***The Role of Women in Life - PH80-01  
  
Advanced Bible Doctrine - Philippians 4:1-3***

We are continuing our study of Philippians, using that as the basis for an examination of major doctrines. We've come to Philippians 4:1-3, where we are thinking about those two women who are in conflict in the Philippian church, Syntyche and Euodia. Women, we have found, were vital in the ministry of Jesus Christ and in the New Testament church. They provided much needed hospitality to the workers of the Lord, and to the Lord himself. They shared, as women, in the personal quality of salvation; in the ordinances of the church age; and, in the local church life. They were also objects of persecution by the Jewish authorities. They were students of Bible doctrine, and they were fully capable of teaching others. They enjoyed full spiritual equality with men in the New Testament church, as to the ability and the privilege of building a spiritual maturity structure in their souls.

However, women in the New Testament, as throughout the Word of God, were in a position of subordination to male leadership. Women were never given the pastor-teacher gift so they could not be pastors (shepherds) of a local church organization. They were to demonstrate their subjection by propriety of dress in public. They were to be in subjection to male authority. This does not mean that they are inferior persons; that they are open thereby to abuse; nor, that they are lacking personal fulfillment because they recognize and accept the place of subordination. It just means that when a woman accepts her place of subordination, she is capable of being happy. When she doesn't, she is absolutely never capable of happiness.

Euodia and Syntyche were under God's decree to respond to the counselor, which Paul has appointed to deal with this problem, the man named Suzygus. This was Paul's associate in the work, back in Philippi, whose name means "yokefellow." The women in conflict here needed the male spiritual leadership to resolve the issue that separated them. Actually, in one way or another, the conflict between Euodia and Syntyche was due to a lack of subordination on their part to their role as women under the authority of male leadership. Women are vital to the Lord's work in the church age, but they can only function in the role that God has appointed for them, and that is a role of subordination.

Such male leadership is essential, we are saying, to any ground of happiness for a woman in any relationship of life. It is only in church life that she finds satisfaction and fulfillment by that subordination. But this is true in every area of life: marriage; business; profession; career; home; or, whatever she pursues. So this is a Bible doctrine principle that we are dealing with.

**The Feminist Movement**

Of course, the minute that we have said this in our day, everyone, sooner or later, thinks of the great movement which was formed in the early 1960s to combat this Bible doctrinal principle – the movement which is known as the feminist movement. A lot of Christians don't really fully understand this movement. They don't fully understand that this movement was designed primarily and basically (and has this still as its primary motivation and goal today) to undermine and to discredit the Bible doctrine principle of the subordination of women in the order of God's creation to male leadership.

Basically, the feminist movement is a human viewpoint movement. It was spawned by Satan as part of the angelic conflict; that is, part of the warfare that the demonic angels and Satan constantly carry on against God. The feminist movement is part of Satan's warfare against God. This is not really as new a movement as we might be led to think it is. Actually, variations of the feminist movement have been on the American scene since the 1700s. Because the feminist movement is a movement of human viewpoint spawned by Satan, we may, of course, expect that it would, first of all, basically violate biblical principles. That is exactly what it says. It violates and seeks to undermine the role that God has assigned to women in the order of creation.

**The Role of Women in Creation**

What is that role? One place in the Bible that spells that rule out for us is Titus 2:4-5, where Paul says that, "The older women may teach the young women to be sober minded, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands that the Word of God be not blasphemed." You will notice that there is a list of things here that is to characterize a woman's life. Most of it is domestic in nature – a great deal of it is to include qualities that will commend her in her personal character, and basically, obedience to her own husband, and to be a keeper at home. That's her role – domestic life, and obedience to her husband. The reason, it says, is so that the Word of God be not blasphemed.

In other words, this is a Bible doctrine principle. And any woman who rejects this is blaspheming the Word of God. Many Christian women do not realize that they are the world's worst blasphemers. They have blasphemed God as few unregenerate women ever thought of blaspheming God because they have not accepted, in the face of enlightened men from the Word of God, their role of subjection. Therefore, they have blasphemed even in a greater degree than those who are unbelieving women and who are ignorant of this principle. The feminist movement is basically designed to blaspheme God by undermining the principle of the subordination of women.

