

Hope For America

P.O. Box 1007
Willow Grove, PA 19090
[215]659-0564
E-mail: hfa@aol.com

Statement Opposing Selective Service Registration of Women, and Recommending Expanded Definition of Conscientious Objector

For the National Commission on Military, National and Public Service.

30 Dec 2019

PURPOSE

This is an abbreviated review of certain Biblical moral-theological considerations that: (a.) weigh against any expansion of the Military Selective Service Act (MSSA) to register women for military conscription, and that (b.) justify a category of Conscientious Objection that does not necessarily include *sincere objection to war in any of its forms*, but that does object to the moral (ab)use of women for the military profession of arms.

CONTEXT

The prospective expansion of military Selective Service draft registration to include women has now become logically and legally a “capstone” expectation of the Nation’s misguided and ongoing incremental regularization of women as military combatants indiscriminately with men. The final repeal and rescission of all legislation, policies and regulations that had formerly differentiated military women and men have, in the language of *Rostker v. Goldberg*, caused men and women now to have become “similarly situated” before the law and so equally subject to its provisions.

While traditional cultural and official regard for women as intrinsically non-combatant has indeed been abandoned, unchanging moral-theological objections remain as associated with the regularization of women as military combatants. The reality of these moral objections will become more significant upon institution of women’s draft registration.

Just War remains intrinsically a morally-weighted vocation, involving the volitional taking and spending of human lives as righteous, defensive response to murderous evil. Thus, a presumption of moral rectitude accompanies the Constitutionally-authorized formation, maintenance and regulation of armed forces by the Congress, who at its outset had imposed Christian morality on the army and navy. The modern addition of women interchangeably with men in armed services imposes a Constitutionally-unforeseen violation of moral order upon the armed forces and upon civilized society, wherein family, not individual, is properly the basic unit, and with the husband bearing primary responsibility before God as leader, provider, and sacrificial protector. (Cf. Reformed Episcopal Bishops’ resolution, hyperlinked among other references below.)

Such moral considerations have not been honored in this nation’s historic transition from a helpful Woman’s Auxiliary Army Corps which *freed men to fight*, to the present point of contemplating mandatory registration of all young women for conscription into armed military forces and warfare as though it were their moral duty to be on call to join men on the field of battle as armed military fighters.

In effect, men have been relieved from their morally-justified and Divine-prescribed duty of honorable manhood as protectors of women, a duty underscored by Christian Church studies cited below. In its place, a practice without historical, theological, or philosophical warrant is being imposed indiscriminately upon women under the guise of diversity, talent management, equality of citizenship, empowerment, and equal “job” opportunity. By the power of positive law, but without Divine authority as disclosed in Biblical moral-theology, women are to be regarded as fungible with men in the fulfillment of a moral duty of love that is unique to men both as husbands (Ephesians 5:25) and as friends (John 15:13.)

Such a substantially revised “morality” was already implicit in hotly-contested deliberations by the 1992 Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces (PCAWAF.) Their debates foreshadowed the work of the contemporary National Commission on Military, National and Public Service as it had contemplated the registration women for conscription. The National Commission, and ultimately Congress, would now be wise to give attention to the moral order as established and revealed by the God in whose name military and civil oaths of office, appointed and elected, are by convention solemnly sworn. (...remembering that: Fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. Proverbs 9:10)

The 1992 PCAWAF report concluded (p. 23) that the inconsistent and irresolute theological testimonials it received had signaled that the nation’s “strong” religious heritage “did not speak” clearly on the issue of women in combat: “...*No major religious establishment in the U.S. [had] adopted a position regarding women being assigned to combat positions on the basis of theology. ...*” <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=umn.31951d00277676f;view=1up;seq=42>

However, the absence of any ecclesiastical “*position regarding women being assigned to combat*” is reasonably explainable by the fact that such a prospect had been previously unimaginable and historically (Biblically) not in question. Reportedly, the Gates Commission (1969-70) had not even mentioned moral considerations or evaluated an expansion of women’s military roles in the All-Volunteer Force, much less as combatants or for Selective Service registration. And the PCAWAF had not addressed formal requests for official advice from the leaders of major Christian establishments. Though testimony was received from individuals who were recognized by their religious affiliations, they were not official spokesmen nor were all of them credentialed theologians or studious about the matter as theologians.

In summary, the present National Commission’s Congressionally-directed consideration of women as candidates for military conscription follows historically novel, morally unjustified, Congressionally-undirected (but tacitly approved,) incremental Defense policy developments by which women have become officially regarded as interchangeable with men for military enrollment and assignments. As now declared fully eligible for military combat assignments, women have become Constitutionally liable for identical treatment with men for Military Selective Service. A “higher power” has arguably established a standard for relationships between men and women superior to the moral standard that informs Holy Scripture.

MORAL-THEOLOGICAL CONCERN

A series of modern Christian studies of the women-warrior question were initiated subsequent to the 1992 PCAWAF's unfruitful moral-theological determinations. Biblical, moral-theological insight had been well-expressed directly to the PCAWAF by at least one scholarly, ordained Christian witness, and a substantial Commission minority had summarized moral concerns in their "Alternative Views" objection to women combatants as: "*Good men respect and defend women.*" Yet conclusions of the PCAWAF Commissioners' majority expressed no evident interest in seeking or urging an expanded exploration of authoritative moral objections to man's (ab)use of women as combatants.

Without specific detail about women, the entire PCAWAF did report that:

"...There was general agreement among theologians, Catholic, Lutheran, Baptist, Jewish and Episcopalian that the military's policy should not unduly infringe upon the rights of the family. Similarly, there was a strong concern that in an effort to defend the country, the nation's internal values not be diminished. ..." (p. 23. PACWAF Report.)

Thus was the nation's moral order identified as at risk of degradation by decisions that might inappropriately assign and engage women in the military.

Again, there was no expressed PCAWAF appetite to explore or to recommend an investigation of the particular family rights or internal values that deserve honor and preservation.

Regarding the integrity of families, common reason alone tells that men in uniform are even now obliged to exercise martial command of other men's wives and daughters who are under sworn obligation to a mode of authority and for purposes that their own fathers or husbands would find no Biblical warrant to assert.

Registration and conscription of women for any purpose would over-reach the father or husband as head of family, by regarding wife or daughter as though she is primarily related and morally accountable to and under the immediate discretionary power of civil government as, in essence and above all, a citizen, and only incidentally, optionally, provisionally rather than primarily and Creatively-ordered to be a woman, daughter, wife, mother. It has been noted that small children are thus subject to a sort of involuntary "conscription" as citizens in service of national security by their involuntary, enforced surrender of mother for a time, or forever.

With no deference to relationally-ordered moral concerns, subsequent Defense Policy decisions ignored even the PCAWAF's recommendations of but limited expansion of women's enrollment in combat naval vessel duties. In 1994, by rescinding entirely the 1988 "Risk Rule," and by a range of other policy initiatives, the Defense Department effectively terminated, in principle and practice, the moral tradition of protecting women from combat and from harm's way. Thus, a path was opened to the further incremental expansion of women's enrollment as combatants. And, as

anticipated in PCAWAF deliberations, women's prospective liability to Selective Service registration became logically inevitable by satisfaction of the conditions of *Rostker v. Goldberg*.

