



SOUTHWESTERN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

THE FAMILY

IT IS NOT HILLARY'S FAULT

THOMAS WHITE

Southwestern Journal of Theology • Volume 49 • Number 1 • Fall 2006

It Is Not Hillary's Fault: A Discussion of Godly Male Leadership

Thomas White

*Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Fort Worth, TX
twhite@swbts.edu*

Introduction

Many years ago, before I had opportunity to learn about the intricacy of automotive technology, I experienced a problem with my truck. My battery died. I looked at the date on the battery and realized that I purchased this fine piece of equipment three years ago. Amazingly, the battery had a three year warranty. As I went to the store to purchase a new battery, I wondered how much time it took to develop batteries that die days after the warranty expires. Not that those pro-rated warranties are worth much anyway, but imagine the brain power expended on maximizing profits by having batteries expire just days after the warranty does.

While at the store, I purchased another battery with the same three year warranty just to test my theory. After installing the battery, within two days this battery died. Being the shade tree mechanic that I am, I immediately went to the specialist to discover that one auto shop wanted me to pay hundreds of dollars to diagnose and fix a “complicated electrical problem.” I decided to get a second opinion before spending more money than the truck was worth.

I went to a member of our church who worked as a mechanic and always had grease under his fingernails. If anyone would know what to do, he would. His response was, “Let’s get it to the shop at my house, and I will show you how to fix it.” I was amazed that just by hearing the problem he apparently knew what was wrong. When I arrived, a little skeptical I admit, I found that he wanted me to replace my alternator. As many of you know, the alternator replenishes power to the battery, allowing the motor to run without a constant drain on the battery. A faulty alternator, the real problem, created the other symptoms that was noticed. Until we fixed the problem, the symptom would remain.

Modern society has a similar situation. We continually diagnose a secondary problem in our society rather than addressing the root problem. The majority of the books written, sermons given, and papers presented concern the improper role of the woman in the male/female relationship. I submit to you that the heart of the gender problem begins with a loss of biblical male leadership. When males fail to understand the biblical mandate for leadership, they fail to fulfill the biblical role. When they fail to fulfill their role, women experience greater difficulty fulfilling their biblical role. Or when the alternator fails to recharge the battery, the battery cannot start the car. We see this situation played out in the home, in the local church, and in society. We must begin to recognize that it is not Hillary's fault.¹ She is merely a visible symptom of the male's problem beginning with biblical illiteracy. Our real sickness comes from a loss of biblical manhood.

Said another way, the symptoms most often associated with improper roles emerge in the form of female pastors, females teaching men in Sunday School classes, females possessing authority over men in the church, females controlling husbands in the home, or females spiritually leading in the home. In some cases, females do not intentionally assume improper roles. These frustrated females fill the void left by apathetic men. When the man follows the biblical model, then the woman has an easier time filling her God-given role. Surely, you will still find the occasional feminist, seeking to ignore the biblical mandate in favor of a personal preference, represented in statements like, "But I have a desire to do this," or "I am only doing what God has called me to do." These experiential statements fail to give proper weight to the fact that God never calls anyone to act against his written revelation. This, however, is another point for another presentation. In this presentation, I contend that until men understand their biblical mandate and fulfill their biblical role, we will continue to see women filling unbiblical roles.

Throughout the remainder of this presentation, we will discuss three poor examples of male leadership. Those examples include absentee male leaders, abusive male leaders, and acclimatized male leaders. After discussing these negative examples, we will positively construct the correct biblical model of appropriate male leadership.

¹Hillary Rodham Clinton was born October 26, 1947. She is the wife of former President Bill Clinton, has served as a United States Senator from New York since November 7, 2000, and at the time of this writing, she was a candidate for the 2008 presidential election. Some have made her the focal point of improper female leadership in our country because of her prominence. This author contends that it is not her fault but that she is merely a visible symptom of a deeper religious problem.

