

LETTER REGARDING THE WOMAN NOT TEACHING OR BEING IN AUTHORITY OVER THE MAN

April 20, 2000

Dear Brothers and Sister:

I am deeply concerned about this matter of failing to follow Yahweh's order of arrangement as regards women's place in the congregation. It is very clear from the scriptures that there is no distinction between the sexes when it comes to our acceptance before Yahweh. In speaking about the Abrahamic covenant and acceptance in the body of Messiah the Holy Spirit inspired the apostle Paul to write "For ye are all the children of Yahweh by faith in Messiah Yahshua. For as many of you as have been baptized into Messiah have put on Messiah. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Messiah Yahshua. And if ye be Messiah's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." (Gal. 3:26-29)

His main point in the context of the entire letter to the Galatians is that the Gentile believers do not need to become Jews. He is speaking as regards the natural sense of that term as relates to becoming circumcised and placing oneself under the Mosaic system of law with the rules and regulations given for the natural nation of Israel. He writes in a similar vein in Phil. 3:3 saying that in Messiah fleshly distinctions do not make us any more or less acceptable in the sight of Yahweh. However, although we are all on the same level as respects our being equally accepted as members of the body of Messiah, that does not mean we all have rights to the same function, position or realm of operation.

There is still to be an honoring of the order of things that exists in the natural. The Jew is still a Jew and has certain responsibilities as a member of that nation which the Gentile does not have. (That is why James indicates in Acts 21:21-25 that the Jews should still circumcise their children and walk orderly, that is, after the law of Moses, but that the Gentile believers are not so required.). The servant is still a servant, and the master is still the master. Therefore each should conduct himself accordingly as is indicated by both Paul and Peter. (See I Pet 2:18, Ephesians 6:5) Each has certain responsibilities or privileges as respects their relationships to each other, etc., regarding one's natural position in life.

To not walk orderly as respects the position one is born into is to transgress. It is to offend Yahweh and the holy angels. It is to become lawless. We are told that many will call Him "Lord", and will even be able to claim to have prophesied, cast out demons, and done many mighty works, but will be rejected by Yahshua because they are lawless. You are all familiar with that passage, and have possibly used it many times, but let's look at it again for the moment. Matt. 7:13-27, "Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it. Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit; neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them. Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity. Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it."

Bringing forth fruit is not a question here of how prosperous and effective you have been in getting people to profess belief, but what you have done about the word of Yahweh. Have you done what He has said, or just heard His words and not done them? Those seen here claiming they did all these great things are not told they did not do them, but told that He never really knew them, that is, acknowledged them, because they were "lawless ones" as the word translated "iniquity" means. Then, what it means to be "lawless" is explained by the parable of the builders, for He says, "Therefore, I say unto you..." etc. One built on the sand by hearing his words and not doing them and the other on the solid rock by hearing and doing his words. This is the difference between being lawless or being lawful, and, therefore, proving whether we will be acknowledged as one of his own or not. It goes much deeper than just being mistaken in one's interpretation of certain passages of scripture. It goes to the very fundamental matter of being willing to obey the scripture no matter what, instead of just following the trend and pressures of the times. It goes to the matter of either entering and staying in the strait and narrow way that leads to life or choosing, at one point or another, to walk the broad way that leads to destruction. The strait (meaning "difficult") and narrow way is doing it according to His order. The broad way is doing it according to our own desires or opinions.

You may build wrongly on the right foundation (Yahshua) and still be saved as by fire, that is, have all your works burned up. In other words, you may seek to be doing Yahshua's work and mess up by not building correctly because of carelessness as to how you build, etc, and, therefore, have nothing that stands the test of the judgment for rewards. However, when you transgress by going directly against Yahweh's order and specific word, setting up your own opinion, because of the trend in society, or any other reason, you are choosing the broad way that leads to destruction. You are in such a case, being a "lawless one". Then, it does not matter how successful you become in casting out demons, doing miracles, building huge churches, etc. Yahshua said He will say "Depart from me; I never knew you lawless one(s)" if you do not do what He says. "Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry". It will not be tolerated by Yahweh.

Some may get away with ignorantly going against the order Yahweh established, but not those of us who have come to encounter the truth and a higher, more perfect way. We have all been led into a way of restoration of order. Yahweh requires us to continue to so walk.