Similar "indecent" abuse of Creatively-ordered relationships was noticed in the fourth century by a still-revered father of the undivided Christian Church, St. John Chrysostom, who was then Archbishop of Constantinople, greatest preacher of his era, and, as it happens, the son of a military officer in Byzantium. He declared:

...Woman was not made for this, O man, to be prostituted as common. O you subverters of all decency, who use men as if they were women and lead out women to war as if they were men! This is the work of the devil, to subvert and confound all things, to overleap the boundaries that have been appointed from the beginning, and remove those which God has set to nature....

John Chrysostom (c. 347-407) Homily 5 on Titus.

BIBLICAL STUDIES

In absence of moral-theological rigor and depth in the PCAWAF's 1992 conclusions, certain established Christian denominations and scholars soon thereafter began to study and adopt Resolutions that, while not the "last word," were substantial, consistent, and sufficient in their determinations that the enrollment of woman as military combatant is morally condemnable and is unjustifiable by any Biblical principle, precept, or precedent. (See sample extracts below.) Simply, the Creator's purpose does not include the ordering of woman as man's guardian, protector, and defender in war. The inverse is true and is the cultural context of ordered civilization and of historical *family* tradition that the nation's Founders constitutionalized in 1787. Early Congresses imposed Christian morality on the army and navy. Common chivalry expressed a valid moral tradition that has now been delegitimized. Modern innovations are immoral aberrations. Biblical language marks relevant disorder as "abominable" (Deuteronomy 22:5).

Certainly, there are able women who are competent to perform some functions that men, as warriors, must accomplish, but "good order" must be a moral order. Resort to utilitarian, consequentialist, empirical, naturalistic determinations do not inherently account for the metaphysical reality of Almighty God as the all-powerful sovereign Person upon whom the Founders ultimately depended for the nation's existence and security, and whose moral law is both good, and immutable.

Here is a sampling of Biblically-derived determinations that have been developed by critical Christian denominational scholars of the "woman as warrior" phenomenon.

CHRISTIAN DENOMINATIONAL FINDINGS

Reformed Church in the United States (RCUS), 1996

"...no biblical warrant for women serving in enforced military service, but on the contrary, finds that women are to be protected from enforced military service that they might fulfill their calling and duties under God as set forth in the order of creation. Further, women are not to serve in combat roles.

<http://www.rcus.org/women-military-1996/>

Reformed Presbyterian Church, North America (RPCNA), 1998

... while recognizing the right and duty that women have to self-defense, which may involve physical violence (Judges 9:53), it is our conviction that Biblical teaching does not give warrant to employ women for military combat.

<https://pcamna.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/PRCCMP-Policy-Guidance-for-PRCC-Chaplains-as-of-Feb.-2015.pdf>

Southern Baptist Convention (SBC), 1998

...moral justification for combat service is the duty to protect and defend ... the welfare, security, and good order of families, which justification is essentially linked to the divinely assigned role and responsibilities of self-sacrificial male headship of the family.

<http://www.sbc.net/resolutions/1089/resolution-on-women-in-combat>

Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC), 2001

"... the use of women in military combat is both contrary to nature and inconsistent with the Word of God."

<https://www.opc.org/GA/WomenInMilitary.html>

Presbyterian Church in America (PCA), 2002

"... This Assembly declares it to be the biblical duty of man to defend woman and therefore condemns the use of women as military combatants, as well as any conscription of women into the Armed Services of the United States.

<http://www.pcahistory.org/pca/studies/1-278.html>

Reformed Episcopal Church (REC), 2017

... the Bishops of the Reformed Episcopal Church do with loyal respect and deep concern, warn against and oppose any laws and policies, which would substitute sexual interchangeability for the aforementioned complementary but distinct responsibilities of male and female;

<http://www.recus.org/documents/WomeninCombatStatement2017.pdf>

Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod (LCMS), 2018

...it is not in keeping with God's created design, intention and will for women to be employed in military combat or to be compelled to serve in the military in any capacity. ...

<https://blogs.lcms.org/2018/ctcr-report-women-and-military-service-a-lutheran-perspective>

LOCAL CHRISTIAN PARISH RESOLUTIONS

Apart from denominational resolutions, certain particular Christian parish congregations are drafting and adopting their own local Resolutions for the immediate instruction and orientation of their own members. Appended to this statement is the complete language of one such recent Resolution by the Heritage Reformed Church, a congregation of the RCUS. This Resolution, as well as other such local Resolutions (extracts below) are being circulated informally to be adopted or adapted by similarly persuaded Christian congregations.

Messiah's Congregation 1995

(Rev Steve Schlissel, was a witness to Presidential Commission)

"...Our daughters may not be subject to military draft, may not be regarded as proper participants in any pool from which commissioned combatants are to be drawn, and ought not to be placed in any environment or circumstances which would otherwise compromise their high and holy calling as women of the covenant community. Signed this Day, November 20, in the Year of Our Lord 1995,

<http://messiahnyc.org/ArticlesDetail.asp?id=83>

Heritage Reformed Church, RCUS, rev. 2019

(Attachment 1. in full, below)

...testimony of the Holy Scriptures requires the conclusion that women are ethically forbidden to serve in the United States Military given their policy adopted as of January 2013 that all volunteers and potential conscripts are considered combatants regardless of gender. Additionally, the United States government sins against God in inviting or compelling women to serve in such a capacity.

OTHER PERSPECTIVES

Attachments 2 & 3 constitute a small sample of the studies, articles and papers by individual Christian writers and scholars that have continued to emerge as a basis for gradually-expanding awareness and alarm that morally-ungrounded ideological alternatives are gaining political dominance of the moral ethic that was national consensus and foundation of the nation's founding documents.

The late distinguished Jewish Biblical scholar Jacob Neusner, when asked several years ago about his Biblical perspective on "woman as warrior," succinctly declared that to answer such a question would oblige a competent Biblical scholar first to "...imagine the unimaginable; there is no such thing." The radical proposition of functional fungibility of men and women as armed combatants has been described as *ontological anarchy*, foolishly frank denial of the Created reality for putatively plausible satisfaction of sentiment.

And so, it's clear that there are *serious* matters for attention that both secular bodies, e.g., Congress, as well as ecclesiastical bodies, have neglected to consider deeply before embarking on the historically and theologically novel track toward government oversight of women in the martial profession and calling, even by conscription, to mortal combat in presumably Just War.

SUMMARY THOUGHTS FOR CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION

1. Initially, there are at least two immediate factors for the Commission and the Congress to consider:

Will Congressional consensus account for the actual, metaphysical reality of Almighty God, to be feared as the singular supernatural authority and power by which the nation exists at all, and by which personal redemption as well as national security ultimately does depend in the face of actual evil of the sort that was confronted with no assured success by Allied armies against the Axis forces of WW II; ... **or**

Will Congressional consensus express perfunctory indifference, as though Almighty God is an impotent figment of subjective personal faith by believers who deserve allowances under First Amendment interpretations of religious freedom – and who as political constituencies need to be attended to democratically as though one equivalent ideological voice and influence among others in public and political affairs?

2. Congress would be wise to call now for consultation among and with major Christian bodies to determine what moral ethics ought, under God, to be imposed on the holy profession of arms, which is like no other profession in the nature of its fiduciary

responsibility to express a true, moral standard of the civilization it defends, "...so help them God."

3. Congress would be wise, as a morally-sound initiative, to establish legislatively an allowance for sincere "Conscientious Objection" based on a woman's or a man's conviction that in good conscience it would be morally impossible to participate in abuse of womanhood within the professional vocation of military arms such as has been demonstrated by Biblical reflection in Christian Church resolutions cited in this paper.

