

*Practical Plan for World Peace:
Unificationism—The Teachings of Sun Myung Moon*
by Jon Quinn

You can read the entire text of this book at my Web site:
www.DivinePrinciple.com

Chapter Four

Helper

The fourth value is for women to be their husband's helper. In Genesis we read that God made the woman to be her man's helper, "Then the LORD God said, 'It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a helper fit for him'" (Gen. 2:18). Every woman's career should be helping her husband. Men are hunters and women are nesters. Women's primary responsibility is to help her husband be successful in the marketplace by managing his home. I list some good books in my suggested reading list at the end of book on the subject of helper such as *So Much More: The Remarkable Influence of Visionary Daughters on the Kingdom of God* by Anna Sofia and Elizabeth Botkin, *Created To Be His Help Meet* by Debi Pearl, *The Way Home* by Mary Pride, *Fascinating Womanhood* by Helen Andelin, *Passionate Housewives: Desperate for God* by Jennie Chancey and Stacy McDonald and *Me? Obey Him?: The Obedient Wife and God's Way of Happiness and Blessing in the Home* by Elizabeth Rice Handford.

Women should not have dreams or goals or desires to earn money inside or outside the home. In *All About Raising Children* Helen Andelin gives excellent advice teaching that women have only one career. She explains that a woman needs "to make her career a career in the home. If she manages her time well, she may be able to do other things such as develop her talents or give benevolent service, but these should be secondary roles. If she is to make a success of family life, she will need to make her duties as wife, mother and homemaker, priority roles." When she says develop "talents" this does not mean a woman should have a dream of attending graduate school, starting a restaurant, climbing the corporate ladder, running for office, being an elementary school teacher, high school teacher, college professor, nurse, accountant, musician, accountant, attorney, doctor, receptionist, waitress or any other of the thousands of paid jobs in the market place.

One of my favorite writers is G.K Chesterton. He lived in the early 20th century and wrote eloquently about the decline of the family caused by feminism and socialism. He taught that men's jobs are not as exciting or fulfilling or meaningful as the woman's seemingly small world of the home. It looks small and narrow but in reality the home is the biggest and most creative place to be. He tried to explain to women how they are far better off in the home than in the workplace.

Chesterton criticizes feminists who glorify the workplace over the home. A few feminists are excited with their glamorous jobs such as being congresswomen and college professors. But for most women and men the workplace is more repetitive and offers less chance for growth than the woman at home. They write about how men have such cool jobs compared to a housewife. Chesterton writes:

Those who write like this seem entirely to forget the existence of the working and wage-earning classes. They say eternally, like my correspondent, that the ordinary woman is always a drudge. And what, in the name of the Nine Gods, is the ordinary man? These people seem to think that the ordinary man is a Cabinet Minister. They are always talking about man going forth to wield power, to carve his own way, to stamp his individuality on the world, to command and to be obeyed. This may be true of a certain class. Dukes, perhaps, are not drudges; but, then, neither are Duchesses. The Ladies and Gentlemen of the Smart Set are quite free for the higher culture, which consists chiefly of motoring and Bridge. But the ordinary man who typifies and constitutes the millions that make up our civilization is no more free for the higher culture than his wife is.

Indeed, he is not so free. Of the two sexes the woman is in the more powerful position. For the average woman is at the head of something with which she can do as she likes; the average man has to obey orders and do nothing else. He has to put one dull brick on another dull brick, and do nothing else; he has to add one dull figure to another dull figure, and do nothing else. The woman's world is a small one, perhaps, but she can alter it. The woman can tell the tradesman with whom she deals some realistic things about himself. The clerk who does this to the manager generally gets the sack.... Above all the woman does work which is in some small degree creative and individual. She can put the flowers or the furniture in fancy arrangements of her own. I fear the bricklayer cannot put the bricks in fancy arrangements of his own, without disaster to himself and others. If the woman is only putting a patch into a carpet, she can choose the thing with regard to color.... A woman cooking may not always cook artistically, still she can cook artistically. She can introduce a personal and imperceptible alteration into the composition of a soup. The clerk is not encouraged to introduce a personal and imperceptible alteration into the figures in a ledger. (*All Things Considered*)

A feminist would argue that if she owned the restaurant she could be creative about how the cheesecake is made in her deli. To me the arguments against women competing in the marketplace are more powerful to me than those for women leaving the home. Helen Andelin writes wisely in her book *All About Raising Children*, "When male and female roles are altered severe problems occur. Such altering occurs when the wife runs the family or works outside the home. When the wife is a mover and a pusher, she can undermine her husband's drive so that he neglects his masculine role." Feminists don't believe this. Traditionalists do. Dear Reader, take your pick. I hope you choose wisely. So far the UC has not chosen wisely and they are not growing because they are reaping what they have sown. When Unificationist sisters return home the UC will grow.

Chesterton was a wise man who saw that the world of the homemaker is not narrow as feminists keep saying. He wrote:

Our old analogy of the fire remains the most workable one. The fire need not blaze like electricity nor boil like boiling water; its point is that it blazes more than water and warms more than light. The wife is like the fire, or to put things in their proper proportion, the fire is like the wife. Like the fire, the woman is expected to cook: not to excel in cooking, but to cook; to cook better than her husband who is earning the coke by lecturing on botany or breaking stones. Like the fire, the woman is expected to tell tales to the children, not original and artistic tales, but tales—better tales than would probably be told by a first-class cook. Like the fire, the woman is expected to illuminate and ventilate, not by the most startling revelations or the wildest winds of thought, but better than a man

can do it after breaking stones or lecturing. But she cannot be expected to endure anything like this universal duty if she is also to endure the direct cruelty of competitive or bureaucratic toil. Woman must be a cook, but not a competitive cook; a school mistress, but not a competitive schoolmistress; a house-decorator but not a competitive house-decorator; a dressmaker, but not a competitive dressmaker. She should have not one trade but twenty hobbies; she, unlike the man, may develop all her second bests. This is what has been really aimed at from the first in what is called the seclusion, or even the oppression, of women. Women were not kept at home in order to keep them narrow; on the contrary, they were kept at home in order to keep them broad. The world outside the home was one mass of narrowness, a maze of cramped paths, a madhouse of monomaniacs. It was only by partly limiting and protecting the woman that she was enabled to play at five or six professions and so come almost as near to God as the child when he plays at a hundred trades. But the woman's professions, unlike the child's, were all truly and almost terribly fruitful; so tragically real that nothing but her universality and balance prevented them being merely morbid. This is the substance of the contention I offer about the historic female position. I do not deny that women have been wronged and even tortured; but I doubt if they were ever tortured so much as they are tortured now by the absurd modern attempt to make them domestic empresses and competitive clerks at the same time. I do not deny that even under the old tradition women had a harder time than men; that is why we take off our hats. I do not deny that all these various female functions were exasperating; but I say that there was some aim and meaning in keeping them various. I do not pause even to deny that woman was a servant; but at least she was a general servant.

Some Unificationists mistakenly see Sun Myung Moon's wife as a leader of men. I see Mrs. Moon as being a traditional wife who focuses on being a helper to her husband. At a conference for professors and intellectuals (the Tenth ICUS) Mother spoke to the women attending the conference. I saw a video of this. She was very sweet and feminine. She told the women that they had helped their husbands and she has tried "to be a wonderful helper for my husband." Unificationist sisters should do the same. They should make their husbands their primary focus by being a "helper." Helping does not mean leading, providing and protecting her husband or any other man or men. Mother said:

They say that behind every great man, there is a woman. In this sense, I respect you all very much. You have helped your husbands create many things to help mankind. I also try to be a wonderful helper for my husband, Reverend Moon.

By being quietly submissive and following her husband, Mrs. Moon has fulfilled the primary responsibility of a woman to be "behind" her husband and center her life on helping her husband reach his goals and hopefully "create many things to help mankind." Submission is not slavish servitude or servile fawning obsequiousness. Modern day thinking wrongly thinks that the old fashioned value of biblical patriarchy is outdated and ancient while today's egalitarian, unisex culture is hip and cool. There is nothing hip and cool about the demographic winter of low birthrates that is going on worldwide. Civilization ends when men and women deny human nature and the laws of the universe that govern relationships in the family and society. The ideology of Feminism puts women in the forefront, the position of prominence while the ideology of Traditionalism puts men in the forefront. Mrs. Moon has restored the position of Eve and therefore ended the ideology of feminism. She has not paved the way and made conditions for women to be

in a situation where they hire and fire men. She is a perfect role model for a wife being a helper to her husband. She quietly supports him from behind instead of castrating men like feminists do when they put themselves on top of and in front of men. As I write Father is 90 years old. Mother is almost 70 years old and she still sits quietly next to him. She is not off doing her own thing. In the rare times when Father has her speak publicly she reads a prepared text that he wrote or approved of and he is reading along with her. This is not an example of a woman in the forefront. Even when she speaks she has body guards. And when she does speak she talks about her husband. About how great he is. She doesn't talk about herself or put any focus on herself. She absolutely does not come across as leading him or anyone else. She is the model follower and helper that Helen Andelin writes of in her book *Fascinating Womanhood*. She has no interest in competing with men, getting a degree, or building some business. Her whole world is her husband. Every woman should do the same and make their husbands her career, not in having a separate career.

Father teaches that men are more aggressive and take initiative and leadership more than women. At the age of 90 Father gave a hoon dok hae on October 9, 2009. At the website familyfed.org we read:

True Father took pains to comment on God's motivation for creating sexual difference and what is proper and not proper. Although the creator God is a unified being of harmonized male and female characteristics, as far as human sexuality goes, the invisible God expresses himself through the convex, male organ, and has created the concave, female organ as his object. The model position is for man to be on top, women on bottom. "In the West, many women are on top. They can't receive. This is going against the Principle," he explained. He also spoke to the issue of Western women tending to use their husbands as servants. "The woman is suckling the baby, nurturing children, and she is seeing her husband as idle, so Western women think they are superior to men because they give birth," he explained.

When husbands make love to their wives, they should start at the bottom, with the feet together and stimulate all parts of the body, moving later to the lips and breasts. A man should try to envelope his partner with warmth. The warmer women feel, the more easily they can feel fire.

I quote Father extensively in my books and I find a motif throughout his speeches over a span of 40 years of a strong argument for patriarchy. In the above quote he says that subject means men are supposed to be "on top" but Western women are on top. This, he teaches, is "against the Principle." Patriarchy is a universal principle of God. The opposite, women being on top, is a universal principle of evil spirit world. Father specifically blasts Western women because Eastern women are far more likely to understand and organize their lives by the traditional value of patriarchy. There is still a lot of respect for patriarchy in the East. Maybe Muslims will be the first to accept Father now that we live in a post-Judeo-Christian culture where most Jews and Christians have rejected patriarchy. Some moderate Muslims have some sense that men and women are different. Maybe the last will be first.

I don't know how anyone can read Father and believe in feminism that has the number one goal of abolishing patriarchy. We have to read Father extensively and in context. He speaks in absolutes

with no exceptions because his job is to speak for God who is absolute. Father clearly despises feminism that puts women on top of men. He is for the biblical model of men protecting women. He has body guards for mother wherever she goes. I see a total disconnect from what Father says and what his child is saying. True Father said at Hoon Dok Hwe on October 07, 2009 at East Garden: “Western people ... have no concept of subject and object.”

WORDS TO LIVE BY

The key to world peace is the truth in Father’s speeches. These are the words we are to live our life by. He says:

Become one with Father's wishes and his words.

You should use Father's words as textbooks. All you need is in these books. They are textbooks for your family for elementary school, middle school, high school, Master’s and Doctoral degrees. When Father is not here his words will guide you.

All people will be united and the world will become one nation attending True Parents as a family. Everyone will receive Father’s teaching and ideology as textbooks to live by. (August 31, 2009)

I choose to guide my life by Father’s words. I take him at face value when he says women should never be on top. And I take him at face value when he says women have a more important role than men. True patriarchs respect and value the work women do as nesters and never think of themselves as having more value even if they become well-known or famous in their field of work outside the home.

WOMEN HAVE MORE IMPORTANT ROLE THAN MEN

Just because some men have abused their role as leaders by mistakenly believing that boys are greater than girls and men are superior to women does not mean we should throw the baby out with the bathwater. By throwing out patriarchy our culture today is the worse for it. R. Albert Mohler Jr., president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary says, “A remarkable culture-shift has taken place around us. The most basic contours of American culture have been radically altered. The so-called Judeo-Christian consensus of the last millennium has given way to a post-modern, post-Christian, post-Western cultural crisis which threatens the very heart of our culture.”

Helen Andelin writes in *Fascinating Womanhood*: “To be a successful mother is greater than to be a successful opera singer, writer, or artist. One is eternal greatness and the other a short-term honor. One day my young son said to me, ‘Mother, boys are more important than girls, aren’t they, for they can become presidents and generals and famous people.’ I replied, ‘But it is mothers who make presidents and generals and famous people. The hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world.’”

Father says women have a “more important role than the men”:

When you treat your husband as a saint and recognize him as the representative of the Lord, you will be able to sacrifice your life for his sake. On that foundation, a great figure who can restore the nation and the world will be born.” (*Blessing and Ideal Family*)

We can conclude that your role is to provide for the happiness of your man, even more so than he may do for you.

I have many different responsibilities and much more to accomplish than Mother in the outside world. However, women have the more important role than the men in their relationship. (7-11-82)

Mrs. Andelin goes on to say, “Every woman can make a worthy contribution to society through her children, but not every man can through his work. Some jobs are unimportant or even destructive. If women feel they must serve their country, the best way is in the home, making a success of family life. Calvin Coolidge, former U.S. President said, ‘Look well to the hearthstone. Therein lies all hope for America.’”

“The work in the home is a different kind of glory than career women enjoy. A great mother lives in obscurity, and the perfect wife is even less known. Her reward is a quiet, unacclaimed honor. Her glory is the esteem of her husband, the happiness of her children, and her overall success in the home.”

The proper role for a woman is to be a nester and the proper role for a man is to be a hunter. These roles should never be reversed or interchanged. Men and women are made to be complementary. They are not the same. Equality does not mean sameness. Men can’t do what women are created to do and women can’t do everything men can do. They are both equal in value but different in function, roles and responsibilities. If they can interchange then they do not need each other. Because so many have bought into the ideology of unisexism we now have a demographic winter where men have lost all sense of chivalry and desire to have many children. Women leaving the home to compete with men is a greater danger than terrorism. Feminism is Satan’s number one core value and the sooner the UM understands that and rejects feminism then the sooner they will start growing internally and externally in numbers. There is great danger in parents telling their children that men and women can and should interchange roles. This is one reason we see so many children of disorderly parents becoming sexually confused, getting divorced, marry late, turning to homosexuality and not caring to have big families. Parents need to encourage their sons and daughters to create traditional marriages and families and teach about the dangers of feminist, egalitarian marriages and families. It is dangerous for fathers and mothers, aunts and uncles, grandparents, elder brothers and sisters to teach young people that girls and women can do anything a man can do. God wants a division of labor.

ROLE MODELS

Unificationists should be the best role models on earth. We should write books, produce DVDs and live by the highest standards. Then the world will jump ship and join us. Sadly the UM is filled with feminists who write books and live by feminist values. Unificationists are supposed to be the role models for God’s way of life. We are supposed to teach books that uplift traditional

values and denounce feminist values. We are supposed to show by word and deed what true masculinity and true femininity look like. Tragically, so many who profess to say they are followers of Sun Myung Moon do the opposite of what he teaches. Unificationist women who dominate men by becoming businesswomen and soldiers in the Marine Corps are uplifted as role models in Unificationist literature and websites. They do not teach girls that their job is to manage the home and be helpers to their husband. Men are supposed to manage restaurants outside the home and women are supposed to be professional managers of their home kitchens and community kitchens that stay within the budget given by their husbands. Families don't sit down to dinner together anymore because women have left the home. They mistakenly think that being a homemaker, a domestic goddess as Helen Andelin calls it, is too confining. It is Satan's lie that women must stop being their husband's helper and help other men outside the home. A woman is not helping her husband by leading other men or following other men. A couple should pray every day together for their goals. It is wrong to pray for men being behind the scenes who encourage their wives to be in the forefront. If a woman wants to help with the war against terrorists or help with any of the other many problems in society she should understand that to truly be of help she should focus on being a stay-at-mom that does as good books like Helen Andelin and Mary Pride teach.

GREATNESS

We all want our children to be greater than us. Every parent and elder wants the young to learn and live by godly values. This means we understand what greatness is. Greatness for women is not having positions of authority in society. Now a woman is only seen as "great" and "loving" if she gets paid to do what she is supposed to be doing in her home. If she runs a day-care center, manages a restaurant or works in a nursing home then she is a "professional" and therefore "great". But if she does those things in her home and lives off her husband's income then she is seen as not helping society, living for others, or being a "great" person. False Unificationists are encouraging girls to leave the home to go fundraising, live far away from their fathers, attend liberal colleges, go to graduate schools that despise the traditional family, and pursue a career outside the home. There is no emphasis on having a huge family and living by old-fashioned values. Do you know of any Unificationist parents who teach their daughters to marry young, have a dozen children and study Helen Andelin who explains how they are to be a domestic goddess?