It is one thing to be mistaken. It is another altogether to see what the word says according to apostolic order and then deny its validity and, therefore, transgress what it says just because it does not fit what we see going on around us in the religious world. To argue against what is clearly stated in the apostolic New Covenant order because it looks like Yahweh has altered it by choosing women to positions of authority in teaching men is a very serious matter. We either hear and do his word, or we hear, but do not do it. We either decide things purely on what the word of Yahweh says, or we decide things according to what seems to be working.

It will not fly with Him in that day of reckoning to say, "Well it looked like you were calling and using women to positions of authority." It will not work to say, "Well I thought Paul was contradicting himself." It will not pass to say, "Well, those many great, successful men taught that that was only because of the customs of that day, or taught that what was meant by Paul and Peter is not what they appeared to be saying." The only thing that will be at issue in that day will be how honestly we treated Yahweh's word in being careful to see what the apostles taught. Did we "tremble at His word", given through them, and seek carefully to be in conformity to it? As you know Yahshua put their word on the same level as His own by saying, "He who hears you hears Me, he who rejects you rejects Me, and he who rejects Me rejects Him who sent Me." (Luke 10:16)

So the question is not what this or that one says. We do have responsibility to give careful consideration to the word of those who are modern day apostles, for they will teach his word with the mind of Messiah. But no true modern day apostles or prophets can contradict what is clearly taught by the original apostles or prophets. Therefore, the primary question is what does His word through His original prophets and apostles say? The "church" is built on the foundation of apostles and prophets: "first apostles, secondarily prophets," etc. (I Cor. 12:28)

Therefore, the question is what do the plain statements of the scripture say on this matter of the women's place in the church, in the home and in society as a whole? We know what society thinks. We know that the trend, the very pressure of society in the world and religious organizations, is toward total egalitarianism. We know that many church leaders now teach that at church, and at home, in husband and wife relationships there is to be full equality - no distinction whatsoever. This teaching is very, very strong even among, in fact, especially among, the evangelical, charismatic leaders.

The question may be raised, "Since both Peter and Paul said the believing servant or slave was to be subject to his master (and the master to treat the slave well) are we still morally free to have slaves?" Was it wrong to free the slaves even as was done in our country? If not, then why is it wrong to free the female by making her function to be on an equal basis as that of the male in the church, the home, and society in general?

The answer is found in answering another question. "What is based on order of operation fundamental to the nature of things as Yahweh made them, and what is merely based on order of operation in situations which exist as merely permitted by Yahweh, but not actually ordained by Him? Did He merely tolerate something until His ordained time to providentially change it, or did He directly ordain it?"

Having slaves is not part of the set up Father Yahweh established, but is contrary to it. It existed (just like divorce did) because of the hardness of men's hearts. Since it was already existing in the days of the apostles, it was deemed necessary to spell out to the slaves and to their masters the correct order for operating within that framework of things. However, in the course of time, when the situation was right, Yahweh brought about social change in the abolition of slavery, for which we all should thank and praise Him. (We need to pray and work for our brethren in the Sudan who are being made slaves, and horribly treated, by the Moslems.)

Now then, the question is this. Was the order of function, position, and relationship of the male and female to one another, as spelled out by Peter and Paul, based on Yahweh's fundamental order of creation - the nature of things - or on a perversion of creation order such as was true of the matter of slavery? Was it based on just keeping order in the societal situation as it existed then, as contrary to Yahweh's original design? If so the societal situation did need to be changed through a movement such as the modern women's liberation movement. And if it was to be changed in the matter of church positions and functions, then, it should be obvious that it should also be changed in the home and all society as well. (We are not talking about correcting abuses, but about fundamental relationships.)

The scriptures make it clear that the relationship between the male and female as established by Yahweh is a relationship which has a clear distinction in related positions of the one to the other and, therefore, in the functions of each. Man is put in relationship to the woman such as to be responsible to lovingly lead, and the woman in position to lovingly accept and follow that leadership. Where abuses exist they need to be corrected, but to change the order itself is to transgress or go beyond the expressed will of Yahweh.

Isaiah speaks of children and women ruling as being a bad thing, even a curse from Yahweh. He says this: "As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths." He had previously pointed out that this type of thing is something He would bring to pass as a judgment on the society, because of their rebelliousness: "And I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them." (Isaiah 3:4,12. Please read 3:1-12.) We live in a very rebellious society. Because of the godlessness of our modern society (including the abusiveness of men toward women and children) Yahweh has brought judgment in the form of both children and women rising up to overthrow the long established order. Women are no longer in subjection to their husbands, nor children to their parents. Does this mean we, as members of the body of Messiah should also abandon His order of things and follow the trend of the world? Are we not to be the salt of the earth? When society is going against Yahweh's order, are we to follow them, or are we to follow Yahweh and set an example of true order as He established it?

