

**Women in Combat: Undermining a Civilization's Right to
Exist**

IDE Symposium: The Just War Doctrine

Rev. John Christian Preus

Trinity Lutheran Church, Clinton, IA

May 21, 2016

As the United States of America, why do we go to war? What is our nation imposing? What is our nation preserving? I believe these are the most important question when considering the topic I have been assigned. So in this paper, with these questions in mind, I'd like to demonstrate that the arming of women for combat does at least three things, in no particular order: 1st, it renders our nation exceptionally unqualified to impose its will on other sovereign nations. 2nd, it undermines our nation's justification for defending itself as a sovereign nation. And 3rd, it mocks the very purpose of national sovereignty itself, which stems from the existence of the home, and which is entrusted to the guardianship of representative lords for the preservation of the same. The home is where virtue and culture are nurtured. Although etymology proves nothing, it is telling that *dominus* [lord] finds its root in the word *domus* [home]. To dominate a people while not honoring the domicile is the essence of tyranny. A righteous dominion is one that upholds the domestic domain.

The manner in which a nation engages in combat, specifically whom it sends to fight, gives us a pretty clear indication as to what that nation openly regards as worth preserving in its homeland. Whether it be mercenaries or slaves, draftees or

volunteers, machines, poison gas, or, of course, boys or girls, what you face in battle gives you a privileged glimpse into the soul of your enemy. The members of a man's household represent him in how they interact with the larger community. And they do so in such a manner either befitting or betraying the integrity of how he runs the affairs of his home.

Therefore, by way of somewhat speculative and totally uncited pontification, with this comparison in mind, or rather with this intrinsic relationship in mind between the estate of the family and the estate of the government, I would like to trace where the corruption of our nation began regarding women in combat. I would further like to investigate what philosophical weeds must first be rooted out before such iniquity can begin to be rectified. More likely, though, I will probably only end up identifying what exactly, among other sins, God is going to judge this nation for. It's kind of a downer, I know, merely to ask: *Where did we go wrong? Why is our fruit so rotten?* But by cursing the darkness of our culture with perhaps a little insight, I hope at least to help keep the candle lit where it remains shining in your homes, which of course is where true culture is fostered anyway.

Imposing Justice and Preserving Liberty:

The purpose of war is to impose and preserve. We can't consider the justice or injustice of war at all if we don't get this straight. As regards what the United States of America should impose, a nation rightly imposes nothing on another unless there is a threat that directly affects its own sovereignty and thus the safety of its own citizens. In such a case, therefore, what a

nation imposes on another is justice - always for the sake of its own liberty. This is how it executes God's wrath. This may come in the form of defense against invaders or in the form of offense against instigators. But either way, it is an imposition of justice in order to defend what is good within itself, namely the common welfare of those being defended.

A nation does not and cannot impose liberty since that is an oxymoron. It *fosters* liberty. It *defends* liberty. Indeed, a nation executes justice within and without for the sake of its own *domestic* liberty. A nation cannot impose liberty on another nation any more than I can impose the tranquility of my home on yours. It is not a father, after all who *imposes* liberty on his own home. It is his wife, the mother of his children, who *fosters* it by teaching their children through word and example to honor their father, thus reinforcing the justice of his headship. He procures liberty, but does not impose it. She fosters liberty, but cannot provide it. Though the purpose of his retaliation is not to impose such liberty on others, yet a jealous father's fury toward those outside his home, or his sternness toward one of his own, will necessarily demonstrate what it is about his home that he wishes to preserve and protect. Both stranger and child thus witness for themselves that justice is done for the sake of liberty - defined and delineated by the domestic life.

The most I can hope for in affecting your home to be like mine is to influence you by example of success and happiness, and by righteous retaliation when these things are threatened by you or someone else. By defending it, I am promoting it. And by promoting it, I am defending the individuals that comprise it in

their various stations. When a community of likeminded householders holds each other to such common standards, this germinates the first seeds of culture and establishes the principle purpose of civil law beyond the home. It is also the basis for those organic means of cohesion such as covenants of marriage, commerce, defense, etc., by which one influences others and precipitates what is noble and healthy. Righteous rulers are wise, therefore, to facilitate the maintenance and self-sufficiency of the well ordered home.

Pursuing justice does not exist in a vacuum. One does not see iniquity and address it in order for liberty to spontaneously arise. No. We pursue justice always to defend that structure which already is.

