

JOHN ROTHACKER MINISTRIES

P.O. Box 3219

Columbus, Ohio 43210

www.JohnRothacker.org

(614) 833-1223

[This letter was originally written to a brother who had fallen prey to “seducing spirits, and doctrines of the devil” in two known areas, diet, and women’s ministry and “gender-neutral” translations.]

January 27, 2007

Dear Brother,

You asked for an answer to your paper entitled “THE BIBLICAL VIEW OF WOMEN IN MINISTRY.”

After reading it and another position paper that you gave me, I want to begin by getting to the root of the problem.

As I’ve told you, the error is found in 1 Timothy 4:1-6 and 2 Thessalonians 2:3 and Jude which begins:

“Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth.”

(1 Timothy 4:1-3 KJV)

Here we find Paul warning that the Holy Spirit was emphatically revealing to us that there would be an “apostasy” before the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that this falling away from the faith would be the result of the activity of seducing, deceiving, evil spirits that men and women choose to hold on to, and then teach and practice from their influence, doctrines that come directly from the devil.

We are in this last day of people falling away, departing from the faith they once held on to, in very profound manifestation.

The first example of this I told you about was the false teaching that Genesis 1:29 is God’s’ only recommended diet for today, and that we are not to eat meat, eggs, or milk products today. This is

clearly warned against in Paul's letter to Timothy, that it is demonic in origin, and therefore brings much sickness and heartache ultimately. I referred you to my book of 26 chapters on this subject, Holy Nutrition, available freely to anyone from my web site. Since you said you counseled with others about this and that they did not believe you were yielding to a seducing spirit, I will also refer anyone reading this to a web article on the dangers of such a diet (www.chetday.com/hallelujah-diet-dangers.htm), endorsed by Dr. Joseph Mercola, who has "the most visited natural health site in the world" and reveals that Chet Day was "the main writer at Hallelujah Acres during the late 1990s" and has now gotten his eyes opened (www.mercola.com/article/diet/biblical_nutrition.htm); George Malkmus and Hallelujah Acres being the major source of this false and demonic teaching which I expound upon in my book, Holy Nutrition, chapter 17. Hundreds of other reports can be found on the web by simply "googling" up such things as "Genesis 1:29 Diet Dangers."

After Richard and I talked with you a number of times about this, you told me personally at lunch one day that you then believed a proper diet could include properly raised clean meats, and eggs and milk from grass fed chickens, cows and goats. However, at the last luncheon with all five of us present you denied changing your position, and again stated emphatically when I brought up the scripture in Luke 11:11-13 where the Lord Jesus says eggs, bread, and fish are "good gifts" to give unto our children, that they are not, that only compared to snakes and scorpions are they good. A careful reading of the scripture, however, reveals He was making no such comparison, but simply and clearly stating what any good father should know and have taught his children to ask for when hungry, that these are good, scriptural, and beneficial foods to eat. To anyone with discernment, they can see that you are under the influence of a seducing spirit and doctrine of the devil when you will not accept the teaching of the Lord Jesus Himself, and rather wanted to go off again on a tangent saying there are men who teach one thing and others who teach the opposite. It is beside the point what men teach, when the Lord Himself has spoken clearly and given us the truth in scripture!

The Lord also spoke of killing the fatted calf, He ate lamb at the Passover meal, and thank God He is our Passover Lamb, and He ate fish and bread and gave it to His disciples both before and after the resurrection (Luke 15:23; 9:10-17; John 21:9-13).

Now, to see how a seducing spirit is also at work in this issue of women's ministry, let me refer anyone to my book, The Public Ministry of Women (PMW), also available from my web site or from me in soft back.

I believe a little history of some recent events in this great end-time apostasy would be most helpful since you quote a couple of perverted translations of scripture to try and substantiate your position.

First, the Revised Standard Version Old Testament was published in 1946 and the complete bible in 1952 (RSV). It was criticized widely as it was done by Unitarians and apostates. These were liberal, unbelieving translators who denied the verbal inspiration of scripture, the virgin birth and deity of Christ, and other significant truth.

To quote one conservative scholar's criticism: "There are two very obvious but nevertheless weighty reasons for condemning this version as an unreliable and unacceptable translation for the reverent Bible-loving Christian. First the Revision Committee, which did the actual work of translation, was composed largely of scholars who hold definitely heretical views such as cannot be countenanced by true conservative Christians and students and it is evident that the personal views of these men have been introduced into the text of this new translation. Second, the sponsoring organization and copyright owner, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. (which absorbed the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America [which was riddled with the endorsement of hundreds of communist front organizations]) has, since 1908, proved to be unbiblical in its objectives, socialistic in its aims and destructively modernistic in its doctrine. . . ." (www.bible-researcher.com/rsv-bibsac.html).

Now comes along further apostasy in producing the New Revised Standard Bible (NRSV).

The liberal revision committee further altered the RSV in revealing their bias against the verbally inspired Word of God and deity of the Lord Jesus Christ in many instances. For example, Isaiah 7:14 reads in the Authorized Version as:

"Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." (Isaiah 7:14 KJV. Which matches and is fulfilled perfectly as revealed in Matthew 1:18-23)

But a reviewer reports on this and then continues:

"The deliberately non-Christian interpretation of the Old Testament which made the RSV unacceptable to conservatives is continued in this revision. In fact the most notorious verse of the RSV, Isaiah 7:14, in the NRSV is moved even further away from its connection with the New Testament. The RSV had rendered it "a young woman shall conceive" (future); but the NRSV has "the young

woman is with child" (present), which effectively prevents the Christological interpretation (and there is no footnote to inform the reader that the RSV's "shall conceive" is a possibility)."

Proponents of gender change like to call these new "translations" "gender-accurate," but those who believe in true biblical accuracy call them "gender-neutral" or "gender inclusive."

"The [inclusive language](#) alterations are very thorough, involving thousands of alterations designed to completely erase the Bible's generic masculine pronouns and other usages offensive to feminists. An attempt has been made to downplay the extent to which this policy was imposed upon the committee by the National Council of Churches (the copyright holder, which in 1980 also commissioned the [Inclusive Language Lectionary](#) as another revision of the RSV), but it is evident that it did not arise spontaneously from a consensus of the translators themselves. Barry Hoberman, writing in the Atlantic Monthly [\[1\]](#) near to the end of the work on the NRSV, reported the following comments from members of the committee:

" 'The basic principle that the RSV committee uses is that we will remove all masculine-dominated language that has been introduced by the translators,' says George MacRae, who serves on the New Testament panel. Thus, no attempt will be made to disguise the fact that every book of the Bible is the product of a thoroughly male-dominated society. To pretend that the ancient Near Eastern world of the Bible was not radically different from our own world would be to deprive Scripture of its historical context. 'I think it's part of God's revelation in history that we take history, and we take the time-boundedness of a biblical writer, seriously,' says William Holladay, an Old Testament panel member who teaches at Andover Newton Theological School, in Massachusetts. 'Then, it's the teaching task of the church or the synagogue, it seems to me, to say, "Well, all right, Jeremiah said it this way. What God intends through those words may be something a little bit different, so let's talk about that for a while.'"

"These quotations would seem to indicate that McRae and Holladay, at least, were unaware of how thoroughly the gender-neutral language policy was about to be implemented in the final editing stages of the NRSV." [Emphasis mine. And the worst is yet to come as the feminist demands are accepted as follows]

"J.J.M. Roberts, another member of the NRSV translation committee, later published an article [\[2\]](#) in which he protested against the 'tyrannical and arbitrary authority' assumed by the final editorial committee which had been elected to revise the translation for 'stylistic consistency':

“... the members of this editorial committee understood their task as involving a far greater authority to revise the translation than the full committee ever intended. According to Dentan [one of the five members of the committee], 'This editorial committee was given power to determine the final form of the text before publication.' Such a formulation is dangerously ambiguous. What the full committee understood and intended as the task of the editorial committee was actually quite limited; while respecting the basic work of the full committee, the editorial committee was expected to make the relatively minor changes to the finished product that were necessary for the sake of stylistic consistency. At least in the case of the Old Testament editorial subcommittee, that is not what happened. Some hint of the far more intensive reworking carried out by this small committee ... can be seen in Dentan's account of non-scholarly consideration that colored their work ... the editorial committee made thousands of changes, some quite substantive, to the translation of the Old Testament made by the full committee, and when members of the full committee became aware of the extent of these changes, many were outraged, feeling that much of their own work on the translation over the years had been irresponsibly gutted." (www.bible-researcher.com/nrsv.html)

So we can see what happens when the publishers under monetary considerations and the National Council of Churches under the pressures of the mounting feminist agenda yield to the spirits of deception. Lets read a comment of another “scholar” who considers himself an “evangelical liberal.”

