

Shalom _____,

As I have before, I want to defend biblical teaching on gender roles. I was surprised to hear you willingly bought into the disregard for the homemaker role, and want to take the chance to examine the subject. I do not think it is very unclear, nor that it is a matter of opinion. I am curious exactly as to why you would defend disregarding this, as I thought you recognized what the Bible taught.

Simply put, I believe truth is knowable and encourage you to look at the objective facts of the matter, as well as the subjective reasoning for abandoning this teaching. I think you can see just as well as I do what the truth is.

The objective point we have to deal with is what scripture says on the subject. The ONLY instructions regarding this in the entire Bible say that the wife is to keep the home. Would anyone deny this? That is our objective point, and if we believe the Bible, then it makes clear God's will for the Christian wife: to care for the home. That's not my opinion. Do I speak wrongly somehow?

Now let me examine the subjective reasoning offered for abandoning the Word of God on this. If I understand correctly, the reasoning you seemed to defend goes like this: It's okay to ignore the biblical teaching if there is a perceived good that is accomplished. In this example it was a chance to work full-time in paid ministry, but in its essence it is basically a perceived good. A perceived good ought to overrule the Word of God, at least according to those who make the argument. Please follow along with me as I point out the flaws in this logic, and I confidently believe you will see the flaws too:

1---This reasoning is flawed because it seeks to disregard God's clear instructions based on a perceived or actual good. Just ask yourself if this is our general guiding principle. Can we really transgress so that good might come of it? Moreover, ask yourself what the results would be if you applied that principle broadly. Could we ignore the male role of pastor for a perceived good? Could we ignore the one-man-one-woman nature of marriage for a perceived good? Could we knowingly allow an alcoholic to be appointed elder for a perceived good? Should we ignore

male headship for a perceived good? Should we allow transsexualism for a perceived good? I think you will see that this is a bad excuse, for if we applied it broadly it would truly be a disaster. It just amounts to ignoring God's instructions and seeking our own will instead.

2---This reasoning is flawed because it assumes one OUGHT TO take a job as a minister of some sort. Of course, nothing in the Bible or in common sense demands that we SHOULD work full-time in ministry. In scripture, only certain people did that. Other people were ministers in less formal ways, and contributed greatly through that. Who says everyone SHOULD be a minister? Or that everyone SHOULD work in that particular ministry that does not pay much? Nowhere does scripture say we ought to do ministry full-time as opposed to sell shoes.

3---This reasoning is flawed because it assumes that one ought to contribute in ministry through full-time work, when in fact one can contribute through part-time less formal work. How about getting a regular job and sharing the Word of God with your coworkers? How about handing out Gospel tracts? How about street preaching? None of this requires that one's wife give up her calling and support you! One can do all of these things while working another job. In some sense it can be BETTER to work part-time independently, because that way no heretic boss demands you preach their false doctrines. You work by yourself. So there is no real necessity to work full-time just to minister to others. So you see, this excuse does not add up.

4---This reasoning is flawed because it ignores the woman's calling , which is clearly in scripture and replaces it with the heart desire of a man. This kind of jumps back to our objective point above (Holy Scripture) but it's important to note that at the end of the day it is simply a choice to follow one's heart, and use another person to support you. Not to sound mean, but that's what it is. No amount of bringing Jesus into it changes that one bit.

5---This reasoning is flawed because it ignores the incredible value of the homemaker. While a man is allowing or demanding his wife take a career, the community is missing out on the priceless work of the homemaker. Ministry destroyed. She could be bearing and raising the children, tending to the house, providing fresh food for her family and a welcome to guests, providing a Christian education to her children, providing a Christian education to unfortunate children in the community who lack it, caring for sick relatives, caring for sick members of the community, keeping the neighborhood clean, being a pro-life activist, doing some home

business or gardening, saving the household money by a variety of means and fulfilling her womanly soul which is more oriented towards the home and the children. But no. This great ministry and work is tossed down the toilet in exchange for essentially some money. The reasoning you told me, and seemed to defend, simply does not count the cost. The Christian home has been destroyed by reasoning like that. It is a tragedy. The homemaker is worth far more than ANY salary in the world.

6---This reasoning is flawed because it disregards the importance of a Christian education. Caring parents who want to be true to their faith simply do not hand over their children to heathen to be educated and in some respects raised, just so they can follow their hearts. Pointing out that there are some public school kids that behave well does not change that. There are some children of single parents who behave well, but that does not justify choosing freely to be a single parent. There are children of sodomite parents who behave well, but that does not justify sodomites marrying or adopting children. You see, if this reasoning is used to defend removing a child from Christian education and placing him in heathen education, then it also works to defend other practices too.

But if you're looking for something to let you know the results of heavy secularization, ask yourself this: has a secularly-trained Christian population sustained its doctrines and moral virtue over the past few generations? Or has a secularly-trained Christian population NOT sustained its doctrines and moral virtue? Which one is correct, brother? I think you know the answer as well as I do. However, I personally do not need to look at the results, because I know that in principle it is wrong to send children to be trained up by anti-Christ secular teachers, whose will and strong desire is to indoctrinate them. I don't need to see statistics, brother. I KNOW it is wrong.

7---This reasoning is flawed because it assumes there is no other way to support this ministry than taking the wife out of the home (*although in our example she already WAS out of the home*). For example, spend more time and you may find the Christian community could provide the support you need to do full-time ministry. Hasn't this long been the way? Locals could support the ministry financially. Why not spend the time to build that up? Moreover, members of the community whose children have moved out could even put ministers up in their home, and this could provide support as well. You see OTHER OPTIONS exist that do not involve disregarding God's instructions and taking the wife away from her calling. Look at those options instead. Or find something else to do.

8---This reasoning is flawed because it assumes that one could not make a single salary go further. Actually, downgrade some of the proposed goals in life, and one salary goes much further. In fact get rid of one car and so-called higher education and you've got some extra funds right there, to say nothing of other choices to save money.

9---This reasoning is flawed because the financial results of this reasoning are part of why it's so hard to support a family in the first place. The multitudes of people who insist on two salaries push up prices of many goods for everyone. Hence in trying to solve a perceived financial problem, it helps to create a real one. Now EVERYONE has to pay higher prices.

10---This reasoning is flawed because, while it suggests making ministry number one in our lives, in actuality it ignores one big way of making ministry number one – through our wives bearing children and raising them up in the Lord. In fact, many shepherds remember their mother as the one who led them to faith. So you see, there are other ways of supporting ministry that do not disregard the Word of God, and which furthermore make full use of the wondrous blessing of the Christian wife. Think about that the next time you hear someone complain about the lack of pastors or missionaries out there. Or the lack of qualified men. If our women were doing their jobs, we would certainly have more!

I know you are an intelligent and analytical person _____, and can thoughtfully consider all of the above. Most important is the objective point, in which the Bible teaches the woman's role in the home. Less important but still relevant is my analysis of the subjective attempt to excuse this behavior. I believe my analysis reveals this excuse to be full of holes and truly untenable. Working in ministry is no excuse for having your wife pursue a career.

Like I say, I believe we CAN know the truth. Is there anything I have said that is false? Is there a great misunderstanding as to the meaning of scripture? Are the weaknesses I have pointed out in the reasoning not weaknesses at all? I believe in using the same measuring stick, we will both see this question the same. So I ask you to challenge yourself on this, if you really think the role of homemaker can be disregarded for less than dire necessity. Please challenge yourself.

Thanks for listening.

Yours in Messiah,

Tom