

The Role Of Women Throughout History

Pastor David Ministries

**Revised
July 2023**

All through history, for thousands of years, women were rarely given general positions of leadership **over men** or professional jobs and were almost always paid less money than men when they did the same types of unskilled labor. It was not until the “women's liberation” movement in the 60's that this ancient custom changed. In 1964 the US government passed the Civil Rights Act that prohibited employers from paying people differently based on gender or race. High paying management and professional jobs were previously only given to men. (See article on: The Consequences of “Women's Liberation”)

It wasn't that they thought that women did low quality work. The ability to do the work correctly had very little to do with it. Don't forget, in those days women used to get pregnant much more often than now. Also, in the minds of the people who lived back then, it was mostly due to the nature of masculinity itself, the essence of normal human nature, the possibility of a pregnancy and obedience to the Word of God that male supremacy and leadership over women was maintained. The nature of masculinity itself is that it automatically takes the leadership role over femininity the same way that management, in a business, automatically takes the leadership role over the labor, which is normal and natural. There is nothing selfish or egotistical about it.

Even in nature itself, when most species mate, the male usually imposes himself by force on the female. (And most of the females like it that way. The first time a male gets close to a female, she might fight or run away, because she does not know what he's doing. But, after the first time she does not oppose him any more.) Most species could not even reproduce (exist) without this masculine attribute. Of course, among human beings this natural masculine attribute is expected to be kept under control and practiced only within “marriage” and always done in a loving way. Marriage is one of the characteristics of human beings that separate people from animals. In a marriage, husbands should always be in control, in a loving way, of their marital mating activities..... and most women like it that way.

However, this natural masculine attribute cannot be seen in a society that trains (brainwashes from childhood) women to act like men and men to act like women. Amazingly, those people in the government who have set out to ruin marriages have actually made a law which permits wives to deny their husbands their marital duty and labels the husband a criminal rapist if he insists that she

performs her marital duty. (Most women who do such things are the type that just like to pick fights with their husbands. If they didn't want to participate in marital mating activities then they had no business getting married in the first place. It's part of marriage and should not be denied its proper place.)

The old custom of the automatic male leadership over women was also considered more romantic. Most women like it, and feel more secure when men are strong leaders, provided they are good, mature and loving leaders. (See article on: The Virtues of the Spirit) Gen 3:16 “Unto the woman he said, and thy desire *shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.*”

Back before women's liberation, women were also paid less than men due to the obvious possibility of a female worker getting pregnant and causing an inconvenience to the business. Back then, women used to get pregnant much more often than now. In those days, they thought that the idea of having the inconvenience of a professional person or manager getting pregnant was so absurd that no one would have been crazy enough to even mention such a thing. (And obviously, a person who will probably take a leave of absence for several months is not worth the same pay as compared to someone who won't ever be taking any such leave of absence.)

They also thought that it was an absolute disgrace to manhood for a man to go to work and be forced to have a woman for a boss..... which is true. Even now it is a disgrace to manhood and causes a stifling hindrance to the normal development of the character of men, in order to reach true manhood. Most modern men don't even really know what “manhood” is. (Notice – It has **always** been men, not women, pushing the modern custom of female leadership over other men. Those men ought to be castrated for doing such a thing. They should also lose all of their adult status in society.) The men who are forced to have a woman as a boss never mature,.... inside they never grow up, they always stay as boys. They are forced to always have a mommy figure telling them what to do.

It must also be noted that after WW2 the cases of infant deaths were much lower than before, due to medical advancements. Back before 1965-1970 married women got pregnant much more often than now. This produced the “baby boom” population explosion, immediately following WW2. It wasn't until around 1965-1970 that most married women in the US started to have noticeably fewer pregnancies and births, because of the legalization of contraceptives, the general understanding that the high birth rate should be reduced to prevent overpopulation and also in order to advance the women's professional careers, which they rarely had before the 60's. (..... and why were contraceptives illegal before that? That's a part of history that has been forgotten..... or erased.)

As a part of the same package of feminism, most modern professional women have also been trained to minimize the respect for “motherhood”. Especially during the unpleasant transitional period, in the 60's and 70's, motherhood was treated as something of lesser importance. It was a common theme in movies and TV shows to have a young female character that showed an intensive dislike to motherhood, as though it was something repulsive. Most little girls grow up with a natural desire to play with dolls, especially baby dolls; they like pretending to be a mommy. It's truly amazing how an influence that seems so small and insignificant could have such a tremendous affect on society. The influence of those TV shows and movies have brainwashed many girls to hate being a mother. The result has been a massive unstable culture in which young people who have had insufficient “motherly” love frequently turn to drugs, alcoholism, crime, mental illness or purposeless suicide.

Even to this day, when parents try to influence their daughters to “make something” of themselves, they try to get them to go to college. They rarely try to get their daughters to be mothers in order to “be somebody”. If their daughter is going to “make something” of herself they have to rise above motherhood, thus, motherhood is still being disrespected. Women are being taught (brainwashed) to rise above “motherhood”. (What kind of a sick mind treats motherly love as being meaningless?) It was at the beginning of the women's liberation movement (60's & 70's) that more women started to get university degrees and noticeably higher paying jobs.

Women also had the reputation, in the days **before** “women's liberation”, of being much more emotional and unstable at work than men. This weakness in women is caused by the presence of men who act like real men. The presence of men who act like real men has now become “taboo” in our present society due to the influence of “feminism”, which is the training (brainwashing) of women to act like men and training men to act like women; gender role reversal.

Most men who go along with modern “feminism” do not make women emotional. The modern “feminism” is **not** the promotion of “femininity” for women. It is the promotion of “masculinity” for women. The emotional instability of women at work is now at a minimum due to the influence of “feminism”, which trains women to act like men and trains men to act like women..... And any man who doesn't go along with it is labeled a woman abuser (which is false),..... And the men who do go along with it rarely make women romantically emotional. Women themselves can't figure out that “feminism” ruins normal romance, nor can they figure out that they would like it much better if men were normal men.

The presence of a man who doesn't act like a normal masculine man can rarely make a woman romantically emotional. The truth is that most women prefer a masculine acting man, but despite their higher education they can't figure out that modern “feminism” is unromantic and it is to their disadvantage by training (brainwashing) the men to act like women. It is the propagation of gender role

reversal which is minimizing normal romantic attractiveness. Modern “feminism” perverts and/or suppresses normal romance. Modern “feminism” also deceives women into thinking that they won't be happy unless they turn into men,..... and when they discover that becoming a man doesn't make them happy, they can't figure out that they need to stop being men. This also increases the cases of abnormal same gender romances..... and most people who start having romantic attractions to their own gender can't figure out why. They can't figure out that masculine acting women and feminine acting men alter many people's romantic physical attractions.

In modern times there doesn't “seem” to be much difference between the performance of men and women at work, that is, apart from the obvious inconvenience of a pregnancy. Indeed, it is extremely inconvenient for almost any business to have a professional person or supervisor take a leave of absence for several months. Why then is this extreme inconvenience concerning women getting pregnant so completely ignored, in modern times? Any company would be considered a “villain” if they didn't bend over backwards to accommodate a pregnant woman professional, regardless of how inconvenient it is.

There are also other differences between the performance of men and women in the work place, but those differences are likewise deliberately ignored to the point that most people don't even observe nor care that they exist. For example: high stress executive positions in very competitive companies are rarely given to women. With confidence it can be said that more than 99% of all the high stress executive positions in competitive companies are occupied by men. Very few women even want to attempt such types of work. Almost all the time, women “executives” are put into positions that are noticeably less stressful, like human resources. Either that or women executives look for positions in the companies that are much less competitive, where the executive positions are much less stressful.

It is right about here that some of the younger women start to notice that most men don't perform as well as women, in almost every work situation. Now we can see the irrational brainwashing effect of feminism. Normally, when a manager gets such low performance from the people they are supervising, it is well understood that the blame is put on the manager. But, in this case, they wouldn't even think of that, because the manager is a woman. And, anyone who criticizes feminism is labeled as a villain. Even if a woman criticizes feminism, she is labeled as a villain. It is taboo to say anything against putting women as managers over men. Therefore, when men perform poorly while they have a woman for a boss, the blame can't be put on the woman manager. But the truth is, in fact, men who are forced to have a woman boss never grow up. The very essence of

manhood is to act macho and take the leadership. But, that is now taboo for men. If any man says anything against feminism, he is automatically labeled as a villain.