“For good measure we will note the remarks of Robert Jewett, professor of New Testament at Garrett-Northwestern Theological Seminary. Jewett is himself a liberal, and a supporter of the feminist cause, but he insists upon the obligation of liberal scholars to behave honestly in translating the Bible. Regarding the NRSV he says: ‘We're facing, with the NRSV, liberal dishonesty in spades. The modern liberated perspective which imposes itself on the text is about as dishonest as you can be. All the way through the NRSV, implying that Paul has all these liberated concepts and so forth like the current politically correct person in an Ivy League school: I mean that's just ridiculous. Here you have the imposition of liberal prejudice on the biblical text with the ridiculous assumption that our modern liberal views were Paul's.’ Against the specious arguments offered by apologists for these politically correct alterations, Jewett declares that a gender-neutral translation that claims to be accurate is ‘almost as bad as Stalin's revisions of world history in which every 10 years he'd change all the history textbooks.’” (www.bible-

researcher.com/nrsv.html#note3)

And let's look at another criticism.

“Conservatives also accused the NRSV of tampering with the text to conform to the socialist agenda, as with the translation of Acts 4.32. The reading of the old RSV was: *“Now the company of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one said that any of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had everything in common.”* But the NRSV translated the verse as follows: *“Now the whole group of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one claimed private ownership of any possessions, but everything they owned was held in common.”* This would insinuate that the early Christians rejected private property and embarked on a communal or communistic lifestyle, rather than merely acknowledging that their property really belonged to God and should be used for His glory.”

(en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Standard_Version)

Now let us consider the New International Version (NIV) and its revision, Today's New International Version (TNIV).

Years ago when the NIV came out, I was in a meeting in Columbus where the man in charge of the publishing and promotion of the new version spoke and he revealed that it was a monetary desire that initiated the translation. After I got a copy and read it, it became obvious as I marked dozens of passages that were inaccurate, that it was not suitable for one who loves the truth of the Word of God, and believes in the verbal inspiration of scripture by the Holy Spirit. Although it has become very popular because of its promotion and ease of reading, I have kept it on my bookshelf upside down for reference only.

But, after the NRSV came out and was being promoted strongly in England, the British publishers of the NIV, Hodder and Stoughton, demanded a unisex version of their own to compete.

The first translation in England is called the New International Version Inclusive Edition (NIVI), and states in its Preface: “. . . it was **often appropriate to mute the patriarchalism** of the culture of the biblical writers through gender-inclusive language when this could be done without compromising the message of the Spirit.”

What is Patriarchalism, what is “gender-inclusive language,” and their message is the message of what spirit?

“Patriarchy (from Greek: *patér*, genitive form *patris*, which shows the root form *patr-* meaning father; and *arché* meaning old,

beginning or, metaphorically, rule) is a word used to describe the cultural expectation that fathers have primary responsibility for the welfare of families (in ancient cultures, this included management of household slaves). (wikipedia.org).

The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines Patriarchy: “social organization marked by the supremacy of the father in the clan or family, the legal dependence of wives and children, and the reckoning of descent and inheritance in the male line” (m-w.com).

This is clearly what the culture was throughout the scriptures, before the O.T., during the O.T., and throughout the N.T. So when you “mute the patriarchalism of the culture of the biblical writers” you are changing the Word of God inspired by the Holy Spirit, and it becomes obvious to any honest person that the message is no longer that of the Holy Spirit, but of “another spirit.” “Gender-Inclusive” means you have changed the specific male gender words inspired by God and given specific meaning to something else. “Fathers” become “parents”; “sons” become “children,” “He, Him, and His” become plural “They” “Them” and “Their” and passages pertaining to the specific responsibility of men and fathers are distorted to include women and mothers. Jesus is no longer the “son of God” but the “child of God.”

Now, notice how the TNIV translators word their "gender-inclusive" methods on their own TNIV website:

“The term "gender-neutral" has often been used in error [Listen to their deception in an attempt to cover up their own deliberate errors] when used to describe inclusive language texts. The *TNIV* is in fact ‘gender-accurate.’ Gender neutrality suggests the removal of specific male or female attributes. The *TNIV* does not remove these attributes or "neuter" any passages of Scripture. The *TNIV* uses generic language *only* where the meaning of the text was intended to include both men and women. These changes reflect a better understanding of the meaning of the original Greek and Hebrew." (TNIV: Questions and Answers, www.tniv.info/QandA.php)

Let’s read a comment from “TNIV Translation Treason.” “The TNIV translators claim they can change the masculine Greek text because ‘. . . the meaning of the text was intended to include both men and women.’ If the Lord God ‘intended’ for the verse to read ‘they / them / their’ or neutered, plural, gender – why didn’t God inspire the men that penned the Greek text to write ‘gender inclusive’? Hmm. . . ? If God didn’t ‘intend’ what He said – then why in the world, didn’t He say what He ‘intended’?” (TNIV Translation Treason www.av1611.org/kjv/tniv_intro.html)

Dr. Wayne Grudem, professor of Biblical and Systematic Theology at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, and president of the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (www.cbmw.org) correctly diagnoses the danger of the NIVI and other Bible versions:

“. . .the generic use of ‘he-him-his’ has consistently been changed to ‘we’ or ‘you’ or ‘they.’ The result is that whenever readers of this inclusive-language NIV read the words ‘we’ and ‘you’ and ‘they,’ **they will never know whether what they are reading is what God originally caused his Word to say, or what the translators have decided his Word should say instead. In hundreds and probably thousands of places, readers will never know whether these are the words of God or the words of man.**

“Such revisions are not the words God originally caused to be written, and thus they are not the words of God. **They are human words that men have substituted for the words of God, and they have no place in the Bible.**” (Wayne Grudem, Comparing the two NIVs, [World Magazine](#). Apr. 19, 1997) This article has many references to specific scriptures that carefully explains the importance of accuracy in the translation of individual words. Two other articles in this edition of World Magazine are also of interest. For instance, in the article entitled: “[The battle for the Bible](#)” we discover that Zondervan has an “editorial style sheet, part of which shows book authors how the publisher expects them to deal with language describing the sexes.” It “begins with a statement about “the growing awareness of subtle sexist messages in language” and goes into three pages of dos and don'ts; for example, Zondervan writers are to use humanity, people, human beings, or humankind in place of man or mankind.”

You can read a very informative article on the NIV going “gender-neutral” also from the “Archives of World Magazine” by Susan Olasky entitled: “Femme fatale: The feminist seduction of the evangelical church: The New International Version of the Bible--the best-selling English version in the world--is quietly going ‘gender-neutral’” ([Worldmag.com March 29, 1997](#)).

Susan reports: “ ‘The British were very strongly pushing this,’ Mr. Walker [a member of the NIV translating committee] said. In England, sales of the New Revised Standard Version, a unisex language revision of the RSV, put such pressure on the NIV that Hodder and Stoughton demanded a new version in order to compete. The NIV’s translating committee took several years away

from its book-by-book review of the Bible in order to complete the unisex language version, now on sale in England as the NIV Inclusive Language Edition.”

Pressure for unisex language came also from the feminists. “Women who, in the words of Mr. Walker, ‘felt left out’ by the traditional language.”

“The result of the shift to unisex language may be to cloud the uniqueness of men and women. And that reflects gains made by feminists over the past decades. It also underscores the uphill nature of the battle being fought by those who seek to preserve a ‘complementarian’ view--that, for example, women can be leaders in many spheres but must not be pastors.

“The move fits with the trend toward egalitarianism--the denial of any distinctions between men and women--in the church and home. Egalitarians assert that women should be pastors, elders, and co-heads of families. Gilbert Bilezikian, professor emeritus at Wheaton College and author of *Beyond Sex Roles*, puts it bluntly: ‘There cannot be authentic community as described in the New Testament without the full inclusion of the constituency of members into the ministry, life, and leadership of the group.’ [I must insert here that this is an absurd lie that actually denies all of the “authentic community” throughout the entire period of the writing of the New Testament (not to mention the previous four thousand years of godly human history) and the last 1900 years before this heresy has become ear-tickling popular!]

