

## Dalrock

Thoughts from a happily married father  
on a post feminist world.

---

### Oh Lord, it's hard to be humble...

Posted on [January 30, 2015](#) by [Dalrock](#)

I came across this while researching Pastor Driscoll's apologies for one of my two final posts in the series. [Relevant magazine](#) links to a Driscoll sermon from 2007 titled [A Rebel's Guide to Joy and Humility](#). Driscoll starts by jokingly acknowledging that he isn't the best man to be preaching on humility:

*Well as we get into it, tonight's theme is humility. We're calling tonight's sermon "The Rebel's Guide to Joy in Humility". And I will start by saying I have no right to teach on this subject. I know many of you are probably thinking, "Pastor Mark is teaching us on humility. That's funny." I guess Brittany Spears will come in and do a parenting seminar at Mars Hill as well since we're at it.*

He goes on to state that a lack of humility has been his biggest failure over the last 11 years, and explains that he is really preaching this sermon to himself. So far, so good. But then in classic Driscoll style, he manages to brag about how great he is while explaining that he needs to be humble:

*...I truly believe that were there one thing I could do over in the history of Mars Hill, it would be in my attitude and in my actions and in my words, **to not only emphasize sound doctrine and courage and strength and commitment and conviction, but to add in addition to that, humility as a virtue.***

Forget Brittany Spears, how about [Mac Davis](#).

Then Driscoll continues his apology for lacking humility all of these years at Mars Hill, in this sermon he is preaching to himself, by identifying the problem:

*And so I'll start by your forgiveness and sincerely acknowledging that this has been a great failure. And I believe that it is showing up in our church in the lives of **men and women who have sound doctrine, but not sound attitude** – that **they** may contend for good things, but **their** motives are bad, and **their** methods are bad, and **their** tone is bad, and **their** tactics are bad, and **their** actions are bad because **their** attitude is bad, even though **their** objectives sometimes is good. I see this in particular with **the men**. I see this with **men young and old** – **men** who have known Jesus for a long time and should know better, and **men** who are new to Jesus and are learning sometimes the hard way. **I will take some responsibility for this.***

*Luke 6:40 says that when fully trained, disciples are like their teacher. And I am primary teaching pastor of this church, and **I can't simply look at the pride in some of our people and say that I am in no way responsible or complaisant.***

Share this:

- [Reddit](#)
- [Twitter](#)
- [Email](#)
- [Facebook](#)
- [Tumblr](#)
- 

Like this:

Like Loading...

## Related

This entry was posted in [Manosphere Humor](#), [Mark Driscoll](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#).

## 65 Responses to *Oh Lord, it's hard to be humble...*

Pingback: [Oh Lord, it's hard to be humble... | Manosphere.com](#)



**MarcusD** says:

January 30, 2015 at 3:57 pm

He really seems narcissistic.

Related: <http://www.charismanews.com/us/46666-mark-driscoll-makes-comeback-launches-new-website>



**Cail Corishev** says:

January 30, 2015 at 4:07 pm

Humble bragging about one's lack of humility. It's like a perpetual motion machine.

I like the way your emphases in the longest paragraph show how he started out talking about "men and women" and then shifted to just "men." Whew, he almost criticized women (equally with men) for a full ten seconds there; good thing he corrected himself and made it clear he means "in particular" the men.

Pingback: [Oh Lord, it's hard to be humble... | Neoreactive](#)



**Cane Caldo** says:

January 30, 2015 at 4:12 pm

Ironic that this should be your topic. I have been pondering the same phenomenon's appearance in a link you left in my comments.



**Rollo Tomassi** says:

January 30, 2015 at 4:43 pm

Humility, heh, from the plagiarist:

<http://www.christianitytoday.com/gleanings/2013/december/tyndale-releases-results-mark-driscoll-plagiarism-investiga.html>



**tz says:**

January 30, 2015 at 4:49 pm

CS Lewis on the topic: <http://www.opendiscipleship.org/mere-christianity-leaders-notes/book-three-christian-behavior/book-three-chapter-8-the-great-sin/>

I can only have one criticism of such a criticism. In what way have you (or I) done better? It is easy to point at others and call them arrogant, but rarely does one do so at oneself.

But I don't understand the last point – he says he can't say he isn't responsible – note the double negative, so he is taking responsibility for setting a prideful example. Then a few paragraphs later:

*Furthermore, I apologize and repent publically to you, the church, for whom I am responsible for much pride in the history of my ministry that some of you have poorly imitated. And for that, I'm deeply sorry. And thirdly, to say that I am not a humble man. But as result of study, I'm a man who is acknowledging his pride and pursuing humility by God's grace.*

What bothers me is that he is attempting to do good in a world gone bad. I don't think anyone can undergo an examination by someone with bad will looking for any error or wrongheadedness – not giving any benefit of the doubt but taking the worst possible meaning. I do not think anyone can survive such an audit. Are such errors common, serious, and/or intentional? There are many critics of sites like this – are they doing wrong by picking small bits with ambiguous context, but how is that different?

Even CS Lewis doesn't attempt to give a long sermon, he merely states it plainly that we all suffer from pride and as Christians need to do something about it.

What is a pastor who is tasked with giving an hour sermon on pride to do? Go on knowing he will fail and expose himself as guilty of the sin he is covering? No matter how many times he acknowledges it within the sermon, the critics will pick it apart and find one or two examples to show he is bad – but the critics themselves never tried to give such a sermon.

It is easy to find flaws in something written by any fallen man, even the saints like Augustine or Aquinas. It is much harder to write a sermon of your own confronting the identical matter with less serious, numerous, or intentional flaws.

