

# Evangelical Culture is Beta Culture

18 upvotes | 12 December, 2018 | by OsmiumZulu

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](http://theredarchive.com)

---

## Comments

---

Deep\_Strength • 9 points • 12 December, 2018 11:35 PM

Very good article.

But the same author has posted some horrendous articles not just a couple years ago. For instance, this example where he HEAVILY misinterprets several passages with a feminist bent:

When David set out to kill Nabal — the brash and brute man who embodied pure masculine folly — Nabal's wife Abigail offered hundreds of fig cakes and loaves of bread and wine skins to David. Yet, she uses the opportunity to warn David that he should “have no cause of grief or pangs of conscience for having shed blood without cause or for my lord working salvation for himself” (1 Samuel 25:31). In other words, Abigail warned: “Be careful. Don't use your power in a way that will make you guilty.” [...]

David was attracted to this strong woman for her strength, for her rebuke, and for her character. Abigail made life harder for David. And David, in a moment of grace, was able to see that Abigail's standing in David's way was a gift of purity to him. That day, David was seeking salvation for himself, but it was gifted to him by God in Abigail, who, even while she was at his mercy as his subject, told him what he needed to hear.

Strong women rebuke good men, who need help in their weaknesses, who need someone to help them see how to be strong.

That article was so bad, I went through and debunked it myself.

I have seen the story of Abigail taken out of context by feminists (who call themselves Christians) so many times. Let's look at the full context, shall we?

1. David is roaming around the countryside and even acts to protect the shepherds of Nabal safe during that time (v14-17)
2. David sends servants politely to ask for food (v2-8). Unlike in our culture, given the customs and law of Israel, receiving strangers is an honor for households.
3. Nabal rejects and disdains David's protection of his people and has no sense of hospitality (v9-11)
4. David, seeing as Nabal is repaying good with evil and decides to act against him. As we know, the Lord hates repaying good with evil. (v12-13 + 21): “Now David had said, “Surely in vain I have guarded all that this man has in the wilderness, so that nothing was missed of all that belonged to him; and he has returned me evil for good.”
5. Abigail intercedes knowing that the Lord was with David and that David is an arm of righteous punishment (v18-22).
6. Abigail is willing to take all of the blame (v22-25).
7. Abigail suggests mercy instead of judgment as mercy is more beneficial to both of them (v26-31).
8. David praises her for her logic as it was able to convince him to stay his hand (v32-35).

Unfortunately, as we can see, the story does not fit the narrative which the author is trying to portray, namely “Strong women rebuke good men, who need help in their weaknesses, who need someone to help them see how to be strong.” In reality, David is not rebuked by Abigail. David was not weak, and Abigail did not show him how to be ‘be strong.’

In fact, David's actions were justified because Nabal was repaying good with evil. However, Abigail was considered righteous because of the points mentioned in 6 and 7. Abigail was willing to take all of the blame

for her husbands actions (v24b — On me [l]alone, my lord, be the blame). She didn't try to justify his evil and even brought a gift of appeasement. Likewise, Abigail suggests mercy instead of judgment. Judgment is what was deserved, but mercy can triumph over judgment. In fact, mercy, like grace, can only triumph if the full guilt of sins is made known and acknowledged by the offender (also, see Parable of the forgiven servant). This mirrors repentance, not a rebuke.

This clearly shows Abigail's righteous actions, and it has nothing to with the false narrative of David being rebuked, being weak or the deficiencies of her husband.

The passage is about Abigail taking the righteous way by taking her husband's blame upon herself and offering gifts and logical arguments to appease David... not rebuke him.

**All of this is to say: Did he have a change of heart in the past year or two?**

Nobody knows?

OsmiumZulu[S] • 2 points • 12 December, 2018 11:36 PM

Very interesting. I had only read the original article I linked. Seems like two very different perspectives.

Deep\_Strength • 3 points • 12 December, 2018 11:41 PM

Hopefully his eyes have been opened by God perhaps?

Whitified • 1 point • 15 December, 2018 09:28 PM

All of this is to say: Did he have a change of heart in the past year or two?