“Mr. Bilezikian is a founding elder and influential theologian at Bill Hybels's Willow Creek Community Church in South Barrington, Ill. Willow Creek's rapid growth and its influence on other evangelical churches through the 2,200-member Willow Creek Association makes its position on the issue important.

“Willow Creek has had women elders since its founding in 1978. But in the past year [1996] the church has made explicit among its leaders the reasons for its position--and demanded a level of agreement from staff and prospective church members. In January 1996, John Ortberg, one of Willow Creek's teaching elders, taught a two-hour class to church ministry leaders, in which he said that staff needed to share the convictions of the church, or study until they shared those convictions; and they had a year to do so.

“Mr. Ortberg's teaching became the basis for a draft position paper dated January 1996, which WORLD has obtained. The paper, which was distributed only to Willow Creek's ministry leaders, says the church ‘has sought to insure an appropriate level of consensus on this issue with new staff members’ to avoid an environment that ‘would be destructive to authentic community and effective ministry.’ The statement makes clear the church's belief that ‘when the Bible is interpreted comprehensively, it teaches the full equality of men and women in status, giftedness, and opportunity for

ministry,' despite 'a few scriptural texts [that] appear to restrict the full ministry freedom of women.'

"What does Willow Creek mean by 'appropriate level of consensus?' In practice, it means that complementarians are encouraged to look elsewhere for a church. As Dr. B--that is what Willow Creekers affectionately call Gilbert Bilezikian--explains, 'Anyone who is a member adheres to the statement of beliefs and practices of the church.'"

In another comment in the article, R. Albert Mohler, president of Southern Baptist Seminary in Louisville said, "I am convinced that this issue will be in the coming decade one of the crucial dividing lines separating evangelicals committed to biblical authority and inerrancy from those who are seeking to transform evangelicalism from within."

"Since 1995, when the seminary's position was 'conclusively clarified,' there has been an 85 percent turnover in faculty, as members retired, left for pastorates, or went to 'friendlier' seminaries. The result has been 'great peace and common purpose' at the institution.

"Within the Southern Baptist Convention, ordination continues to be a burning issue only 'within the elites of the denomination with access to the press,' Mr. Mohler says; he points out that the Southern Baptists have fewer than 50 female pastors out of 38,000 churches. Mr. Mohler's tough approach ended the controversy at Southern Baptist Seminary, at least for now.

"But Wheaton's Gilbert Bilezikian is confident that the egalitarians will win. 'It is a quiet reform movement that is unstoppable,' he says. 'In two or three generations from now it won't even be an issue.' He predicts there may be groups that hold to the traditional view in 100 years, but they will be relegated to the margins.

"It is easy to understand Mr. Bilezikian's triumphalism. After all, when egalitarians lose a vote, they just come back for another vote. In effect, they wear down the opposition. As Larry Walker of the NIV Committee says: Unisex language 'bothered me to begin with very much. I guess I've evolved.'

"But Wayne Grudem hasn't given up hope. The Council for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood boasts many prominent evangelicals as members. [www.CBMW.org] 'Though this controversy is painful,' Mr. Grudem said, 'I think ultimately the Lord will bring good out of it.'"

All that you've just read is revealing, but I especially want to bring to your attention the very last remark by a translator of the NIV who then worked on the TNIV, which Wayne Grudem reports has at least 3686 gender changes which are inexcusable but are

obviously in agreement with the spirit of seduction that Paul warned us about (1 Tim. 4:1-2).

Paul revealed that the consciences of those involved in this end-time apostasy would be seared, that is, that people would violate their own consciences so much that after a while they would be seared, impervious to the conviction of the Holy Spirit. That is what is happening, and that is exactly what Larry Walker reveals about the conviction that what they were doing was wrong, but after repeated, consistent refusing to repent and be honest with the Word of God as originally written, he became calloused and hardened in his rebellion against the truth of the Word of God, while welcoming the acclaim and praise of men, and after awhile it no longer bothered him. Listen again as he says that the unisex language “bothered me to begin with very much. I guess I've evolved.” This is the result of the process of searing one’s conscience. He not only continued to sin against his own God given conscience, but the theory of evolution also crops its ugly head up, one which all liberals (unbelievers) and more and more Christians are succumbing to, against mounds of scientific evidence to the contrary, to say nothing of the scriptures, and the words of the Lord Jesus Christ who was there and participated in the creation. They compromise with the ungodly culture around them, influenced by “the spirit of this world.” (1 Cor. 2:12)

Now what has happened within the souls of the other translators who did the original NIV and thought it was so accurate, and then now have succumbed to the “cultural forces” of the feminist movement and made thousands of changes?

Listen as they reveal their apostasy in the preface to the TNIV:

"While a basic core of the English language remains relatively stable, many **diverse** [spirits of error] and complex **cultural forces** [from whom?] continue to bring about the **subtle** [Gen 3:1] **shifts in the meanings** and/or connotations of even old, well-established words and phrases. Among the more programmatic changes in the TNIV is the removal of nearly all vocative ‘O’s **and the elimination of most instances of the generic use of masculine nouns and pronouns.**" (TNIV, Preface, p. vii). [Emphasis and bracketed comments mine]

As another commentator has well stated: “Now, what "cultural FORCE" is interested in the elimination of masculine nouns and pronouns? Only one. . . The radical, pro-abortion, feminist.” ([TNIV: TRANSLATION TREASON www.av1611.org/kjv/tniv_intro.html](http://www.av1611.org/kjv/tniv_intro.html)) And what “diverse forces” are there but the multitude of spirits of error fighting against the truth today. (1 Jn. 4:6). And who was the “subtle” one in the beginning who changed God’s Word? (Gen. 3:1) And how can anyone justify the “subtle shifts in the meanings” of

words that have stood the tests and trials of thousands of years of bible copying and the persecution of faithful translators?

In fact, they are so committed to their abominable new feminist bible perversion that Mr. Walker says “the consensus of the Committee for Bible Translation in America is to have the unisex-language version ‘take the place of the other’” whereas “in England there are two versions, the unisex-language and the traditional one.” And another TNIV translator, Mr. Barker, says “ ‘If our committee had its way there would be no separate inclusive-language edition.’ But he says, ‘I’ve heard--I can’t say that this is actual fact--that Zondervan will keep making the two editions,’ at least for a while if the traditional version finds a market niche.” (Worldmag.com Femme Fatale cover story, March 29, 1997) Makes them money is what he meant in 1997. And “Making Mammon” is what it has done, 50% of Zondervan’s entire annual income, as the opposition to the TNIV has forced the continuation of publishing the NIV as it was.

Now, many fine articles can be read from the internet, and I would recommend such ones as an overview of “The Gender-Neutral Language Controversy” by Michael D. Marlowe, 2001 (revised January 2005) (www.bible-researcher.com/inclusive.html). And many others concerning this controversy on the website of The Council for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (www.CBMW.org) such as Wayne Grudem’s article “What’s Wrong with Gender-Neutral Bible Translations?, 1997” (www.cbmw.org/resources/articles/genderneutral.php).

However, I want to look deeper at the character of the major translators, contributors, and publishers of the TNIV. When one reads the qualifications of an elder given to us in the Word of God, we find character the essential qualification (1 Tim. 3; Tit. 1). There is nothing about formal education. In fact, the seminary trained corrupted educated elites of Jesus’ day were amazed also at the men God chose and anointed when **“they observed the confidence of Peter and John, and understood that they were uneducated and untrained men, they were marveling, and began to recognize them as having been with Jesus”** (Acts 4:13 NAS).

This is not what organizations, Churches, or many people look for today, and unfortunately bible translation is no exception. Doctor’s degrees on a moral reprobate is still like a jewel in a swine’s snout (Proverbs 11:22). And contrary to false accusation, the Spirit of God does not hesitate in scripture to name those who are wicked and against the work, Word, or men of God (Num. 16; 1 Tim. 1:19-

20; 2 Tim. 3:8; 3 Jn. :9), as well as naming even great men of God who compromise with sin or yield to it (Abraham, David, or Peter).

First, let's look at the integrity of the publishers. When the Inclusive version of the NIV first appeared in England, many prominent Evangelicals became alarmed, and called for a meeting with the publishers, because they did not want this perversion coming to the United States from England where it had been published and was being promoted and sold.

A meeting was called at Focus on the Family Headquarters, Colorado Springs, and the following were in attendance on May 27, 1997 when guidelines were confirmed and signed (and further revised on Sept. 9, 1997) agreeing not to bring the Inclusive language translation to the US.

