

**REPLYING TO *ORDINATION FACTS***  
**“WHAT DOES THE BIBLE REALLY SAY ABOUT WOMEN ORDINATION”**

by **Dr. Alberto R. Treiyer**  
**June 2015**  
**www.distinctivemessages.com**

**Introduction**

The conservative wing of our church on the subject of ordination has gathered several pastors and scholars under the title *Ordination Truth*. They believe that the Bible does not authorize Women’s Ordination (WO). The liberal wing on this subject gathers authors who promote WO under the title *Ordination Facts*. In a message posted online on June 5, 2015, this second group summarizes ten arguments on behalf of WO, under the title *What does the Bible really say about WO*. The conservative side had already clearly replied to these arguments, revealing their fallacies. Those conservative answers were condensed in a little book entitled *Adventist Ordination Crisis (AOC)*, and posted online two or three weeks earlier, in May. I suspect that *Ordination Facts* was not aware of this conservative document, because they are repeating the same arguments as if no answer was given.

They were also apparently unaware of the document I wrote three years ago, *How typology affects ecclesiastical structure. In the context of the discussions on WO*, as well as two more recent documents entitled: *Divine titles quoted to deny a complementary role in the church*; and *Replying to Ty Gibson in A closer look at WO*. The ten arguments summarized in the document which we will study now, have been widely responded to in those other documents.

Why did I decide to reply again to *Ordination Facts*? I could be satisfied with referring the reader to the documents mentioned above as well as others found in the page of *Ordination Truth*. But I realized that a brief reply would allow many who are not familiar with this subject, to more easily recognize the fallacy of those who want to project onto the Bible the particular problems of the current world. Of course, there is always something additional to say.

The liberal document under consideration starts with a brief introduction where two points are anticipated which in some ways seem to be at odds with other arguments which are developed later. Let us examine them.

**a) It is affirmed that culture is not to intervene in the determination of what to believe when interpreting the Bible.**

**Answer:** Good! This statement seems to be a breath of fresh air after hearing and reading for a long time from the liberal perspective that culture is determinant in the discussion of the issue. Therefore, this would be expected to be a good beginning for our study. But in the fifth argument we see that the culture this group is trying to reject is that of the Jews of the first century, because they believe that Jesus introduced a revolutionary trend toward women which would allow them, in due time, to abandon such a culture. When? Not before the 21st century, an epoch which, more than ever before, is unsettling the order of God’s creation, just as Jesus and the apostles had warned us (like in the days of Noah and Lot).

Ufff! How long did the world have to wait so that modern culture could replace the presumable Jewish culture!

**b) We are required, in this view, to take the principle which the Bible teaches, not what it says literally.** For example, the Bible doesn’t speak of cigarettes, but the principle issues of health are contained in the Bible, allowing us to reject cigarettes. Since the Bible would supposedly not say anything either regarding WO, we could imply it under the biblical principle of accepting that which is likewise not explicitly stated concerning her ordination.

**Answer:** What biblical principle? Is it a principle which says, “It is not written,” instead of another which says, “it is written”? Actually, why not to draw the biblical principle from the explicit testimony regarding man’s leadership of woman, which covers more than 4,000 years of Bible revelation? Do we need to replace that explicit testimony by another which never existed of woman’s leadership over man in the church?

Concerning the biblical principles of health there is no silence. The apostle Paul said that “our body is temple of the Holy Spirit,” so that if we intentionally destroy it, will perish forever (1 Cor 3:16-17; 7:19-20). Neither is there silence on the biblical principle of man’s leadership over woman. If there is silence it has to do with woman’s leadership over man, and this is revolutionary in the revelation of the Bible, because all surrounding peoples ordained priestesses and had also queens (the only two of which in Israel were bloodthirsty impostors). In consequence, that presumable silence of the Bible seems to be anything but unconscious.

