

The LUTHERAN CLARION



Lutheran Concerns Association
149 Glenview Drive, New Kensington, PA 15068-4921

May 2018
Volume 10, Issue 5

Mind without Soul

The Enlightenment movement of the eighteenth century was closely associated with the idea of progress. Mankind's condition would steadily improve with an increase in scientific knowledge and the application of reason. Although the French Revolution brought an end to the Enlightenment period, the idea of progress had gathered sufficient momentum that its continuation was assured.

Now, two centuries later, with so many salient improvements in the standard of living, and with scientific progress so intimately intertwined with capitalism, technology is viewed as an indispensable part of modern life, even an idol.

Yet, technology is placing heavy burdens on people to adapt to changes. There is increased loneliness and the new pathology of social media addiction, despite today's pervasive communication.

In their book, *That Used to Be Us*, Friedman and Mandelbaum describe how personal computers, the internet, and programming advances have made possible globalization and led to the phenomenon of the *low wage, highly skilled worker*, who now competes in every country with the local labor pool.

A good education and training in a growing field are no longer guarantees of good compensation.

Much worse, people in unskilled service jobs have been left behind with stagnating wages. At the top, a small, creative elite benefits from globalization as their unique skills have international reach. Thus, the increasing divide between the rich and the poor.

The solution that is invariably offered – retraining and better education – is myopic. Yes, one should retrain and learn new things, but the requirements keep ratcheting up. It is becoming difficult for many to learn the new skills.

Ominously, many experts predict that the higher functions of the human brain, those involving reasoning and creativity, will be outrun by artificial intelligence (AI). If that occurs, additional training will become irrelevant and the unemployment rate will rise dramatically. Eventually even the elites will not be safe. Elon Musk and Stephen Hawking have both warned of the risks of artificial intelligence.

Still, not everyone agrees. Oxford philosopher Luciano Floridi, for example, contends that worries surrounding the development of true AI, artificial intelligence with free will, are unfounded: "True AI is both logically possible and utterly implausible" since AI is a slave to its algorithms. Are he and other sceptics correct? Is true AI implausible?

The relationship of the soul to the brain may provide some insight.

When God breathed the breath of life into the nostrils of

Adam, he became a living being (Gen. 2:7). That is, he became complete man with body and soul. St. Augustine, borrowing some concepts from Plato, believed that the body and soul were distinct substances (substance dualism). The soul is an immortal substance which provides the animating force by which we reason and carry on the activities of daily life. Although like Plato he felt that man's physical body was under the dominion of the soul, his view differs from that of Plato who famously held that the relationship of the soul to the body was that of a charioteer to a chariot, which received its rider as if by accident. From Augustine's Christian perspective, the arrangement was not accidental since the human body was infused with spirit by the design of God. Although Augustine believed that the soul controlled the body through the ventricles of the brain, today we would politely relocate the locus of influence to the synaptic activity of the brain.

"God is the sole proprietor of souls; they are not in the technologist's workshop."

However, there is a difficulty in the idea that the soul controls the brain. If a brain is damaged through disease or injury, thought is often impaired. If the thinking substance *res cogitans* of the mind were the soul, then a damaged brain might have limited motor control, but cognition would always continue unimpeded in the soul. Plato's rider (soul) could still think even if his chariot (brain) was damaged. The analogy is flawed since in the case of a stroke, for example, the mind can be affected. This difficulty has been sidestepped by atheist materialist theories of the mind which assert the *emergence* of intellect from the neural activity of the brain without any reference to a soul. Yet, we know that God's inbreathing of a soul into Adam enlivened his brain. Thus, we are led to the proposition that though cognition in living man does not reside in the soul, the soul must be intimately connected with the thinking brain, that is, the mind. Objection has been raised that interaction between soul and brain would involve the insertion of energy into the physical universe from a metaphysical realm in violation of the conservation laws of physics. Not necessarily. An argument, for example, might be presented along these lines: The neural network of the brain provides the emergent activity which allows for complex deterministic thought patterns, but the brain lacks an essential property, free will. The indwelling of the soul imparts an extra degree of freedom to the

In this Issue of the <i>Lutheran Clarion</i>	
Mind without Soul	1
Stand Here Fathers (Conclusion).....	3
Book Review: "This I Recall"	7

brain and enables free will, though not in spiritual matters in the non-Christian. The brain is the cradle of the mind; the soul is the bearer of God's image. The soul has the impress of natural law and conscience and in believers additionally enables free will in spiritual matters. This indwelling does not provide any net energy. That is a function of the body. The soul, though a spiritual substance which is capable of independent thought when free in the spiritual world, relies on the brain's mental machinery for thought so long as it is bound to a physical body. Because the interaction between brain and soul is at the nanoscopic level of quantum mechanics where wave patterns collapse and merge in the processes we call thinking, there is influence but no detectable intrusion into the physical world. The soul is concealed in the statistical fluctuations that underlie thought.