Since men with such moral convictions may affirm the legitimacy of Just War and be willing to participate apart from enabling or participating the misuse of women, Congress may want to consider provisions for military formations that are exclusively male, adapting in some fashion the practices of the IDF wherein Orthodox Jewish soldiers serve Israel in all-male environments.

4. So long as volunteer (AVF) recruitment constitutes the entire U.S. military population, those men and women who hold moral convictions in objection to the integration of women with military fighting forces are free simply to leave or not to enroll in the military at all. Were Selective Service registration for conscription to be extended to women, conflicts of conscience will become activated and have effect. Provisions for Conscientious Objection will be needed.
5. Notice the chronological span of publication dates among denominational studies identified in this paper. Christian constituencies are only slowly becoming attentive to this historically novel "woman warrior" phenomenon that itself is a component of far wider cultural disorientation respecting the Created ordering of Man as male-and-female. Important denominations remain silent and thus far unresponsive. Denominational authors of various Resolutions remain irresolute in their own application of them. But general coherence in truthful conclusions of these studies with others by reliable Biblical scholars portends a mounting season of moral tension that warrants sober, prayerful reflection and attention by legislators and policy makers as well as by ecclesiastical leaders. Truth that has informed these studious determinations may not and cannot be denied with impunity before Almighty God, whose Identity remains fixed in this Nation's public foundational documents and traditions and is recited significantly in the solemn personal oaths of public leaders.

The Nation's Founders were affirming reality when they unanimously subscribed to the Constitution on an historical day in the "...*year of our Lord 1787.*" That Lord is the Creator, the Lord God, the Redeemer and Provider in whom the national motto even now says "...*we trust.*" and under whom the Pledge of allegiance is rendered. He is God whose "...*help...*" is routinely asked as official military, civil, judicial, and legislative oaths of office are personally sworn or affirmed. He is invoked by Congressional Chaplains before sessions of Congress and by the U.S. Supreme Court's Marshal.

The moral order of western Christendom had informed our Constitutionalized civilization, as rooted and ordered within the marital union of men and women and to be conveyed trans-generationally through their offspring by their exemplary and instructive manhood

and womanhood. The Army that the Constitution empowered Congress to raise for the preservation of such a society was to be an army of men whose Divine ordering toward family headship included sacrificial service as guardians, protectors and defenders by corporal warfare when necessary. According to Biblical wisdom, corporal warfare is a Divinely ordered vocation of honorable manhood.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Heritage Reformed Church, Statement on Opposition to Women Serving in the Military, 2019.
2. Female Warriors and Feminized Men. Philip Lancaster, 2003
3. Our Daughters and Wives in Combat? Richard Mayhue, 2013

ATTACHMENT 1

Heritage Reformed Church, RCUS, Statement on Opposition to Women Serving in the Military

September 12th, 2016; amended February 19th, 2019

The Spiritual Council of Heritage Reformed Church of Waymart, PA adopted the following amended resolution on Opposition to Women Serving in the Military February 19th, 2019* (Minutes XI..a).

Whereas, on January 24, 2013, the former Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Army General Martin E. Dempsey, unilaterally rescinded the policy—in place throughout our national history in the combined armed forces of the United States of America—that women are excluded from combat service; and

Whereas, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Army General Martin E. Dempsey, wrote regarding women serving in the military, “We all wear the same uniform and we all fire the same weapons. And most importantly, we all take the same oath,” thereby renouncing the distinction between men and women with respect to their service in military combat roles; and

Whereas, Congressional legislation has been proposed that would require women to register with the Selective Service System; and

Whereas, the United States Supreme Court, in a case adjudicating the constitutionality of a male-only Selective Service registration requirement, ruled that registration serves no purpose beyond providing a pool for the draft of potential combat troops;[1] and

Whereas, the United States Supreme Court rested its decision validating the male-only Selective Service registration requirement in large measure upon the military rule that distinguishes between men and women’s service in combat roles [2]—a distinction the United States military has now repudiated, thus eliminating the Court’s principal rationale for permitting Congress to require only men to register with Selective Service; and

Whereas, an impermeable distinction between combat and non-combat troops is not, and has not been, a policy of the United States military,[3] nor are battle risks and martial readiness training and expectations avoided by those designated as non-combat troops; and

Whereas, women in military assignments have been put in harm’s way and will in all likelihood be given increasingly dangerous combat assignments; and

Whereas, the theater of battle carries risks different for women than men, risks from which women should be diligently protected—not intentionally subjected; and

Whereas, in the circumstance of an armed force constituted of both men and women, military exigencies are such as often would make impractical or forbid the separation of men and women otherwise required by dictates of modesty, respect, and protecting women from risks of exploitation and other improprieties; and

Whereas, the shortfalls in recruiting accompanied by the increasing demands caused by numerous deployments and escalating attrition in the ranks of the armed services, together with an international environment of geopolitical instability carrying the potential to trigger numerous additional military conflicts involving the United States, entails that it is reasonable to anticipate a conscription of men and women into military service in this country; and

Whereas, the issue of the service of women in the military generally, and in combat positions specifically, has been an enduring matter of concern in the national discourse; and

Whereas, all women (apart from one's own family) are "other men's" daughters or wives for whom they have accountable responsibility as covenant head and to whom alone submission is required; and

Whereas, those daughters and wives of one's own family are to be under the covenant headship of their fathers and husbands; and

Whereas, to step voluntarily away from their lawful biblical "head" and submit under the immediate authority of the law of war, and military regulations and law, to submit under immediate command of (largely) the government of uniformed men who are not husband or father, and who will be required to exercise a mode of authority that their own fathers or husbands do not regularly have; and

Whereas, the military men themselves will be obligated to direct the women officially without regard to their divine vocation of "womanhood", i.e without a covenant head's obligation to love them as Christ loved the Church and protect them from abuse/assault from their fellow "soldiers" or to protect them from assault if captured by military adversaries who will regard them as enemies rather than non-combatants; and

Whereas, it is the duty of the Church, as the pillar and foundation of the truth, to declare the will of God on all matters of faith and practice; and

Whereas, the failure of the larger Church to speak clearly on this issue of women in military service places all women, including those of Heritage Reformed Church, in jeopardy by not providing them with the Church's declaration on this issue, leaving them to plead only their personal beliefs should they be conscripted;

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Spiritual Council of Heritage Reformed Church, Covenant East Classis, Reformed Church in the United States, hereby adopts as its position the statement in the following paragraph, along with the series of affirmations and denials appended hereto (in Appendix A).

The testimony of the Holy Scriptures requires the conclusion that women are ethically forbidden to serve in the United States Military given their policy adopted as of January 2013 that all volunteers and potential conscripts are considered combatants regardless of gender. Additionally, the United States government sins against God in inviting or compelling women to serve in such a capacity; and

Be it further resolved that the adoption of this statement, and any documentation referenced herein, be communicated to the members of Heritage Reformed Church RCUS and that copies of this statement be kept on file and made available to anyone requesting a copy.