Moreover, I do not believe that there was silence in the Bible concerning the role of women, because God assigned her another role not identical to that of man, but complementary. There are texts which deny women a leadership over men. Man is the head, not woman. This fact can be denied only by violating the most elementary principles of biblical interpretation. In the context of a rejection of feminism, E. G. White stated that “the Scriptures are plain upon the relations and rights of men and women” (1T 421).

Let us now deal with the ten points.

**1. Adam and Eve were created “completely equal, without any hint of submission/subordination of one to the other, even though they are created with sexual differentiation.”**

**Answer:** Is it not strange and contradictory to affirm that Adam and Eve were created “completely equal,” “though . . . with sexual differentiation”? Please, take out the word “completely”, or simply banish gender differentiation altogether, as many are doing today.

Is it true that no hint of submission/subordination of one to the other appears in the Bible? Why, then, and through whom sin was introduced? What did Eve do before eating the fruit, which she didn’t have to do? “The angels had cautioned Eve *to beware of separating herself from her husband* while occupied in their daily labor in the garden; with him she would be in less danger from temptation than if she were alone” (PP 36). Is this not subjection to her husband? When Adam saw her later with the fruit in her hand, “he mourned that he had *permitted* Eve to wander from his side” (PP 56). Doesn’t this imply, again, an authority of man over his wife, a role that corresponds to someone who is the head?

The problem introduced in the liberal document with these two words, *submission* and *subordination*, is that they look at them under the later magnifying glass of sin, where submission and subordination would become conflictive for the now fallen nature. But no plaintiff, violent, and involuntary submission and subordination existed before the fall. When the Son of God came to redeem the world, did He submit or subordinate Himself to the Father against His will? There was a moment of struggle, because by bearing our sins He would be separated from the Father and die in the cross (Matt 27:46). Notwithstanding He said that no one took His life, but He laid it down voluntarily (John 10:18).

What is to be said about His deliverance of the kingdom of this world to the Father after redemption, with His own submission included? “Then the Son himself will be made subject to him who put everything under him, so that God may be all in all” (1 Cor 15:28). Paul meant by this that this creation had been disbanded in rebellion, but recovered to the original control and subjection to an everlasting harmony under divine government.

**2. It is stated that Eve was made a help meet for Adam (as an equal), and that the ideal of the gospel is for her to become again equal to Adam.** In addition, God appears often as a helper of man and His people, without implying inferiority or subordination to man. Therefore, Adam and Eve would have been on an equal footing for fulfilling any role over God’s creation. It is audaciously declared that “no

inspired person—not Moses, Jesus, Paul, or Ellen White—teaches a creation headship or leadership of man over woman.”

**Answer:** The term “help” is often employed in reference to someone who is in an advantageous position to help. But in the case of Eve, it has to do with someone whom God created as a complement to the activity of man. This is seen by the word *nagad*, “at his side,” which follows *‘ezer*, “help.” Adam saw a complement in every animal, but he didn’t find it for himself. This is why the translation, “suitable helper” is right, someone who would be at his side to support him, not as the head, not as the leader, but backing the leadership of her husband. Never does the Bible refer to Adam as having been made a suitable helper for Eve, because Adam was created first (1 Tim 2:13-14). For this reason, in the relation of Adam and Eve, that expression means complement, not equality in the subject of leadership. The same ideal of God for the human couple, of them bearing a “difference”, still stands. Redemption consists in this.

“The husband and wife can so blend in labor that the wife shall be *the complement of the husband*... The wife may *continually be a great help to her husband*” (6 MR 43). “The wife can often labor *by the side of her husband*, accomplishing a *noble work*” (Ev 41). “We women must remember that God has placed us subject to the husband. He is the head, and our judgment and views and reasonings must agree with his, if possible. If not, the preference in God’s Word is given to the husband where it is not a matter of conscience. We must yield to the head.—Letter 5, 1861.