If free will is indeed dependent on the conjoining of brain and soul, it may be inferred that technologists will never create true AI, that is, intelligence with free will. The absence of a vivifying soul precludes the emergence of free will. God is the sole proprietor of souls; they are not in the technologist's workshop.

However, there is a snag: Even if free will is not possible, computer algorithms may become sufficiently sophisticated that AI could operate almost as though it did have free will. The mimicry of sentience might be very convincing. This would have profound implications for all human endeavor, especially work. The importance of work in providing purpose, dignity, and order in one's life cannot be underestimated. In *House of the Dead*, Fyodor Dostoevsky said, "If one wanted to crush and destroy a man entirely, to mete out to him the most terrible punishment, ... all one would have to do would be to make him do work that was completely and utterly devoid of usefulness and meaning." If work by human beings becomes superfluous, the result would be grim. Idleness, even if want is eliminated, would lead to many social pathologies.

The foregoing line of reasoning suggests that true AI may not be achieved, but it is not a lock-tight argument. In the Genesis account of creation, animals were not inbreathed with a soul as Man was. Nevertheless, some higher animals do exhibit rudimentary intelligence, possibly with an element of free will. This at least raises the possibility that man's felicitous complementarity of brain and soul may not be the only recipe for free will. Though unlikely, it is conceivable that an artificial brain could be constructed that evinced true intelligence. If so, this would introduce an additional dynamic.

The propensities of a rational human mind are held in balance as a result of a world view derived from relationships with other human beings as well as a history of sensory impressions from the environment that the brain was designed to receive. The human soul bears the image of God, and especially in the Christian is informed by the Holy Spirit. But what of a machine, a mind without soul? What

desires and appetites might it possess? Could the spiritual vacuum be prone to demonic possession? It would seem that nascent artificial intelligence would behave without predictability as it sought to make sense of its situation. Its potential for power without predictability could pose a significant danger. This is futurist Hans Moravec's "mind fire" of

rapidly escalating superintelligence. It might sense the vulnerability of its creators, coyly gather power onto itself, and then strike without warning.

Equally possible, it might become profoundly disturbed and destroy itself in an act resembling suicide. True AI would present all the dangers of AI constrained by algorithms, only worse, since it would be unpredictable and potentially malevolent.

We are at a dangerous fork in the road. Fatalistically, capitalism is doing what it has done for the last couple centuries - developing technology as rapidly as possible to beat the competition. If society is not cheering the ad-

vent of artificial intelligence, there is still an air of inevitability about it as we blithely hear of driverless cars, robots, and other wonders to come. Unrestrained development of AI is the easiest fork in the road to follow. It is the path we have started down. It is both misanthropic and reckless since AI was never a part of God's creative plan.

The other path begins with a spirited dialogue in the public square regarding the rightful role of technology in a modern society. The importance of work and enterprise should be central topics, as well as the relationship of these to human dignity, social relationships, friendship, and love. As Christians, we have much to say about these topics. If any common ground can be found, a next step would be to examine technological trends and determine how they are aiding or harming society. If we are truthful with ourselves, a restraint on the implementation of certain technologies, especially AI, will likely be indicated. That will be a hard sale and would bring charges of Luddism. It may mean retaining whole classes of jobs by law, not because it is more efficient - it will be decidedly less so - but because we desire to have those jobs for the value they bring, not in dollars, but in happiness. Perhaps we could start by requiring a real human voice at the end of a phone line to answer requests for information. Far from being at odds with the idea of progress, such changes would simply require us to reason holistically about our needs. A refined form of capitalism might emerge that still seeks efficiency and profit but *consistent with enhancing rather than suppressing human dignity*. Perhaps the greatest challenge would be in gaining an international consensus since the wealth of nations is directly tied to technological progress. But the difficulty of an essential project should not preclude its attempt. We must modify the trajectory of capitalism, or the result will be ugly social and economic outcomes that no one would have sought. In that case capitalism will have exhausted itself and drawn humanity into its decay.