If the manager was a man those young women would surely throw the blame of the low performance of the employee's on the manager. But, when the manager is a woman, it's taboo to notice that women are bad managers. However, the bad results are only when women are bosses of men. This does not apply to women managers over other women. So, when male employee's perform poorly when they have a female boss, these young girls can't seem to notice why, all they know is that it's taboo to put the blame on the woman manager. And,.... they have never seen anything else to compare it to. Even when the boss happens to be a man, all the male employee's still have a mental condition of being trained to be submissive to female bosses. No matter who the boss is, they still have the same mental condition of wimping out to feminism. Those young women who have copped the attitude that women do everything better than men, have never known men who act like real men. After all, feminism has been around since before they were born.

Sometimes special positions are created exclusively for women "executives" which men are never permitted to have. (Like taking the "head secretary" in a large office and putting the title "vice president" on her and giving her a few extra responsibilities.) But, the results of doing this is that the woman "vice president" starts doing things like playing "musical cubicles" and wasting a lot of valuable time having the men constantly changing their office cubicle. (They love to snap their fingers and watch the men jump and have the joy of running the men in circles..... And those men deserve it as long as they go along with this stupidity. They ought to be kicked in the pants, like one of those people with a sign stuck on their back with an arrow pointed down saying "kick me". If they know the sign is there, and they won't do anything about it, then they should be kicked. Any normal man would protest. But they don't protest because they don't want to even admit that the problem exists. It's much easier to ignore it, or sugar-coat it by calling it something that it isn't.)

Hereafter, all the men who put women like that as bosses over other men should be removed from their positions and castrated, with the letters CASTRATED branded onto their foreheads so that everyone will know they put a woman boss over other men. (However, more realistically, if the men formed their own union and demanded the removal of such women supervisors, they might accomplish more. Of course, they must be willing to strike in order to accomplish anything. Unfortunately, most men see an action like this as rubbing the disgrace in their faces (as though someone was rubbing dung in their faces). They know that most men won't cooperate with such a protest. Most men can't accept the reality

that the disgrace actually exists, so they usually just sugar-coat it, handle it by calling it something that it's not, and refuse to even admit that this disgrace really exists. Most men cannot accept that what is going on is really what is going on.)

It seems that the black people who protested racial injustices back in the 60's had more balls than the average American man. Manhood has been disgraced, and the average American man can't seem to act like a man anymore. They don't want to protest it because they can't even admit that this disgrace really exists. They don't want to even talk about it.

If women want men to be real men, then the women must first try motivating them kindly not to be cowards. Women must keep in mind that men have been brainwashed from childhood **not** to act like real men. But, if any men still refuse to accept it, and fight against this problem, then they will need to have it rubbed in their faces until they stop pretending it doesn't exist. And,..... women must acknowledge that this "feminism" is **NOT** to their advantage.

Most people in modern times continue to think that there is very little difference between the performance of a man and a woman at work. This deliberate misinterpretation of reality is a type of mental illness that has definite negative consequences. (See article on: The Consequences of "Women's Liberation")

xx The satanic people inside the government, media, churches and educational system are the ringleaders promoting this modern perverted way of thinking that all started way back around 1920 when many changes were made in US law concerning women. The most publicized change was that women were permitted to vote for the first time in the US. Voting, by very nature is masculine, not feminine. Women are supposed to obey the decisions of the men. [1Co 11:3](#) "..... the head of the woman is the man.....". A little further back, even all the universities were exclusively for men. None of the universities even permitted women entrance as students, much less as teachers or administrators.

The first few universities that started having women students were exclusively for women and had much different courses of study than the universities for men. There was no such thing as a female doctor, professor, engineer, lawyer, business administrator or politician etc. (These professions must be considered "macho". Even today they are "macho" professions, except possibly for a pediatrician, obstetrician or a gynecologist. There may be a few other exception cases, too.)

The only women teachers, in those days, were teachers of children or of other women, never teachers in universities over adult male students. Even Harvard didn't have women as students or teachers on the same standing as men for many years. Instead, they had a special arrangement with Radcliffe, the all women's university, that they should be like brother/sister universities.

All of the **first** universities that permitted women as students on **equal** standing with men had a philosophy that was very “humanistic”, “atheistic”, “anti-Christian” and “socialistic”. All this started from the influence of Lenin and Marx supporters who usually did not advertise the source of their propaganda. (They didn't want people to know who they were or where it was coming from.) (In those days, the “communists” were thought of as very bad.) The rejection of God and all religions has always been their first priority. Of course, when most people thought of communism as something bad they usually were thinking of the tyrannical reputation their political leaders had back then, rather than communism’s anti-Christian objectives, to get as many people to burn in hell as possible.

This movement was world-wide. Most people called it “communism” or “socialism”. Make no mistake, the “women's liberation” movement was propagated by atheistic satanic anti-Christian deceptive communist philosophy. Most people have been brainwashed into thinking that if a woman is not permitted to be a man, she is somehow being abused. However, “abusiveness” does not consist of denying women the right to become men. Those people can't seem to understand that macho acting women are unromantic, abnormal and anti-Christian. Modern feminism minimizes normal romance,..... and increases abnormal same gender romances >>> cause and effect.

For many years, all the countries that adopted an atheistic “communist” type of government were all very bad. They always had patrols around their borders to keep their own citizens from escaping. Nowadays, North Korea even has electrified fences to kill anyone attempting to escape. From WW1 until now, the “communists” have tortured and/or killed more innocent people than the Nazis ever did in the Nazi death camps during WW2. (Watch documentary called: The Soviet Story.)

When they were first getting started in Russia, they propagated themselves to the masses of gullible poor people as the “good guys” against the horrible tyranny of the Russian royalty. They had public marches with banners that said things like: “Brotherhood and Freedom”, “Justice, Equality and Bread”. Those marches usually ended by the police shooting at the people or the Czar's cavalry trampling the people. The new communists were using the widespread tyranny and poverty that existed in those days as a tool to get the gullible masses of poor people to assist them rise up and take control of the government. But when they took control of the government after the Russian revolution they were worse tyrants than the previous Russian royalty and the poor people were poorer after the revolution than before. People starved to death by the millions.

In 1932 Stalin even sent an army to the Ukraine to forcefully remove all of the food and even take all the seed for the next years planting, and shoot anyone leaving or bringing food in. The enormous supply of confiscated food was sold outside of Russia to make Stalin and his fellow communist politicians rich. After the hunger took its toll, when they were removing the millions of dead bodies and

dumping them into mass graves, occasionally there were a few who were still barely alive, but they were thrown in anyway and buried alive.

Hitler was a small mass murderer compared to Stalin. After all this, why was the United States allies with Stalin during WW2? The truth is that the US has had undercover communist politicians for a long time now, who are satanic wolves in sheep's clothing that love to deceive, conquer and kill. (like Bush's 9-11. See 9-11 documentaries: "Loose Change", and "Fahrenheit 9-11")

Obama's open socialist backing goes back at least to 1996, when he received the endorsement of the Chicago branch of the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA) for an Illinois state senate seat. Sometimes, they use the name "socialists" instead of "communists" because they want to pretend **not** to be associated with the bad reputation of the "communists". But, they are the same group of people.

Sometimes they even do good things trying to pretend to be the "good-guys", which is the same fake mask the "communists" used back when they were getting started. According to Cliff Kincaid in Accuracy in the Media, Obama endorsed openly Socialist Senator Bernie Sanders in 2006. Obama was later endorsed by the Communist Party USA in his run for President of the United States. President Obama had openly suggested Marxist ideologies and had surrounded himself with numerous outspoken Marxists.

Trump, on the other hand, supposedly had some communist interference computer hacking that supported him during his election. Trump does support "redistribution of wealth", which has a clear communist origin. Before the rise of communism rich people were never heard to promote "redistribution of wealth", an obvious lie, that only a real schmuck would believe. Trump is the most communist president that the US has ever had. (See documentary: "Active Measures" and "Fahrenheit 11-9") ("Fahrenheit 9-11" is about Bush.)