Did E. G. White really say nothing regarding man’s leadership over his wife and creation in Eden, before the fall? Would it be possible that these people don’t want to read what doesn’t please them? If they don’t want to read what the Bible clearly says about this, rather assuming that it belongs to a different time no longer relevant for us, read what the Spirit of Prophecy wrote in our modern language. (For a biblical analysis, read *AOL*, 28, 56ff).

Who did God create first at His image, and what did it mean, according to the Spirit of Prophecy? Adam, not Eve, was nominated by God as “monarch,” “vice-regent” of the Creator, and “ruler” of the world. Do we believe in the Spirit of Prophecy, in confirmation of what the Bible says? What was the text of the Bible quoted by E. G. White to support this? Gen 1:26: “God said, ‘*Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion*’” over the entire creation.

“Adam was appointed by God to be *monarch of the world*, under the supervision of the Creator. ‘God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let him have *dominion over*’ the creation (ST, August 30, 1899). “Adam was monarch in this beautiful domain” (ST, April 29, 1875). “Satan... proudly boasted that the world which God had made was his dominion. Having conquered Adam, *the monarch of the world*, he had gained the race as his subjects..., and be monarch of the world” (RH Feb. 24, 1874). “Adam was *the vicegerent of the Creator*. His was not an independent *rule*... Adam was to *reign subject to Christ*. When Adam betrayed his sovereignty into Satan’s hands, Christ still remained the rightful King” (DA 129; she quotes Dan 4:17 to affirm this).

If we read carefully, E. G. White here is applying the testimony of the apostle Paul: Adam (man) subject to Christ as his head in the very creation (1 Cor 11:3). Redemption recovers the *rule, monarchy, and vice-regency* of Adam. Jesus, the second Adam, recovered for the first Adam, the father of humanity, all his lost dominion. Clearly, when redemption is completed, “Adam is reinstated in his first *dominion*” (GC 647: the *dominion* granted in Gen 1:26).

Were our first parents created equals? Yes, especially in what has to do with their nature. But this did not imply equal roles, because God made them “man” and “woman.” Do we have other examples of equal beings in nature but fulfilling a different function? Yes.

The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are equal in their divine nature. However, the Father is head of Christ, and will continue being His head after redemption. As already seen, the Son will deliver to his Father the world that had been entrusted to him, now completely redeemed, and the Son will submit himself to his Father.

The angels share also the same nature with one another. However, every company of angels has a high commander “head” (EW 145). Why, then, by the fact of sharing the same nature, should Adam not be head of Eve? Adam was in charge of this creation, the head. He lost that leadership which only a second Adam (not a second Eve) could recover. The initial purpose of God will be completed when the second Adam will reinstate the first Adam as head and monarch of this creation forever.

**3. It is stated that: a) Adam and Eve were co-regents of the creation before sin; b) it is assumed that submission came after sin and, c) not of the woman to all men, but limited to her husband (Gen 3:16).**

**Answer.** a) No text is given to confirm the supposition that both Adam and Eve were co-regents of the creation before sin. That position was assigned by God to Adam. Eve was his complement. What we may say, however, is that for being one with her husband (Gen 2:24), both participated, each in their sphere, in the dominion of the creation (Gen 1:27-28).

b) While the submission of the woman to Adam, and of Adam to the Creator, as already seen, took place peacefully and pleasantly; now that submission would take place painfully. For this reason the apostles insist on the submission and obedience of woman to man at home and in the church (Eph 5:21-24; 1 Cor 14:32-34; 1 Tim 2:11-12), of the sons to their fathers (Eph 6:1; Col 3:20), of the members of the churches (men and women) to their leaders (Heb 5:17), of the servants to their masters (Eph 6:5-9; Col 3:22; 1 Tim 6:1; Titus 2:9; 1 Pe 2:18; though if they could obtain freedom, he advised to obtain it: 1 Cor 7:21-24), and of the citizens to the rulers who are God’s servants (Rom 13:1,5; 1 Pe 2:13). This is because essentially, the kingdom of sin consists in rebellion and insubordination. In this way, the whole creation is unraveled, church, family and all. Unless men are able to maintain a certain subjection to all human authority and institution, the ruin of this creation is accelerated and consummated.

