

173 Responses to *Twisted Scripture*.



infowarrior1 says:

November 30, 2013 at 7:43 pm

@Dalrock

Is judgement already coming upon the church as a result of this? Is the church going to be cleansed of this?



Mr. J says:

November 30, 2013 at 7:57 pm

If anyone finds a REAL church, let me know.
All I've found are "baptist" cults run by criminal dictators and feminist freakfests.



patriarchal landmine says:

November 30, 2013 at 8:24 pm

tradcons are just another pack of useful idiots for feminism.



Ashley lakes says:

November 30, 2013 at 8:30 pm

Since I found Dalrock, I have been thinking about several concepts (like modern marriage). I have also been reading some on the following:
talk about marriage and married man sex life.

It seems to be a general theme: When a man submits, his wife treats him like a doormat and increasingly disrespects him.

I am super in love with my husband. I would say that he is not alpha or beta or anything that simple.

He doesn't let anyone treat him disrespectfully; he has impenetrable morals; he works like a dog to provide.

I tell him thank you everyday and am super nice to him. He does not mistreat me even though I am super passive by nature. He prioritizes my needs ahead of his needs.

In short a man submitting does not work because it goes against the woman's nature.



Ashley lakes says:

November 30, 2013 at 8:49 pm

You are all right: I think that a pastor that coaches men in a more bible-centered way would end a lot of pain.

For instance, if you look at talk about marriage, coping with infidelity a lot of those men would have fared a lot better if they had pre-marriage counseling that taught them what the bible actually says.



Ceer says:

November 30, 2013 at 8:54 pm

@Ashley Lakes

Alpha and Beta are archetypes. Virtually no man is FULLY alpha or beta. We tend to have a mix. The trick is to get the best of both.

Many women today are hyper-fearful of submission. The cultural message says that submissive wives leave themselves open for abuse, but any time I've seen a healthy relationship, the wife has always had a mix of submissiveness and a distinct lack of snark.



tacomaster2 says:

November 30, 2013 at 9:01 pm

Daltock, I posted this last week over at SSM's blog. I think it's relevant to this conversation.

Yesterday I went to a wedding and the couple chose (wonder how they interpreted them) to do Ephesians 5 covering love and respect. The pastor prefaced it by saying these verses are "controversial". I was expecting he would be honest and frank about what they meant. That was not the case at all. The groom was given a long list of things to do like love the bride unconditionally, always show love no matter what she does or says (basically supplicate) which

went on for about 5 minutes —I wanted to stab my ears with a pen at this point—. A long list was given like tell her she's beautiful every morning, accept that she'll gain weight, respect her, etc. The pastor then spoke on this verse: "Wives, submit yourselves to your own husbands as you do to the Lord" which was interpreted by the pastor as, "bride your responsibility is to submit to his undedding love even when you don't want to. When he tells you you're beautiful and you don't feel it, submit to his love and accept that you are beautiful and loved like God loves the church" (I wrote that as he was saying that). I have never heard the verses abused and taken so far of context like that. Submit basically means, according to this pastor, to just lie down, do absolutely nothing, and let another person spoil you with praise and love for the rest of your life. Uh, where can I sign up?



Ashley lakes says:

November 30, 2013 at 9:03 pm

I am not saying that their wives infidelity was the husbands fault, but it would have been less likely if the husband didn't try to "nice" his wife into loving him.



Ashley lakes says:

November 30, 2013 at 9:06 pm

Ceer

Yeah that seems right.



Brent says:

November 30, 2013 at 9:11 pm

[quote]D: Thank you, but I have no intention of doing any such thing.[/quote]

Why?

The Western world is crumbling. A Great Inheritance of liberty, justice and prosperity is being squandered.

An inheritance paid for with the blood of our fore fathers.

I wish I could find a way to feed myself fighting the cultural marxism that the deciever is using to undermine the West.

You clearly have the knowledge to do so.

This is still a battle for minds and ideas. It won't remain that way forever. Especially if those equipped to fight won't.