Unfortunately, Unificationist girls are taught to find husbands who will help them advance a career outside the home while he gets up in the middle of the night to care for babies and does 50% of the ironing. This is not being "great." This is a small and insignificant lifestyle. I encourage Unificationist sisters reading this to look to the authors of the books and DVDs I uplift such as Michelle Duggar who has 18 children so far. Watch DVDs of her and read her book. Live the way she lives and reject the teachings and lifestyle of the false Unificationist women who live the opposite of her. Also, do not get influenced by the argument that Mrs. Duggar's lifestyle is good for her but not for every woman. Reject arguments that some women can be supermoms who can both be in the U.S. Army or get a job or hold leadership over men in the UM and can also be a good wife and mother.

I pray this book will end the feminism rampant in the current UM. I have listed some books and DVDs in my suggested reading list at the end of this book. Please study them. I challenge Unificationists to buy Anna and Sophia Botkin's book *So Much More: The Remarkable Influence of Visionary Daughters on the Kingdom of God*, their audio CD titled *Strength & Dignity for Daughters* and their DVD *The Return of the Daughters*. These two young women are excellent role models for girls on how to live by true values instead of the satanic values of the STF. Buy the DVD titled *Monstrous Regiment of Women* and show it to young girls. In it are some great role

models for women. It breaks my heart to see so many Unificationists being dupes of Satan who unwittingly teach the opposite of the anti-feminists in the DVDs *The Return of the Daughters* and *Monstrous Regiment of Women*. I am on a crusade to get these DVDs in every Unificationist home so young girls can see what truly feminine girls and women look like. Women are supposed to show true love by being stay-at-home moms, not by being CEOs, soldiers and cops. Women are not supposed to be the Prime Minister of England like Margaret Thatcher or be a United States Senator like Hillary Clinton. These are not heavenly role models. They are sexually disorderly women who influence millions of girls and women to become sexually confused, build dysfunctional families, and create dying civilizations that are now in the grip of some horrible demographic winter. Unificationists should be defining what is “great” and what is “true love.” Right now the UM teaches the opposite of what is great and what is true love. This is why the UM is dead in the water and going nowhere.

HOMEWORKING

Mrs. Pride writes: “Homeworking is the biblical lifestyle for Christian wives. Homeworking is not just staying home either (that was the mistake of the fifties). We are not called by God to stay home, or to sit at home, but to work at home! Homeworking is the exact opposite of the modern careerist/institutional/Socialist movement. It is a way to take back control of education, health care, agriculture, social welfare, business, housing, morality, and evangelism from the faceless institutions to which we have surrendered them. More importantly, homeworking is the path of obedience to God.”

WOMEN’S ROLE: CARING FOR THE ELDERLY

Another reason women should not spend time away from the home earning money is because their role is to care for the aged and sick at home. Father speaks harshly about Americans who send the old “to the asylum for the aged Blessed families in the Unification Church should be able to attend and serve the grandparents and parents” (*Blessing and Ideal Family Part 2*) in their home. Mary Pride says it is women in homes that are to care for the aged and dependent relatives. The last few generations have given up that responsibility to others. Mrs. Pride goes into detail on this subject. I’ll only quote a few lines: “It costs a whole bunch less to put Mom in the spare bedroom than to pay for her apartment in a nursing home. And there is equipment available on a rental or purchase basis which will answer all of Mom’s noncrisis health care needs.” Women can easily become experts on specific health problems. She gives an example of a famous Christian woman: “Edith Schaeffer had a daughter with chronic rheumatic fever and a son with polio, both of whom she cared for personally. ... Then for years Dr. Schaeffer’s aged mother lived with them.” And finally she cared for her husband at home instead of letting him stay at a hospital and he died “in front of his fireplace in the arms of his wife.” She says, “Can you imagine what a blessing it would be to the economy if this kind of family responsibility spread? And it would show true Christian charity to the world as well.”

THREE JOBS

Mrs. Pride explains that women have three jobs inside the home: first, to be a loving wife, mother and homemaker; second, to homeschool her children and, third, to care for the aged. In God’s ideal, families would be extended families where the grandmother would teach and help the younger housewife. Most women have given up these sacred responsibilities. In her book *All the Way Home* she is furious over the fact that so many parents and grandparents are not helping their children. She writes, “Young parents today have been disinherited. Winnebago’s sprout the message on neon red bumper stickers: ‘We’re Spending Our Children’s Inheritance’. While Grandpa and Grandma party, young parents struggle.” The Bible says a good man helps his

children's children. Patriarchal long-range thinking has been given up for weak men's instant gratification. The last two generations have given up their responsibilities. In *Good Housekeeping* magazine a woman wrote an essay summing up the satanic ideology of parents abandoning their children and grandchildren. A woman writes in the October 1995 issue that families are "scattered to the four winds" and it's difficult to get together. "It's not that we want our grown children surrounding us daily; indeed their productivity and our freedom and pleasure in knowing they have independent, fulfilling lives are often causes for rejoicing. We know that silence and solitude are both the rewards and punishments of life." Solitude is a "reward"? "Freedom"? Many in America haven't got a clue to what freedom is. This woman senses that something is wrong saying, "The once-a-year holiday dinner or occasional get-together doesn't provide enough glue to cement the family." This woman speaks for our culture that has abandoned the extended family. Why has it done this? Because it has abandoned patriarchy. Grandfathers have no power. There is no sense anymore of generational land, roots and group living. Satan has got everyone right where he wants them—screaming at each other in single family homes.

Mrs. Pride is quite right in being livid that grandparents voted in a Ponzi scheme of social security and ruined the economy for their grandchildren. They failed to teach their children how to be parents. She writes, "Dad and Granddad usually subscribed to the theory that each child (male and female) should earn his or her own way in the world. This translated into dump-em-out-the-door-at-eighteen policy." She says, "The Bible, of course, clearly says the generations must help each other. Grandparents are not supposed to hop into the Winnebago and vanish over the horizon. They are supposed to teach their children how to teach, and then help teach the grandchildren. ... Adult women are supposed to have a home in their father's house until married. Grown children, in turn, are supposed to take in the dependent oldsters in their families." Instead, she says they are having fun in adults-only Florida retirement communities. There are no elder women performing the mentor role in Titus 2:3-5. She says, "Homeworking will not usher in the Millennium, but it will change society. And if homeworkers don't reconstruct society, the feminists will."

Mrs. Pride writes against the materialism of so many mothers and grandmothers who are obsessed with money instead of being obsessed with being the elder woman in Titus 2:3-5 in the Bible that teaches that a woman's career is to help her husband wherever he lives, serve her husband's family and to help her children. So many women reject their husband's family and their own family and make their primary focus to earn money instead of putting their energy into their husbands and children and grandchildren. Many women today are so confused they would choose to go to a business meeting instead of choosing to go to be with a daughter who is having a baby. Mary Pride writes: "Every new Christian woman reads Titus 2:3-5 and goes on a search for an older woman who will train her to love her husband and children, to be self-controlled and pure, to be busy at home, to be kind, and to be subject to her husband. I know, because a large number of them write to me complaining that such a female is not to be found. The older women are all busy with new careers or retirement plans. They have no time for their daughter's babies, or to give house-cleaning lessons, or to hold a new couple's hands while they adjust to married life."

WOMAN'S ROLE: TITUS 2:3-5

Mrs. Pride divides her book, *The Way Home*, into chapters that explore each of the womanly roles listed in Titus 2:3-5: "Likewise, teach the older women to be reverent in the way they live, not to be slanderers or addicted to much wine, but to teach what is good. Then they can train the younger women to love their husbands and children, to be self-controlled and pure, to be busy at home [literally, home-working], to be kind, and to be subject to their husbands, so that no one will malign the word of God." She says women are "unwilling to face up to" the responsibility to do these things. "Titus 2:3-5 is the most important text in the Bible on married women's roles, capsulizing a young wife's marital, sexual, biological, economic, authority, and ministering roles.

Yet women's books routinely ignore, mutilate, or even mock this passage. There appears to be a great desire to accommodate Christianity to our culture, and a corresponding willingness to dismiss the Bible's teaching as a remnant of outdated, male-dominated culture."

Mrs. Pride writes, "For us wives, it boils down to this: are we willing to obey God, to love our husbands and children, to be self-controlled and pure, to work at home (not the office), to be kind, and to be subject to our husbands, so that no one will blaspheme the Word of God? ... Homeworking will not automatically solve every problem. But it will get us on the right track. 'The wise woman builds her house, but with her own hands the foolish one tears hers down' (Prov. 14:1). Women have helped tear down the home; women can rebuild it. We have seen enough torn-down houses: broken marriages, rebellious children, barren churches. Now it is time to be wise. It's time for homeworking. It's time to see what the true God can do."

A Baptist minister wrote this at his website (www.tbaptist.com):

The most natural thing in the world for a young girl to become is a mother.

When girls leave that which is against nature, society will be affected. When women are no longer seen by men as mothers, when women want to be men in a men's world, when the hearts' desire of societies young ladies are to be business women then we are in trouble.

When I was a senior in High School I went to work for a lumber company to earn money for college over the summer. I had worked every summer from 13 in farming jobs, fencing, hauling hay, cleaning horse stalls, etc. The saw mill job was the first time in my life that I had been exposed to working along with women. I was amazed, and shocked at the attitude the men had toward the women. They were no longer seen as someone's mother and wife, they were not even seen as co-equal laborers, but they were seen as sexual objects to be joked about and used.

The feminists, in trying to live in a man's world, have taken women lower than they have ever been. A girl walking down the street is no longer seen as someone's mother, or someone's prospective mother, but as a sex object to be exploited. Young boys have not been taught the high and holy calling of women to motherhood. Fatherhood has been lowered because motherhood has. Young girls are no longer seen as the one to raise your children, but as sex objects to be exploited.

Could it be that it is the women who have sparked the moral decline in America? Could it be true that as is the home so is the nation? Could it be a mother's love and being home when junior comes home is far more important than being able to buy junior a new bicycle and new clothes?

You may call me a male chauvinists pig, or a bigot. But the best vision of a woman is not Marsha Clark cross-examining O.J. Simpson while someone else is taking care of her children and her husband is filing for divorce. It is not Connie Chung on CBS. It is not the cashier working in the bank. But it was running home from school, finding my mom elbow deep kneading bread, ready to give me a hug. It is not the woman about town, it is not the one who has finally made it into the man's world. But to me it is my wife, homeschooling 5

kids, being available, and just being there, when being there, meant all the world to my children.

The greatest thing a woman could ever be is a mother. The hardest work a woman will ever do is to be a full-time mother. I believe it is a job that cannot be done on a part time basis, without some catastrophic effects upon the children.

Listen!!! Only a child's real mother can really mother that child. No one will care for it naturally as she will. It is a high and holy work. It must not be lowered; it must not be left to another.

Though many things have contributed to the moral decline in America, the departure from God's plan for the home must be ranked as one of the major contributors. Prior to World War II, the USA was much more of a moral nation. The role of the mother was exalted, there were many large families, and few women were in the work force. But with the coming of Rosie the Riveter to the ship building yards in WW II things changed. Momma left home to work while another raised her child. The bearing of children was seen as restrictive, the size of families declined. With it all, America began a great moral decline.

Sad to say but we have many women today who are looking for a purpose in all kinds of places, when it is at home waiting for them. God's pattern for the home is being violated today more than at any time in our society. We are reaping the moral decline in our nation as never before. I believe people are looking for a better way. We as God's people know the way. Will we commit ourselves to lead the way?? It will take work, it will not be easy, we may have to give up some of our TOYS, we may have to buy clothes at Salvation Army. But we cannot afford the other option.

Let's take a look at some feminist arguments for women leaving the home and critique their bogus arguments. Let's begin by looking at the founders of Communism—Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. In *The Origin of the Family*, Engels wrote that the essence of the Communist goal is to destroy the traditional family by getting women to desert the home. He puts down the patriarchal family by falsely saying that men “command” women and “degrade” them. He says women are slaves to men, and when they are taken out of the home to earn money then they will be free. He says that when “The man took command in the home the woman was degraded and reduced to servitude; she became the slave of his lust and a mere instrument for the production of children ... within the family he is the bourgeois and his wife represents the proletariat.” Women, he says, are unpaid servants who have talents that can only be used if she is earning money in “social production” and “public industry.” Like all Feminists, he disparages homemaking saying that the wife's household labor “became a private service; the wife became the head servant, excluded from all participation in social production.” To liberal/communist/feminists there is only value in making money, not in anything a housewife does. Freedom for women will come when they get a paid job outside the home. He writes: “It will be plain that the first condition for the liberation of the wife is to bring the whole female sex into public industry and that this in turn demands the abolition of the monogamous family as the economic unit of society. ... The emancipation of woman will be possible only when ... domestic work no longer claims anything but an insignificant portion of her time.”

These evil words were revolutionary when they were written but they are now mainstream in much of Christianity now. Anyone who argues strongly for women leaving the home should think

carefully about the company he is keeping. The number one goal of Communists is to destroy the traditional family. Does anyone want to be on their side?

The Communist Manifesto is a little 40-page book written in the 19th century that changed the world of the 20th century. Marx and Engels list 10 core values. Their first core value is to “abolish private property.” One of their goals is “Heavy, progressive taxation.” They talk about “centralization” and big government. This is Cain writing. Abel writers like Adam Smith and John Locke wrote that private property was a sacred core value. John Adams said, “The moment that the idea is admitted into society that property is not as sacred as the laws of God and that there is not a force of law and public justice to protect it, anarchy and tyranny commence. Property must be sacred or liberty cannot exist.” Twentieth century America made a tragic mistake in rejecting the values of our founding fathers and embracing with enthusiasm the collectivist mentality of Marx and Engels.

Marx and Engels write that their goal is the, “Abolition of the family!” ... “The Communist Revolution is the most radical rupture with ... traditional ideas.” The family they are talking about abolishing is the traditional family that the 19th century had. The 10 values in this book are the opposite of the 10 values in *The Communist Manifesto*. This is my *Unificationist Manifesto*. Marx has his 10 “to do” list and I have mine. It is imperative that the UM is united on our “to do” list.

Happily there is a trend for Ph.D. and CEO women to return home in America. It is rare for a woman to become the CEO of a Fortune 500 company. One woman became head of Pepsi and then made headlines because she walked away from it. She said her two teen-age daughters were sick of her being away from home and needed her. She became a stay-at-home mom. Many people are waking up to the lie of feminist/communists and returning to the old-fashioned family. I hope the UM will see the light and join the traditionalist movement.

Tocqueville visited America in the early 19th century and wrote his classic book *Democracy in America*. He warns that if we take women out of the home and “mix them in business” we will produce “weak men and disorderly women”: “There are people in Europe who, confounding together the different characteristics of the sexes, would make man and woman into beings not only equal but alike. They would give to both the same functions, impose on both the same duties, and grant to both the same rights; they would mix them in all things—their occupations, their pleasures, their business. It may readily be conceived that by thus attempting to make one sex equal to the other, both are degraded, and from so preposterous a medley of the works of nature nothing could ever result but weak men and disorderly women.”

De Tocqueville’s prophecy has come true. American men are weak, and American women are disorderly. Father says this many times. Here is one of many examples from Father’s speeches: “... in this country women have a commanding voice at home. In a typical American home the wife is master of the house, while the husband is like a servant; his shoulder is hunched over and he is always checking to see what his wife’s mood is.

“Because of the fall of man the chain of order and command has been completely reversed, and now men follow behind women, particularly with regard to love affairs. Men have become so helpless, and women always take command” and “Now the time has come for women to restore their original role, particularly American women. Nowadays American men just do not want to get married and become the slaves of domineering women” (5-1-77). “Chain of command”? “Slaves”? This is pretty strong speech because he sees a matriarchy in American homes. Men may have a lot of position externally, but internally the women wear the pants.

Father often blasts America for letting women lead men, “Then are women meant to live their lives alone, following their own goals, without considering man? (No.) It is a very serious subject.

Women alone cannot live their lives. No matter how great a man might be, he cannot live his life on his own. No matter what this world might say, the inevitable consequence is that man and woman must travel together in life. Then how should men and women live their lives together, in conflict or in harmony? (Harmony.) Suppose they fought each other in order to occupy the central position? Who is usually the central figure of the average American family? You American men answer Father. [Laughter] Are you the center of your families? (Yes.) We are not talking about Unification families, but rather secular American families. Who plays the central role in the average secular American family? (Woman.) Those American women consider themselves as family queens who can control their husbands. Would such families prosper? (No.)” (5-5-96)

As feminism infiltrated America in the early part of the 20th century there were some voices of reason who tried to be alarm clocks to our sleeping nation. Mrs. John Martin wrote a book against feminism titled *Feminism: Its Fallacies and Follies* published in 1916 and articles in magazines and newspapers about the deadly ideology that was making women independent of men. Women, she pointed out, were losing maternal feelings. She was alarmed at the falling birth rate. Thomas Jefferson was America’s President in the beginning of the 19th century. In the early 1800s his daughter, Martha, had 12 children. No children of a President in the 20th century would even consider having 12 children. It would never even occur to them. Mrs. Martin wrote in an article in the *New York Times* on April 12, 1914 that men were changing from lords of creation to being superfluous:

Between feminism and the family there is an inherent and irreconcilable antagonism. They are pulling in opposite directions, and sooner or later society will find itself called upon to choose between them.

The family is a closely organized coherent interdependent group. The basic principle upon which it rests is the mutual dependence of its members. It is founded upon the needs of its members for one another. Were it not for these mutual needs the family would not have been formed.

All organizations rest upon the need of its parts for one another. The organs of the body find their continued existence as an organism because they need and serve one another. When this mutual dependence ceases dissolution begins.