Despite the modern high level education for women, they are not capable of understanding the deception of the satanic communist "feminism" (women's liberation) brainwashing (propaganda). (This comment is not intended to insult women. It is intended to take note that women need loving husbands to guide them and protect them from dangerous errors.)

This is kind of like the story of the little hamster who was desperately struggling trying to open the door of her cage to get out. But she didn't realize that just outside her door was a big dog staring intently at her and licking his chops, just waiting for her to get that door open. The poor little thing didn't know that she was much safer and happier inside the cage than outside. Modern high level educated women can't perceive the big dog ready to gobble them up. (The communists drag as many souls to hell as possible.)

Because of the influence of the Lenin and Marx supporters, almost every modern university, in the US, has adopted an atheistic "communist" philosophy.

They don't call themselves "communists" or "atheists", but they act like communists by always prohibiting any meaningful influence of Christianity in their classrooms. Sometimes they even use inappropriate propaganda like the "separation of church and state" (which is not found in any American law) in order to prohibit any influence of religion in state supported schools. They are mostly noted for a general absence of any religion, and also noted for gender role reversal. The "separation of church and state" was never made law in the US,..... it has only been used the same way as things like the Salem witch trials, which in the end, served to show bad consequences of prohibiting satanism, and thereby strengthen satanism by saying it's bad to oppose it. (In those witch trials innocent people were falsely accused of being witches (by the real witches) and then they were executed.)

Communism is not primarily a political movement. It is primarily anti-Christian, social, atheistic and anti-religious, the same way that the "theory" of evolution is particularly atheistic. (See article on: The Lie of Evolution) The communists are particularly fond of gender role reversal, which is considered **blasphemy** in faithful Christianity. (See article on: The Consequences of "Women's Liberation") Sometimes they even call themselves "Christians", but their conduct is that of a "wolf in sheep's clothing", doing everything they can to drag as many souls to hell as possible. (See article listed below on: "Wolves in Sheep's Clothing")

Likewise, almost every modern politician, in the US, has adopted an atheistic "communist" philosophy, but they don't call themselves "communists", but sometimes they will admit to being "atheists". Do "wolves in sheep's clothing" openly call themselves "wolves"? (See article on: Wolves In Sheep's Clothing) Make no mistake, the anti-Christian custom of putting women in positions of authority over men in the modern society, like promoting female bosses and politicians, was the result of decades of atheistic communist propaganda. The communist philosophy is the most powerful political, media, anti-religious, social and educational influence in the world today, especially in America. Communism is mostly noted for a general absence of any religion or the deliberate corruption and restriction of religion,..... and also noted for gender role reversal.

Communism is primarily social, not political, even though they are always sticking their noses into just about everything. Their satanic influence in the churches, especially female leadership over men, is intended to keep Christians in a state of corrupt "lukewarmness". (See article on: The Lukewarm Church) Notice – it is possible that those politicians, church leaders and university leaders are not really "communists" themselves, but they have been trained (brainwashed) by an abundance of communist philosophy (propaganda) to adopt communist habits. They've been well trained to "go with the flow" and "don't rock the boat". The main point is that communism is the origin of this movement and..... the question is:

what will the future consequences be? (See article on: The Consequences of "Women's Liberation")

Women in politics should be thought of in the same category and the same nature as same gender marriages (or romances). Gender role reversal causes physical desire confusion in many people. In the Bible, God rained fire down from heaven on Sodom and Gomorrah for this perversion. Gen. 19 The punishment for this sin is supposed to be death. Lev. 20:13 "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." If someone says that God is wrong, they are speaking **BLASPHEMY!!!** God is the one who makes the rules! Especially what happens to people after they die. (See article on: The Consequences of "Women's Liberation")

Back in the 60's, most of the people who were against the "women's liberation" movement also thought that it would cause a considerable increase in "sodomy", along with many other abnormalities. They also had a fear that God would send a horrible punishment as a result of permitting sodomy. According to Louis Crompton, Ph.D. on early American history, referring to this abomination..... "in 1776, in the original 13 colonies was universally subject to the death penalty". However, later on, the death penalty for this crime was reduced to long-term imprisonment. As time went by, little by little, the US government decreased the punishment for this crime to less and less time in prison. Eventually, they completely repealed all the laws against it.

The subject of "same gender" marriages is not necessarily about the legalization of that type of marriage. It is about the natural human reaction to the practice of giving women dominant positions over men. Gender role reversal alters many people's physical desires. (Men acting like women and women acting like men.) Most people exposed to this abnormality don't know if they're more attracted to the opposite gender, their own gender, both or neither, without ever knowing why.

The whole idea of female politicians and bosses over men at work goes hand in hand with raising many people's attraction to their own gender, thus increasing the quantity of same gender romances, who eventually start living together as a result. Whether or not they receive legal marital status is a secondary, minor issue. The corruption is already in full swing. Female politicians and bosses over men are equally abnormal as, and responsible for same gender romantic relationships, >>> cause and effect.

For a long time most people believed that permitting this type of corruption was a major factor in the downfall of many past great empires, like the Greek empire and the Roman empire. But, few people know how much this corruption was in practice during the downfall of the nation of Israel shortly after the time of Jesus Christ. In the book called "Wars of the Jews" or "History of the Destruc-

tion of Jerusalem”, by Flavius Josephus. (available at: <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/2850/2850-h/2850-h.htm>) In book 4, chap. 9, para. 10, Josephus says: “.....and indulged themselves in feminine wantonness, without any disturbance, till they were satiated therewith; while they decked their hair, and put on women's garments, and were besmeared over with ointments; and that they might appear very comely, they had paints under their eyes, and imitated not only the ornaments, but also the lusts of women, and were guilty of such intolerable uncleanness, that they invented unlawful pleasures of that sort. And thus did they roll themselves up and down the city, as in a brothel-house, and defiled it entirely with their impure actions; nay, while their faces looked like the faces of women, they killed with their right hands; and when their gait was effeminate,.....” Shortly after this, in about 70AD, the Romans conquered Israel with a relatively small army, and the few survivors were removed from that land, and dispersed in small groups through-out the Roman empire. And, so they stayed scattered all over the place until 1948 when Israel was reborn as a nation, after the holocaust in WW2. (Josephus gives many details in his history.) (They didn't need a large army because the Jews were not united, they had no federal government, and could not raise a large army.)

Notice that, through history, in societies that have let this type of corruption run wild, those people have a tendency to get very aggressive, murderous and abusive. It is a common occurrence for them to gang rape other innocent people, as they tried to do in Gen. 19:4,5. (Note – Any person who reads this warning, and rejects it, is not “innocent”, they will deserve the consequences they get for rejecting this warning.) When any society permits this corruption to be accepted, that type of corruption always gets out of control. As Josephus says, they even start killing people. No society that has ever permitted this type of corruption has ever survived,..... never! The disaster that always goes along with the package is always severe enough to stop people from permitting it, afterwards.

The subject of “same gender” romance is not necessarily about the legalization of that type of marriage. It is about the unnatural human reaction to the practice of giving women dominant positions of leadership over men, like bosses at work over men or positions in politics. (From the position of president all the way down to the drivers license clerk who gives men permission to drive.) Gender role reversal alters most people's physical desires. Most people exposed to this abnormality don't know if they are more attracted to the opposite gender, their own gender, both or neither, without ever knowing why.

The whole idea of female politicians and female bosses over men goes hand in hand with raising many people's attraction to their own gender, thus

increasing the quantity of same gender romances, who eventually start living together as a result. (Whether or not same gender marriages are legalized is a secondary issue. The contamination of same gender romances is a problem started by gender role reversal,..... And is equally as damaging to society.) Female politicians and bosses over men are equally as abnormal and responsible for same gender romantic relationships >>> cause and effect.

No society that has ever permitted same gender marriages has ever survived. Permitting that type of marriage is an **absolute** sure bet that the society will fall. "The writing is on the wall". (see Dan 5, which is the origin of the phrase of the writing on the wall.) God is merciful, and gives people time to repent. But, eventually this type of corruption must be destroyed.