Dated: February 19th, 2019



Rev. Ron Potter, President of the Spiritual Council

APPENDIX A AFFIRMATIONS AND DENIALS

1. We affirm that the Holy Scriptures (the 66 Canonical books of the Old and New Testaments of the Bible) are God’s revealed will to mankind and are the sole rule for faith and practice.
2. We affirm that in addition to the explicit teachings and commands of the Holy Scriptures there are normative teachings therein that can be deduced “by good and necessary consequence” from the Scriptures’ content (Westminster Confession of Faith, Chapter 1, Paragraph 6).
3. We affirm that woman (Eve) was created by God from the rib of man (Adam) and was created to be a “help mate” for Adam in his God-given mandate to “be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it; have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth.” (Genesis 1:28 NKJV)
4. We deny that men and women are products of random chance that have evolved over thousands of millennia in a process commonly designated macro evolution, rather that they are created by God in His image and distinctly created and called to be distinguished as male and female (Genesis 1:27).
5. We affirm there is a revelatory mandate indicating the purpose for which man and woman were created.
6. We affirm that the highest purpose to which woman was created was to bear and nurture the offspring from her marital union in keeping with the God-given mandate to be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth.
7. We affirm that, in addition to woman’s created purpose of “giving life” she was also endowed with a constitution suited and directed to the life-preserving nurture and care of children.

8. We deny that men and women are fungible and that there are no distinctions of ability, constitution, gifts, or purpose between men and women, and we further deny that these distinctions are social constructions rather than being created and inherent.
9. We deny that women should strive to minimize their distinctive abilities, constitution, gifts, and purpose in an egalitarian quest purported to achieve equality with men.
10. We affirm that women should celebrate the distinguishing and God-ordained qualities of their sex, and gladly comport themselves in conformity with His design.
11. We affirm that in Adam's failure to obey God's command not to eat of the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" and his failure to defend his wife against the temptations of the serpent, he imposed upon the whole of creation the consequences of sin precipitating all subsequent wars throughout human history.
12. We affirm that in all places in the Holy Scriptures where wars are described, only men were called to arms (e.g. Numbers 31:3-4; Joshua 1:14; 6:3; 8:3; Judges 7:1-8; 20:8-11; 1 Samuel 8:11-12 (contrast verse 13); 11:8; 13:2; 14:52; 24:2; 2 Samuel 24:2; 1 Chronicles 21:5; 27:1-15, 23-24; 2 Chronicles 17:12-19; 25:5-6; 26:11-14; 2 Kings 24:14-16; and Nehemiah 4:14).
13. We affirm that a woman should not wear uniforms or other military accoutrements that make her indistinguishable from a man (Deut. 22:5).
14. We affirm that Deborah accompanied Barak to Mount Tabor notwithstanding God's command and promise of success to him as leader of the army of men (Judges 4:6-7) and that it was to Barak's dishonor and penalty that he requested Deborah to accompany him (Judges 4:8,9).
15. We affirm that upon reaching Mount Tabor, which was located above the battlefield where the Israelites engaged the Canaanite army, Barak with his 10,000 male soldiers went down to the battlefield without Deborah and that Deborah remained away from the battlefield on Mount Tabor (Judges 4:10, 12, 14b).
16. We deny that Deborah took part in the battle between the Israelites and the Canaanites in Judges 4.
17. We affirm that Sisera, the commander of the Canaanite armies in Judges 4, fled the battlefield and took refuge in the house of Heber, whose wife Jael later drove a tent peg through Sisera's temple and into the ground while he slept in her home (Judges 4:21).
18. We deny that Jael's actions were those of a soldier in combat in the army of the Israelites. Rather, her actions were carried out (a) in her domestic jurisdiction, (b) against one who had fled the field of battle, and (c) were carried out through artifice and cunning that facilitated her enemy's incapacity to resist or threaten her person.
19. We affirm that women possess attributes of courage, perseverance, endurance through hardship, the willingness to shed their own blood and give their own lives. These admirable qualities are to be

employed in childbearing, acts of nurturing and care, and other callings consistent with these, such as was evidenced by the Hebrew midwives in Exodus 1:15-26.

20. We deny that women are to use in military service, in or out of the theater of battle, their attributes of courage, perseverance, endurance through hardship, and willingness to self-sacrifice.

21. We affirm that some women are capable of doing many, if not all, activities associated with warfare. However, their mere capacity to perform these activities does not validate the propriety of their participation in them, let alone serve as grounds to compel their participation.

22. We affirm that it is licit for a woman to aid in the care and treatment of soldiers who are ill or injured as a result of the soldier's service in the military.

23. We deny that it is pragmatically necessary for women to become part of the Armed Forces of the United States to serve in a capacity of caring for and/or treating soldiers who are ill or injured.

24. We affirm that the oath of enlistment required of those entering a service branch of the United States military obliges the enlistee to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic and to obey the orders of the President and the officers appointed over the enlistee.

25. We deny that it is lawful according to the Holy Scriptures for a woman to take such an oath, as it both communicates the propriety of and obliges her to take on the forbidden role of military defender of her society, and subjects her to orders to participate in or carry out martial pursuits contrary to her created nature.

26. We affirm that it is a disgrace and a capitulation of responsibility for the men of any nation to place the women of the nation in harm's way or to rely on them to carry out the combat service necessary to protect and defend the society.

27. We affirm that God's teachings in Scripture supersede any edict of the civil authorities that is in opposition to God's teachings.

28. We deny that any institution of man, civil or otherwise, possesses authority above the Holy Scriptures.

29. We affirm that in faithfully keeping the teachings of the Holy Scriptures which do not permit a woman to serve in the armed forces of the United States as currently constituted, that such fidelity to the Holy Scriptures could be construed as "civil disobedience" when a woman refuses to serve in the armed forces as currently constituted.

30. We affirm that refusal to submit to any governmental coercion compelling women to serve in the armed forces of the United States is not a violation of the admonition in Romans 13 to obey the civil authorities, because, "We must obey God rather than men." (Acts 5:29 NASB)

31. We affirm that any civil authority requiring or compelling women to take up arms for any purpose does so in violation of the Holy Scriptures.

[1] *Rostker v. Goldberg*, 453 U.S. 57, 60, 68, 75, 77 (1981).

[2] *Id.* at 78-79.

[3] *See id.* at 81-82.

* Reference also the position paper adopted by the Reformed Church in the United States. Abstract of the Minutes 96:60; 99:75. <http://www.rcus.org/women-military-1996/>

ATTACHMENT 2

Female Warriors and Feminized Men

by Phil Lancaster, April 15, 2003

Earlier this month, the news media reported the dramatic rescue in Iraq of an American soldier, a nineteen-year-old supply clerk in an Army maintenance unit that had been ambushed after the unit made a wrong turn in the city of Nasiriyah. What was remarkable to me about this story, aside from the daring nature of the nighttime raid in the heart of enemy territory, was the fact that the rescued soldier was a young woman, Pfc. Jessica Lynch. By now every American who is not comatose has seen the photograph of the fresh-faced teenager in her camouflage fatigues in front of the stars and stripes.

However, the media does not seem to have been as fascinated as I over the gender of the soldier. I don't recall seeing or hearing any report that addressed the fact that a woman had been serving in a role in which she was vulnerable to violent attack and that the capture and rescue of an ambushed female soldier in a war zone is surely unprecedented in the annals of American warfare. Although she was not technically in a combat position by military definitions (e.g., infantryman or tank gunner) — nor at this point in history does the law allow a woman to be — she was armed and obviously in harm's way. The media, by their lack of comment on the novelty of the gender issue in the story, seem to be attempting to treat this situation as normal. And indeed it will be the new normal, if the feminists get their way: they want armed forces that fully integrate women into every military specialty, including all combat roles.