c) If man was to rule only over his wife, according to the interpretation offered of Gen 3:16, why were the people of Israel who were nominated by divine designation as “heads,” “elders,” “captains,” “princes,” “rulers,” always and only men, and not only over their particular home, but also over their clans, tribes, and people? This is what we also see in the NT, in relation to the position of an “elder,” who must not only rule over his house, but also over the church (1 Tim 2:11-12; 3:4-5; 5:17).

**4. a) Miriam, Deborah, and Hulda, are offered as examples of women being leaders even over men. Debora is also introduced as a military leader. On the other hand, b) the plan of God would have been that all Israel was a priesthood, but that because of sin, God chose only one tribe.**

**Answer:** The answer has been given again and again on these points! Why don’t they want to hear? The least we could expect is a rebuttal to the answers already provided. But nothing of the kind is provided.

a) Miriam was a prophet and leader among women. When she wanted to usurp the position of her brother Moses, drawing Aaron, she became leprous. Moses had to pray requesting God to forgive her (Num 12). Deborah was not a military leader. The military judge was Barack (Judg 4:6). She judged in the sense of giving the counsel of God as the people came to her for her advice. In other words, she was a messenger of the Lord, and delivered her messages from God under a palm tree on a mountain (Judg 4:5), not at the entrance of the city as the elders when they met to judge (Deut 16:12; 21:19; Josh 20:4). Hulda was also a prophet, nothing else. As has been proven more than once, to be a prophet did not qualify a person to exert a ruling leadership over the people of God.

b) On this point we see a serious misconception by those at *Ordination Facts*. They confuse the all Israel priesthood as mediators between God and the other nations (Exod 19:5-6: God’s people “*among all peoples*”), with the temple priesthood which must mediate between God and His people (Num 18:6: “*among the sons of Israel*”). Actually, the inner Levite priesthood didn’t replace the priesthood of all Israel, but that of every first-born of Israel in the centralized temple. Because of the sin of the first-borns, the faithful sons of Levi must replace them in that inner priesthood (Num 8:14,16,18: “*instead of the*

*firstborn* among the people of Israel”). Even so, God determined that over each family, clan, tribe and the whole people, only men would rule as heads, elders, captains, rulers, princes, chiefs, etc. (See my study, *How typology affects ecclesiastical structure. In the context of the discussions on WO*). [www.distinctivemessages.com](http://www.distinctivemessages.com) (under articles).

**5. Jesus would have been a revolutionary for his treatment of ladies in comparison with the Jewish culture, because He tried to bring back the relation of men and women to the original plan of creation.**

**Answer:** Jesus was not a revolutionary, but the true interpreter of the Law which He himself had given to the people of Israel through Moses. The treatment given to women is the same as He required for His people in ancient times. Foreign women like Rahab (a prostitute), and Ruth the Moabite, received the same treatment that Jesus gave to the sinner woman and the Canaanite mother who requested Him to heal her daughter. We see the same in what Elijah did for the widow of Sarepta in Sidon (in the Phoenician territory), feeding her for several years, and resurrecting her son (Luke 4:25-26), etc. Care of widows and fatherless sons permeates the divine laws in behalf of the poor in the Old Testament (Exod 22:22-24; Deut 10:18; 14:29; 24:17; 27:18-19; Ps 68:5; Isa 1:17,23; Jer 7:6; Zech 7:10; Mal 3:5), and is also prominent in the commission that Christ gave to His apostles (Acts 6:1-7; 1 Tim 5:3; James 1:27).