The Absentee Leader

Now the serpent was more cunning than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said to the woman, "Has God indeed said, 'You shall not eat of every tree of the garden?'" And the woman said to the serpent, "We may eat the fruit of the trees of the garden; but of the fruit of the tree which *is* in the midst of the garden, God has said, 'You shall not eat it, nor shall you touch it, lest you die.'" Then the serpent said to the woman, "You will not surely die. For God knows that in the day you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil." So when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree desirable to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate. She also gave to her husband with her, and he ate. (Genesis 3:1–6)²

These verses establish the first biblical example of the absentee male leader. While Scripture does not explicitly tell us that Adam stood right beside Eve during the entire event, Scripture states in Genesis 3:17 that God said to Adam, "Because you have heeded the voice of your wife, and have eaten from the tree of which I commanded you." Perhaps Adam stood by while the serpent and Eve carried on a conversation. Perhaps Adam allowed Eve to incorrectly answer the question from the serpent. Eve responded by adding that the fruit should not even be touched. The Bible does not indicate whether Adam poorly performed the role of teaching God's command to Eve or whether Eve legalistically added to Adam's teaching. Perhaps Adam stood by while the serpent challenged God's command and authority. The serpent responded with a direct contradiction to God's command by stating, "You will not surely die." The serpent continued and stated that eating of this fruit would make one like God himself, knowing good and evil. Adam never corrected this accusation. He never defended God's truth nor took his rightful place as the spiritual leader.

Perhaps Adam stood by while Eve ate of the fruit. Perhaps he did not intervene to protect his wife from danger. It is from this point that we move from the realm of what probably happened to the realm of what we know happened. After Eve ate the fruit, Adam faced a choice. He could choose Eve's way or God's way. Adam, without being deceived, chose to follow Eve and, by doing so, he abdicated his leadership responsibilities

²All Scripture references are from the New King James Version unless otherwise noted.

and disobeyed God. Adam became an example of the absentee male leader. We know he was the leader because it was not until Adam ate that both of their eyes were opened (Gen 3:7). If Eve had been the representative her eyes would have been opened when she ate. In addition, in verse 9 the Lord called out to Adam and not Eve to address the matter of sin. The beginning of God's curse pronounced on Adam indicates that he failed because he "heeded the voice of his wife," which contradicted God's established order and represents the first biblical example of abdication of male leadership responsibilities.

Our society at large struggles more with this issue than with any other. When we look around at our church attendance to notice that more women than men fill the pews, we know that we have absentee males. When we listen to men claim that they can worship God anywhere but most often choose to do so from the seat of a fishing boat or while sitting in the woods with a hunting rifle, we know that we have absentee males. When we observe the statistics, which tell us that on average an American father spends less than 3 minutes of undivided attention with his children per day, we know that we have absentee males.³ When males care for hobbies or sports more than the home or the church, we have a society of absentee males. When we no longer hear discussions of family devotions or family worship, because the spiritual leader's absentee ballot has been lost in the mail, we know that we have absentee males. I fear that God is looking for a few godly men and cannot find them. Are we any better than Sodom and Gomorrah when Abraham searched for a handful of righteous men?

The Abusive Leader

Our second example of failed leadership is the abuse of male leadership, which can be first seen in the curse declared after the Fall. Scripture states in Genesis 3:16, "I will greatly multiply your sorrow and your conception; in pain you shall bring forth children; your *desire* shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you." The curses pronounced on the woman include pain in both of her important relationships. First, the woman will struggle in her relationship with her childbirth through pain in childbirth. Second, the woman will struggle in her relationship with man through an affinity to usurp proper authority and for the man to abuse his authority through harsh rule. The same word "desire" occurs in Genesis 4:7, which

³Weldon Hardenbrook, "Where's Dad? A Call for Fathers with the Spirit of Elijah," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1991), 379.

indicates that the desire is to control.⁴ Genesis 4:7 says, “If you do well, will you not be accepted? And if you do not do well, sin lies at the door. And its desire is for you, but you should rule over it.”