A nation cannot impose liberty on others. Though one might argue with some anecdotal justification (maybe? no?) that a nation may *depose* foreign tyrants, yet even then, liberty itself is not *imposed*. Rather its opposite is simply *opposed* in order that those formerly subjected to tyranny might then be freed to *suppose* that form of government which they deem most fitting for themselves. This may or may not be a very liberal form of government created in our own image. The void will more likely be filled by another form of tyranny in the likeness of the one just overthrown. Alexander the Great, for instance, did not spread Hellenism by mere conquest, but by retaining, lest his conquest be for naught, those natural structures that his new lieges had always depended on to exist.

For instance, I might witness the sorry situation of others and actively work to have an abusive father arrested and removed from his home. That might be a just end for the father. But it does not necessarily vouchsafe for the wife and children anything better – unless I place them under *my* authority, I suppose. In such a case they will likely chafe under my unsolicited patronage. Or else they will take it for granted and neglect those virtues and habits that I sought to safeguard, thus negating the purpose of my patronage. This is an indictment against nanny-state socialism as well as imperialistic nation building, which are wrong. But more specifically I make this point to demonstrate the connection between justice and liberty in the home, and thus also in a nation. Justice does not create liberty. It is rather executed for the sake of liberty. War creates homelessness, fatherlessness, widowhood, etc. We engage in it, therefore, only and always to promote peace, that is, to protect peace where it is our responsibility to protect it, not to create it elsewhere. Tending to our own affairs is, in the grand scheme, under God’s almighty control, and as we witness by the many unintended, “collateral” consequences of war, tends to the greatest peaceability and quietness for both us and other nations.

Sure the Iraqi people were freed from Hussein. Saddam deserved to die. But just as the woman whose deadbeat husband is locked away finds another bum to take his place, without the available structure of domestic/political coherence and virtue, such freedom is a fleeting illusion. Either the home is well ordered or there is no hope to improve a domestic

culture. Freedom requires not mere responsibility. That maxim falls short because it fails to consider the conditions under which freedom is always granted. Freedom is the natural result of God-given duties justly ordered, managed, and protected. What obtains in the home obtains in the nation.

Liberty and peace cannot be imposed on a family any more than on a nation. Justice can be executed. Liberty, however, must be nurtured in the minds of those who are taught to cherish righteousness and who desire to practice it in peace. For this, there must be a self-regulated basis undergirding the power of centralized authority. This is what I mean by culture. It requires the distinctive obligations of men (who seek justice) and women (who nurture liberty) being met for the sake of their children (who, learning the relationship between the two, perpetuate it where it is best preserved).

Nations are improved the same way families are improved. It happens not merely by the removal of vice, but the inculcation of virtue. It requires not only the execution of justice, but the nurturing of liberty. The success of a nation is patterned upon the success of a family. Therefore, the means by which a nation promotes its own right to exist (let alone defends itself) is by recognizing the unique roles that men and women play in the home and by running its own affairs not merely as a rough model of function, but in a way that encourages this order as society's highest good.

Just as pursuing justice does not exist in a vacuum, nor does liberty. It has a context. It cannot be seized, let alone

maintained, by just anyone, but only by those who appreciate the natural environment whence such liberal conditions arise. Political freedom is the product of time-tested and virtuous culture. It is nothing more than the wherewithal to impose order upon ourselves and those subject to us - order that is congenial and fitting for the mutual maintenance of peace and prosperity among those who have the same end in common if not also the same means.

Thus the freedom which we Christians generally mean by the word freedom is properly that which exists in the natural order of the household, not the personal independence of one who would cut off natural ties to his community and/or overthrow every social yoke that maintains functional cohesion. As I said before, justice is executed not merely as an end in itself, but with the hope that its fruit might thereby be preserved in so doing. The fruit of justice is liberty among those who earnestly pursue what is righteous. It is a real blessing when our fatherland reflects the same sense of peace, liberty, and justice that our fathers' homes more immediately rely upon. To a great extent, by God's grace it still does, despite the evidence of rapid decay that tends to confirm us in our cynicism.