How so? Everything in his latest article can be written by a Complementarian.

In his fantasy world, Christian women are being blamed for men failing to Man Up:

Consequently, women are often blamed for men failing to grow into men for failing to challenge men.

This is of course only imaginable in the mind of an effeminate man who defers responsibility.

He then spends the entire article being mostly correct describing the symptoms which the Church is suffering from (something all Complementarians can do as well). His solution, of course, is for men to Man Up:

Where does this leave us? What is the solution?

It's simple—it must start locally. It must start with a group of Christian men in a local church who value these ideals and find ways of encouraging them of pursuing masculine competencies that are in accordance with typical masculine qualities alongside their spirituality.

As usual, there is no mention of the huge elephant in the room: feminism. The root of the problem. Control + F "feminis" returned just 2 results: neither which singles out the feminist movement, or chivalry, as the culprit.

The author's denial of feminist rebellion is most telling in him completely absolving women of responsibility in demonizing male behaviour:

I understand why women reject it—**they're women**; they don't know what it's like to be a man, and they didn't grow up in male locker rooms.

Using this concept, women can effectively be absolved of all responsibility from all feminist crimes. This is *perfect* Complementarianism. Any sane, non-Complementarian person would know that modern women demonize "locker room talk" because feminism (and because it's 2018).

Of course, the author also did not mention Biblical Headship, the one true antidote to this mess. The best he

could do is call out "political correctness", but that's something all Conservatives are (still) willing to call out anyway.

Things that might actually upset the feminist status quo (calling out 200 years of feminism, calling rebellious women to repentance) he did not mention. Things that might offend Christian women (pastors' wives having de-facto leadership of the church) he did not mention. What we have instead is one huge "Man Up!" article.

Last but not least there is this hilarious nugget:

So, what you end up getting from evangelicals about masculinity are effeminate men yelling at other effeminate men that they need to be men.

Pot calling the kettle black?

This isn't a good article at all. Same old same old

Deep\_Strength • 1 point • 15 December, 2018 10:58 PM

Sure, it COULD be better. But it's fine for what it's trying to do... identify why Evangelical culture is a beta culture.

The solutions are ok at best. Not amazing. I agree that the feminist rebellion is another side of the coin to be looked at, but you don't need to go after that initially to start working on being masculine.

Whitified • 1 point • 16 December, 2018 10:38 AM

feminist rebellion is another side of the coin to be looked at, but you don't need to go after that initially to start working on being masculine.

Like I said, Christians urging men to be "masculine" (Man Up) is an everyday occurrence. Yet Christian men continue being effeminate because the underlying cause has not been addressed. So perhaps your statement here is not accurate.

Lairhoss • 5 points • 13 December, 2018 07:51 PM

It's a good text, a bit too much on the pessimist side for my taste, but that's the reality nowadays anyway.

I find it hard to fit on any church since there's no place to discuss masculine topics anymore, even talking about women became a subject of deep respect and distance, as if it was a subject too far away from the Christian life.

I have also seen a rampant increase of female pastors everywhere, which brings masculinity even farther away from the leadership that it was supposed to have.

But the reality is that Christ died for the Church to exist, even if it's not as great as it could be, leaving our personal preferences aside is more important than dismissing the communion just because things aren't as we want.

OsmiumZulu[S] • 3 points • 13 December, 2018 07:56 PM

The question is: are these spineless evangelically "churches" the churches that Christ died for to exist?

I'd respectfully posit, no.

Lairhoss • 1 point • 13 December, 2018 08:16 PM

Definitely he didn't die for this lukewarm structure that people try to maintain, but most of the time it's inside it we'll find the remnant of true Christians fellowship though

rpsheepdog • 2 points • 13 December, 2018 08:42 PM

I'm glad you posted

I've noticed in a lot of the churches in my area there tends to be a very "feelz" type component each week we go. There have been a few times where the worship leaders skip the entire message to sing more and have altar calls, for close to an hour.

I understand the emotional calls and singing, but I have noticed a large skew away from the intellectually stimulating messages and sermons in favor of the kind that are much more watered down and evoke feelings.