So Jesus did not violate the Law that He himself had given through Moses. He was not a revolutionary as if what He was bringing forth was a new consideration for disinherited people and women. What He did was to correct a bad interpretation of the Law that had been changed or made void in his days (Mark 7:7-13, etc.).

What texts are offered to support this idea of Jesus as “revolutionary” in his treatment to women? Please, read the texts given in the document, and ask yourselves if they have anything to do with a woman exercising leadership in the midst of His people or of His church. I don’t think I even need to spend words to answer that. The texts employed are these: Matt. 15:21-28; Mark 5:25-34; Luke 8:1-3; John 4:7-30; 20:1-18.

**6. It is supposed that the instruction of Paul that women should not teach or exert authority over man (1 Tim 2:11-12), a) would have to do with an imaginary local situation in Ephesus, of women being deceived by false teachers. Thus, they interpret that: b) what Paul rebuked was a domineering attitude of women teaching over man, a behavior that no one must have over other people.**

**Answer:** a) This conspiracy theory amazes me for the lack of biblical support. Look at the texts offered to speak about that presumable deception of the women in Ephesus: Eph 4:1-5; 6:3-10. Do you find anything in these texts which confirm that notion? Let me quote how AOC responds to this theory.

“The problem is the method of interpretation itself. An extraneous, unverifiable story is told that alters the meaning of the text and limits to a given time and place a teaching that would otherwise have universal application. Is this method of Bible study consistent with Adventist hermeneutics? This type of storytelling purports to be within the ‘historical-grammatical’ method, but it effectively redacts Scripture by using an extra-biblical teaching, so how is it really different from outright criticism? Would it not be better to simply accept the text at face value?” (*Adventist Ordination Crisis*, 30; more on 1 Tim 2:11-12 in *Replying to Ty Gibson...*).

b) If this presumable domineering attitude was not overtly visible anyone, why did Paul threaten go to the Corinthians with a rod to put things in order there? (1 Cor 4:21). Didn’t Jesus also reveal authority when He showed a whip and expelled the traffickers of the temple? (Jn 2:15-17). Could a woman have done what Nehemiah did when he established order among the people of God? (Neh 13:25).

Why is it that Paul never prohibited men from exercising that type of dominion over women? Because he was the man, the elder, the leader, who must assume the rule of the church (1 Tim 5:17), not woman.

What for women would be looked upon as a domineering behavior, for men would be considered a natural developing sign of authority.

Why did Paul employ the word *didásko*, “to teach,” for elders (1 Tim 3:2-3; and he considered himself fitted to teach (1 Tim 2:7)), but denied that faculty to women using the same word (v. 12; see Rev 2:20), except as regarding their connection with younger women? (Tit 2:3-4). Because women could prophesy (1 Cor 11:5; Acts 21:9; see Luke 2:36-37), expose or explain doctrine (Acts 18:26), and proclaim the gospel (Jn 4:39-42), but could not require obedience and submission as a leading elder, as was implied by the Greek term “to teach” (1 Tim 2:12). Such a pretention would constitute usurping the role of man.

**7. The translation in 1 Tim 3:2 of: a) “husband of one wife” is interpreted as “husband faithful to his spouse.” b) The case of Phoebe is cited again for her presumable position as deaconess. c) The fact that the ten commandments are written with masculine gender does not mean that they are not applied to women.**

**Answer:** a) The interpretation of “husband faithful to his spouse” changes nothing, because in order to be faithful to his wife, the elder must have only one woman (it doesn’t say, “his wives”). The divine order was: “a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife” (Gen 2:24). Neither is it said here “to his wives.”

b) Paul says of Phoebe that she was a “servant,” without necessarily implying that she had been nominated deaconess (“servant”). This term is mostly employed in the NT without reference to a position. Paul even applied it to himself, without meaning that a church nominated the apostle to officiate as a deacon (Col 1:24-25). In contrast to the Biblical description of the office of deacon, no characteristics are provided to us for the service of Phoebe, excepting that she was a “helper” in the church (Rom 16:1-2), an equivalent role that God assigned to Eve at creation in connection to man: “suitable helper” (in this case of the ministry of Paul and others).