When Yahweh made the woman, we are told He made her to be a fit help (a "help meet") for man. In first Cor. 11 this is part of the Spirit's reasoning (as given through Paul) for the woman to wear the head

covering. He said, "For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man. For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels." This is all based on creation order, not expediency of just conforming to the customs of the times they lived in. What purpose is there of continuing the head covering in this our day if we are going to give women authority over the men?

Let's look at I Tim 2: 9-15. "In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array; But (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works. Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety." According to this passage the woman is clearly to take a place of meek, quiet, unobtrusiveness. This is to be reflected in how she dresses, how she learns when teaching is going on (obviously by male leadership), and by the fact that she is not to teach or to exercise authority over the man. "To usurp authority" is one word in Greek. It merely means, "to exercise authority." The word "usurp" is not there in the original language. So the excuse, "My husband (and/or pastor) gave me permission and, therefore, I am not usurping authority" does not excuse the women for transgressing this apostolic order, and Yahweh's own order of things. What modern day minister has the right to permit that which Yah's apostle forbade?

Paul says the same thing in I Cor. 14:34,35. He says, "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." Once again the matter is the woman taking an unobtrusive place of silence. She is not "to be speaking in the church". (The word translated "speak" is present tense in the Greek and should, therefore, be translated in modern language as "to be speaking". In other words she is not to be presenting her own thoughts or asking her own questions in the public gathering – questions, of course, often being used as a way of teaching.) The fact that we have all been careless about this by allowing the women to ask questions verbally does not make it right. We must reconsider this more carefully and make any corrections needed to follow the scripture, not completely throw out proper order just because we may have failed unintentionally in this regard. We could have the women write out their questions to be answered later. (The subject context, by the way, is judging or discerning the meaning of prophecy, which act includes teaching and leading, and is, therefore, only a male function.) Besides, it is one thing to be careless in a matter, but an entirely different thing to actively transgress by initiating the ordination of the woman to a place of actual leadership and teaching of men. In one case, we may have been less careful than we should have been and need to review the matter and make necessary adjustments. In the other case, we are actively changing the order, and are opening the door to even greater abuses of Yahweh's ordained created order of things.

The exceptions given to this matter of the female being silent and unobtrusive (that is, not in a place of prominence) is found in chapter eleven. She is free to "pray" and to "prophesy" ("prophesy" meaning to speak under direct divine, Holy Spirit, utterance, not in expressing her own opinions to the men). But, in keeping with her being under authority and not being on display, she is even to do these authorized things only when covering her head. Woman is man's glory and, therefore, made in the image of Yahweh by derivation from, i.e., "out of", the man. Therefore, she is to be somewhat hidden, and not on display. That is why the head covering is required. It is due to this fundamental principle of order of creation and design. She is a beautiful thing as "the glory of man", and as being made "out of man" is in the image of Yahweh, but reflecting that image only by derivation from man as man's "glory".

Man is the "image and glory of Yahweh". This is direct rather than by derivation. Therefore, the man is not to cover his head when he speaks publicly, directly to Yahweh – by prayer – or directly from Yahweh – in prophecy – as should the woman when she does these things.

Paul is not contradicting himself, as has been claimed by those who treat the scripture as though we can pick and choose as to what part of it we accept as the word of man and what part we accept as the word of Yahweh. It is all inspired of Yahweh. "For all scripture is given by the inspiration of Yahweh and is

profitable for doctrine, for reproof for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of Yahweh may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." In any document you are to take the whole of the document to decide what it is saying. The whole of the document (in this case the first letter to the Corinthians) says the female is to keep silence in the church except to speak directly to Yahweh by prayer, or directly from Yahweh by prophecy. However, even then, she is to do so only when showing her submission to Yahweh and His order (as being subject to the male leadership) by using a sign of being still under authority by covering her head. Most, supposedly called of Yahweh, women teachers do not even follow this clear teaching of the Bible of wearing a head covering. Nor do most of their men supporters teach that they should do this, even though most churches from centuries past taught they should wear something on their head "in church". To teach women should do this would not fulfill their aim, which is to be fully egalitarian - to promote full equality among the sexes.

