more men than liberal or latitudinarian churches. Unless the Church takes its own message seriously, as indeed a matter of the uttermost importance, it cannot expect men to take it seriously either.¹¹

Biblical preachers were plain-speaking men, not given to sugar-coating the truth. Of course, when you speak like that, you will upset some people. But Biblical preachers seemed to be singularly indifferent to upsetting some people. Their focus was on faithfully declaring the truth.

Think of Stephen. Speaking of the fathers of his listeners, he said that

They killed those who had previously announced the coming of the Righteous One, whose betrayers and murderers you have now become; you who received the law as ordained by angels, and yet did not keep it (Acts 7:52-53).

Of course Stephen himself was then murdered, but his message and life serves as a warning to all leaders of the Church. Don't go "softly, softly" with the truth.

Does this mean we are to be mean, crude, or without understanding? No. Jesus' ministry to the woman at the well (see John 4) is a wonderful illustration of ministering faithfully, yet with understanding of the life and circumstances of His listener.

Here's my warning: the feminisation of the Church has tended to compromise faithfulness to God in our preaching. In wanting to supposedly "reach out to people," we have sometimes forgotten that we are called to be Christ's ambassadors (II Cor.5:20). Preachers have emphasised the love of God, but not His judgment or justice or His anger at sin, when the scripture speaks frequently of these things. We've been lowering the bar. We've been making it easier for people to sit in church without conviction of sin.

Biblical preachers spoke of God as the Creator of the world, of sin, and of the obligation for repentance. They spoke of God's righteousness, His justice, and the accountability of individuals to Him. Interestingly, the New Testament preachers when speaking to non-Christian audiences never spoke of the love of God.

Is that what preachers do today? In some places, church has apparently become an opportunity for some kind of romantic encounter with Jesus. That's a result of feminisation, and it's not Christian.

¹¹ Leon Podles, "The Feminisation of the Church," 1999, p.204.

Doesn't God love His people? Yes, He does love them individually, but the bride of Christ is corporate. There are no individual brides of Christ.

In wanting to make it easier for people to become Christians, the Church has gone off into some dangerous territory, and is in grave danger of misrepresenting Him.

But there's more to this. Church can steadily become a place where men don't feel welcome anymore, because church over centuries became quietly adapted to the majority.

And who is that? Women and children.

We must re-think church. We have to re-think what we do and say. Most of all, we have to re-think how we represent God in the community, and the Church.

And if we fail to do these things faithfully, Jesus had a warning for us;

You are the salt of the earth; but if the salt has become tasteless, how can it be made salty again? It is no longer good for anything, except to be thrown out and trampled underfoot by men (Mat.5:13).

The Feminisation of the Church (IV)

By Andrew McColl, 14/5/2012

As David's time to die drew near, he charged Solomon his son, saying, "I am going the way of all the earth. Be strong, therefore, and show yourself a man" (I Kings 2:1-2).

Be on the alert, stand firm in the faith, act like men, be strong (I Cor.16:13).

There are no two ways about it: when the Church fails to faithfully represent God in the world, it misrepresents Him.

Why does this happen? There are a lot of reasons, going back many hundreds of years. And one of these reasons is the feminisation of the Church, which also has been happening for hundreds of years.

The feminisation of the Church is evident in the Church's preaching. More often than not, we don't want to offend people by drawing attention to the supposedly harsh aspects of God's character. So, we speak of His love and grace instead.

Anything wrong with speaking of God's love and grace? Not at all, but if we fail to speak of His justice, His election, His righteousness and His anger at sin, we do our listeners a great disservice, and misrepresent God. The Bible actually instructs us to "Behold then the kindness and severity of God..." (Ro.11:22). We've fallen a long way since 1741, and Jonathan's Edward's sermon, *Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God*.

The Psalmist prayed,

Let sinners be consumed from the earth, and let the wicked be no more (Ps.104:35).

Heard that prayer (or something like it), in church in your time? I haven't. John the Baptist taught,

He who believes in the Son has eternal life; but he who does not obey the Son will not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him (Jn.3:36).

The Bible makes it clear that God sent a huge, world-wide flood in Noah's era, because of the wickedness of humanity. Then He destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah because of their arrogance and indifference towards the poor (Ezek.16:49), and their homosexuality. Proper preaching requires that ministers draw attention to all of God's character attributes, so that God's people learn to fear God and keep His commandments.

This makes preaching more effective and fruitful, because the Bible says "...knowing therefore the fear of the Lord, we persuade men" (II Cor.5:11).

The feminisation of the Church is evident in its songs. Think of the many songs of our era that perpetuate this kind of nonsense: "Softly and tenderly Jesus is calling, calling for me and

for you...” Then there is, “Tis so Sweet to trust in Jesus.” What’s so sweet about it? I thought that trusting in Jesus Christ was an aspect of my obedience to God.

God didn’t call Moses “softly and tenderly.” Actually, His anger burnt against Moses when he tried to avoid his calling (Ex.4:14). When Jesus did call someone, He tended to simply say, “Follow Me!” (Mat. 4:18-19; 9:9; Jn.21:22). Neither soft nor tender, but extraordinarily authoritative.

Jesus wasn’t a wimp. He was a powerful, confident man, certain of His relationship with His Heavenly Father. He was also a man angry at sin, which He frequently confronted in very blunt ways amongst religious people (see Mat 23).

The picture of Jesus in the gospels is not a meek teacher of non-violence...To be sure, Jesus is supremely kind and gentle. But the Jesus pictured in the gospels is much more a warrior than a benign guru.¹²

But we have abandoned this ideal, and what’s the consequence? Our authority in society has all but disappeared.