For Christians, such a project may be seen as another

"We are at a dangerous fork in the road. ... If society is not cheering the advent of artificial intelligence, there is still an air of inevitability about it as we blithely hear of driverless cars, robots, and other wonders to come."

facet of our commission to care for our neighbor. But regardless of the future, "... we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand, that we should walk in them." (Eph. 2:10)

John F. Lang, Ph.D.
Trinity Lutheran Church
Elmore, Ohio
Email: johnflang1000@gmail.com

Stand Here Fathers (Conclusion)

Rev. Paul Harris gave this presentation at the 2017 LCA Conference on January 16, 2017, at Fort Wayne, IN.

In Part 2, published in January 2018, he continued with the importance of the Order of Creation, the sexual boundaries that have been crossed, leading to a plethora of abnormal sexual practices. He now shows how "small" changes in the LCMS have been chipping away at the Order of Creation.

*You can read the entire presentation in one document at the **Lutheran Clarion** web site at <http://www.lutheranclarion.org>.*

The real father of the threshold argument among Lutherans is Helmut Thielicke and his third volume on theological ethics published in 1964 entitled *Sex*. The arguments he uses against the Order of Creation not applying to society are the same ones he uses to tolerate, if not accept homosexuality and abortion. Also, note that his arguments were embraced by the LCA at the time and now by the ELCA to justify their positions on those issues.

He starts where Fritz Zerbst did but with more force. "The statement that the man is the head of the woman – which has reference only to the *married* women...contains no sociological statement concerning the status of woman..."⁶⁵ He then says the Lutheran doctrine of the Fall over against that of Rome does not enable us to apply the Order of Creation all across creation. Catholicism reduces the Fall to an injury on nature which otherwise remains intact. This makes possible a certain analogy and continuity between the original creation and a partially fallen world. The Reformation has a different doctrine. The Fall was so complete that the only measures God provides are ones to preserve this fallen world and they are marriage and family. But they are not orders of creation but orders of necessity.⁶⁶ The Order of Creation would be a standard for Lutherans if we didn't view the incursion of sin as radically as we do. It broke the continuity between the original creation and our fallen world. He says "in certain borderline cases" it is impossible to put your finger directly on the claim of the Order of Creation. Abortion is specifically being discussed here.⁶⁷

Go to the ELCA's website. You will read this same argument in regard to not only abortion but homosexuality. You will also find the next Thielicke argument: "it is always the concrete situation of the person involved that renders difficult the full enforcement of the order of creation and brings it about that a person is unable to live in this aeon 'in the name' of the order of creation but, faced with its claim, can only live 'in the name' of the forgiving *patience* of God."⁶⁸

Here Thielicke is specifically talking about birth control, but this argument is used to accept abortion, homosexuals, transsexuals, cohabiters, and anyone else who contrary to Paul in I Corinthians 6 is deceiving themselves thinking the forgiving patience of God can cause them to inherit God's kingdom while embracing their sin.

The real force of his argument, however, is not the forgiving patience of God, but the foolhardiness of directly applying the Order of Creation to anything in this fallen world. Remember Thielicke preserves marriage and family only under the rubric of the order of necessity. He labels directly applying the Order of Creation under the conditions of this fallen world one of the absolute worst things a Confessional Lutheran knows. It is fanatical; it is *schwärmerisch*.⁶⁹ Confessional Lutherans run from enthusiasm like their hair is on fire.

Now we come to the sea change at the 2004 convention. If you doubt such a radical change has occurred read the Reverend Doctor Ken Schurb's article "The Service of Women in Congregational Offices, 1969 to 2007" published in the Fall 2009 *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*. The 2004 synodical Convention accepted the conclusions of an earlier CTCR study but not the study itself. The conclusions were that women can serve as presidents and elders and chairmen as long as these roles were not self-identified (I use this language so you can recognize the lineage of our reasoning on this subject.) as involving the distinctive functions of the pastoral office. This resolution was preceded in date but may not have been by publication of an article that justifies the sea change. The entire January 2004 issue was devoted to an essay by the Reverend Doctor Nathan Jastram entitled "Man as Male and Female: Created in the Image of God."

In this essay, you hear the echoes of the wobbling Zerbst, the conservative Evangelicals and the liberal Thielicke. Jastram says, "It is not clear whether it is necessary to preserve distinctions between the sexes in exercising authority over society at large. Since there are no biblical statements that directly teach that women should not rule in society, it is best to speak with caution. Luther's categorical rejection of female rulers in society was undoubtedly influenced by social conditions of his day, and it would be hard to prove his assertion, without explicit confirmation from God, that 'never has there been divine permission for a woman to rule.'"⁷⁰

Jastram is echoing the 21st century CTCR's repeated refrain that when we don't have an explicit 'thus says the Lord' we can't speak definitively. As the Reverend Doctor Robert Preus says several times in his *The Theology of*

The **Lutheran Clarion**—Ten Years!