Dictating the Common Cause:

A father dictates. Thus a home enjoys freedom as it heeds the voice of its head. A political dictatorship may likewise do a fine job of securing and promoting liberty insofar as the dictator is virtuous and committed to what makes a home happy and successful. But if he undermines the home, which is the basis

for his own right to rule, he becomes a despotic dictator rather than a benevolent and wise king. But this is not because he chooses to do what each of his subjects didn't explicitly request – that is not what makes him a despot – no more than a good father is beholden to the whims of his household. No. It is because he has failed to represent each subject's common right to exist as whatever particular member he is and to reap the natural rewards for so living. The way he does so is by having regard for the unique value and relative sovereignty of a man's home. As a man orders his household, so his wife teaches those who live under him to find satisfaction in the fulfillment of their duties. This is freedom.

We do not currently live under a dictatorship. Such a form of government has always tended to spiral swiftly into oppressive tyranny. So instead of having rulers rule by the compass of their own vulnerable sense of virtue, our American form of government was devised to represent more safely the virtue of its constituents instead – by a division of the three branches of power with checks and balances on each. This was not so much revolutionary as conservative. It is based on our English heritage concerning the rights of free men. Our rulers dictate, to be sure. But they do so according to their legal obligation to uphold the lot and interests of those they represent. They have a duty toward the lower magistrates whose more immediate jurisdiction is the basis for their own. Justice for the sake of liberty is always better preserved in familial and local communities, which are its natural stewards and nurturers. Therefore, rather than to private individuals, it is to this

domestic institution that a just ruler is primarily obligated. Herein lies the justification for both secession and conscientious objection in cases where it can be justified – not as to personal naysayers, but as to heads of homes primarily.

The basis for limited, local governance as a principle on which to stand is not anarchistic at all. Nor is it some peculiar form of libertinism. No! Very much the opposite! It is the recognition that the primary referent in the 4th Commandment is the parental office of mother and father in the home. Limited central, and stronger local, control is based on the biblical commitment to, and Christian justification for, patriarchy, namely the proper order and roles for men and women in the domestic estate.

Such a government based on representation is also not incompatible with monarchy. What makes a government tyrannical is not the centralization of power so much as the negligence of promoting this more basic form of itself: the home. The King protects. The President defends. What? Protects what? Defends what? People? Their liberty? How? By defending those institutions of God upon which people depend and upon which the need for and justification of centralized authority is based. Thus a limited government in line with Christian and natural law principles is not necessarily limited by power (though practically it usually is). Rather it is limited by the duty to preserve the domestic estate. This duty is so clearly appealed to in the grievances of the Declaration of Independence, for example, and codified in the Bill of Rights.

To raise arms in a free society, therefore, does not indicate a nation's authority over its own subjects, but the moral fortitude of its subjects in opposing that which would threaten their common way of life. For this reason even the right to bear arms guaranteed in the 2nd Amendment is expressly justified for the sake of "*a well-regulated Militia*" and its necessity "*to the security of a free State.*" This obviously safeguards personal self-defense and hunting. But it is clear that even as these themselves are safeguarded, the primary purpose of this amendment is to protect individuals *by means of protecting communities* from subversive threats of tyranny over the home.

To dictate justly is to speak the common voice, not of each individual, but reflecting those universal mores that bind individuals together, which mores are nothing more than the variously reflected commitments to the natural order of the home. This truth is denied not only by conscription in general, when those who have no domestic urgency to fight are forced to anyway, but also by unjust military ventures inasmuch as such campaigns do nothing to protect the home or, therefore, the nation. So much more obviously is this truth denied when young women are encouraged to abandon their natural roles and to assume the duties befitting their fathers and brothers instead – to pursue justice with no thought as to whose duty it is to foster the liberty that makes such a pursuit worthwhile. It is denied because it subverts the very thing that just war would seek to preserve: community, family, and yes, the patriarchy that represents both.

Raising Arms Bares the Soul of a Nation:

Whatever a nation justly imposes upon another, always being for the sake of its own defense, the real question comes down to what a nation desires to (conspicuously) *preserve* in itself. An enemy who faces slaves on the field of battle rightly concludes that (for good or bad) that enemy which he fights seeks to preserve slavery, and so on. So then what does an enemy suppose we aim to preserve when he meets one of our woman in combat? Don't get me wrong. Who cares what an enemy nation thinks, right? And yet we must. We do.