The feminisation of the church is evident in the number of churches that ordain women ministers. When we do things that God forbids (I Tim.2:11-15), there will always be negative consequences, and women leading and preaching to the whole church really does say something. It says, “We don’t care for God’s commands.” David Pawson may have written an excellent book entitled “Leadership is Male,” but most of the church prefers to ignore it.

The feminisation of the church is evident in the discipline of its members, which is now almost non-existent. Hardly a week goes by when there isn’t another public allegation involving sexual abuse by ministers.

There are church people who publicly support abortion and homosexuality. Shouldn’t they be ejected: thrown out of the church, for supporting what in the Bible is a capital offence? The fact is, the Church has tolerated evil in its midst, and this toleration for decades is now coming back to haunt us. And haunt us it should, for it has been our fault. People (including children) have needlessly suffered, and the Name of the Lord has been dragged through the mud.

When Paul uncovered sexual sin within the Corinthian church, his command was blunt: “...Remove the wicked man from among yourselves” (I Cor.5:13).

We must recover the Biblical means of church discipline. This begins with local church government by elders. Membership of the church is not a right but a privilege, and this privilege can be withdrawn. We call this excommunication. The church needs this form of discipline to be restored for the sake of its purity, and for restoring discipline and order.

¹² Gary Demar, “The Reduction of Christianity,” 1990, p.211.

Conclusion:

It's been said, "When hell goes from preaching, justice disappears from society." I think that's true, and is an apt description of what has happened in the world over the last century.

If we really want to please the Lord, we will have to go back to the beginning, where we got right off the track of His plan. And it will involve throwing out of the house of God a whole lot of intellectual and doctrinal garbage, accumulated over centuries. This is what reformation really requires: "...taking every thought captive to the obedience of Christ" (II Cor.10:5).

And it means that the feminisation of the Church stops. Wouldn't that be a good thing?

The Feminisation of the Church (V)

The Call to War

The greatest enemy of the Church has always been humanism, in its many variants. The devil's devious promise to Eve, when he proposed that she take of the forbidden fruit, was "*You surely will not die! For God knows that in the day you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil*" (Gen.3:4-5).

Clearly, the Church historically has had both internal and external threats, but the greatest threats have been internal ones: subtle adjustments to doctrine for instance, that call into question the deity and humanity of Christ.

Thankfully, in its history the Church has generally recognised the danger of accepting heretical variations on fundamental issues, and has often been prepared to be thorough in seeking an outcome. The early church Councils to their credit were willing to root out heresies, such as Arianism. But in every century, the Church has had its challenges and failures. One of the Churches' failures over the last fifty years, has been over the issue of Feminism.

The tolerance of feminism in the Church has been assisted by confusion over texts such as Galatians 3:28: "*There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free man, there is neither male or female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.*" But this text is speaking of the nature of our redemption in Christ, not our differing roles as men and women. A helpful saying I've heard, is that men and women are *redemptively equal, functionally different*.

Feminism today has a tap-root going back historically to other, much older heresies: Neoplatonism (the philosophy of Plato, the pagan Greek philosopher), and Pietism.

A radical deformation of the gospel and of the redeemed man's calling crept into the church as a result of neoplatonism. Dominion was renounced, the earth regarded as the devil's realm, the body was despised, and a false humility and meekness cultivated. Dominion was regarded as a burden of the flesh rather than a godly responsibility. Especially with Pietism, Jesus was pictured as meek and helpless, pacifistic and mild in manner...

The rise of pietism in the late medieval era, and the deep infection of both Protestantism and the Roman Catholic Church with pietism has led to a decline of emphasis on Biblical law. Pietism stresses "spiritual" religion; law stresses a very material religion in every sense of the word, relevant to the world and practically concerned with everyday affairs.¹

This leads Pietism (especially when mixed with Feminism) to a unisex view of male and female roles. It teaches men in the Church to be wimps; not be confident, bold or authoritative. Jesus Christ

¹ Rousas Rushdoony, "The Institutes of Biblical Law," 1973, p. 449, 651.

is pictured as a gentle, long-haired guru with children sitting on His lap, who never raises His voice (which He clearly did) or show anger, zeal or determination (all of which He clearly showed).

Isn't it then logical, that Church leaders today very frequently appear to be awkward, ambivalent and confused individuals, without the confidence to speak authoritatively or lead their people boldly? What men would want to join their institution?

With very few exceptions,² the church has generally not known what to do about feminism, and its response to the phenomena has been muted and awkward.

All of this must change, and the sooner, the better. The goddess theology which Eve subscribed to (“*you will be like God...*”) must be removed root and branch from the Church. Women must understand their true Biblical role, ordained by God.

But much more than this, Christian men must begin to act as bold (“*the righteous are as bold as a lion*”-Prov.28:1), authoritative, confident individuals, as those who know they will give an account to God for their actions. This is our proper role as men, and has as an outcome, the proper protection of women and children. This means we must go back to scripture and faithfully determine what God requires of us as men generally, but also as husbands, fathers and leaders within the Christian community, and the community as a whole.³

Only then, when Christian men and women across the nations are diligently fulfilling their callings under God, will the Church have the authority to rise and speak in the nations of the world of the whole council of God, found in scripture.

We have a call to war. The question is, will you join the ranks?

² See David Pawson, “Leadership is Male.”

³ See Andrew McColl, “They Shall Become One,” 2009.