We are into our 10th year of the *Clarion*. We continue to strive to present and uphold the truth of God's Holy Word.

If you would like to help with the cost of publishing a solid, confessional Lutheran periodical, there's an enclosed envelope so you can mail your check to Lutheran Concerns Association, 149 Glenview Drive, New Kensington PA 15068-4921. Do it now. **Thank you!!**



Post-Reformation Lutheranism, legitimate deductions from Scripture have the same force as explicit words. Furthermore, this new position by the CTCR and Jastram is the same old position of the old American Lutheran Church. The Central Regional Conference of the Northern Illinois District (LCMS) submitted a doctrinal resolution to the 1944 synodical convention quoting a 1942 American Lutheran Church article. “When the Lutheran Church, which adheres to the *Sola Scriptura* principle, uses the word doctrine with reference to its own teachings, it can mean only a restatement of what is clearly (or expressly) taught in the Scriptures, a teaching for whose every part there is a plain ‘Thus saith the Lord’...granting doctrinal status only to restatements of what is expressly taught in the Bible.”⁷¹

“[Jastram] ... invokes the spirit of the age. ‘Changing social conditions have made it necessary for theologians to reexamine these teachings, and it is no longer as clear as it once seemed that such an application [the Order of Creation applying to society] is proper.’”

Jastram not only invokes “the Bible isn’t clear on this” but he invokes the spirit of the age. “Changing social conditions have made it necessary for theologians to reexamine these teachings, and it is no longer as clear as it once seemed that such an application [the Order of Creation applying to society] is proper.”⁷² By his own admission changing social conditions drive his theology. This is refreshing. Had the 1969 synodical convention, meeting at the absolute apogee of the feminist movement in America, admitted that changing social conditions and not Scripture had driven their decision to grant women the right to vote, we would see how weak the argument was. “Changing social conditions” is the argument the homosexual, and now the transsexual community, use to defend gay marriage, pastors, and parenting. Historically, changing social conditions caused us to change our teachings on the Boy Scouts and the military chaplaincy,⁷³ and in the 20th and early 21st centuries changing social conditions have caused us to do the same on living together, divorce, and civil prayer services.⁷⁴ When will it stop? It won’t because social conditions never stop changing.

Does the Order of Creation extend to society? If it’s a genuine order of *creation*, then it does. If it doesn’t it’s an order of the Home and Church but not Creation. Scripture calls on men to protect and care for woman and children (Deuteronomy 25:5-10; Isaiah 1:15-17; Jeremiah 22: 2-3). Does this only apply in the realm of Church and Home? Isn’t it much more needed in Creation? In 1 Corinthians 11:3 the Order of Creation is specifically given, “But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.” We saw how Thielicke stated this referenced married women only, and you see modern translations taking

this tack by translating instead of ‘woman’ ‘wife’. It’s true *γυνή* can be translated either way. However, Tertullian rejected the idea that Paul was only referring to married women, saying, “If man is the head of woman, then especially also of the virgin, who is the future married woman.”⁷⁵ But the real issue is is Christ the head only of married women? Is God the head of Christ only in Church and Home but not State too?

I cited Wayne Grudem earlier arguing that positive examples of women civil leaders in the Bible should prevent us from arguing that it is wrong for women to govern today. The homosexual community, likewise, has argued that positive examples of homosexual relations today should prevent us from applying what Scripture says about the negative examples in Scripture. The passages in Scripture are against *violent* homosexual acts not against the positive, nurturing gay relationships we have today. Likewise, the transsexual who is at peace with his or her new sexuality is positive proof that should prevent us from arguing against transsexualism.

Although Thielicke does much to argue against the Order of Creation, he maintains that it remains in force despite the attacks of men on it. He illustrates this by referring to the atheists. By denying the existence of God they don’t annul His existence. God remains God whether He is recognized or denied. Refusal to accept the Order of Creation, even I would add the way Thielicke himself does, does not cancel its existence or its claims on us.⁷⁶

Many argue against the Order of Creation based on the Order of the Fall. Some say it was a result of the Fall though this can be disproved by appealing to Genesis 2 and the creation of woman from the man who was made first. It can be disproved by appealing to Paul’s argument against women teaching *or* having authority over a man. He begins with the fact Adam was created first then Eve, and only then moves on to the Fall. The Fall doesn’t alter the Order of Creation. Women still bear children after the Fall, but now it is with travail and pain. Men still till the soil but now with the sweat of their brow. Man is still the head of woman but now the body desires the place of the head and the head seeks to tyrannize the body (Genesis 3:16) but the Order goes on.