Ken Barker, Secretary, Committee on Bible Translation; Member, Executive Committee of Committee on Bible Translation; Timothy Bayly, Executive Director, Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood; Pastor, Church of the Good Shepherd, Bloomington, Indiana; Joel Belz, Publisher, God's World Publications; James Dobson, President, Focus on the Family; Wayne Grudem, President, Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, Professor of Biblical and Systematic Theology, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School; Charles Jarvis, Executive Vice President, Focus on the Family; John Piper, Member, Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, Senior Pastor, Bethlehem Baptist Church, Minneapolis, Minnesota; Vern S. Poythress, Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Westminster Theological Seminary; R. C. Sproul, Chairman, Ligonier Ministries; Ron Youngblood, Member, Committee on Bible Translation, Professor of Old Testament, Bethel Theological Seminary West.

These guidelines have also been endorsed by Gleason Archer, Hudson Armerding, Clinton E. Arnold, S. M. Baugh, Alistair Begg, James Montgomery Boice, James Borland, Bill Bright, Vonette Bright, Harold O. J. Brown, Bryan Chapell, Edmund Clowney, Robert Coleman, Charles Colson, Jack Cottrell, Jerry Falwell, John Frame, W. Robert Godfrey, Jack Hayford, H. Wayne House, Elliott Johnson, Peter Jones, Mary Kassian, D. James Kennedy, George W. Knight III, Andreas Kostenberger, Beverly LaHaye, Tim LaHaye, Gordon R. Lewis, Robert Lewis, Erwin Lutzer, Richard L. Mayhue, R. Albert Mohler, Jr., J. P. Moreland, Joel Nederhood, J. Stanley Oakes, Stephen Olford, J. I. Packer, Dorothy Patterson, Paige Patterson, Dennis Rainey, Pat Robertson, Adrian Rogers, Paul Sailhamer, Robert Saucy, Jerry Vines, John Walvoord, Bruce Ware, Stu Weber, William Weinrich, David Wells, John Wimber [The Vineyard Churches].

An article giving all of the pertinent info is available on the web

at www.cbmw.org/resources/articles/genderneutral.php.

Now, the significant thing is that after signing the agreement, the publishers and their translation committee continued in deception preparing for the TNIV, and then wrote a letter after having the perversion completed and printed and said just two weeks before release that they were no longer going to agree with their previous signed agreement, and unleashed this abominable translation and paraphrase upon the public here in the US. The publishers and the entire committee who also knew of the agreement purposefully LIED, AND CONTINUE IN THEIR DECEPTION TO THIS DAY.

And by the way, in “following the money,” it is reported that half the annual income of Zondervan, the North American publisher, has been from the sale of the NIV. The rights to the text are owned by the International Bible Society now based in Colorado Springs. They were originally known as the New York Bible Society when they began the work on the NIV in 1965. Zondervan was sold and is now owned and controlled by unbelievers, and is a division of HarperCollins Publishers, a subsidiary of News Corp., owned by CEO K. Rupert Murdoch, who owns FOX and other international media. The admonition to not be unequally yoked together with unbelievers makes no difference to the disobedient or apostates.

Now, let’s look at other aspects of moral character.

Dr. Marten Woudstra was the head of the Old Testament Committee for Bible Translation of the NIV. He was an admitted homosexual and friend of Evangelicals Concerned, Inc. (ECI), “a nationwide task force and fellowship for gay and lesbian 'evangelical Christians' and their friends.” The other translators were not only aware of his homosexuality, but sympathetic to the views of ECI.

Dr. Virginia Ramey Mollenkott, a literary consultant for the New International Version (NIV), was an admitted lesbian who wrote extensively on the subject. Much more information can be found about these two on the web in an article entitled “Homosexuality and the NIV” (www.wayoflife.org/fbns/twohomosexuals.htm & www.wayoflife.org/fbns/virginiamollenkott.htm).

The articles reveal from her own writings that “Mollenkott is a pro-abortion feminist who claims to be a ‘left-leaning’ evangelical. In reality she denies the very God of the Bible and worships an idolatrous female god of her own imagination.”

“In 1978 Mollenkott co-authored (with Letha Scanzoni) the book entitled *Is the Homosexual My Neighbor?*, in which she called for nondiscrimination toward homosexuality. The book argues that the Sodom account in Genesis does not teach the evil of homosexuality, but the evils of violent gang rape and inhospitality to strangers. The book also claims that ‘the idea of a life long

homosexual orientation or 'condition' is never mentioned in the Bible' (p. 71), and that Romans 1 does not 'fit the case of a sincere homosexual Christian' (p. 62)."

"Her view of the kingdom of God on earth is a society in which 'lesbian women, bisexual people, and gay men are going to be accepted as first-class citizens in the church and in society as a whole' (p. 153). Mollenkott claims that providing mutual sexual pleasure, whether it be homosexual or bisexual or whatever, is one of the most important things in life."

She said " 'One of the greatest benefits of coming out publicly as lesbian was that I could go through my closets and give away all my dresses and skirts except for a few Gertrude Stein-ish floor-length skirts that somehow seemed less of an affront to my nature.' This lesbian's admission that dresses are feminine reminds us that clothing is a form of language. We make social statements by our clothing choices. In Western society, pants have long been associated with masculinity and dresses with femininity. That was based on the biblical injunction that women and men are not to dress the same. Only in recent decades has this barrier been breached, and those at the forefront of the unisex fashion industry are in open and admitted rebellion against traditional biblical mores." [For scriptural insight see my book: [A Woman's Dress](#)]

" 'As an incest survivor, I can no longer worship in a theological context that depicts God as an abusive parent [referring to Christ's death on the cross] and Jesus as the obedient, trusting child.' "

She says that God is really a woman, and that Jesus was actually a woman in a man's body. "She cited the research of biologist Edward Kessel, who argued that Jesus was 'born in parthenogenesis; that parthenogenetic births are always female; that in some cases, therefore, he would be willing to refer to Jesus as 'she' -- up until the last minute of sex reversal, in which case Jesus remains chromosomally female throughout life, but functions as a normal male and looks like a normal male.'"

"Mollenkott concludes that 'in a very physical sense we are all gay, we are all lesbian, we are all heterosexual, we are all bisexual--because we are all one.'" [The ultimate corruption and perversion of Gal. 3:28]

Mollenkott wrote an article claiming that refusal to ordain homosexual "clergywomen" is unscriptural discrimination.

When the scripture says: "Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination. Neither shalt thou lie with any beast to defile thyself therewith: neither shall any woman stand before a beast to lie down thereto: it is confusion [perversion NAS]" (Lev. 18:22-23 KJV) and "If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them" (Lev. 20:13 KJV) "Dr. Mollenkott argues that this is part of the ceremonial

laws, and as such, are to be disregarded by the Christian. She places this act on the same level as wearing clothes of two different materials.”

For more information on this, you can read “Homosexuality and the NIV” by David Cloud, which includes “Sodomy and the NIV” by Carl Graham.

Virginia Mollenkott is a completed apostate, having been reared in a fundamentalist, bible believing home but then seduced by evil spirits until she now has fallen away from the faith completely.

Now let’s look how this homosexual and lesbian influence has affected the translation of the NIV. The word sodomy, which refers to sexual activity between members of the same sex as well as animals, has been completely deleted from the scripture. And then instead of the sin being simply named and translated properly, the idea of the activity being associated with temple idolatry and prostitution is introduced. This is subtle, as these perverts do not believe their sin of homosexuality is sin, only when associated with idolatry or prostitution. Let’s look at an example:

“There shall be no whore of the daughters of Israel, nor a sodomite of the sons of Israel.” (Deut. 23:17 KJV)

“No Israelite man or woman is to become a shrine prostitute.” (NIV)

This change is done throughout the Old Testament, and is why perverts (and I’ve interviewed some on the radio) pervert the scripture and the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah as only involving gang rape or in some cases even denying that and saying their sin was “inhospitality” and others listed in Ezekiel 16:49-50 and ignoring the declaration there that their sin was that they “committed abomination before me: therefore I took them away as I saw good.” And “Just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh, are exhibited as an example, in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire” (Jude 1:7 NAS).

But clever deception is even more clearly seen in the New Testament where we read:

“Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind [homosexuals, NAS], Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor

revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.” (1 Cor. 6:9-10 KJV)

But the NIV translates the Greek words as “nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders.” And the TNIV, after much criticism, changed the translation to “nor male prostitutes nor practicing homosexuals.”