Furthermore, to say that Paul contradicts himself on this issue, and that, therefore, instead of finding the totality of what he says in all his writings and following the whole of it, we can follow whatever part appeals to us, is to invalidate Paul as being a true spokesman of Yahweh. In such a case we are free to throw out all his writings, because we can never know for sure when it is Paul and when it is the Spirit. In fact if this is the case, we cannot suppose it is ever the Holy Spirit. In that case, we can just do away with any passages we find difficult and/or unpalatable in Paul's writings or, for that matter, any part of the Bible.

In I Tim. 2 Paul's argument for the woman to dress unobtrusively, to learn in silence, and not teach or exercise authority over the man is based not at all on custom of the day, but on what happened in the beginning. I repeat, it is first the matter of the order of creation: "For Adam was first formed, then Eve." This parallels the statement in I Cor. 11 that "the man was not made for the woman, but the woman for the man." Order of, and purpose in creation is the main thing. Then, the Holy Spirit speaking by this specially chosen apostle adds another very important reason for the woman not teaching or exercising authority over the man: "And Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being in the transgression, was deceived." The woman's natural, emotional makeup, that of being sensitive and impressionable to spiritual forces - and being more receptive, or passive, than resistive - while making her able to hear from Yahweh so that she can function in prophecy and prayer according to the Spirit (often even better than the man) also makes her more susceptible to deception if she does not defer to the man before carrying out matters - as Eve should have done to Adam when the serpent tempted her. (Adam "was not deceived", but entered with his eyes wide open because of his love for the woman with whom he was one flesh. This is another reason to keep the proper order. Man is easily wrapped around the woman's finger if she does not keep her place as being meek and quiet - undemanding, non aggressive, and not on display. Yahweh made the woman as having great attractiveness to the man. If she does not stay in proper order, but, as Jezebel did, flaunts herself before man, man can easily yield to her winsomeness and give in to her.)

Even though he does not go into the detail and specifics as it relates to woman teaching (as the Spirit led Paul to do) Peter, nevertheless, lays it out in the same manner. He says, "Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation (i.e., "conduct") of the wives; While they behold your chaste conversation ("conduct") coupled with fear. Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; But let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price. For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands: Even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him 'lord': whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement."

The same Holy Spirit, Yahweh, inspired Peter to write just like Paul did, even though in this case dealing with private, instead of public, relationships. Notice He also starts here with the matter of the outward adorning, just as when He wrote to Timothy through Paul. The woman is not to flaunt her appearance by the kind of apparel she wears (as fancy stuff) or how she fixes up (by fancy hairdos, etc.), but she is to adorn herself with a "meek and quiet spirit." (Now the man is also to be meek and lowly of heart, but he is never told to have a "meek and quiet spirit.") The woman is to be in submission even as Sarah who called Abraham "Lord". She is not to be a gospel nag even to her unsaved husband, but to influence him to want Yahweh by herself being in proper, submissive order.

So, again, although this is not dealing directly with public appearances, since the women's own unsaved husbands are to "without the word be won by the behavior of the wives ", it should be obvious that this is the same type of influence the woman is to exercise in public. That is, she is to win others over to righteousness by her godly conduct. By her following Yahweh in proper order she can win others to the way of holiness. She is to function in the same manner when speaking publicly to or from Yahweh, that is, keeping herself as unobtrusive as possible, and displaying her willingness to be in subjection (by covering her head). It should be quite obvious that since she is to be meek and quiet in the home (by not teaching, preaching or nagging her husband - a practice few women adhere to in this modern era) she is to be meek and quiet in public as well, except as Yahweh spontaneously speaks through her in prophecy, or when she prays, with covered head. If she is to win her husband by her godly behavior in the home, she is to do the same in public. If she is not to flaunt herself in physical appearance in the home, she is certainly not to do so in public either. If she is to be in submission to her own husband rather than teaching him or being in authority over him, she is not to be in authority over other men or teach them either.

So Peter and Paul are on the same sheet of music as far as a woman's place is concerned, but Paul was an apostle that wrote more, because he was a vessel chosen to cover instructions to the gentile churches and their leaders. The Jewish believers and their leaders already knew some of that order and no doubt followed it. Of course it is the same Holy Spirit speaking through both men to whatever extent Yahweh so chose to use each.

Look at what is written in Ephesians 5:22-24: "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Messiah is the head of the church: and he is the savior of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Messiah, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing." There is no place here for the woman teaching and leading her husband. Therefore, there is no room for her doing so publicly in the church either. How can she be free to do it in the public arena – that is, teach and have authority over the man – if she is not to do so in private? In the world, in its overall situation we have no direct say. We have to function as best we can in that arena of life, but in the church we are called to set the example and to walk in Yahweh's order.