Even as we invoke God as our witness our just cause, so we symbolize his favor and approval in as clear and dignified a way as we can by fighting with the integrity becoming a righteous people. We do so in the presence of those we face. For this reason we fly our flag in battle - so that the execution of justice might have a face in the eyes of those we punish. For this reason our Constitution requires a two-thirds majority of the nation's *legislative* representatives before we declare war, since by presenting troops on the battle field, our common commitment to them is thereby represented. For this reason the 6th Amendment guarantees that an accused party "*be confronted with the witnesses against him,*" not only for his sake in the case of innocence, but for his sake also in the case of guilt - to silence any naysayers who would question the justice of his conviction.

And so for this reason, the executors of justice who represent our nation in battle compose themselves with the dignity that befits our righteous retaliation. They represent the cause of the nation and all its constituent parts, the hope for its future in the event that they prevail, and the righteous cry for justice in the

event that they fail. A decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that we represent our cause in battle by the very manner in which we wage it.

This requires that those who fight in battle be those who at home have the duty to seek justice, not those who have the duty to nurture liberty. A wicked nation ignores the sacred structure of the home in order to defend its homeland.

To be sure, a wicked nation could be justified in defending itself – a nation, say, that sends women and children to do their fighting. Yet in defeat their blood could hardly cry justly to avenge the nation, and in victory their celebration would only herald the triumph of iniquity. By presuming to sue for justice it sues for the right to exist as it is: unjust – and so reveals its wickedness by the very act of wanting to preserve and perpetuate its savagery.

Take any Islamic country for example. What they desire to preserve is evil – a caricature and mockery of the order of creation. Yet, we can hardly fault them for chafing under the yoke of western imperialism. They chafe because they want to preserve their filthy culture, to be sure, from what they see as bad – not just the physical threat of our military, but the cultural influences of our secular apostasy. See! Even they are motivated by a preservation of their albeit savage homes. For this reason, we cannot deny that oppressed minorities benefit when such nations are left alone to carry on with their status quo since even their status quo cannot help but unwittingly uphold a father's right to run his household. For good or bad,

patriotism is kindled when a nation fights a war of defense. (For good if the host patria is good, for evil if the host patria is evil.) So are they justified in defending themselves against preemptive attack by the west? Of course! So is any nation. God blesses a just cause. And yet, it is either a nation's virtue and right to exist, or else a nation's vice and worthiness to be conquered, that shines forth when it takes arms to defend itself.

This pertains to the use of terror as a tactic in warfare; it pertains to the undue use of chemical weapons and weapons of mass destruction; it pertains to suicide attacks. Just as much it pertains to the sex of the soldiers a nation sends to war. All these things indicate not the justification for a preemptive attack against them - no! - but their own lack of justification for existing. Muslims shoot themselves in the foot when they fight the way they fight, because by doing so they indicate what they fight for. So do we. They have every right to defend themselves. No doubt. So do we. And yet they have no right to exist as a civilization. Whether *we* should wipe them out is another question. Whether God should is beyond dispute. And he will. But whom will he punish first?

American Heritage:

Our nation has a long history of defending itself, and presenting its cause in the very manner of warfare it implemented. From scouts and woodland snipers defending their own land to neighborhood militias headed by jealous fathers and sons, this nation's first quest for independence was demonstrably a concern for domestic tranquility. And so the

justice of their cause was reflected in the manner they fought for it. Conceived and built on the zealous desire of its citizens to enjoy liberty, and practice justice in their families and communities, the causes which impelled them to rise to arms for independence were fundamentally those unlawful impositions on their homes, as well as on those commercial institutions designed and intended for the preservation and promotion of the same. This has clearly changed. Or rather, history has repeated itself.

By sending girls into battle, no less than nation-building, imperialistic hegemony, or taxation without representation, it is quite clearly not the preservation of the home that our nation currently aims to promote. It is a mockery of the home. For this reason the merit of that ostensible cultural foundation of western civilization (i.e. the Christian Church), which even our Deist founders knew enough to acknowledge, is mocked by the nations on account of those presumptive tyrants who present in battle not what makes our nation fit to survive but what indicates the deep decay that even savages find abhorrent. Even if it *were* a just war they were waging, imagine if our troops flew a rainbow flag when they overtook some terrorist cell. This is the practical symbolism of sending women to do men's work.