One does not realize the subtle deception of the perverts who did the NIV until it is pointed out that they are not condemning homosexual behavior as the scripture does, but only homosexual “prostitution” or when it “offends” someone. And then later, after being criticized for their inaccurate translation in the NIV, they claim that those of “homosexual orientation” who do not “practice” homosexuality (TNIV), or argue that those who are not “promiscuous” but have a “loving monogamous homosexual relationship “ are not condemned but are only participating in “their God given sexual orientation.”

It is worthy of note that the actual Greek words Paul used in this passage were “malakoi” and “arsenokoitai.” A “malakos” was “a soft, effeminate male who submitted his body to unnatural lewdness.” And an “arsenokoites” (arsen, a male; and koite, a bed) means “one who lies with a male as with a female, a sodomite.” Therefore, these two words simply mean anyone “receiving” or “giving” homosexual acts is condemned.

Now, how is this spirit of error affecting the ministry of women? As you can read from many articles and books that have been written and published, the scriptures have been mis-translated to either add or subtract words so as to change the “patriarchal” creation of mankind, and to teach that there is to be “no distinctions between men and women--in the church and home” and that “women should be pastors, elders, and co-heads of families.”

Now, in order to do this, words must be added, deleted, or the meaning of words changed, or somehow explained away.

But before we look at examples of this, it is imperative to consider the consequences of this perversion of scripture. The Lord Jesus Himself said “**the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers [fornicators, whether heterosexual or homosexual], and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.**” (Rev. 21:8 KJV)

Jesus said, “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.

“Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie. I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.

“And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.

“For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book:

“And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.

“He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all.
Amen.”

(Rev. 22:13-21 KJV)

These are very serious words by the Lord Jesus Himself. All liars, and those who add to or subtract from the Word of God are condemned to an eternity without God. Such are the translators of these abominable “translations”; the New Revised Standard Version, [NRSV](#) (© National Council of Churches, 1989); Today’s New International Version, [TNIV](#) (© International Bible Society, Zondervan Pub., 2005); and others such as the New Living Translation, [NLT](#) (© Tyndale House Pub., 1996); New Century Version, [NCV](#) (World Bible Translation Center, orig. Sweet/Worthy Pub., then Word Pub., now Thomas Nelson Pub., 1987, 1991); [Contemporary English Version, CEV](#) (American Bible Society, 1995); Good News Bible: Today’s English Version, Second Edition (American Bible Society, 1992); and (in England only) the New International Version-Inclusive Language Edition, NIVI ([Hodder and Stoughton Pub. in London, 1996](#)).

And a paraphrase like [The Message](#) (Eugene H. Peterson, 2002) also has introduced gender-neutral language (compare it with the following in Gen. 1:27).

Anyone wishing to compare translations can go to their web sites or to www.biblegateway.com where most are available.

There are good and very accurate translations of the scriptures. The Authorized King James Version, KJV, since 1611 held as both beautiful and accurate, and the New American Standard Bible, NASB (© [The Lockman Foundation](#) 1971), which is widely acclaimed “the most literally accurate translation” from the original languages, are “word for word” translations that have been my favorites for years. Also there are now many other “word for word” translations of various degrees of accuracy available.

Now let’s look at a few instances of perversion to show how they deliberately change the Word of God to try and justify the error that women can be “pastors, elders, and co-heads of families.”

They start out immediately in the first chapter of Genesis where we read:

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.
(Gen. 1:27 KJV)

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them.

(Gen. 1:27 NIV The same translators’ work before they changed “accuracy” into the “gender-neutral” Feminist TNIV)

So God created human beings in his own image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them.
(Gen. 1:27 TNIV)

The perverters have changed the very specific Hebrew word for man, “adam,” which God named Adam, into “human beings,” to include women. Then they change the masculine “him” into “them.”

This is contrary to not only the honest translation of the words here, but also when Paul gives us additional revelation in the New Testament. Here we read for instance: “For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man.” (1 Cor. 11:7 KJV) Here God reveals that the man is in a divine order of headship when it is revealed that he is in the image of God, that is, the man is created in the position of authority, and the woman is not in this same image of authority. That is why a few verses later, the reason is revealed why she is to have “authority on her head, because of the angels.” (verse 10, see my book [A Woman’s Headcovering](#) for a more thorough exposition of these scriptures and this apostolic practice).

In Paul's first letter to Timothy, a young apostle given responsibility for ordaining elders in the body of Christ, men who are the overseers, the ones who shepherd the flock of God, another gross and inexcusable perversion is clearly seen. We read that "A bishop [overseer] then must be blameless, the husband of one wife" and "Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife" (1 Tim. 3:2, 12 KJV).

But in order to allow for women to be in these positions of authority, the words have been changed to read:

"Now a bishop must be above reproach, married only once" and "Let deacons be married only once." (3:2, 12 NRSV). And this same deliberate perversion is done in Titus 1:6 also.

When Paul calls the elders (the masculine form of the word for elder, presbuteros) he tells them:

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.

"Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears." (Acts 20:28-31 KJV).

Here Paul warns these men elders that certain of themselves, even of these God called overseers, shepherds, shall some men arise that go bad and seek to divide and separate the one true church in Ephesus and gather to themselves a personal following.

However, again to allow for women elders and make the scripture "gender-neutral" we read:

"Even from your own number some will arise and distort the truth in order to draw away disciples after them." (:30 TNIV)

Now, let us examine the issue of "Headship."

God clearly states in many places that Christ is the one and only Head of the church, both in heaven and in earth (Eph. 1:22; 4:15; 5:23; Col. 1:18; 2:10, 19).

In 1 Corinthians Paul gives a divine order of authority, God is the head of Christ, Christ of man, and man of woman. This is why both men and women are to demonstrate this, a man without a head covering and a woman with a headcovering. It is called here "authority," not "source" or some other perversion of the meaning of the word that some use to distort the clear meaning of the word.

There is not one of us who if working in a place and someone came in and asked for “the head” would not know exactly what is meant – the one in authority, the one in charge.

Although God clearly reveals in 1 Corinthians 11 that the man was the one from whom woman was taken, he says the source is God, not man (vs. 8 & 12).

In Ephesians we read concerning this:

“Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body.

“Therefore as the church is subject [Gk. Upotasso, “to place, or rank under, to subject, middle (voice) to obey”] unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing.” (Eph. 5:22-24 KJV).

This Greek word “upotasso” is a word that is used consistently when instructing people of one station in life to be subject to those in another, such as children to parents, slaves to masters, citizens to secular authorities, as well as wives to husbands. It means to obey, which you say over and over, “Nowhere in scripture does it say wives are told to obey their husbands.” This is absurd!

Let’s look at what Peter says when he instructs: **“wives, be in subjection to your own husbands”** (1 Peter 3:1-6)

Peter explains that holy women made themselves beautiful by how they conducted themselves with a meek and quite spirit, and dressed modestly, and then says, **“being in subjection unto their own husbands: Even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement”** (5-6).

The scripture plainly says that wives are to follow the example of Sarah in OBEYING their husbands! That Sarah even addressed her husband as “lord.” That women today are only daughters of Sarah if they obey their husbands with respect, and live right in the fear of God and not the fear of man.

Nowhere does the scripture say that husbands are to be in subjection to their wives, but rather to love them and sacrifice for them and sanctify them (Eph. 5).

Now, you also say: “Eve’s punishment was that Adam would rule over her.” This is not part of the curse or judgment of God upon Eve and all women. God was also telling her that her desire would be for her husband. Can any one in their right mind believe that this is a curse -- that women would desire their husband and love them sincerely? Absurd! It is no more part of the curse because

God states it with part of the curse than that Adam would eat vegetables is part of the curse when it is mentioned with the curse (Gen. 3:17-19). As one who has been a committed vegetarian, you know very well that eating vegetables is not part of the curse, but a blessing, the same as for Eve's desire for her husband, and the fact that he would have authority over her as part of God's Divine Order!

In 1 Corinthians 11, Paul gives the reasons for this as all part of creation, before the fall and God's judgment.

It's worth considering for a moment the importance of fathers in the home and the biblical support of patriarchy.