When the cave-woman sat nursing her infant in the cave, that cave-man went forth to strangle wild beasts with his hands at a risk of his life to provide food for them all, and the stirrings of gratitude in her savage breast, prompting her to make the cave warm and comfortable against his return, to cook the food according to his liking mark the beginning of the home.

What distinguishes this human family from the mating pairs among the animals is their respective helplessness and need of one another. Without the man the woman will starve; without them both the child will perish; without the child and its prolonged period of helpless dependence upon them the bond which unites them will weaken.

It is the prolonged infancy of the human offspring which has been most potent in producing the organization of the family, and next to the dependence of the infant upon the parents, the dependence of woman upon man has been the chief agency in his development.

Moreover, on her part, gratitude, that most human of qualities, has worked in her the utmost womanly ingenuity of effort to please, reward and repay him.

The birthrate, as it is well known, has been notably falling, dating from the year 1876 or thereabout as the maternal instinct declines.

It is apparent that the unity of the family arises out of its common needs and mutual services. But when woman has no need for man as breadwinner and he has no need for her as home-maker, and the child has no further need for either of them as nurse, teacher, guide, friend, but finds most of its needs supplied elsewhere by paid experts generally outside of the home—then, with the disappearance of reciprocal needs and services, the cohesive force of the family dissolves, and when the last bond, affection, weakens from disuse the family easily disintegrates.

The family is a unity or it is nothing. Remove the needs which hold it together and the family disappears,

In our day certain powerful changes are at work in society, the effect of which is to remove little by little the needs which hold the family together and therefore point to a possible final dissolution of the family unit.

Unnatural Struggle

... there sprang up innumerable social quacks ready to demonstrate that the decay of the family was merely the breaking of the shell which held woman imprisoned and its consummation the setting of her “free”. In ever-increasing volume to this day they swell the chorus of thanksgiving. Women and girls by the millions, who have been sent out from the home to enter into an unnatural struggle for bread against the men who should be their natural protectors, robbed little by little of their reason for existence, are being taught to regard their condition as one of “liberation,” “freedom,” “progress.”

The Ideal Family

... the nature of the antagonism between feminism and the family becomes apparent. The keynote of the family is dependence; its very existence depends upon the mutual dependence of its members; the greater their degree of dependence the closer is its integrity. The keynote of feminism, on the contrary, is independence. The ideal family has no place in it for feminism, and feminism finds the family continually an obstacle in its way.

Putting Father Out of Business

The integrating factor of the family is the husband-father. Feminism is a process of putting father out of business; of deposing him from his position of distinction and responsibility as the family’s breadwinner. Feminism undertakes to render him superfluous and unnecessary. It is showing woman how she can quite well get along without him and still have everything that she wants— independence, prosperity, self-support, self-direction even independent motherhood if she desires it and can afford it.

Relieved of all responsibility and distinction, homeless, childless, wifeless, objectless, with nothing to do but stake out his own grub and lay in a supply of cigars and pocket money, man will wander through life like a lost soul; his final position as time goes on, becoming that of the drone in the beehive.

Lord of Creation

In the completed feminist state the male, preserved for one purpose only, will be permitted to drag out a subordinate and somewhat surreptitious existence, sneaking in and out of the back door, when sent for like a guilty plumber. He, once lord of creation, now reduced, as someone has said, to the domestic status of the tomcat.

The continued existence of our race depends upon keeping the desire for maternity alive in woman. But the final outcome of feminism is inevitably the deadening of this desire by reason of its antagonism to the family—the sole means of keeping it alive. Woman today, for the first time in history, holds in her hands the key to the situation. At her pleasure she may lock or unlock the gates of the future. Therefore nothing is more urgent than that she shall be released from the tightening, hardening effects of feminism and kept in the fruitful atmosphere of the family.

THE FLAWS OF FEMINISM

Mrs. Helen Andelin wrote an article on her website www.fascinatingwomanhood.net called “The Flaws of Feminism” saying:

What is feminism? Feminism is an aggressive program to claim and protect the rights of women. It was first launched in the 19th century by Susan B. Anthony and her followers who believed women were not given a fair deal in government and the market place and needed to demand equal rights with men.

Feminism began anew in the 1970s with an even more aggressive program, broader complaints and higher goals, gaining momentum until the 1980s when its flaws became apparent. The reason I am writing about it here is that many of you who stumble onto this web site or hear about the teachings of *Fascinating Womanhood* in other places, may find these teaching new, different and even strange, causing you to resist or challenge the teachings of *Fascinating Womanhood*. This is because for the past 20 to 30 years you have been exposed to the views of feminism and many of their teachings have influenced your way of thinking. To clear your mind of these false concepts and make it a fertile field for truth I will review the flaws of feminism. First let’s take a look at their views and goals:

From a 1970 *Weekly Reader*: “Today’s school girl may have a bright future in the world of work. Even now some women are becoming steel mill workers, drivers, jockeys, pilots and even Army generals. For years our country’s hard, high paying or important jobs were mostly ‘for men only.’ Now this is changing.”

From Betty Friedan, former president of N.O.W. “We hope to change the entire concept of man as the breadwinner and the decision making head of the family and the wife as the subordinate helpmeet.”

From Hubert Humphrey, a political figure who once ran for President: “One of the untapped resources of this country is woman power. We need them in science, medicine, engineering, politics, education—in all endeavors.”

Women in the feminist movement suffer a great misconception about life and its

most basic principles. For example, their complaint about “inequality” is a misconception. The man’s position as the breadwinner and decision making head of the family is not more important than the woman’s position in the home, as a wife, mother and homemaker. Both are essential building blocks of society—equally important but different in function. If women have been unhappy with their role in the home it is because they have not given enough to it. If we merely feed and clothe children and keep the house clean we are “unprofitable servants,” deserving neither thanks nor reward. Success and happiness comes when we make a wholehearted effort, go the second mile. This follows a principle of truth, “He who loseth his life in service to others, will surely find it.”

Women of the movement feel they must leave their meager roles in the home to serve humanity elsewhere. They must find a cure for cancer or serve in science, industry or the government. They ignore the fact that they can best serve society in the home, preparing their children to be useful citizens, instilling in them moral values, inspiring them to noble goals and serving as their husband’s support in an increasingly threatening world. We do not need a woman to be president or rescue a dwindling world. There are plenty of men to do that. The greatest need of our country today is better mothers and more secure, happy homes. In this lies the strength of America.

The feminists have rejected their feminine sphere, where they are so desperately needed and are forcing their way into the man’s world, thinking it is a better place. Here they must compete with men for equality. Here they must strive for position, taking on the traits of aggressiveness and determination if they are to succeed along with men. But women, if they are truly women, will never excel men in his world, unless they lose their womanliness. They will be misfits, wandering between two worlds but excelling in neither. They have underestimated the value of being a woman and exaggerated the benefits of being a man. There is no justification for women to desert their posts in the home and offer to help men solve their problems. Women have had a record of failure in the home. Most of our social problems stem from homes where the woman has failed to establish a successful home life. We have an alarmingly high record of divorce, family turmoil and youth problems. Isn’t it presumptuous on the part of women to leave their homes, where they have failed, and offer to help men solve their problems? The weak spot in America is the home— where the emphasis should be in solving problems.

Their complaint about discrimination is another misconception. If men have taken the initiative to keep women out of the man’s world or treat them differently it is because they respect femininity and would like to preserve their gentle nature. The feminists ignore a fundamental fact, that men and women are different psychologically, temperamentally and socially as well as physically. The theory that the masculine and feminine traits are learned is false. God created male and female and each was given characteristics to function in his role. One has only to care for a large number of children from infancy to see the pronounced difference in the male and female children as they play together, yet develop differently in nature. A busy mother does not have time to teach her children to be male and female. They are so without instruction.

It is strange, but the feminists never speak of love, either the love between a man

and a woman or between parents and children. Yet love, next to food and warmth, has been recognized as the most basic human need. And last, the feminists think entirely too much of what they want, instead of where their responsibility lies. If our world is to succeed, both men and women must serve where they are most urgently needed and do so unselfishly.

Feminists say that women can find fulfillment in working outside the home. Women should not leave the home and earn money because they often have to take orders from a man or men and often women lead other men. This is sexual chaos. The Bible explains that a woman is made to be her husband's helper. Father praises his wife for helping him prepare to go to work, "When Father, verging on seventy years old, wants to go out to the ocean, Mother prepares all his equipment with her whole heart. She even prepares the supplies needed in case he stays out overnight and prays for the accomplishment of Father's will. What a beautiful helper and supporter she is!" (*Blessing and Ideal Family*)

Father says women should not be aggressive like men:

Men and women certainly have different characteristics. Would it be better for us to follow the men or women's direction? I tend to agree with the men that we had better follow the men's direction because men are basically born with an outgoing, aggressive nature.

The characteristics of men and women are very obvious when they have extra time; men are always going out to find some adventure while women sit down to do needlework or draw pictures or work in the kitchen. What would have happened to this world if there had been no men but only women pioneering human civilization? If there were only women to advance human civilization, we might still be living in a primitive age. Do you women agree? It is women's nature to disagree and answer no, even though inside they know it is true.

All things considered, what are women really good for? Who designed your clothes, women or men? Answer me honestly, who runs faster, men or women? Who designed the watches and created the eyeglasses and made the beautiful rings that you women wear? You women are sitting idle and trying to exploit men, aren't you? Do women at least show gratitude and humbly accept whatever is given to them, or are they always trying to take advantage, taking more whenever they are given something? (5-21-77)

When a husband looks tired after working, she should prepare water to wash his face, and toothpaste and toothbrush to brush his teeth, and she should be able to wash his feet and comb his hair." (*Blessing and Ideal Family Part 2*)

Father teaches that wives need to be respected in their role of homemaker: "Are you men going to give more to your wives, or are you going to be indebted to them? You have promised to give more, so you must take it seriously and carry it out. Don't try to meddle in her management of the home—she is like the Home Minister and you are like the Foreign Minister!" ("In Search Of Our Home" July 11, 1982)

Husbands are called to be good leaders which means they should not be very critical of their wives. Father teaches: "Even though you may believe something your wife is doing is not right and you would like to tell her, don't say anything and don't fight about it. Even though it is very clear that she is wrong, leave her alone. Give her enough time to change. She knows she is wrong, so she will change. I mention this specifically for men who feel that when they know something is

wrong they must say something in criticism. If you have a critical nature you should not say all the things you might feel like saying.” (7-11-82)

Father says that husbands and wives have to live by the universal laws of the universe. They should not have any tension between them. “Unlike the secular world your life is never centered upon just the two of you ‘having fun’ together. Your goal is solving the two major problems of economics and education and the establishment of an enduring home. When one problem or the other becomes a source of great difficulty, there will be tension between you and your husband. Perhaps your husband will complain about the way you are educating the children, or perhaps you won’t have the money to pay bills and the electricity will be cut off sometimes” (7-11-82). Let’s build families that are well-oiled machines that are exemplary in solving the problems of economics and education. Brothers—make sure that your wives have a secure nest where the children are educated in morality and the electricity bill is always paid. Women should never have to worry about food, clothing or shelter.

The philosophy that degrades mothers who stay at home to care for their children is feminism. One of their favorite plays is Ibsen’s *A Doll’s House* in which the main character, Nora, leaves her family to find fulfillment. Mrs. Moon, the True Mother of mankind, says that it is not in Korean women’s “blood” to leave the home. She says, “We must become wives whom our husbands can trust as they trust God. A wife’s fidelity is our distinctive virtue. Korean women are descendants of Choon Hyang. We have blood that will never allow us to become descendants of Nora in *A Doll’s House* by Ibsen, who left home.”

Men look at work completely differently than women. Gilder says in *Sexual Suicide* that the feminist goal of having equal pay for equal work is “extremely difficult to apply.” Employers value motivation and career ambition more than anything. And men are more innately motivated because it is their God-given responsibility. He writes, “To most men, success at work is virtually a matter of life and death, for it determines his sexual possibilities and affirms his identity as a male in a socially affirmative way. A business thus can control a man by paying him well and can almost irrevocably purchase his loyalty by paying him above the amount he can earn elsewhere. The business literally has him by the balls. For a female employee the sexual constitution of money is much less important. Her sexual prospects are little affected by how much she makes. Thus even if the woman is a very dependable employee, a payment to her does not usually purchase as great a commitment as does a payment to man.” This is why women can take welfare and not suffer as much as men who take welfare. They are biologically made by God to be more objective and to be provided for. The reason government has grown so big is because the twentieth century is feminized. If our culture were masculine centered instead of feminine centered, if it was centered on the subject instead of the object, then there would be very little government and much more religion.

Helen Andelin writes: “Although a man may love his wife devotedly, it is not always possible or even right for him to make her Number One, and this is because of the nature of his life. A man’s Number One responsibility is to provide the living for his family. Often his work and life away from home are so demanding that it must take priority over all else if he is to succeed. This often means that he must neglect his family.... In reality, he is putting his wife and family both Number One, but women often fail to interpret it this way.”

“In addition to making the living, men have always shouldered the responsibility to make the world a better place. They have largely been the builders of society— have solved world problems and developed new ideas for the benefit of all. This challenging role of public servant is not easy and also demands the man’s attention away from his family.”

“If you will examine the lives of these noble public servants, you will usually find a wife who was

willing to put the man and his work Number One and be content to take a second place. President and Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower are a good example of this. Mrs. Eisenhower recalls that during the first two weeks of their 53-year-long marriage, her husband drew her aside one evening and said, ‘Mamie, I have to tell you something.... My country comes first and you second.’ Mamie accepted this, and this is the way they lived. So, when you make a man Number One, you also make his work and outside responsibility Number One. But when the wife takes a second place to the man and his world, she loses nothing. The tender love he returns for her cooperation is more than a compensating reward.”

“When a woman fails to fill the man’s need to be Number One, when she puts her children, homemaking, career or other interests first, he can suffer a tremendous lack. This is often the very reason a man is driven to another woman. In fact, it is a very well known fact that men are seldom driven to a mistress because of sex passions. It is usually her ability to fill an emotional need, to make him feel appreciated and important in her life.”

Sun Myung Moon is the finest teacher in human history on marriage and family. He often explains the woman’s role is to care for her husband and children. The husband comes first: “Women have two duties: to love your children and to love your husband. Who comes first, your children or your husband? (Husband.) You don’t sound very confident in your answer. Please answer Father clearly. (Husband.) That is true.” (5-5-96)

In *Fascinating Womanhood* Helen Andelin writes, “Dr. David V. Haws, chairman of psychiatry, General Hospital in Phoenix has said, ‘Mother must be returned to the home. The standard of living is a fictitious thing. It is a woman’s primordial function to stay home and raise children. She should not join the hunt with men. A man, too, feels less of a man when his wife works.’” Mrs. Andelin and books like hers teach that women earning money in the marketplace hurts men, women, children and the nation. She writes, “Harm to the Man. When you work, you rob your husband of his right to meet ordinary challenges, and to grow by these challenges. And, as you become capable, efficient, and independent, he feels less needed, and therefore less masculine. This weakens him. As you lift, he sets the bucket down.” Of course feminist women and their feminized men strongly disagree with statements like this and say they are doing just fine in their so-called progressive, modern and enlightened marriages that are “beyond” patriarchy in the out-of-date biblical, old-fashioned family. Feminists love to talk about “diversity” and being “flexible.” To them there are many kinds of families and all are equally happy. What is our definition of family? Where do we draw the line? I believe Father clearly says there is only one kind of family—the traditional family that honors the innate differences between men and women. All other types of families are inferior and therefore poor role models.

The traditional, patriarchal family is God’s design. Jesus said, “Enter by the narrow gate; for the gate is wide and the way is easy, that leads to destruction, and those who enter by it are many. For the gate is narrow and the way is hard, that leads to life, and those who find it are few” (Matt. 7:14-15). The next verse says, “Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep’s clothing but inwardly are ravenous wolves” (Matt: 7:16). The cultural elite of America are the wolves dressed as sheep saying that the Bible is wrong and there are many kinds of families.

When women work they usually see successful men. This is dangerous. The Andelin’s write: “Still another harm to consider is the woman’s relationship to her employer, especially if he is a man. The wife is accustomed to looking at her husband as the director of her activities. When she finds herself taking orders from another man, it is an unnatural situation for her. She owes him a certain obedience as her employer. And in countless hours of close contact she may find herself physically attracted to him. Seeing him at his best and perhaps as a more dynamic and effective leader than her husband, she makes comparisons unfavorable to her husband whose faults and failings she knows all too well.”

A woman may have a good man as her boss and this is dangerous. She may have an archangel type of man and that is dangerous. The reverse is also true. A man may work for a good woman and compare his wife unfavorably, or he may have an Eve type boss and struggle with that. Husbands should not let their wives be bossed around by other men. Andelin writes: "She cannot serve two masters. Her neglect of home life results in lack of love, attention, and development of the children as well as her failure to serve as the understanding wife."

When most women stayed home America did not have the massive breakdown in family and problems with kids like we do today where most women work outside the home. Newt Gingrich said, "American civilization cannot survive with twelve-year-olds having babies, fifteen-year-olds shooting one another, seventeen-year-olds dying of AIDS, and eighteen-year-olds graduating with diplomas they cannot read." More and more social workers pinpoint the cause of these problems to the breakdown of the traditional family. Dr. Brenda Hunter is a renowned psychologist, author of *Home by Choice: Creating Emotionally Secure Children in an Insecure World*. She has appeared on radio, national television, and before congressional staff. She says in an interview with *The World & I* magazine:

For the past twenty-five years, the mother at home has been massively devalued by the culture. The eighties was the era of the superwoman, and it also was the time when the notion of quality time developed, was demythologized, and disappeared. You don't hear anybody talking about quality time now. What I'm hearing more and more is employed mothers talking about the reality of being too pushed, too pressured.