We tried to point out to you last time that a great number of women think that they are subordinate, and they are in subjection to their husbands, when in truth they are not. This is evidenced in many ways. Women who are in subjection to their husbands actually follow the scriptural principle of learning from their husbands. Therefore, they talk in interrogatory sentences most of the time. They're asking things; they are inquiring; and, they're seeking to learn. Whereas the woman who is not in subjection is, most of the time, talking to her husband in declaratory sentences. She's making statements; she's telling him off; and, she's sounding off to him.

The feminist movement covers its spiritual disorientation by championing some legitimate needs of women. Obviously, the feminist movement doesn't want to come out and say, "We are a movement designed to blaspheme God and to undermine a basic biblical principle." That wouldn't get much dignity or much response. So they do pursue things that are legitimate problems that women have, and there are legitimate areas where women do not get equal treatment; fair treatment; or, justifiable treatment. But these are all incidental to the feminist movement. You would think that they're at the core of it, but they are not. They are incidental to the feminist movement. The first and basic thing that the feminist movement wants to do is to destroy the concept of a woman in the place of subordination to male leadership.

**The ERA Amendment**

This is being expressed in our day by the ERA amendment. That stands for the Equal Rights Amendment. It sounds innocent enough when you read it, as it has been proposed, for an amendment to our Constitution, but in truth, the ERA amendment is the primary means by which the feminist movement expects to achieve its goal of blaspheming God by undermining the principle of the subordination of women. Supposedly, this is for the preservation of womanhood, but in truth, it is for the perversion of womanhood. The ERA concept is a potential source of great injury to women.

I performed a wedding ceremony not so long ago up in the Chicago area, and as people came by the receiving line, one lady came through and said, "That was a very lovely ceremony, Dr., and I agreed with everything you said except the part about women's submission." Usually, what I try to do is spell out specifics when people are going to get married. I tell a woman, "Now, you're telling God and these people who are out here that you are going to swear before almighty God to do certain things relative to this man. There are about seven primary things that the Bible says a woman does relative to the man she marries. My point to them is that if you are not willing to do this with this man, then don't say, "Yes," and don't marry him. Don't bring misery into his life. The Bible says there are various things that she is to be, relative to being a mother; her domestic duties; her body being available to her husband; and, so on. But it also says, in a very strong way, the principle of submission – subjection to her husband.

So this lady said she thought it was very delightful all the way through, but she didn't agree with that. She said, "I'm in favor of the amendment."

So I said to her, "Well, madam, I was simply quoting God, and I'm sure He would be very pleased to be enlightened by you on the matter." She didn't even have the brains to realize that I was simply quoting from the Bible. You see how the feminist movement can be dumb – just dumb. She at least should have had the good judgment to say, "I wonder if that's what the Bible really means." That at least would have dignified it. I just passed the buck to God, and I was scot-free, because it was His idea and not mine to begin with. So I didn't even want to discuss it with her, and I sent her up to the front office.

But this is the point of the ERA amendment. They want to break the back of a biblical principle. Never forget that that's what's behind the movement. The feminist movement views marriage itself as a male conspiracy. They view this as a male invention to subjugate women. They don't realize that this is one of the four basic divine institutions which God has provided to protect the human race in the era of the angelic warfare, until Satan has been dealt with, in order to preserve humanity alive. If it we're not for the four basic divine institutions, one of which is marriage, the human race would have torn itself to shreds and destroyed itself long ago.

So the feminist people are very wrong in thinking that marriage is simply a male device in order to keep women under their heels. But they see it as discrimination against women, because it places the women in the basic role of homemakers. That's what the feminist movement leaders hate. They do not like to see women in the role of homemakers.

**Men and Women Look Alike**

So the feminist says, "Unisex is the answer to female happiness;" that is, to look alike. I noticed something while driving to a camp this past week. We came into a town, and as we drove by, I noticed on one side of the road there was a huge sign that said "Unisex Haircuts." So here's a barber shop where you and your wife can go in, and come out looking alike: either long hair alike, or short hair like – whichever. You come home, and your little two or three-year-old child wants to speak to mother. He walks up, and he turns this way and that way, and he can't decide which one of you is mommy and which one of you is daddy. He says, "Are you the mother?" Then he knows which one to speak to. The feminist movement says this will make a woman wonderfully happy, when her child can't recognize her as the mother and as the homemaker. That takes brains to come up with that.