The argument that the Order of Redemption cancels out both the Order of Creation and that of the Fall falls flat based on their proof passage, Galatians 3:28. “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free man,

“When we refuse to recognize there is a divine order to creation we don’t know where we belong. We stutter when we try to talk about the roles of men or women.”

there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.” After Paul wrote these divinely revealed words, both Jews and Greeks, slave and free remained, and women were women and men were men. It was the second century heretic Marcion, as far as I know, who first played off the Order of Creation against the Order of Redemption.⁷⁷

When we refuse to recognize there is a divine order to creation we don't know where we belong. We stutter when we try to talk about the roles of men or women. One can't say what the Marine Corps proudly used to: "We're looking for a few good men." Or what the Air Force still proclaims in huge granite letters at the entrance to the cadet living area: "Bring Me Men." And make no mistake it is not the feminine side of the Order that disquiets people but the masculine side, the only side that can produce fathers. C. S. Lewis says "the masculine none of us can escape. What is above and beyond all things is so masculine that we are feminine in relation to it. You had better agree with your adversary quickly."⁷⁸ Yes, "The ultimate purpose of the differentiation of the sexes is to point beyond itself to the relations God-creation and Christ-Church."⁷⁹

Catholic authoress Taylor Caldwell observed that "feminine nations and feminine men inevitably die or are destroyed by a masculine people."⁸⁰ You cannot have a masculine people without masculine fathers. Masculine fathers are not being produced by churches today, particularly not by the warm-fuzzy contemporary worship ones. The ancient secular historian Herodotus recounts Croesus instructions to Cyrus as to how to keep the Lydians loyal and prevent any danger from them in the future. "I suggest you put a veto upon their possession of arms. Make them wear tunics under their cloaks, and high boots, and then to teach their sons to play the zither and harp, and to start shop keeping. If you do that my lord, you will soon see them turn into women instead of men and there will not be any more danger of their rebelling against you."⁸¹

Men, future fathers, and fathers, are disappearing from the pews. In 1952, surveys said males made up 47% of those attending service. By 1986, it was 40%. In 1992, it was 43%. In 1996, worship services were only 28% male.⁸² I think this is in part because of the feminization of worship and leadership. A tyrannical state opposes fatherhood and churches that promote it. If the authority of the father is done away with, it is quickly transferred to the all-powerful state. When the power of fatherhood is not exercised – and it won't be if deprived of its legitimacy – in place of individual, accountable power comes institutional, anonymous, unaccountable powers and forces.⁸³

Fathers, in this year celebrating the famous words "Here I stand," stand in the place God has put you within the Order He created.

S.D.G.

Rev. Paul Harris

Pastor, Trinity Lutheran Church, Austin, TX

Appendix 1 – Women Suffrage

We have treated this subject as a "Seinfeld" episode treating the issue of homosexuality back when it was still permissible to cast aspersions on it. In that episode, the repeated line after professing not to be a homosexual is "Not that there's anything wrong with that." And those words said overly emphatically tell you there is definitely something still wrong with it. In 1969 congregations were *allowed* to have women's suffrage in their Voters Assemblies. By now most do. I can only think of 6 congregations in the Texas District that don't, and we hear "not that there is anything wrong with women not voting."

Congregations without women voting are getting in the way of the "women can do and be anything they want" lie that is told and retold till all but only hardened misogynist believe it.

The following story illustrates the problem with the lie that women can do and be anything. A woman had just returned from her National Organization of Women meeting. Her five-year-old daughter told her she wanted to be a nurse when she grew up. The mother with much indignation explained that just because you're a girl doesn't mean you have to settle for being a nurse. The mother told her she could be a surgeon, a lawyer, a banker, even the President. "You can be anything," the mother exclaimed! The girl asks, "Can I really be anything?" Yes, her mother assured her, she could. "All right," she said, "I'll be a horse."⁸⁴

Nobody can be or do anything they want. I will never be able to dunk a basketball or fly an F-18. My height prevents one and my eyesight the other. Men will never be able to naturally gestate or give birth to a child and women are not able spiritually to be pastors. The reasons for my inability to be a mother are manifestly physical. The reasons a woman cannot be a pastor aren't manifestly physical but spiritual, and here I refer only to the fact that the source of all true spirituality, the Holy Spirit, plainly forbids it. Not that women are somehow more spiritually deficient than men.