The main impetus nationally for this transformation of the military comes from the Defense Advisory Committee On Women In The Services (DACOWITS). The charter for this group (February 28, 1998) reads in part: "In carrying out its duties, the Committee serves as a vital link between the civilian community and the Department of Defense regarding the need for, and role of, women as an integral part of the Armed Forces." Only feminist ideologues see a "need" for an androgynous society in which women and men have interchangeable roles, but this is manifestly the course on which our nation has embarked. If they succeed, Jessica Lynch will be only the first of many female combat casualties. But the larger tragedy is the seemingly inexorable dismantling of the patriarchal culture that once protected women from such dangers.

To have women serving as soldiers on the battlefield is an abomination in the eyes of God and ought to be an offense to righteous men and women. It is an abandonment of the God-given order for society in which men are called upon to lay down their lives in defense of their wives, their homes, and their country, so that women can fulfill their primary calling to bear and nurture life. Christians ought to oppose this modern development on principled, Scriptural grounds. However, before we look at the biblical case against women in combat, we should also note the simple impracticality of this attempt to deny God's design for the genders.

The Practical Case

Feminists are at war with God and with His creation, and that's a tough battle to fight! They treat gender as an abstraction that can be manipulated by wishful thinking. However, an ideological commitment to egalitarianism does not change the fact that men and women are different. Every study comparing the sexes concludes what common sense already knew: men are by nature more aggressive, more competitive, more willing to take risks, more combative. Women have 55% of the muscular strength and 67% of the endurance of men. Studies at West Point have identified no less than 120 physical

differences between men and women that have a bearing on military requirements. In short, men make better warriors than women, moral considerations aside.

Not that this abundance of evidence will stop those whose mission for the military is that it becomes an agent for the transformation of society, with national defense a secondary concern. This is why the services now have different standards of physical performance for men and women. Although we don't know her test scores, Jessica Lynch could qualify for her dangerous position by meeting physical standards that would have disqualified a male for the same occupation. But the lethal threat in that Iraqi town was no less threatening for her than for her male counterparts. The fighting effectiveness of that American unit, and thus the safety of each of its members, was reduced to the extent that it was manned by women.

Mixing men and women in the military services creates a whole set of sexually-related issues that also have an impact on overall combat readiness. Not surprisingly, sexual immorality increases dramatically in a coed force, as does the incidence of sexual harassment and abuse. Female soldiers and sailors have a high incidence of pregnancy, both in and out of wedlock, and are thus obviously hindered in fulfilling their military mission. Though it is difficult to quantify, the normal sexual tension in a mixed-gender atmosphere creates a distraction that cannot have a positive effect on mission effectiveness.

Many male military personnel are dissatisfied with gender norming and the preferential promotion of inferior officers to meet social policy goals. Some become disgusted and simply leave the armed forces altogether. This has the perverse effect of encouraging the entry of yet more women into the military and assuring that there will be more positions for them to fill.

It's not just combat readiness that is negatively affected by having women in the service; there are broader social costs as well. Sending married women overseas creates hardships for the husbands and children they leave behind. A married woman soldier has two masters — her husband and her commander — and there is no doubt about whose claim on her is primary when push comes to shove. So the God-given domestic focus of a wife and mother is abandoned as she takes on the calling of national defender.

The inclusion of women in the armed forces makes no sense militarily or socially, and you don't need a Bible in hand to know that it's a bad idea for women to be in combat. But Christians do have the Bible as a guide for faith and life, and Christians throughout the ages have believed that the Bible requires men, not women, to give their lives in defense of home and nation.

The Historical Case

If I profess with the loudest voice and clearest exposition every portion of the Word of God except precisely that little point which the world and the devil are at that moment attacking, I am not confessing Christ, however boldly I may be professing Him. Where the battle rages there the loyalty of the soldier is proved; and to be steady on all the battle front besides, is mere flight and disgrace if he flinches at that point. -Martin Luther

A key battle that rages today is the multiple-front war of feminism upon biblical patriarchy. In their reckless attack upon God's order, feminists have injured women and degraded society in many ways. As women have left home to enter the workforce, they have come to add the stresses of the workplace to their inescapable domestic duties, thus multiplying their physical and emotional burden. As women have been sexually "liberated" (a.k.a., promiscuity) they have contracted diseases; they have become more expendable in the eyes of lustful and self-centered men and divorce has increased; and they have learned to kill their babies through abortion to remove the "inconvenience" that pregnancy creates in their quest for "freedom," thus suffering the physical and spiritual trauma associated with murdering their own offspring.

Pushing to have women in military service, even in combat roles, is just the latest surge in the battle to transform a patriarchal society into an egalitarian utopia. Ask Jessica Lynch, with her multiple bone fractures and gunshot wounds,

how that equality feels. (As of this writing no one knows if she was raped, an entirely likely additional trauma for captured women soldiers.)

Opposing women in combat is essential to a faithful confession of Christ in our day because this is one of the places where the devil is attacking the Word of God and the social order that Word prescribes. Unfortunately, the lies of the enemy have already so infiltrated the minds of Christians that their objections are often muted or nonexistent. Godly men of the past have uniformly opposed the very notion of women in combat. Here are the words of just two. First, John Chrysostom, a fourth century church father:

O ye subverters of all decency, who use men, as if they were women, and lead out women to war, as if they were men! This is the work of the devil, to subvert and confound all things, to overleap the boundaries that have been appointed from the beginning, and remove those which God has set to nature. For God assigned to woman the care of the house only, to man the conduct of public affairs. But you reduce the head to the feet, and raise the feet to the head. You suffer women to bear arms, and are not ashamed. (John Chrysostom, AD 344-407, Homily V on Titus)

Here are the words of John Calvin from his sermons on the book of Deuteronomy:

For it is good reason that there should be a difference between men and women. And although there were no law written, doth not even nature teach it us? ... Again, when women go appareled like men of war, (as there be some which had rather to bear a hackbut [an ancient firearm] on their shoulder than a distaff in their hand:) it is against kind, and we ought to abhor it. Although we were not spoken to, nor had any law or ordinance of God: yet do we even of ourselves perceive it to be strange and whosoever hath any spark of pureness in him, will judge so. (John Calvin, *Sermons on Deuteronomy*, AD 1556)

There are some bright spots in the contemporary church where saints have spoken with clarity against women in combat. First this from the Baptists:

That the messengers to the Southern Baptist Convention, meeting June 9-11, 1998, in Salt Lake City, Utah, do with loyal respect and deep concern, warn against and oppose the training and assignment of females to military combat service because: it rejects gender-based distinctions established by God in the order of creation; it undermines male headship in the family by failing to recognize the unique gender-based responsibility of men to protect women and children; and it subordinates the combat readiness of American troops and the national security of the United States, to the unbiblical social agenda of ideological feminism. (“Resolution No. 3, On Women in Combat,” in *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1998)

Some of the Presbyterians also have recently addressed the issue of women in combat:

Historical theologian, Harold O.J. Brown, has written: “Within both Judaism and Christianity, indeed almost universally in all human culture, the military profession has been reserved for males... Ephesians 5 (tells us) that Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for her... (H)usbands should be prepared to die for their wives rather than vice versa.” With this weight of testimony enumerated above, it becomes clear that the burden of proof does not rest on those who claim that man has a duty to defend woman, but those who deny this duty. (“Man’s Duty to Protect Woman,” *Journal of the 29th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America*, 2001)

The weight of historical evidence from the church is on the side of opposition to women in combat. It has only been in recent decades that the corrupting effects of feminism have taken their toll on many of the churches and their teachers. But our supreme authority is neither the wisdom of great teachers nor the pronouncement of church councils; it is the teaching of the Word of God. Let’s now consider the Scriptural evidence against women serving in combat.