I've read or listened to the whole of most sermons and plan to, and I really don't see it to be as bad as being advertised. I can agree that there are problems, and that they are more serious than Driscoll may realize because of the state of the world, but at what point do the flaws get treated and corrected charitably instead of being funneled in to what appears to be a personal attack?

And the rest of that passage from Driscoll:

*And I am primary teaching pastor of this church, and I can't simply look at the pride in some of our people and say that I am in no way responsible or complaisant. So I'm a guy who's pretty busted up over this personally, and it really came to my attention last December, just in time for Christmas. The critics really brought me a lot of kind gifts of opposition and hatred and animosity. Merry Christmas. And some of those most vocal and nasty critics were Christian – some of them prominent Christians – and so I was getting ready to fire back my usual tactics. They hit you. You hit them twice and then blog about your victory, which I don't have any verses for. I'm not saying it was a good idea, but it had been a pattern in my life until a man names C.J. Mahaney called. He wrote a book called "Humility". Much of my sermon today will be simply taken from his book. I would commend it to you all for reading. It's a good, simple book. He's a very humble, gracious and good man. Not humble. He's a man pursuing humility. That's what he would say. I need to get that right; otherwise he'll call me this week.*

*C.J. is a guy who pastored Covenant Life Church and handed it over. Runs the Sovereign Grace network. He called me up during these periods of criticism in December and said, "Mark, I know we don't know one another. We have many mutual*

*friends. How do you respond to these critics? What is your plan?" I said, "I don't have a plan." And he said, "Might I suggest that this is an opportunity for you to practice humility, grow in humility, learn humility – that perhaps God and his providential care for you has this season appointed to you for humility." My first thought was, "Well I sure hope not. That sounds convicting."*



**earl** says:

January 30, 2015 at 4:51 pm

'And I am primary teaching pastor of this church, and I can't simply look at the pride in some of our people and say that I am in no way responsible or complaisant.'

Well there you go...this was the church of Mark Driscoll. Jesus barely makes a cameo appearance.



**okrahead** says:

January 30, 2015 at 4:57 pm

"I see this in particular with the men. I see this with men young and old – men who have known Jesus for a long time and should know better, and men who are new to Jesus and are learning sometimes the hard way. I will take some responsibility for this."

It seems Senior Driscoll missed Paul's admonition to Timothy in 1 Tim. 5:1; namely not to rebuke an older man. At the time Driscoll gave this sermon he would have been 37 at the most, and he specifies he is addressing older men.

D, I believe that the greatest problem here is a colossal level of ignorance of basic New Testament doctrine. It boggles the mind that anyone firmly grounded in New Testament theology, regardless of his background, would be taken in by a crank like this, yet Driscoll apparently managed to convert 15,000 people to himself. I say himself, because in his absence Mars Hill church is apparently in the process of closing up shop. If you follow the history of the church of Driscoll, you will find that anyone who questioned him, even members of the church's eldership, were removed, often via secret trials which they themselves were not allowed to attend. If that's not a cult I cannot imagine what it would take. If Driscoll had not fallen it was only a matter of time before they all got on planes to Guyana and had a special dose of fruit punch.



**the sheep nazi** says:

January 30, 2015 at 5:12 pm

A closed-mouth friend of mine says, humility isn't thinking less of yourself, it's thinking of yourself less.



**Gunner Q** says:

January 30, 2015 at 5:16 pm

I find it hard to generalize from this. Humility isn't a major issue for Churchians. There are some wolves in sheep's clothing but also a lot of True Believers in feminism.

For all their faults, most feminized churches don't have a strong personality cult going. The hypergamy-fueled potential is there but I haven't seen it come out much. Perhaps that'll be fourth-wave feminism: the Christian church descending into celebrity cults as the male exodus continues. (The secular people would instead have harems.)

It isn't hard to imagine Mars Hill as a harbinger of American society.



**Dalrock** says:

January 30, 2015 at 5:39 pm

@TZ

*What bothers me is that he is attempting to do good in a world gone bad. I don't think anyone can undergo an examination by someone with bad will looking for any error or wrongheadedness – not giving any benefit of the doubt but taking the worst possible meaning. I do not think anyone can survive such an audit. Are such errors common, serious, and/or intentional? There are many critics of sites like this – are they doing wrong by picking small bits with ambiguous context, but how is that different?*

...

*I've read or listened to the whole of most sermons and plan to, and I really don't see it to be as bad as being advertised. I can agree that there are problems, and that they are more serious than Driscoll may realize because of the state of the world, but at what point do the flaws get treated and corrected charitably instead of being funneled in to what appears to be a personal attack?*

As I mentioned in the post, I came across this while searching for Driscoll's apologies. I mention this because I've been looking for meaningful signs of his repentance and not yet found them, and since you feel I've been unfair to Driscoll you might be able to set me straight. In the Relevant link in the OP Driscoll says he looks forward to preaching under authority. Yet by all accounts he continued to fight tooth and nail against that authority for another five months, until he finally agreed to step away to permit an investigation of long running charges in August 2014 (the relevant apology is from March 2014).

Then when the Board of Overseers investigation was wrapping up, Driscoll promptly resigned, emphasizing that the investigation proved he hadn't done anything serious enough to stop preaching. He does offer an apology in his resignation letter, but it seems not to match the level of abuse of power and dysfunction that lead to him no longer being able to preach at Mars Hill. You no doubt will find this uncharitable, but it looks to me like Driscoll refusing to preach if he is to truly be under authority, something he claims to repent of in the Relevant apology.

If you can correct me in this, I will be in your debt.



**Cane Caldo** says:

January 30, 2015 at 5:49 pm

I hope I have not misled anyone with my comment above. I was referring to the author of a link that Dalrock left at my blog; not to Dalrock himself.