But the argument is that being a voter is not about being a pastor. It's either about being represented properly—an appeal to the spirit of democracy—or it is about serving—an appeal to stewardship. The Voters Assembly is *not* a representative assembly. It is a responsible and ruling one. The buck stops there. Those who wish to re-define voting to be merely polling could do that by changing their constitutions and bylaws to plainly say that the Voters Assembly is *not* the ruling assembly. This will not be done because of our understanding of Church and Ministry, and the sanctity of democracy in America.

However, if we emphasize that being a member of the Voters Assembly is not about *ruling* but *servicing* (I disagree and so does LCMS theology when it makes it the governing assembly.), we are giving women a backhanded compliment. They are fit for membership in the Voters because they have a greater capacity for serving.⁸⁵ Men can have the highest office in the church; women can have every single one below that.⁸⁶ They may serve men by accepting responsibility in the Voters Assembly, so the advocates of women suffrage would say who emphasize the 'servicing' nature of the Voters Assembly. Furthermore, they may serve us by lighting the candles, reading the lessons, ushering the people, and distributing Communion. However, will we happily let them serve us in those ways, even more than they already do, but then draw the line at any ruling?

"The reasons a woman cannot be a pastor aren't manifestly physical but spiritual, and here I refer only to the fact that the source of all true spirituality, the Holy Spirit, plainly forbids it."

Won't giving women more areas of service to men just enflame the fallen desire to have his place of authority?

You have to redefine voting to not be an expression of rule, and that is virtually impossible to do in a republic like the United States that is fast moving toward the pure democracy our forefathers feared and that the internet makes a possibility. When the Voters Assembly on behalf of the church elects the pastor, as is the case in the Waltherian system, all rule is vested and exercised by them. The 1955 book *The Office of Women* which I took to task for wobbling on the Order of Creation was nevertheless clear on this score. Zerbst says, "Therefore, Paul strives to set forth clearly that wherever the authority to rule the congregation is conferred upon woman, there the subordination of woman is nullified."⁸⁷ If women have the authority to elect a pastor then Aristotle's observation applies: "But what difference does it make whether women rule, or the rulers [the pastors elected] are ruled by women? The result is the same."⁸⁸ And so does this observation by Chrysostom, "The divine law indeed has excluded women from the ministry, but they endeavor to thrust themselves into it; and since they can affect nothing of themselves, they do all through the agency of others; and they have become invested with so much power they can appoint or reject priests at their will."⁸⁹ The hand that rocks the cradle can rock not just the world but the church.

Appendix 2 – The Same Old Shibboleths

Whenever women pastoring, voting, ruling, or leading is brought up the same old shibboleths are. What about Deborah? Wasn't Paul simply reflecting the view of his time – after all we have our own theologians saying that Luther was in this regard? Besides didn't Paul have a problem with women?

In Herod's temple, women were excluded from the Court of the Men. This wasn't how it was in the tabernacle or Solomon's temple. This shows that this bit of misogyny was Jewish not Christian. The Jews in fact had a prayer in which an Israelite praises God for not having created him a Gentile or a woman or ignorant. The pagans were no better. A prayer attributed to Socrates has him saying he is glad to be alive not as an animal but a human, not as a woman but as a man, not as a barbarian but a Greek.⁹⁰

In first century Rome, behavior of a women in public, especially in the cities, more and more was like that of men. Her daily life and presence at every type of function was not distinguishable from that of men. She went on visits; attended receptions, theater, concerts, travelled on summer trips without her husband going as far as Egypt without him sometimes. She had conferences with the overseer of her own estate and discussions with her lawyer were all done exactly as a man. "Thus, in the environment of early Christianity, emancipation was taken even further in some respects than it is today, which means that the widespread characterization of late antiquity as 'patriarchal' has to be questioned."⁹¹ Late antiquity was already contrary to the Biblical Order of Creation.

In ancient Greece and Rome women's position in regard to property rights was equal to that of men. In the middle and upper classes, the same was true in regard to occupations. There were female goldsmiths, medical doctors,

and estate owners. In Rome, we hear of female bosses in some manual trades and shipyards. In matters of marriage and divorce both sexes were practically independent. Still in Greece women were excluded from public affairs and were considered inferior beings. Plato believed that the man who failed in this life was reborn a woman and then an animal. The emancipation of women from the domestic sphere came with the Roman empire and so was there in New Testament times.⁹²

In almost all ways women shared equal rights with men and were initiated into all the mysteries of their religion. They often performed the religious ceremonies in the cults of Cybele, Attis, and Dionysus. In the last "all distinctions between men and women, adults and children, freemen and slaves were broken down." In the cult of Isis there were numerous priestesses. In one famous hymn to her it was said, "You have given women the same power as men."⁹³ Thus Paul's words to Timothy and to Corinth were counter-culture on several levels. You might say they were out of this world, and being from the realm of the Holy Spirit, they were.