They fight for freedom, they say. But what does this even mean? Freedom is not synonymous with autonomy any more than justice is synonymous with totalitarianism. To fight for freedom is not to fight for self-realization. To be free is to maintain the God-given wherewithal to be what God created us to be: to be ruled by our fathers and nurtured by our mothers

until we might become what they themselves were free to be (heirs of both their customs and their means of perpetuating virtue). It is to this self-evident purpose of the home that St. Paul appeals in Galatians 3 and 4.¹ This is also the self-evident purpose of a justly ordered and defended society. The quest for freedom is necessarily conservative even as it expresses itself in economic and military concerns. Otherwise it undermines itself as a noble pursuit either a) by divorcing the individual from his community and God-given duties, or b) by imposing a foreign standard upon those who would rather live as their fathers lived. To dismantle the family produces a nation of slaves who never learn to grow from sons to fathers, and from daughters to mothers. Freedom to progress is self-defeating unless it is governed by the duty to preserve.

The so-called Revolutionary War, better titled the War for Independence, was a conservative resistance against tyranny, not a progressive retaliation against convention. It was fought not so much to start a new thing, but to preserve an old thing. It was not a propositional idea – something that Reason told them was theirs to take by force. It was an experiment commended to the Providence of God. They sought to implement something that was already theirs, rooted in common law tradition and bequeathed to them as a domestic patrimony. But it was in danger of being stolen. That is why they did not declare independence with a logical syllogism explaining why they *should* be free. No. They gave a rhetorical appeal to the justice

¹ “Therefore the law was our tutor to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after faith has come, we are no longer under a tutor. ... Now I say that the heir, as long as he is a child, does not differ at all from a slave, though he is master of all, but is under guardians and stewards until the time appointed by the father.” (Galatians 3:24-25, 4:1-2)

of their cause – to govern themselves as free men born of free men. For this reason, they came not to mathematical conclusions as to every man’s right to be free, but pledged their lives and sacred honor to each other for the preservation of what they inherited.

The reason this matters is because the right to sue for independence is not something that one can prove he has by a bare appeal to reason. This would presuppose that freedom was his natural state of existence. No, the founders did not appeal to what any intelligent man could claim for himself; they appealed to what only free men could claim – men who, on the basis of the culture and traditions and prerogatives they inherited from their fatherland, could make an appeal to the justice that was now being denied them. In other words, they did not set out as men justly fighting to build a free home. No, they started with the home, and for its preservation men carried on with their duties to protect it for the sake of the women and children who inhabited it.

When Abraham Lincoln ignored these principles by instigating war with the Southern States who, regardless of the rectitude of slavery, sought to preserve their homes, he precipitated the notion of freedom as a propositional idea rather than the domestic experiment it was. No longer was war regarded as primarily to defend oneself against usurpation of lawful authority or from violation of natural rights, because no longer was sovereign government primarily intended to represent and protect the home as free householders saw best fit to run them. Mid-war, Lincoln’s justification for fighting got tied up with the

sanctimonious abolitionist movement so as to present the cause as a cause for justice. Because of this, many Northern supporters thought they were defending their homeland from an invasive moral evil. But they weren't. They were fighting for the triumph of an idea - an idea of freedom divorced from the place where freedom is nurtured. This resulted from and lent itself to the growing popularity of what would become the social gospel movement. Freedom as a lofty idea - disconnected from the home, let alone the homeland (not to mention the spiritual freedom that the gospel actually delivered) - has been growing in the minds of our nation ever since. This has had consequences.

Just Representation within a Free Society:

"Freedom's just another word for nothing left to lose." So sang the hopelessly placeless Janis Joplin who died of an overdose of freedom in her late 20s. She didn't know what freedom was. She was taught (or at least falsely concluded) that freedom was the state of having no tethers binding you to anything - hence, *"nothing left to lose."* How tragic! Such who think like this are truly to be pitied. This reflects the false and hopeless understanding of freedom by most people today.

When liberty is defined as an individual state of being, children are raised to regard their most felicitous status outside of the home, freed from the constraints of patriarchy. But being freed from the patriarchy, they cut themselves off from the matriarchy through which those useful prejudices necessary for freedom are ingrained. It is through these home-nurtured prejudices that

one is enabled to navigate as a truly free person who benefits society at large rather than roam as a vagabond who lives as a parasite on domestic virtue and success. Such an understanding of placeless freedom does not promote virtue, since one is thereby encouraged to seek his own above others. When the matriarchal duties are abandoned as oppressive since they do not tend toward autonomy but undesired service instead, then the patriarchal duties, detached from that noble context that justifies its priority, are also attacked as a threat to personal fulfillment. As the family decays so does the fabric of society, and vice versa.