**Thornstruck** says:

January 30, 2015 at 6:13 pm

After reading your series, Dalrock, I believe the easiest and forthright question to those of Pastor Driscoll's vein of thought is "Do you believe women sin or are capable of sinning?" Alternatively you could walk the rhetorical route, "Why do you believe women are not capable of sinning?"

On a separate note, I've just finished reading Tony Evan's Kingdom Man: Every Man's Destiny, Every Woman's Dream with the men's church group I attend. The book does have a chapter titled The Real Meaning of Headship, Chapter 6.

"Since this is a book for men, I am not going to go into all of the details of the submission of a woman right here. And men, if you are single, take notes on this section so you will have the right understanding when you get married. But what I do want to point out is that the Scripture clearly states that the man is the head of a woman, no the head of *all* women. This is not a blanket ticket for male domination; rather this is a hierarchical structure for the home (if a woman is married), and for the church (if a woman is single and no longer under her father's authority).

Likewise, I want to note that this does not mean that a man has absolute authority over a woman. He has authority over a woman only as long as it is consistent with the Word of God. For example, a man cannot tell his wife to rob a bank then hold her guilty for not submitting if she doesn't do it. The man's authority, as we are about to see, must directly be placed under the authority of Jesus Christ for it to be legitimate, which is why Paul says a woman is to be a subject to her husband "as to the Lord" (Ephesians 5:22)"

It's another man up book but framed around scripture and God's desire for men to follow him. The review from [Mathew Sims](#) on Amazon best sums the book up as a mixed bag of theology and supporting scripture with heavy use of sports analogy.



**Oscar** says:

January 30, 2015 at 6:18 pm

Vanity is the one temptation and sin from which we all suffer. Vanity is an un-Godly preoccupation with self. And one can't escape oneself, which means we can't escape the temptation. Furthermore, vanity (or pride – they're very closely related, if not the same thing) is THE original sin, as in Satan's original sin.

Isaiah 14:12 "How you are fallen from heaven,  
O Lucifer,[b] son of the morning!  
How you are cut down to the ground,  
You who weakened the nations!  
13 For you have said in your heart:  
'I will ascend into heaven,  
I will exalt my throne above the stars of God;  
I will also sit on the mount of the congregation  
On the farthest sides of the north;  
14 I will ascend above the heights of the clouds,  
I will be like the Most High.'

Some of us are, of course, more prone to vanity than others. But we all have to be wary of it.

On very rare occasions, popular culture serves up the truth.

**Vanity, Definitely my favourite Sin!**



**Dalrock** says:

January 30, 2015 at 6:29 pm

@Thornstruck (quoting a book)

*He has authority over a woman only as long as it is consistent with the Word of God. For example, a man cannot tell his wife to his wife to rob a bank then hold her guilty for not submitting if she doesn't do it. The man's authority, as we are about to see, must directly be placed under the authority of Jesus Christ for it to be legitimate, which is why Paul says a woman is to be a subject to her husband "as to the Lord" (Ephesians 5:22)*

I think he is correct in the first two quoted sentences. It is the second part, where he appears to claim that Paul in Ephesians contradicted Peter in 1 Pet 3 is where I would disagree. But perhaps I'm misreading him.



**Dalrock** says:

January 30, 2015 at 7:23 pm

@TZ

*But I don't understand the last point – he says he can't say he isn't responsible – note the double negative, so he is taking responsibility for setting a prideful example.*

This isn't really what he did. He said he lacks humility and set a bad example. But then he goes off on a tangent pointing out all the people he sees who lack humility. It isn't a simple admission that he created a toxic culture, but a shift of focus from himself to everyone beneath him. It isn't that he noted that his example was being followed, but the way he noted it.



**Thornstruck** says:

January 30, 2015 at 7:29 pm

@Dalrock

From what I've read Tony Evans is using this part of scripture to illustrate how women were created to receive and respond to men's actions. I didn't pick up that he was attempting to contradict [1 Peter 3](#) though.

Further in the chapter

“Now, because of how some women were raised, perhaps in an atmosphere of abuse or in a strong matriarchal home, they may not recognize or exhibit this trait, but women have been created to receive and respond. It is built into how God programmed them. It is even built into them biologically as to how they have been anatomically designed. Don't think too long on that one – I want you to stay with me. Women have been created to receive and respond physiologically, emotionally, and spiritually.

But what you need to know about a woman is that just as much as she can receive and respond positively, she can also receive and respond negatively. If the wrong things are said or done to her, she may react in a way that reflects what is being done to her. Because of that, you could end up with nagging or a rebellious heart. Or, if she lacks attention or protection, then she will receive that and respond by doing everything in her power to protect or provide for herself, as well as position herself in a way so she won't run the risk of being let down again. All she is doing is giving you feedback based on what you are giving to her. She is a mirror reflecting to you the impact and influence that you, or other males, have had on her.

If you want a summer wife, men, then don't bring home winter weather. But if you have a winter wife, men, then it is time to bring out the sun. Women have been created to receive and respond; therefore, you regulate much of the temperature in your home. Of course, there may be extenuating factors out of your control, but for the most part, men simply are not recognizing or maximizing the power of their influence in the home.



Keep in mind, though, that this can take some time. Depending upon how long biblical manhood has been absent in a woman's life, that may be how long it takes for her to receive and respond because she needs to be sure biblical manhood is real when it does show up. She is not going to expose herself in a vulnerable manner just because you say that you hear a sermon, read a book, went to a conference, or had a great morning devotion. Neither is she going to be vulnerable if she thinks you are just talking nicely so you can turn up the heat in the bedroom. For a woman to receive and respond by willingly placing herself under the functional headship of a man, she wants to know that you are a kingdom man and that you are under the headship of Christ.