AmStrat says:

November 30, 2013 at 9:44 pm

Question: Is the title of the article a play on words of "twisted sister"?



Ashley lakes says:

November 30, 2013 at 9:54 pm

Ceer I guess seeing every man as a wife beater is like seeing every woman as Casey Anthony/Jodi Arias—yes those people exist but they are not the rule (thankfully) they are an exception.

Unfortunately, men are often treated unfairly.



Jason says:

November 30, 2013 at 10:08 pm

The reason you don't want to start a ministry Dalrock is because you're too cowardly to do personally what you constantly exhort in others.



Tim says:

November 30, 2013 at 10:27 pm

"The reason you don't want to start a ministry Dalrock is because you're too cowardly to do personally what you constantly exhort in others."

Shaming language.

I think Dalrock's blog IS his ministry. We readers are the ones to take the teaching out into the wider world.



Dalrock says:

November 30, 2013 at 10:30 pm

@AmStrat

Question: Is the title of the article a play on words of “twisted sister”?

Yes. It is a play on the vulgarity of gender-bending Scripture.



BC says:

November 30, 2013 at 10:35 pm

Shaming language.

One of the trademarks of a tradcon.

That, or someone trying to get Dalrock to out himself.

After all, it's kind of hard to burn the witch when you don't know who she is.



tz2026 says:

November 30, 2013 at 10:43 pm

Then there's 1 Timothy 2, verses starting at 9 and ending with “But women[c] will be saved through childbearing—if they continue in faith, love and holiness with propriety.” Childbearing? How inconvenient. Then the husband will have to provide for the children borne. That's no fun. Sex has to be without consequences! Isn't that what the 180 degree turn starting with 1930 and ending in the 1970s was about? That Luther, Wesley, Calvin and every last orthodox founder, father, theologian got the Onan incident wrong?

It is proper in calling wives to be submissive, yet forgetting husbands are called to be fathers – that withholding fertility – waving your fist at the creator of the new soul and saying “No” – might be not much different than “non serviam!”.

I can only approach claims of “twisting scripture” with the most charitable interpretation of irony.

To go to the greek, there is a verse that is often translated “through a glass, darkly”, but the thrust is a badly distorted mirror, something like a carnival mirror but worse. Yet that is what

happens when scripture is said to be the only authority. If the lenses through which we are looking twist straight lines into curves, and curves into knots, how do we know when we are getting untwisted scripture? The “Trinity” is not obvious from scripture alone.

Some people perceive one set of verses as more important, or dominant, wider or narrower, and such cannot be contradicted – there are many verses that belong to each category. I’ve found no system that will give an unbiased gloss to allow me to figure out the essence of particular verses, so I’ve switched to an authority which said it defined scripture – canon and at points the critical interpretation.

Feel free to dismiss 1 Tim 2:15, but if you are willing to bend or twist this, then you have no basis for criticizing others who do no different back up to verse 9, or the parallel verses discussing husbands, wives, and submission.



rycamor says:

November 30, 2013 at 10:46 pm

Most likely, Jason, Dalrock is making a strategic choice, since he has to hold down a job and provide for his family, and at this point an unmasking would result in destruction of his job AND destruction of this blog.

Also It’s possible that Dalrock is just not much for public speaking and the like.

We can’t know for sure, of course. It is possible that he is unnecessarily fearful, but I doubt it.

While I don’t give a hoot whether Dalrock “unmasks”, I do hope that his blog provides a catalyst for Christian leaders to take back this spiritual ground that has been lost. I have noticed lately that Christian leaders and men in my circles are not dancing around this topic as lightly as they used to.

I have tried to do my part in encouraging younger married men to just **assume** leadership and move forward with planning a life instead of the usual “I’ll have to see if my wife lets me do X”. One man I know confided in me that he agreed that a man should have at least a gun or two in the house to protect his family, but felt stymied because his wife “put her foot down” and wouldn’t allow a gun in the house. He was surprised by my answer, because he was used to men saying “Sorry man... keep praying about it, and she’ll come around,” but I said “at some point you have to decide who’s in charge when it comes to these things. And anyway, how exactly is she going to stop you? When something’s really got to be done, I just do it.” He looked me in the eye and said nothing, but a few months later I found that he had indeed gotten a couple guns and was teaching his wife how to use them.