Instead of believing in quality time, we have developed what I call the myth of the infinitely resilient child. This child can enter day care at three weeks of age, experience a succession of care givers until he enters school, come home to an empty house during his school years, and then emerge at age eighteen with a strong core sense of self. Everything I know tells me this is not accurate. Children need an enormous amount of committed, on-line parental time. A legion of mothers know this and are choosing to stay home.

What I'm seeing as a therapist is this: Adults who in their childhood experienced rejection by their mothers have difficulty establishing close interpersonal relationships. The mother is the architect of intimacy. I've come to see this more strongly as I've been working as a therapist. The mother really is the architect of intimacy.

The crusade of the Left for day care has been a disaster. Now there is research that shows it has been harmful such as we read in *Home-Along America: The Hidden Toll of Day Care, Behavioral Drugs, and Other Parent Substitutes* by Mary Eberstadt. La Shawn Barber writes this in his review of an excellent book against day care titled *Day Care Deception*:

My fondest memory of childhood was coming home from school knowing my mother would be there to greet me. Because she provided me with security and attention, my natural inclination to imagine, to write and to create developed spontaneously. My mother was committed to raising me and my three siblings herself. As Brian C. Robertson points out in his persuasive new book, *Day Care Deception: What The Child Care Establishment Isn't Telling Us*, a growing number of children are not so fortunate.

Some children spend 35 to 40 hours per week at day care centers. Despite a mounting body of evidence that commercial day care is psychologically and

physiologically harmful to children, the industry is thriving. Robertson expertly makes the case for parental care over commercial care in his well-researched 222-page book.

Ever since women entered the workforce during WWII to make up for the shortage of men, the feminist movement has done much to discredit their traditional roles. In the 1960s, feminists began clamoring for universal day care. “A significant contingent of feminists and civil rights activists was bent on overturning long-held assumptions about the family,” Robertson writes. One assumption held for generations was that parents knew best. Robertson warns parents not to defer to “child development experts” in rearing their children.

A damning indictment on the day care industry, *Day Care Deception* is long overdue. Robertson warns, “We are just beginning to see the consequences of this enormous, unprecedented shift toward a new and basically untested way of rearing and socializing young children.” Our children, once considered a valuable resource for America’s future, may soon become its chief liability.

Aubrey Andelin in *Man of Steel and Velvet* says, “The trend for the Mother to be out of the home is a pattern of living which has extended for many years in America, since the emergency of World War II took millions of women into the factories. It has been during this time that we have developed some of our most threatening social problems—marriage problems, divorce, violence in the streets, drug abuse, and rebellion against social customs and moral standards. Many of these problems can be traced to homes of working mothers.”

Father says the role of mothers, these architects of intimacy, are central: “The key to world peace is to bring mind and body into unity and also man and woman into unity, which is another form of mind and body. The core of the American problem lies in the family, and the center of the family is the mother. If the mother plays her role correctly, then that is the way to restore the family” (4-24-94). Father is saying there is a role for women different from the role for men:

When you blessed couples start a family, the husband should lead a public life (life of service) and the wife should be in charge of the family life (the domestic life). Will you be a representative and exemplary family?

The wife should make her husband successful; that is to say that she should be his great supporter.” (*Blessing and Ideal Family*)

Beverly LaHaye teaches that a woman having a career hurts both men and women. She writes in *The Restless Woman* that the workplace is one of “fierce competition,” and women do not belong there: “A division is created between males and females when they are forced to compete with each other. The relationship between men and women should be one of cooperation, not fierce competition. The tendency of women to compete in the work world with men results in their masculinization. ... A masculine man is attracted by the feminine characteristics in a woman—qualities such as gentleness and virtue. He’s not seeking a clone of himself. The attraction that men and women have for each other is in their ‘differentness’—not their sameness.” Opposites attract!

In a chapter titled “The Withering Away of the Family” in *The Recovery of Family Life*, Elton and Pauline Trueblood write, “When we consider the human price of this increasingly accepted social pattern of double earning, we usually stress the harmful effects upon children or the hardening of the mothers, but the effect upon the adult men may be quite as important in the long run. Once men took great pride in being able to provide for their families and resented any implication that a

second paycheck was needed, but now many men welcome whatever help the wife can give. What we are witnessing is a feminization of men, a psychological development independent of physical characteristics. In modern life a man often goes from dependence on one woman to dependence upon another. Thus the man is cheated of his basis of self-respect and the woman is cheated in that she never has the sense of security which a strong man gives. In this situation it is hard to know how much is cause and how much is effect; the wife has to earn because the man does not provide sufficiently, but his very failure to provide may come partly because of a social pattern which undermines his self-respect.”

“We are sure of two things. First, those of us who do not face this economic and social problem must be very tender toward those who do, and, second, we must understand clearly the human harm which comes as the family withers away at important levels in our society. Only as we understand the loss will we have the incentive adequate to make us use our imagination to reverse the process of decay.” He says women are trying “to perform the miracle of carrying on two full-time occupations at once.”

ARCHITECT OF INTIMACY

Brenda Hunter in *Home by Choice* says that when women bring home paychecks, “men lose authority.” The result is that men increasingly get less strong and decisive. Finally, she says, “intimacy” is lost from the home. A woman, she says, is the “architect of intimacy,” and when she works she is too stressed, tired and busy to really respond to her family as they need her. She says that, “when emotional intimacy disappears in a marriage, it isn’t long before sexual intimacy evaporates as well.” She writes: “grown men, as well as little children, need someone at home to function as a ‘secure base.’ The wife and mother, it seems, is the architect of intimacy for her husband as well as her children.”

FRAGILE MALE EGO

There is a popular belief that men are basically brutish despots who are not faithful to women. Women are seen as superior in morals and kindness. Every man is seen as having a “fragile male ego.” Their ego is viewed as being so delicate that women must be careful to not upset men by competing with them.

Men are designed by God to be strong leaders but our culture is so out of order that men have become confused and therefore timid. Feminists have created a society which is so polluted that it is hard for anyone to understand how sick it is. An analogy is that the perfect ecology in nature is powerful but if it is upset by even a small thing it can weaken and even destroy the environment.

Housewife is Ecologist

Edith Schaeffer helped her husband build a worldwide ministry from their home. In her books she teaches women to treasure the career in the home to build families as an “oasis” as she did with her home. In her book, *What is a Family?* she says that everyone is concerned with the environment. There are laws in nature, and when man disrupts them all hell can break loose. She gives examples of how devastating things became when people did simple things like introduce an animal or a plant to an area and change its whole ecostructure. She goes on to detail how devastating it is when women leave the home or how the environment blossoms when women do the right things in the home. She ends that section by saying, “A living, growing, changing real family is as thoroughly an ecological demonstration of what human beings thrive in as any ‘experimental farm.’ It is as noble a career as can be entered in the ecological field! Profession? ‘Housewife.’ No! ‘Ecologist’ — in the most important area of conservation—the family.”

In *Fascinating Womanhood* Helen Andelin writes:

When a man's and woman's roles are not distinctly divided it is called a blurring of roles. In this case the woman does part of the man's work and he does part of hers. ...it can be injurious to the family.

If children are to develop their sexual nature, they need a strong masculine and feminine image to pattern from. The mother demonstrates this feminine image when she functions in her feminine role. As she moves about the house in feminine clothes, tending to her domestic work, tenderly caring for her children, and nursing her baby, she provides this image. If she also indicates contentment and happiness in her role, she gives her children a positive picture of femininity.

When the father functions in his masculine role as a strong leader, protector, and provider, and when his children are given the opportunity to see him in action once in awhile, and see that he willingly assumes his masculine responsibility and enjoys his work, he provides them with a favorable masculine image. With this distinct masculine and feminine image in the home, boys grow up to be masculine men and girls feminine women.

When this is not so, when there is a blurring of roles it can lead to problems. Much homosexuality is traced to homes which have a blurring of the roles. The girls and boys from these homes have not had a sexual image to pattern from. This has denied them normal sexual development.

When we think of all the things children need to learn as they are growing up, and what we need to teach them if they are to become normal, successful, happy human beings, nothing is more important than a boy becoming a masculine man and a girl becoming a feminine woman.

We cannot fight universal laws and win. Women working has driven men into the arms of another woman. Even well-meaning conservative and religious women who have left their homes with the motivation to help mankind have experienced coming home from work one day and found a son who became gay or a daughter a lesbian. This has happened to some famous Republican women. Where do we find the greatest breakdown of the family and the greatest violence? It is where there is the least patriarchy. It is the black matriarchies of the inner city. When we reject the biblical model of a patriarchal family we reject order and maximum achievement in life.

George Gilder in *Men and Marriage* explains that men have to be workaholics in the marketplace if they want to succeed, "Just as the female role cannot be shared or relinquished, the male role also remains vital to social survival.... On forty-hour weeks, most men cannot even support a family of four. They must train at night and on weekends; they must save as they can for future ventures of entrepreneurship; they must often perform more than one job. They must make time as best they can to see and guide their children. They must shun the consolations of alcohol and leisure, sexual indulgence and flight. They must live for the perennial demands of the provider role." He must perform a "lifetime of hard labor.... All the major accomplishments of civilization spring from the obsessions of men whom the sociologists would now disdain as 'workaholics.'" Men, he says, "must give their lives to unrelenting effort, day in and day out, focused on goals in the distant future. They must struggle against scarcity, entropy, and natural disaster. They must overcome the sabotage of socialists who would steal and redistribute their product. They must resist disease and temptation. All too often they must die without achieving their ends. But their sacrifices bring others closer to the goal."

“Nothing that has been written in the annals of feminism gives the slightest indication that this is a role that women want or are prepared to perform. The feminists demand liberation. The male role means bondage to the demands of the workplace and the needs of the family. Most of the research of sociologists complains that men’s work is already too hard, too dangerous—too destructive of mental health and wholeness. It all too often leads to sickness and ‘worlds of pain,’ demoralization and relatively early death. The men’s role that feminists seek is not the real role of men but the male role of the Marxist dream in which ‘society’ does the work.”

George Gilder in *Sexual Suicide* (revised later to *Men and Marriage*) explains that as women become aggressive, men leave the home and turn to destructive behavior which we see increasing as women become more aggressive. He writes, “As a general rule of anthropology, the likelihood of his presence in the home decreases in direct proportion to the aggressiveness of the woman. Instead, he will conduct male rituals, drink, commit crimes, hunt, seek power, take drugs, pursue women on male terms. Unless he is performing a masculine service for the marriage commensurate in some way with the bearing of a child, the marriage will cramp his manhood. He will feel unworthy of the woman and thus unable to love her. The relationship will fail.” “The women’s movement is striking at the Achilles’ heel of civilized society: the role of the male.”

In *Men and Marriage* he writes, “The imperious power and meaning of male sexuality remains a paramount fact of life and the chief challenge to civilized society. Failing to come to terms with masculinity, a society risks tearing its very ligaments—the marriage and family ties that bind men to the social order. For it is only their masculinity, their sexual nature, that draws men into marriages and family responsibilities. When our social institutions deny or disrespect the basic terms of male nature, masculinity makes men enemies of family and society.”

I think it is better training for a young Unificationist sister to be with elder women as they make a quilt together than having her go door-to-door alone in some strange city making money that emasculates, confuses and demoralizes brothers. It would be better to have young sisters live in a cozy community where they are near nature and can have a garden. Becoming experts at preparing salads with organic lettuce and carrots they grew themselves is far better training than sending them to pushy, harsh, macho sales teams. It is better sisters are trained by elder women who teach them how to care for babies and the elderly and grow flowers than going from bar to bar selling flowers to drunken men. They don’t need to travel so much, and they don’t need to spend time in dangerous cities damaging their hearts and minds by trying to earn big money.

Helen Andelin says that a woman staying home is the ultimate romantic life. What woman does not want romance? When women work they reduce romance in their life. Mrs. Andelin writes that when the wife works and when her man sees other women excelling him in the marketplace it breaks his heart, but the traditional family brings “soul satisfaction,”: “Picture, if you can, a mother at home nurturing her little ones, making a comfortable home for her family; the father goes out into the world, struggling against the elements and oppositions of life to bring home the necessities and comforts for his loved ones. This romantic scene, instead of being taken for granted, should be viewed as the heart and core of life which, when lived properly, brings soul satisfaction that cannot be measured. There is nothing to equal it and nothing more important.”

Father says, “Father cannot compete with Mother in loving a child. Because the mother pours out power more than anyone else and suffers more than anyone else in bearing a child, she more than anyone else loves the child.

“In this respect, woman occupies the eminent and precious position in the realm of emotion. No matter how much the father loves his baby, he doesn’t know love as much as the mother does. Therefore, women will go to the Kingdom of Heaven of heart. Understanding this, it is not too bad to be born as a woman. God is fair.” (*Blessing and Ideal Family*)

Helen Andelin teaches that women should not work “to ease the pinch ... for luxuries ... when you are bored at home ... to ease the load for the man ... to do something important.” On doing important things she writes, “You may feel that what you are doing from day to day in the home is relatively unimportant, and that men have the more important jobs. Noble contribution to mankind, you may reason, are made in the fields of science, industry, government or the arts.

“Women who think this have a false notion. They exaggerate the importance of the man’s work, and underestimate the importance of the woman’s work in the home. Noble as the contributions of men are, they do not surpass a well-brought up family. A doctor spends his time *saving lives*. You on the other hand, in the simple routine of your home, are *saving souls*. Learn to see the distant scene, how your patient devotion to family produces men and women of worth, the greatest contribution.”

Helen Andelin’s books are overwhelmingly correct. But I disagree once in a while with her. For example, she writes that women are “justified in working” in certain circumstances such as “if you are widowed, divorced, single, or your husband is disabled.” Then she says, “If your husband is physically able, you are justified in the following situations.” She lists them as “Compelling Emergencies,” and “Furthering the Husband’s Education or Training.” Douglas Phillips in his audiotape, *The Blessed Marriage*, is correct in saying this is not a good idea because the worst thing that has happened to marriage is women leaving their homes. Countless marriages have been destroyed because of men and women working closely with each other.

It seems that a core value in many homes in America is to push girls to go to school to get a skill and education that will give her a good paying job. The reasoning is that half of all marriages fail so she will have a way to earn income if she divorces. Or her husband could die or not be able to support a family by himself as most men think they cannot in today’s economy. A woman should get an education to be a good teacher of her children, not to advance a career. A man should have enough term life insurance that his wife could live comfortably for life on the interest if he dies. If a man has a \$500,000 term life policy (never buy whole life insurance) and his wife bought debt-free income producing real estate that brought a 10% return then she would get \$50,000 a year.

Women are to focus on being dependent on other men instead of working in the marketplace competing with them. Teddy Roosevelt said: “There are certain old truths which will be true as long as this world endures, and which no amount of progress can alter. One of these is the truth that the primary duty of the husband is to be the homemaker, the breadwinner for his wife and children, and that the primary duty of the woman is to be the helpmeet, the housewife, and mother. The woman should have ample educational advantages; but ... she need not be, and generally ought not to be, trained for a lifelong career as the family breadwinner.”

When women go to work it often becomes a lifetime habit. Some women start working with the idea they will only work for a brief time but many end up working their entire life.

Unificationists need to write their values and be completely united on those written values.

When a woman gets a job she is taking a job away from a man. Women in the marketplace weaken a nation’s economy. Helen Andelin writes in *Fascinating Womanhood*:

The working wife has also upset the economy of our country so that now she feels locked into working. In 1975 I made a prediction on national TV. It was a time when women were crying for the chance to work outside the home. I addressed such women with this statement: ‘If you don’t stop crying for the choice for work, you will so upset the economy of this country that the time will come when you will not have a choice—you will have to work.’ That time has

come. Employers have now lowered pay to fit a two-income family. In many cases a mother feels she must work. She seems to have no choice. She feels locked in.

If you are a working wife who feels locked in, the situation is not irreversible. First, learn the womanly art of thrift so you can live on your husband's income. If necessary, sell your home and move to one less expensive, in a less prestigious neighborhood. If you have two cars, sell one. Cut out vacations and spend time at the park or go to the mountains. Meals can be made simpler and less expensive without losing nutritive value. Be content with fewer clothes, content to wear them over and over. Shop for children's clothes at used clothing stores.

The next step is to quit work. Do all you can to provide a peaceful home life, build your husband's self-confidence, and live all of F.W. These things motivate your husband toward success, toward a more adequate income.

The courage required to take this step, and the faith you demonstrate in doing that which is morally right, bring unexpected blessings from God. Benefits come that you have no way to anticipate. Solutions appear that make life better than before. You cannot lose by doing what is right.

When you quit it brings immediate peace in the household. Mother is home when the children come home from school. She is rested, composed, not in a hurry. The house is tidy and homey. All is well. This brings more lasting memories than the fine material comforts.

Mrs. Andelin is correct in saying that working women "upset" the economy. If women want to be patriotic and love their country they would not hurt the national economy by entering the marketplace. Let's look at this for a minute. A reviewer of Allan Carlson's *The "American Way": Family and Community in the Shaping of the American Identity* wrote that Carlson says: "The subsequent flood of married women into the workplace depressed men's wages, increased the commercialization of the household economy (the roots of today's obesity epidemic), and starved America's previously rich associational life."