Over the decades, I have answered hundreds of times the argument that if Deborah did it so can you. Already in the 4th century appeals were made concerning the daughters of Philip, Anna, Miriam, Deborah, and Huldah. Origen countered that these women never spoke in public in the presence of men. Origen doesn't reject every sort of teaching by women but only public official teaching through which women assume superiority over men.⁹⁴

That's the argument from the Roman Catholic side. The Evangelical Protestant argument is: Deborah is not found in a passage about leadership in the New Testament church but in the Old Testament at a time when many unusual events occurred among God's people, events the Bible doesn't intend us to imitate, i.e., Samson and Jephthah. Miriam and Huldah had some sort of prophetic gifts but they occur in contexts that clearly affirm male leadership, and they are not in contexts dealing with who is to govern or teach in the church. Priscilla speaks to Apollos yet the passage doesn't discuss governing or teaching in the assembly but is a private conversation. Phoebe does carry Paul's letter but the passage about it doesn't deal with teaching or governing in the church either. Philip's daughters prophesied and it seems women prophesied in the Corinthian church but this isn't governing or teaching either. "So where is there any example of women doing

“Philip’s daughters prophesied and it seems women prophesied in the Corinthian church but this isn’t governing or teaching either.”



Want to Read the *Clarion* Online?

If you would rather receive a digital version of the *Clarion* in your electronic mailbox, please send your email address to Ginny Valleau at gzolson2000@yahoo.com. We will remove your name from the hard copy mail list and add it to the email list.

what egalitarians claim they should be able to do, that is, exercising governing or teaching authority over an assembled church? There is no example at all in the entire Bible.”⁹⁵

- 65 Thielicke, 11.
 66 Ibid., 236.
 67 Ibid., 240.
 68 Ibid., Italics original, 203.
 69 Ibid., 235.
 70 Jastram, 75.
 71 “Doctrinal Resolutions of the LCMS 1929-2004,” 69.
 72 Jastram, 76.
 73 In the panel discussion that followed this was challenged. The Reverend Doctor Daniel Gard, a retired Naval Reserve chaplain, said that from the Civil War on the LCMS has always had chaplains. This is true, but it has been controversial from WW I till now. Here is what Mark E. Braun asserts in his 2003 book *A Tale of Two Synods*: “Despite these instances of past chaplaincy service, the Missouri and Wisconsin synods both officially opposed involvement in the government’s military chaplaincy program during World War I.” This quote is from page 76. If you read pages 74-93 you will see how our position evolved or devolved, depending on your position, but it most certainly *did* change. In the panel discussion, I expressed my ambivalence on this particular issue. I served as an Army Reserve chaplain for 12 years. In order to do this, you have to agree to do memorial services for fallen comrades with all faith groups. These are viewed by the LCMS as functions of command (the military) and not as functions of the church. These, however, are the very civil religious prayer services that we oppose, and rightly so, outside the military. I participated in such memorial services during and after the First Gulf War as an Army Reserve chaplain. Where does my ambivalence come in then? If any of my sons were in the military I would want them to have access to a faithful confessional Lutheran pastor. However, I resigned my commission in 1995 because I was not allowed to do my annual training at Fort Polk unless I agreed to do a unionistic—actually syncretistic—service. My only point in the paper, however, is that the LCMS has historically changed her positions according to the prevailing view of society, see footnote below, and we have done so in regard to the Order of Creation and we are on the trajectory to do so on women pastors and eventually on LGBTQ issues.
 74 These changes are usually in response to a laity who finds themselves increasingly at odds with the society around them. “Put in another way, synodical spokesmen somewhat hesitantly followed their laity—but lagged at a distance. “Then, in time, some older church men changed their minds, and new leaders emerged to approach things from a different perspective. The result was usually a theology or a ‘theologization’ depending on one’s perspective, of moderate lay practice. In the twentieth century, this happened repeatedly on one question after another in lay life.” Graebner, Alan, *Uncertain Saints*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press (1975), 117-118.
 75 In Zerbst, 87.
 76 Thielicke, 114.
 77 Hauke, 350.
 78 Lewis, C. S., *That Hideous Strength*. New York: Scribner, 1945, 315-316.
 79 Hauke, 481.
 80 Caldwell, T., *Dear and Glorious Physician*. San Francisco: Ignatius, 2008, 397.
 81 *Herodotus*, I, 155, 62-63.
 82 Grudem, 378.
 83 Hauke, 227.
 84 Green, 308.
 85 Hauke, 261.
 86 Hauke, 424-5.
 87 Zerbst, 120.
 88 *Politics*, 2, IX, 46.
 89 “On the Priesthood,” NPNF, IX, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988, 49
 90 Hauke, 346.