This concept is all about the covering. When she knows that you are covered by God, she will respond to your covering her. She will rest. When she hears you say "I've got it," and then she sees that backed up by your actions, she will follow you.

When you are a kingdom man, when she hears you say "I've got it," when you lead with compassion, consistency, and wisdom, when you involve her in every significant decision, and when you value her input and desires, you will discover that your relationship with her will go to a level you never dreamed possible. For a man to be "over a woman," he must take seriously his responsibility for her well being. He must cover her in such a way that she is free to respond well."

This is a best case scenario, you do X and Y will happen. He doesn't go deep enough as far as addressing a rebellious wife threatening divorce, which is beyond the scope of this particular book.



**Weenis says:**

January 30, 2015 at 7:33 pm

I want to note, if it hasn't been already, that the consistent element of Driscoll defenders that show up here (inexplicably)...

Is the undeniable smell of hamster. They rationalize that Driscoll's not so bad because of this or that, or stuff he was potentially right about, trying to at least get some slack that he was only dead wrong a lot, instead of always dead wrong.

Male rationalization hamster, big time, because they are so ego invested, it's like tasting the red pill the first time... so hard to take, some guys can't just embrace the horror of the red pill, or how wrong they've been, through and through, and how embarrassing it is



**embracing reality says:**

January 30, 2015 at 8:29 pm

My take from these quotes by Driscoll and the point made here by Dalrock is that Driscoll is absolutely blind to his true failure.

Driscoll: "emphasize sound doctrine and courage and strength and commitment and conviction, but to add in addition to that, humility as a virtue."

Driscoll did \*none\* of the above! Driscoll's unsound doctrine on men, women and marriage has only further perpetuated the biggest problems in our culture and the church. The failure to hold women accountable for their sin and bad behavior. Courage and strength? He displayed neither when he failed to hold women accountable. He never told women they must remain committed to their husbands no matter what unless he was unfaithful. Where was the conviction of the sin of failure of wives to submit, remain married, not withhold sex? Humility? Hell, we wouldn't mind an arrogant preacher who actually taught the truth for once.



**MarcusD says:**

January 31, 2015 at 12:14 am



**Fighting couples**<http://forums.catholic.com/showthread.php?t=943447>**RichardP** says:

January 31, 2015 at 12:19 am

Driscoll claims his call is/was to minister to men. That is what he did. Calling out women for their sin is not part of ministering to men and training them up in the way that they should go. Criticize him for how well he did (or didn't do) what he was called to do. You make yourself look silly when you criticize him for not doing what he wasn't called to do.

**RichardP** says:

January 31, 2015 at 12:28 am

In the business world, a certain type of temperment and personality is required for starting and growing businesses to maturity. But, once the business becomes mature, a different type of temperment and personality is called for to manage the mature, on-going enterprise, long-term. Driscoll has the temperment and personality of an entrepreneur – the person who starts and grows a business or church. Mars Hill grew to the point where Driscoll should have stepped aside and let a person with the temperment and personality to manage a mature church long-term take over.

I also find it interesting that his parents moved the family to get Mark away from a group of male relatives who were a bad influence. In the angry hissing of “how dare you” I hear the young Mark admonishing that group of male relatives – from a safe distance. And perhaps using the words of his parents that he may have heard, directed towards those men, rather than using his own words.

**Dale** says:

January 31, 2015 at 12:30 am

@Thornstruck

> “If the wrong things are said or done to her, she may react in a way that reflects what is being done to her. Because of that, you could end up with nagging or a rebellious heart. Or, if she lacks attention or protection, then she will receive that and respond by doing everything in her power to protect or provide for herself...”

Perhaps it is not the author's intention (since I did not read the whole book), but the several paragraphs you quoted seem to be another example of the theology that women do not sin, and if they did, it would only be because some man forced them to do so.

I would agree with the author if he had something like the following, which shows that my sin can offer an opportunity for sin on your part, but you are still responsible for your own sinful choices.

“If the wrong things are said or done to her, she may sin herself by responding in a hateful or disobedient way, contrary to the commands to the wife in 1 Peter 3:1-7. Because of that, you could end up with nagging or a rebellious heart. Or, if she lacks attention or protection, then she [may] receive that and respond with sin by refusing to submit to her husband...”

Thanks for the extensive quote Thurnstruck. It can be difficult to accurately read an idea when we only have a partial sentence, or partial paragraph.

@embracing reality

>Humility? Hell, we wouldn't mind an arrogant preacher who actually taught the truth for once.

Thanks for a great laugh 😊

**Josh the Aspie** says:

January 31, 2015 at 12:47 am

This is a sin where I can more easily sympathize with those fighting it, since it is a Sin I need to contend against as well.

**Hank Flanders** says:

January 31, 2015 at 1:04 am

I've always found it amusing how pride is essentially one of the "good" sins that some people will so readily "admit to" (brag about) having a problem with in a veiled attempt at conveying how confident they are. I'd love to hear an evangelical person who tries to speak to others from a position of self-appointed authority admit to (brag about) having a sexual sin or dishonesty problem in the same way they do about having a problem with pride.

**Hank Flanders** says:

January 31, 2015 at 1:19 am

I should add that I'm not actually judging Driscoll (whom I don't know much about, anyway) on this particular subject. He may have been genuine for all I know, but when people do like he did "admit to" being prideful or having a lack of humility, it does cause me to at least start to question their real motives.

**Spike** says:

January 31, 2015 at 5:22 am

Driscoll and Mummy Blogger Jenny Erikson have one thing in common: they are gifts that keep on giving. I have followed this blog for years. Driscoll and his brand of feminist /church apostasy were bound to unwind, a ticking time bomb that would self immolate. It was just a question of when.