The Scriptural Case

If someone reads the Bible through the lens of feminism, he will be inclined to find what he wants to find: a justification for his cause. But an honest reading of Scripture, letting it speak for itself without ideological presuppositions, yields a patriarchal view of men, women, and society. Specifically, it reveals a world in which men have the duty to defend their families and their nation and in which women are not placed in harm's way. The Scriptural case is fourfold.

God Appointed Men to be Warriors in Israel

First, the Lord Himself determined who should be the warriors in the nation He established to show forth His glory in the world. Consistently it is men, and men only, who are directed to wage war.

And he said to them, "Thus says the LORD God of Israel: 'Let every man put his sword on his side, and go in and out from entrance to entrance throughout the camp, and let every man kill his brother, every man his companion, and every man his neighbor.'" (Exod. 32:27)

Now the LORD spoke to Moses in the Wilderness of Sinai... saying: "Take a census of all the congregation of the children of Israel, by their families, by their fathers' houses, according to the number of names, every male individually, from twenty years old and above — all who are able to go to war in *Israel*." (Num. 1:1-3)

When a man has taken a new wife, he shall not go out to war or be charged with any business; he shall be free at home one year, and bring happiness to his wife whom he has taken. (Deut. 24:5)

Your *wives*, your little ones, and your livestock *shall remain in the land* which Moses gave you on this side of the Jordan. But you shall pass before your brethren armed, all your mighty men of valor, and help them. (Josh. 1:14; cf. 6:3; 8:3; Jud. 7:1ff; etc.)

In addition to the uniform example of God's calling men to fight in battle, we also find references to the shame of women being involved in military-type action. When a woman dropped a millstone from a tower onto the head of Abimelech, fatally wounding him, "...he called quickly to the young man, his armorbearer, and said to him, 'Draw your sword and kill me, lest men say of me, "A woman killed him"' (Jud. 9:54). Since women have no place in warfare, it is a shame to be killed by one.

In predicting the destruction of Babylon, Jeremiah wrote this description of their warriors:

The mighty men of Babylon have ceased fighting, They have remained in their strongholds; Their might has failed, They became like women; They have burned her dwelling places, The bars of her gate are broken. (Jer. 51:30)

Because women have no place in battle, it is a sign of judgment when men become weak and defenseless like women.

Deborah the judge is the poster child of feminism and she is regularly trotted out as an example of a woman who was a military and civil leader, as if her example is proof that women can fill the same roles as men. But even a casual reading of the narrative reveals a very different conclusion. First, this was a period of great decline in Israel's history when everyone did what was right in his own eyes; it is hardly an example of God's ideal (Jud. 2:10ff.; 21:25). Second, when it was time for war, Deborah called on a *man* to raise ten thousand *men* to do the fighting (Jud. 4:6)! Third, when this timid man said he wouldn't go fight unless Deborah accompanied him, she said she would go but that the glory for the victory would go to a woman; and, in fact, it was a woman who killed the commanding officer of the enemy (Jud. 4:9,21). The whole point of the story is that in times of spiritual degradation, when men are wimpy and need women to take on the roles of men and to hold their hands, God is still faithful to deliver His people. This is hardly a commendation of gender role reversal.

Every relevant command and example in the Bible points in the same direction: men fight the battles and defend the women and children.

The Father and the Son Are Warriors, Defenders, and Saviors

The feminists believe patriarchy is just a bad habit inherited from the past, one that needs to be abandoned completely. But patriarchy is, in fact, God's decreed pattern for human life, and it is rooted in the very nature and actions of God Himself. In the Godhead are the original Father and the original Son, and human fatherhood and other relationships are rooted in the patterns that exist eternally in the Trinity. God's Fatherhood and Sonship are the archetypes upon which the callings of manhood are based, and both Father and Son are warriors, defenders, and saviors. This is the second evidence from Scripture that men, not women, are called to take up arms.

The prophet Isaiah presents the Lord as a "man of war" going out to battle against his enemies:

The LORD shall go forth like a mighty man; He shall stir up His zeal like a *man of war*. He shall cry out, yes, shout aloud; He shall prevail against His enemies. (Is. 42:13)

Although this is anthropomorphic language (speaking of God as if he were a man), it is not that God just describes himself in terms we can understand. He is revealing his own nature. God is a fighter, a defender.

We find this taught in other passages. "A father of the fatherless, a defender of widows, Is God in His holy habitation" (Ps. 68:5). One of the characteristics of the Lord is that he takes up the cause of the weak and defenseless and protects them from their oppressors. "For the LORD your God ... administers justice for the fatherless and the widow, and loves the stranger, giving him food and clothing" (Deut. 10:17,18). Because this is what He is like, the Lord makes the same demands upon men who would obediently follow His example: "Defend the poor and fatherless; Do justice to the afflicted and needy" (Ps. 82:3).

Jesus Christ, the Son of God, like his Father, fights on behalf of the needy. He has done battle with Satan in order to win the freedom of his bride, the church: "Inasmuch then as the children have partaken of flesh and blood, He Himself likewise shared in the same, that through death He might destroy him who had the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb. 2:14). Of this Warrior-Savior, Tertullian wrote:

[Christ] came to wage a spiritual warfare against spiritual enemies, in spiritual campaigns, and with spiritual weapons... Christ also must be understood to be an exterminator of spiritual foes, who wields spiritual arms and fights in spiritual strife. (Against Marcion, Book 4, Chapter XX)

The exemplary nature of Christ's role as defender of his bride is seen most clearly in Ephesians chapter 5, where Paul draws the tight analogy between Christ and a faithful husband. "For the husband is head of the wife, as also Christ is head of the church; and He is the Savior of the body" (v. 23). To properly love his wife as her head, the husband must be her savior. Obviously this refers not to redemption from sin but rather to the need for the husband to sacrifice himself for the welfare of his wife, even to the point of death. This is confirmed two verses later: "Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself for her" (v. 25). As Christ gave Himself for His bride, so must a husband lay down his life for his wife.

So we see that the role of men as warriors and defenders is not arbitrary; it is rooted in the very nature of God and in

Gender Distinct Roles Derive from the Creation Order

The third Scriptural proof that God has called men, not women, to the role of protector of home and country is the distinctive callings that God gave man and woman at the creation. When God created mankind, he created them male and

female (Gen. 1:27) and pronounced this creation “very good” (v. 31). Gender distinction is not an accident; it is part of God’s perfect plan for men and women, and part of that plan is a distinction of roles.

Before God had created the woman, he gave Adam a twofold task in the garden: “Then the LORD God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to tend and keep [guard] it” (Gen. 2:15). Adam’s task was to cultivate the plants and to guard the garden. The next verse suggests a source of danger: he and his were to stay away from a particular tree. As we know too well, Adam failed to guard his wife from the temptations of Satan and instead readily succumbed to his wiles along with Eve. The point is that the man was created first and given the assignment as the leader and protector of his wife and all future children. He failed to act faithfully in his role as defender, and we have all been paying the price since.