Allan Carlson is a distinguished writer on family and government. He wrote a review of a book titled *The Two-Income Trap: Why Middle Class Mothers and Fathers Are Going Broke* saying the, "feminist economic project has produced widespread disaster for American families, children ... and women as well. ... the feminists' coveted 'two-breadwinner family' has, in practice, brought the 'dance of financial ruin.' ... families saw real wages for men decline: the predictable result of more laborers pursuing the same number of jobs." Carlson wrote in his book *The "American Way"* about the work of Gary Becker who won the Nobel Prize for economics in 1992. One reviewer wrote of him, "Becker is recognized for his expertise in economics of the family." Carlson writes, "Nobel Laureate Gary Becker has shown [in his book *A Treatise on the Family*] that notable economic gains associated with marriage come from a division of labor in the home, as when a housewife focuses on domestic tasks and a husband on outside labor. As American men and women became more alike in economic function after 1970, [when Father arrived in America] the financial advantage of the joint (married) household faded, and the marriage rate began to fall. Partly for the same reason, the divorce rate rose 150 percent. With women shifting priorities away from home toward outside work, the marriage birthrate tumbled sharply as well, particularly during the early 1970s. Meanwhile, the number, rate and ratio of out-of-wedlock births climbed steadily." We can see from this that women leaving the home hurts the nation.

Some of Sun Myung Moon's followers have written their views on what is true masculinity and true femininity. Joong Hyun Pak and Andrew Wilson in their book *True Family Values* write:

The marriage relationship requires different roles. ... The husband is like heaven; the wife is like the earth. ... It is the nature of a man to be forthright and initiate love. It is the nature of a woman to be modest and wait for love. A man is endowed with a mind and body fit to hard labor and to an aggressive public life. A woman has the abilities fit for nurturing children.

Division of Labor

There is an economic division of labor between public and private. There is the function of breadwinner ...taken by the father, who goes out into the world to earn a salary. Then there is the responsibility to manage the home and raise the children ...by the mother.

Complementary Roles

The complementary roles of husband and wife in a relationship make for a strong and beautiful attraction. In their love, they honor each other's distinctive roles and contribute their different abilities to the welfare of the whole.

Contemporary feminists have advocated absolute equality between men and women, but based on rights, not on love. ... Feminism has done a disservice to family life. It is paradoxical but true that spurning the natural differences between men and women, feminism has impoverished and weakened the family. Families centered on true love start by honoring the natural diversity of roles out of which love grows, and end by achieving true equality.

Andrew Wilson in *World Scripture: a Comparative Anthology of Sacred Texts* shows the similarities in religions on many basic areas of life. In his chapter titled "Husband and Wife" he says this before he gives quotes from the sacred texts of different religions that agree with what he writes: "But love is not merely a matter of unfettered emotion. Subsequent passages spell out some of the responsibilities of marriage for both the husband and wife. The husband should honor his wife, never oppress or mistreat her, and always be faithful—and the wife should do likewise. The scriptures of all religions also distinguish between roles of the husband and wife: the husband protects and supports his wife, the head of the household yet deferring to his wife in domestic affairs. The wife is obedient to her husband, serves him with kindness, and takes primary responsibility for raising the children. While of late these traditional roles have been questioned, they have served to strengthen the bonds of family through every generation."

The following are a few quotations given in Wilson's book:

"Men are the protectors and maintainers of women, because God has given the one more strength than the other, and because they support them from their means. Therefore the righteous women are devoutly obedient, and guard in the husband's absence what God would have them guard" (Islam. *Qur'an* 4.34).

"In the family women's appropriate place is within; men's, without. When men and women keep their proper places they act in accord with Heaven's great norm. Among the members of the family are the dignified master and mistress whom we term father and mother. When father, mother, sons, elder and younger brothers all act in a manner suited to their various positions within the family, when husbands play their proper role and wives are truly wifely, the way of that

family runs straight. It is by the proper regulation of each family that the whole world is stabilized.” (Confucianism. *I Ching 37: The Family*)

“You wives, be submissive to your husbands, so that some, though they do not obey the Word, may be won without a word by the behavior of their wives, when they see your reverent and chaste behavior” (Christianity. *Bible*, 1 Peter 3:1-6).

“Wives, be subject to your husbands, as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Savior.” (Christianity. *Bible*, Ephesians 5:21-33)

Here are a few more quotes I personally found:

“By a girl, by a young woman, or even by an aged one, nothing must be done independently, even in her own house. In childhood a female must be subject to her father, in youth to her husband, when her lord is dead to her sons; a woman must never be independent” (Hinduism. *Laws of Manu*, V, 147-8).

“It does not belong to a woman to determine anything for herself, but she is subject to the rule of Three Obediences: when young she must obey her father, when married she must obey her husband, when a widow she has to obey her son” (Confucius).

In *The Divine Principle Home Study Course* we read, “While it has recently become fashionable in some circles to interpret the differences between men and women purely in terms of cultural conditioning, *Divine Principle* would see such an interpretation as questionable. In a famous work by Switzerland’s Professor Emil Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, for example, this scholar describes a biological difference between the sexes that is basic and deep-seated. Spiritually, he tells us, the man expresses the productive principle while the woman exemplifies the principle of bearing and nourishing. Man tends to turn more to the outside world while the woman concentrates more on the inner realm. The male often seeks the new and the female longs to preserve the old. While the man often likes to roam about, the woman prefers to make a home.

“For *Divine Principle*, such distinctive orientations exist by divine design. Physically and psychologically, man and woman are to complete each other’s inner nature and outer structure.”

TAMING OF THE SHREW

Shakespeare’s *The Taming of the Shrew* ends by Petruchio telling Kate to explain to “headstrong women” how they are to live with their husbands. He says:

Katherine, I charge thee, tell these headstrong women
What duty they do owe their lords and husbands.

She responds:

Thy husband is thy lord, thy life, thy keeper,
Thy head, thy sovereign; one that cares for thee,
And for thy maintenance; commits his body
To painful labor both by sea and land,
To watch the night in storms, the day in cold,
Whilst thou liest warm at home, secure and safe;
And craves no other tribute at thy hands

But love, fair looks, and true obedience;
Too little payment for so great a debt.
Such duty as the subject owes the prince,
Even such a woman oweth to her husband.
And when she is forward, peevish, sullen, sour,
And not obedient to his honest will,
What is she but a foul contending rebel,
And graceless traitor to her loving lord?
I am ashamed that women are so simple
To offer war where they should kneel for peace,
Or seek for rule, supremacy, and sway,
When they are bound to serve, love, and obey.

One of the founders of American feminism, Susan B. Anthony said, “Women must not depend upon the protection of men but must be taught to protect herself.” Gloria Steinem, the most famous feminist of the twentieth century, summed up the feminist philosophy in one sentence when she said, “A liberated woman is one who has sex before marriage and a job after.” A godly woman does not have sex before marriage and is a stay-at-home mom after marriage.

Hollywood and TV Brainwashing

Many Hollywood movies and television shows have promoted the immoral lifestyle taught by Gloria Steinem and other feminist leaders. In the movie, *Father of the Bride*, Spencer Tracy is a pathetic patriarch. Elizabeth Taylor plays his daughter. She was 18 years old then. In the movie she announces at the dinner table she is engaged. In the Last Days Satan has worked to make sure that young people do not consult with their parents in the choosing of a mate. This movie was made in 1950 and shows that patriarchy was dead in the 1950s.

There is a scene in the movie where the father asks the daughter to tell her fiancé that he would like to talk to him about finances. The daughter is disgusted he would do that saying such a thing is a joke—that it is just “old-fashioned rigmarole.” Elizabeth Taylor went on to become one of the most famous superstars in the 20th century who rejected old-fashioned values. She has been married eight times and is currently unmarried in her old age. Katharine Hepburn was Spencer Tracy’s mistress. Hepburn may have earned more Oscars than any other actress, but she has never had children. The disease of feminism is deadly to the marriage and family and therefore personal happiness.

Forty years later Hollywood remade the movie *Father of the Bride* with Steve Martin. The daughter is now determined to have a career after she is married. Traditional family values are constantly portrayed as oppressive and restrictive as seen in movies like *American Beauty* and *Pleasantville*. Christian leaders have not been able to counter the media’s brainwashing because they are divided and often confused themselves.

The Provider

Aubrey Andelin writes in *Man of Steel and Velvet*: “We have already learned of a man’s sacred responsibility to rule the family and protect them from the hardness of life. His obligation to provide the living is just as sacred, for in the beginning God said, ‘In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, until thou return to the ground.’ We need to remember this command was not given to the woman, but to the man. This he must do regardless of the struggle involved or the diversion of other interests that may be uppermost in his mind.”

“There’s a disregard nowadays for this sacred and traditional role. ... Many feel the man’s role as sole provider is unfair, that it overtaxes him and may be injurious to his health. They advocate an equal sharing of this burden. In return he’s expected to share equally in housework and child care. Some advocate the government also share the responsibility. When a man’s load grows heavy, he’s entitled to assistance. ... This is a far cry from God’s command and has led to unexpected difficulties.

“Trends and laws don’t establish correct principles. There’s a consequence for disobedience to eternal law. Man’s responsibility to provide is a fact of life. A failure on his part creates serious problems. In the New Testament the Apostle Paul warned, ‘If any provide not for his own he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel.’ (I Tim. 5:8).

“The responsibility to provide the living should be in top priority in a man’s life— his first and foremost obligation. ... Not only is his a sacred responsibility—it’s a moral one. Each man has this obligation to care for himself, his wife and children. A man who does so is a gift to society. The man who doesn’t is a burden. Because of his failure, others must sacrifice to carry a responsibility that belongs to him. In this failure he’s failed as a man. He doesn’t have strength, but weakness. This is the most fundamental area in which he must function. The man who does not provide for his own is not a man.” The Andelins correctly explain that men can do all the work of the world—even traditional jobs like nursing. Women can volunteer their time in hospitals to help, but God’s will is that no woman earns money. A woman who thinks she has to work has not focused on making it a goal in her life to have a godly man or men care for her.

Suzanne Fields wrote in one of her newspaper columns (1-19-06) that feminists hate the stay-at-home mom. She quotes Linda Hirshman who wrote an essay titled ‘Homeward Bound’ in *American Prospect*, a liberal magazine saying, “The family—with its repetitious, socially invisible, physical tasks—is a necessary part of life, but it allows fewer opportunities for full human flourishing than public spheres like the market or the government.” Fields comments, “In her telling of it, home and family is still the deadly trap for women, a trap that Betty Friedan once called ‘a comfortable concentration camp.’”

Patriarchy means that men are the leaders of their home. They work all day and may be tired when they come home. But the woman does not stop working in the home. Men should stretch and work in their home along side with their wife. When they play, they should play together as a family as much as possible. Men should give attention to their wife and kids. They should praise them for all they do. This means a husband should know what his wife is doing. The home is so devalued that it has become a place for men to space out and watch ball games on TV now. Women cook and put the kids to bed at night while he watches junk on TV. Men should be family men. They should be involved in their kid’s education—teaching them values and knowledge. We are at war with feminists who work day and night for their agenda to disparage homemakers.

LEADERS TAKE RESPONSIBILITY

Whenever there is a problem we have to examine leadership. If women are out of order it is because men are not doing their job. Unificationist husbands need to make it a priority to create an atmosphere where their wives feel secure and not be confused and frantic. Men have to take the primary responsibility for the breakdown of the family and nation that we see today.

COMPARTMENTALIZE

Women are made biologically and spiritually to be mothers whose world is primarily the home. Men are created by God to be able to compartmentalize. They can work outside the home and then come home and focus on their family. Women do not have this ability. Men and women’s brains

are wired differently. My wife and I have raised both boys and girls. Our sons did not play with dolls like our daughters. If women mix home and work they feel pressured and become completely overloaded.

Of course she can physically fundraise and maintain a job but what is not obvious but very substantial is the spiritual fallout from maintaining two full time jobs. By focusing on one she neglects the other and her original mind and heart are devastated. There is no security and no safety in her inner core. So she gets into a defense mode and war mode. This is not conducive to a good family life. And women are essential for creating a home and intimacy. Without their full attention there is no home or intimacy. Hence, since women have started working there is a high divorce rate, much juvenile delinquency, and much violence in society.

Modern men and women are completely confused and in a dust cloud about masculinity and femininity. The world is so out of order it is difficult to walk out the door and look at it. Everything is so ugly and disgusting. It is total chaos.

It is time to return to chivalry and protect women from the harshness of this world. In context, Father is completely politically incorrect.

WOMEN ARE LIKE “BASKETS”

Father says in a parable-like speech, “American women may feel that my explanation of life gives them no value whatsoever. Women are like an empty receiving basket. Your value will be determined by the contents you hold within your basket. I suggest that you utilize your beautiful face, well-developed bosom and hips and produce as many precious children as possible. That is your value” (6-9-96). A woman’s value does not come from competing with men in the marketplace. It is in having many children and caring for them in the home.

Helen Andelin writes, “A man also has an inborn need to feel needed as a provider, to feel that his wife depends on him for financial support and can’t get by without him. In addition, he has an inborn need to excel women as a provider. A man’s feeling of worth can be undermined when he sees women in the work force doing a better job than he, advancing to a higher position, or earning more pay. How much worse when his own wife excels him.”

FATHERLESS AMERICA

Because feminists teach the lie that women can interchange with men, men are using their natural aggressiveness in unhealthy ways. David Blankenhorn, in *Fatherless America*, says that this is America’s number one problem. Blankenhorn says it is the cause of most of our problems, “from crime to adolescent pregnancy to child sexual abuse to domestic violence against women.” He says that nobody understands this: “The most urgent domestic challenge facing the United States at the close of the twentieth century is the re-education of fatherhood as a vital role for men.” Men are hurting because they are not the sole providers. His book is excellent in showing how our social problems are caused by the insanity of throwing out traditional values. He writes, “In sum, over the past two hundred years, fatherhood has lost, in full or in part, each of its four traditional roles: irreplaceable caregiver, moral educator, head of the family, and family breadwinner. As the historian Peter N. Stearns put it: ‘An eighteenth-century father would not recognize the ... parental leadership granted to mothers or indeed the number of bad fathers.’”

Blankenhorn details how men have become unneeded. Feminism has destroyed the role of breadwinner and has therefore destroyed men. Gloria Steinem said it for all those who don’t believe in the division of labor for men and women: “We are human beings first with minor differences from men that apply largely to the act of reproduction. The only functional difference

between men and women is the woman's ability to give birth; therefore a woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle." This is the belief our culture holds for men and women— interchangeable parts. More and more men are saying, "What's the use?" and checking out.

Blankenhorn is a powerful voice against the feminist's dream of taking the breadwinner role from men: "Does paternal breadwinning burden men? In some ways, of course, yes. A man who embraces the New Father philosophy of employment does indeed unburden himself. He frees himself up to make choices, perhaps to express more emotions, certainly to discover himself apart from externally defined 'roles.' Certainly there is much to commend in this aspiration. Freedom is good. Especially in America, freedom is hard to argue against. But in this case, let me try."

"For in liberating fathers from the breadwinner role, the New Father model also seeks to liberate fathers from widely held norms of masculinity. At the same time, our elite cultural script notwithstanding, most men in our society simply do not wish to be liberated from their masculinity. This viewpoint is a key to understanding their unprogressive, lopsided commitment to the provider role."

"Paternal attachment to breadwinning (and I would add, women as homemakers) is neither arbitrary nor anachronistic. Historically and currently, the breadwinner role matches quite well with core aspects of masculine identity. Especially compared to other parental activities, breadwinning is objective, rule-oriented, and easily measurable. It is an instrumental, goal-driven activity in which success derives, at least in part, from aggression. Most important, the provider role permits men to serve their families through competition with other men. In this sense the ideal of paternal breadwinning encultures male aggression by directing it toward a prosocial purpose."

BREADWINNER

"For these reasons, the breadwinner role has always been, and remains, a basic cultural device for integrating masculinity into familism—the clearest, simplest means for men to act out their obligations to their children. Faced with these stubborn facts, our society can respond in one of two ways. We can, through the New Father model, continue to assault male breadwinning in a root-and-branch attempt to reinvent men and deconstruct traditional masculinity. Or we can endeavor, however imperfectly, to incorporate men as they are into family life, in part by giving them distinctive, gendered roles that reflect, rather than reject, inherited masculine norms—such as, for example, the breadwinner."

"The New Father model does not merely unburden men of breadwinning as a special obligation. Ultimately, it unburdens them of fatherhood itself. For, as the example of breadwinning demonstrates, the essence of the New Father model is a repudiation of gendered social roles. But fatherhood, by definition, is a gendered social role. To ungender fatherhood—to deny males any gender-based role in family life—is to deny fatherhood as a social activity. What remains may be New. But there is no more Father."

Daniel Amneus, a professor at the University of Southern California, writes these profound insights into the peaceful nature of patriarchy in his book, *Back to Patriarchy*: "Where are the high crime areas of our society—and where are there large numbers of families headed by women? The two questions have a single answer: matriarchy and violence are twins. The boys' vice-principal of your local high school, the man responsible for discipline, will tell you that the troublemakers are the boys from fatherless families and that the boys from motherless families are not a problem at all. Boys from fatherless homes frequently fail to learn what it means to be responsible and civilized men. They often grow up lacking self-respect, respect for authority, self-reliance, dignity, and magnanimity, incapable of doing the work of society. Girls from fatherless homes all too frequently produce fatherless families themselves, thus perpetuating matriarchy and violence into

the next generation.