One can interpret the comment that “he shall rule over you” in two different ways. First, this could mean that the woman’s desire will be to usurp the authority of the man given by God but that the man “must rule over you” by design, which would represent the establishment of a godly order.⁵ There is another option, which states that the woman will attempt to usurp the authority and the man will by force “rule over you.” This interpretation presents an image of an overpowering abusive man.⁶ No matter which way one interprets the results of the fall, one cannot deny that God has ordained male headship. The curse on the man rests upon the work of providing, a role given to the male along with protection and spiritual leadership.

Male headship that rules by brute force or by verbal or physical intimidation by no means models God-ordained leadership. The image we often have in mind is of the pudgy man drinking beer and sitting on a stained 1950s couch with a white “wife beater” tank top adorning his bulging, hairy, and unflattering flesh. The typifying television characters may be Archie Bunker from “All in the Family” and Al Bundy from “Married with Children.” These images demonstrate the ungodly abuse of leadership more common in past years but still present in some situations. For the man who wishes to exhibit godly leadership, the abusive leader cannot be his trademark.

Consider 1 Peter 3:7, which states, “Husbands, likewise, dwell with them [your wives] with understanding, giving honor to the wife, as to the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life, that your prayers may not be hindered.” Furthermore, Ephesians 5: 25–29 states, “Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for her, that he might sanctify and cleanse her with the washing of water by the word, that he might present her to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that she should be holy and without blemish. So husbands ought to love their own wives as their own bodies; he who loves his wife loves himself. For no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, just as the Lord does the church.”

⁴Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 201.

⁵For a discussion of the various positions on this verse, see Kenneth A. Mathews, *Genesis 1–11:26*, The New American Commentary (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001), 250–52.

⁶Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis*, 202.

Finally, Colossian 3:19 states, “Husbands, love your wives and do not be bitter toward them.”

Feminists often caricature the abusive leader as representing all those males who hold to biblical role distinction. They create this straw man to win the battle of public opinion. However, this type of leader finds no friend among complementarian godly leaders. While feminists often try to paint all godly male leaders as abusive men who beat their wives and children, this portraiture is simply not the case.⁷ Rather, godly male leaders should treat their wives better because we do not operate on a system of fairness, but on a system that says, “love your wife as Christ loved the church.”⁸ Other feminists paint any form of male superiority, including marriage, as part of the Fall and something to be overcome. Sheila Cronan states in the book, *Radical Feminism*, “Since marriage constitutes slavery for women, it is clear that the Women’s Movement must concentrate on attacking this institution. Freedom for women cannot be won without the abolition of marriage.”⁹

The Acclimatized Leader

The acclimatized leader adjusts to the temperature of the culture around him. Place him in a hot climate and eventually he adapts to become comfortable with the heat, but drop him in the middle of Alaska and given enough time, he will find great comfort in the cold. This type of leader follows the lead of Hollywood with movies and television setting the pace for popular culture. You might find this leader at the other end of an opinion poll attempting to discover the most popular position. Such leaders do not stand on principle but on popularity. Such men as these have embraced the position known as mutual submission. They have been told that women are equal, which ontologically is true. They have been told that a woman can do everything a man can do, which is partially true. They have been told that any distinction in roles violates equality, which is completely false. They have swallowed this logical fallacy hook, line, and sinker by jumping into the popular boat of feminism.

⁷Some feminists make this claim, such as Carolyn Holderread Heggen, “Religious Beliefs and Abuse,” in *Women, Abuse and the Bible*, ed. Catherine Kroeger (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 15–17. Cf. James and Phyllis Alsdurf, *Battered into Submission* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1989). For a response, see Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism & Biblical Truth* (Colorado Springs: Multnomah, 2004), 490–96.

⁸In August 1995, the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood published a statement against abuse in all forms. *Ibid.*, 494.

⁹Sheila Cronan, “Marriage,” in *Radical Feminism*, eds. Anne Koedt, Ellen Levine, and Anita Rapone (New York: Quadrangle, 1973), 219.