c) The fact that the tenth commandment uses the masculine as its reference shows us once more that man is the head. The reference to woman is implied through him, as when Paul said, “sin entered the world through one man” (Rom 5:12). But an attempt to apply a reference to man for any other case is reaching too far. In the case of the elder, he is given the rule of his home (which the woman does not have: 1 Tim 3:2), and of the church (which woman also does not have: 1 Tim 5:17). Also the elder is given the authority to teach requiring obedience and submission at home and in the church (1 Cor 12:28-29; 1 Tim 3:2), which is denied to the woman (1 Tim 2:12).

**8. Eph 5:21-23 is taken as an example to affirm that only the husband is head of the woman, and that the only head of the church is Christ.**

**Answer:** This is answered in *AOC*, p. 68, with an analysis of the statements of E. G. White. I have also responded to this point in my reply to Ty Gibson, in the consideration of the divine titles that God possesses in an absolute way, but that are conferred in a limited manner to His leaders who represent Him here on earth. Thus, in His sphere, the only head of the church is Christ or, as Paul says, the higher head of the church (Eph 1:22-23). But He exerts that authority and leadership through His ministers who lead the church (1 Cor 11:3). That chain of submission, says the apostle, passes from the Son to the Father, from the husband (Eph 5:22) or elder or under-shepherd of the church to the Son (1 Pet 5:1-4), and from the woman to the leadership of her husband at home, and of the elders in the church in spiritual matters (1 Cor 11:3; 1 Tim 5:17; Heb 13:17). We are leaders and authorities under other leaders and authorities, Jesus Himself being the Supreme Pastor of the elders of the church (1 Pe 5:1-6).

**9. It is presumed that: a) Paul treated women on an equal level, on the basis of what he wrote in Gal 3:28. That equality would not be limited to a right of being saved, because Paul identified the relation of Jews-Gentiles, Master-servants, men-women. Though it took time to banish these social barriers, it is argued that: b) there were women leaders in the churches (Philip 4:2-3), Priscilla**

would have taught with authority over Apollos (Acts 18:24-28), and in Rom 16:1-16 Paul mentions a list of several women exercising leadership in the church. c) The gifts of the Spirit given by Jesus to the church in Eph 4:11, especially those of pastor and evangelist, would apply to both genders according to this view.

**Answer:** a) Gal 3:28 has to do with an equality for the right to salvation. Paul's mention of the different strata of society was common in the days of the apostles, without suggesting a position in the church, but as a reference to the social situation of the people (Rev 6:15-16; 13:16). The fact that Paul mentions the different strata of society purposes to show that the gospel is for all. The Jews excluded the Gentiles, and Peter was given a vision so that he could understand that the gospel was for them also (Acts 10).

b) The biblical references given in the article in the nine argumentation, do not refer to any single leading position. We have already seen in another document that when Priscilla, together with her husband Aquila, gave Apollos a more careful explanation of the gospel, they employed a different verb which is not *didásko* (which in the old world had different connotations), but *exezento*, "to expose" or "explain" the Word of God (Acts 11:4; 18:26; 28:23), a role that corresponds to both men and women.

c) In Eph 4:11 women are not mentioned, but they may be included in some of the gifts there specified, excepting those which God determined in ancient times and confirmed through His apostles as corresponding only to men. This is because the Spirit does not work against the divine will expressed in His Word. Jesus said that He would not speak "on His own" (John 14:26).

It is striking that in point nine, they quote Eph 4:11, and not 1 Cor 12:28-29. Would it be because Paul is there more precise in saying that the Spirit does not give all the gifts to all? He ends by asking: "Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers (*didáskalos*)?" Frankly, I cannot understand how some may try to infer from these verses that all are fitted to occupy all the gifts, men and women! The rest of the Bible confirms that this is not the case.