The importance of gender distinction is seen in the commandment found in Deuteronomy 22:5: “A woman shall not wear anything that pertains to a man, nor shall a man put on a woman’s garment, for all who do so are an abomination to the LORD your God.” Men should act and dress like men, and women should act and dress like women. And what more blatant violation of this commandment than for a woman to adorn herself with military fatigues and the gear of war? In that act she not only wears the clothes of men, she also takes on the male role of defender. The gender distinction that God pronounced “very good” is thus abandoned as women dress like, and try to act like, men.

Men Are Called to Protect the “Weaker Vessel”

A fourth and final evidence from the Bible that God has given men the duty of protecting home and nation, even to the point of death, is the unique vulnerability of women and their need for protection. In our last point we saw that God gave Adam the role of protecting his wife and the garden, but God also had a role for Eve to play. We know, of course, that she was made as a “suitable helper” for Adam (Gen. 2:18). One of the chief ways in which she would help Adam was to bear his children, thus enabling mankind to fulfill God’s command that they be fruitful and multiply, fill the earth, and subdue it to the glory of God (Gen. 1:28). Adam recognized his wife’s essential nature and calling, and so he named her Eve, which means “mother of all living” (Gen. 3:20). Central to a woman’s role in the world is the bearing and nurturing children. This fact is also evident in that the curse pronounced upon the woman for her sin involved pain in the bearing of children (Gen. 3:16), just as Adam’s curse was related to his primary task, the tilling of the earth (vv. 17-19).

It is not just in Genesis that we see the childbearing role of women emphasized; it is the consistent message of the Bible throughout:

Your wife shall be like a fruitful vine
In the very heart of your house,
Your children like olive plants
All around your table.
(Ps. 128:3)

...that they admonish the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, homemakers, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be blasphemed. (Tit. 2:4,5)

For Adam was formed first, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression. Nevertheless she will be saved in childbearing if they continue in faith, love, and holiness, with self-control. (1 Tim. 2:13-15)

Therefore I desire that the younger widows marry, bear children, manage the house, give no opportunity to the adversary to speak reproachfully. (1 Tim. 5:14)

The central place of childbearing and child nurture in the life of a woman gives meaning to the exhortation addressed to men in 1 Peter 3:7:

Husbands, likewise, dwell with them 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.

Men need to understand the unique vulnerability of women. A woman's body is equipped with the means to bring a new human being into the world and to nurture that person in the early years of life. God shaped her body not with the physical strength to take dominion over the rocks and soil, nor to wage war against evil men, but with a special strength that enables her to be a life-giver. Yet this very strength leaves her vulnerable to many physical dangers and thus in need of a protector. She is a "weaker vessel" not because she is weak, but because her very strengths leave her more threatened by the harsh conditions which sin has introduced into the world. This is why, in the midst of a description of great tribulation on the earth, Jesus said, "But woe to those who are pregnant and to those who are nursing babies in those days" (Matt. 24:19)! It is a great tragedy for these life-givers to be subject to the threats of war and violence. A man who views a woman "with understanding" will "give honor" to her by taking account of her vulnerability and trying to keep her out of harm's way, even to the point of laying down his own life for her. The very idea of placing a woman on the field of battle ought to be repugnant to real men who understand the preciousness of women. In a sense we can say that men are "expendable" in a way that women are not. Here is the insight of

F. Carolyn Graglia in *Domestic Tranquility: A Brief Against Feminism* (which though not written from a strictly biblical perspective contains the substance of a biblical view of life):

If a nation must wage war, a young man's death in combat fulfills his destiny as protector of a society the fundamental purpose of which is to reproduce itself and secure its children's safety and well-being. A young woman's death in combat can never fulfill, but only negate, her destiny as bearer of those children. (p. 190)

For men to allow women in combat is a denial of the central calling of both genders.

But we must consider more than the fate of a man or woman on the battlefield. Since a young woman is a life-giver, she could at any time be carrying another human being in her womb, possibly unbeknownst to her. Even if one were to grant her the "right" to choose to be a soldier, a woman has no right to subject another person — the one who may be in her womb — to the life-threatening dangers of war. The goal of that murderer, the devil, from the beginning has been to destroy the seed of the woman. Placing women and their unborn children in harm's way is one effective strategy in that diabolical plan. It is noteworthy, in this connection, that savage enemies have always made it a point to destroy both women and their unborn children. Elisha the prophet said to the king of Syria, "I know the evil that you will do to the children of Israel: Their strongholds you will set on fire, and their young men you will kill with the sword; and you will dash their children, and rip open their women with child" (2 Kings 8:12). A godly society will keep women and children as far as possible from the violence of war.

Lest it be thought that women have a soft life and only men are called to self-sacrifice, let me clarify something. Women are warriors, too, and bloodshed is part of their calling. They are called, just like men, to self-sacrifice and service for the sake of others. But the domain of the woman's warfare is the home. There she gives birth to children, and childbearing has always carried with it pain, bloodshed, tears, and even the threat of death. Christian women are engaged in a very real warfare for the dominion of Christ over Satan when they submit to their calling to bring forth new soldiers for Christ's kingdom. Just as men sacrifice themselves for the protection of their women and children, so women sacrifice themselves to bear and nurture new life for the glory of God. When each one takes up his or her position in the battle, the kingdom of God will gain ground in the world. When men and women abandon their unique duty posts, the enemy gains the advantage.

Conclusion: Calling Men to be Men

The evidence is not in doubt. Women do not belong in combat roles; men do. This is evident not only from the biblical and historical data but from a common sense look at the practical effects of violating this rule. Yet as we have noted above,

neither the revelation of God nor the proofs of hard reality can penetrate a heart and mind blinded by the lies of the devil in the form of feminist ideology.

So the first thing we must do is to carefully examine our own minds to discover where we ourselves may have been affected by the pervasive worldview of egalitarianism. Any compromise with a lie is a lie, and the fruit will be destruction and death over the long term. Christian men and women must strive not to be conformed to this world but to be transformed by the renewing of their minds, taking every thought captive to Christ (Rom. 12:2; 2 Cor. 10:5).

Then, having our minds filled with the truth of God's Word, we must seek to implement that in everything we do. This means embracing the distinctive callings of men and women first in our own hearts and homes. But it also means taking a stand for truth in the public square, resisting the attempts to overturn God's order in our civil life, particularly in this matter of women in combat.

When I see Pfc. Jessica Lynch being rescued and now returned to safety in America, I don't blame her for having been on the battlefield. She was just following an opportunity that was held before her as desirable. I blame the men of America, and particularly the Christian men who should know better, for not having taken a stand against the movement of women into the armed forces. The violence against Jessica Lynch is a tragedy, but it points to the greater tragedy of feminized men who have abdicated their role as protectors of women.

Let's not allow ourselves to watch the media reports of women in combat and simply become further desensitized to this **abomination**. Let's reflect on the cultural sickness of which it is a symptom and recommit ourselves to the battle to restore our homes and our nation to health. This healing can only come through a return to biblical patriarchy, a course of life rooted in the nature of God Himself and in His design for the human race.

Published in PATRIARCH Magazine, 47; p. 21-27. April 2003

ATTACHMENT 3

Our Daughters and Wives in Combat?

by [Richard Mayhue](#) on July 1, 2013

This question is not theoretical any longer. The Obama administration has forced it upon American households. Will I let my daughter or wife fight? Before answering that question, we must ask, “What does God’s Word say?”