One group of radical feminists calls themselves, Feminists Earning A Reputation United States [FEAR US]. According to their website, "Fear Us is a secret, underground organization whose **sole mission is the elimination of patriarchy. . .**" (www.fearus.org)

In an excellent article on the importance of fathers, "The TNIV and the Missing Fathers" we again hear from the literary consultant and major influence of the NIV, "Radical feminist and lesbian author, Virginia Ramey Mollenkott . . . author of at least 11 radical feminist pro-homosexual books, including the highly controversial "Is the Homosexual My Neighbor" and "The Divine Feminine: The Biblical Imagery of God as Female." Mollenkott leaves little doubt to the feminist position on "fathers" or "patriarchy." She writes:

"Patriarchy is a profoundly **mistaken social system that has caused misery to millions and could yet cause the destruction of humankind and the planet we share together.**" (Virginia Mollenkott, *Sensual Spirituality: Out From Fundamentalism*, p. 73).

And for a further comment as to what these radical feminist think of men and fathers, let's read a statement from The National Organization for Women (N.O.W) Action Alert, December 3, 1999: "It's a father's **presence, not his absence, that is harmful to kids.**" (www.alliance4lifemin.org "Here's to you, dad")

The article entitled: "TNIV and The Missing Fathers" (www.av1611.org/kjv/tniv_fathers.html) points out many facts as to the importance of fathers, such as the following alarming statistics:

- 63% of youth suicides are from fatherless homes. [U. S. D.H.H.S. Bureau of the Census]
- 90% of all homeless and runaway children are from fatherless homes.
- 85% of all children that exhibit behavioral disorders come from fatherless homes. [Center for Disease Control]
- 80% of rapist motivated with displaced anger come from

- fatherless homes. [Criminal Justice and Behavior, Vol. 14 p. 403-26]
- 72% percent of adolescent murders come from fatherless homes. [William J. Bennett, The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators, p. 61]
 - 71% of all high school dropouts come from fatherless homes. [National Principals Association Report on the State of High Schools]
 - 70% of juveniles in state operated institutions come from fatherless homes [U.S. Dept. of Justice, Special Report, Sept., 1988]
 - 70 percent of long-term prison inmates come from fatherless homes. [William J. Bennett, The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators, p. 61]
 - 85% of all youths sitting in prisons grew up in a fatherless home. [Fulton County Georgia Jail Populations and Texas Dept. of Corrections, 1992]
 - Nearly 2 of every 5 children in America do not live with their fathers. [US News and World Report, February 27, 1995, p.39]

It is obvious to any honest person that fathers in the home are not the cause of “misery” and “harmful” but the biblical model is what children need. People who have given themselves over to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils are blinded to the most obvious truth. And these corrupted and perverted scriptures, “gender-neutral” or “gender-inclusive” translations, obliterate the specific importance and responsibility of fathers and their role in the training and discipline of children.

The above article reveals that the word father or fathers is deleted dozens of times from just the New Testament alone.

Another point I should make in refuting your false teaching is that you use the teachings and sayings of ungodly, unloving Rabbis to say that those who believe the scriptures concerning God’s ordained authority structure are also unloving legalists like them. Preposterous! Keeping the laws and word of God is not unloving, but what true love is. It is not legalism but righteousness. Jesus Himself said:

“For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

“Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do

and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

“For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.”

(Matthew 5:18-20 KJV)

“If ye love me, keep my commandments. . . .

“He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him.

“Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot, Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?

“Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.

“He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me.”

(John 14:15, 21-24 KJV.)

Another point I would like to make is that you state that Priscilla was an “apostle” and “the leader” over her husband Aquila just because her name was mentioned first most of the time. When Aquila was mentioned first, you make an excuse for this, that it is not indicative of who was leader, but only when Priscilla was mentioned first. This is absurd! Neither one was ever identified with a particular five-fold ministry, but they were both humble, obedient servants of the Lord, hosting the church often in their own house. Merely mentioning a wife’s name before her husband says nothing of their importance, order, ministry, or anything else except to name them. I would suggest you or anyone read the four pages of my exposition of this in [The Public Ministry of Women](#), or concerning any of the other great women of God, none of which are ever mentioned as having authority over men.

Now another important point. You state that you evaluated 23 versions of the bible and the King James Version is the “most anti-women of them all.” This is amazing and very revealing. The KJV has lasted for centuries and has been the most beloved and used by women as well as men of any English translation ever, and has been recognized by the people, as well as scholars, to be the most wonderful and influential English translation ever produced. It is overall very accurate and yet you also say concerning this issue of women that “word for word translations leave the meaning unclear.”

They are not “unclear” to those who love what they say. They are not “unclear” to you either, as you know what they are saying

because you say they are “anti-women” because you don’t want to accept and believe what they do say. Only in the last few decades of the past two thousand years, under the steady harassment and influence of the ungodly Politically Correct and Feminist Movement, and the apostasy and greed, has the idea of “gender-neutral” translation ever been accepted. It is only fitting that this is so, as God is testing everyone, where their hearts are, and sifting us all.

Let me say clearly, those who change the Word of God, who delete words and add words to suit their own agenda, no matter what it is, are condemned to an eternity in hell by the words of the Lord Jesus Himself. Anyone who does this is without excuse! And those who go along with these corruptions and perversions of the Word of God, who knowingly sell and promote them, are guilty before God and will suffer the same punishment. Jesus said concerning any truth or practice thereof:

"My teaching is not Mine, but His who sent Me.

"If any man is willing to do His will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from Myself.

"He who speaks from himself seeks his own glory; but He who is seeking the glory of the One who sent Him, He is true, and there is no unrighteousness in Him."

(John 7:16-18 NASB)

Another error that you hold to is “Jesus’ main message was advance God’s Kingdom, not individual salvation.” I bring this up because it is not just error, but I believe it is reinforced and influenced by the demonic spirit of the “Feminist Bible” that you are reading that has neutered the generic “he” and singular pronouns and has made them plural so as to destroy the proper sense of verses that speak to individuals by making them speak instead to a group.

Let me quote just a few verses speaking to individuals about salvation:

“For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.” (Mt. 18:11)

“But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.” (Mt. 24:13)

“For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel’s, the same shall save it.” (Mk. 8:35)

“And ye shall be hated of all men for my name’s sake: but he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.” (Mk. 13:13)

“He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” (Mk. 16:16)

“For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.” (Lk. 19:10)

“I am the door; by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture.” (Jn. 10:9)

And there are so many incidences in scripture where the Lord talked to individuals about their salvation, like Nicodemus, the woman at the well, and continuing through just the Gospel of John, the healing of the blind man.

Let me give an example of distorting the scripture by replacing singulars with plurals, and some comments by Wayne Grudem:

“Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.” (John 14:23 KJV)

“Jesus answered him, ‘Those who love me will keep my word, and my Father will love them and we will come to them and make our home with them.’” (John 14:23 NRSV)

“Jesus replied, ‘Anyone who loves me will obey my teaching. My Father will love them, and we will come to them and make our home with them.’ ” (John 14:23 TNIV)

“Jesus replied, ‘All who love me will do what I say. My Father will love them, and we will come and make our home with each of them.’” (John 14:23 NLT, now the favorite of Willow Creek)

Wayne Grudem: www.cbmw.org/resources/articles/genderneutral.php

“The problem is that Jesus did not speak with plural pronouns here; he used singulars. Jesus wanted to specify that he and the Father would come and dwell *with an individual believer*. But the NRSV [TNIV, NLT, and other “gender-neutral” translations also] has lost that emphasis, because the plurals “those” and “them” indicate a group of people. “We will come to *them* and make our home with *them* indicates coming to a group of people, such as a church. The words of Jesus have been unnecessarily changed in translation, and the meaning is different. This is what the NRSV preface says are the “paraphrastic renderings” they had to use in dealing with gender-related language, and the preface rightly sets these in contrast to the rest of the NRSV, which is called “essentially a literal translation.”

The rejection of generic “he, him, his” obscures the personal application of Scripture in many other verses, such as “I will come in to *him* and eat with *him*, and *he* with me” (Rev. 3:20, where three

Greek pronouns are masculine singular). The NRSV changes this to, "I will come in to *you* and eat with *you*, and *you* with me," but "you" in this context would then refer to the whole church, and individual application of a familiar verse is lost. The NIVI, ncv, CEV and NLT, change "him" to "them," which also represents Jesus eating with a whole church, not just an individual. This is a serious loss of the specific individual application that Scripture intended for our benefit. . . ."