Hold on, correction: not just one thing: both Erikson and Driscoll have pride in common as well.

One of your bloggers here wrote that feminism is corrosive, destroying everything it touches. There you go.

**honordads** says:

January 31, 2015 at 5:57 am

Reblogged this on [Honor Dads](#).

**mdavid** says:

January 31, 2015 at 7:00 am

*Okra, It boggles the mind that anyone firmly grounded in New Testament theology, regardless of his background, would be taken in by a crank like this, yet Driscoll apparently managed to convert 15,000 people to himself.*

Personally, I'm baffled anyone can say "firmly grounded in NT theology" with a straight face. Especially regarding the complex cultural topics Driscoll preached on. For example, how many women in Driscoll's flock wore headcoverings, something that was universally considered "NT theology" just a hundred years ago?

My point: saying nonsensical things like "biblical marriage" or "biblical headship" or "NT theology" doesn't further an argument. They are merely proof by assertion. Honest, well-educated folk have split over core theological questions like baptism & divorce, so methinks a little diversity on complex issues like gender relations is to be expected.



**Thornstruck** says:

January 31, 2015 at 7:44 am

@Dale

Yes, that is how I interpreted his idea's. In Tony Evans view, women are not autonomous and free to make their own decisions but only react to men's actions. As if women do not have their own desirous natures. Women don't sin on their own but only sin if men tell them to sin.

Since reading Dalrock's post I've been more attuned to these types of views and was surprised to discover a chapter which discussed this very topic.



**Anonymous** says:

January 31, 2015 at 10:17 am

Off-topic, but... Honey Maid normalizes divorce in its new ad– never mind the disruption and new faces, have some comfort food!

Honey Maid "This Is Wholesome" 2015 Introducing GoBites | Official



**Mr. Roach** says:

January 31, 2015 at 11:42 am

It's as if he believes in some imaginary Christian doctrine that women are without sin, are not easily deceived, do not deceive, are not vain, concerned with popularity, sensual, indifferent to others out of their immediate circle, lacking in constancy, chastity, and all the other distinctly feminine vices. There are no doubt male vices too. We are all fallen, we are all sinners, but this guy is a flatterer of the worst order.



**Anonymous Reader** says:

January 31, 2015 at 12:07 pm

*And I am primary teaching pastor of this church, and I can't simply look at the pride in some of our people and say that I am in no way responsible or complaisant.*

It's not new for a preacher, especially one that likes to yell a lot, to decide that he's got a private phone line direct to God. The next step often is when he decides that he's the real middle man between God and other men, or God and family members. I've seen this a time or two in various ways. Some in person, some on TV, some in blogs...there's a name for this, I do believe.

In this particular case, "Driscollianity" would fit.



**carl** says:

January 31, 2015 at 12:09 pm

'It's as if he believes in some imaginary Christian doctrine that women are without sin, are not easily deceived, do not deceive, are not vain, concerned with popularity, sensual, indifferent to others out of their immediate circle, lacking in constancy, chastity, and all the other distinctly feminine vices. There are no doubt male vices too. We are all fallen, we are all sinners, but this guy is a flatterer of the worst order.'

That doctrine has been floating around...'women have no moral agency'.



**Anonymous Reader** says:

January 31, 2015 at 12:16 pm

*Driscoll claims his call is/was to minister to men.*

Got cite? If true, it's another negative. Because it's stupid, given that women were never excluded from Mars Hill.

*That is what he did.*

Yeah, not really, unless you consider "The beatings will continue until morale improves" to be an example of how to minister to men.

*Calling out women for their sin is not part of ministering to men and training them up in the way that they should go.*

But it is part of ministering to a church that consists of both men and women. So either Mars Hill should have been men only, or Driscoll should have had a different job description.

*Criticize him for how well he did (or didn't do) what he was called to do.*

Question: who gets to decide what a pastor has been called to do, the pastor himself, or someone else?

*You make yourself look silly when you criticize him for not doing what he wasn't called to do.*

Hey, if I get to write – and then rewrite at my convenience – my own job description, I can avoid criticism for "failure to to my job", too?



**da GBEM lzzzzzzlzlz (TM)** says:

January 31, 2015 at 12:33 pm

RichardP writes, "In the business world, a certain type of temperament and personality is required for starting and growing businesses to maturity. But, once the business becomes mature, a different type of temperament and personality is called for to manage the mature, on-going enterprise, long-term."

Steve Jobs launched Apple and ran it as a mature business too.

Larry Page launched Google and ran it as a mature business too.

Bill Gates launched Microsoft and ran it as a mature business too.

Mark Zuckerberg launched Facebook and runs it as a mature business too.

What RichardP meant to write was, “a certain type of temperment and personality is required for starting and growing businesses to maturity. But, once the business becomes mature, a different type of temperment and personality—the uncreative bureacrat MBA—always tries to steal the fruits of the creators’ labor. While MBA John Scully did succeed in seizing Apple from Jobs, they had to resurrect Jobs to save the flailing company.”

Chances are RichardP received his MBA from a top state school. Not a Stanford nor MIT, per se, but a very respectable state school, such as Ohio State. RichardP would last ten minutes in Silicon Valley, which is why he likely has a mid-level management job at P&G.

lzozolzlzz



**Looking Glass** says:

January 31, 2015 at 12:37 pm

@RichardP:

Considering his epic failure at actually “ministering” to Men, I don’t think most of the criticism isn’t well founded. Driscoll’s unwillingness or inability to “call out” Women is a sign of the failure of his own ability to follow his calling. If he was called to minister to Men, he’s still called to minister in Truth. That is the crux of his failure.