**Men and Women Act Alike**

Furthermore, it is the principle of the feminist movement for males and females to act alike. That's the second factor. They look alike, and they act alike. For what? So that women can be free. So if we're going to act alike, that means that men do half of the house work. They do half of the cooking. And the women get out of the home, and on the job. The feminist movement says that women will never be happy until they are out of the home; have a career; and, can be out on the job.

One of the interesting things about college women is that in the 1920s, about 40% of American women were moving toward college careers. Between 1920 and 1960, that dropped off tremendously. Then since 1960, it's been moving back up to where 40 percent of women go to college. But what is happening is that women went to college, and two out of three of them (from the 1920s to 1960) dropped out of college to get married. The feminist people tear their hair because college girls are more interested in running showers for one another, and finding husbands. Now, however, we have girls in college who are the daughters of career women. They neither want to be in the home, nor do they want the careers that their mothers had.

This spawned the hippie generation. This was basically why young women in the hippie era so revolted against what their parents stood for. What they were revolting on the one side was a mother that they had been taught should be free from domestic duties, and not be in the home as a homemaker. But on the other hand, because they had grown up in a home where there was not a mother who was a homemaker, but a career woman, they were denied the attention of the mother, and they were denied the care that a child inherently needs from a mother. They lost all that warmth and all that tenderness. So they determined, "I don't want to be like my mother. I'm not supposed to be in the home as a homemaker, but I sure don't want to be a career woman like my mother is."

So there was only one alternative, and that was to drop out. That's exactly what spawned the hippie generation – the dropping out of young women from being homemakers on one side (they were taught that they should not be if they wanted freedom), and yet their own experience had hurt them so, in having a mother who was a career lady that they didn't want to do that. So they had no place else to go but down. The feminist movement is a horrendous joke if it were not for the disastrous qualities that it produces. This attempt to remove identification between male and female is at the core of it. Unisex and the feminist movement go together.

As you know, one place that this movement seeks to make its point is on titles. All of you know that "Mr." stands for "mister." All of you know that "Mrs" stands for a married woman. Really, the word is "mistress." All of you know that "Miss" stands for a young, unmarried woman. Now, this distinction between married and unmarried woman is what bugs the feminist movement. They have, therefore, solved this by coming up with another title, "Ms.," which stands for "mess" – just so you're acquainted with that. When you see "Mr.," you pronounce that "mister." When you see "Mrs.," you pronounce that "misses." "Miss" is "miss." And anytime you see "Ms." you pronounce it as "mess" – "Mess Suzie Jones," or whatever it is, because that's exactly what the title really signifies. Any woman who is proud to bear that is a mess.

We have such women in our school here. We have a few women who have detached themselves from their husbands; deserted their husbands; or, divorced their husbands. They have their kids in our school. When we deal with them, they sign themselves as "Ms.," and they are a mess indeed – these pathetic creatures, who are struggling to reach out for something and missing the boat all the way. In some degree, Euodia and Syntyche we're doing the same thing. At the heart of their conflict was this resistance to male leadership. Whenever women squabble, and whenever women are in conflict, there is always, in the background someplace, this quality of lack of submission. So the feminist operates from the human viewpoint concept that there are no psychological or biological differences between human males and human females. The Bible very radically contradicts this. The Bible makes it very clear that a man's psychological makeup is radically different from that of a woman's.

**Nest-Builders**

The feminist movement, with its Equal Rights Amendment, wants mainly to destroy, therefore, the male-as-breadwinner concept, and the female as nest-builder principle. So they champion everything they can in order to destroy these distinctive roles of male as breadwinner, and female as nest-builder. Thus, they sponsor abortion. The whole abortion movement, under the feminist influence, became popularized as a key feature of destroying the fact that women are nest-builders. The government is trying so desperately to establish the concept of day-care nurseries, so that women do not have to be homemakers. They can just bear their children, and then dump them into somebody else's nursery someplace down the street to care for them while they go out and have a profession; a career; or, a job. This resistance to this biblical principle of women as nest-builders is expressed in various ways in our society. If you just stop and think about that, you'll be surprised to see how often it pops up, and our government is not above getting itself entangled in it.