Leon Panetta, then U.S. secretary of defense, shocked the nation when he announced in January 2013 that he had lifted the ban on women serving in combat. While I was discussing when it’s okay for daughters and wives to fight, a friend reacted in the same way many others feel: “I can answer in one word, ‘Never!’”

Because we live in a fallen world this is not a new question. The first known Christian scholar, Clement of Alexandria (ca. AD 155–215), would have agreed wholeheartedly. “For we do not train our women like Amazons to manliness in war; since we wish the men even to be peaceable” (*The Stromata*, Bk IV, Ch VIII).

Concerned citizens have adopted multiple approaches to grapple with this vexing question, appealing to morality, physiology, nature, tradition, emotion, history, politics, and psychology. As a naval officer who piloted a hovercraft in the dangerous northern waterways of South Vietnam, I could also speak from personal experience. But what gives one person’s opinion greater authority than any other? God the Creator’s perspective takes precedence over all others, so I have chosen to appeal exclusively to the divine authority that resides uniquely in Scripture. Surely, the Bible has an answer to such a pressing contemporary query.

Old Testament Examples That Indicate Gender Roles as They Relate to Combat

While Christians are not under the Law ([Hebrews 8:6–13](#)), the Old Testament provides a framework for understanding God’s intentions. The military requirements for Israel set a pattern that we should consider carefully. Has God revealed any underlying principles about gender roles that reflect His higher purpose for all nations?

Only Men Were Counted to Go to War

This practice continued all the way from Moses’s time to David and Amaziah ([Numbers 1:2–3](#); [2 Samuel 24:9](#); [1 Chronicles 21:5](#); [2 Chronicles 25:5](#)).

Kings Chose Only Sons for War

Samuel mentioned this to Israel as the word of the Lord ([1 Samuel 8:11](#)). Israel’s first king, Saul, did exactly this ([1 Samuel 14:52](#)).

Only Men Went to War

God the Father is pictured as a warrior on behalf of Israel ([Isaiah 42:13](#)). The military bodyguard that protected Israel's king is referred to as the "valiant men of Israel" ([Song of Solomon 3:7-8](#)). When reading through the historical books (Genesis to Esther), we frequently encounter male armies but never a mention or even veiled suggestion of women co-combatants. Pagan armies that fought against Israel were male only ([1 Samuel 4:9-10](#)). God even foretold that the male Babylonian army would fight without strength as though they were women ([Jeremiah 51:30](#)).

No matter what era one examines in the biblical history of Israel, fighting units were exclusively staffed with men. When Abram gathered a quick-strike force to rescue Lot from his kidnappers, he chose men ([Genesis 14:14-15](#)). When Moses assembled an army to attack the Midianites, he selected "men of war" ([Numbers 31:3](#); [31:21](#); [31:49](#)). When God elaborated on rules for temporary absences from combat duty, the excused soldiers were men ([Deuteronomy 20:5-8](#)). When the Jews marched around Jericho, the males marched ([Joshua 6:3-9](#)). When Joshua attacked Ai, he did so with a male army ([Joshua 8:3](#)). Before Gideon went to war, God reduced his fighting force to 300 men ([Judges 7:7](#)). Saul's army proved to be only male ([1 Samuel 11:8](#)). King David's bodyguard was composed of mighty men ([2 Samuel 23:8-37](#)). Jehoshaphat's army enlisted only men ([2 Chronicles 17:10-19](#)).

Daughters Served in Domestic Roles

Samuel reported this as God's word to Israel ([1 Samuel 8:13](#)).

[n.b. Samuel was conveying God's warning against "conscriptio," an eventuality that would be accomplished by a human King for whom Israel was clamoring in place of the Lord God. (1 Samuel 8:9). R.H.Miller]

Wives and Children Did Not Go to War

While men went forth to conquer ([Deuteronomy 3:18](#)), the women and children remained behind ([Deuteronomy 3:19-20](#); [Joshua 1:14-15](#)).

Additionally, [Deuteronomy 24:5](#) says that male soldiers in their first year of marriage were to remain at home with their new brides in a domestic setting rather than go to war with their fellow-soldiers. Nehemiah urged the men to fight for their families and homes ([Nehemiah 4:14](#)).

Women Welcomed Men Back From War; Never Did They Return With Them

Such was the case when King Saul and David returned from battle ([1 Samuel 18:6-7](#)).

"What about Deborah and Jael?" many people ask. Deborah reluctantly went into battle with the Israelite warrior Barak, not as a female combatant but as a judge of Israel, possibly to shame his cowardice ([Judges 4:4-9](#)). The woman Jael killed the enemy general Sisera, not in battle but while doing her domestic chores in a tent where Sisera had retreated to hide ([Judges 4:17-22](#)).

[n.b., Deborah did not actually go into the battle, but remained on Mt. Tabor while Barak, at Deborah's command, led 10,000 men to engage the enemy. (Judges 4:9-10, and 14-16) R.H.Miller]

New Testament Guidance on Using Old Testament Examples

THE BIBLE TEACHES THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN WOMEN'S AND MEN'S ROLES FIRST ESTABLISHED IN GENESIS 1–2.

While the Old Testament says much, the New Testament is virtually silent on this specific question. It does reiterate the distinction between women's and men's roles first established in *Genesis 1–2* ([Ephesians 5:22–33](#)); and it confirms the scriptural authority of the Old Testament ([2 Timothy 3:16–17](#)).

It also speaks of unavoidable *spiritual* warfare for believers in Christ, whether young or old, male or female ([Ephesians 6:10–17](#); [1 Peter 5:6–9](#)). But it does not directly address the question at hand.

However, two texts urge the New Testament reader to consider the instructions and examples of the Old Testament: [Romans 15:4](#) and [1 Corinthians 10:11](#). The Old Testament pattern speaks clearly and with divine authority. It does so both prescriptively and descriptively to provide crucial scriptural guidance on this issue.

Based on Paul's assertions, believers should employ the historical pattern found in the Old Testament—informed by the New Testament and with the Holy Spirit's guidance—as the pattern for all their decision-making today with respect to the possibility of women in combat.

Mothers in the Military?

Women in combat is just part of a bigger puzzle. Should our daughters, wives, and mothers be involved in military service at all—or in any other demanding career that takes them outside the home? Read the author's [insightful, Bible-based perspective](#) on these matters.

The most celebrated early-church Bible expositor, John Chrysostom (ca. AD 344–407), apparently preached and wrote with these very same convictions in mind (*Homily V*; see [Titus 2:11–14](#)): “Woman was not made for this, O man, to be prostituted as common. O ye subverters of all decency, who use men, as if they were women, and lead out women to war, as if they were men! . . . You suffer women to bear arms, and are not ashamed.”

While I still cannot answer with just one word the question, “Should our daughters and wives be trained to serve in armed combat?” From my understanding, I can now do it authoritatively with three, “Never, biblically speaking!”

Take courage. We have the divinely authoritative Scripture and the testimony of Christian scholars and teachers from the early church on our side as fellow soldiers in the ongoing battle for truth.

Dr. Richard Mayhue, retired, was executive vice-president and dean of The Master's Seminary.

As published in the magazine *Answers in Genesis*, July 1, 2013

<https://answersingenesis.org/christianity/christian-life/our-daughters-and-wives-in-combat/>