Consider that with the exception of the term prophetess all the nouns used of the fivefold ministry are only used in the masculine. And even "prophetess" not being a ruling office, is not included in the list of the gifted ones that are to lead the saints to perfection in the unity of the faith, etc. Yes, there are prophetesses mentioned in the Bible. Deborah was one such, as also was Miriam, and Huldah in the O.T., and the daughters of Stephen in the N.T. But where do you ever find it speaking of "Apostles", etc. The terms used to delineate these offices are all found in the masculine in the New Testament. The twelve apostles were all men. If one's sex no longer mattered why didn't Yahshua appoint some women when on earth and/or when He ascended on high and gave gifts to humans. Women received many gifts, but not as part of the five-fold ministry mentioned further down. These, I repeat, are all masculine in gender. Yahshua had many women following Him. Why didn't they replace Judas with a woman? Why do we not find any clear instances of women apostles, etc, mentioned in the New Testament? (Junia in Romans 16 is not clearly a woman's name as some would try to make it out to be. It is one of those names which either a man or woman could have. Also being "of note among the apostles" is not necessarily the same as being one.)

Both men and women could prophesy, but only the man could be in the place of leadership. You might reply that Deborah judged Israel. This is true. However, how did she judge and/or why? If she ruled, then, she did so as a judgement upon the people as Isaiah indicates is the case when women (or children) rule, and, therefore she did so contrary to Yahweh's originally established order. He may have permitted it, and even ordained it, when His people were in such a fallen disorderly state of morals. However, regardless of the state of the nation of Israel at that time, and Yahweh's reasons for doing or allowing whatever it was He then did or allowed, we are now in New Covenant order. What He permitted or did because of the hardness of human hearts (such as permitting divorce to the extent to which He did under Moses) is not necessarily New Covenant standard. Especially at this present time in Yahweh's workings, we are supposed to be concerned about church order being restored and properly functioning with people who have chosen to walk in restoration truth. (What those churches do that are not striving for restoration of truth is their responsibility. And what Yahweh Himself does among them in grace and mercy to accommodate the level

they have attained to is not for us to be concerned with either. We are held to a higher standard as restorers of truth. Therefore, we could fall into the category of being lawless if we refuse to seek earnestly to learn and walk in the light since we have been brought this far.)

Consider this. Deborah most likely judged by prophesying. The people probably came to her to hear from Yahweh directly through her prophesying. This does not say she functioned as a teacher and leader of the people in the sense of expressing her own understanding. We have no clear case of any women being appointed by Yahweh to directly rule, or teach men through expressing their own understanding as was done by David, Solomon, etc. Naturally, even today, if a sister who is known to be a proven prophetess prophesies something, we are duty bound to obey that word, after it is judged and determined to be of Yahweh. But this does not give her the authority to express her own understanding of scripture, or even to judge other prophecy when the prophets speak. (As per I Cor. 14:29-34)

Furthermore, it is clear what the New Covenant order is, and what it is based on. It is that the woman is to "learn in silence", to "be silent in the churches" (with the exception of praying or prophesying with her head covered) not to be in a place of prominence, nor to rule.

If Deborah were the actual leader of the nation it would have been her place to lead Israel into battle. Yet she did not feel that was her prerogative until Barak refused to go without her. She then only consented to go with him while prophesying that this would, therefore, lead to his dishonor by having a woman (Jael) defeat Sisera, the leader he fought against. So this is hardly a suitable example (of putting a woman in leadership) for us to follow.

We never find a woman queen leading in Israel, but always a king (with the exception of Athaliah who desiring the throne for herself ruthlessly killed all her grandsons – the males who would have otherwise reigned). Yahweh's order is clearly male leadership. Anything else is due to the failure of the people to walk with Him.

Now then, what about all the women seemingly called to the ministry by Yahweh today? What about the teaching of highly successful charismatic male leaders who teach women can be ordained, teach, and lead?

My first answer is Isaiah 8:20. "To the law and to the testimony if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." It is the word we are to go by, to build our spiritual house on. It is by the word that will judge us in that day. "Examine all things". How? By the word. "Hold fast that which is good". Good according to what? According to the word of Yahweh of course.

Also, what Yahweh allows, and does, among those who are not in the restoration of truth and order is not our concern. Our responsibility is to seek the full, proper, New Covenant, apostolic order. That order, as regards this matter, is to establish an eldership that meets the qualifications set forth in I Timothy 3 and Titus 1. Only men, not women, can fill those qualifications.