So while men seek to maintain order, and women have nothing to nurture, it is only natural that Feminism should swoop in to offer a brand new *raison d'être* to replace the one just abandoned. In other words, seeking justice outside the home as individual agents, people are likewise left to pursue tranquility outside that divinely ordained structure of the home where each sex, age, and measure of talent finds its useful function. What caused what I can't presume to know. Surely both libertinism and feminism are hand-in-hand among the most ancient forms of sin.

The practice of sending women to combat reflects our culture as much as it deforms it. Inasmuch as feminism seeks to define womanhood apart from its natural use and unique benefit to others, its fruits can be identified also by critiquing the cult of individualism.

As regards the purpose of warfare, we can trace this social illness in the shifting motivation for Americans to fight for their country. Remember those recruitment commercials in the 90s? “*Be all that you can be – in the Army.*” Or later on: “*Army of one.*” Other examples might come to mind. No longer is patriotism promoted by speaking of the enduring value of the homeland, but by speaking of the potential to improve and fulfill yourself. It’s almost like it has already been conceded that there is nothing that ties our soldiers together on the battle field as they fight for house and home any more than a group of jocks who each hope to reap as much glory as possible. There is no “*I*” in team. Sure. We must work together. But the end goal and motivation for success is encouraged not by the appealing to the permanent things that unite these boys as sons of the same fathers, but by promises of fealty to the almighty Me. Instead of being encouraged to come and fight for a cause that they all share – in that which binds them together as a nation – they are recruited by appealing to their common commitment to no one but themselves.

If our boys, why not our girls? Are they not just as autonomous? If men are to be men unto themselves and not for the sake of their sacred duties to home, why should a woman tend to that boring and increasingly empty abode which is no longer even the thing that the boys are encouraged to fight for? If for *me* I fight – for the idea of freedom that *I* also want – why should girls feel excluded?

As these latter generations are encouraged to represent their nation by force, so they were first encouraged to represent their

nation by voice. Again, this is not a voice of community, but of individual. They are taught to function as a whole as a necessary evil for the sake of the individual. We hear this. Calling government a necessary evil is wrong. It is instituted by God. He instituted it when he gave Adam dominion over creation, and when he confirmed Noah's duty to shed the blood of anyone who violently seeks justice outside of the rule of law. Civil government is an extension of the home for the preservation of homes.

The purpose of government is not to represent individual needs except as it represents the foundational institutions whereby God meets those needs. Democracy as it is understood today is therefore a monstrous caricature of representative government. Universal suffrage undermines the purpose of legitimate government because it fails to promote the more fundamental duty of householders, lords, patriarchs, and boys trained to be actual men. This duty is to rule, protect, and represent that microcosm of society known as the family. In order to fulfill this duty, such men must vouchsafe to the mistresses of their homes the leisure and means to foster virtue among their children and domestic associates. He does this not only by supporting the home financially, but by facing every threat against it, as Psalm 127 says, "*They shall speak with the enemies in the gate.*"

The very purpose of representative democracy, therefore, is for heads of home to represent the needs and rights of their households. While his children are like arrows in the hands of a warrior, which he raises up to fight off foreign and domestic threats that would subvert their tranquility, it is not he who fills

his quiver, but God. They are a gift, a heritage from the Lord. So is his wife who sharpens those tools in the home. She does so by fostering virtue and instilling the wisdom that her husband has the divine duty to teach his children. Just as he represents her needs outside the home, she represents his needs inside the home. His children are arrows which he brings with him when he does - his sons to strike the hearts of enemies who aim to dismantle what God gave by nature and right and to establish new homes representing the same virtue and religion - his daughters to strike the hearts of prospective husbands who do well to take them as brides and perpetuate, through and with their influence and encouragement which they bring with them from their father's home, this beautiful and tranquil estate.

Our needs as individuals are not necessarily represented by speaking up and being heard, but by being among those who share the common virtue that we depend on - by seeking out and promoting and upholding that community we live in. So also in defending such a treasure, as much if not more as in choosing and vouchsafing it, there is no need for every individual to represent him or herself - whether at the voting booth or on the battle field. But much more so is there need rather for there to be a common commitment to righteousness by all members! It is this commitment that elect members rise to give voice to or take arms for as the duty arises.