I think most of his problem can be seen in his response to the Vision about his Wife’s unrepentant slutiness. I don’t doubt God specifically answered a long-running prayer about what was causing the problem in his Marriage. God answered; Mark chose poorly in response. Driscoll’s wife had blue-balled him for years because she could never give up she was \*still\* an unrepentant slut while working in a very public ministry. She took out her conviction in the Spirit upon her husband. And, let’s be honest here, what really probably got Mark the worst is his personality/ability could have gotten him a Harem. He could have been plowing the entire Sunday Morning Nightclub set. (This would not have been lost on him, nor do I doubt for a second he hadn’t had to turn down offers over the years. What’s a big, key driver of “good, Christian Men” leaving the Church? Failing when you “do everything right”. Which is what we have here.)

So, rather than understanding that God was telling him that his Marriage problems were not stemming from his inability but from Sin of his Wife, he took to blaming everyone but the source. Now, obviously, this type of approach was seen throughout a lot his preaching, so it would seem to predate the understanding of the martial issues. Which isn’t surprising, as he really wasn’t preaching anything different than the current culture. All he did was get really brash and talk about sex a lot. (This is how he built “Mars Hill”, which is actually the area in Seattle the church was started. It was/is (?) a nightclub area, apparently.) An approach that appealed to the area and the Spirit of the Lord being there will get you pretty far. It’s ignoring that the second part is what does the work is what causes problems and the eventual failure.

@Thornstruck:

Those passages from Evan’s book strike me as someone who is writing out of his depth. He “gets” that there is something there, but he’s still trapped within the culture. Able to see that’s there something that needs to be said, but unable to get to where God is on the topic. That’s actually worse than being really wrong, in some ways. You’re allowed to be out of your depth; just don’t put it in a book while you can’t give a proper answer.



**DeNihilist** says:

January 31, 2015 at 2:01 pm

Anon, divorce IS normal. That's the thing.



**Boxer** says:

January 31, 2015 at 2:58 pm

*Anon, divorce IS normal. That's the thing.*

It's still fuck'n disgusting.



Not found

*Divorce is great, says [@HoneyMaidSnacks](#) in a new insane commercial. [#boycottNabisco](https://t.co/XVTG93gLLg)*

— *Herbie Marcuse (@herbiemarcuse) [January 31, 2015](#)*

Honey Maid is a division of the Nabisco corporation. #BoycottNabisco



**Thornstruck** says:

January 31, 2015 at 4:01 pm

@Boxer

I've never found any use of boycotting things. Unless you are prepared to completely live off the grid from major companies and their services it's just another first world problem. Trying to coordinate a nation wide boycott the nation doesn't necessarily reject is futile.

Sure there are some things I can live without and find alternatives but on an individual basis. I agree with Dalrock that the problem needs to be addressed from the church before it can be addressed from the culture.

[Psalm 11:3](#)

When the foundations are being destroyed, what can the righteous do?"



**RichardP** says:

January 31, 2015 at 4:27 pm

@da GBFM – let me turn my statement around for you – because it is equally true both ways: the type of temperament and personality needed for running a mature business is not the type of temperament and personality that is needed for starting and growing a new business. Generally. The exceptions don't ever disprove the general rule. And Driscoll has proven that he is excellent at fishing for men, but not so excellent at running a large bureaucracy.

AR: Driscoll claims his call is/was to minister to men. Got cite?

For starters, look up Mark Driscoll on Wikipedia. Under "Early Life", middle of second paragraph. But I've also seen that point referenced in other writings. Some of them I think were linked from this blog.

**Mark says:**

January 31, 2015 at 4:41 pm

@Earl

““And I am primary teaching pastor of this church, and I can’t simply look at the pride in some of our people and say that I am in no way responsible or complaisant.’

Well there you go...this was the church of Mark Driscoll. Jesus barely makes a cameo appearance.””

Great call!.....I think that this guy has forgotten that “pride comes before a fall”.....and from what I have read?.....he has fallen.....and keeps falling! Also,for a man devoted to Christ(as he says).....I have to wonder about his devotion.Not only that.His knowledge of the bible(Old & New Testament) I seriously have to question.The Evangelical Pastors or Priests,that I admire have a cognizant understanding of both....because they go “hand in hand”.Shalom!

**Anonymous Reader says:**

January 31, 2015 at 5:10 pm

*AR: Driscoll claims his call is/was to minister to men. Got cite?*

*For starters, look up Mark Driscoll on Wikipedia. Under “Early Life”, middle of second paragraph. But I’ve also seen that point referenced in other writings. Some of them I think were linked from this blog.*

Missing the point. I’ll put it differently: either Driscoll was called to run an all-male church or women don’t need to be ministered to. Mars Hill was never all-male. So what does that imply?

Before replying, you might find the Driscoll text in this posting to be of interest:

<https://dalrock.wordpress.com/2015/01/31/she-who-must-be-obeyed/>

And again, I repeat: Driscoll “ministered” to men only in the sense of “The beatings will continue until morale improves”. You may find that useful, helpful, etc. but other men do not.

**Dalrock says:**

January 31, 2015 at 6:13 pm

@RichardP

*Driscoll claims his call is/was to minister to men. That is what he did. Calling out women for their sin is not part of ministering to men and training them up in the way that they should go. Criticize him for how well he did (or didn’t do) what he was called to do. You make yourself look silly when you criticize him for not doing what he wasn’t called to do.*

You don’t reference another commenter or quote what you are referring to above. I mention this because nowhere in the OP (the post you wrote your comment in response to) did I criticize Driscoll for not calling women out in their sin. When you write comments wildly out of context, you tend to make yourself look silly.