A good example in the Bible of one of those female religious and political leaders was Queen Jezebel the wife of King Ahab, who had spread the worship of the false god Baal in Israel. The end of that accursed woman would be a very fitting end of all those women pastors in churches corrupting Christianity. (And also female politicians and female bosses over men, not over women.) In 2Ki 9:30-37, the man Jehu had her thrown down out of an upper window of a building. Then he had his chariot horses trample her under their hooves, crushing her bones like what happened to the villain during the Roman chariot race in the film Ben-Hur. Then dogs came and ate her. She never had a funeral or a burial. 2Ki 9:36, 37 ".....,And he said, This is the word of the LORD, which he spake by his servant (prophet) Elijah the Tishbite, saying, In the portion of Jezreel shall dogs eat the flesh of Jezebel: 37 And the carcase of Jezebel shall be as dung upon the face of the field....." So that, if anyone in those days saw some dog droppings laying on the ground, they might say, "there lies Jezebel", as though they were looking at her grave and laughingly mocking her. How appropriate!!!

Even the name itself, "communism", is a lie. They teach that they will one day make the whole world one great big "commune". Everyone will all live together and share all their possessions like one big happy family in peace, love and harmony. They say that the government, the military and the police will eventually not be necessary, because the human race will have "evolved" into the highest form of living: a commune, where everyone is equal. (See article on: The Lie of Evolution) However, they have never produced any such a commune, only tyranny, torture, murder and corruption. The leaders always get the riches for themselves (except when they are putting on a fake show in order to deceive the gullible masses who can't figure out that communism is a big fat lie).

What does all that have to do with rejecting God and His teachings? Why do they prohibit all religions? Why is the denial of God and correct Christian customs

their **first** priority? Why do they lie about an unrealistically good “commune” that they have never been able to produce? Answer: They are liars and satanic “wolves in sheep's clothing”. Also, this movement is primarily in relation to the prophesied outpouring of the Holy Spirit along with its accompanied commune. Acts 2 (See article on: The New World Order was Prophesied in the Bible)

Why is their second priority propagating female authority over men? Answer: All male authority over women is faithful religious teaching, and they reject all religions. Eph 5:23,24 “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. 24 Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing.” (Notice – whenever this propaganda is being pushed, it is important that people recognize its origin and the purpose of the evil people who are propagating it.) Satan has chosen women for leaders (witches) because God has chosen men for leaders; starting all the way back in the garden of Eden.

Christian churches with women leaders are really churches of Satan with female “wolves in sheep's clothing”. (Remember Jezebel.) They are satanic people who want to drag as many souls to hell as they can. They want people to burn in hell for eternity. This movement is primarily anti-Christian. What is God going to do about this blasphemy? The modern rise of terrorism is a justifiable curse from God that goes hand in hand with the rejection of God's sacred Bible. No progress is going to be made against this satanic movement until God steps in, and strikes down the leaders. (See article on: The New World Order was Prophesied in the Bible)

Since the supposed downfall of “communism” (the downfall of the iron curtain and the Soviet Union) many people mistakenly think that this horrible “communism” is dead. However, the communists have learned that they can make much more progress by infiltrating all countries and influencing as many positions of leadership/influence in every social orientation as possible rather than keeping their own people prisoners and maintaining a bad reputation. Communism is **primarily** social and anti-religious, not political.

When they were horrible tyrants in the Soviet Union they were showing their true character without using any “sheep's clothing” (no mask). Now that they're concentrating their efforts on influencing all countries as a social effect rather than a political one, they need very professional “sheep's clothing”. (See article on: Wolves In Sheep's Clothing) This is done in each country primarily by citizens of their own countries, not by foreigners. Remember, communism is primarily social, not political, even though they are always sticking their noses into just about everything. They are primarily social and anti-religious.

They used to say that they were primarily interested in the “redistribution of wealth”, but that was just a lie intended to deceive all the gullible masses of poor people who existed back in those days to get them to assist them rise up against

the government. But, they were getting side-tracked with politics,..... and the “redistribution of wealth” was an obvious deception. Back in those days it was the communist political leaders who got all the wealth, it was not redistributed to the poor people.

The “women's liberation” movement was a very important part of their deception. It makes them look like the “good guys” against the supposedly horrible tyranny of the “all male leadership” that existed before “women's liberation”, which in reality was much less tyrannical than the injustice and discrimination done against men that is going on right now in modern times. (See article on: Fatherhood) The truth is that it is the women who are the discourteous, rude and “ungentlemanly” tyrants against the men. Most men treated women with a very courteous “gentlemanly” manner, back in those days, which the women didn't deserve.

Women should not be in positions of authority over men. They need to be tamed and trained in a loving, gentlemanly manner. (See article on: Domestic Discipline) When men are the leaders, they have the reputation of being true gentleman, not the women. I repeat, as leaders it is the women who have a reputation of being discourteous and ungentlemanly tyrants against the men. And,.... the men can't even admit it, because whole thing is a disgrace to manhood. The men usually sugar-coat it by calling it something that it is not, and sweeping it under the rug.

Back in the days (in the US), when the black people were very much discriminated against, they stood up and protested against that discrimination. But, now that men are being discriminated against, they won't even admit to themselves that what is going on is really what is going on. It is too far to the extreme disgraceful to manliness. It is so much easier to sugar-coat it, and call it something that it is not, and sweep it under the rug, and pretend that it is not there. (see article listed below on: Fatherhood)

The “women's liberation” movement is equally a **disadvantage** to women as an “employee's liberation” movement would be a **disadvantage** to employees. An “employee's liberation” movement would destroy almost every business in America. It would cause more damage than the great depression. An “employee's liberation” movement would cause the worst economic disaster in the history of the world. Yet, modern highly educated women are not capable of perceiving how “women's liberation” has already destroyed or perverted their marriages, romances and families. (This comment is not intended to insult women. It is intended to take note that women need loving husbands to guide them and protect them from dangerous errors, so that they can be winners instead of losers.) (See article listed below on: The Consequences of “Women's Liberation”)

Make no mistake, no communist government has ever produced a good commune. Having a “government” is itself a denial and exposure of their own deceptive and malicious philosophy, which is why they have, for the most part, gotten out of politics..... and are now concentrating on social and anti-religious influence. The purpose of communism from its very beginning was invented specifically concerning the Biblical prophecy about the coming outpouring of the Holy Spirit on all flesh just before the return of Jesus Christ. (along with the accompanying commune) (See article on: The New World Order was Prophesied in the Bible)

The few “communes” that have been somewhat successful through history were more like a “democracy”. It must also be kept in mind that pure “democracy” is impractical on a large scale. In a large government where hundreds of daily decisions must be made, it would be impossible to have a national citizen's vote every day on every detail. Not forgetting that managing a government also bears many similarities to managing a large business, and most of the common people are very incompetent business managers. Thus, we have the need for a more practical government in the form of a republic, with the spirit of “democracy” by the election of representatives who are capable managers.

True pure “democracy” is an unrealistic myth that can never be reality on a large scale. The only “democracies” that could possibly exist are little tiny ones in small communities. Once they become larger, they must be converted into a republic. However, both democracies and republics on a large scale are false anyway. The real leadership is run behind the scenes by a secret group of people. The fake puppet politicians rarely go against the orders from the underground.

Even though the “communists” who are the same group as the “socialists” claim (falsely) to have many of the attributes of “democracy”, there are five main differences between “democracy” and “communism”. (Apart from their reputation of tyranny, torture, brainwashing and murder.) (Remember, the current movement is more social and anti-Christian than political. And the “socialists” are the same type of people as the “communists”, but wearing “good-guy” masks.)

First, “communism” is always atheistic. Their first priority is to remove all religions, religious practices and religious teachings (like “fatherhood”. A father is a symbolic representation of God), because they are led by Satan. (Once they get the fathers out of the way, then they can brainwash the children any way they want. Remember the hamster and big dog mentioned above. They want to drag as many souls to hell as they can. In other words, they want their big dog to gobble up the gullible people who fall for their deceptions.) Democracies and republics permit freedom of religion. Despite the fake US communist puppet politician leadership, freedom of religion is sort-of permitted anyway..... only in accordance with the lukewarm church leaders. (see article listed below on: The Lukewarm Church)

Second, “communism” removes the automatic authority of men over women because that authority is taught in faithful Christianity, and in other religions.