**10. The document "Seventh-day Adventists Believe" is quoted, specifically doctrine number 14, where it is stated that we are one in Christ, independent of race, gender, social condition, etc. Again, Eph 4:11 is quoted and it is interpreted as implying to both genders.**

**Answer:** We agree that all of us are one in Christ, but this has nothing to do with being fitted for every position in the church.

**Conclusion.** The paper concludes affirming that Acts 10:34 would require impartiality. 1 Cor 12 is interpreted as referring to both men and women, and that the office of pastor is listed among those gifts (Eph 4:11-13). Therefore, it is assumed that the vote of the General Conference in 1985 would be correct in permitting the ordination of women as pastors. The consensus of the committee TOSC for the study of ordination in 2013-14 would have been as that nothing hinders women from being ordained as pastors.

**Answer:** No World Congress of the General Conference approved a recommendation to ordain women as elders or pastors. This is the maximum court of appeal in our church for making decisions. Neither was such a consensus reached in TOSC on WO as it is assumed here. Acts 10:34 has nothing to do with positions in the church, but with salvation to Gentiles. 1 Cor 12 and Eph 4:11-13, as already seen, do not say that all gifts are for all, without regard to gender (this is a gratuitous inference that passes over the clear prescriptions of the whole Bible).

**Additional reflections.** The honest reader who takes time to compare the two groups which have studied the subject, will see that within the conservative group there is willingness to dialogue because it attempts to answer objections by appealing to material within the Bible itself. However, on the liberal side there is an agenda which wants to impose its vision without answering or giving consideration to the observations which come from the contrary position. On one side we find a grappling with the inspired

sources; on the other hand, we find that, in spite of a feigned respect for the Scripture, there is a will to impose a modern cultural norm which upsets, as no other former generation, the order of God's creation.

I am amazed at how some are still insisting on continually repeating that which lacks biblical basis, without concern for a sound exposition of truth. We may clearly see in all these liberal propositions an attempt to open a space for that which the Bible does not allow. In the face of such insistence on that which is lacking in any real content, we might ask if those who don't want to accept the truth are following the politics of Joseph Goebbels, the Reich Minister of Propaganda of the Nazi regime in Germany. He calculated how many times a lie needed to be repeated before being accepted as truth.

Still, I find something useful in all this, because it helps me to see that in order not to fall under the spell of the lie, I must cling to the Bible. If I focus on cultural norms I will end up seeing things as the world sees them. Only in the Bible do we find the true spiritual perspective.

This crisis in our church helps me to see what will take place soon in the world when all will praise the farce, ceaselessly repeating the lie which will unleash the final crisis. At that time there will appear to be no reason to insist on keeping the seventh-day Sabbath sacred, instead of Sunday. It will appear enough to keep one day. Why upset all the world to keep a different day? Why not accept the offering of Cain, bringing the fruit of our own labor? Why not eat from the forbidden tree, if its fruit seems not to be so different from the other fruits of the garden?

Because the world will be lacking a "thus says the Lord," "we shall be treated as traitors" (6T 394; LDE 146.4), "as enemies of law and order, as breaking down the moral restraints of society, causing anarchy and corruption;" our "conscientious scruples will be pronounced obstinacy, stubbornness, and contempt of authority." We "will be accused of disaffection toward the government" (GC 592).

In an anticipated vision of that crisis E. G. White wrote about the world accusation of taking "an independent position from all the rest of the world..." In their view, "we must concede to the customs, practices, and laws of the world, or go out of it. If we were the only people in the world whom the Lord favored the appearances were awfully against us... The whole world was converted and in harmony with the Sunday law, and this little feeble people stood out in defiance of the laws of the land, and the laws of God, and claimed to be the only ones right on the earth..." But we "are to take "our stand on the living Word—'It is written.'" (Mar 209).