These men, the acclimatized leaders, are analogous to thermometers. They merely take the temperature of the culture and adjust to reflect that degree. They can change quickly, when needed, in order to register a new cultural change. Thermometers are useful only for registering the state of affairs, but they cannot bring about change or lead the way forward. They are reactionary by nature. Christians need more thermostats and fewer thermometers. A thermostat can change the temperature. The situation then adjusts to the setting that is controlled by the master. Unfortunately, some oppose any form of masculinity or differentiation in roles. For example, in *Mutuality*, an egalitarian publication, Jim Banks suggested that a better title for John Gray's book *Men Are from Mars, Women Are from Venus* would be "Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus, but Some Men are from Venus and Some Women are from Mars, and All of God's Children Have Both Mars and Venus Qualities Within Them So Why Not Just Say That Men and Women are from the Earth and Let's Get about the Business of Developing the Unique God-given Mars/Venus Qualities That God Has Given All of Us for the Sake of the Kingdom."¹⁰

The most common defense of mutual submission begins with Galatians 3:28, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus."¹¹ The argument for using this verse to support mutual submission relies upon the early dating of the book of Galatians, and believes that if Paul did indeed write Galatians first, then all else that he wrote concerning women's roles must be interpreted in light of this work. This misguided presupposition exalts Galatians 3:28 to the level of the lens through which all other Pauline verses must be viewed. The key phrase to them in this verse, of course, is "there is neither male nor female." Although this verse relates to equality in salvation and not roles in the home and the church, some view this as the key verse establishing that differing roles no longer exist. Those supporting this viewpoint often identify themselves as egalitarians and agree with the concept of mutual submission.

Others holding to the concept of mutual submission will use Ephesians 5:21, "submitting to one another in the fear of God," as the key to unlock the interpretation of Ephesians 5:22 and following. With this concept in mind, the position of mutual submission believes that everyone

¹⁰Jim Banks, "Science Fiction," *Mutuality* (March 1998), 3. Available at <http://pages.prodigy.net/nedesautels76/faith/marsvenus.htm> (accessed 27 December 2007).

¹¹For example, see Rebecca Groothuis, *Good News for Women* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997), 25–26. Gilbert Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985), 126–28. Wayne Grudem agrees with the current author when he states, "This claim is probably the most common one made by egalitarian writers." See Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism & Biblical Truth*, 183.

should submit to each other. Rebecca Groothuis states concerning this passage: “The call to mutual reciprocal submission in Eph. 5:21 establishes the framework for the instructions to wives and husbands that follow. . . . Wives are to submit to their husbands in the same way that all believers are to submit to one another. This text is not advocating a unilateral female submission to male authority.”¹²

This viewpoint fails to take into account the threefold submissive relationship established in the context passage regarding the submission of wives to husbands, children to fathers, and slaves to masters. The other relationships in this passage are not mutually submissive. Parents are not required to submit to children, nor are owners to slaves. It should be noted that using Ephesians 5:21 to interpret the remaining portion of the passage was not used before 1968.¹³ This being the case, you must decide which generation has given into culture—our generation or every generation before us! Another consideration must be that husbands are never told to submit to their wives anywhere in Scripture. Taking a high view of Scripture means the Holy Spirit’s inspiration of Scripture overcomes cultural situations. There are three final reasons this view is wrong: (1) this view depends on giving *hupotasso* a meaning it has never been shown to have; (2) the term translated “one another” often means “some to others” and not “everyone to everyone;” and (3) Colossians 3:18, Titus 2:5, and 1 Peter 3:1 do not allow an egalitarian sense of mutual submission.¹⁴

A third argument for acclimatized leadership states that women can teach men under the authority of the pastor. I would encourage you to consult Wayne Grudem’s book entitled *Evangelical Feminism & Biblical Truth* on this issue. Even devout feminists do not agree with this as they desire for women to be pastors. This position rears its head in churches that wish to accommodate or acclimatize to the culture of our age by letting women teach men without allowing them to be pastors. It is not allowable for three reasons: (1) pastors or elders cannot give someone permission to disobey the Bible; (2) Paul does not provide the exception, “unless you are under the authority of the elders,” but simply says “I do not permit;” and (3) this interpretation sets up an unbiblical authority, which could undermine other scriptural principles. Would it ever be allowable to fornicate or commit adultery under the authority of the elders? Would it be allowable to gossip, dress immodestly, or glutton oneself as long as they are under the authority of the pastor?