They claim to promote “equality”, but in family life it is very clear that they promote female dominance (satanic witchcraft). Any honest person who makes an objective examination of US law concerning husbands and wives must come to a conclusion that the law is heavily in favor of wives against husbands,..... which is **not** equality. Furthermore, these laws motivate wives to fight against their husbands, thus ruining marriages..... Which was their goal in the first place. Those laws also inhibit men from acting like real men; they stifle and suppress the normal development of the character of manhood. They have disgraced manhood. Men don't act like men anymore.

The purpose of these laws is **not** to prevent men from abusing women, nor to establish “equality”, nor to prevent children from starving. The purpose is to destroy marriage completely..... And those laws have been very successful up until now..... which has been a **disadvantage** to women.

But even highly educated women can't figure it out; like the little hamster and dog mentioned above, who was better off and happier staying in her cage. Those women can't see the big dog. Their marriages, romances and families are destroyed or perverted, and they can't figure out why. (This comment is not intended to insult women. It is intended to take note that women need loving husbands to guide them and protect them from dangerous errors. So that they can be winners instead of losers.) Christian churches should protest those laws by excommunicating any female member who uses those laws against her own husband.

In true “democracy”, before the influence of communism (before 1920), each man was the head and representative of his family and the only one in each family to vote. Previously, husbands were the representatives of their families just as Senators are representatives of their states. It is no more an injustice for husbands to make decisions for their wives and children than it is for a Senator to make decisions for the citizens of his state. Voting for women was not started until 1920 in the US, which was the result of the influence of “communist” propaganda and deceptive secretly “communist” politicians in the US. Voting, or decision making, is macho. It is abnormal for women to be decision makers as though they were men. IT IS ABNORMAL FOR WOMEN TO BE MEN!!!

The very first thing the women did as soon as they got the vote was to start the prohibition. (Prohibition was literally started by the 18th amendment in an all-male congress, but it must be remembered that there were many female-run organizations putting a lot of influence on congress to change such laws, equally as much as changing the laws about women voting.) They started to act like mothers of all the men by telling them that they couldn't drink. (Most of the protestant churches also voted for prohibition because they had forgotten that before the pasteurization process was invented in 1869 by Thomas Bramwell Welch, which preserved unfermented grape juice all year long, the Lord's supper had to have been done with real wine. Jesus Christ himself drank wine, not un-

fermented grape juice. Jesus was even accused of being a drunkard (wine-bibber). (Luke 7:34)

Those churches also rejected the first miracle Jesus did, which was to turn water into wine. (John 2:1-11) The prohibition of drinking became their new man-made spiritual law, to make them feel more spiritual. Some of them even went as far as to change the definition of the word “wine” in the Bible to falsely mean “grape juice”. Example, a Jewish wedding reception: John 2:10 “..... Every man at the beginning doth set forth good ~~wine~~ “grape juice”; and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse: but thou hast kept the good ~~wine~~ “grape juice” until now.” (How absurd can you get?) The Jews have always used real wine at their wedding celebrations, not unfermented grape juice, which was not even available to them at that time of year. Is there anyone who would go into a restaurant and ask for a glass of “wine” and expect to receive a glass of “grape juice”? The word “wine” means “wine”, both in English and in the original NT Greek.)

The protestant church support of prohibition caused an inappropriately favorable mind set justification toward women voting, which they should have treated the same as satanic witchcraft instead. To this day, most of the protestant churches in the US refuse to accept that the word “wine” in the Bible means “wine”. Jesus' first miracle was to change the water into wine. He did **not** change the water into grape juice. (John 2:1-11)

Notice the negative consequences of the prohibition (1- The continued sale of liquor on the black market. 2- The rise of crime and violence.). Later on, that law of prohibition was repealed. However, they failed to recognize that the real cause of the problem was permitting women to vote, which was the most important law that should have been repealed.

Third, “communism” requires (by force) that everyone share all possessions and living space, whereas in true “democracy” sharing possessions and living space is voluntary. (The phrase “by force” indicates the absolute necessity of a government power in order to enforce communism. In the Soviet Union, after the Russian revolution, people with large houses were forced to share them with other poorer families, without receiving rent.... and most of their household possessions got stolen in the process. There was no love and harmony in all that.)

Notice that the communist political leaders never subject themselves to the same regulations as the people they are ~~governing~~,.... rather, as the gullible dupes they have brainwashed and conquered. (Remember the fate of the hamster mentioned above.) The communist political leaders always save the best possessions and living space for themselves..... and all of the people who believed their talk about a big happy commune where everybody shared all their possessions are a bunch of gullible fools.

Fourth, “communism” must destroy the family unit. They cannot allow a mother-father-children family unit, because this also was established by God and is taught in correct Christianity. Most importantly, once they gain control of the

children, then they can raise them any way they want. (Brainwashing – remember the hamster and dog.) As everyone is required (by force) to share their possessions and living space, likewise women and men and children must all be shared equally. Marital commitment (husbands and wives), male leadership and parental authority over their own children cannot be permitted. They must destroy the family. They want people to live more like dogs that roam the streets.

The removal of all male leadership, destruction of marriage, the “women's liberation” and the “children's liberation” movements are all part of the same package. Children's liberation is more a **disadvantage** to children than the women's liberation has already been a **disadvantage** to women,.... but somehow even highly educated women are not capable of perceiving it. (This comment is not intended to insult women. It is intended to take note that women need loving husbands to guide them and protect them from dangerous errors.) The story about the little hamster and big dog mentioned above is even more applicable to “children's liberation” than it is to “women's liberation”. Women cannot be “liberated” from male leadership without losing any normal relationship with their own children in the process.

The removal of the authority of the husband/father was the first and most important step toward the destruction of marriage and family,..... and so far, they have been very successful at ruining marriages and families. Permitting the women to vote was a denial that husbands were the leaders and representatives of their families. As a result of these changes, family life, in the US, is much worse than it was before “women's liberation”. Almost all modern women are not nearly as happy as women were before “women's liberation”. God created women to be the happiest, healthiest and feel most secure under the authority and protection of a loving husband. (See article on: The Consequences of “Women's Liberation”)

To a large degree parental authority has already been removed. The US government spends an enormous amount of money on a gigantic agency that spends all of its time butting-in to family matters at the least little report of a neighbor or an acquaintance. That agency claims to be protecting children from abuse, but in reality, by suppressing parental authority over their own children not to apply normal discipline, they have corrupted the family environment so that chaos, craziness and/or violence escalates. When correct discipline is suppressed, children get out of control and chaos increases. Parents feel more and more under pressure until they're like a volcano ready to explode, and as a result of those out-of-control explosions, cases of child abuse go up. Statistically speaking, there are many more cases of child abuse now in comparison to before that supposed “protective” government agency started “protecting” people. Not that having such an agency itself is bad. The problem is that the people running it are satanic with bad intentions to ruin families.

Most parents are afraid to discipline their own children. Many parents live in constant fear that the government may, who knows when, come and remove their

children from their home..... And if they ever want to get their children back they are forced to attend certain lunatic “counseling” sessions. At first glance, those lunatic government “counselors” seem to be people who have never had children before and just don't seem to understand what it's like to manage children. But, in reality, when you realize that they're not interested in fixing any problems, they're interested in ruining everything, then the lunatic “counseling” sessions start to make sense..... And the parents won't get their children back unless they co-operate with that lunacy.

As a result of these changes, family life, in the US, is much worse than it was before this movement started. [Pro 23:13,14](#) “Withhold not correction from the child: for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell.” [Pro 22:15](#) “Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him.” If parents would only apply correct normal discipline with loving self control and moderation at the beginning of their children's misbehavior, then excessive violence, beatings, screaming and anger would not happen. Moderate discipline with loving self-control is the antidote for excessive violence/abuse.

Fifth, “communism” claims to be fighting for the freedom of poor and oppressed people. The communists call it: “revolution” or “class struggle”. Years ago in Russia, the communists were helping the poor oppressed people to fight for their freedom from the tyranny of the rich Russian royalty. Supposedly, the communists were the “good guys”. They were also new at that time, so nobody really knew if they were good or bad. They were using the widespread extreme tyranny and poverty that existed in those days, from the Russian royalty, as a tool to get the masses of poor gullible people to assist them rise up and take control of the government. Communism was something new, at that time, and most people didn't even know what it was.