“The association between crime and matriarchy is obvious, though the feminists and welfare bureaucrats would prefer that the public didn’t notice it, since patriarchal families would mean the demise of feminism and the erosion of the welfare empire. These people would much prefer that the public think crime is the result of poverty—and that, to eradicate it, taxpayers must dig deeper into their pockets for more money to finance Great Society and Head Start programs and larger AFDC payments, which, of course, have the added consequence of enlarging bureaucracies. If crime were caused by poverty, the American-Chinese, who have been against heavy odds in our society for over a century, ought to have had one of the highest crime rates. They don’t. They have the lowest crime rate and they have patriarchal families. Much the same is true of the Japanese and the Jews—both groups with low crime and a patriarchal family structure. High crime and delinquency—and illegitimacy—come from those areas where there are enormous numbers of families headed by women....”

ENORMOUS BURDEN

Helen Andelin teaches women how different men and women look at the world of business in a section titled “His Pressing Responsibility to Provide.” She writes, “A woman needs to understand with an all-comprehending sympathy what a man faces in earning the living. For the majority of men, when they come of age and marry, take on an enormous burden which they may not lay down with any conscience this side of the grave. Quietly, and without histrionics, they put aside, in the name of love, most of their vaunted freedom and contract to take upon their shoulders full social and economic responsibility for their wives and children.”

“As a woman, consider for a moment how you would feel if your child should be deprived of the good things of life; proper housing, clothing, education. Consider how you would feel if he should go hungry. Perhaps such ideas have occurred to you and have given you a bad turn momentarily. But they are passing thoughts: a woman does not give them much credence; they are not her direct responsibility; certainly she does not worry about them for long.”

“But such thoughts, conscious or unconscious, are her husband’s daily fare. He knows, and he takes the [worrying] thought to work with him each morning (and every morning) and to bed with him at night, that upon the success or failure of his efforts rests the happiness, health, indeed the very lives of his wife and children. In the ultimate he senses he alone must take full responsibility for them.”

“I do not think it is possible to exaggerate how seriously men take this responsibility; how much they worry about it. Women, unless they are very close to their men, rarely know how heavily the burden weighs sometimes, for men talk about it very little. They do not want their loved ones to worry.”

“Men have been shouldering the entire responsibility for their family group since earliest times. I often think, however, when I see the stresses and strains of today’s marketplace, that civilized man has much harder going, psychologically speaking, than his primitive forefathers.”

“In the first place, the competition creates a terrible strain on the individual male. This competition is not only for preferment and advancement it is often for his very job itself. Every man knows that if he falters—lets up his ceaseless drive, he can and will be easily replaced.”

MEN UNDER ENDLESS PRESSURE

“No level of employment is really free of this endless pressure. The executive must meet and exceed his last year’s quota or the quota of his competitors. Those under him must see that he does it, and he scrutinizes their performance most severely and therefore constantly.”

“Professional men—doctors, lawyers, professors—are under no less pressure for the most part. If the lawyer is self-employed he must constantly seek new clients; if he works for an organization he must exert himself endlessly to avoid being superseded by ambitious peers or by pushing young particles just out of law school and fired with the raw energy of youth. A score of unhappy contingencies can ruin or seriously threaten a doctor’s practice, not the least of which is a possible breakdown in his ability to practice. A teacher must work long hours on publishable projects outside his arduous teaching assignments if he is to advance or even hold his ground.”

“There is no field of endeavor that a man may enter where he can count on complete economic safety; competition, the need for unremitting year-in, year-out performance is his life’s lot. Over all this he knows, too, stands a separate specter upon which he can exert only the remotest control. It is the joblessness which may be caused by the cyclical depression and recessions that characterize our economy.”

Helen then says, “Do women who work feel the same pressure men do? Women who work do not feel the same kind of pressure men do. This is because they have a different orientation to the world of work. Whereas a man feels he cannot turn aside from his work with a clear conscience, a woman doesn’t feel this same sense of duty. She can resign her job at any time for any reason, without a feeling of guilt. Economic problems may result but she won’t have a lower opinion of herself or feel disgraced in the eyes of the public.”

IMAGE TO THE PUBLIC

“On the other hand, if an able-bodied man were to stop working it would injure his feeling of worth and his image to the public. He and everyone else would consider him a failure if he were to neglect this important duty. A woman feels pressure, but of a different kind—a time pressure which comes from living a double role. A man feels a binding moral pressure.”

SEPARATE, NOT DIVORCE

When marriages reach a point where divorce is considered, a couple should separate before they divorce. Sadly, most couples never think of separation. They just go straight to divorce. They often choose marriage counselors who haven’t got a clue to what a godly marriage is and are counselors because they are trying to figure out their own life. Too many counselors are quick to push divorce. The only counselor a couple should see is someone who is religious, believes in the traditional, patriarchal family and will fight for the marriage.

FORGIVE

We have to forgive those who say hurtful things that wound our hearts. We have to forgive those who rape our minds and our bodies. We have to stop harboring and holding on to our anger. Some people are experts at hating for a lifetime. They will be angry at their parents or someone for 80 years. We lose power and strength and lower our quality of life when we won’t let go of our memories of being hurt. Many times people are angry and they are only projecting their own mistakes on others.

GYNECOLOGISTS

There are many arguments for and against women working. One argument for women working is that there should be female doctors. I believe that men should not be gynecologists. Milton

Friedman has correctly advocated that the government should not license anyone. It is wrong to force people to take four years of college before they can go to a medical school and then doctors have to study every part of the body. He teaches that people should be able to focus on an area and become skilled and then offer their services. Some women could study certain areas and then offer their skill to help other women. Women have done this kind of thing from the beginning of time by being midwives.

If a woman is single and on her own, is a single mom or widowed and there are no men in the Unification Movement or in her family that will care for her, and she has to work, then she should seek work that is as feminine as possible. If she can it would be best if she had a home-based business such as network marketing companies offer. Women in America and women in third world countries do not need loans to start businesses. Women should not be so focused on earning money but put their primary focus into finding UM brothers to care for them in a trinity situation. A key to success in achieving a goal is to write it down and pray for it fervently every day. God and high spirit world will work to help. Single women and single moms who work are under terrible stress. They become fearful. A single woman who works may become afraid to have many children because she fears for her security. Her memories of terror at having to support herself will continue into marriage. Single moms who work are terrible role models for her children and they are cheated of being a contented mom in a secure nest. Married women who work emasculate every man in sight and confuse her children because she is in a state of division, not unity.

MARRIAGE BOOKS

There are thousands of books on marriage and family to choose from. Some become best sellers and influence millions of people to do what the author advises. The secular manuals on marriage are flawed because they do not get to the root of the problem because they don't give God's goal for a happy family that is found in the Bible. Sadly, many Christian books on marriage give bad advice because the authors have been digested by our feminist culture. They teach that the traditional patriarchal family is either totally false or for only a few people. These are Cain books. For example, in *The 5 Love Needs of Men And Women* Gary and Barbara Rosberg do not understand that women should not work. Even though the Rosbergs say they are Christian and wise and they may have some good points their book is worthless because they do not understand that it is ungodly for women to earn money. We need to give our children and those outside our movement books that are on the Abel side such as those by the Andelins that explain why it is wrong for women to provide money for their families.

BIBLICAL MARRIAGE

Gary Chapman is another popular author to stay away from. At his website he says of himself, "The leading author in biblical marriage counseling speaks love in your language." He does not understand what a biblical marriage is. In a traditional biblical marriage the husband is the sole provider. Stay away from his books such as *The Five Love Languages: How to Express Heartfelt Commitment to Your Mate*. Let me give you an example of what he teaches. At his website he answers the question given to him — "We are both working full time and when I get home, I start dinner but my husband comes in and sits on the couch. How do I encourage him to participate in household chores?" He does not advise the woman to stop working. He tells her to tell her husband to do what should be her jobs. If a marriage counselor does not know the basic truth that women should not compete with men in the marketplace then their books and lectures are worthless.

PROVERBS 31 WIFE

There are many good books on marriage by Christian authors I would recommend such as those

by such authors as John Piper and John MacArthur. Unfortunately they see Proverbs 31 teaching the value that it is all right for women to be businesswomen. They would prefer women staying home but cannot be absolute about women not working. I am being absolute. I don't interpret Proverbs 31 as praising this ideal wife as being a real estate salesman as so many Christian books portray her as. I have yet to read a Christian book that talks about the Proverbs 31 wife and mother that gets it right. Even the Botkin sisters in their book *So Much More: The Remarkable Influence of Visionary Daughters on the Kingdom of God* do not see that girls and women should never make money. Some parts of the Bible should not be taken as truth for today.

Mark Gungor has a DVD lecture series on marriage titled *Laugh Your Way to a Better Marriage*. He is popular with some Unificationists I know. He helps them understand the differences between men and women. I highly recommend him. He has profoundly helped some marriages. Unfortunately he has an audio CD titled "A Wife of Noble Character" that portrays the Proverbs 31 woman as a real estate investor who leaves her kids at day care. He teaches the false view that children in day care "flourish" and "thrive." He says, "The Bible does not condemn women who work outside the home." Those who wrote the Bible did not live in a feminist culture like ours where women wear pants as a police officer who report to a woman chief of police who reports to a woman mayor who reports to a woman governor. The spirit of the Bible is for the traditional family. Gungor calls children "rug rats" and sympathizes with women who want a career to get away from them. The Bible does not look at children the way he does.

T.D. Jakes is a best-selling author that is typical of Christians who see Proverbs 31 as giving the green light for women to work in the marketplace. He is correct when he teaches that men lead women in their homes, but he is wrong when he teaches that women can lead men in business and in churches. In his book *Life Overflowing* he quotes Ephesians 5:22-24 and explains that a wife should submit to her husband, "The natural minds of people in this generation want to put the husband and wife on the same playing field, both playing umpire at the same time. Can you imagine a baseball game with two umpires standing behind the plate? Husband and wife do not play the same position when it comes to making decisions, manifest authority, or taking responsibility.

"When a wife rebels against a husband's wishes, desires, and his position as a decision-maker, she undermines his authority over the family and dismisses his responsibility." Ephesians 5:29 teaches that men are to "cherish," "love," and "nourish" their wives. There is nothing in the Bible about men being tyrants and treating their wives like second-class citizens.

What Jakes doesn't understand is that when women leave the home and become the final decision makers over men she "diminishes" men. He thinks it is wonderful that women are in the workplace. In his book *Reposition Yourself* he quotes from Proverbs 31: "She sells her handmade goods in the market place" and teaches that this model woman is "a savvy real-estate investor." He says that women can have "no limitations." This contradicts what he says about women not being able to be the final decision makers in their marriages. There is a limit to her authority in the home. He says that being "sexist" is wrong and it is crucial that women join the workforce. In his chapter titled "Breaking the Glass Ceiling – Sharing the Secrets of Success-Savvy Women" he writes, "I shudder to think where our contemporary society would be without their collective brain power in the workforce." He says that men at the time "when this country was founded" were "male chauvinists." He gives the blanket criticism that "Men often punished women as if they were children." I do not believe this is historically accurate. De Tocqueville says that women were treated with great respect.

He writes that there are some negative consequences to all this egalitarianism. He gives the example of women journalists in men's locker rooms. He was invited to meet the professional basketball team, the Lakers, after a game in the locker room. He writes how women reporters

came in and the men were changing clothes and taking showers. He thought this was not right but he feels that overall we have progressed as a society to free women from being homemakers. He doesn't see that women leaving the home has devastated America. Dr. Phil McGraw writes an introduction to this mega church pastor's book saying that Jakes is "the spiritual shepherd to millions across the globe" and writes, "I wish this book by Bishop Jakes" will be a success because it is an "inspiring message by providing extremely useful tools and practical guidance to help people in the real world." The opposite is the truth. Dr. Phil is wrong. Jakes is not inspirational and he is not providing "practical guidance."

The best books on marriage are by the Andelin's. One minister wrote the following at a bookseller's website about her book *Fascinating Womanhood*: "I have given approximately 250 copies of this book to women I have counseled in the past 5 years. In this period of time, I have yet to see ANY of them NOT improve their marriage by working on what they bring to the marriage, as an individual and to the whole."

Let's take a look at a popular Cain author. One reviewer wrote, "More than a million husbands and wives have improved their marriages through books by Dr. Willard Harley. ... He gives you the tools you need to meet two important goals: staying in love and helping your children thrive." At his website www.marriagebuilders.com Harley wrote an article titled "How to Develop Your Career and Keep Love in Your Marriage" saying, "I strongly encourage both husbands and wives to develop challenging careers for themselves (my daughter has a Ph.D. degree in Psychology)." He is the typical brainwashed father today who encourages his daughter to work outside the home. Let's look at two letters he received. The first says:

Dear Dr. Harley,

I hope you can help me. This morning my husband told me he doesn't love me anymore. I love him very much and want to do what I can to save our marriage.

I have just earned a doctorate degree in Chemistry. While I was in school, my husband supported me, and was willing to move so that I could get the education I needed. But he has recently found a job he really enjoys and has talent for. My training is very specialized and there are very few jobs available in my area of expertise. I have been offered a job I would love to have but my husband doesn't want to leave the area we're in because he loves his job so much.

I am hurt that, after my being in college so very long and training so hard, he is not absolutely supportive of my career. Now the hard part is over and it is time for us to reap the financial rewards of years of diligence. Can you offer assistance? I would be so grateful.

We have learned that this woman is wrong in pursuing a doctorate. She should be bearing children and taking care of her family as a stay-at-home mom. Harley thinks the opposite of this and encourages women to earn money and tells men to respect women who focus on a career outside the home just as he respects his daughter who has a doctorate and works outside the home.

Another letter to him says:

I am a 29-year old woman who has been married for 6 years and I really love my husband. I am a medical student and he works to support my education. I appreciate what he is doing to help me financially, but I am not getting enough emotional support from him.

I really feel overworked and I am frustrated that my husband is not more

supportive. When we decided that I would go to medical school, I thought that he was making a commitment to help me get through. Instead, I feel that he has abandoned me.

The cleaning and grocery shopping falls to me primarily because I have trouble keeping my thoughts organized when the house is a mess and when meals are not planned. When I repeatedly ask him for more help, he says he will, but he either does nothing or does a crappy job. School has been tough and I feel that my husband does not understand my increased need for his support during this difficult period. I have repeatedly expressed my frustration but it seems as though he takes my need for partnership as a demand and as an expression of his failure.

My husband also refuses to tell me what he wants or how he feels about practically anything. I have tried to make him feel less threatened and more willing to explore his own emotions to no avail. I know that my frustrations are not his responsibility. But he waits until I get over whatever's bothering me instead of trying to fix the problem.

He spends hours trying to fix things at work, trying everything he can think of. But if our marriage has a problem, he's satisfied to say, "I don't know." But after every fight, he comes to me and apologizes in tears. I really feel desperate. What do you suggest?

What is his advice? He believes couples can sit down and have heart-to-heart talks and negotiate how they can both have demanding jobs and both do housework that will make both feel happy. He writes to these women saying: "Here's the solution to your problem: Spend fifteen hours a week with each other engaged in 1) affection, 2) sex 3) conversation and 4) recreational companionship (not all at the same time!). In other words, take fifteen hours a week out of your busy schedules to have fun with each other. Take a vacation from your problems. Don't bring up unpleasant topics for a while. Instead, enjoy your time together."

This is trivial and unprincipled advice. Harley does not understand the innate differences between men and women. Many men will consciously encourage and praise their wives for getting advanced degrees and having careers but often their conscience and deepest desires to live a Godly life where men are sole providers makes them seem inconsistent. On the one hand they think and say what is politically correct but their heart is broken because they are out of order with the laws of the universe.

Stay away from books and authors like the one I quoted from above that encourage women to work. Do not listen to marriage counselors or marriage seminar teachers or college professors who praise and recommend such authors. Unificationists are called by God to know what the absolute values are for marriage and family and be able to discern what is true and false when they hear and read fallen man's opinions. We need to give books that give good, godly advice to the Second and Third Generation so they will have maximum happiness. Authors like Harley that I quoted earlier say they help people to have happier marriages but the happiest marriages are those who live by traditional family values where the man is the hunter and the woman is the nester.

Let's look at Harley's book *His Needs, Her Needs* as an example of books that give bad advice. I hope analyzing his book in light of the truth will help you judge other books and seminar leaders on marriage. Harley begins by praising his book: "Fifteen years after the first copy came off the press, over one million copies have been printed and it has been translated into eleven languages. Many have called it the best book on marriage ever written. That may be true, because as far as I

know it is still the only book written that provides a tried and proven plan for married couples to restore and sustain their love for each other.”

His book is not the best book. The Bible is the best book in human history on marriage and the Bible teaches the opposite of what he teaches. For example, Harley writes that it is wonderful if women want to work: “I don’t oppose women who choose a career early in life. My daughter who is married with two small children earned a Ph.D. and is a licensed psychologist. I am proud of her achievement, and she is happy with her dual role as homemaker and psychologist. And so is her husband.” What has this got to do with Titus 2:3-5? Absolutely nothing. It is Satan’s ideology that women leave the home and compete with men. Harley and his daughter are out of order. His son-in-law is a wimp who hasn’t got a clue to what true happiness means. There are many psychologists who believe gay couples when they say they are happy. Harley’s daughter is living a lower level of happiness.