Non sequitur aside, your claim that:

*Calling out women for their sin is not part of ministering to men and training them up in the way that they should go.*



is only true if you assume that men's role doesn't involve leadership. We live in a time where feminist rebellion is considered a virtue, even among Christian women. If you are training men to be Christian leaders, part of this will have to include training men to call women out on their sin, especially since the culture teaches that men should never do so. The best way to teach this is to lead by example. Saying otherwise would be, to use a feminine manner of speech, *silly*.



**embracing reality** says:

January 31, 2015 at 9:12 pm

I wonder if RichardP is by any chance a follower of Joel Osteen?

While Driscoll apparently had the good fortune to receive the trendy 'calling' of only to holding men in the flock accountable for their sin (read: sin of messing up feminism) Osteen was really lucky. He had the wonderful fortune to receive the trendy and very lucrative 'calling' of holding absolutely no one accountable for anything. Exhortation all the way baby!

Some guys have ALL the luck.



**BradA** says:

February 1, 2015 at 9:49 pm

Thornstruck,

I skipped a lot of replies here and may have missed something, but I wanted to note that I heard Tony Evans say (I think it was on a FotF show, though it may have been his own) that it was a man's fault if his wife wasn't following his leadership. I was VERY disappointed with that as he had seemed one of the rare few to hold to a proper Biblical teaching in the area.

He basically said the man needed to be the head, but was completely responsible for his wife's obedience in that area. He didn't clarify exactly what the man should have done, IIRC, but the fact that he did not even address the role of female rebellion is sad.



**RichardP** says:

February 2, 2015 at 10:58 am

A number of folks have responded to my initial comment above. That comment was responding to Embracing Reality's statement two posts above my initial one: "He displayed neither when he failed to hold women accountable."

Folks are called to different ministries. Mark Driscoll has stated that he was called to minister to men. With that focus, it makes sense that he would not "rebuke" women to the same extent that he "rebukes" men. Or even rebuke women at all. Given his stated calling to minister to men, it is indeed silly to criticize Driscoll for not equally ministering to women. Commentators above have applied my comments far beyond that narrow focus. I intended my comments to apply only to that narrow focus. My comment was not a comment on how well or not he has done what he thinks he is/was called to do (minister to men). My comment was not a defense of Driscoll. It was a defense of logic. (Called to do this, criticized for not doing that, is indeed weak logic.)

I said: "Some of them I think were linked from this blog." I should have said "Some of them were found in links presented in the comments section of various threads on this blog." Nothing I said was directed to what Dalrock has said in these threads on Driscoll or in any links he has provided. Since I was not specific enough, I understand the misunderstanding.

Joel Olsteen has also stated what he feels he is called to do. And it is not to be a winner of souls. Because he has stated what he is called to do, I know what that is, think he is doing it well, and do not feel a need to criticize him for it. But I am not a fan of his. I also think that some opera singers do what they are called to do exceptionally well. But that doesn't mean they would

make good folk-rock singers. Even tho I recognize the opera singers' technical excellence, I do not like opera. I assume the readers here all have similar thoughts about many parts of life.



**PokeSalad** says:

February 2, 2015 at 11:37 am

...and so we are back to 'not my place to criticize anyone about anything.' But you backpedal well.

Be gone, troll.



**innocentbystanderboston** says:

February 2, 2015 at 12:01 pm

Dalrock,

I'm going to defend a troll for just one moment.

*Non sequitur aside, your claim that:*

*Calling out women for their sin is not part of ministering to men and training them up in the way that they should go.*

*is only true if you assume that men's role doesn't involve leadership. We live in a time where feminist rebellion is considered a virtue, even among Christian women. If you are training men to be Christian leaders, part of this will have to include training men to call women out on their sin, especially since the culture teaches that men should never do so.*

That part is fine. Using Troll-Richard-P's logic, it would be okay to criticize Driscoll for not telling men to call out women for their sin. Because he is called to minister ONLY to men.

*The best way to teach this is to lead by example. Saying otherwise would be, to use a feminine manner of speech, silly.*

This part is not okay Dalrock. Driscoll is (according to Troll-Richard-P) only supposed to be ministering to men. In that sense it is not acceptable to "lead by example" and say ANYTHING to women. Nothing. He is supposed to tell the men of his congregation to do that for their wives. In that sense (and that sense alone) Richard-P should be saying (according to logic, because he likes using that word) Driscoll failed.



**Dalrock** says:

February 2, 2015 at 12:16 pm

@IBB

*I'm going to defend a troll for just one moment.*

Neither his disagreeing with me, nor his having a laughably weak argument while doing so make RichardP a troll.



**innocentbystanderboston** says:

February 2, 2015 at 12:19 pm

Fair enough. I was just echoing Poke Salad.



**Anonymous Reader** says:

February 2, 2015 at 2:01 pm

RichardP

*A number of folks have responded to my initial comment above. That comment was responding to Embracing Reality's statement two posts above my initial one: "He displayed neither when he failed to hold women accountable."*

*Folks are called to different ministries. Mark Driscoll has stated that he was called to minister to men. With that focus, it makes sense that he would not "rebuke" women to the same extent that he "rebukes" men. Or even rebuke women at all.*

Then, as has been pointed out, Driscoll should have been preaching to men only, or he should have learned something about women beyond his own personal marriage-demons. It is telling that Driscoll did not join any denomination but set up his own. So it isn't that he was called by some church to serve, it's that he made up his own call, and his own job description.

You don't appear to actually read the responses to your claims. That's informative. You're not here to discuss, you are here to lecture to the rest of us. So be it.

Thus it appears that you are just another of the "women don't do wrong / behave badly / sin" crowd.