"Consider James 5:14-15 in the RSV: "Is any among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him . . . and the prayer of faith will save the sick man, and the Lord will raise him up"

"Now there would be no objection to changing "the sick man" to "the sick person" (there is no word specifying "man" in the Greek text), but the NRSV has gone much further: all the singulars are changed to plurals, to avoid the forbidden word "him": "Are any among you sick? *They* should call for the elders of the church and have them pray over *them*, anointing *them* with oil in the name of the Lord. The prayer of faith will save the sick, and the Lord will raise *them* up . . ." [TNIV is the same: "Is anyone among you sick? Let them call the elders of the church to pray over them and anoint them with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer offered in faith will make them well; the Lord will raise them up. If they have sinned, they will be forgiven."] "The situation that comes to mind is entirely different; James wrote about a private home with one person sick, but now it looks like a hospital ward! The meaning has been changed. This is not accurately translating the Bible; it is rewriting the Bible.

"How often are singulars changed to plurals? The words "they, them, their, those" occur 1,732 more times in the NRSV than in the RSV. In many other places, "he" has been changed to "you" or "we." Why? There have been no new archaeological discoveries, no changes in our knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, no ancient texts discovered that make us put plural pronouns instead of singular in these places, or first or second person in place of third person. The changes have been made because the NRSV translators were required by a division of the National Council of Churches to remove "masculine oriented language" from the Bible.

"This is not a small difference in the meaning of a few verses. This systematic change from singulars to plurals is a substantial alteration in the flavor and tone of the entire Bible, with a significant loss in the Bible's emphasis on God relating directly to a specific, individual person." ([What's Wrong with Gender-Neutral Bible Translations? by Wayne Grudem, 1997](#)).

So, I hope you can discern the danger of reading or studying

these “gender-neutral” translations. When you read from an accurate word for word translation, a true “gender-accurate” translation, you receive from the Holy Spirit who inspired it. When you read from a “gender-neutral” translation, you receive from the same spirit that inspired it, a demonic, seducing spirit from the pit of hell, which those who are responsible for producing and promoting these abominable translations will spend eternity with, and rightly so according to the words of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself!

As I close this writing, I want to include the Summary that I wrote many years ago after my expounding on this subject and is found in [The Public Ministry of Women](#), pages 28-29. The “clarity” of the true Word of God is astounding!

SUMMARY

In summary, we have found that the man is specifically appointed to the positions of authority and teaching in the church, and that the woman is specifically not appointed to these positions. This has been verified by every conceivable means:

1. Specific statements of the scriptures, both Old and New Testaments
2. Examples, both Old and New Testaments scriptures
3. The creation of mankind supported by Old and New Testament scriptures
 - a. Purpose of creation
 - b. Order of creation
 - c. Manner of creation
 - d. Nature of creation
4. The fall of mankind
5. Word derivation and gender, both Old and New Testament scriptures
6. The Septuagint Greek translation of the Old Testament scriptures
7. Required qualifications, both Old and New Testament scriptures

We can add here that not only do the scriptures teach thoroughly these truths, but also centuries of experience invariably confirm them as the Word of God. Not only has the church consistently practiced these truths from the creation of man until the Lord Jesus Christ came in the flesh, but during the twenty consecutive centuries of the New Testament, the church has consistently done so as well. Not until this century, and particularly the past few years, have these truths been so perverted. But this we must expect as God reveals the creation of Babylon the great, the great harlot church that would be filled with every form of false teaching and demonic practice (Rev. 17, 28; I Tim. 4:1-2). But God is building and preparing His true church, the bride of Christ, which will be in order and prepared for her heavenly bridegroom, without spot and without wrinkle (Rev. 19, 21, 22; Eph. 5:27). When Christ is submitted to as Lord, and meetings flow under the freedom of the Holy Spirit allowing God to operate as He chooses, the church will come **“unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ”** (Eph. 4:13).

To the degree that we deceive ourselves or allow Satan to deceive us, to that degree we devitalize the ministry of the body of Christ to which we all must look for edification, maturity, and perfection in our Lord Jesus Christ (Eph. 4:11-16).

Therefore, brother, as I close this reply to your writing, I want to thank the Lord that since our beginning discussions you have recently changed your beliefs on food and accepted the truth that we are now to eat clean meats and eggs. I shall continue to pray that you will also be delivered from this “seducing spirit and doctrine of the devil” concerning a Feminist interpretation and their translations of the scripture. Unfortunately, you have accepted the same seducing spirit and the propaganda that they spew out. When you write “The NIV and TNIV have gained the widest readership and acceptance in all parts of the English speaking world. Translators from 5 countries and over 15 denominations have participated on these translations. This has brought some unity to the Body of Christ” you do not yet realize how demonic and deceitful the error is that they are attempting to seduce the Christian church with, or how untrue it is as to bringing unity to the Body of Christ.

While it is true that the old line denominations accept this perversion, as well as the spirit of homosexuality that goes along with it, and all others who reject the holiness and righteousness of God and the truth of His Word who are prophetically forming this last day apostasy in the final fulfillment of “Babylon the great” who is becoming “a dwelling place of demons and a prison of every unclean spirit, and a prison of every unclean and hateful bird” (Rev.

18:2 NASB, see my book on [The church](#)), knowledgeable saints of God, and there are multitudes including bible scholars by the hundreds, totally reject these perverted translations and say so clearly and loudly.

Satan and his seducing spirits propagate all false doctrines through lies. Jesus said the denominational leaders of His day were “of their father the devil” who is “the father of lies” (John 8:44). Therefore I want to add one more example of the many lies the wicked people who are responsible for the translation, publication, and spread of this false translation used to try and gain credibility. I want to bring attention to the Press Release of June 11, 2002 when Zondervan and the International Bible Society deliberately and deceitfully falsely quoted a statement supposedly from the Forum of Bible Agencies: “It is the consensus of the FBA that the TNIV falls within the Forum’s translation principles and procedures.” Affirming the FBA as representing “the world’s leading experts on Bible translation.” They even added members to the list who were not members, but they got caught speedily as the FBA answered in a press release just days later refuting this assertion. Many scholars and members of the FBA were very upset, and rightly so. And they lied about the guidelines of the FBA as well. You can check this out in www.genderneutralbibles.com/timeline.php

Finally in summation, it was spoken so clearly when Wayne Grudem said: “The translators consistently disregarded precise, grammatically correct English equivalents and resorted to gender-neutral paraphrases.” And “It is artificially contrived English for the purpose of politically correct speech.” (What's Wrong with Gender-Neutral Bible Translations? by Wayne Grudem, 1997 www.cbmw.org/resources/articles/genderneutral.php)

Brother, I am praying that you and others who reads this information will repent of any sin that causes one to be bound by the spirit of “Evangelical Feminism,” be forgiven and delivered. The consequences are eternal.

Now, I must close with the warning the Lord gave me after reading your teaching:

“This was written by a spirit of error, held on to by a rebellious man who is determined to have his error submitted to. He shall die in his sins if he does not repent!”

Now, after presenting this info to the brother and other leaders in the church, I feel led to add a few more thoughts before wider distribution.

If you read about the many different mistranslations being foisted upon an unsuspecting church today, you will soon discover the spirit of confusion manifested in the thinking of these last day apostatizing scholars. You will discover the spirits of pride, rebellion, unbelief, selfish ambition, and greed, all spirits of the Babylonian Church.

One way they deceive themselves and then those who follow their pernicious ways is by sophisticated, invented, but very erroneous methods of translation. They do this from “new” “theories” and “philosophies” of translation, they say. But what makes it so wicked as well as demonic, is that when Peter warned about some who wrest the scripture to their own destruction as being “unlearned and unstable,” these are certainly not unlearned, but are educated scholars who have so yielded themselves to the spirits of this age that after repeatedly sinning against their own consciences, they have thoroughly seared them “as with a branding iron.” (2 Peter 3:16; 1 Tim. 4:1-2) Impregnable! Branded “apostate!”

One method of so called translation, which really is not translation but interpretation, is most often called “thought-for-thought” translation theory. Let me quote from the official website of the New Living Translation, an example of such audacity as to presume that they can understand the scripture perfectly so as to put it into words according to their thoughts better than the words of the men inspired of God to write the scripture in the first place, and then call it “translation.” It is not! It is interpretation! That’s what “thought for thought” really is. And then when these degenerates pervert the gender (at least 3,686 times in the TNIV), you can see that they are not only demonically deceived, but deliberately wicked. Sinners will lie about that which pertains to themselves, but when people lie about what God has said, they are without excuse, align themselves with the serpent in Genesis 3, and will pay the price of eternal destruction which they justly deserve!