Our only safeguard is now and forever, to cling to the Bible, not to the culture of the world, because if we look at the world, we will not understand why to insist on keeping the Word of God and His Law, like Eve who ended up not understanding why was she prohibited to eat the forbidden fruit; like Cain for looking to the fruit of his labor and not God's prescriptions. Let us cling to the Bible, and we will overcome!

"Prompted by the adversary of all righteousness, they call evil good, and truth falsehood. It is as the prophet has described—'Truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter.' It is because such is the condition and spirit of the world that God calls upon his people to come out and be separate.

***Those who mingle with the world will come to view matters from the worldling's stand-point, instead of seeing as God sees...*** But "God's people will see as he sees" (LP 236.2).

I believe that this Congress of the General Conference will be a good barometer to allow us to see to what extent the world has permeated the church or to what extent was she kept the world from meddling in her affairs. Let us keep always in mind the exhortation of Paul: "Do not conform any longer to the pattern of this world [of its modern culture], but be transformed by the renewing of your mind" (Rom 12:2). Because "the god of this age [of this culture] has blinded the minds of unbelievers, so that they cannot see the light..." (2 Cor 4:4).

### **Additional statements**

*"The husband is the head of the family, as Christ is the head of the church; and any course which the wife may pursue to lessen his influence and lead him to come down from that dignified, responsible*

*position is displeasing to God. It is the duty of the wife to yield her wishes and will to her husband. Both should be yielding, but the Word of God gives preference to the judgment of the husband. And it will not detract from the dignity of the wife to yield to him whom she has chosen to be her counselor, adviser, and protector. The husband should maintain his position in his family with all meekness, yet with decision” (1 T 307-308 (1862)).*

“We women must remember that *God has placed us subject to the husband*. He is the head, and our judgment and views and reasonings must agree with his, if possible. If not, the *preference in God’s Word is given to the husband* where it is not a matter of conscience. *We must yield to the head” (Letter 5, 1861).*

“I am trying to help my husband bear his burdens...The work was not pleasant to me at first, but I have overcome my dislike for it. I no longer feel that sentimentalism must be woven through all our experience in the married life...I had for a time to study hard and pray much to overcome my weakness of character, and become, in some degree, *what a woman should be, a true helpmeet*. I desire not to lead into sin, as did Eve [see 1 Tim 2:14], but with a firm hold upon Jesus I would lead away from sin, and pride, and love of show, in the quiet paths of meekness and lowliness of heart” (14 MR 305.3).

“Eve had been perfectly happy by her husband’s side in her Eden home; but, like restless modern Eves, she was flattered with the hope of entering a higher sphere than that which God had assigned her. In attempting to rise above her original position, she fell far below it. A similar result will be reached by all who are unwilling to take up cheerfully their life duties in accordance with God’s plan. *In their efforts to reach positions for which He has not fitted them, many are leaving vacant the place where they might be a blessing. In their desire for a higher sphere, many have sacrificed true womanly dignity and nobility of character, and have left undone the very work that Heaven appointed them” (PP 59).*

The same principle is applied to the church. “*The home is a school where all may learn how they are to act in the church...*” (CG 549.2). “Every Christian family is a church in itself... The father... is the priest of the household, accountable to God for the influence that he exerts over every member of his family” (3 SM 209.2). “*The father as a priest of the household, the mother as a home missionary” (CCh 143.1).*

“He who is engaged in the work of the gospel ministry must be faithful in his family life... As the priest in the home, and as the ambassador of Christ in the church, he should exemplify in his life the character of Christ... God will not serve with the sins of men who have not a clear sense of the sacred responsibility involved in accepting a position as pastor of a church. *He who fails to be a faithful, discerning shepherd in the home, will surely fail of being a faithful shepherd of the flock of God in the church” (6MR 49).*

“All members of the family center in the father. He is the lawmaker...” (AH 212.1).

But in the church, should all her members center in the mother? Forgive my irony...