Later on, especially during the early 1990's, the economy all over the world had changed. That intensive poverty is not nearly as common now, so it has been necessary for the communists to change their battle tactics. The talk about “redistribution of wealth” has now become obsolete. This is why the Soviet Union was deliberately dissolved. They are now much more a social movement than a political one. It must be noted here that by taking control of the government they had lost view of their main purpose, which was **not** primarily political. (The way they took control of the government in the US, as undercover political spies, was much more suited to their purpose and the achievement of their goals.) Their main purpose has always been to corrupt religions and destroy families and marriages,..... and that is done better by infiltration as socialistic spies, like wolves in sheep's clothing. Trump was the most communist president that the US has ever had. (See documentary: Active Measures) Right now, it's the ones that call themselves “socialists”, who are wearing the best “good-guy” masks, that have everybody fooled the most. The communists and the socialists are the same group.

Immediately after the Russian revolution, as soon as the “communists” took control of the government, they were worse tyrants than the previous Russian royalty. But, that type of tyranny doesn't exist in the US..... or does it? Isn't the enforcement of charging enormous and unjustifiable quantities of “child support” or “alimony” tyranny against men? Meanwhile, most men in America go to work and at least one of their bosses is a woman who earns more money than they do. The poor men who are low income couldn't pay both the enormous “child support” and also their own basic necessities even if they wanted to.

They are forced to either become street people (this is probably the number one reason for the high quantity of male street people in most cities in the US)..... or, in order to survive, they have to change their jobs (thereby losing any good income they had previously, forced to take any low-paying job available), abandon their children, move to a secret address and use mass transit. (They are denied renewal of their driver's license or identification in government offices where the manager and clerk many times are women, who many times earn more money than the poor men denied their identification. In large cities with mass transit, the police never ask for identification.)

Or, in order to survive, those men might also consider moving to one of the oodles of English speaking countries around the world. But they should get their passport before their “child support” or “alimony” debt surpasses the limit of money owed in order to get one. Canada is the closest to the US. But, those men should do some Internet research about the laws in the country they want to go to, to make sure they don't fall into the same problem they have now, all over again. They also must check the requirements for getting permanent residency in the country they want to go to, and permission to work.

In addition to this disgrace at the hands of women, they are also labeled as “criminals” or “dead-beats”. Sometimes, in those government offices. Those women managers even put pictures of men on a bulletin board and are literally labeled as “criminals” for owing “child support” or “alimony” in a government office where the manager or clerk, many times, is a woman who earns more money than the poor men who are denied the renewal of their identification. This is almost like the old custom that can be seen in western movies, when they put posters up saying “Wanted, Dead or Alive”. Whereas, the real criminals are in the government, who steal a man's children, and then demand exorbitant amounts of money to pay for those children, which is more correctly called “kidnapping” and “extortion”. (Notice – it is legal in the US that someone can make their own general ID card and have it sealed by an official “Notary Public”. But, unfortunately, getting a driver's license or passport is not so easy or legal.)

In some cases this “alimony” motivates some men to avoid registering their marriage at all. By never being officially “married” they will never have to go through the injustice of paying “alimony” to a wife who deserves punishment,

not reward for her bad behavior. Those unjust laws are actually promoting fornication.

And to top it all off, if any man refuses to go along with this crazy malicious spiteful system, those government people who have kidnapped the man's children and attempt to steal enormous amounts of money to pay for those children, poison the minds of his children by telling them that their father "abandoned" them. (The fact that the quantity of money demanded is unrealistically high is evidence that the main purpose of charging that money is not to support children. The main purpose of charging that money is to destroy the authority of men over their own families and to destroy families. More than anything else, this one law has converted the men of the US into wimps.) Rest assured, this is the number one cause of the destruction of American families. (This thing motivates women to fight against their husbands, and win.)

This isn't just tyranny, it's the disgrace of manhood and "fatherhood" at the hands of their own wives, legalized and falsely painted as something "good" (in the name of protecting children from starvation) by the government (brainwashing).

By nature, women are more tyrannical than men, despite the abundance of lying propaganda against men, which they used to alter social lifestyle, back during the transitional period, when the "women's liberation" movement was getting started. Why do communists claim to be freeing people from tyranny when in reality, all they really want to do is fight against God's standards, ruin marriages and families..... and conquer unsuspecting gullible people any possible way they can? Make no mistake, the majority of US politicians are communists!! Obama openly endorsed Socialist Senator Bernie Sanders in 2006. Obama was later openly endorsed by the Communist Party USA in his run for President of the United States. Trump was the most outward and public communist president that the US has ever had. (See documentaries: "Active Measures" and "Fahrenheit 11/9") (The documentary Fahrenheit 9/11 was about Bush.)

In the days of the European royalty in England, among the common people, the law itself continued to maintain male dominance over women, even at the same time that a queen was occasionally on the throne. Remember, in those days, **all** of the noble and royal families, including their children, had supremacy over **all** the common people, as though they were a different species. (blue blood) The only reason a queen would have been on the throne instead of a king was that the previous king had no sons, only daughters.

Even when Edward VI was crowned king of England at nine years of age, in 1547, he had a sister who was 21 years older than himself. But, she wasn't considered eligible as long as there was a male heir available. In France, as in most other countries, women were never ever permitted on the throne under any

circumstances. It was considered extremely anti-Christian, abnormal and problematic. In the old Roman Empire, not even once was there ever a woman on the throne. If a Roman emperor lacked a son, he usually adopted one.

Centuries ago, in England (and in the US until around 1920) among the common people, men were legally permitted to physically discipline their misbehaving wives in the same manner that the government physically disciplined delinquent men in public. (Even at the same time that a queen was occasionally on the throne.) (Discipline applied correctly, with moderation, self control and love when an adult is truly delinquent is not violence or tyranny. The tyranny is when an innocent adult is disciplined. See article listed below on: Domestic Discipline)

Women were legally prohibited from having even the smallest government position with authority over men. (like a driver's license clerk who denies a driver's license to a man because he hasn't paid child support or alimony, who often times earns more money than the man who was denied renewal of his identification.) Women could not vote. (voting is masculine) Wives could not own property nor have a business without the supervision and permission of their husbands. Women were not permitted to divorce their husbands. Of course, they could leave their husbands, if they wanted. The only purpose of a divorce was to get a remarriage, which is prohibited for women by correct Christian teaching. (See article listed below on: Correct Divorce)

All of the things mentioned above, in the previous paragraph, are in accordance with the Word of God and have been considered normal for thousands of years. Furthermore, all of the things mentioned above are part of God's recipe for the happiest and healthiest family life for everyone. (See article on: Marriage Misunderstandings Explained) (See article on: The Virtues of the Spirit) In addition, it must be noted that the removal of these tried and tested customs is corrupting the present society so much that the present society will probably collapse all by itself. Either that or it will hit an iceberg like the Titanic did.

But, even though England occasionally permitted a queen on the throne, sometimes there was still a protest against it. Speaking out against the royalty was very dangerous in those days. They usually executed people who said **anything** against the royal or noble families. It was considered treason.

In 1558 John Knox, a church leader in Scotland, anonymously published a pamphlet condemning the accursed practice of putting women on the throne, called: "The First Blast of the Trumpet against the monstrous regiment of Women" (this pamphlet is online at: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/9660/9660-h/9660-h.htm>) (Afterwards, John Knox personally confronted the queen face to face and threatened her. She was so afraid of him and his supporters, that she just broke down in tears and made no attempt to oppose him.) (What an excellent example for men to stand up against the current discrimination against men!!!)

In his pamphlet Knox states three main points condemning the abominable practice of women ruling over men:

- 1 – Repugnant to nature. It is abnormal and unnatural.
(See article on: The Consequences of “Women's Liberation”)
- 2 – Contumely to God.
(It is disrespectful and rebellious against the Word of God.)
- 3 – The subversion of good order, of all equity and justice.
(It causes chaos and injustice. It is always abusive to men.)

Surprisingly, when the chaos and injustice happen as the direct result of rebelling against God, most people insist that something else must be causing it. They also imagine that if men were always the leaders over women there would be chaos and injustice done to the women..... This is the communist propaganda lie (brainwashing) used during the “women's liberation” movement to bring down the previous “all male” leadership. Most men do not abuse women. Most men love and protect women. Now, it is the men who are being abused. (See article listed below on: Fatherhood) Men rarely abuse women, but women commonly abuse men, when they have the chance. Most commonly, it is the women who have the rudest most discourteous conduct, not men.