¹²Groothuis, *Good News for Women*, 164–65. See also Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles*, 153 ff.

¹³Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism & Biblical Truth*, 190.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 198.

Another, and in my opinion more dangerous position, for us, is what may be called “functional egalitarianism.” This idea involves the exaltation of servant leadership and would be presented similarly to the following logic: “Because husbands must love their wives as Christ loved the church and because Christ gave up everything for the church, then husbands should give in to their wives, thus demonstrating servant leadership.” Perhaps the position may come across as jokes from the pulpit, such as, “My wife told me what to preach today,” or “Check with your wife and see if she will let you come to the men’s breakfast.” In many different ways, conservative churches communicate that the decision-making process lies equally between the husband and the wife, that the responsibility for leadership in the home lies equally between the husband and the wife, and that the opportunities for all ministerial positions in the church avail themselves equally to men and women.

Unlike the theologically egalitarian position of misinterpreting Galatians 3:28 and 5:21, this position demonstrates functional egalitarianism by the misapplication of Ephesians 5:25, “Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself for her.” The misapplication comes from stating that males should serve and love to the point of giving in to their spouse’s desires. Examples of this error may include Abraham giving in to Sarah’s decision to give him Hagar in Genesis 16:2–5, or Ahab’s description of giving in to Jezebel in 1 Kings 21:25. This position could also be categorized as abdicating leadership through a false application of servanthood. Functional egalitarianism with this misapplication cannot be supported from a biblical foundation. While Christ came to earth and gave his life for the church, he still demands holiness and purity from his church. Christ neither gives into the church’s every request nor negotiates the rules of holiness. In fact, our prayers often result in the answers of “No,” or “Wait.” The church cannot force Christ to act sovereignly by giving revival, money, blessings, or anything else at its whim. Thus, to become a husband who loves his wife as Christ loves the church does not mean that he grants every request, but that he loves his wife unconditionally and would willingly lay down his life for her.

The Appropriate Leader

The first step in demonstrating the biblical model of male leadership is to build the biblical foundation for male headship. This pattern of male headship begins in creation for the following reasons.

1. The order: Adam was created first, and the story of Genesis centers on Adam. Adam being the first-born would have pre-

- cedence over Eve. Eve was later formed, but this is not as central to the story (note the sequence in Gen 2:7, 18–23, and 1 Tim 2:13).
2. The representation: Adam, not Eve, had a special role in representing the human race (1 Cor 15:22, 45–49; Rom 5:12–21).
 3. The naming of woman: Adam named Eve, and Eve did not name Adam (Gen 2:23).
 4. The naming of the human race: God named the human race “Man,” not “Woman” (Gen 5:2).¹⁵
 5. The primary accountability: God called Adam to account first after the Fall (Gen 3:9). In fact it is not until Genesis 3:7, after Adam eats of the fruit, that both of their eyes were open.
 6. The purpose: Eve was created as a helper for Adam, and Adam was not created as a helper for Eve (Gen 2:18; 1 Cor 11:9).
 7. The conflict: The curse brought a distortion of previous roles, not the introduction of new roles (Gen 3:16).
 8. The restoration: Salvation in Christ in the New Testament reaffirms the created order (Col 3:18–19). Jesus is listed as the second Adam and not the second Eve (1 Cor 15:45; Rom 5:17–21).
 9. The mystery: Marriage from the beginning of creation was a picture of the relationship between Christ and the church, and the church submits to Christ (Eph 5:32–33).
 10. The parallel with the Trinity: The equality, differences, and unity between men and women reflect the equality, differences, and unity in the Trinity (1 Cor 11:3).¹⁶
 11. The source: Woman was created from man, and man was not created from woman (1 Cor 11:8, 12; cf. Gen 2:22).¹⁷

With the presupposition that God intended for male headship, one may wonder what male headship encompasses. A complete presentation could be given merely on the positive aspects of the appropriate male leader but for the purposes of this presentation, I will point out three areas where the

¹⁵For more information, see N.P. Bratsiotis, “*ish*,” in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, eds. G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, trans. by John T. Wells. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 224, 229.