What the others do, and even what Yahweh does where proper order is not being established (or when men, like Barak, refuse to live up to their responsibility) is not our concern.

Furthermore, even women who are called to be healers – as it appears Catherine Kulman was – are not, thereby, authorized to teach or exercise authority over men. (Nor does such a call authorize them to dress up in a showy manner.) Some men have also refused to remain in their calling as healers and have gone to teaching, sometimes with horrible results. One such example was William Branham who was greatly used in the gift of the word of knowledge and healing, but who went haywire when he went beyond his calling and started teaching. (For instance, he taught a terrible doctrine called "the serpent's seed" doctrine.) One of the best known of the women teachers is Kay Arthur. I understand that she has stated emphatically that she is not to teach or exercise authority over men. She does not forbid men to come to her teaching sessions, but she does not invite them. Nor does she accept ordination as being made a pastor, elder, or teacher of men, if what I have been told is correct.

The bible says the older women are to teach the younger women. It specifically says they are to teach them "to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed." There is absolutely no New Testament example of women being part of the council of leaders. Such is a perversion of Yahweh's ordained order. Are we going to walk according to the Bible in this matter, or according to that which is going on in the churches that have departed from the Bible in many other ways as well, such as pertains to the Sabbath, the sacred name, baptism in the Savior's name for the remission of sins, head covering, etc.? Even those that have started back to the Bible are not to be our examples in anything except that which fully conforms to the word.

If there are or have been exceptions made in the past due to things not being as they should be, does that mean we are to follow that disorder which may seemingly have been permitted by Yahweh? Are we not held to the higher standard of restoration truth? Let Yahweh judge the others. But let us not become judged as lawless, and cast out because of willfully, knowingly transgressing His established order. Do we think it is impossible for us to lose out with Yahweh? We are warned, "Let him who thinks he stands take heed lest he fall." (I Cor. 10:12) One act of willful disobedience, or justifying wrong action according to our own opinion can easily lead to another, then another, and another in a downward spiral that can take us far from Yahweh's will without our realizing it. It can then become a matter of salvation even when the issue in and of itself is not such. Not loving the truth enough to search it out thoroughly can lead to greater and greater deception.

Regardless of what they practice in the actual carrying out of their ministries, I know of no bonafide prophets who have prophesied that the woman is to be allowed to teach and to exercise authority over the man. However, even if some apparently real prophets have, the real test of the spirit in such matters is not what we see or hear going on around us, or what feelings and spiritual impressions we get, but what the word says. Even prophecy must be judged by the word.

This is not just a matter of some academic doctrine, or technicality, that does not directly affect people's lives. This is a matter of fundamental, functional order that can foster further rebelliousness. It can tremendously effect many facets of our lives.

To say you are going to do this thing regardless of what it appears the word says, because of what you see going on, or what has gone on in the past (in the way of women being successful in teaching and leading men) and just ask Yahweh to be merciful to you if you are wrong, instead of stopping to thoroughly investigate and see if there is any clear teaching in the Bible, will just not cut it with Yahweh. He requires us to be very cautious – to "tremble at" His "word". That means to do nothing that the clearer evidence of the word teaches against. As in everything else, we must not allow less clear portions of scripture, overthrow what is clear. Pastoral authority cannot excuse one from walking in full confidence of what is true and right. All modern pastor, or even apostolic, authority must agree with what has gone before. Otherwise we would have the Holy Spirit, working by the mind of the Messiah which is given to those who truly have the calling of an apostle, contradicting Himself. And Yahweh does not change so as to contradict Himself.

It is one thing to recognize a woman's ability to teach, and to appoint her a place of teaching the younger women. It is another thing altogether to ordain a woman into the ministry. Both parties – the ones ordaining and the one accepting such – hold responsibility in the carrying out of such a breach of Yahweh's order. Ordination should be done under apostolic authority and, therefore, in apostolic, biblical order.

What we have in the world today is the feminizing of society with the attempt to obliterate the distinction between the sexes. It is a goddess worshipping, witchcraft promoting society. It is the final stages in the devil's work and is a major cause in the increase of homosexuality, the open acceptance and widespread practice of which leads to judgment of any nation or society that tolerates it. As J. David Pawson said in his book "Leadership Is Male", "It would be ironic if a church abolishing sex distinction was actually doing the devil's work for him!"

Sincerely – in our Savior's Love,