In modern times, the idea that the practice of putting a woman on the throne being somehow offensive, has been completely removed from history. Even the concept of the monarchy being tyrannical and abusive has been somehow eliminated. Even children's stories regularly have a princess who is beautiful and desirable. The hero is always the guy who rescues the princess from the big bad villain. Just as the old tyranny has been forgotten, equally as much the repulsiveness of females reining over men has been forgotten.

The whole episode that Henry VIII went through by executing his wives was primarily over the desire to have a son, so that his next successor would not be a female on the throne, but a male. The problem with his first wives was that they only had daughters, no sons. So, king Henry VIII went through numerous divorces, executions and remarriages in hopes of getting a son. But, in modern times, most people think that having queens on the throne was considered good and normal, back in those days.

Tit 2:4,5 “That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, 5 To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not **blasphemed**.” Notice how the Bible says that wives should be primarily “keepers at home” and “obedient to their own husbands”. But, in modern times such things are considered somehow bad or wrong. Quite to the contrary, the Bible is correct and true on this point. Those people who contradict God on this subject are speaking **blasphemy**. By disrespecting the Word of God on the correct role of women, the re-

sults are the highest divorce rate in history, an epidemic of drug addiction, an epidemic of suicide, an epidemic of Sodomy, and basically a very unstable society. Please notice, these verses ([Tit 2:4,5](#)) describe the very essence of the nature of “femininity”, this is the way God created human nature to be, without which society so far to the extreme corrupts itself, that it is now just like a big fat Titanic at the point of hitting an iceberg. Society is so corrupt that it will fall all by itself.

During the transitional period of “women's liberation”, when examples of cases of men abusing women were frequently publicized, it was more than likely that those were cases of communist volunteer men and women willing to do anything or say anything necessary to bring down the previous social system. In addition, statistically speaking, the quantity of cases of abuse, against men, women and children, in the present social system is much higher than it was before the change, when men were the leaders.

But, even in the best social system possible, there are going to be at least a few rotten people who cause trouble. The existence of a few corrupt individuals does not mean that the system itself is bad. Just because there were a few cases of husbands who had been abusive to their wives does not mean that the social system of “all male” authority over women is bad. Most men were very loving and protective of their wives. It was much more common that husbands liked to spoil their wives. As stated above, most of the publicized cases of men abusing women were frauds.

But rest assured, the **majority** of the more legitimate cases of husbands abusing their wives were caused by the wives deliberately provoking their husbands. Most of those women who provoke their husbands had didn't get enough love and discipline from their fathers when they were little girls. They wanted their husbands to give them the normal discipline they needed for improvement of character (maturity) and make them feel secure, which they should have gotten from their fathers when they were young. (See article on: Domestic Discipline) The men, on the other hand, who were supposedly abusing their wives, were usually gentle, kind and not prone to use physical force; exactly the type of man most of those women want to be disciplined by. (See article listed below on: Domestic Discipline)

In the US, according to the book HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES published by the Macmillan Company in 1921, there have been many changes in the laws concerning women and family life. In chapter 23 it says: “... *a married woman's personal property—jewels, money, furniture, and the like—became her husband's property; the management of her lands passed into his control. Even the wages she earned, if she worked for some one else, belonged to him. Custom, if not law, prescribed that women should not take part in town meetings or*

enter into public discussions of religious questions.....” (This book is on-line at: <http://history-world.org/USA.pdf>)

Also see Zinn’s “A People’s History of the United States”, chapter 6. This book is online at: <http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon1/zinnint6.html>)

Notice that the phrase “town meetings” implies attendance/participation as a local male voting citizen/resident. At that time women were not even participants as voting citizens, how much less would it have been possible for a woman to be a politician with authority, on even the lowest level? Back then, the US law considered a married couple to be “one person”, in perfect union and the husband was the head and representative of that union. True “union” in a marriage **must** have leadership. Is there any human organization that can maintain unity with no leadership? Certainly not!!! If leadership is genuinely good it will produce love, joy, peace and harmony. (See article on: The Virtues of the Spirit)

The modern notion that a married couple should be perfectly “equal” and that the husband should not automatically take the leadership over his wife, but rather, they should share the leadership equally, is absurd. Is there any country that would elect two “equal” presidents? (Which would only produce conflict, chaos and irresolvable “deadlocks”, also known as a “stalemates”.) In real life, an organization such as a marriage cannot maintain order and unity without leadership..... And when the husband does not take that position, the wife **always** takes it automatically. Then, she starts bossing him around like she's his mother. (Divorce is better than this disgrace. Divorce is also more spiritually pleasing to God. God calls female dominance over men “blasphemy”. Titus 2:5)

The extreme absurdity of the notion that a married couple should be perfectly “equal” and make all the decisions “equally” is very obvious to almost every couple immediately after they get married. The only purpose of this propaganda of being “equal” in leadership is exclusively to get the man to step down as the leader so that the woman takes command. Once, the husband is no longer the leader, there's no more talk of being “equal”. The purpose of this absurd and deliberately lying propaganda is intended to get the young inexperienced husband not to automatically take the leadership in a marriage, so that the woman takes over. (witchcraft) (Divorce is better than this disgrace to manhood.)

Over a century ago, in the US, the legally established leadership of the husband was called “coverture”, which was a legal practice whereby, upon marriage, a woman's legal rights and obligations were subsumed by those of her husband, in accordance with the wife's legal status of **feme covert** (married woman). An unmarried woman, a **feme sole** (single woman), had the right to own property and make contracts in her own name. The principle of coverture was described in William Blackstone's “Commentaries on the Laws of England” (which were applied the same way in the US, at that time) in the late 18th century: [By marriage, the husband and wife are one person in law: that is, the very being or legal existence](#)

of the woman is suspended during the marriage, or at least is incorporated and consolidated into that of the husband: under whose wing, protection, and cover, she performs every thing; and is therefore called in our law-French a feme-covert; is said to be covert-baron, or under the protection and influence of her husband, her baron, or lord; and her condition during her marriage is called her coverture. Upon this principle, of a union of person in husband and wife, depend almost all the legal rights, duties, and disabilities, that either of them acquire by the marriage. I speak not at present of the rights of property, but of such as are merely personal. For this reason, a man cannot grant any thing to his wife, or enter into covenant (contract) with her: for the grant would be to suppose her separate existence; and to covenant (contract) with her, would be only to covenant with himself: and therefore it is also generally true, that all compacts (contracts) made between husband and wife, when single, are voided by the intermarriage.

As it has been concisely expressed, husband and wife were one person as far as the law was concerned, and that person was led by the husband. A married woman could not own property, sign legal documents or enter into a contract, obtain an education against her husband's wishes, or keep a salary for herself. If a husband permitted his wife to work, under the laws of coverture, she was required to relinquish her wages to her husband. Notice – along with the elimination of the coverture laws was the elimination of the essence of unity, that is, the idea that a married couple was “one person”. Married couples were no longer united any more than the states of the US could be united if the authority of the federal government was eliminated. Then it could no longer be called the “United States” any more. They would then have to be called the “Independent States” of America. And they would probably end up fighting with each other like the typical US marriage does in real life. Rest assured, US marriages didn't fight like that when the laws of coverture were in effect. Unity and independence are opposites of each other.

After these laws of coverture were terminated in US history, and before “women's liberation” started in the 1960's, it was a common practice that when a couple got married, the husband would immediately forbid his wife from working. Unity was considered more important than extra money. (Don't forget that women were paid very little in those days.) The men of that time understood that the termination of the coverture laws was destructive to good marriage.

Believe it or not this was actually mentioned in a modern movie about that era before “women's liberation” started. The 2014 film “Big Eyes” showed what was very rare back in the 1950's, which was a single mother looking for a job to support herself and her daughter. When she applied for the job, the boss in the interview asked her: “So, your husband approves of you working?”. Her husband was expected to give his permission in order for her to get the job. Separations were very rare at that time. The cause of the separation was because she “...walked out on her suffocating husband”.