¹⁶For more information on this topic, see Peter R. Schemm Jr., “North American Evangelical Feminism and the Triune God: A Denial of Trinitarian Relational Order in the Works of Selected Theologians and an Alternative Proposal” (Ph.D. diss., Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2001).

¹⁷This list borrows heavily from, but is not identical with the one found in Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism & Biblical Truth*, 109.

appropriate male will lead. These three include the family, the church, and society.

Family

An appropriate godly leader must lead in the home. First, the Bible describes the husband as the provider and wife as the caregiver. From the very beginning Adam was to till the ground in order to provide food, while Eve was responsible for childbearing (Gen 2:15; 2:18–23; 3:16–19). Second, the husband is to protect the family. Joseph was commanded to protect Mary and the baby Jesus by taking them to Egypt (Matt 2:13–14). The husband should be willing to give his life for his wife as Christ gave his life for the church (Eph 5:25). The wife should be considered the weaker vessel (1 Pet 3:7). Moreover, the Bible provides no evidence that the wife should fight for, provide for, or protect her husband.¹⁸ Third, in addition to serving as the provider and the protector, the male is called to be the priest or spiritual leader of his family. This means that the male will be held responsible for the spiritual life of his family. The male will answer to God for what occurs spiritually in his family. You can see from 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 that man is the head of woman, and from Ephesians 6:4 that fathers are to rear their children in the training and admonition of the Lord. Just as God called for Adam in the garden, one day God will call for the man of each family to give account for his leadership. If all families operated with the appropriate biblical model, then you would have no need for further discussion of the roles of male leaders. With the basic building blocks working correctly, then outside the family there would be revealed healthy churches and a healthy society.

The Church

Because all families do not properly understand the biblical model, the church must teach and often confront improper models of role distinction. The church, in addition, should mirror the relationship established for the home. This means that men should be the elders or pastors. Timothy and Titus both include the qualification, “husband of one wife,” which necessitates a male for the position of pastor. In addition, 1 Timothy 2:12 states that a woman should not teach, nor should she have authority over a man. Thus, appropriate male leaders must be in the roles of teachers and in the roles of authority over the other men in the church. An additional admonition often overlooked for the church reinforces the proper role distinction. Scripture states that the church should care for widows but does not provide for widowers (1 Tim 5:10; 1 Tim 5:3–16; Titus 2:5). Why should the church not care for widowers? Because they were intended to

¹⁸Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism & Biblical Truth*, 44–45.

function as providers. The church needed to step into the situation when the male provider was no longer present. For those who are thinking this is a cultural phenomenon, I remind you that the Holy Spirit inspired all Scripture, which means that his revelation is eternal, and eternal principles transcend culture. He knew and intended these words for all times as part of his plan.

Society

Men should also set the appropriate example by being godly leaders outside of the home. In my opinion, any man who allows his wife to work outside the home has set his wife up in a position of being under the authority of another male influence, whether that is the boss or a supervisor. This relationship is not the way God intended. Necessity may create these situations, but where they can be avoided, they should be. I do not intend these words to condemn widows or to prohibit temporary necessity, but the Bible does intend for the home to be a priority in married women's lives (Titus 2:4–5). In society, men are commanded to go to war and not women (Deut 20:7–8; 24:5; Josh 1:14). Barak did not get the glory, because he insisted on a woman accompanying him into battle in Judges 4:8–10. Nehemiah 4:13–14 states that people fight for their brothers, homes, wives, and children, but it does not say they are to fight for their husbands.