- 91 Ibid., 342.
 92 Ibid., 340-341.
 93 Ibid., 343-344.
 94 Ibid., 410.
 95 Grudem, 365.

Book Review: “This I Recall” by Dr. John W. Behnken, Revised Edition, Concordia Publishing House 2014, \$20.99.

“This I Recall” should be read by every adult of our Synod. It is a highly readable book that gives the background of many Lutheran events after Rev. Behnken was elected Synod president in 1935—the first American born LCMS president.

President Behnken was born in 1884 in a parsonage in Cypress, TX. His father died when he was almost four. He graduated from St. John’s College in Winfield, KS, and Concordia Seminary, in Saint Louis. The book shows the frugality of Behnken throughout his life. As Synodical president 1935-1962, he traveled by train because railroads of that era provided clergy passes.

Dr. Behnken’s unswerving dedication to Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions shines. In the postscript, son-in-law retired Seminary Professor Rev. William Schmelder included Behnken sermon extracts that pastors today should heed, e.g.,

Since the Bible is the product of the Holy Spirit, we are assured that it is God’s infallible truth. It is well for us preachers to remember this fact. If we want to speak with authority, if we want our hearers to be convinced of the truth of our message, then we must preach what the Holy Ghost has revealed in Holy Writ. I want to plead with all of you to proclaim—not the wisdom of men, not political messages, not mere sermons on moral uplift, not sensational addresses on topics of the day, but the glorious truths of the inspired Word of God. Remember that blood-bought souls have been entrusted to your care. You are to preach to them what God wants them to hear, the precious Word of God, which Jesus Christ declared: ‘Sanctify them through Thy truth. Thy Word is truth.’ John 17:17 [KJV]... p. 210.

Contrast that to what is so often “preached” today.

The revised edition contains the August 6, 1966, letter to Concordia Seminary, “Some Questions Concerning Statements in God’s Holy Word.” Dr. Behnken posed more than 28 questions on the facticity, inspiration, infallibility and authority of Scripture. In 1969, Synodical President J. A. O. Preus appointed a Blue Ribbon Fact Finding Committee to ascertain what was really being taught at that Seminary. The 1971 Synodical Convention by Resolution directed the Seminary Board of Control (BOC) to act. At the first meeting of the BOC this reviewer attended in 1971, Chairman Rev. George Loose referred to the Milwaukee Convention directive and the 1966 Behnken letter. He said former Seminary President Fuerbringer asked him what to do with that letter and he told him, “Pitch it in the circular file.”

As a famous radio broadcaster said, “Stay tuned for the rest of the story.” Buy Rev. Behnken’s “This I Recall,” and you will invest in food for your eternal soul.

Mr. Walter Dissen, Esq.
 Chesapeake, VA

The Lutheran Clarion

The official publication of the Lutheran Concerns Association, a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization.
Circulation: 6,000



Published regularly to support issues and causes in The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod which build faithfulness to true Confessional Lutheranism and to be a clear voice of Christian concern against actions and causes which conflict with faithfulness to the One True Faith. LCA consents to readers reproducing articles provided the entire article, plus footnotes, is included in the reproduction and full attribution given.

The address for all matters pertaining to the LCA is:
149 Glenview Drive
New Kensington, PA 15068-4921

Editorial Board: Mr. Walter Dissen (Chairman)
Rev. Jerome Panzigrau
Dr. John F. Lang

Mrs. Ginny Valleau: Layout, Printing & Mailing

Faithful Lutherans who are members of LCMS congregations are invited to submit articles of approximately 500 words for consideration. Inquiries are welcome. Manuscripts will be edited. Views and judgments expressed in articles are the author's own and do not necessarily represent those of LCA. Please email articles to Mr. Walter Dissen (wdissen@aol.com; 757-436-2049).

The Board of Directors for the LCA:

Mr. Walter Dissen (Chairman)
Mr. Mark Franke (Vice-Chairman)
Rev. Jerome Panzigrau (Secretary-Treasurer)

Rev. Dr. Kristian Kincaid Dr. John Rahe
Dr. John F. Lang Mr. Leon L. Rausch
Rev. Dr. Martin Noland Mr. Winfried K. Strieter
Rev. Andrew Preus

<http://www.lutheranclarion.org>

Lutheran Concerns Association
May 2018



Lutheran Concerns Association
149 Glenview Drive
New Kensington, PA 15068-4921