Interestingly, despite the typical communist propaganda portrayal of the man as the cause of every problem back when men were the leaders, they appropriately showed that she had an equally rebellious daughter who thought that her mother was being “suffocating” to her. (Yet another case that the men are typically shown in the film to be the villain, back in those days. But the real problem was that the wife was rebellious and wanted to be “independent”. Most women who receive sufficient love from their husbands don’t feel “suffocated”, even when the husband is the leader. The problem was not that the husband was “suffocating”, the problem was that the wife was “rebellious” and wanted to be “independent”.) (Remember, “unity” and “independence” are opposites of each other.)

Any person who is rebellious against their own correct authority figure cannot expect anything but rebellion in the children they produce. The most common case of this phenomenon is when a mother is rebellious against the authority of her husband. This is clear evidence that nature itself dictates that God has ordained the father as the correct authority in a family. When a wife rebels in this manner, she should not expect to get anything but rebellion from her own children. It is a curse from God; she has rebelled against the authority which God has placed over her, so God has given her children that rebel in the same manner against her. It’s not by chance that America is number one in divorces and also number one in rebellious bratty children.

When wives have money, property or a business apart from the authority of their husbands, they are acting “independently”, which is the opposite of “unity”. “Unity” and “independence” are diametrical opposites of each other. It is a common modern misunderstanding that married couples think they can be “united” in marriage and at the same time be “independent” and free to do whatever they want.

Is it possible for a business to operate in this manner? Can a large business have internal departments using company money obtained in their own department for purposes outside the control of the company's higher management? Certainly not! Husbands having authority to give orders to their wives in regard to their income, property or business activities is no more abusive than higher management in a large company having authority to give orders over the money earned within individual departments of their own company, without which they would have chaos. Husbands must have control of the money their wives earn, without which there can be no unity..... only chaos, conflicts, dead-locks (stalemates) and separations.

This belief that a marriage can have “unity” and “independence” at the same time is kind of like the old example of someone who has a birthday cake which is so beautiful that they want to keep it and preserve it. But, on the other hand, they also want to eat it. Well, if they eat it, then they won't be able to preserve it. And if they preserve it, then they won't be able to eat it. It has to be one or the other. How is it possible that modern highly educated women can't figure out that if they

eat their cake, then they can't preserve it? Or, they can't figure out that if they preserve their cake, then they can't eat it?

Most women, if they were given the choice between having a high paying prestigious macho profession..... or having a truly loving and virtuous relationship with a good husband, would choose the good husband. Unfortunately, most women think that they can have both. They think they can be “united” and “independent” at the same time. Despite the higher education of modern women, they still think they can preserve their cake and also eat their cake. When people try to maintain a marriage “united” and “independent” at the same time it doesn't work. The best of them are more like two independent roommates living together than like a married couple. When they attempt to be closer than roommates they end up with confusion, chaos, deadlock stalemates and craziness,.... not happiness and harmony. Mental illness doesn't just happen by itself, something causes it to happen. Trying to be “united” and “independent” at the same time causes mental illness; it's crazy.

Also, women are **not** supposed to be church leaders, except over other women or children, under a man's supervision. [1Cor. 14:34,35](#) “Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but *they are commanded to be under obedience*, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.” [1Tim. 2:11,12](#) “Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer (allow) not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.” KJV Obviously, according to the Word of God, women are not supposed to be leaders **over men** at home, in the church, at work, in adult education or in the government. (Especially no female politicians. From the position of president all the way down to the driver's license clerk who gives men permission to drive.)

Christian churches with women leaders over men should be considered churches of Satan wearing Christian masks, and the women leaders should be considered female “wolves in sheep's clothing”, like Jezebel. (Poorly made masks (sheep's clothing), very easy to detect. The teachings against it in the Bible are very clear. There's no room for honest mistakes, only deliberate rebellion.) (See article listed below on: What About Deborah?)

Here are two quotes from American history books referring to the practice of husbands physically disciplining their wives before “women's liberation” in the US. These laws were also applied to the common people in England even at the same time when an occasional queen sat on the throne. (See article on: Domestic Discipline)

In Howard Zinn's “A People's History of the United States” he says in chap-

ter 6: *“The husband’s control over the wife’s person extended to the right of giving her chastisement.But he was not entitled to inflict permanent injury or death on his wife....”*

(This book is on-line at: www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon1/zinnint6.html)

In “American Legal History, Law in the Morning of America”, on page 30, William Blackstone is quoted from his commentaries on law, saying: *“By marriage, the husband and wife are **one person in law**.....The husband also (**by the old law**) might give his wife moderate correction. For as he is to answer for her misbehaviour, the law thought it reasonable to intrust him with this power of restraining her, by **domestic chastisement**, in the same moderation that a man is allowed to correct his servants or children; for whom the master or parent is also liable in some cases to answer. But this power of correction was confined within reasonable bounds, and the husband was prohibited from using any violence to his wife....”* (This quote was taken from Blackstone’s Commentaries on law which is on-line at “The On-line Library of Liberty” at:

http://oll.libertyfund.org/index.php?option=com_frontpage&Itemid=149)

Notice that they did **not** consider “**domestic chastisement**” with **moderation** to be “violence”. In fact, moderately applied discipline with loving self-control is the antidote for violence. (The removal of moderate discipline causes tension, pressure and conflict to escalate, leading to an increase in violent out-of-control explosions,..... like a volcano that builds and builds pressure until it explodes.)

Also notice that the phrase “(**by the old law**)” is referring to the general understanding, back in those days, that this custom had been in practice as far back as anyone knew. They considered it to be an ancient, normal, indisputable and unquestionable “law of nature” established by God ever since the beginning of creation, in the Garden of Eden. [Gen. 3:16](#) “....your **desire shall be to your husband, and he shall rule over you.**” It is not possible for anyone to “**rule over**” anyone else without the ability to apply discipline for disobedience. Without this type of discipline the supposed subordinate would just disrespectfully tell the supposed leader to get lost. Also notice that most women “**desire**” having their husband rule over them, provided it is done in a mature, respectful and loving manner. (See article on: Domestic Discipline) (Also see article on: The Lie of Evolution)

This life is only a **temporary** test so that God will determine what to do with each person in the next life, which will be **eternal**. The question is: do you obey God now in this life? [2Cor. 4:17-18](#) “For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.” [Luke 9:23-25](#) “And he said to them all, If any man will come after me, let him deny

himself, and take up his cross **daily**, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it. For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away?" KJV (See article listed below on: Salvation)

Recommended free Bible software:
www.e-sword.net or www.theword.net

Also free Bible audio recordings at:
www.audiotreasure.com

e-mails: PastorDavidMinistries@protonmail.com
PastorDavidMinistries@tutanota.com

To donate, see document called "Donations" at:
<https://goo.gl/992nQY>

OTHER ARTICLES

All on Google Drive - <https://goo.gl/992nQY>
You need a **free** g-mail account to open this.

The Holy Scriptures
<http://docdro.id/aoytoK1>

The Lie of Evolution
<http://docdro.id/8iHTZPE>

What About Deborah
<https://docdro.id/vKSRLyz>

Fatherhood
<http://docdro.id/rRBGPzi>

The Role Of Women Throughout History

<http://docdro.id/y5N76mt>

The Consequences of Using Incorrect Terminology

<http://docdro.id/iScIIFT>

Domestic Discipline

<http://docdro.id/1p3ZWPv>

The Lukewarm Church

<http://docdro.id/8yBgpqf>

Correct Divorce

<https://docdro.id/ZiGuAz2>

Baptism

<https://docdro.id/3ZGhC0R>

The Consequences of “Women's Liberation”

<http://docdro.id/mvyN0Kw>

The New World Order was Prophesied in the Bible

<http://docdro.id/8PCQUwN>

Self-Love and Self-Esteem

<http://docdro.id/kOEGq3w>

Angels are Aliens, Aliens are Angels

<http://docdro.id/88ttGOQ>

Wolves In Sheep's Clothing

<http://docdro.id/aFuq27A>

Slavery

<http://docdro.id/ULokluY>

The Virtues of the Spirit

<http://docdro.id/rAyRmTw>

The Babylonian and Egyptian Captivity

<http://docdro.id/iZXZXo0>

The Suffering Of The Great Depression

<http://docdro.id/sUSrdWV>

Salvation

<http://docdro.id/Fwlc0hR>

Marriage Misunderstandings Explained

<http://docdro.id/jPdKvu5>