Bible translations tend to be governed by one of two general translation theories. The first theory has been called “formal-equivalence,” “literal,” or “word-for-word” translation. According to this theory, the translator attempts to render each word of the original language into English and seeks to preserve the original syntax and sentence structure as much as possible in translation. The second theory has been called “dynamic-equivalence,” “functional-equivalence,” or “thought-for-thought” translation. The goal of this translation theory is to produce in English the closest natural equivalent of the message expressed by the original- language text, both in meaning and in style. (NewLivingTranslation.com)

To refute the declared “accuracy” of such corruption, I am going to demonstrate from a verse that was brought to the attention of Dr. Palmer in 1979 here in Columbus when he was on tour promoting the NIV. The Greek is very simple, and easy to translate as can be seen below, or examined by a Greek-English Interlinear, or Strong’s, and Lexicon.

The simple verse is: “It is good for a man not to touch a woman.” (1 Cor. 7:1). It is translated accurately with these same exact words in all “word for word” translations ([KJV](#), [NASB](#), [NKJV](#), [KJ21](#)), as it is very simple Greek and can be easily translated into any language.

With the huge problems of out of control sexuality today, not just in the world but in the church, this phrase is so beautiful as many excellent points can be drawn from it in teaching. Youth particularly need to be instructed early how “touching” stimulates desire, and must be controlled within proper boundaries. Stimulation through touching is normal, and God-given, and needs to be understood properly, and taught. And touching involves more than the sense of feeling with one’s hands, but we “touch” physically with all five senses. Our ears are touched with sound waves, our eyes with light, our noses with smells, our tongues with taste, as well as our hands and bodies with feelings, and they must all be properly controlled and disciplined. I’ve written more about “touching” and the senses in my book, [A Woman’s Dress](#), which is available. What a shame that these so-called translators cannot simply translate the Word and not think that their thoughts are superior to God’s. One cannot help but wonder how some can actually believe in the verbal inspiration of scripture, every “jot and tittle,” and torture the Word of God the way they do.

Now, to see how people interpret instead of translate, let’s look at the context and accuracy in the NASB and then examine different “thought for thought” “Bibles” attempting to get your money and unfortunately your souls.

[1 Cor. 6:19 – 7:5 NASB] “Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit who is in you, whom you have from God, and that you are not your own?

[20] For you have been bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body.

[7:1] Now concerning the things about which you wrote, it is good for a man not to touch a woman.

[2] But because of immoralities, each man is to have his own wife, and each woman is to have her own husband.

[3] The husband must fulfill his duty to his wife, and likewise also the wife to her husband.

[4] The wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband does; and likewise also the husband does not have authority over his own body, but the wife does.

[5] Stop depriving one another, except by agreement for a time, so that you may devote yourselves to prayer, and come together again so that Satan will not tempt you because of your lack of self-control."

Now let's look at the NIV and others purporting to be so accurate.

[NIV] It is good for a man not to marry.(a) **2**But since there is so much immorality, each man should have his own wife, and each woman her own husband. **3**The husband should fulfill his marital duty to his wife, and likewise the wife to her husband. **4**The wife's body does not belong to her **alone** but **also** to her husband. In the same way, the husband's body does not belong to him **alone** but **also** to his wife. **5**Do not deprive each other except by mutual consent and for a time, so that you may devote yourselves to prayer. Then come together again so that Satan will not tempt you because of your lack of self-control.

Footnotes: [NIV] (a) "It is good for a man not to have sexual relations with a woman."

Now notice with what follows that after being confronted with their inaccuracy, they changed the NIV to being more accurate in the TNIV. However, the horrible gender-neutral changes make this "translation" totally unacceptable. Notice also that the NIV adds words stating that the body of the husband or wife belongs to themselves as well as to their spouse. The scripture never says this. In fact, the Holy Spirit through Paul just got through saying immediately before this that our bodies do not belong to us, but God (6:19). Misunderstanding this fact is the major problem today. People think they can do whatever their physical desires want. They dress the way they want and society dictates, eat the same, and are now committing fornication and little is being said about it in so many places. That is the way I thought as an unbeliever. But thank God for faithful preaching and the true Word of God. We are not our own, but have been bought with a price, the precious body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, and are to glorify Him with our bodies!

[TNIV] "It is good for a man not to have sexual relations with a woman." **2** But since sexual immorality is occurring, each man should have sexual relations with his own wife, and each woman with her own husband. **3** The husband should fulfill his marital

duty to his wife, and likewise the wife to her husband. **4** The wife does not have authority over her own body but yields it to her husband. In the same way, the husband does not have authority over his own body but yields it to his wife.

[NLT] Yes, it is good to live a celibate life. (a)

Footnotes: (a) Greek *It is good for a man not to touch a woman.*

[CEV You asked, "Is it best for people not to marry?" ^[a] **2**Well, having your own husband or wife should keep you from doing something immoral. **3**Husbands and wives should be fair with each other about having sex. **4**A wife belongs to her husband instead of to herself, and a husband belongs to his wife instead of to himself. **5**So don't refuse sex to each other, unless you agree not to have sex for a little while, in order to spend time in prayer. Then Satan won't be able to tempt you because of your lack of self-control.

Footnotes: [1 Corinthians 7:1](#) *people not to marry*: Or "married couples not to have sex."

Here the CEV is most pathetic when suggesting that married couple are “not to have sex,” and that in this context where Paul says in the very next verse that men and women should marry in order not to commit fornication, implying that marriage would take care of their sexual needs. This is what happens when you allow your thoughts to preempt the Word instead of just simply translating the Word! How pathetic! And the words used certainly don't ring with holiness either!

[ESV} “It is good for a man not to have sexual relations with a woman.”

[HCSB] “It is good for a man not to have relations with a woman.”

Footnote: Lit *not to touch*

Well, beloved, I trust you can see from just this one simple example that “thought for thought” translation is not translation but interpretation. And this is what you will get throughout their works. It results in what is sometimes referred to as “Eisegesis,” meaning “Reading into the text what we want it to mean.” True translation is “Exegesis,” meaning “Reading out of the text the intended meaning of the author.” And in this case, God! And “gender-neutral” translation is “eisegesis” at its worst!

As we close, it is interesting to note the following from

Wikipedia concerning [Eisegesis](#):

Modern evangelical scholars accuse [liberal protestants](#) of practicing biblical eisegesis, while [Mainline](#) scholars accuse [fundamentalists](#) of practicing eisegesis. [Catholics](#) say that all [Protestants](#) engage in eisegesis, because the Bible can be correctly understood only through the lens of [Holy Tradition](#) as handed down by the institutional Church. Jews counter that all Christians practice eisegesis when they read the [Hebrew Bible](#) as a book about Jesus.

Beloved, when we consider all that I've written about in this message, principally about the danger and wickedness of "gender-neutral" translations, isn't it wonderful that the Lord has promised the Holy Spirit to those that obey Him? (Acts 5:32) He said:

"When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak." (John 16:13)

Ask Him then, concerning what you have just read, and if you meet the condition He laid down, "you shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free." (John 8:32)

"If any man is willing to do His will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from Myself."
(John 7:17 NASB)

Sincerely in Christ Jesus our Lord,
John P. Rothacker

"But you, beloved, ought to remember the words that were spoken beforehand by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, that they were saying to you, "In the last time there shall be mockers, following after their own ungodly lusts." These are the ones who cause divisions [Gk. αποδιοριζοντες, apodiorizo, disjoin; KJV, separate themselves], worldly-minded [Gk.: ψυχικοι, psuchikos, soulish], devoid of the Spirit [Gk. & KJV: having not the Spirit]. But you, beloved, building yourselves up on your most holy faith; praying in the Holy Spirit; keep yourselves in the love of God, waiting anxiously for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ to eternal life.

And have mercy on some, who are doubting; save others, snatching them out of the fire; and on some have mercy with fear, hating even the garment polluted by the flesh.

Now to Him who is able to keep you from stumbling, and to make you stand in the presence of His glory blameless with great joy, to the only God our Savior, through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, majesty, dominion and authority, before all time and now and forever. Amen.”

(Jude 1:17-25 NASB)

For those wanting to study this problem more thoroughly, I would like to recommend the following additional resources:

- “The Problem with the TNIV” an interview of Dr. Wayne Grudem by James Dobson, available on CD from [Focus on the Family](#). (Oct 2005)
- Why is my choice of a Bible translation so important? by Wayne Grudem and Jerry Thacker.
- The TNIV and The Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy by Vern S. Poythress & Wayne A. Grudem. (All available from Focus on the Family, search.)