Since 1960, the feminist rights-demanding crusade has been gaining a lot of momentum, and it is now even given approval by government leaders, and the wives of government leaders. All of this shows us that, in the highest echelons of American political life, we have nothing but human viewpoint disorientation. It is almost impossible for an American today to hope to find somebody on the political scene that has much divine viewpoint at all. At best, you're going to have to try to settle for the lowest common denominator – the one who has the least human viewpoint, because that is basically what each of them in their minds are immersed in.

So all is motivated by the desire, of course, to see women be happy, and to find personal fulfillment. Many of them indeed need to learn to be happy. Many of them do lack personal fulfillment, because the truth of the matter is that the feminist movement could not have gone anywhere if there were not millions of women who were not unhappy, and for whom the feminist movement struck a responsive note. It struck a note of hope for them because they found themselves in doldrums and miseries. But the point that I'm trying to make is that anything that is contrary to God's viewpoint is a false hope. The feminist movement is wrong from the very beginning, and therefore, it is a false hope. These areas where women need better treatment and better care (and there are some where they do) are not the prime concern of the feminist movement.

We don't need an Equal Rights Amendment, incidentally, to secure these equalities and these justices for women, because what we have already in the way of a legal apparatus is well capable of providing that, and it has, by and large, provided it. Everybody knows that. The Equal Rights Amendment will only remove the distinction between men and women so that it would literally be impossible for a judge to rule against someone who brought suit against different washrooms in public places – men's and women's washrooms. One of the first things that somebody would immediately do would be to sue for the discrimination of distinctive washrooms. While the Equal Rights Amendment people try to present that as an exaggeration, that is not true. It is not an exaggeration. How would you keep a homosexual from adopting a child and rearing him in that tradition? Once you have an Equal Rights Amendment, you could never keep a homosexual from adopting children. So this has nothing but potential destruction for everything that is female; that is fine; and, that is noble in women. Millions are unhappy. This movement gave them some hope.

Historically, in societies around the world, it is true that women have been discriminated against in one way or another. But this was due to the human viewpoint of their husbands and the human viewpoint of their government leaders. Anywhere where Bible doctrine has gone, the lot of women has been elevated and eased inevitably. So the solution to discrimination against women does not lie in destroying the divine order of male leadership and female subordination, but in getting doctrine into the minds of men. When men get oriented to the Word of God, then they know how to deal with women on a godly basis. Women then find themselves in the position of happiness. Women with legitimate mistreatment and frustrations foolishly think that the feminist principles are the solution for their doldrums. That's the question.

Is unisex the solution for an unhappy woman? Never. Is a career outside the home the answer? The feminist movement says that it is. That's not true. Is marriage a 50/50 proposition? Will that solve it? That is not so. Marriage is not 50/50. The stock is held in majority by the husband. Is living without any marriage the answer? The feminist movement has promoted that, and that has proven to be nothing but unhappiness. Is not having children the solution for a woman's unhappiness and her doldrums. That's currently the solution which is being tried. That is also equally a failure. Is rejecting male authority the final solution? It is not.

So the current unhappiness of women in the United States is indicated by the rising flood tide of marital separations; divorces; adulteries; desertions; and, mental illness. Women are unhappy. The feminist movement has given them some hope. Well, all that the feminist movement has suggested have been false solutions. But they are unhappy. Out of every three marriages in the United States, one ends in divorce, as a result of one thing or another. Someone has estimated that out of ten marriages, only one can be said to be a truly satisfying relationship between a man and a woman.

So for most American women, marriage inevitably means unhappiness, unless you are wise enough to marry a man oriented to divine viewpoint principles. But that won't bring you happiness in itself because you might be a woman that has a man who is thoroughly oriented to divine viewpoint principles, while you yourself, as a woman, are oriented to the idiocy of the type of thing that the feminist movement promotes. You are not oriented to God's viewpoint. If you have a man who is oriented to divine viewpoint, and a woman who is not oriented to divine viewpoint, she will be living in misery – a living hell on earth. It is inevitable that unless she orients herself to the Word of God, she will gradually become worse and worse. She will either go into mental illness; desert; or, separate herself. From what? She is separating herself from God's divine viewpoint.

So if you want to be happy as a married woman, first of all, get yourself oriented to divine viewpoint. That takes years of being taught by a pastor-teacher. That is not by reading the Bible, and not by reading books. You're not going to get far in studying on your own, but by having an expository explainer of doctrine to you as a woman, and to what your parents teach you as your role as a woman. Then find yourself a man who is equally oriented to divine viewpoint. Then you've got a basis for a tremendous marriage relationship. Women do need to grow mentally, and they can; emotionally, and they can; and, spiritually, and they can, just as much as men do. They need purpose in life, and this is the only way they find it.

So the problem for women is to find the divine viewpoint which gives them this kind of experience of growth. A woman's role is determined by God who created her, not by Satan with his human viewpoint point ideas such as the feminist movement. Only the Bible can show a woman the avenue which leads to personal fulfillment and to her happiness as a woman.

So we recognize women have a lot of unhappiness, and I get to hear a lot of it. One of the reasons that this has developed, in contrast to an earlier era in American history where women were not so unhappy, is because the woman's biblical role has been eroded by our modern lifestyle. What is a woman's biblical role? Nest-builder. That was her vital place in the relationship to her husband, to her children, and to a home.

In the past traditions of this country, that was a very vital role. 100 years ago, American society was entirely home-centered. 100 years ago, the American home was a self-contained unit. The father worked at home, or he worked very close by – so close that he was in constant contact, in effect, with the family. So what pertained to home and to the job was not distinguishable. In the American home, 100 years ago, a father's job was not over here, and his home over there. You couldn't separate the two. Where his job was, his home was. That made a big difference. And the mother was a very critical factor in that home for the survival of the family, because she was the one who prepared all the basic needs. While the father may have been the farmer producing the food, the mother was the one who prepared and preserved it. The mother was the key factor in the clothing and the basic supply. The whole sustaining life of the family was on the mother.

A woman, as a homemaker under those conditions, had a very fulfilling role. It was a very socially important role. We read about American life 100 hundred years ago when a mother died, that a man considered it a very important thing that, as quickly as possible, he find another wife. We might pass that off as, "Well, he just likes to be married." It wasn't that. It was because a key factor in survival for himself and whatever children were left, was a woman in the home. Thus, men immediately would look around to find another wife in order to fill that role without which they could not survive themselves.

Today, we don't have this kind of dependence on mother anymore. We have all kinds of prepared foods. So we have mothers who can't cook. They can just read labels – where to set the oven, and how long to cook the TV dinner. If you think this is a joke, you just stand at a supermarket sometime and watch how some women shop. They have a cart loaded with TV dinners. They're not all the same kind: some Mexican dinners; some beef dinners; and, some hamburgers. They know how to pick variety. But they don't know how to cook. Therefore, what happens? Well, the mother drops dead. The supermarket is still going. All as well. Meals are just like they always were.

Today, mother doesn't prepare clothing. All of that is prepared elsewhere. So we have women who can't sew. We have women who, if they tried to sew a button on her husband's shirt would sew their finger to it too. They can't sew. So, the mother drops dead. You still have the clothing store. You don't need her.

Today the children are sent to school. They spend many hours there. Mothers used to teach their children. Now, mothers have their children for shorter and shorter periods of time at home. They don't have the capacity to teach them, or the influence over them. So she drops dead, and education goes on.

TV is the anchor point of entertainment in the family. There was a time when that was a mother's role. She was the one that created entertainment. She was the party maker. Now you don't need mother for entertainment. You just carry this out, and you will see that there is a big contrast between the role of women 100 years ago and what they are in our society today.

There was a time when there was no question that a woman found fulfillment as nest-builder. She was the core of it. That's not true today. The American home today is mostly a place to drop in between the real activities which are going on someplace else: school; the office; the factory; the movies; the bowling alley; the restaurants; church; down at the lake; or, vacations. Someplace else is where the action is. The home is someplace you drop in; get the laundry done; and, head out again.

Home is no longer the mainstream of American society, and the consequence for women is a profound depression. That's because they're not that critical. They've lost orientation to their role, and they've not been able to keep the biblical principle of nest-builder, and relate themselves to the modern scene with all of its conveniences, and the new lifestyle that has evolved.

So the feminist movement says that getting out of the home is the solution. But that only makes the problem worse, because getting out of the home is a new disruption to her role as nest-builder. It doesn't help it. Boredom plagues the wife at home, but she doesn't realize that her husband is plagued also. So many men, in a technological age, go to work in the morning. They have to check in at a certain hour. They give him a certain-sized wrench. He sits on an assembly line, and when a certain-sized nut comes along, he gives it two turns. All day long, he sits there with this wrench, turning it. He sees this nut come by, and he turns it. That's not very inspiring. He just turns it. He doesn't even have to think, because when you see him going home at night, he's walking out of the plant, and he's still turning his hand to turn that nut twice when it's no longer there. That is boredom.

So now he's not in a position much to inspire her life either. He's all shot up with his own boredom, when she comes home and tries to share her boredom with him. That's a wonderful way to finish a day for two people – to share their boredom at the end of the day with one another.

So again, the solution seems to be to get out of this place where all the boredom is and all the friction is. Here's why I'm unhappy. Get out of the home. But women have not outgrown the home. I can tell you on the basis of the Word of God that they never will outgrow the home, because that is her basic place of fulfillment. There are some exceptions to that. At certain stages of life, there may be exceptions to that – that the homemaker role would receive a lesser part of her attention and devotion. But fundamentally, this is where a woman finds happiness. If there is an exception, it is by God's special decree and treatment of her in her particular case to what He has called her to be. He may call a woman never to marry. Then she will find fulfillment, not in her right man, but in service that He has called her to fulfill, and that becomes her right man. But the basic principle of fulfillment is in the home.

Now, I'm not trying to say that housework, in itself, is the source of women's fulfillment. The feminist always comes along and says, "That's easy for you to say. You don't have to scrub those floors; make those beds; do all stuff; change diapers; and, so on." The implication is that all these chores are just such a delight that a woman just can't wait to scrub the next floor, and all of the life centers around that. Well, a lot of women have mistaken that for an avenue of liberation. The people who are at fault for that are those who are in the advertising and the manufacturing professions in our capitalistic society. Capitalism is God's designed economy system for humanity. But the advertising and manufacturing professions in a free enterprise economy are also able to sell their products. They have taken women for a ride, because a housewife has been told by marketing professionals to find fulfillment in the home for the wrong reasons, and in the wrong ways.

Interestingly enough, they have struck upon the fact that this is a biblical principle. A woman's happiness is going to be found primarily in her home rule. Therefore, they have taken advantage of that to suggest to women that they can find happiness in the home in the wrong way and for the wrong reasons. By this I mean that women have been told that they are to find meaning by fleeing to the latest product being sold. This is how to escape their frustration; their drudgery; and, their boredom – flee to the latest product which is being sold. Marketing researchers have sold American women on the human viewpoint principle that things will make her happy, and that if she can accumulate new things, they will enable her to find fulfillment as a nest-builder. That is as subtle as the idea that she'll find fulfillment out of the home. It is a satanic notion that she'll find fulfillment with the things that she manipulates within the home.

So what do we have? We are constantly bombarded through advertising media with smiling women who are using a myriad of products. Here's this woman who's in the shower using the soap, and you can just see that she's just all alive. You say, "I'll have to get that. I'm going to be happy. This is the last boring shower I'm going to have. I'm going to be happy with this soap."

Or she has to deal with the service of the kitchen floor. Here is this woman in the advertisement, sparkling white, in her tailor-made suit. She walks into her kitchen with that little scrub thing, and she swabs, and there is this black streak all around, and this beautiful white streak comes through. You just see her smiling, and you say, "There's happiness. If I use that wax, I'll be happy." So she rushes out and buys the wax. They've conned her again.

Or she checks the latest deodorant that she finds promoted. She finds that women who use this deodorant are just stimulating. So she deodorizes herself with this to be happy. Or she finds the latest kitchen range. She has a neighbor who has a certain type of kitchen range, and she notices, "That lady is always happy by her stove. I'll get a stove like that. Every time I come near it, I'll just be happy." Or she thinks a certain car will make her happy. Or cake mixes will make her happy – a cake mix that will be better than her mother-in-law's. Now that will make you happy, won't it? You can have a cake mix that'll make a cake that your mother-in-law would claw her eyes out to make. A refrigerator – that'll make you happy.

Remember that guys up on Madison Avenue in New York City are sitting around tables, and they're thinking this over. They know this housewife, and she understands the American dignity toward a wife being in the home. They're going to sell her on a right principle of a false concept – that things are going to give her fulfillment in that home. Millions of women are hurt because of what they see and hear and believe on advertising.

So women have, in this very subtle way, been manipulated into thinking that they could be happy with things. So they become manipulators of things in the home. They move things around. The human viewpoint attitude of marketing has been accepted by them, that if they have certain things, and they keep moving them around in the house and replacing them, they're going to find satisfaction as homemakers. But the truth of the matter is that she has not become happy by rearranging things.

But the woman, who is caught up in this syndrome of buying things and rearranging things to be happy, also drives her husband to make more money, and thus she adds a new dimension to her misery. If she's going to be buying things, she has to have the money to buy things. So she begins seeing her husband as one huge cash register – as a source of income for all these things that she wants. Therefore, she begins to pressure him, and she steps, again, out of her role of subjection by pressuring her husband financially. This is one sign of a women who is not subject to her husband – when she starts putting screws on her husband relative to financial matters. You can always spot a non-subject wife with that little feature in itself.

So what she does is she degrades herself to bargaining with her husband. She bargains her favors to him, providing he will return certain favors in a material way to her, and then she hurts him. That's his first reaction by that kind of cash register treatment. Then he becomes angry about it. Then the worst thing of all happens. He becomes indifferent toward her. If you want to play that role, you just go ahead and do it. But I'll tell you, you're going to go by those stages.

First your husband will be hurt by it – that you treat him with that kind of pressure, finding fulfillment in him as a provider of money for you to rearrange things and buy things. Then he will get mad about it, and he may bust up a few of those things you bought. And then he's not going to care anymore. He's going to go neutral and indifferent. Then you will find what misery you have as you sit surrounded by your things, as you grasp them in your clawing, grasping, greedy, little hands. That's all you're going to have – your things. Why? Because you did not understand the role of subjection and subordination as a homemaker. The wife herself becomes totally disillusioned. She wonders what happened to all the carefree, blissful, fun-filled marriage she was pursuing by listening to the advertising.

Parents themselves are often guilty of creating this identity crisis for their children. When husbands and wives follow the unisex concept, and they mix up their biblical roles, their children just cannot make it themselves in marriage later. God does not permit women to be like men. Women cannot be like men. I don't care how much they try it. They cannot be like men. God does not permit women to dominate men. Women may try it. It's always a disaster. God does not permit women to find maximum fulfillment and happiness outside of the homemaker role. She may combine other elements. She may work in the community. She may be a civic worker. She may be a church worker. She may even have a job on the side. But her basic fulfillment is going to be as a homemaker. If anything outside (extraneous) interferes with that, she'd better stop doing those outside things, and get back to the one place that she's going to find happiness. God will never permit any other arrangement. God does not permit women to abandon their natural qualities as women without great personal misery.

The principle we have been describing to you is declared in 1 Peter 3:1-2, where we read, "In the same manner, you wives be in subjection to your own husbands, that if any do not obey the Word, they also may without the Word be won by the behavior of the wives, while they behold your chaste conduct coupled with fear," and so on. So the principle there is subjection to your own husband. A woman's maximum happiness, fulfillment, and peace with herself; with her husband; with her family; and, with other women come by abiding by this principle of being in subjection to male leadership in the home and outside of the home. This is a divine principle, and you will never beat it. The feminist movement can only bring misery to women who follow it, because it's blaspheming God at a point that God will not take that kind of rejection and that kind of violation of His rules. But if you want happiness as a woman, then remember the principle that God has a distinction he makes between men and women. You're not going to break it: neither you; nor the feminist; nor the ERA; nor, anybody else.

Dr. John E. Danish, 1973
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