Moreover, the Bible indicates that we should protect the weak. Psalm 68:5 says that, "A father of the fatherless, a defender of widows, is God in His holy habitation." Isaiah 1:17 states, "Learn to do good; seek justice, rebuke the oppressor; defend the fatherless, plead for the widow." Godly male leaders in their desire to be like God should be fathers to the fatherless, defenders of the weak, and protectors of the widows. Lastly, appropriate male leaders should take the initiative to lead in society. The prophet Isaiah characterizes a weak nation by saying in Isaiah 3:12, "As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people! Those who lead you cause you to err, and destroy the way of your paths." A society marked by women rulers demonstrates a weak society. Why is this, you ask? Strong societies are built upon a strong foundation, which is the foundation of the family. Without strong families, you cannot have a strong society and you cannot have strong families unless those families understand their God-given role distinctions. Proper families lead to proper churches, which in turn lead to a strong society.

The Bible indicates that all people have sinned and will one day be responsible to God, the righteous judge, for their actions. This means we are all under authority to one degree or another. The church is under authority, men are under authority, women are under authority, workers are under authority, and citizens are under authority. We must learn to embrace our

God-given roles as defined by God's authority and live as though we will one day be judged. A society with women rulers demonstrates a society that is losing some major battles. A society that has women rulers is losing the battle in the home and is losing the battle in the church.

Conclusion

Godly men of the world must recognize that we are in a spiritual battle. Our problem is that many of our troops are AWOL (Absent Without Leave). In fact, many of our troops have yet to recognize that a war even exists. We fight against spiritual terrorists seeking to destroy the infrastructure of God's design. If we correct the families, then the churches will in time follow. It will take a revival or the conversion of much of society to fix the cultural problem. However, a revival will likely not occur until Christians get their own homes in order. Until men enlist and engage in the spiritual battle occurring in their own homes, there is little hope of winning battles in the churches or in society. With that I issue a call to each and every man to fulfill his God-give role. Perhaps you have been beaten and did not know it. You now recognize the seriousness of the battle and the strategic arms of our spiritual foe. Now is the time to change things.

Where I grew up, on occasion, a new horse or two would need breaking. A few of us boys had bigger egos than we had brains and desired any opportunity to prove ourselves. I remember one particular occasion where a new horse needed breaking. Confident and eager to demonstrate my ability, I decided to wage war with a particular demon-possessed equine. As happens on occasion, this particular horse possessed an equally independent spirit, beginning with breathing and expanding the belly while the saddle was tightened, and proceeding to quick turns and sudden bucking even before both of my feet rested in the stirrups. As the saddle began to slip off the side of the horse, a sudden kick, while my weight resided improperly on the horse, resulted in an Olympics-worthy dismount from my leather perch. I landed firmly on the ground where the thud of my arrival was only engulfed by the momentum causing me to roll uncontrollably on the dusty ground.

I remember looking up after my fall to see nothing but the blue sky fighting off the cloud of dust stirred by my recent arrival. Suddenly, the thought of my unforgiving and less-than-encouraging friends entered my mind. I looked to see the group riding the fence in anticipation, and heard these words, "Cowboy up!" I am not sure of the origin of the words, but we all knew their meaning. "There ain't a horse than can't be rode and ain't a cowboy that can't be throwed." When that phrase eventually comes, "Cowboy up!" means one should get up and get back on the horse. It means you

cannot afford to let the horse win, because too much is at stake; if allowed to triumph, the horse could be ruined for life.

My final word to those of you who did not understand you were in a battle, or who have not been fighting is, "Cowboy up!" The lives of our children, the establishment of biblical homes, the maintenance of biblical roles in biblical churches, and the future of our society depends on it. There is too much at stake to continue with absentee, abusive, or acclimatized leadership. Men must rise to the challenge. We must stand for biblical principles against the drifting tide of cultural influence and contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. We must partner with Christ to win a war waged not with guns but a spiritual war waged by principalities and powers. We serve a master who holds all the power, the Lord of hosts, controller of thousands upon thousands of mighty angels, and it is time we began acting like it.

It is not Hillary's fault that our families, our churches, and our society are in bad shape. Her leadership and power in our society represent a symptom of what we find in far too many homes in America. It is the fault of every male. It is my fault, and it is your fault, and it is time we do something about it. Cowboy up!