The reason women want to fight in combat is for the same reason that they want to vote. They want to be represented. They want their own strengths to be appreciated and used. But a woman's true dignity is not represented when she vies for it

with her enemies at the gates. No, it is, as Proverbs 31 says, her children who do that when they rise up to call her blessed. Her dignity is represented when her lord – you know what Sarah called Abraham, and was right – when her husband fulfills his duty in the public square to represent their domicile – that very institution that God placed them in. He does this not by voicing her opinions for her as though she doesn't have her own. That's not the point of suffrage! It isn't to voice opinions! It is to promote the home, which, when a woman presumes to abandon in order to do what is her husband's job, defeats the very thing she ought to promote.

A man promotes the home by speaking with his enemies at the gate, that is, by opposing any form of oppression, tyranny, or unjust legislation that fails to take into account the relative sovereignty of each man's castle and the divine purpose thereof. In this way he does not presume to represent his wife's opinions nor even his own, but her best interests, which are by nature domestic, because they are his best interests and the best interests of their children and future generations. This is the point of suffrage and the reason it was that in every free society not only women couldn't vote, but also children and placeless men who had no ties to land or social duties.

If this is confused – if a woman is welcomed to join the men at the gates or in the city hall when speaking with their enemies, why should she not face them in battle if it comes to that? Because it undermines the home. That's why. And undermining the home, it undermines the justification for a nation to call itself free or to sue for justice in its quest for preservation. By

usurping the duty of her man, a woman steals it unwittingly and causes those duties that make him great to appear as overbearing hindrances to her own self-realization as an autonomous individual. When matriarchy is regarded as impoverished without the right to speak out and fight outside the home, patriarchy necessarily becomes a seemingly tyrannical yoke when fathers seek to run the agenda of public affairs.

Conclusions:

Domestic Defense

It is true that women face threats too. When the threat comes home, she is particularly fit to defend herself and her own, as Rudyard Kipling says so eloquently in his poem, *The Female of the Species*:

But the Woman that God gave him, every fibre of her frame
Proves her launched for one sole issue, armed and engined
for the same;

And to serve that single issue, lest the generations fail,
The female of the species must be deadlier than the male.

She is wedded to convictions—in default of grosser ties;
Her contentions are her children, heaven help him who
denies!—

He will meet no suave discussion, but the instant, white-
hot, wild,

Wakened female of the species warring as for spouse and
child.

But such deadly force, when unleashed outside of that sphere for which she was made, proves catastrophic. We have seen this. Talk about undue force! Such violent imposition of nurture is monstrous if not oxymoronic, and can be traced in the various presumptuous ventures of our nation (both here and abroad) to tend to the problems in other homes and nations without invitation or warrant. No wonder the generations grow more and more contemptuous of both motherhood and the rule of law. No wonder there is such resistance against such unsolicited social influence in Muslim nations who are appalled by what we export by both force and social influence. No wonder our military “conflicts” have more and more left both home and homeland bereft of its caretakers while facilitating less and less the duty of a father to engage only where it is expedient for the protection and preservation of his family and community!

As a social weapon, a woman is intended for domestic defense, not foreign invasion. And she is needed there. Her first defensive, however is not in retaliating against unforeseen threats. It is by confirming and inculcating those prejudices and virtues that her head and their father taught by divine command, which prejudices and virtues he also defends by both public voice and raised arms.

This is the horrible irony of feminism. It seeks to liberate. But it enslaves by removing both men and women from freedom’s safest and most natural context. True liberty is found where women uphold justice by tending to the home and hearth of those whose job it is to safeguard both. For this reason even those early secular pagans depicted liberty as a woman in the

Statue of Liberty - because it is not by force of arms, but by the nurturing hand and quiet spirit that freedom is best preserved.

Fatherland & Mother Tongue

The mother tongue is the most precious and identifiable characteristic of the fatherland. Each is cherished for the sake of the other. As children learn to speak from their mother, as Christians learn to speak from the Church, what makes both the family of man and the family of God what it is meant to be is when there is no substantial dissonance between husband and wife and between Christ and his bride. We speak in public to honor our Patriarch and so to safeguard our heritage as children of his Home. Men fight to retain this right to speak, therefore, not for their own honor, but for the honor of him who is their Father. Women fight for this right by teaching future men and women to speak. This again is not for their own honor as the immediate goal, but for the sake of that whence the entire family's honor is derived. Thus she speaks not publicly, but where her voice finds its most natural value and most affable force.