Harley tells the story of a couple who came to him that had a problem that many couples have. The husband was not bringing enough money home to pay for all the bills and the wife was unhappy. He told the couple, “Perhaps Sean could earn quite a bit more if he finished his education—I believe you said he had two years left. Would you be willing to go to work to help him?” They did as he advised and he writes, “This new plan saved their marriage.” Unificationists should not listen to this satanic advice. Let’s counsel men to get two jobs before they let their wife work.

Harley teaches that men should do some of the “cooking meals, washing dishes, washing and ironing clothes, and child care. ... In earlier generations, it was assumed that all husbands had this need and all wives would naturally meet it. Times have changed, and needs have changed along with them.” This is terrible advice. His book is like so many that are best-sellers in our secular culture. Even many Christians are duped by books like this. This is why Christians have such a high divorce rate.

Two popular authors today who present themselves as relationship experts are Dr. Lee Parrot and his wife Dr. Leslie Parrott. In their book *Saving Your Marriage Before It Starts* they give examples of what they see as healthy relationships. In one example there is a couple that lived in Chicago. The husband was building his career and his wife decided to take journalism courses at a university. She was offered a job out of town and her husband did the politically correct thing and followed her. Later she got a job back in Chicago as an anchor for a TV station. The Parrotts present this as an example of a man respecting his wife. They give ungodly advice. Their books on marriage are not good books.

Have you heard the parable of the boiled frog? If you put a frog into a pot of boiling water, it will jump out to escape the danger. But, if you put a frog in a kettle that is filled with cool water that feels pleasant, and then you gradually heat the pot until it starts boiling, the frog will not realize the threat until it is too late and dies. In real life a frog may not do this but the point of the story is that America has been ignorant of how Satan works. He gradually introduces his vile ideas and values incrementally until no one knows what hits them. Father uses the analogy of cancer in the following quote from one his speeches: “When a cancer starts the victim hardly notices it. As it progresses, he notices it only a little bit. However that person will certainly die unless the cancer is stopped. America is in the same situation. I have been telling you American members that you cannot remain idle or indifferent. You cannot just think about your own life and your own family’s blessing and going to Heaven eventually. What would be the difference between you and conventional Christianity?” (3-1-83)

Satan gradually raised women’s dresses and slowly but surely introduced more and more socialism and feminism until America is in danger of falling like Rome did. One reason the

Roman Empire fell is because it degenerated into sexual chaos. America and much of the world is completely in a fog on what a man and woman are. They are clueless to what masculinity and femininity are. Satan and evil spirit world have been able to dominate the world through socialists/feminists with the insane belief that men and women are the same and that the big government, welfare-state is daddy who will take care of us from cradle to grave. Unificationists need to be the group that understands Satan's strategies the most. We need to alert people of how he works to destroy the family. Let's expose the lies and rebelliousness of the Women's Studies departments in universities. Let's work hard to counter the avalanche of feminist books that preach against patriarchy. Our job is to educate Americans about the sexy fashion, bad morals, and liberal agenda of movie stars in Hollywood whose lives so many are obsessed with.

Liberals love to accuse conservatives of wanting to "turn the clock back to the 1950s" or "1890s". It seems so sophisticated, modern and enlightened to denounce those who want to revive the traditional family as being naive reactionaries who are wrapped up in nostalgia for something that liberals wrongly say wasn't very good anyway like Stephanie Coontz does in her feminist book *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap*. It is easy to say we can't go back to Ozzie and Harriet, *Father Knows Best* and June Cleaver always wearing a dress. But there are some values our ancestors had that were better than ours.

ANTI-FEMINISM

Wikipedia.org has a site on anti-feminism. They have two quotes I like from two authors who believe feminism is "a destructive force that endangers the family":

Political scientist Paul Gottfried writes: "The Trouble With Feminism—serious conservative scholars like Allan Carlson and F. Carolyn Graglia have maintained that the change of women's role, from being primarily mothers to self-defined professionals, has been a social disaster that continues to take its toll on the family. Rather than being the culminating point of Western Christian gentility, the movement of women into commerce and politics may be seen as exactly the opposite, the descent by increasingly disconnected individuals into social chaos.

Antifeminist writer Jim Kalb writes (mensnewsdaily.com. 2006-09-30):

To be antifeminist is simply to accept that men and women differ and rely on each other to be different, and to view the differences as among the things constituting human life that should be reflected where appropriate in social attitudes and institutions. By feminist standards all societies have been thoroughly sexist. It follows that to be antifeminist is only to abandon the bigotry of a present-day ideology that sees traditional relations between the sexes as simply a matter of domination and submission, and to accept the validity of the ways in which human beings have actually dealt with sex, children, family life and so on. Antifeminism is thus nothing more than the rejection of one of the narrow and destructive fantasies of an age in which such things have been responsible for destruction and murder on an unprecedented scale.

Allan Carlson wrote a review of *Marriage, A History: From Obedience to Intimacy or How Love Conquered Marriage* by Stephanie Coontz. Her books are often taught in college classes on marriage and family. Carlson does a good job of showing how bad her books are. This article appeared in the *National Review* and is posted at his website www.profam.org. He writes:

The television spirits of Harriet Nelson and June Cleaver haunt historian Stephanie Coontz. Along with Margaret Anderson (*Father Knows Best*), Donna Reed, Ricky Nelson, Ozzie, Ward, Wally, and the Beaver, these black-and-white specters from the 1950's materialize as whole chapters in her books. Like the fifteen angry co-authors of the recent volume, *NOT JUNE CLEAVER: Women and Gender in Postwar America*, Coontz sees "the 1950's American Family" as the lodestone of American social history and these sit-com housewives as the bearers of an awesome, culture-shaping power.

The big news this year is that Coontz has changed her mind about the 1950's family. Her earlier book, *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap*, has been standard reading for a dozen years in college level history and American studies courses. Here, she vigorously insisted that "contrary to popular debate 'Leave It To Beaver' was not a documentary." Rather, the 1950's represented "a very deviant decade" and the 1950's family model found in the old sitcoms—wise, pipe-smoking fathers, well-dressed, happy, homemaking mothers, and endearing teenagers—was both "a new invention" and "a historical fluke."

Her new book, *Marriage, A History: From Obedience to Intimacy or How Love Conquered Marriage*, sharply reverses course. Now, she essentially argues that *Ozzie and Harriet* and *Leave It To Beaver* were documentaries, and of a largely positive nature. Indeed, instead of being a statistical fluke, she says that the 1950's family should be seen as the product of "a gigantic marital revolution," the "culmination of a new system that had been evolving for more than 150 years." Rather than being tragic pawns of patriarchy, the spectral Harriet Nelson and June Cleaver actually emerge as quasi-revolutionaries, the shapers of history who unconsciously ushered in the new age of cohabitation, easy divorce, and same-sex marriage.

In her breezy new analysis of marriage, Coontz sees human history divided into three phases. From ancient times until 1750, arranged patriarchal marriages focused on economic survival, property, and politics dominated everywhere. Then, in the mid-18th Century, the "love revolution" broke out. Men and women on the cutting edge now sought their soul mates and developed the "male provider marriage" as the preferred sentimental nest. Just below the surface, though, the tension between fleeting love and life-long attachment broiled away, portending a greater upheaval. For generations, several forces held the marital dike: belief in innate differences between women and men; pressure from relatives, employers, and the law; the unreliability of birth control and the stigma of illegitimacy; women's continuing legal and economic dependence on men; and men's domestic dependence on women. The 1950's brought a kind of perfection to this model, with "the Cleavers" and "the Nelsons" as true icons, "the result of a unique moment of equilibrium in the expansion of economic, political, and personal options."

Then came the deluge, as a "perfect storm" emerging from "the subversive potential of the love revolution" swept away the seemingly solid 1950's family. Marriage became more joyful, loving, and satisfying; and also more optional and brittle. Intentional singleness, cohabitation, non-marital births, care-giving dads at home, and same-sex marriage emerged as compelling lifestyle options. The marriage model of two becoming one flesh became obsolete: "It is no

longer possible to assume that two people can merge all their interests and belief.” Marriage vanished as an institution and as the primary center of commitment and caregiving. Marriage now meant “love, honor, and negotiate,” and when any of these failed, quick and easy divorce and a move to other options were the answers.

There are aspects of Coontz’s argument that I admire. I, too, agree that the 1950’s family model—its rise and fall—is the key to understanding our contemporary “culture war.” I share her judgment on sociologists of the era such as Talcott Parsons, whose strange advice to wives was to pursue the role of “glamour girl” and whose confidence in the stability of the 1950’s family “seems hopelessly myopic.” She is also correct in identifying portents of radical change during the 1950’s, including an uptick in divorce in the latter part of the decade, the quiet growth in the number of working wives in the service sector, and the allure of the Playboy ethos, where men revolted against the breadwinner family (e.g., “Miss Gold-Digger of 1953”) a decade before Betty Friedan sparked a similar revolt among women.

Still, *Marriage: A History* exhibits fatal flaws in analysis. On the one hand, the book is curiously Marxist in its relentless historical determinism, with “love” displacing “class conflict” as the driving force of history; as though Karl Marx had instead authored a romance novel or a soap opera. Phrases such as “these changes have profoundly and irreversibly transformed modern marriage,” “we cannot turn back the clock,” and “wrenching, far-reaching, and irreversible” form a drumbeat that seeks to smother alternate interpretations.

On the other hand, the book is not Marxist enough. It all but ignores the true “great disruption” in family affairs that occurred about two hundred years ago: the industrial revolution. This upheaval displaced the home as the center of productive activity. It pulled fathers, mothers, and children out of households for work in centralized factories. It thrived on a hyper-individualism that denied the claims of family and community. The historical pageant of the last two centuries has actually been the seeking of ways to shelter families from the full logic of the industrial principle. This quest, not romance, was the true source of the breadwinner/homemaker model: the factories could have the fathers, but not the mothers and the children.

Coontz’s cultural analysis is also remarkably shallow. Her obsession with *Leave It To Beaver*, *Ozzie and Harriet*, and other “new television shows that delivered nightly images of happy female homemakers in stable male breadwinner families” overlooks the true diversity of sit-com programming in the 1950’s. As Paul Nathanson of McGill University has chronicled, the more common sit-com households of the 1950’s featured: married couples without children (*The Honeymooners*, *I Love Lucy* [the early, classic years], *I Married Joan*, and *Amos’n’Andy*); extended families (*The Goldbergs*, *The Real McCoys*, and *Make Room for Daddy*); single parent households (*My Little Margie*, *Bachelor Father*, and *December Bride*); surrogate families centered on the workplace (*Our Miss Brooks*, *The Gale Storm Show*, *Private Secretary*, *The Ann Southern Show*, *You’ll Never Get Rich*); and “complex” households (*The Jack Benny Program* and *The Bob Cummings Show*). In this true Hollywood mix, Harriet Nelson and June Cleaver lived a minority lifestyle.

The vital role of religion in shaping recent family trends is also absent. Coontz gives superficial treatment to Christian teaching on sex, marriage, and family from the early era through the 16th Century Reformation. Religion then more or less disappears from her analysis. This is unfortunate, for the evidence strongly suggests that the “Baby Boom” of the 1950’s was denomination-specific: a Roman Catholic thing. Consider these numbers: the average number of children born to non-Catholics was 3.15 in 1951-53 and 3.14 in 1961-65; for Catholics, the respective figures were 3.54 and 4.25. In the early 1950’s, only 10 percent of Catholics under age 40 had four or more children, a figure close to the Protestant figure of 9 percent. By 1959, the Protestant figure was unchanged, while the Catholic number had shot up to 22 percent.

Coontz also studiously ignores the role that public policy played in undermining the already fragile 1950’s family. She briefly mentions the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (which she mistakably places in 1963), but neglects to cite the way in which Title VII prohibitions against sex discrimination in employment destroyed America’s family wage regime. (Perhaps she is embarrassed by the fact that Congress added “sex” to the list of prohibited discriminations only through a bizarre coalition of Dixiecrat segregationists who thought this change would sink the whole bill and feminists in the Republican Party). Tax reforms in the mid and late 1960’s scuttled the strongly pro-family tax regime cobbled together during the 1940’s. Finally, the author dismisses an alternate historical possibility. As Harvard sociologist Carle Zimmerman outlined in his 1947 magnum opus, *Family and Civilization*, history is replete with examples of social decline, where the healthy “domestic family” gives way to the “atomistic” family. In this world, marriage is reduced to a weak contrast, “the individual becomes sacred,” and illegitimacy vanishes as a legal concept. This family change has commonly been prelude to civilizational collapse.

In the end, Coontz actually stands exposed as a disciple of Jean Jacques Rousseau, the 18th Century French philosopher who also believed that sentiment is the true driving force of history. She rejects marriage as properly an aspect of religion as natural law. She also refuses to see marriage as the product of human social biology. In addition, she dismisses social science as a guide to government action (“using [statistical] averages...to construct social policy for all is not wise”). All that can be relied on is the fickle arrow of Cupid...and of course the activist state, which will pick up the human pieces created by weak, broken, or never-formed marriages. In this sense, *Marriage, A History* is actually a would-be elegy for our civilization.

The Unification Movement was in a wilderness course for 40 years from 1960-2000. We were crazy for God and we did a lot of crazy things. We were experimenting with how to build a movement. We were at war with Communism and felt the world was in an emergency situation. It was war and sisters were often treated like men. We were a salvation army. It was onward Christian soldiers. Women were “frontline”. We lived in coed communes. We called ourselves Moonies like everyone else did. Father matched couples. Then we changed. Father gave parents the responsibility to match their children. During World War II millions of women worked in factories making bullets and welding ships. They were called Rosie the Riveters. This was our past, but now our movement is in Canaan and we need to fight the good fight differently. The world is still a dangerous place but it is time for sisters to leave their welding jobs, go home, and live as traditional families. Frontline is now focusing on grass-roots, local communities, not headquarters. We think globally and act locally. The Internet is God’s gift to reach everyone

internationally. Let's focus on the small, the intimate, the family. It may seem boring and not very exciting, but it will bring the greatest results in the end. Let's make the means to be the same as the ends. Let's organize our lives so our families are happy and guests are blown away by our joy.

MISSIONARIES SHOULD BE SELF-SUPPORTING

We should end the concept of full time missionaries supported by others who earn money. We should also end the concept of church businesses. Let's sell all the fish businesses, boat building, ginseng farms, manufacturing plants, jewelry businesses, newspapers and all other businesses supported by the church to brothers in the movement or other people and pay off all debts. No brother should work for a church business unless it is changed to be employee owned. He should compete in the marketplace and be more successful than his competition. We need to gain the reputation of being superior to others. If a brother works for a church supported fish business it prevents him from being an entrepreneur. He becomes dependent on the church and will encourage his wife to work for the church. We witness mainly by example. We need to show people strong, centered men who compete in the workplace and show a higher standard.

Unificationists should not imitate Christian churches when they support foreign missionaries with tithing. When a man earns money and gives it to another man to be a missionary who does not earn money then the man who earns money gives up thinking about being a missionary. We are all missionaries. To "adopt" a missionary and give him hard earned money gives the wrong signal to the missionary and to those the missionary is witnessing to. People being witnessed to should be looking at someone they want to emulate. If we support a full-time missionary to such places as Africa the missionary is not practicing what he should be preaching—that men are to be successful at providing. He cannot tell the men in Africa to get a job or build a business when he does not have one himself. People who see missionaries who do not pay their own way will dream of having someone support them like the missionary is being supported. They will see him as the goal of living a life where they can spend their time roaming the countryside being so-called spiritual leaders without having to earn a living in the marketplace. Unificationist brothers should not emulate Mother Teresa or Saint Francis who spent much of their time begging. A good role model would be John Adams who was successful at business and at being a revolutionary Founding Father who did not have any slaves. Let's create a tradition in our movement of men giving money and not asking for donations. Let's focus on giving, not receiving. Let's be famous for teaching and living the core value of the traditional family in which men provide for their families even with disability insurance if they are unable to work. The worst thing we can do is have wives work to pay for outreach activities. Let's be known for living in trinities which insure that women and children will be taken care of even if a man is disabled or dies. Let's go witnessing as trinities instead of individual families and bring people over to see us living as trinities in spiritual communities. When we travel to poor countries we should show videos of our communities that will inspire them to create trinities of traditional families so they, too, can live in safety and security.

PASTORS ARE SPIRITUAL EUNUCHS

A paid missionary gives the image and idea that those who work in the marketplace are inferior to those who are so-called missionaries. We should teach that capitalists are spiritual and help mankind. Most people think the very opposite because they have grown up in a socialist environment that puts down capitalism and capitalists. Those men who live as pastors, marriage teachers or missionaries off tithing and donations are failures at being strong, godly men. They are spiritual eunuchs; they lack virility or power. They are an embarrassment to God. These men do more harm than good simply by living a wimpy life. And this goes for men who ask their wives and encourage their daughters to work alongside men in the business world. It's now time to stop building churches led by worthless pastors and start building communities led by strong

patriarchal men.

The only men who should teach premarital classes are those who are not on any payroll of a church and they do not charge any fee. These men live and teach traditional family values. We should not have young Unificationists taught by brothers who have their wives work and who believe in egalitarian marriages. The best books on the roles of men and women are by Aubrey and Helen Andelin. I hope their books never go out of print. If they do let's figure out how to get them back in print and make sure everyone is told of their books and hopefully every Unificationist will read and study the wonderful insights the Andelins teach.