Whether you do this out of some pedestalizing, supplicating "women are more spiritual than men" fantasy, or in support of overt feminism, or just as yet another variation on the endless support for the Female Imperative isn't clear.

It isn't relevant, either. You're wrong. You've been shown to be wrong. You won't admit it, though. So what does that make you, "RichardP"? Aside from untrustworthy, that is.



**JDG** says:

February 2, 2015 at 2:11 pm

*Mark Driscoll has stated that he was called to minister to men. With that focus, it makes sense that he would not "rebuke" women to the same extent that he "rebukes" men.*

If this were true, then he would have no business giving sermons before the church UNLESS he also was teaching that the husbands were to instruct their wives at home. If this were the case, then why does he teach that women decide when their husbands are in line with God's will and when they are not? And why does he address women separately in his book if his ministry is only for men?



**Dalrock** says:

February 2, 2015 at 2:26 pm

@MarcusD

*Related:* <http://www.charismanews.com/us/46666-mark-driscoll-makes-comeback-launches-new-website>

I hadn't seen that. The about page for his new site is striking. He is like the main character in a Greek tragedy, except trapped in a world of denial. See the [About](#) page to see what I mean.

Also note that Driscoll didn't get RichardP's memo that his ministry has always been about men:

*With a skillful mix of bold presentation, accessible teaching, and unrelenting compassion for those who are hurting the most—particularly women who are victims of sexual and physical abuse and assault—Pastor Mark has taken biblical Christianity into cultural corners rarely explored by evangelicals.*

I assume excuse number 37 (or is it 38?) will be that since Driscoll is focused solely on women who were abused (and always has been, just like we have always been at war with East Asia—or is it Eurasia?), holding women to account would be cruel.



**Anchorman** says:

February 2, 2015 at 2:50 pm

***At the age of 17 in 1988 while in high school, a young woman named Grace gave him a nice Bible. Mark, a non-practicing Catholic at the time, was born again reading that Bible in college.***

His father obviously failed to lead him, which was why he was non-practicing.

Men just kept screwing up Driscoll's life. Good thing there were women around to lead him.



**Anchorman** says:

February 2, 2015 at 2:53 pm

And, boy, get a load of the picture on the website. [Link](#)

He faces his wife. She stares ahead, in command, smiling confidently.



**Dalrock** says:

February 2, 2015 at 2:59 pm

Regarding the Greek tragedy comment, here is some more detail:

*Various ministries trace their roots to Pastor Mark's leadership. Mars Hill Church began as a Bible study he and his wife Grace taught in their home. He is also the founder of [Resurgence](#), a ministry that offers resources for Christian leaders, including books, events, classes, multimedia, and a blog. He is the co-founder of the Acts 29 Network, which has planted over 400 churches in the US and 13 other nations.*

**Mars Hill:** Driscoll resigned in disgrace in October. Mars Hill quickly [dissolved](#). Rick Warren gave the [final sermon](#) Jan 4th.

**Resurgence:** The link from Driscoll's about page is dead, and the domain and its content are (or were) [up for auction](#).

**Acts 29:** Driscoll was ejected from group in August and urged by the board to [step down and seek help](#).



**Dalrock** says:

February 2, 2015 at 3:06 pm

Add to the above, Driscoll's previous statements on how [important](#) it was to him to lead a growing enterprise:

*At the height of his influence and popularity, Driscoll admitted that he harbored grand ambitions, both for himself and the church he built from scratch.*

*"I'm a guy who is highly competitive," Driscoll said in a 2006 sermon. "Every year, I want the church to grow. I want my knowledge to grow. I want my influence to grow. I want our staff to grow. I want our church plants to grow. I want everything — because I want to win."*

*Driscoll conceded that he wouldn't be content with remaining the same.*

*"That's my own little idol and it works well in a church because no one would ever yell at you for being a Christian who produces results. So I found the perfect place to hide," he said.*

*"And I was thinking about it this week. What if the church stopped growing? What if we shrunk? What if everything fell apart? What if half the staff left? Would I still worship Jesus or would I be a total despairing mess? I don't know. By God's grace, I won't have to find out, but you never know."*



**Anonymous Reader** says:

February 2, 2015 at 6:56 pm

*And, boy, get a load of the picture on the website. [Link](#)*

An obvious pose of supplication on his part. Confirmation is always useful.



**Anonymous Reader** says:

February 2, 2015 at 7:02 pm

So it appears that Driscoll's next step is to become a Famous Talking Head. At least the *about* page suggests that media famousness is where he is heading. I don't see how that can work out too well, since all the other TV Famous Talking Preachers have a church to base out of.

Driscoll does not appear to have learned much of anything from his crash.



**Anonymous Reader** says:

February 2, 2015 at 7:06 pm

On the other hand, the blog at the driscoll.org site hasn't had an update since December...



**Looking Glass** says:

February 2, 2015 at 8:58 pm

Driscoll laid 7 "I want" in a row, in a Sermon. So much for a "God-focused life", me thinks.

Pingback: [The Aperture and its Pretenders | v5k2c2](#)



**Renee Harris** says:



February 4, 2015 at 6:27 am

“Luke 6:40 says that when fully trained, disciples are like their teacher. And I am primary teaching pastor of this church, and I can't simply look at the pride in some of our people and say that I am in no way responsible or complaisant.”  
Is mark transgender ? I mean a lady with guy parts ? Or just one of those Pharisees?

This site uses Akismet to reduce spam. [Learn how your comment data is processed.](#)

---

**Dalrock**

 at WordPress.com.  Not Sell My Personal Information

Privacy & Cookies: This site uses cookies. By continuing to use this website, you agree to their use.

To find out more, including how to control cookies, see here: [Cookie Policy](#)

%d bloggers like this: