

Marriage Misunderstandings Explained

Pastor David Ministries

Ezekiel 34:10, 23

www.pastordavidministries.com

**Revised
January 2026**

In the Bible, the relationship between the church and Jesus Christ is spiritually portrayed as a marriage. (Rev.19:7-8; 2Cor.11:2; Ez.16:8) The church is the wife (bride) and Jesus Christ is the husband. (In those days people were considered to be married from the point of the engagement. The wedding celebration and consummation usually took place about a year later.) Right now, in this life, we (people who are saved) are in the period of engagement. The wedding will take place when we get to heaven. It is very important that the relationship between a man and his wife be understood correctly so that people don't misunderstand or disregard the church's proper relationship to Jesus Christ. In the last 50 years alone there has been an enormous change in the way people, in the US, handle their marriages.

The essence of what forms or begins a true marriage is a mutual wedding "vow", like a "pledge", "promise", "covenant", "contract" or "testament", between a man and a woman to stay united, "till death do they part". From the beginning of a marriage there is an invisible inner **seal** or bond between a man and his wife, within their spirits, similar to the **seal** of the Holy Spirit in a believer, at the moment of salvation. Son.8:6 "**Set me as a seal upon thine heart, as a seal upon thine arm: for love is strong as death;**" KJV (also: Eph.1:13; 4:30) Once marriage vows are exchanged, God takes it into account and considers them to be married all lifelong until one of them dies. (Rom.7:2) (See article listed below on: Salvation.)

Only in modern times have there been certificates of marriage (and divorce) written by the secular (non-religious) governments. In Bible times there was no mention of such a thing. In the book of Ruth there wasn't even a wedding ceremony. Boaz went to the gates of the city where the city elders regularly gathered and he simply told them that he was going to take Ruth to be his wife. (Ruth chapter4) (In those days, most people couldn't even read and write. Paper wasn't even invented until 104 AD in China and didn't reach Europe until the tenth century. Before that, they usually wrote on animal skins or papyrus plants pressed into strips, both of which were very expensive and bulky. Occasionally, they wrote on stones, metal plates or clay tablets. Not only that, but paper itself was very expensive until the beginning of the 19th century.)

The only thing that could possibly be interpreted as a “certificate of marriage” in Bible times was the “tokens of virginity” (Deut. 22:14-20), which was probably some sort of cloth with the evidence of the bride's virginity and witness signatures of people who were probably standing outside the wedding chamber on her wedding night waiting for the evidence of the brides virginity on the designated cloth. (Notice the non-involvement of the government.)

Certificates of divorce, however, were mentioned in the Bible. (Deut. 24:1) But, these were written by the husband, **not** by the government. The husband probably wrote it on an animal skin and placed it directly into the wife's hand. There was no paper in those days. It was also understood that those divorces were merely declarations of separation and did not end the marriage..... Even the US government, last century, considered a divorce to be nothing more than a declaration of separation, more like a modern “legal separation”. Last century, the US government did **not** consider a divorce to end a marriage. Those Biblical divorce certificates probably also included some sort of explanation of the wife's bad behavior, which caused the separation.

In modern times, they do marriage and divorce registrations with the government much in the same way that they register the sale (ownership exchange) of real estate or automobiles. In the modern ownership registrations the certificates themselves are not what constitute true ownership, because those papers can be falsified, lost or stolen. They merely help to make it more difficult for a thief to rob the true owner of his rightful property. True change of ownership is made when two parties come to a mutual agreement on the terms of a sale and then those terms are transacted correctly and honestly. Then, and only then, does true ownership change hands. And, it **always** happens that true change of ownership occurs at a different time and place than the registration of the sale.

Similarly, a governmental certificate of marriage or divorce does not constitute nor dissolve a marriage. It merely registers what is supposed to have already taken place (marriage vows exchanged). Don't forget that marriage registrations can be falsified too. Every year there are people from other countries who get false US marriage certificates so that they can obtain residency and permission to work in the US. Spiritually speaking, those false marriages are like people who are only Christians by name. They only know Jesus Christ from far away, the same way that someone can know any famous person. But they don't have a personal spiritual relationship with Jesus Christ and therefore aren't saved. (Mat.13:24-30,36-43) (See article listed below on: Salvation.)

A true marriage, once made, is considered by God to be equally as permanent as any other family relationship. God takes wedding **vows** seriously. Num.30:2 “If a man **vow** a **vow** unto the LORD, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond; he shall not break his word, he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth.” Deut.

23:21 “When thou shalt **vow** a **vow** unto the LORD thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it: for the LORD thy God will surely require it of thee; and it would be sin in thee.”

KJV Breaking a vow is the same as breaking a contract. However, in modern times, in the US, breaking a marriage vow (contract) is treated very lightly as though it doesn't really matter. Divorces have become an epidemic. Isn't breaking a contract supposed to be a serious crime? So, what's the purpose of a contract if people are just going to break it as though it really doesn't mean anything?

Only in modern times have marriages been based on personal feelings like 'falling in love'. The fact is that most people who 'fall in love' 'fall out of love' just as easily as they 'fell in love' to begin with. When something as important as a life-long commitment to marriage is based on such a changeable and whimsical thing as current 'feelings', it ends up being very unstable, and easily broken. The old-fashioned time-tested custom of parental selection for life partners is much more stable. The glue that holds a relationship together must be based on things like responsibility, commitment, honesty, character development and self-control. The 1971 film 'Fiddler on the Roof' portrays this concept very clearly. Those marriages practically **never** ended in divorce.

Yet another aspect of marriage is the age of the two persons involved. In most places the government establishes regulations about the minimum age of the individuals involved. It's the same way in Christian salvation. Baptisms for entrance into the Christian church are not supposed to be done for small children. The correct teaching from the Bible is that each person must make their own decision as an adult whether or not they believe in Jesus Christ. And likewise, marriage is not supposed to be for children. Keep in mind that there are some places in the world where child marriages are a regular part of their customs.

However, most of those practices have been discontinued within the last century due to the influence of Christianity. Even as late as Gandhi, child marriages were still in practice in India. Gandhi and his wife were married at 13 years of age. In some cases, parents of babies still in their mother's womb made marriage commitments with other friends who likewise had a child which was soon to be born. In the Muslim culture it has always been a common practice for a man to take an under-aged girl as a wife. Their prophet Mohammed himself married a 9 year old girl. He wanted to marry her at 6, but her father insisted on waiting until she was 9.

So,.... what age does the Bible say marriages should start at? **Ezek. 16:7-8** “I have caused thee to multiply as the bud of the field, and thou hast increased and **waxen great**, and thou art come to excellent ornaments: thy breasts are fashioned, and thine hair is grown, whereas thou wast naked and bare. 8- Now when I passed by thee, and looked upon thee, behold, thy time was the time of love; and I spread my skirt over thee, and covered thy nakedness: yea, I swore unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee, saith the Lord GOD, and thou becamest mine.” The phrase

“waxen great” means to “enlarge” or become adult. (In old English “waxen” means to increase.) Also the phrases “thy breasts are fashioned” and “thine hair is grown” refer to adult body parts. It is not saying that only women with large breasts can get married, but rather, a woman must have a completely developed adult body in order to get married. Well, what age is that? It doesn’t say. That age would be different for different people. Obviously, it is a decision that must be made by the girl’s parents.

All family relationships are permanent. Try to imagine the government writing someone a certificate of divorce for your brother. Would an “official” piece of paper from the government mean that your brother is no longer your brother? Certainly not! Could he ever be your ex-brother? Certainly not! Could he ever be just an acquaintance? Certainly not! Could he ever be your cousin? Certainly not! The government would be over-stepping its bounds by writing such papers. That is as out of place as the government making an official declaration that the earth is flat, not round. They have no business making any such declaration. Concerning family matters, the US government is **always** butting-in where they don’t belong, and messing things up.

Only in the last few centuries has the government been involved in marriage registration. The original purpose of those governmental registrations of marriage and divorce has been lost and forgotten. The government does not have the authority to make or unmake **any** family relationship. Why does the government even have to be involved in marriage registration, anyway? The US government is always butting-in where they don’t belong, deliberately messing things up.

Most people in our modern culture don’t even know what the original purpose of those registrations was. Nor do they understand that there are people in the government who are intentionally trying to destroy marriage all together. Nor do they know who and why those people are so intent on ruining marriages.

In modern times, those registrations only confuse people about the true nature of morality and marriage. People think that the government seal on a piece of paper makes it acceptable to renege on a marriage vow (contract). But quite to the contrary, any secular government claiming to have the authority to annul (invalidate) a marriage **vow** is rebelling against God Himself. Even the US government itself last century considered a divorce to be nothing more than a declaration of separation, similar to a modern “legal separation”. Governments change from generation to generation, but people faithful to following the Word of God should understand an error when they see it. Am I saying that people should disobey the government? Not at all. Those laws have changed in the past, and could change correctly in the future. Faithful Christians need to influence the government to keep them on track for what is good and right. The churches especially need to be a positive influence. But unfortunately, most

churches just follow along with the errors of non-Christian government officials, who are lead by Satan.

In the Bible, a certificate of divorce was to be written by the husband, **not** by the government. A good example of a justifiable divorce involving God Himself is found in [Jer. 3:8](#), when God says to the nation of Israel: “..... whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce;”. But notice that immediately **after** this, (vs.3:14) God says: “Turn, O backsliding children, saith the LORD; for I am married unto you.” Here we see that God considers Himself to be still married to them even **after** He had given them a bill of divorce. The divorce is nothing more than a declaration of separation. Also notice that in some churches a divorced man is considered disqualified from church leadership because, they say that he does not have his house in order. [1Tim 3:5](#) “For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?” This type of doctrine would disqualify God from being God, because God is divorced. This way of thinking was only in practice before divorce became an epidemic in America. Now that the divorce epidemic has been continuing for long-term, qualified men on the first marriage are exceedingly scarce in America. So,... who is going to be a church leader if they can't find any qualified man on his first marriage?

The fact that God considers Himself “married” to them indicates their true salvation. It is inappropriate to imagine that they are only saved by name and not in truth. (Some churches teach that the spiritual divorce indicates that they were never really saved to begin with.) A woman who was never really married to begin with cannot commit adultery against a husband she doesn't really have. This passage also shows that the main purpose of the divorce (declaration of separation) is to discipline the wife hoping to get her to repent of her hard-hearted disobedience and return to her one and only true husband. ([Mark 10:2-12](#))

(Notice – before 1964 it was very difficult for women to get jobs with reasonable pay. Back then, it was very rare that women could get a well paying job and live independently from male supervision, which means that when a man sent a wife out of his house, it was normally a heavy punishment.) (See article listed below on: The Role Of Women Throughout History.) The phrase “see article” means to “see article”. It's amazing how people have questions and those questions have been answered in the designated article, and I tell them to “see article”, yet they don't see the article which would answer their questions.

This also shows that the government forcing men to pay alimony to a rebellious wife is extremely unjustifiable and contrary to the Word of God. Rebellious wives need to be punished..... not rewarded, so that they can sit like queens sponging off their husbands for the rest of their lives without ever having to work. The US government is always butting-in where they don't belong, **deliberately** trying to destroy marriages and families. (The word “**deliberately**” indicates that the average American citizen doesn't know that the US government is full of bad people with bad intentions, intent on des-

troying marriage altogether.) (See article listed below on: Wolves in Sheep's Clothing.) In some states they have already stopped alimony because of its obvious injustice. But, child-support is always so much money that it works like a combination of alimony and child-support together. (See article listed below on: Fatherhood.)

Another example of how a marriage is still binding after a separation (divorce) is found in [Mat.5:32](#) “...whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.” Adultery is an act committed by two people, of which at least one must be a married person. Any man, whether previously married or not, who marries a divorced woman is marrying someone who God considers to be another man's wife! It is adultery! (See article listed below on: Correct Divorce.) [1Cor.6:9,10](#) “Know ye (y'all) not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor **adulterers**, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind (men with men, women with women), Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.”

Rest assured, the day is coming when the US government will fall, (like the twin towers, [Bush's 9-11](#)) due to this type of wicked corruption. (See article listed below on: The New World Order was Prophesied in the Bible.) After the US government falls, (like the twin towers, [Bush's 9-11](#)) what value will those official pieces of paper stating “divorce” have? When the government that wrote out those official divorce (separation) certificates no longer exists, how will those people perceive their marital status? Governments come and go and change from one generation to the next, but the Word of God continues for eternity. Jesus said: [Mat.24:35](#) “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.” [Mat 7:21](#) “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven.” Last century, even the US government did not accept that a divorce ended the marriage. Back then, a divorce was the same as a modern “legal separation”.

In the original Greek language of the NT, a common grammatical form is “aorist”, which is not used in English grammar. But, a good English dictionary might give a definition like: “[aorist](#) – an inflectional form of a verb typically denoting simple occurrence of an action without reference to its completeness, duration, or repetition.” In other words, in Greek they use additional inflectional forms not used in English, and the term “aorist” indicates that none of those additional inflectional forms apply, in that case. An example of an additional inflectional form used in English would be adding “-ing”, “-ed” or “-s” on the end of a verb. (talking, talked, talks)

However, this is an over-simplification of the meaning of “aorist”. Don't forget, this grammar form “aorist” doesn't exist in English. In English, most of the time we are accustomed to talking in past, present or future tense. But, “aorist” is the absence of time. The closest formation in English to “aorist” would be the “present perfect” form,

which uses two verbs in a row, the first in present tense, and the second as past participle, in this case “**have**” and “**had**”. Example: [John 4:18](#) “For thou **hasthad** five husbands”. In modern English we would say, “for you **havehad** five husbands”. In Greek, the term “**have had**” is written with only one “aorist” word. (ἔσχες) The concept of a wife having an “ex-husband” did not exist back then, kind of like how we have no concept of having an “ex-brother”. Is it possible to have an “ex-brother”? NO!

To explain,.... suppose that instead of talking about her husbands, he was talking about her brothers. In English we would simply say, “for you **have** five brothers”. Obviously, the time factor is irrelevant, unless any of her brothers had previously died. Then, we would use past tense, “for you **had** five brothers”. It is well understood that as long as the brothers are still alive, the sister-brother relationship never ends. (The possibility of having an “ex-brother” did/does not exist.) Therefore, the time factor would be irrelevant. So, in Greek those irrelevant time situations would get the “aorist” grammar form. (ἔσχες) But, in English we don’t think of it that way. We think of the word “have” to include the idea of “now”, which is present tense. But, in the case of brothers, there exists the concept of “time past” along with “time present”. This is why they translated it: “For thou **hast had**.....”, “For you **have had**.....”, which implies something that started in the past and has continued up until the present. So, in English we are accustomed to using two words, whereas in Greek they use just one word. (ἔσχες)

The problem, in this case, is that the term “**have had**” also implies, in English, the idea that the past marriages **have been** terminated by a divorce. Years ago, when people made their wedding vows, they used to say, “till death do we part”. Only in modern times do people think of marriages as terminated when they get a paper stating divorce from the government. Back then, marriage was considered equally as permanent as any other family relationship, which is how it was perceived in the Bible. So, when Jesus was speaking in [John 4:18](#), he used the “aorist” word for “**have**” (ἔσχες), which was not past, present or future, just the same as if he was talking about her brothers. In English, we would say: “For you **have** five brothers”. It was possible to have a dead brother, but not an “ex-brother”. Likewise, it was possible to have a dead husband, but not an “ex-husband”. (See article listed below on: Correct Divorce.) A divorce does **not** end the marriage.

The translation using “**have had**” is definitely legitimate, in terms of a general translation of this Greek word. But, in English when someone says “you **have had** five brothers”, the listener will automatically understand that not all the brothers are still alive. But, concerning marriage, due to modern customs, this form of speaking implies something that Jesus was **NOT** saying. Back in those days, they did **not** believe that the previous marriages were terminated, except by death. Modern government registration of marriages and divorces did not exist back then. In the Bible, a divorce was written by the husband, not by the government..... and it would be better understood using the modern translation “separation”, not “divorce”. Jesus was definitely saying that she **had been** previously married five times..... and now she **has** five husbands,

not five ex-husbands.

Yet another example is to try imagining a person who is just learning English, and they haven't learned yet how to say the words am, is, are, was, were yet. Instead of saying "You have been married five times" or "You were married five times", they simply say "You marry five times", which sounds strange to us, yet it's still understandable. In some languages, like Hebrew, they don't even have any word for am, is, are, was, were. So, this sentence "You marry five times" makes perfect sense to them. And there is no reference to past, present or future, just like in the Greek sentence aorist form used in John 4:18. They had no concept of a woman having ex-husbands. Just like how we have no concept of an ex-mother or an ex-father or an ex-brother.

What does this mean? In modern times, everyone who has been married more than once is married to more than one person, at the same time. The government has no business butting-in where they don't belong and writing pieces of paper that claim they have the authority to end a marriage. So, the modern concept of marriage and divorce has been corrupted, which will cause horrible consequences, as all corruption eventually does. Eventually, it will be like the Titanic, which some day will hit an iceberg and sink.

And, all the people who insist on following that corruption will not have access to a lifeboat to save themselves. And, in most cases, they won't want a life boat, because after they get off the life boat, they will have to deal with changes that they don't like. So, they would rather go down with the ship.

You must reject this corruption, now! You must reject the corruption and start following Jesus Christ, now! Believe in Jesus Christ, don't wait until it's too late. (See article listed below on: Salvation.) And you Christians, stop following wolves in sheep's clothing, who are leaders of your church.

Before the last half century, it was included in the wedding vows that the wife was to **obey** her husband. In practice, this has been forgotten, disregarded, rejected or corrupted. The **obedience** of a wife to her husband touches on the very foundation of true faithful Christian life. The church must **obey** her spiritual husband Jesus Christ to do God's will. Eph 5:22-24 "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing." Titus2:4,5 "That they may teach the young women to be sober, 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**." (also: Col.3:18) God considers it to be **blasphemy** to disregard this.

Mat 7:21 “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that **doeth the will** of my Father which is in heaven.” Among those few cases of Christians who want to believe that they are obedient to God on this issue, the understanding of what it actually means in real life for a wife to obey her husband has been so badly changed, twisted and corrupted in our modern culture that they cannot distinguish what obedience really is. Some people even joke about it saying things like: “the husband is the head, but the wife is the neck that turns the head” **BLASPHEMY!!!** (**Titus 2:4,5** “That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not **blasphemed.**”)

One of the best examples of how a wife should obey her husband is how employees should obey their bosses at work. Everyone likes a job where the boss treats them reasonably and respectfully. But, if the wives from those modern churches that think they are obedient to their husbands went to work and obeyed their bosses the same way they obey their husbands, they would all lose their jobs. All of those women would get fired! And if those husbands bossed their wives around like a typical good and respectful boss at work, those wives would probably go to church and complain crying that their husband is being a horrible tyrant.

Then, those churches that teach male leadership in the home would most likely be against the husband and say that he should treat her as an equal and make compromises with his wife. (Notice – in the Bible a compromising Christian is called “lukewarm”. See article listed below on: The Lukewarm Church.) They can't figure it out that in so doing they are also demanding that Christ, as the spiritual husband of the church is supposed to compromise on God's will. **Mat 7:21** “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that **doeth the will** of my Father which is in heaven.” People who compromise on God's will won't enter into the kingdom of heaven. The best of them are lukewarm Christians.

First of all..... what they are calling “compromise” is not “compromise” at all. A “compromise” involves two sides. Merriam-Webster's dictionary defines “compromise” as: “**settlement of differences by arbitration or by consent reached by mutual concessions.**” But, this thing which they call “compromise” is one-sided. The word “mutual” does not apply. They are just asking the husband to step down as the leader of the marriage. It is a “surrender” not a “compromise”. The word “compromise” is used because when people hear that word, they automatically think that any person who won't “compromise” is labeled as the bad-guy. This is modern psychology, which Christians ought to recognize as irrational, crazy, anti-Christian, and even satanic. (See article listed below on: The Consequences of Using Incorrect Terminology.)

Also, notice that the word “compromise” can be used two different ways. Supposedly, they intend it to be like a “mutual arbitration”. But in reality, it's a decrease of quality, like a restaurant that changes their food, making it inferior to save on money. A “compromising” Christian is someone who waters-down the gospel by only half-way following Jesus Christ. They only do God's will when they feel like it. Jesus said to the

Lukewarm church: [Rev 3:16](#) “So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue (spew - vomit) thee out of my mouth.”

Husbands are not supposed to make “compromises” any more than an employer should be expected to make “compromises” with employees. It is an inappropriate denial of correct authority that would cause chaos in the work-place and destroy most businesses, just as it has already caused chaos in many marriages and ruined most marriages, in the US. (See article listed below on: The Consequences of “Women's Liberation” **also** “The Role Of Women Throughout History”.)

In real life, when husbands “compromise”, it ends up merely to be a “surrender” of his leadership. And, in real life, as soon as he steps down as leader, the wife takes over. This type of “compromise” is a fraud/deception. Just as in a business partnership, either the one partner takes the lead or the other partner takes the lead. The idea that both partners share the lead equally is unrealistic, impossible and irrational. Technically, both partners have equal authority, but in practical reality one of them **must** take the lead while the other follows. Otherwise, they will have nothing but conflict, stalemates, deadlocks and irresolvable battles.

The Bible says in [1Cor.11:3](#) “... the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man;...” Men have ordained authority by God over women. It also says in [Eph.5:22-25](#) “Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the savior of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything. Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;...” KJV. Notice that the husband is supposed to love his wife so much that he would be ready to lay down his own life to protect her, if necessary. Only this type of man is worthy to be the head and boss of his wife.

God asks both the husband and the wife to make a personal sacrifice. They both need to be unselfish. The husband must direct his wife in a truly unselfish loving manner and the wife must unselfishly submit herself to her husband's leadership. If this is put into practice, marriages today would have love, peace and harmony. This is God's short simple recipe for happy marriage that works! (See article listed below on: The Virtues of the Spirit.) God created the nature of the female to be the happiest and most secure under the authority and protection of a loving and mature husband.

However, many times there are other negative factors involved which cause negative results. Most of the time, in the modern society, one or (usually) both of the spouses lack maturity. Due to the lack of correct discipline from fathers during childhood, many people have grown up into adulthood and yet still act childish. (See article listed below on: Fatherhood.) Some adults don't grow up until later on in life and other adults never grow up at all. If an adult, especially a husband, is not capable of growing up on his own, then progress is impossible without outside intervention/help from somebody else.

It is not reasonable for a wife to accept a childish spoiled brat husband for a leader. It should also be noted that every woman is responsible to verify, over a period of time (recommended one year), the quality of character of the man she intends to marry. If she knows he is a spoiled brat before she marries him, then she is equally as responsible for the disastrous results..... and has no right to complain afterwards.

Jesus Christ said to his wife (bride), the church of the Laodiceans: [Rev.3:19](#) “As many as I love, I rebuke and **chasten**: be zealous therefore, and repent.” KJV The word “**chasten**” (παιδεύω) in the original NT language more specifically means “to discipline as a child”. It literally uses the Greek word for “**child**” as a verb, which is not done in English. “As many as I love, I rebuke and “**child**”: be zealous therefore, and repent.” In those days, it was understood that it is appropriate for an adult who misbehaves like a child, to be disciplined like a child. It was probably most common at that time to discipline children with a “rod” or “scourge”. [Pro 13:24](#) “He that spareth his **rod** hateth his son: but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes (early).” [Pro 22:15](#) “Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the **rod** of correction shall drive it far from him.” [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.” Jesus Christ himself made a “scourge of small cords”. [John 2:15](#) “And when he (Jesus) had made a **scourge of small cords**, he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep, and the oxen; and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables;” (also: [Mat. 20:19](#); [John 19:1](#))

Also, the same word for “**chasten**” (παιδεύω) was used in [Luke 23:16,22](#) just before they “**scourged**” Jesus. [Luke 18:33](#) “And they shall **scourge** him, and put him to death: and the third day he shall rise again.” Therefore, the English word “**scourge**” would be a good translation of what Jesus Christ said to his disobedient wife: “As many as I love, I rebuke and “**scourge**”: be zealous therefore, and repent.” Thus, it can be said that Jesus Christ, as a husband, is going to strip his wife **naked**, as it says in [Rev. 3:17](#), and then whip her with a “**scourge**” (whip or belt of some sort). Since the word “child” is used, a translation using “spank” might also be acceptable: “As many as I love, I rebuke and “**spank**”: be zealous therefore, and repent.” The purpose of the whipping is to get the wife to repent, change her disobedient conduct and return to fellowship with her one and only true husband. (See article listed below on: The Lukewarm Church.) (Also see article listed below on: Domestic Discipline.)

The idea that it is wrong to use bodily punishment on delinquent **adults** is characteristic only of our present century. For thousands of years it was considered normal to punish delinquent **men** physically and publicly. The Word of God agrees with this custom. [Deut. 25:1-3](#) “If there be a controversy between men, and they come unto judgment, that *the judges* may judge them; then they shall justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked. And it shall be, if the wicked man *be* worthy to be beaten, that the judge shall cause him to lie down, and to be beaten before his face, according to

his fault, by a certain number. Forty stripes he may give him, and not exceed....” KJV [Prov.26:3](#) “...a rod for the fool's back.” [Lev.19:20](#) “... she shall be scourged;” [Psa.89:31,32](#) “If they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes.” KJV (Also: [Prov. 19:29](#) [Neh. 13:25](#) [Prov. 20:30](#)) However, in most cultures **women** were not disciplined publicly. They were usually disciplined privately at home by their husbands..... or parents, if an adult daughter was not married. In those days, men were held responsible for the misconduct of their wives and adult unmarried daughters. Back then, it was very rare that women could get a well paying job and live independently from male supervision. (See article listed below on: The Role Of Women Throughout History.)

In the case of wives, God himself established from the beginning that physical pain should be a normal and regular part of a woman's marital life. [Gen.3:16](#) “Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow (עצבון=pain) and thy conception; in sorrow (עצבון=pain) thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall **rule over thee.**” KJV (God designed intercourse so that when it is performed in a natural normal manner, it is painful for the wife, but not for the husband, which is the most advisable way that it should be performed.) Also, notice how God established from the very beginning in the garden of Eden that the husband shall “**rule over**” his wife.

All through history the term “**rule over**” has always (except in this last century) meant not only the authority to give orders, but also the authority to apply punishment in the case of disobedience. Without the ability to apply punishment, it is impossible for anyone to “**rule over**” anyone else. Without discipline the supposed subordinate would just disrespectfully tell the supposed leader to get lost. The word “**desire**” implies that women **crave** having their husbands “**rule over**” them. As long as, it is done in a loving, mature, just and respectful manner. Every leader should be a good and unselfish leader! No wife wants a childish tyrant brat husband for a leader.

This “old law” of nature used to be common knowledge and in regular practice for a long time. (See article on: Domestic Discipline.) However, in modern times it has been suppressed by an abundance of contrary satanist communist propaganda, so much so that most of our modern generation doesn't even know of its previous existence.

Male leadership in a marriage is kind of like Einstein's famous formulas in physics. You know: $E=mc^2$. But, in this case: love + male leadership + discipline = happy marriage. (Notice – don't mistake the word “love” for the commonly misused word thrown around in many modern songs, as simply meaning selfish desire. For a better understanding about true “love” see my article on: The Virtues of the Spirit.) This formula is not complete without ([Eph. 5:22-25](#)). The husband must act in a truly loving way to his wife and the wife must be submissive to her husband's leadership.

It must also be stated that it is the responsibility of women to verify that their prospective husband is of virtuous character over an extended period of time before they

marry him. (recommended period of one year demonstrating virtuous conduct.) (See article listed below on: The Virtues of the Spirit.) Any woman who is negligent in verifying the virtues of her husband before she marries him is equally as responsible for the disastrous results that follow, and would have no right to complain about his lack of virtue afterwards.

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.

In Howard Zinn's “A People's History of the United States” he says in chapter 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.....”*. (On-line at: <http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon1/zinnint6.html>.)

In “American Legal History, Law in the Morning of America”, 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 (slaves) 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 and is on-line at numerous places.)

Notice that they did **not** consider “**domestic chastisement**” with **moderation** to be **violence**. They considered “**domestic chastisement**” with **moderation** and self-control to be the antidote for violence. Without this type of discipline pressure, conflict and tension build and build until there's an out-of-control explosion. Correct discipline stops tension from building and building, and it stops the consequential explosions.

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** “Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow (pain) and thy conception; in sorrow (pain) thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall **rule over** thee.” KJV

Throughout all history the term “**rule over**” has always meant not only the authority to give orders, but also the authority to apply punishment in the case of disobedience. Without the ability to apply punishment, it is impossible for anyone to “**rule over**” anyone else. Without this type of discipline the supposed subordinate would just disrespectfully tell the supposed leader to get lost. (See article listed below on: Domestic Discipline.)

Why is it considered normal for bosses at work to give orders to their employees, but if a husband were to give orders to his wife in the same way, many people would say that he is being abusive and horribly tyrannical? What would happen if a boss married one of his own female employees? If he stopped giving her orders the way it is typically done in most modern marriages, what would happen to his business? His business would experience the same disaster that most modern marriages have already experienced. It would end up even worse if she started bossing him around.

In modern America, most of the marriages have the wife dominating her husband. She orders him around like she's his mother and yet nobody says anything at all about it or thinks it's abnormal..... and they never consider it tyrannical. (Even though it is **always** tyrannical. The men can't even talk about it because it is so disgraceful. No accusation could possibly be made, because the disgracefulness of the whole thing would be intensified, just by calling it by what it really is.) (However, most children tend to recognize this type of abnormality as being weird. Without even being taught it, most children know that there's something wrong about a wife who dominates her husband. Divorce is better, more recommendable and healthier (spiritually and psychologically) than a wife dominating her husband. It is more pleasing to God if such a man were to get a divorce rather than continue in a marriage with a dominant wife. (See article listed below on: Correct divorce.)

The churches should know better and yet nobody in any of the churches does anything about it. Most modern churches, in the US, are filled with marriages with wives who dominate their husbands, yet nobody seems to be aware that it is **blasphemy**, neither do they even care about it when they are informed that it is **blasphemy**. [Titus2:4,5](#) "That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not **blasphemed**." They usually get upset at the person who informs them of the problem, but not at the people doing the problem. They don't even want to admit that the problem really exists, much less do anything about it.

In many modern large businesses they have a regulation that prohibits anyone in the company from getting married to another person in the same company. If any couple want to get married, one of them must leave the company. They all know perfectly well that the modern way of conducting marriage with both the husband and wife trying to run things usually leads to disaster,..... and they don't want those conflicts to contaminate the work place. Notice that large businesses never have two CEO's with the same authority, both trying to run things as it is typically done in modern marriages. However, this type of absurdity, of having two equal CEO's, is somehow not so obvious to most people concerning marriage, even though it really is equally as absurd; both husband and wife sharing leadership equally like having two equal CEO's in a company or two equal presidents of the US. How ridiculous can you get?

In competitive pair ice skating, the teachers always tell the male and female skaters **not** to get romantically involved. They already know that most romances end in disaster, so if the romance goes down the toilet, the skating competition goes down with it. So, if the teachers want their students to excel, they have to make sure there's no romance. The world champion skaters Tessa Virtue and Scott Moir refuse to get romantically involved. (See them on www.youtube.com.) But, in countries like Russia or China the pair skaters usually get married. They don't have this problem over there, and their skating teachers never get worried about romance. Their marriages seem to make them skate even more in unison. Sad to say, many people immigrate to the US looking for financial opportunity, but they don't understand that they have to make a sacrifice. America is a romantic desert. Most romances in America end in disaster.

But, it is true that there does exist at least a few bosses who are indeed abusive and tyrannical. (This is usually caused by the presence of an abundance of workers due to the present influx of immigrants in the last few decades into the US. Wherever there is an abundance of laborers, the employers tend to get abusive, because those laborers are easily replaceable.)

Imagine if it was said that since there really does exist a few bosses who are abusive and tyrannical, let new labor laws be passed which deny all bosses the authority to give orders to employees. It would be an “employees' liberation” movement similar to the “women's liberation” movement back in the 60's. Employees would be free to do whatever they wanted. If any employee doesn't like the way their boss treats them, than they can quit..... and their boss would have to continue to pay them for a long time. If any boss were to refuse, then he would be labeled an “irresponsible” or “dead-beat” employer and the government would come and forcefully take enormous quantities of money (double or triple) from him, demanding that he must be “responsible” and pay the employees.

(Notice – There do exist some countries where the government forces employers to bear the entire burden of unemployment compensation, but only temporarily, (only for layoffs) not for a long time, as it is done to husbands and fathers, in the US.) Doesn't **everyone** know that such absurd laws would cause the collapse of almost every business in America? It would produce unimaginable chaos!!! It would cause the worst economic disaster in the history of the world. (See article listed below on: The Consequences of “Women's Liberation”.)

How is it possible that such extreme absurdities, which sound so ridiculously ludicrous in the workplace, have actually been accepted as **normal** in our modern marriages? How is it possible that such insanity could be accepted as **normal** and established by force as law by the US government? The US government is butting-in where it doesn't belong with the deliberate intention of destroying marriages. (Yet most Ameri-

cans don't realize that it is being done deliberately by bad people in the government; by people who ought to be removed from the legislature.)

This also causes mental illness. This is not just the illogical denial of the correct authority of men over their wives and children, it is an immoral abuse of the law in order to suppress and disgrace manhood..... and fight against God's standards. (This thing was implemented by satanic people who are intent on fighting against God's selection of the man as the leader. In Satanism, women are the leaders: witches) This is the number one cause of the destruction of marriages and families in the US today. [Rev 21:8](#) “..... and **sorcerers**, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.” [Rev 20:10](#) “And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.”

How is it that all those people deny that men have such authority and at the same time demand and charge the men with the responsibility that goes along with that authority? The mere fact that they demand such responsibility from men is an open confession that they really do know that men are supposed to have the authority that goes hand in hand with such responsibility, yet they deny it. (When men run away from this lunacy, people commonly call them “irresponsible” or “dead-beat”. But in reality, any normal man ought to run away from this type of lunacy. The problem is not the men who run away. The problem is this forcing of lunacy upon the men, and at the same time making that lunacy irresolvable..... by force..... by law.)

The people who started it claim to be promoting “equality”, but it is very obvious that this is not “equality”!!! Any of those people who claim to be promoting “equality” is a liar. This is a deliberate anti-Christian attack by satanic people in the government to sabotage the correct teachings and customs of God. It produces crazy disorder, mental illness, conflict and contention in homes. They don't charge men enormous quantities of “child support” or “alimony” because they want to be sure that the children are always provided for and don't go hungry. They do it because they want to get wives to fight against their husbands and thereby ruin marriages and families. This is the number one cause of the destruction of marriages in the US today.

There has never been an era when marriages were more unstable and unhappy than now. The divorce rate is the highest it's ever been. Some of the negative by products of modern unstable marriages are the rise of cases of mental illness, the epidemic of drug usage, alcoholism due to bad crazy family environment and the epidemic of purposeless suicides among teenagers who were raised in those unhappy crazy homes. [2Tim. 1:7](#) “For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a **sound mind**.” (See article listed below on: Fatherhood.)

Notice that there is a big difference between suicides **with** a purpose as compared to suicides **without** a purpose. Before the loss of true “fatherhood”, purposeless suicides were very, very rare. Among the very few cases that did happen, before the total loss of “fatherhood”, most of those cases could be directly connected to some sort of bad fathering. All through history there have always been at least a few cases of

bad fathers, but there has never been such a complete absence of true “fatherhood” as what exists now in the US today. Without a good father, children grow up with insufficient love, purpose (guidance and direction) in their lives. The children end up with emotional instability and lack of purpose in life. (See article listed below on: Fatherhood.)

True “marriage” is dead, in America. What is called “marriage” in modern times is so extremely corrupted, twisted and distorted that it's an injustice even to call it by that name. People use the word “marriage” only out of long-time habit. At times, some couples prepare for divorce even before they get married..... just in case. A new name should be invented for these types of marriages. From now on in this article examples of modern corrupt marriages will be referred to as a “Modern Corrupt Two-some”, MCT. (see article listed below on: The Consequences of “Women's Liberation”.)

Would “more communication” help to overcome the typical problems in MCTs? That way, everyone would be a lot more informed of the true extent of the super conflict, chaos and craziness. Would being well informed of super conflict, chaos and craziness automatically enable people to overcome those problems just by being well informed of it? Certainly not! Likewise, a business that is well informed of its own super chaos won't be able to stop the super chaos from happening just by being well informed of it.

“More communication” is only the first step in what is necessary to resolve the problems. “More communication” with no further steps is worse than nothing at all. “More communication” followed by corrupt, absurd procedures would be even worse. (like having two bosses trying to run the home at the same time. Can you imagine the disaster of having two equal presidents of the US?) It would be better not to know..... not to be well informed..... not to have “more communication”. The problem is unresolvable. Being well informed of an unresolvable family problem is painful. Alcoholism kills that pain 100%. And so..... some men escape this unresolvable situation by drowning it in alcoholism. Then, the wife blames everything on her husband's alcoholism, when in truth, she was the one producing the unresolvable conflict that drove him to it.

How about a compromise? What if husbands and wives agreed to compromise exactly 50%? This sort of compromise won't keep an MCT together any more than keep a business together. Those “fifty-percenters” usually get very selfish, and they can never agree on what 50% even is. All they ever get is selfish fights and conflicts. In the workplace, is it possible to make an employee/employer compromise like this? It would cause inconceivable chaos and confusion! Is there any employer who would agree to this arrangement? Neither in an MCT nor in a business could the conflict and chaos be stopped by everyone doing whatever they wanted 50% of the time. They

can't even stop themselves at 50%, they ALWAYS take more, always more, always more. This type of "compromising" cannot possibly work. It is a bogus deception.

In the Bible, a 50% compromising Christian is called: "lukewarm". Jesus said: [Rev 3:16](#) "So because thou art lukewarm, and neither hot nor cold, I will spew (vomit) thee out of my mouth." Lukewarm Christians nauseate Jesus Christ. (See article listed below on: The Lukewarm Church.)

Or.... how about electing two equal presidents, and then telling them that they have to learn how to "compromise" with each other and make things work out. How come the stupidity of this type of "compromising" is so obvious in other situations, but it's not obvious in marriage? Something smells fishy. But, nobody seems to be aware of it, or even seems to care. Yet, their marriages are ending in disaster all the time. America is the number one country in the world with the highest divorce rate in the world. Will the day ever come when people will start doing something to stop it?

Expecting a husband to make compromises like that is like expecting Jesus Christ, as husband of the church, to make compromises about God's will. [Mat 7:21](#) "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." People who expect Jesus Christ to make compromises like that will have no part of the kingdom of heaven. Modern churches are full of people who don't even know what the will of God is, much less would they do it, if they did know. It is God's will that the husband is the leader in all marriages. Those who have the wife as the leader of the marriage are rebellious against God's will, they shall have **NO** part of the kingdom of heaven.

In reality, this type of compromise in this type of husband/wife situation is a myth. Even simple minded newlyweds can figure out immediately after they get married that having two equal bosses doesn't work. Yet, the media continues to pump society with this absurd irrational simple minded, dummy propaganda. Decisions are either one way or the other. It's either what the one person decides or what the other person decides. This is why the only possible solution is that the husband must be a loving leader, as the Bible says. That type of compromise which they are promoting doesn't work,..... it is crazy, impractical, simple minded, illogical and irrational. This craziness causes mental illness. In America there is now an epidemic of mental illness, yet the psychologists can't fix it, because they refuse to recognize that modern "feminism" is causing it. (See article listed below on: The Consequences of "Women's Liberation")

This sort of "compromise" is only supposed to be used between two opposing organizations or opposing individuals, like two different companies, separate opposing individuals or two different countries. This type of "compromise" must not be used between two members or groups within the same organization, such as players vs. coaches on the same athletic team or employees vs. employers in the same company. This type of compromise within the same organization would be nothing more than a denial of the authority of the leadership. How could a manager possibly get anything done if he had to constantly make compromises with crazy demanding employees? In

marriage it would be a denial of the authority of the husband over his wife..... and therefore a denial of the Word of God..... blasphemy and irrationality. It is not only satanic, witchcraft and anti-Christian, it is downright stupidity.

Even the absolute dumbest newlyweds can figure out that two equal leaders is crazy. Even children can figure it out. When a bunch of children get together to play games, usually the child with the strongest character starts acting as the leader, and the other children usually follow along. If that child does a good job as leader, all the children end up having a good time playing games. But, if it happens that two children try to be the leader, they end up spending all of their time battling over who's the boss. And all of the children know perfectly well that having a good time playing games is out the window. Even children can figure it out.

In reality, the real purpose of this crazy illogical, satanic propaganda dummy "compromise" "equal leader" stuff is intended to deceive an inexperienced young husband to not accept his God ordained authority in the marriage (in the name of "equality" and "nobility") so that, as a result, the wife will then take the lead. This is not "equality" nor is it "noble", it is a disgrace to manhood and **blasphemy** to the Word of God. This supposed "equality" is just as foolish as electing two "equal" presidents of the US. Or having two equal bosses in a business. How ridiculous can you get?

Implementing such absurd craziness would obviously cause a big fat disaster. But, now that most marriages have experienced this type of disaster, nobody can figure out why. Really? Isn't it obvious? In any human organization the leadership cannot be "equal" in this manner. Someone has to be the leader! All the other people involved must be followers. In America, this problem is most commonly resolved by the wife taking the leadership. **BLASPHEMY!!! WITCHCRAFT!!!**

And, how about in the military. Suppose we were fighting the Nazis in WW2. Try to imagine what would happen if all of our general's thought they should have "equal" leadership just like how people expect it in modern marriages. How could our army accomplish anything if each general was giving different orders? They couldn't..... it would produce disaster. (This actually happened in WW2 with US general Patton. See biography about Patton on the internet. YouTube has numerous video documentaries about Patton.) But, now that most marriages have experienced this type of disaster, nobody can figure out why. Really? Isn't it obvious? Modern "feminism" destroys marriages. It is Satanic. It is rebellion against God.

When any married couple start their marriage with this belief that they should share the leadership of the marriage "equally", the foolishness of this "equality" in marriage leadership is so obvious that even the dumbest newlywed couple recognize it's impracticality immediately after they get married. No exceptions!! It is obvious to even the couples of lowest possible intelligence. (Amazingly, despite its obvious foolish impracticality in real life, this absurd dummy propaganda is constantly being promoted in mass media, especially on TV and in movies, teaching people to accept it.)

Once the husband declines to take the lead, the wife automatically starts telling him what to do, like she's his mother. There is no middle ground. It's one way or the

other. (Equal “compromising” is a myth that can never apply realistically in marriage, any more than having two equally “compromising” presidents of the US.) Those satanic people who propagate this simple minded (low intelligence) deception intend to produce conflict, chaos, mental illness and destroy marriages. They know perfectly well that this “equality” in marriage leadership is dummy craziness.

All of this absurdity is nothing more than an illogical and ludicrous denial of correct normal male authority in a marriage. God has given husbands authority over their wives. To say the contrary is to rebel against God Himself. It is satanic!!! It is witchcraft! It is **blasphemy!!!** [Titus2:4-5](#) “That they may teach the young women to be..... keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not **blasphemed.**” Modern church leaders, in the US, refuse to teach the people this truth. Either that or in a few cases the modern church leaders teach it correctly and then the people go home and don't practice what was taught. The modern habit of putting women in authority positions over men at work, in government offices and politics has corrupted their minds..... and the church leaders refuse to recognize its effect and stand up against it. Modern “feminism” is poison.

When those church leaders see that the people don't do what they're supposed to do, they don't do anything to stop it. Most of those church leaders are usually playing Ostrich, with their heads in the sand, so they don't even know what is going on in the homes of their own church members. Most modern church leaders are usually making a comfortable income with very little work to do, so why would they ever want to do anything unpopular and rock the boat?

Has there ever been a case of “church discipline” (excommunication) against a wife who did not obey her husband in any church in America since the “women's liberation” movement started? More than likely, no church in American has ever done such a thing. (Except maybe the Amish, who live separate from everyone else.) All of those disobedient wives are always considered to be good members of their churches, when in fact the correct thing to do is to have them excommunicated (thrown out) from the church, especially if they take any type of legal action against their husbands.

One thing that helps maintain correct male leadership in a proper marriage is the husband being older than his wife. [1Tim.2:13](#) “For Adam was first formed, then Eve.” **KJV** Most people think that it is “best” if a man and wife are about the same age. But God designed marriage from the very beginning with the husband being older than his wife. It is not a sin if a wife is older than her husband, but it will be much more difficult for the husband to be the leader, especially in a society full of women who are not accustomed to having all male leadership over women. Remember, if a wife does not obey her husband, God considers it to be **blasphemy.** ([Titus2:4,5](#))

Some of the people on the Titanic said things like: “the unsinkable ship” and “God himself could not sink this ship”. **BLASPHEMY!!!** “Women's liberation” (feminism) is a big fat Titanic! Warning! Warning! Get off that ship as soon as possible!

Sooner or later, every **blasphemous** Titanic must sink! Notice -- if a warning like this had been given on the dock to all those people boarding the Titanic, would any of those people who had already purchased their tickets, refused to get on? What do you think? More than likely, they all would have gotten on anyway. Likewise, among you people reading this warning, are there any who reject the modern “women's liberation”? Probably not..... in practice anyway (most people don't even understand what changing this thing would involve)..... until you hit an iceberg. Sad to say, almost everyone has to hit an iceberg before they will change anything..... but then it is too late. No progress can be made until the blasphemous Titanic of modern feminism “women's liberation” hits an iceberg. However, this witchcraft is so corrupt that an iceberg might not even be necessary. It might just collapse all by itself without an iceberg.

God's statement that: “**the head of the woman is the man**” (1Cor. 11:3), is intended to be applied to all areas of life, not just marriage. Women are **not** supposed to have authority **over men** in the home, in church meetings..... (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. 35- 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. 12- But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.**”) at work, in adult education or in all levels and departments of the government (from the position of president all the way down to the drivers license clerk who gives men permission to drive.) This is how things were in America before “women's liberation”. (See article listed below 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. It is the main cause of the modern rise of same gender romance. In the Bible, God rained fire down from heaven on Sodom and Gomorrah for this type of corruption, (which is primarily caused by gender role reversal). 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 listed below 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 such behavior. According to Dr. Louis Crompton,

on early American history, referring to this abomination..... "in 1776, in the original 13 colonies was universally subject to the death penalty". If they ever found a man with another man in bed, both would have been executed.

However, later on, the 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. As the role of women changed, and they became more like men, little by little, the problem of people preferring their own gender in romantic relationships became more and more common.

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. Most people exposed to this abnormality don't know if they're more attracted to the opposite gender, their own gender, both or neither. The whole idea of female politicians and 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. Female politicians and bosses at work over men are equally abnormal and responsible for same gender romantic relationships >>> cause and effect. (From the position of president all the way down to the drivers license clerk who gives men permission to drive.)

The treatment of "same gender" romance has been on a roller-coaster ride understanding all through history. Every time it gets out of hand, they start to cause serious trouble. Its nature is rebellion against God, so they always become problematic as soon as they are in a position of power. Then, after everyone else sees how far they become bad, eventually everyone else unanimously makes it illegal and puts a stop to it. When the US first started, this crime received the death penalty. The death penalty was unanimous in all 13 colonies. Then, years later, people forget what happened before and they start to think differently about it. So, they change the laws and start permitting it again. But, it doesn't cause trouble again until it reaches a position of power.

It works about the same way with communism/socialism. Those people talk so nice and pleasant. They know how to persuade everybody else that they must be good people. But, every time, whenever they get into a position of power, they **always, always, always, always** turn into horrible tyrants. There are no exceptions. History repeats itself. Why can't people figure out that communism/socialism is evil? It is atheistic and satanic. And so is "same gender" romance/marriage.

It must be kept in mind that the best spiritual condition for any person is to remain completely unmarried. This is not because marriage is wrong or sinful, but rather, an unmarried person has more free time to devote to God's spiritual service, which is better. Marriage is not prohibited, it is simply **less** recommended. [1Cor.7:38](#) "So then

he that giveth her in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better.” (Also: 1Cor. 7:32-35)

Even though it is more recommendable that people stay single, God has no problem if they decide to get married. Believe it or not, all through the Bible, both Old Testament and New Testament, God has even permitted men to legally and honorably marry more than one wife at the same time. (Mat. 25:1; Song 6:8; Ex. 21:10; Ruth 4:11; Jud. 8:30; 1Sam. 1:2; Is. 4:1; 2Sam. 3:2-5; 1Chr. 14:3-7; Num. 12:1-10; Gen. 25:6;33:5) Women, on the other hand were never permitted to marry more than one husband at the same time. Rom. 7:2,3 “For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. 3- So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.”

In those multiple wife marriages, the men were obligated to stay united with each wife, take turns and not abandon any of them. That practice was **not** like the common modern misinterpretation that the men, in those days, were just very selfish and were constantly going from woman to woman to woman without any marital commitment, as though they were no more than dogs that roam the streets. (Sometimes modern people even go so far as to call that type of multiple wife marriage a “brothel”. Notice that in multiple wife marriages the women are not prostitutes. The marriage with each wife is life-long, clean and respected as legitimate by God.)

But, quite to the contrary, it is the **modern** habit that men are very selfish. They go from “wife” to “wife” to “wife”, and sometimes woman to woman to woman, all at the same time, like dogs that roam the streets. (It should also be remembered that war was much more common back in those days (thereby reducing the quantity men) and most societies had a higher population of women than men, which means that allowing men to have more than one wife permitted many women to get married who otherwise would have had to stay single, because of a shortage of men.) Isa 4:1 “And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel: only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach.”

Some people even inappropriately misuse such words as “womanizer” in order to put down any man who would have more than one woman. The term “womanizer” is supposed to mean: to make someone into a woman. As compared to the word “feminist”, which is the reverse: to convert women into men. (See article listed below on: The Consequences of “Women's Liberation”.) The Bible specifically teaches to make women out of women, and modern “feminism” is considered blasphemy against the Bible. The Bible permits men to have more than one wife provided they are married properly with a lifetime commitment. The sin of adultery is when men go from woman to woman to woman with no commitment whatsoever, as they do commonly in modern times.

In modern times, the men who try to be respectable imagine that getting an “official” divorce piece of paper from the government declaring that they have permission to shirk on their previous wedding vows, makes their conduct moral. But in most cases, they start living with their new “wife” even before they receive their “official” piece of paper stating “divorce” for their previous wife. But even if they don't, this custom of divorce and remarriage “at will” makes marriage absolutely meaningless. Why do they even bother with it? That “official” piece of paper of marriage or divorce from the government has corrupted their minds. This flagrant misuse of those “official” pieces of paper by the government is immoral! In comparison, the ancient custom of multiple wife marriages was far superior and healthier mentally, emotionally and spiritually than what is happening now in the MCTs, all across America.

Polygamy (multiple wives) for men is a custom accepted by God. (But not recommended. It is recommended that a person stays single. [1Cor.7:38](#)) However, the custom of a man marrying a divorced woman has never been accepted by God. God has always considered it to be adultery. Remember, a divorce is nothing more than a declaration of separation. God considers a divorced woman to be still married until the day her first husband dies. (See article listed below on: Correct Divorce.) (Only a century ago the US government considered a divorced couple to still be married. They considered a divorce to be the same as, what we call in modern times, “legal separation”.)

But those multiple wife marriages in the Bible were **not** considered by God to be adultery. They were legitimate, honorable and legal. And, they did not inhibit spiritual growth. Otherwise, men like Abraham, David, Moses and Jacob could not enter into the kingdom of God. [1Cor.6:9,10](#) “**Know ye (y'all) not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.**” **And** [Luke13:28](#) “**There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye (y'all) shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out.**” **KJV** (also: [Gal.5:19-21](#)) Most modern day church members who reject polygamy for men will indeed be “thrust out” of the kingdom of God, while many of those men who had multiple wives will enter in. Don't forget that most modern churches are also filled with many people on their second or third marriage; lots of adultery. (Remember, it is recommended to stay single and not marry at all. [1Cor.7:38](#))

Why did God permit men to marry more than one wife at the same time? Why and when did that custom stop? Was it God's will that it stop? Why were women never permitted to marry more than one husband at the same time? (Remember, it is recommended to stay single and not marry at all. [1Cor.7:38](#)) The question under consideration here is the morality of multiple wife marriages. The entire western culture has been conditioned to believe that multiple wife marriages are immoral, unspiritual, unstable and unhealthy. However, in comparison to the modern epidemic of free

and easy divorce and remarriage, at will, the old custom of multiple wife marriage is **much** more moral, **much** more spiritual, **much** more stable, **much** healthier and **much** more pleasing to God.

God approves of multiple wife marriages, but He does not approve of free and easy divorce and remarriage. **Rom. 7:2,3** “For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. 3- So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.” Modern churches are full of adultery.

In the New Testament the only negative mention of this custom was applied exclusively to the leaders of the church. A church leader must be: **Titus1:6** “.... the husband of one wife...”. (also: **1Tim.3:2,12**) (NOTICE: A statement like this would not be necessary in a society that doesn't legally permit multiple wife marriages. This indicates that the custom of polygamy was in common practice at the time that the NT was being written.) Concerning the church members, the NT is amazingly silent on this subject. If it is true that polygamy is such a horrible sin, then how is it possible that the NT does not address this subject at length, in a society that openly practices it? Why did the NT writers **not** consider it important enough to give it any more than just a few brief lines? (Remember, it is recommended to stay single and not marry at all. **1Cor.7:38**)

Jesus Christ Himself spoke positively concerning polygamy in His reference to the ten virgins. **Mat.25:1** “Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps, and went forth to meet the bridegroom.” KJV The **kingdom of heaven itself** is symbolically compared to a man who is going to marry more than one wife!!! Jesus Christ is spiritually married to the church, which consists of many persons. The faithful church is united in spirit only, not in the flesh. Jesus Christ is spiritually married to many persons all at the same time. (In those days people were considered to be married from the point of the engagement. The wedding celebration and consummation usually took place about a year later. In our spiritual marriage relationship with Jesus Christ, we are now in the period of “engagement”. The consummation will not take place until we get to heaven.) This passage also explains why women can never have more than one husband at the same time. There is only one Jesus Christ. All other gods are false.

This is why idolatry is considered to be spiritual adultery. (Notice – this “idolatry” includes churches that worship idols or images of supposed Christian characters, like false images of Christ or false images of the mother of Christ. Those images of Christ are not Christ and must not be worshiped as though they were Christ. Is there anyone who would accept a photo of an unknown woman as a remembrance of their own mother? Would Caesar have been happy if they filled his empire with statues of him that didn't look like him? The early church never made images of Jesus or his mother, so why do some churches make false images? >>> For the purpose of false idol

worship. Those images of Christ are false and must not be worshiped as though they were Christ. (Rev 2:14,20) Idol worship was never practiced in the NT. Rev 2:20 “Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest (allow) that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols.”

Furthermore, it must be recognized that at the beginning of the formation of the Roman Catholic Church, at the time that the Roman political government first stopped persecuting the Christians, there was an abundance of influence from the false pagan religions, at that time. Those pagan religions had idols of things like a virgin mother holding a savior baby. So, when they started the Roman Catholic Church, due to the commonly accepted practice of idol worship, there was an abundance of idols already in existence. So, all they had to do was to chisel off the old names and chisel on the new names..... and voilà, instantly they had statues of the virgin mother Mary and baby Jesus.

On the plus side, the Roman Catholic Church has always had a reputation of helping the poor with good charitable works. This can be seen in the example of the church of Thyatira in Rev. 2:18-29. The church of Thyatira was known to have good charitable works. Rev 2:19 “I know thy works, and charity, and service, and faith, and thy patience, and thy works; and the last to be more than the first.” However, despite this good reputation, they also had a bad reputation of idolatry. (Idolatry is spiritually compared to fornication and adultery because it is as though a wife was with some other man besides her husband. Thus, it is compared to the worship of some other gods besides the true God; which is idolatry.) Rev 2:20 “Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest (permit) that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols.” Jezebel, the false prophetess, is represented by the idol which is falsely called the image of the virgin mother of Jesus. (Notice how her virginity is exaggerated by claiming it to be eternal; they refuse to recognize that after Jesus was born she had other children by natural means through her husband Joseph, thereby losing her virginity after the virgin birth of Jesus. Mark 6:3; Mat. 12:46-50)

The phrase: “to eat things sacrificed unto idols” is a clear reference to the manner in which they offer up the communion bread of the Lord's Supper to those false images just before they partake of it. Those images are not real images of Christ or his mother; they are false images..... idols. (The mother of Jesus was not a goddess anyway. She was a normal person, just like anyone else who is faithful to God. Why do they insist on making her into something that she was not? Prayers are supposed to be directed to God, not to a mortal human dead woman.)

Going back to the subject of the custom of permitting polygamy for men..... it was not discontinued until after the New Testament was finished being written. After the NT was finished, there began a lot of heavy persecution of the church by the Ro-

man government and most Christians were very poor and could not be concerned about such things. After that, there was the rise of the state church of Rome (the word “Catholic” in Latin means “universal”) which, some people say, due to the influence of the customs in the pagan religions of their time, prohibited all church leaders (priests and nuns) from getting married and taught the people that the highest level of spirituality is attained only when a person stays unmarried. (The Bible only recommends staying unmarried, but does not force it on anyone. The Bible does NOT require church leaders (priests and nuns) to stay unmarried.)

In those pagan religions which influenced the beginning of the Roman Catholic Church, the “nuns” were like “holy prostitutes” which all the male members and male leaders of their religion would have intercourse with, as though they were marrying the religion. There have even been found Roman Catholic Church buildings with secret rooms below for them to practice this custom. Sometimes they even had a tunnel which went between the priest's building to the nun's building..... and other underground dirt floor rooms where they could bury the murdered babies which resulted from this practice. (Who knows, maybe all of their buildings have them.) (In some of those pagan religions, at that time, the male members would have intercourse with the “holy” woman of their religion (= nuns) right in front of the idol, in public view.)

The purpose of prohibiting the religious leaders from getting married is to get people, especially the leaders of the religion, to participate in this immoral conduct. The very essence of this custom is to promote fornication. It is human nature that people get a higher desire for something when it is prohibited. Like, during the 20's and 30's when the US government prohibited liquor. Liquor sold more when it was prohibited than when it was permitted. There should be no doubt in anybody's mind that it is most probable that the majority of those church leaders have not been faithful to their vow of celibacy. This problem must not be treated as an occasional rotten egg. The rotten eggs are the majority. The system itself was designed to cause corruption. That system is anti-biblical. It is contrary to sound Bible teaching. It is satanic. 1Tim 4:1 “Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;”

It must be emphasized here that this problem is not just the occasional bad apple that should always be expected to exist..... and should be expected in every human organization. This problem is caused by the direct contradiction against the Word of God and against human nature. Church leaders are not supposed to be denied marriage. The denial of marriage is a corrupt situation that is against sound Bible teaching and against normal human nature. This corruption was specifically designed by satanic spies inside the church to deliberately cause a problematic situation. The Roman Catholic Bible itself says that a church leader must be: Titus1:6 “...the husband of one wife....”. (also: 1Tim.3:2,12)

The practice of having “holy” prostitutes in a religion is even found in Gen. 38:15-21, where the original Hebrew word for a female “holy one” is translated “harlot”,

“whore” or “prostitute” in most English Bibles. A few English Bibles translate it better with “cult prostitute”. However, the original Hebrew word literally calls her a female “holy one”, just like how the Roman Catholic Church calls her a “nun”, indicating that she is supposed to be a “holy” woman, dedicated to her religion. The origin of this custom was that those “holy” women were supposed to offer themselves for intercourse to every male member of their religion. Notice – this is not a comment about every modern Roman Catholic nun, it is about the original purpose of the custom..... and the resulting most common consequences. The Roman Catholic Church has always had this well known reputation..... and they’re continuously trying to cover it up.)

The state Church of Rome (Catholic) obstinately refuses to recognize the teaching of their own Holy Word of God that church leaders must be: [Titus1:6](#) “... the husband of one wife...”. (also: [1Tim.3:2,12](#)) (This is found in the Roman Catholic Bible) They have disregarded the Word of God because they have more respect for the word of the Pope than the Word of God..... and also they have more respect for the influence of the false pagan religions which influenced the formation of their church at the beginning.

It was mostly the influence of the state church of Rome (Catholic), in western Europe, that caused the prohibition of multiple wife marriages, as well as any divorces and remarriages. This custom of permitting only one wife per husband does **not** originate from the New Testament. It does **not** originate from Christianity. Jesus Christ never taught that men cannot have more than one wife. This custom comes from the influence of false pagan religions in order to promote fornication.

It wasn't until many years later that divorce and remarriage were legally reinstated in the western European culture, starting with Henry VIII king of England. However, multiple wife marriages have never been reinstated in the western culture. Henry VIII would have been better off, (more acceptable to God) by marrying additional wives rather than divorcing his first wife. He divorced her for no other reason than that she had no sons. Henry wanted sons, and she produced no sons, only daughters. (Remember, it is recommended to stay single and not marry at all. [1Cor.7:38](#))

The question under consideration here is the morality of multiple wife marriages. The entire western culture has been conditioned to believe that multiple wife marriages are immoral, unspiritual, unstable and unhealthy. However, in comparison to the modern epidemic of free and easy divorce and remarriage, at will, the old custom of multiple wife marriage is **much** more moral, **much** more spiritual, **much** more stable and **much** healthier. God approves of multiple wife marriages, but He does not approve of free and easy divorce and remarriage. [Rom. 7:2,3](#) “For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. 3- So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.”

And, don't forget about what John the Baptizer said, [Mat 14:3-4](#) "For Herod had laid hold on John, and bound him, and put *him* in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife. 4- For John said unto him, It is not lawful for thee to have her." It must be understood that this applies equally as much to the modern epidemic of free and easy divorce and remarriage. What does this mean? It means that modern churches that have lots and lots of people who are divorced and remarried are loaded with adultery.

Some people also blame the well-known Roman Catholic problem of priests having inappropriate relationships with other men or even boys as being caused by the church's prohibition of marriage. Another way of saying that would be like the problem in prisons, where nothing but men are available. Men who would not normally do such a thing do it simply out of the absence of their preferred female choice. However, this does not apply in a place where there is no shortage of women. So, the biggest cause of that problem is their "do whatever you want" attitude accompanied with their "sweep it under the rug" treatment along with the knowledge that "nobody ever gets caught". Then, the other Catholic authorities always denying the reality and severity of the problem.

The most potent cause of the problem of priests having inappropriate relationships with other men or even with boys is due more to the modern male/female role switching. Any man who speaks against letting women take on the masculine role is always labeled as a villain against women, or a stupid arrogant woman abuser. The real cause of the problem of men losing natural attraction for women is due to the character of the women being unattractive and offensive to them. Any normal man should **not** be attracted to a woman who acts like a man. Modern "feminism" teaches women to act like men. It is now taboo to speak against the "feminism" movement. But, I say that "feminism" is satanic witchcraft. It is anti-Christian, but modern church leaders won't recognize it as such. The best of the modern churches are lukewarm in the faith. (See article listed below on: The Lukewarm Church.)

The most hypocritical situation would be one of those court cases accusing some man with inappropriate behavior with children, yet the judge in the court case being a woman. A woman taking on the masculine role as a judge is not only freaky abnormal behavior worse than a man who shows inappropriate conduct with children, but it is the most influential cause of the problem, to begin with. It's hard to get more hypocritical than that. (See article listed below on: "The Role Of Women Throughout History" **and** "The Consequences of Women's Liberation".) Any normal man should **not** be attracted to a woman who acts like a man. (Which is the effect of modern "feminism")

Well, what about all those poor innocent abused children? It's about time that people woke up and faced the fact that converting women into men has horrible consequences. Cause and effect. WAKE UP PEOPLE!!! If you want to stop this problem, then fix the cause!! It is not the least bit harmful to women if they are prevented from being macho bosses over men. (See article listed below on: The Consequences of "Women's Liberation".) IT'S NOT NORMAL TO PERMIT WOMEN TO CONVERT

INTO MEN!!! Modern “feminism” is the cause of the problem. Modern “feminism” teaches women to act like men.

Well, what about all those poor innocent abused men who are forced into having an offensive (super bitch) woman boss at work, disgracing their manhood? Or the government forcing them to pay enormous outrageous child-support or alimony? The purpose of that money is **not** to keep innocent children from starving. Most of the time those children were taken from the father against his will. (See article listed below on: Fatherhood.) The purpose of taking a man’s children by force and then charging them outlandish sums of money is to destroy the authority of the fathers; to destroy fatherhood and manhood. If someone stole your car by force, are you then “responsible” to pay double or triple monthly payments? What kind of man would be attracted to a woman who uses such laws to abuse their own husbands? No normal man.

Look! In the manager’s office.... It’s a man.... It’s a woman.... NO. It’s..... SUPER BITCH!! Louder than a grenade blast. More irritating than a mother dog (bitch) continually barking non-stop all day long. Able to crumble the plaster right off a wall with a single growl. Able to reverse the course of a locomotive with a single nag at the engineer. Able to make an entire professional football team run away like cowards with a single glare. She seems like an alien from another planet with powers and abilities far beyond those of mortal humans.

It’s It’s It’s
SSSSUUUUPPPPEEEERRRR BBBBIIITTTTCCCCHHHH!!!!

For the sake of those people who are too young to understand what I was just talking about..... The old black and white Superman TV shows, that can be found on places like YouTube, used to start off by saying: “Faster than a speeding bullet. More powerful than a locomotive. Able to leap tall buildings at a single bound. Look,.... up in the sky,..... it’s a bird,..... it’s a plane,..... it’s Superman. Yes, it’s Superman. Strange visitor from another planet who came to earth with powers and abilities far beyond those of mortal men. Superman, who can change the course of mighty rivers. Bend steel in his bare hands.....”

The main point of all of this is that, if the man doesn’t take the lead..... the woman takes it automatically. There is no middle ground. The modern myth that a husband and wife can share the leadership equally is an absurd, irrational and a low intelligence propaganda lie that has actually managed to deceived many people who,

by modern standards, are smart. It's as dumb as electing two equal presidents. By denying God ordained male leadership, you get super bitch bossy women.

This phenomenon is so disgraceful to manhood that it cannot even be recognized for what it really is. The old racial discrimination against blacks was much easier to recognize, face and overcome than this. Most modern men cannot even confess what it really is, much less face it and overcome it. It's so much easier to call it something else and sweep it under the rug. But, when men do this, they increase the problem. The super bitches get stronger when men run away like cowards. (See article listed below on: The Consequences of "Women's Liberation".)

Now, back to the subject before this interruption.

POLYGAMY, MAIN POINT #1 - God's allowing of multiple wives for men is absolutely indispensable in order to explain why men can remarry again after a divorce (separation), in a society that legally permits only one wife per husband at the same time, provided that he is not guilty in the first separation (divorce). (See article listed below on: Correct Divorce.) (It is not permitted for him to dump his first wife to marry another.) Any man who is remarried must be considered, by God, to be married to more than one woman at the same time, yet only living with one. (But, the US government mistakenly considers him married to only one woman. The government is wrong and God is right.) However, women cannot marry again under any circumstances, as long as their first husband is living. Women must wait until their first husband dies, in order to remarry.

All existing marriages to divorced (separated) women must be expected to break up; it is adultery. (Breaking up adultery is not the same thing as breaking up a proper marriage.) Those marriages must be recognized as a man being inappropriately married to another man's wife. **Rom.7:2,3** "For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to *her* husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of *her* husband. So then if, while *her* husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man." **also: 1Cor.7:11** "... if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to *her* husband:" **KJV** The only way to interpret the Bible concerning the subject of marriage and divorce (separation) without contradictions, is that God treats women differently than men. It must also **not** be taken out of context. The entire New Testament was written to people who were accustomed to God permitting multiple wives for men. (Remember, it is recommended to stay single and not marry at all. 1Cor.7:38)

POLYGAMY, MAIN POINT #2 - It is also very important to realize that, on the great wedding day of Jesus Christ to the church in the kingdom of heaven, Jesus Christ **WILL** have a bride. [Rev.19:7](#) “Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready.” KJV But, rest assured that probably most of the truly saved Christians will be excluded from that wedding celebration. Is it possible that Jesus Christ, after repudiating His lukewarm bride, could be standing all by Himself on His great wedding day, with no bride? (In those days they were considered to be married from the point of the engagement. The wedding celebration and consummation usually took place about a year later.) A disobedient wife cannot render her husband to be permanently wifeless. No wife has that kind of authority over her husband. (But, if there are some true Christians who will be excluded from the wedding celebration, does that mean that they will be put in hell? No. See article listed below on: Salvation.) (Remember, it is recommended to stay single and not marry at all. [1Cor.7:38](#))

A passage like: [Luke16:18](#) “Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery” must be understood within the correct context. Jesus was regularly being questioned by the bad religious leaders of his day who were constantly trying to find fault with him. This is a clear reference to a husband dumping one wife just because he wants another woman instead. [Mat. 19:3](#) “The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?” The problem was a misinterpretation of the Law of Moses, which did indeed permit divorce. ([Deut. 24:1](#)) Those corrupt religious leaders used that law incorrectly to permit men to divorce their wives “for every cause” (any reason = dump). God's original purpose of permitting divorce (separation) was to discipline the wife, hoping that she would repent of her “hard hearted” disobedient conduct and return to her one and only true husband. ([Mat. 19:8](#)) (In those days men were in control of the money and it was very difficult for a woman to get a job that paid reasonable wages. A wife being put out of the house was a heavy punishment in those days.)

The divorce was nothing more than a declaration of separation. God never intended that a divorce would be used to completely dissolve a marriage and invalidate (shirk on) their wedding vows. (Even the US government, last century, considered a divorce to be nothing more than a “legal separation”, which did not end the marriage.) If a man just throws his wife out of his house (dumps her) for any insignificant reason as an excuse because he wants another woman instead, then he would be committing a sin against his first wife. The only way he can legitimately put her out is if she has done some sort of horrible sin, like: fornication, adultery, theft, witchcraft, murder, idolatry, rebellion, etc. ([1Cor. 5:10-13](#); [Mat. 19:9](#); [Gal. 5:19-21](#); [Eph. 5:5](#))

Secondly, the passage above ([Luke 16:18](#)) appears not to fit the culture at the time of Christ. If it was permitted for men to marry more than one wife at the same time, in those days, then why would any man leave one wife for another? Why didn't

he just marry them both? First, in those days men were in control of the family money and most men could not afford the expense of two wives. Back then, it was very rare that a woman could find a job that would pay for more than only meager food and scanty clothing, without enough for rent. (See article listed below on: The Role Of Women Throughout History.)

The most probable reason for this misinterpretation was that the husband just didn't like his first wife and he had been taught by the corrupt religious leaders of that time that the Law of Moses permitted him to freely divorce his first wife for any reason. (This corruption is the equivalent of how modern churches accept any divorced and remarried couple simply because the government has approved it. They accept the errors of the government more than the Word of God. The Word of God is too heavy and inconvenient for any church in America. Except for the Amish.) However, the correct interpretation is that it was permitted by God for a man to marry additional wives, if he had the financial capability. But, if a man wanted to dump his first wife for another, God considered it to be a sin against the first wife.

In the Bible, Abraham, who had multiple concubines, even apart from Sarah and Hagar (see [Gen.25:6](#)), was used as the **primary** example of **New Testament** faith. [Gal.3:29](#) "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Abraham was the "father" of the **New Testament** faith. [Rom.4:16](#) "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all," KJV (also: [Gal.3:7,14,16](#); [Mat.3:9](#); [Rom.4:1-3;13-22](#), [Luke13:28](#))

Yet, if Abraham himself were here today and tried to visit some of the modern churches, in the US, most of them would probably not even want him to visit as an observer, much less become a member and absolutely not become a leader. His multiple wives and concubines would be too offensive for the modern churches. What chance would he have of being accepted as a modern church "father" of the **New Testament** faith? Is there any modern church, in the US, that would not reject him, even as a visitor? Certainly not! They would run him out the door. (Yet, they openly permit men married to other men's wives.)

What's more, if Abraham tried to ask them questions about their corruption, they wouldn't even give him the time of day. They wouldn't even recognize that he spoke anything, much less answer his questions. He wouldn't be anything more to them than the breeze that passes by..... as though they never even heard any question. Jesus Christ gave Satan more respect than that. At least Jesus answered Satan when Satan asked him questions. But in this case, those modern churches wouldn't even give father Abraham the same respect that Jesus gave Satan. ([Mat. 4:1-10](#)) (Remember, it is recommended to stay single and not marry at all. [1Cor.7:38](#)) What am I talking about the "breeze" for? That's how most modern church members would disrespect the message in this article.

In fact, they commonly regard Abraham's episode with Hagar as an error. (Because, they think that all multiple wife marriages are wrong. Whereas, the real error didn't have anything to do with that. The real error was his lack of faith that God would give Sarah a son.) Yet, in the New Testament Hagar is regarded as a symbolic illustration of the comparison between the bondage of the law to the freedom of grace from above. [Gal 4:24](#) "Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar." [Gal 4:26](#) "But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all." KJV So, if Abraham really made a mistake when he took Hagar as a second wife, then it must be concluded that God made a mistake by establishing the law at Mount Sinai. But quite obviously, Abraham's taking more than one wife was no error, in the manner that they think of as an error. (Remember, it is recommended to stay single and not marry at all. [1Cor.7:38](#)) His error was a lack of faith that God would give Sarah a son, at 90 years of age.

[Mat.19:5](#) "...For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain (two) shall be one flesh? ..." KJV Many people mistakenly interpret phrases like "they twain (two) shall be one flesh" to mean that a man must have **only** one wife. The physical union in marriage is symbolic of the spiritual union of the church with Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is united in spirit with many persons, all at the same time, which clearly demonstrates that the term "**one flesh**" does not mean "one wife only". This is also a quote out of the Old Testament when multiple wives were permitted for men. Obviously, they interpreted this passage to mean that multiple wives were permitted.

In an earthly marriage a man and wife are only united in "**one flesh**" at the point of intercourse, not continuously. Therefore, it is possible for one man to take turns with multiple wives and be "**one flesh**" with each of them in their respective turns. (Remember, the Bible recommends that it is best to stay single and not marry at all. [1Cor. 7:38](#))

The question under consideration here is the morality of multiple wife marriages. The entire western culture has been conditioned to believe that multiple wife marriages are immoral, unspiritual, unstable and unhealthy. However, in comparison to the modern epidemic of free and easy divorce and remarriage, at will, the old custom of multiple wife marriage is **much** more moral, **much** more spiritual, **much** more stable and **much** healthier. God approves of multiple wife marriages, but He does not approve of free and easy divorce and remarriage. [Rom. 7:2,3](#) "For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. 3- So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man."

Most modern Christians automatically assume that polygamy was not in practice during the writing of the NT. This must **not** be taken out of context. In both the Old

commended. It is **not** recommended. It is **not** recommended. It is **not** recommended. It is **not** recommended. Rest assured, there is no number of times that I could repeat this, and yet still be accused of promoting multiple wife marriages.

Funny thing, now that all America, including the churches, are so corrupt that most people are on their second or third MCT (marriage), it is the Mormons who have the reputation for the best family conditions. Everyone seems to have forgotten that the Mormons used to promote multiple wife marriages many years ago. They originally started in the east of the US. But they were persecuted and chased all the way out west, looking for a place where they wouldn't be bothered about their religious practices. They didn't stop this custom until the US government sent the army out there to force them to stop it. But, there is a rumor that now they are still practicing it anyway.

John the Baptizer never said anything against the common practice of men marrying more than one wife, but he did speak out against Herod the king when Herod had married a supposedly "divorced" woman. (It was the common practice in those days that kings had more than one wife, so Herod most probably had other wives too, but John didn't say anything about that. Nor did he say anything against any other man who had multiple wives.) [Mat.14:4](#) "For John said unto him, It is not lawful for thee to have her." KJV (Mat.14:1-12) Some people argue that the woman was not "officially" divorced. (Which they cannot show from the Bible.) The law of Moses did not even permit a woman to "divorce" her husband..... and a "divorce" itself is nothing more than a declaration of separation, written by the husband, **not** the government.

The government did not write certificates of marriage or divorce in those days. This belief that the government has the authority to un-make a marriage is exclusively a modern phenomenon, which didn't exist before this last century. Also, don't forget that King Herod was himself the personification of the government. Does being the leader of the government allow him, or any other government leader, to invent whatever laws they want about marriage and divorce? (Like Henry VIII did in England.) (Or how the US government now claims to have the authority to over-rule and invalidate marriage vows. Oops..... not all marriage vows are the same. Over the years it has now become the custom to invent whatever vows they want. In fact, the whole concept of being a "vow" of anything, could probably be completely missing.) In modern times people make marriages however they want..... and the US government respects that.

If you go back more than a century ago, the US government had laws concerning marriage, "divorce" and family life that were **extremely** different than present day laws. In those days, the US government considered a divorce to be nothing more than a declaration of separation. They considered the wedding vows to be still binding..... till death do they part. (In modern times, is there anybody who still vows "till death do we part"? They used to. It's part of the traditional Christian concept of marriage.) Governments are always changing. Being the "government" does not make them always right. Yet another change is that, back then, the vows used to include a statement that the wife was supposed to "obey" her husband. That used to be understood as part of a Christian marriage. The Bible says it is. It must be understood that modern marriages

are **NOT** Christian in the USA. Many people have the idea that America is a “Christian” country. Not any more! These changes are anti-Christian. They are satanic. And, most Christians are following right along. Most of them don’t know. Most of them don’t care. And, most of them don’t understand what’s ahead for following this corruption.

Therefore, the goal of every faithful Christian must be to follow God's laws whenever the continually changing laws of man contradict what God says. (See article listed below on: The Role Of Women Throughout History.) In as much that, in some cases, the laws of the government are **not** in conflict with the Word of God, all Christians should obey the government. But, when the government contradicts God, Christians should not follow the corruption of the government. Corrupt marriages should not be allowed in the church. Every couple that has a corrupt marriage must be excommunicated from the church. (Neh. 13:23-29 Ezra 10:2,3)

However, many times there are special cases in which the government is not completely in accordance to the Word of God (like when the government only permits one wife at a time). In such cases it is possible to obey the government without disobeying God. Multiple wife marriages are an option permitted by God, but in no way is it obligatory by God nor is it disobedience to God if it is not practiced/permitted. Therefore, in such a case, it is possible to obey the government without being in conflict with God. Of course, in a free country, like the US, it is possible for citizens to request a change in the law, made in the legislature.

There still remains the need to explain why, in the New Testament, **only** the leaders of the church aren’t permitted to marry more than one wife at the same time. **First**, church leaders are supposed to be primarily concerned with spiritual matters and not to be preoccupied with an excess of fleshly or any other worldly distractions. 2Tim. 2:4 “No man that warreth (serving as a soldier) **entangleth himself with the affairs of this life; that he may please him who hath chosen (enlisted) him to be a soldier.**” KJV

Second, having multiple wives was a sign of wealth in those days and the church ministry is not supposed to be used improperly to make church leaders rich. 1Tim.6:5 “Perverse disputing of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that **gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.**” Titus1:11 “Whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, **for filthy lucre's (riches) sake.**” KJV The sin in question is not adultery, but covetousness. The phrase “**gain is godliness**” is a clear reference to the modern “prosperity” doctrine which teaches that Christians (especially church leaders) ought to be wealthy, thereby teaching Christians to have an intensive love of money. And, what are the instructions for the faithful Christians? It says: “**from such withdraw thyself.**” Stay away from them. They have a contagious sickness. If you continue in fellowship with them you **will absolutely** catch the sickness. It is contagious!

Nowadays, there are **many** church leaders who make a lot of money in the ministry of Jesus Christ who refuse to teach anything from the Bible that would make them unpopular..... and risk losing their good income, with very little work to do. This would include the US middle class, which is much wealthier than the average American only 70 years ago..... unless they were somehow carrying the cross of Christ..... which is highly unlikely.

Notice that faithful Christians are commanded to “**withdraw**” themselves from such church leaders. (1Tim. 6:5) This also shows why Abraham was considered the father (leader) of New Testament faith, even though he had multiple wives and concubines. (Gen 25:6) Abraham didn't make his income from church donations. In his case, the service of the Lord was not what made him wealthy. (Remember, it is recommended to stay single and not marry at all. 1Cor. 7:38)

There is no sin if a church **member** has a profitable worldly income, provided that it is obtained honorably and legally. However, they are instructed to use their money according to God's will and do good to other people. 1Tim.6:17-19 “Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; That they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate (inclined to impart); Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life.” KJV If the rule of having only one wife applies to church members as well as to church leaders, than the rule of not making lots of money must apply to church members as well. Nobody in the church could have a large income. But, the Bible does not teach that. (Remember, it is recommended to stay single and not marry at all. 1Cor.7:38)

Money is a basic human necessity. Having money is not the problem. 1Tim.6:10 “.... **The love of money is the root of all evil:....**”. The problem is when people **love** money more than they **love** God. The sin of covetousness is idolatry. Col.3:5 “**covetousness, which is idolatry:**” Idolatry is spiritual adultery. (Jer.3) If anyone **loves** money more than God, then they have replaced the true God with a false god >>> **MONEY.** Mat.6:24 “**No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon (riches)**” KJV Mat.6:19-21 “**Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.**” KJV One way to know if a person **loves** money more than God is if they had to break God's laws in order to get the money they have.

A good example of a religious leader in the Bible who was truly saved and yet turned out bad was Balaam. He was a true prophet of God and even prophesied part of the true Word of God. (Numbers chap. 22-24) But, just like the rich (US middle

class) lukewarm church, Balaam corrupted himself for the love of money and worldly luxuries, thereby making himself an enemy of God. He loved money more than God. (2Pet. 2:15 Jude 1:11 Rev. 2:14) There are few better examples from the Bible of the modern wealthy (US middle class) lukewarm church leaders than Balaam. Balaam acted more like a “wolf in sheep's clothing” than a true prophet of God. (Outwardly, it is difficult to distinguish between a corrupt true believer and a satanic spy. Balaam was not a satanic spy.) God even caused a donkey to speak to Balaam, hoping to turn him back onto the right path. 2Peter 2:16 “... But was rebuked for his iniquity: the dumb (mute) ass (donkey) speaking with man's voice forbad the madness of the prophet.” KJV God himself called Balaam a “prophet”. (Num. 22:22-35) (See article listed below on: The Lukewarm Church.) Some modern churches even go so far as to teach that it is not possible that a truly saved person could even get on the wrong path. Thus, they assume that Balaam was not a truly saved person, and certainly not a prophet of God. However, God calls him a “prophet”. And, Balaam prophesied part of the true Word of God. (Numbers chap. 22-24)

In the original Hebrew Old Testament, the two words translated “husband” (בעל) and (יִיטָא) both mean “owner” and “lord” and “master”. 1Pet.3:5,6 “For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands: Even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him **lord**:...” KJV Spiritually speaking, if we want to receive an eternal inheritance and authority (crown) in the kingdom of God we must **voluntarily** make the spiritual husband Jesus Christ “Lord” and “owner” and “master” of our lives. 1Cor.7:22 “For he that is called in the Lord, *being a servant* (slave), is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, *being free*, is Christ's servant (slave).” KJV (Some old Bible versions translate the word “slave” (δουλος) as “servant”. The meanings of the words in English have changed over the years.) Rom.1:1 “Paul, a servant (slave) of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God,....” KJV Here we see that the apostle Paul calls himself a “slave” of Jesus Christ.

The modern concept that slavery is automatically abusive and tyrannical is not correct. Gal.4:1,2 “.... the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant (slave), though he be lord of all; 2- But is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father.” KJV (See article listed below on: Slavery.) The Bible treats slavery the same as a parent/child relationship. There have been some occasional cases of a parent abusing their child, but that doesn't mean that parents always abuse their children. Why would anyone assume that the parent/child relationship is automatically abusive? (See article listed below on: Fatherhood.) Most modern parents like to spoil their children.

A female slave who was also taken as a wife was called a “concubine” in the Bible. 2Sam. 15:16 “And the king left ten women, which were concubines, to keep the house.” 1Chr. 1:32 “Now the sons of Keturah, Abraham's concubine:” 2Sam. 5:13

“And David took him more concubines and wives out of Jerusalem,....” (Also: Deut. 21:10-13 Son. 6:8,9) Concubines were normally purchased with money. A concubine's master was her husband and was also like her father at the same time. That means that a concubine ought to receive twice as much love! She is a “love-slave”. (See article listed below on: Slavery.)

As long as the husband/master maintains a loving manner towards his wife, a master/slave type of marriage would definitely be very romantic and have a higher degree of security, which means: a lower chance of divorce. This type of marriage is also the only way a woman could confidently propose marriage to the man she wants to marry without coming across being too dominant, precocious, presumptuous or forward. (See article listed below on: Slavery.) Of course, in modern times, many women act too forward anyway. They act more like men than women. Modern “feminism” teaches women to act like men. (See article listed below on: The Consequences of “Women's Liberation”.)

The primary cause of husband/wife conflict is the removal of male authority, the ridiculous “equal leadership” propaganda (which produces stalemates and deadlocks) and the suppression of correct discipline applied with love and self-control. When correct discipline with love is absent, then the situation gets more and more out of control. Chaos, conflict, pressure and tension start and escalate the same way as if you had two equal presidents or two equal CEO's in a company. Stress builds and builds until it's like a volcano ready to explode. If a husband would only apply correct normal discipline with loving self-control and moderation at the beginning of his wife's misbehavior, then excessive violence, anger and marital separations would not happen. (See article listed below on: Domestic Discipline.)

In the Song of Solomon, which is the only book in the Bible to address the physical and sensual side of marriage, many figures of speech and metaphoric symbolisms are used in order to poetically talk about God's recipe for the maximum marital physical experience. It does not talk directly about things that should be private and intimate. In one place, instead of the wife stating directly that her husband is disciplining her, metaphorically she talks about the “watchmen” or “keepers of the walls”. **Song 5:7 “The watchmen that went about the city found me, they smote (beat) me, they wounded (bruised) me; the keepers of the walls took away my veil from me.” KJV**

The exact definition of the original Hebrew word for “**veil**” (רִדְדִי) has been lost, that is, the meaning has been lost over the years. (Nobody knows exactly what type of garment it was.) The root meaning implies something spread like a wide wrapper or large veil. Other English translations say: “mantle” or “cloak”. The Septuagint translates it using: “θήριστρον” – a light summer garment. The Septuagint was the Greek translation of the original Hebrew Old Testament in common use at the time of Christ. The garment could even be considered a “nuptial robe” or “wedding dress”, which obviously would need to be removed when the couple were alone, thereby initiating the husband's practice of disciplining her after he had stripped her naked. It is not likely to

think that unknown men, the “keepers of the wall”, publicly stripped her naked and beat her, right after getting married.

The cities in those days had walls around them for protection, which symbolized the husband's protection for his wife, especially protection against spiritual error. (Like “women's liberation”.) Obviously, it is implied that the wife had gone to the limit of acceptable conduct and needed to be disciplined (and protected from error). It is also possible that they both simply had a craving for this type of physical experience, usually started at the wife's request. The husband is represented by the “keepers of the walls”. He “smote” (beat) her and “wounded” (bruised) her with physical discipline after he had removed her garment. It sounds like her husband stripped her “**naked**” (as mentioned in [Rev. 3:17](#)) and then beat her bare behind enough to leave bruises. (Some women bruise easier than others.)

Notice that her reaction to the punishment was to get very emotional and love-sick for her husband. This more than likely implies that the discipline was started at her request. [Song 5:8](#) “**I charge you, O daughters of Jerusalem, if ye (y'all) find my beloved, that ye (y'all) tell him, that I am sick of love.** (love-sick)” **KJV** God created women to be the happiest and feel the most secure, loved, maritally stable and protected under the authority and discipline of a loving, virtuous and mature husband. When a husband applies discipline correctly, it can seem very romantic/sexy to both him and his wife. (See article listed below on: Domestic Discipline.)

A husband must actively “train” his wife to obey him. In every other area of life leaders know the importance of “training” subordinates to obey orders. Bosses at work are always giving orders and they expect immediate obedience. Every professional athletic coach knows the importance of giving orders rigorously. Practice, practice, practice. Can you imagine a professional football coach speaking to his team members with the same non-authoritative and non-assertive tone of voice that most American husbands use when speaking to their wives? How absurd! Isn't it true that professional football coaches are **always** pushy and rigorous during training?

Yet, at the same time they have to show genuine care and concern for all of their team members' needs. (Notice: it is possible to be “pushy” in a good way, as well as in a bad way. The best progress is made when the coach is “pushy” in a good way. If he's not “pushy”, very little progress will be made.) Practical application: in marriage a very important thing is that the husband should be sure to take command of the marriage bed, in both a loving and firm way, but not selfishly.

Similarly, the leaders in the military are constantly giving orders. Practice, practice, practice. There is a certain feeling of security when quality leadership is applied correctly and rigorously (pushy) with true caring attention (love). Is it not true that most women crave the feeling of security and care that quality leadership and discipline produce? Women should be getting it from their husbands. But modern men have been taught ever since childhood that it's wrong to use that kind of leadership over their wives. Over new female soldiers, yes..... over female college students, yes..... over

female employees, yes.... but over wives, no. Most women desire that their husbands take command, provided it's done in a loving, mature and courteous way. Modern husbands need to be **“re-trained”** on how to overcome the incorrect corrupt teaching they have been receiving ever since they were little boys. (See article listed below on: Domestic Discipline.)

The most important aspect of marriage is unity. The very nature of God is unity. God is Father, Son and Holy Spirit, all in perfect unity, so much so that all three of them together are considered to be only **one** God. **1John 5:7** “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are **one** (unified).” KJV (This verse does not exist in modern lukewarm Bibles. If your Bible doesn't have it, you should get one that does. The old KJV is the best.) The “Word” is Jesus Christ, “the Son”. **John1:1** “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” (John1:1-13) The three persons constitute “one” God, just as two persons, man and wife, constitute “one” marriage, to the point that some people even call them “one” person. (See article listed below on: The Trinity.)

Just last century, the US law itself referred to a married couple as “one person”. Some churches even teach that the Holy Trinity, The Father, The Son and The Holy Spirit, is “one person”. Therefore, a clearer definition of the term “one person” must be made. God created each individual person with their own mind, their own will, their own emotions and their own body, but at the same time God wants to teach people the importance of unification between individuals, so much so that they can all be unified as “one”. In **Judges 20:1** “Then all the children of Israel went out, and the congregation was gathered together **as one man**, from Dan even to Beersheba,.....” we see that a large group of people were so unified that they were considered **as** “one man”. After all, if God or marriage consisted of just one individual, then how could unity among multiple individuals be relevant? The essence of unification must start with single individuals, united together.

Perfect unity can only be known in the spirit. Jesus Christ alone gives perfect unity. It is a gift from Him through the working of the Holy Spirit. There is great joy in perfect unity. In the natural world people only have small and/or short tastes of unity. Jesus Christ gives it in abundance only to those who are obedient to Him, as a wife should be obedient to her husband. Without this submission of the wife to her husband, perfect unity can never be known. It's just like how all of the states must be obedient to the federal government, without which they would have to be the “independent” states of America, not the “United” states of America. If they were “independent”, they would probably end up fighting with each other all the time the same way that most MCT's do.

The desire to have perfect unity must be primarily with Jesus Christ before anything else, even before earthly marriage. Everything else must become smaller and less important. Never forget that earthly marriages are only a temporary similitude of

the eternal spiritual marriage of many persons with Jesus Christ, in order to help us understand it, which is why God permits multiple wife marriages. (But, doesn't recommend them. The spiritual marriage with Jesus Christ is best nurtured when a person remains single.) The most important thing is our eternal condition in the next life. [Mark 12:29-31](#) "And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: 30- And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. 31- And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these." KJV [2Cor. 4:18](#) "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."

What is the true definition of the term "good marriage"? Most working couples, who think they have a "good marriage", spend most of their time at work. It's possible that they could live in the same house together for years thinking that they have a "good marriage", but are they truly united in spirit? The truth is that they are no more than "good friends". They could even be "very good friends" and yet not be united in spirit. If they are, then they live more like roommates who get along well.

The US and Canada are two countries that are "good friends". They have lived on the same continent together peacefully for a long time. But are they united? No,..... they are independent countries. Nevertheless, suppose they did want to unite? Rest assured, the very first concern would be about who runs the government.... Who's in charge? Unity, in any human organization, must have leadership. Without leadership there can be no unity. Without leadership they're just "friends", who come and go as they please, without ever experiencing the joy of unity. They're more like roommates who voluntarily live together and cooperate in paying the bills. Or, they're like a bunch of friends who get together to play baseball. They come and go as they please, and have fun. But they could never be considered a professional team, even if they were good enough players. All professional teams have a coach and manager, who run the team.

The modern concept that the husband and wife should "share" decision making as though they were both equal concerning "leadership" is absurd. Is it possible to have two presidents of the US with exactly the same power and responsibility? The conflict and chaos would get out of control. Constant deadlocks and stalemates is what would happen. Telling them that they have to learn to make "compromises" is foolish absurdity that just prolongs the deadlock. In the end, either one is the leader or the other one is the leader. Female leadership in marriage is witchcraft. They will both burn in hell. Any man who has a dominant wife is better off divorced.

Occasionally, two people start a business as equal partners, but very soon it is necessary for one of them to take the lead and the other one to follow. They both recognize that reality dictates that one of them must be the leader and the other the follower, otherwise the business will not survive (they will always end up fighting). In real life, if the husband does not take the lead, then the wife automatically steps in and takes command, and then starts bossing him around like she's his mother. (Witchcraft)

Even children, when they play together, in any kind of organized games, the child with the strongest personality automatically takes the lead over the other children..... and if that child does a good job, the rest follow with pleasure. Otherwise, if two of the children contend for the leadership, all the children know that the result will be nothing but conflict..... and having fun playing games will be out the window. Even children can figure this out, but somehow most people can't figure out the foolishness of the modern propaganda. And, why are they always pushing it on TV and in movies?

Why is this absolute absurdity of "sharing" leadership commonly accepted as normal in marriage? The truth is that it is only accepted as a "theory" before marriage for gullible inexperienced people who don't understand it. (But, children can understand it.) After **every** married couple start their life together, in reality, the absurdity of this "theory" becomes obvious immediately. This "theory" is an obvious low intelligence propaganda lie, which has only one purpose: it is intended merely to get the inexperienced young husband to "surrender" his leadership and get the wife to take command. (Witchcraft) This lie is propagated by satanic people who understand its purpose very well. Notice that the "surrender" is **not** a "compromise". Sometimes they talk about this low intelligence lie using the word "compromise". This word is used because when most people hear it, they understand that anyone who won't "compromise" is automatically labeled as a villain. But, this is NOT a "compromise", it is a "surrender" to witchcraft, which is contrary to Christianity. It is following satanism, and it drags people to hell.

On the subject of unity – "Unity" and "independence" are diametrical opposites of each other. It is a common modern misunderstanding that spouses think they can be "united" in marriage and at the same time be "independent" and free do whatever they want. This 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. When people try to maintain a marriage "united" and "independent" at the same time, it does not work. It produces confusion, conflict and craziness,.... not happiness and harmony.

In the US, according to the book HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES published by the Macmillan Company in 1921 there has been many changes in the laws con-

cerning women and family life. In chapter 23 it says about previous laws which were at the point of changing: “.... *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 online at: <http://history-world.org/USA.pdf>) 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 listed below on: The Virtues of the Spirit.) However, female leadership over men is called, witchcraft. It is satanic, which leads people to hell.

The modern notion that a married couple should be perfectly “equal” and that the husband should not automatically take the leadership over his wife is absurd. Has any country in the world ever elected two equal presidents with exactly the same authority and responsibility? In real life, an organization such as a marriage cannot maintain order and unity without leadership; one must be the leader and the other the follower..... And when the husband does not take that position, the wife takes it automatically. (Witchcraft)

Over a century ago, in the US, the automatic male leadership in marriage 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**”. An unmarried woman, a “**feme sole**”, had the right to own property and make contracts in her own name. The automatic American legal principle of **coverture** was described very well in William Blackstone's “Commentaries on the Laws of England” 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 lead by the husband. A married woman could not own property, sign legal documents or enter into a contract, obtain an education or keep a salary for herself against her husband's wishes. If a husband permitted his wife to work, under the laws of coverture, she was required to relinquish her wages to her husband.

After these laws of **coverture** were terminated in US history, and before “women's liberation” started, 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 working women in those days usually earned very little money.) The men of that time understood that the termination of the **coverture** laws was destructive to good marriage; it was crazy. **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 is “[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, they could no longer be called the “United States”, they would have to be called the “Independent States” of America. And they would probably end up fighting with each other, like the typical US MCT 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.

Examples of how marriage unity was before the practice of “**coverture**” was eliminated can only be found in writings from that era. In one of the Sherlock Holmes old books, a wife was talking about her husband saying: “.....[he cut himself in the bedroom, and yet I in the dining-room rushed upstairs instantly with the utmost certainty that something had happened.](#)” They were so much united in spirit that she could sense in her spirit without being present that something had happened to him..... and indeed she was right. In another old Sherlock Holmes book, a wife turned over all of her money to her husband when they first got married. She even seemed to prefer it that way even more than her husband did.

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 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 do whatever they want.

Is it possible for a business to operate in this manner? Can a large business have internal independent groups 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 or business activities is no more abusive than higher management in a large company having authority to give orders over the money earned or business decisions made

within individual departments of their own company. Husbands must have control of the money their wives earn.

This belief that a marriage can have “unity” and “independence” at the same time is ridiculous. 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 **truly** good husband, would choose a loving husband. Unfortunately, most modern women think that they can have both at the same time. Either that or they think they should maintain the profession “just in case” the marriage fails, thereby contaminating the “unity” of their own marriage, which otherwise could have succeeded. They think they can be “united” and “independent” at the same time. Despite the higher education of modern women, they think they can preserve their cake and also eat their cake. How is it possible that women who received degrees from universities can't figure out that if they eat their cake, they wouldn't be able to preserve 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.)

When people try to maintain a marriage “united” and “independent” at the same time it doesn't work. It produces confusion, chaos and craziness..... not happiness and harmony. In modern times, there is an epidemic of mental illness, and this craziness of thinking that marriages can be “united” and “independent” at the same time is one of the leading causes of mental illness. But, modern highly educated women can't figure it out. (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. Women need to be winners, not losers.)

Sad to say, that in most MCT's that **stay together** long term, in the US, the wife is in charge. The people who **stay together** long-term both understand very well that without a leader the twosome won't survive. It is absolutely clear that without a leader there is no hope that they can **stay together** long-term. They both reject the ridiculous modern “propaganda” that the husband and wife should “share” decision making as though they were both equal concerning “leadership”, which they both recognize only produces chaos and conflict, like the absurdity of having two equal presidents.

Now that society has trained (brainwashed) men from childhood, mistakenly in the name of “equality”, **not** to automatically assume the leadership role, the wife automatically takes that position. This is not equality!!! This is the suppression and perversion of masculinity. Total equality in leadership is impractical and absurd!!! Without a leader the twosome can **not survive!** The couples that stay together are more like friendly roommates who stay together temporarily until the time comes for them to go their separate ways. (Divorce) It is more spiritual and mentally healthy and pleasing to God for a husband to get a divorce than it is for him to follow the leadership of his dominant wife.

Female leadership in marriage is not only a disgrace to manliness, but it is also **blasphemy** against the Word of God. (See article listed below on: The Consequences

of “Women's Liberation”.) Modern churches in the US do absolutely nothing about their church members who blaspheme God in this manner. MCT's in modern churches that have the wife dominating her husband should be excommunicated from the church. They should be thrown out and denied entrance to church meetings, activities and all fellowship with church members, even outside of church gatherings. They should be “shunned” by the church. The trouble is..... they are now the majority..... and all those pastors are very much in love with all that donation money they get that makes them very comfortable.

Female leadership over men is called “witchcraft” and the female leader is a “witch”. All modern churches with female “pastors” are corrupt and the female “pastors” are following Satan. All of those female “pastors” know perfectly well that they are blaspheming God.... and they like it that way. They love to corrupt Christianity. (See article listed below: What About Deborah?)

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 female bosses over men and female politicians.) 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 similar to what happened to the villain during the Roman chariot race in the 1959 film Ben-Hur. (See the Ben-Hur race scene on youtube.com.) Then the 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 (excrement) 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 mocking her and laughing..... How appropriate!!!

Satan has chosen women for leaders (witches) because God has chosen men for leaders. Every person who reads this writing and insists on continuing in this witchcraft is cursed of God. All you people who reject these words will burn in hell for eternity. If you indeed reject these words, then yes, I'm talking about you the reader. This custom includes female authority over men in all areas of life; home, church, work, education, government offices and politics. (From the position of president all the way down to the drivers' license clerk who gives men permission to drive.)

The first sin in the Garden of Eden was the man following the leadership of his wife. Gen 3:17-19 “And unto Adam he (God) said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou

return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.” If Adam had not followed his wife's rebellious leadership, Eve alone would have died as a consequence of her sin. After that, God would have given Adam a new wife. (Please read all of [Genesis 3](#))

Without the obedience of a wife to her husband there can be no unity in a faithful Christian marriage. And there is no freedom from the disgraceful suppression of manliness caused by witchcraft and no part of the kingdom of God after death, which is eternal. If a wife is head of her husband, they have both rebelled against God. [1Sam 15:23](#) “For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry.” Everyone who follows Satan will **not** have part of the kingdom of God. They will be excluded from the wedding feast of the Lamb and excluded from entrance into the New City of Jerusalem. ([Rev. 19:9](#); [21:24-27](#)) [Rev 21:27](#) “And there shall in no wise (way) enter into it (New Jerusalem) any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie.....”

But, it is not too late, there is still time to repent and get right with God. [Act 26:18](#) “To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.” (See article listed below on: Salvation.)

The physical part of a marriage is very important. In the Bible, the Song of Solomon gives the recipe for the maximum marital physical experience. But, notice how almost everything is written poetically with metaphors and symbolism. Each aspect of the physical relationship is usually portrayed with numerous different illustrative symbols. For example, it does not say what is the literal thing that the husband's “apples” symbolize, but rest assured that his “apples” symbolize the same thing as his “figs” and his “tender grapes”. The reader must interpret the literal application, through the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Marital intercourse itself, which is physical “unity”, is an example and illustration of the spiritual “unity” between the church and Jesus Christ through the entrance and indwelling of the Holy Spirit inside of every true believer. [John14:17](#) “Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.” KJV This spiritual “unity” is not possible without obedience to Jesus Christ, as a wife is supposed to be obedient to her husband. Jesus Christ is the leader and any true Christian must be the follower.

But in real life, most modern lukewarm Christians don't even know what the will of God is, much less are they willing to do it. They have trouble understanding things that are clearly written about in the Bible, like how men are supposed to be the leaders of women. How could they possibly interpret the will of God in decision making by means of the leading of the Holy Spirit concerning things in daily life not clearly written

in the Bible? God has selected the man to be the leader in earthly marriage. This is clearly stated and yet the lukewarm church refuses to accept it, understanding what it really means and doing it. (The man must be the leader, especially in the marriage bed.) If they have so much difficulty understanding things clearly stated, how could they possibly know what the will of God is for their everyday life? (Which is the leading of the Holy Spirit.) **Mat. 7:21** “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that **doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.**” Only those people who do God’s Will will enter and reign as kings in the New City of Jerusalem. All those who don’t do God’s Will will have NO part as kings in the next life. They have lost their crown.

Obviously, another necessary ingredient of unity is faithfulness. However, “faithfulness” itself must be more clearly defined because different cultures have different concepts of what “faithful” means, just as different types of business contracts have different expectations of fulfillment vs. failure of fulfillment. For example, when Steve Jobs contracted Bill Gates to write software for Apple, it was understood from the beginning that Bill would also be writing software for other companies as well. However, Steve expected Bill not to write software for other companies anything similar to the software he was writing for Apple. He wanted Apple to be the best. But, when Steve discovered that the software Bill was writing for other companies was very similar to the software he was writing for Apple (too similar for his liking)..... and that the software from those companies would be strong competition against Apple, Steve was very angry at Bill and accused him of **not** being faithful to his contract. But, he really couldn’t say too much, because the main conflict was over the Graphical User Interface, (GUI), which they both “got free” from Xerox..... And, even to this day, Microsoft is always very concerned about any of their software that other people “get free” from them.

In comparison, when Bill offered to write software for IBM, he told them at the beginning that he wanted to sell the exact same thing to other companies, as well. (It was understood that this would make all computer brands compatible, thereby increasing sales for everyone.) Obviously, the expectations of fulfillment of contract were completely different. Thus, the expectations of faithfulness in marriage in a society that is monogamous would be different than the expectations of faithfulness in a society that is polygamous.

Other aspects of “faithfulness” are self-control and honesty. Any person who has made long term non-virtuous habits of lying and showing no self-control in their physical relationships will, undoubtedly, carry these bad habits into marriage. Before marriage, it is important to form virtuous habits and not to run around like a dog that roams the streets. Also, when someone wants to marry someone else, they are responsible to verify, over a period of time (recommended one year), that the person they want to

marry has indeed developed virtuous habits. If they don't, that is, if they jump into a marriage before they really have enough time to know the other person, then they are equally just as guilty as their non-virtuous marriage partner in the disastrous results that obviously will follow..... and therefore have no right to complain about the non-virtuous conduct of their marriage partner afterwards.

Even though the physical part of marriage was invented and blessed by God, speaking about it as openly and shamelessly as how people commonly do in modern times must still be considered inappropriate. Also, if anything that was intended to be private and intimate is publicized so openly, it always loses its intimacy and the spiritual bonding of unity. Marriage "unity"/intimacy must be private!

There is an overemphasis on the physical in modern times, resulting in a deficiency of true quality of character development (virtuous habits), which is necessary to maintain a good marriage and family for a lifetime. On TV and in movies virtuous habits are often ridiculed or excluded (not even mentioned) as though they are assumed to be impossible or non-existent. Either that or they assume that only weirdoes and nerds who couldn't get a romantic relationship anyway are the only people capable of virtuous habits. Not only that, the term "virtuous" is too noble for them to use. They would refer to such things with more insulting terminology. That is, until they want "virtuous" habits from their mate. When they want their marriage partner to be honest and faithful, then they start to have more respect for "virtuous" habits.

Or, sometimes they perceive this type of mentality as bad censorship against other people's right to "freedom". But, all the people who see it that way refuse to acknowledge that their "freedom" has a very negative influence on other people, especially children, who don't understand the danger. When sexual "freedom" is allowed to rein unchecked with censorship, it will produce an entire generation of extremely selfish people who are incapable of being normal parents. Real-life parenting requires self-discipline and a certain amount of character development (virtuous habits). By allowing uncontrolled sexual "freedom", the stability of the family and society itself will be destroyed. The whole thing is a big fat Titanic that absolutely WILL sink. Society WILL become so corrupt that it WILL collapse and self-destruct, all by itself. This kind of Titanic won't even need an iceberg to sink it. It will sink from its own corruption.

By acting like dogs that roam the streets and showing total lack of self-control in their physical relationships they are destroying any possibility of having a quality life-long marriage and family; it is something they will never know. By comparison, people who develop virtuous habits will have the opportunity for a quality life-long marriage.

FOR YOUNG PEOPLE SEEKING MARRIAGE

- 1 – Faithful Christians must **not** marry lukewarm Christians or non-Christians. (1Cor. 7:39)
- 2 – Dating must only be done with an appropriate chaperon or in the fellowship of a group of other faithful Christians.
- 3 – It is highly recommended that the man be older than the woman. It is best that they are **not** the same age. 1Tim. 2:13 “For Adam was first formed, then Eve.”
- 4 – Absolutely no romantic touching, hand holding or kissing until their wedding night. 1Cor. 7:1 “... It is good for a man not to touch a woman.” (One thing leads to another, especially when they’re alone)
- 5 – The quality of character in both the man and the woman must be shown to be virtuous over a recommended period of one year before marriage. (See article listed below on: The Virtues of the Spirit.)
- 6 – Faithful Christians must only marry other faithful Christians, normally found in a faithful Christian church. However, a faithful Christian church is difficult to find in the US. (And probably doesn't even exist in the US.) Therefore, it is recommended that all new marriages be postponed until after this problem is resolved by Jesus Christ removing **all** the corrupt church leaders and replacing them with “Shepherd David”. All faithful Christians should now be praying for this event to happen. (See article listed below on: The Lukewarm Church.) (Also see article listed below on: The New World Order was Prophesied in the Bible.) Jer. 16:2 “Thou shalt not take thee a wife, neither shalt thou have sons or daughters in his place.” The US is corrupt, like unfertile soil which is not capable of producing good fruits or vegetables. It is foolish to plant a garden in such a place.
- 7 – Eze 14:14,16 Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord GOD. Though these three men were in it, as I live, saith the Lord GOD, they shall deliver neither sons nor daughters; they only shall be delivered, but the land shall be desolate. If someone tries to plant their favorite fruits or vegetables in unfertile soil, they shouldn't expect to get nice beautiful juicy produce from it. They should expect to get ugly rotten vegetables that are unfit for human consumption. The US has the highest rate of divorce of any country in the world, and therefore it has the absolute worst soil to plant a marriage in. Unless some special type of fertilizer is applied first, it would be illogical to expect to have a good marriage in it. Therefore, it is recommended that all new marriages be postponed until after this problem is resolved by Jesus Christ removing **all** the corrupt church leaders and replacing them with “Shepherd David”. All faithful Christians should now be praying for this event to happen. (See article listed below on: The Lukewarm Church.) (Also see article listed below on: The New World Order was Prophesied in the Bible.) Jer. 16:2 “Thou shalt **not** take thee a wife, neither shalt thou have sons or daughters in this place.” The US law itself is heavily in favor of wives against their husbands, thereby motivating wives to fight with their husbands. It is foolish and crazy to have a marriage under such con-

ditions. All of those laws that have been deliberately designed to ruin marriages must be removed by the US legislature before anyone should consider marriage. (Some of those laws are state laws.)

- 8 – Parental marriage partner selection is preferable. (As seen in the 1971 film “Fiddler on the Roof”.) But, since modern parents have completely lost control of their own children, such a recommendation is impossible to implement.

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

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

e-mail: pastor_david@tutamail.com

OTHER ARTICLES at
www.pastordavidministries.com

The Messiah for the Jews

The Trinity

The Holy Scriptures

The Lie of Evolution

What About Deborah

Fatherhood

The Role Of Women Throughout History

The Consequences of Using Incorrect Terminology

Domestic Discipline

The Lukewarm Church

Correct Divorce

Baptism

The Consequences of “Women's Liberation”

The New World Order was Prophesied in the Bible

Self-Love and Self-Esteem

Angels are Aliens, Aliens are Angels

Wolves In Sheep's Clothing

Slavery

The Virtues of the Spirit

The Babylonian and Egyptian Captivity

The Suffering Of The Great Depression

Salvation

Marriage Misunderstandings Explained