I believe that Father teaches a division of labor where men earn money and women care for babies at home. Unificationists need to be very careful to not be digested by our culture that brainwashes women to think that they have to earn money because it is too difficult for men to support a family alone and that working outside the home brings personal satisfaction. Don't listen to the Democrats and Liberals and those on the Left like Bill and Hillary Clinton who teach and live the ideology of "equality" that says women should be working with men in the workplace because they are needed there so they can grow and the nation can prosper. They are wrong when they criticize limited government as being heartless. They disparage free enterprise by calling it a trickle-down theory that does not work and that government programs are needed to directly help the poor and make the workplace safer and friendlier for women to work. If anyone wants to argue this they have to find quotes of Father that support the view of egalitarian marriages that liberals champion.

What I write is not my agenda. I did not come up with the core values I write of. I quote authors and books that have converted me because they say the truth that rings in my heart and seems logical to my mind. I quote the Bible and Father. If you do not like what I write then realize that I am just the messenger and you are disliking the people I am lifting up. Those who want to argue the ideas in this book need to find books that express their ideology or their ideas and they need to find quotes of Father that express what they think is true.

We should be united on our core values and we need to shout them from the rooftops. Unificationists are supposed to be bold and courageous. We need to be outspoken. Isn't Father outspoken? The dictionary defines outspoken as, "Speaking without fear or reserve: direct and open speech or expression. To declare openly or boldly." Let's be like Father and speak boldly and in unison about our blueprint for world peace.

I challenge anyone who thinks that Father is not for the traditional family to find quotes in his speeches that clearly say he is for women making money as an absolute value. Those who feel that it is principled for women to compete with men in the marketplace need to find books that explain that view. The books that I have read that push women to leave the home are feminist. I do not see Father pushing women to leave the home and have a career. I do see him talking about men being hunters and women being nesters who care for their husbands when he comes home. Here are a few quotes of Father that clearly say a woman's place is in the home:

American women may feel that my explanation of life gives them no value whatsoever. Women are like an empty receiving basket. Your value will be determined by the contents you hold within your basket. I suggest that you utilize your beautiful face, well-developed bosom and hips and produce as many precious children as possible. That is your value.

It is natural that a woman should take care of the home while the man should be going out into the world. It seems much more natural that a woman come to the door whenever you go to visit a home.

Look at the birds; the male is larger and more dominant, while the female is smaller and follows the male. It is not always possible for the female to keep up with the pace of the male; therefore, she has a nest to stay in. Likewise with women; you need a comfortable home to stay in and take care of. When you go out and try to keep up with your husband's pace, you may have to take 15 steps to his 10; therefore you get more tired. It is natural for you to want to get back home where you can rest.

A wife shouldn't think that she fulfills her responsibility by just preparing a meal when her husband comes home from work. The most important thing is to share a time of confidential talk of love at the dinner table. If she comforts her husband's hard work of the day with the whispering sound that she had in their first meeting, his fatigue will fade away and their conjugal love will become deeper.

Man has an active and conquering nature. ... Women in the Unification Church should clearly know that man is subject and woman is object.

On the foundation of their oneness, they as a union can serve their new subject. In other words, their union becomes the object in order to make a love relationship with God. Love does not come unless there is a subject-object relationship. Is man plus or minus? (Plus.) What about woman? Is woman plus or minus? (Plus.) You answered both sides are plus; that's why you just want to receive love instead of giving. When man wants to give to woman and woman wants to give to man in a perfect plus and minus relationship, their love will circulate smoothly. The sickness of American women is due to the selfish desire just to receive love from the husband. The master of the American family is woman. Men are overpowered by women in the family. The man dresses the woman instead of the woman dressing the man. It is a total inversion. When the husband comes home from work, the wife who has spent idle time at home commands the man to do things. If the wife greets her husband with a joyful, welcoming heart and invites him to eat right away, happiness dwells with the family. (*Blessing and Ideal Family*)

The mother takes care of the baby all day long while her husband is working. In the evening when the husband returns home, he will run to the baby and give it a hug and kiss. (10-3-95)

STAY-AT-HOME DAUGHTERS

Doug Phillips says a girl is in danger going off to college in his audio CD *Making Wise Decisions About College and Life After Home School*. In the DVD of Ken Carpenter being interviewed in the Nightline episode on the Quiverfull movement he mentions that he will not send his daughters away to college and he is preparing them for a life of being a homemaker. All fathers and guardians of girls should be doing as Ken Carpenter is doing. All men and boys should watch him on the DVD and emulate him. He is a good role model for men and boys. Young women should be stay-at-home daughters and then become stay-at-home wives. There is some great advice against girls leaving home to work and to go to college in the works of Anna Sofia and Elizabeth Botkin in their book *So Much More: The Remarkable Influence of Visionary Daughters on the Kingdom of God*, their audio CD is titled *Strength & Dignity for Daughters* and in their DVD *The Return of the Daughters*. The idea that girls have better things to do than spend time in college is also addressed in the DVD titled *Monstrous Regiment of Women*, in the audio CD by the Botkin sisters *Strength and Dignity for Daughters* and at their website VisionaryDaughters.com. Every

father should use their book and audio-visuals to teach their daughters how to fulfill the mandate to be helpers.

At the Vision Forum website Doug Phillips writes:

Sending Daughters Away

I am amazed at how many men today have no sense of their clear duty under biblical law to protect the virginity of their daughters. Once upon a time, it was highly unusual for a woman to travel abroad without the protection of a male guardian, normally her father. Women without male escorts were described as “unprotected ladies.” (Aboard the Titanic, for example, first class passenger Archibald Gracie was personally responsible for the protection of six women, all of whom survived the night because he made sure they made it to safety.) The notion of protecting women at home and abroad stems from the biblically-mandated obligation not only to protect a woman generally from harm, but from the father’s duty to preserve the chastity of his daughters from any who would seek to violate it. It is the unique responsibility of fathers to watch over their daughters. An unwed daughter, be she eighteen or twenty-eight, is under the headship of her father, which means his protection and provision. Protection requires proximity — one of about six reasons why I have concerns about fathers sending their unmarried daughters thousands of miles away from home for extended periods of time to college. Yesterday, I received the following sobering letter from a reader. Her experience is worth noting: “I have listened to your tape *What’s a Girl to Do* several times but today a sentence that you spoke jumped out at me as if it was just added to the tape. (Shows how I am always listening while mothering, sewing, and doing other tasks doesn’t it! hee hee) Anyway, I had to make a comment about the statement ‘When you send your daughters thousands of miles away without even a church, etc., you are asking for trouble’ (VERY loosely quoted mind you). I want to comment on that.... I was allowed to go almost two thousand miles away to a Bible school at a young age. I DID have much support by the church but that didn’t keep me from foolishly opening the door to my apartment at midnight and being assaulted. The result was the birth of my first child. While this worked out to the glory of God in ways that you can’t imagine, this was also the result of my being in a place where I ought not have been. I was out from under my father’s protection and this would NEVER have happened in his home. (Not that it wouldn’t have happened anyway, but not IN my father’s home.) THANK YOU for telling fathers to guard their daughters’ safety. Not enough men are willing to be so bold. I praise God that my husband is such a man.”

THE KEEPERS OF THE SPRINGS

Unificationists need to uplift the true ideals of traditional Judeo-Christian ethics. Here is a good example. Peter Marshall was one of America’s most famous ministers and former chaplain of the U.S. Senate in the 1940s. The following is an excerpt from a sermon called “The Keepers of the Springs”:

Once upon a time, a certain town grew up at the foot
of a mountain range. It was sheltered in the lee of the
protecting heights, so that the wind that shuddered at the
doors and flung handfuls of sleet against the window panes was a wind whose
fury was spent.

High up in the hills, a strange and quiet forest dweller took it upon himself to be
the Keeper of the Springs.

He patrolled the hills and wherever he found a spring, he
cleaned its brown pool of silt and fallen leaves, of mud and
mold and took away from the spring all foreign matter, so that the water which
bubbled up through the sand ran down clean and cold and pure.

It leaped sparkling over rocks and dropped joyously in crystal cascades until,
swollen by other streams, it became a river of life to the busy town.

Mill wheels were whirled by its rush.

Gardens were refreshed by its waters.

Fountains threw it like diamonds into the air.

Swans sailed on its limpid surface

and children laughed as they played on its banks in the
sunshine.

But the City Council was a group of hardheaded, hard-boiled business men.
They scanned the civic budget and found in it the salary of a Keeper of the
Springs.

Said the Keeper of the Purse: "Why should we pay this
romance ranger?"

We never see him; he is not necessary to our
town's work life. If we build a reservoir just above the town,
we can dispense with his services and save his salary."

Therefore, the City Council voted to dispense with the unnecessary cost of a
Keeper of the Springs, and to build a cement reservoir.

So the Keeper of the Springs no longer visited the brown pools but watched
from the heights while they built the reservoir.

When it was finished, it soon filled up with water, to be sure, but the water did
not seem to be the same.

It did not seem to be as clean, and a green scum soon befouled its stagnant
surface.

There were constant troubles with the delicate machinery
of the mills, for it was often clogged with slime, and the
swans found another home above the town.

At last, an epidemic raged, and the clammy, yellow fingers of sickness reached into every home in every street and lane.

The City Council met again. Sorrowfully, it faced the city's plight, and frankly it acknowledged the mistake of the dismissal of the Keeper of the Springs.

They sought him out in his hermit hut high in the hills, and begged him to return to his former joyous labor.

Gladly he agreed, and began once more to make his rounds.

It was not long until pure water came liltng down under
tunnels of ferns and mosses and to sparkle in the cleansed reservoir.

Mill wheels turned again as of old.

Stenches disappeared.

Sickness waned

and convalescent children playing in the sun laughed again

because the swans had come back.

Do not think me fanciful

too imaginative

or too extravagant in my language

when I say that I think women, and particularly of our

mothers, as Keepers of the Springs. The phrase, while poetic,

is true and descriptive.

We feel its warmth ...

its softening influence ...

and however forgetful we have been ...

however much we have taken for granted life's precious

gifts we are conscious of wistful memories that surge out of

the past —

the sweet

tender

poignant fragrances of love.

Nothing that has been said

nothing that could be said

or that ever will be said,

would be eloquent enough, expressive enough, or adequate to make articulate that peculiar emotion we feel to our mothers.

So I shall make my tribute a plea for Keepers of the Springs,

who will be faithful to their tasks.

There never has been a time when there was a greater need

for Keepers of the Springs,

or when there were more polluted springs to be cleansed.

If the home fails, the country is doomed. The breakdown of home life and influence will mark the breakdown of the nation.

If the Keepers of the Springs desert their posts or are un-faithful

to their responsibilities the future outlook of this

country is black indeed.

This generation needs Keepers of the Springs who will be courageous enough to cleanse the springs that have been polluted.

It's not an easy task—nor is it a popular one, but it must be done for the sake of the children, and the young women of today must do it.

Peter Marshall on to say:

It remained for the twentieth century, in the name of progress, in the name of tolerance, in the name of broadmindedness, in the name of freedom, to pull her down from her throne and try to make her like a man.

NOT PROGRESS

Twentieth-century tolerance has won for woman the right to become intoxicated, the right to have an alcoholic breath, the right to smoke, to work like a man, to act like a man—for is she not man's equal? Today they call it "progress"... but tomorrow, oh, you Keepers of the Springs, they must be made to see that it is not progress.

No nation has ever made any progress in a downward direction. No people ever became great by lowering their standards. No people ever became good by adopting a looser morality. It is not progress when the moral tone is lower than it was. It is not progress when purity is not as sweet. It is not progress when womanhood has lost its fragrance. Whatever else it is, it is not progress!

OLD-FASHIONED MORALITY

We need Keepers of the Springs who will realize that what is socially correct may not be morally right. Our country needs today women who will lead us back to an old-fashioned morality, to an old-fashioned decency, to an old-fashioned purity and sweetness for the sake of the next generation, if for no other reason.

This generation has seen an entirely new type of womanhood emerge from the bewildering confusion of our time. We have in the United States today a higher standard of living than in any other country, or at any other time in the world's history. We have more automobiles, more picture shows, more telephones, more money, more swing bands, more radios, more television sets, more nightclubs, more crime, and more divorce than any other nation in the world. Modern mothers want their children to enjoy the advantages of this new day. They want them, if possible, to have a college diploma to hang on their bedroom wall, and what many of them regard as equally important—a bid to a fraternity or a sorority. They are desperately anxious that their daughters will be popular, although the price of this popularity may not be considered until it is too late. In short, they want their children to succeed, but the usual definition of success, in keeping with the trend of our day, is largely materialistic.

MOTHER'S APRON

As you think of your own mother, remembering her with love and gratitude—in wishful yearning, or lonely longing, I am quite sure that the memories that warm and soften your heart are not at all like the memories the children of today will have... For you are, no doubt, remembering the smell of fresh starch in your mother's apron or the smell of a newly ironed blouse, the smell of newly baked bread, the fragrance of the violets she had pinned on her breast. It would be such a pity if all that one could remember would be the aroma of toasted tobacco or nicotine and the odor of beer on the breath!

The challenge of the twentieth-century motherhood is as old as motherhood itself. Although the average American mother has advantages that pioneer women never knew—material advantages: education, culture, advances made by science and medicine; although the modern mother knows a great deal more about sterilization, diets, health, calories, germs, drugs, medicines and vitamins, than her mother did, there is one subject about which she does not know as much—and that is God.

GODLY WOMEN

The modern challenge to motherhood is the eternal challenge—that of being a godly woman. The very phrase sounds strange in our ears. We never hear it now. We hear about every other kind of women—beautiful women, smart women, sophisticated women, career woman, talented women, divorced women, but so seldom do we hear of a godly woman—or of a godly man either, for that matter.

I believe women come nearer fulfilling their God-given function in the home than anywhere else. It is a much nobler thing to be a good wife than to be Miss America. It is a greater achievement to establish a Christian home than it is to produce a second-rate novel filled with filth. It is a far, far better thing in the realm of morals to be old-fashioned than to be ultramodern. The world has enough women who know how to hold their cocktails, who have lost all their illusions and their faith. The world has enough women who know how to be smart. It needs women who are willing to be simple. The world has enough women who know how to be brilliant. It needs some who will be brave. The world has enough women who are popular. It needs more who are pure. We need women, and men, too, who would rather be morally right than socially correct.

Let us not fool ourselves—without Christianity, without Christian education, without the principles of Christ inculcated into young life, we are simply rearing pagans. Physically, they will be perfect. Intellectually, they will be brilliant. But spiritually, they will be

pagan. Let us not fool ourselves. The school is making no attempt to teach the principles of Christ. The Church alone cannot do it. They can never be taught to a child unless the mother herself knows them and practices them every day.

In the DVD *Interview with Nancy Campbell* (www.aboverubies.org) Mrs. Campbell is asked the question, “What are the keys to a peaceful home and a blessed marriage?” She responds, “You have to get in sync with God. If we’re not in sync with God—well, we’re not going to make it. In God’s plan there is headship. When we reject that we reject God’s way and we get out of order and it won’t work. To have a marriage that is in harmony and that works, you have to do it God’s way. Women reject submission. They reject headship. But what is the fruit of it? What do we see? Broken marriages everywhere. Families broken because they are walking away from God’s way. It won’t work. We have to do it God’s way.” When wives and daughters return home to become helpers to the boys and men in their families they will be “in sync with God.”

I believe men and women should study books and audio-visuals on how to be a godly helper for their husbands. This includes books on how to build excellent, godly families. There are many books on how to be a parent. Here is a few that I have found helpful:

All About Raising Children by Helen Andelin
Love in the House by Chris and Wendy Jeub
Have a New Kid by Friday: How to Change Your Child's Attitude, Behavior & Character in 5 Days by Kevin Leman
Parenting by the Book: Biblical Wisdom for Raising Your Child by John Rosemond (www.rosemond.com, www.parentingbythebook.com)
The Duggars: 20 and Counting!: Raising One of America's Largest Families—How they Do It by Jim Bob Duggar and Michelle Duggar
ScreamFree Parenting: The Revolutionary Approach to Raising Your Kids by Hal Runkel

Also check out the following by Steve and Teri Maxwell (www.titus2.com):

Managers of Their Homes: A Practical Guide to Daily Scheduling for Christian Homeschool Families
Managers of Their Chores: A Practical Guide to Children's Chores
Managers of Their Schools: A Practical Guide to Homeschooling
Redeeming the Time: A Practical Guide to a Christian Man's Time Management
Homeschooling with a Meek and Quiet Spirit and the study guide
Preparing Sons to Provide for a Single-Income Family
Encouragement for the Homeschool Family 10 CD:
 2 CDs *The Homeschooling Family: Building a Vision (for families)*
 1 CD *Managers of Their Homes (for ladies)*
 2 CDs *Manager of His Home (for men only-this is the full, unabridged version)*
 1 CD *Loving Your Husband (for ladies)*
 1 CD *Sports-Friend or Foe? (for families)*
 1 CD *Anger-Relationship Poison (for families)*
 1 CD *Experiencing the Joy of Young Womanhood (for young ladies)*
 1 CD *Success or Failure-Where Are You Headed? (for young men)*

The topic of the woman’s role is so big that I have written more on this in my book titled *Helper*.

I challenge every Unificationist family to be live by traditional family values with the wife as the helper to her husband and daughters as helpers to their father and mother.