I say *aunt*. My kids, thanks to my wife, say *ont*. No worries. She has done her job. There is no substantial dissonance. They respect me and commend their wellbeing to my representation. She has taught them to expect from my hand what I as a father owe them (and owe God to provide). In fact, I often find my children expressing precisely the substance of that which I would have them believe - from my wife, their mother. Upon formally instructing them, when I do as their teacher or pastor, I

often find that I am often not so much forming them for the first time as much as I am simply reinforcing what has already been instilled in them by my wife's presence with them. This owes to our concord as husband and wife in both conviction and awareness of our respective duties toward one another and the kids. But what a blessing! What seems like a mere practical need to stay home and tend to their wellbeing turns out to be an enormous and indispensable influence. Hers is greater than mine could ever be without her, which confirms the wisdom of our respective designs and vocations. Thank God she is home! Thank God my children's mother tongue is tuned to the preservation and honor of their true Fatherland.

God speaks clearly on the issue of men and women. But we often have a difficult time applying what he clearly says to certain situations. Cases rise that are difficult to address pastorally because we are afraid to be too forceful on an issue that seems only implicit from Scripture - especially in the minds of those who have long entertained subtle contradictions to those things that used to be self-evident, and which were once also somewhat confirmed by the culture we lived in. But we must take caution not to fall into any substantial dissonance with God's word even if we exercise caution in speaking too bluntly. We see what God teaches as a mystery. No worries. It is. But it is not a secret. As stewards of our Father's House, we honor the mystery of marriage by teaching Christ's Church to recognize their Father's order where it can be seen in their lives, and to submit to their Head for the sake of their salvation.

Why We Fight about Who Fights

As theologians and pastors, we are not fighting to preserve some paradise here on earth, as though our goal is to correct all unrighteousness and establish peace and liberty in this fallen world. No. But for the sake of the perfect freedom already won by Christ our Head, we contend for the freedom to live as Christian families. This is where our stewardship of earthly things and our stewardship of heavenly things are so intimately united. When we fight for such a noble cause, we are not trying to fix the world. We are simply guarding our heritage as children of God to worship him without fear and to teach our children to suffer all, even death, rather than let such childlike familiarity with and confidence toward God be stripped from them. In this way we become a blessing to the world otherwise wasted by confusion. In the midst of our enemies, we stand on God's word and press its authority to every false god and general of this present age of apostasy. So precious is the Christian home. The gospel makes it worth the fight.

This issue we face concerning women in combat is important, because just as the One who fought this battle for *his* Household (and won) joined a family to do so - *growing in wisdom and stature in a God-fearing home while subjecting himself to Joseph and Mary* - so we tend to our homes for the sake of our children who so dearly need to know their Savior. We keep our children subject to us especially for the sake of the gospel, that they might see the beautiful relationship between mother and father, subjection and love, and brother and sister too. And so in love for them and for God we subject ourselves to the powers that be only insofar as they do not presume to rob us of this holy and

precious responsibility. We honor the king. But we do so in order to honor God and uphold the institutions he has given us for our mutual benefit.

Scripture is certainly not unclear in aiding our responsibility to do this. And thus upholding them in our relationships, we justify fighting for them against all foes foreign and domestic. Foreign — as regards the laws of this nation and impositions on Christian citizens. Domestic — as regards our misled congregations, our silent synod, our confused members, and our cowardly brothers. This is perhaps the solution I was expected to present on. I'll leave that for discussion. But suffice it to say that as pastors we address it best by speaking [more] clearly [than we have] on the rolls of men and women in the Home, and how this relates to the first estate (Church). Maybe then, the self-evident use of women in the third estate (State) will return to the consciousness of those who have been taught to deny it.

If we speak of earthly things without understanding them, how will we speak of those heavenly mysteries that bring joy and anticipation to the Church militant? She who is the mother of us all by water and the Spirit waits as a virginal bride to become the Church triumphant, when all questions and doubts will be answered at last. Yet even now, we are not left without insight into this spiritual joy. He who joined our flesh so that our union with him might be more than what our own marital unions can be continues to join our homes through that divine word for which purpose the home was first granted to the sons of men. As men and women uphold the earthly, as they are designed and equipped to do so, we help our children speak more clearly

about the heavenly, where our abode with Christ will be more than our earthly homes will ever be. May God defend, preserve, and continue to bless both.