Good things happen when men support and encourage other men in these things. I'm sure Dalrock's blog was a genesis of that for many.



Blake says:

November 30, 2013 at 10:55 pm

@tz, I'm not getting your point. Most of this blog deals with women taking off on their husbands, because both society and their church have given women carte blanche when it comes to marriage. Generally, when the wife takes off, she takes the kids, because that's her meal ticket.

If the husband has had children with his wife, how is he not a father?



Ceer says:

November 30, 2013 at 11:44 pm

I have a friend who was recently divorced. He was always tiptoeing around his wife's feelings... Tried introducing him to the red pill, but it was too late for him to absorb it and turn around his marriage.

The funny thing is, this man is in shape, far above average as a fighter, holds down a consistent job, AND does amazing service work. This package STILL wasn't enough for his wife who "wasn't interested" in his choice of hobbies. From what I've heard, she thought of his social group as a competition for his time.



Cane Caldo says:

November 30, 2013 at 11:54 pm

@TZ

To go to the greek, there is a verse that is often translated "through a glass, darkly", but the thrust is a badly distorted mirror, something like a carnival mirror but worse. Yet that is what happens when scripture is said to be the only authority. If the lenses through which we are looking twist straight lines into curves, and curves into knots, how do we know when we are getting untwisted scripture? The "Trinity" is not obvious from scripture alone.

You realize you are appealingly to the authority of scripture (as seen by you) to make this argument, correct? You realize that it is the scripture that existed BEFORE Christ was born that confirms the Christ is Who He says He is; that it is how we know Him, correct? You realize that Roman Catholics to this day teach birth control (regardless of what you believe they are supposed to be teaching by NFP.), and send their children off to be raised by someone else for the majority of every day, correct? This is a Christianity-wide issue, TZ.

More to the point: Dalrock is correct, and you could have added to the discussion with some emphasis on 1 Timothy without any interference or recrimination whatsoever. It even would have made sense! Instead you chose to go out of your way to be incoherent and backbiting. That was stupid.



rycamor says:

November 30, 2013 at 11:55 pm

Blake, tz is just sharpening his Catholic axe against we schismatic Protestants. Or perhaps tilting at Protestant windmills? I find it ironic that he uses a verse to make his final point in a passage where he disputes Sola Scriptura.

Not that I particularly care, for I am neither Protestant nor Catholic, merely someone who wishes as much as possible to know the will of God and to understand how that was brought forth in the life of Christ.

The Catholics (and perhaps more so the Orthodox) do have a point in that we should not be so quick to dispense with thousands of years of human history, in which many things have been tried and proven to be utter failures and others found generally to be successes (patriarchy for example). Protestants of various stripes have a tendency to form elaborate structures of reason based on some minor Bible passage, without stepping back to let the whole picture (and common sense) provide some tempering.

But that's about as far as I'm willing to take it. In the end, each of us is responsible for what he or she believes, and why. Yielding one's theology uncritically to a human authority just doesn't square with the life Jesus led, nor the things He and His followers taught.



MarcusD says:

December 1, 2013 at 12:22 am

@Jason

Why is it that most superheroes keep their real identity secret?



Eric Wilson says:

December 1, 2013 at 12:27 am

I'm not necessarily opposed to tz's (and the RCC's) stance against contraceptives. But for him to suggest that **Luther, Wesley, Calvin and every last orthodox founder** got it all wrong is laughable.



GeeBee says:

December 1, 2013 at 1:10 am

"They hated the Book, but they loved the movie."

I loled so hard.



MarcusD says:

December 1, 2013 at 1:22 am

"They hated the Book, but they loved the movie."

Reminds me of:

"Never judge a book by its movie."

– J.W. Eagan



Jake says:

December 1, 2013 at 1:56 am

>Is judgement already coming upon the church as a result of this? Is the church going to be cleansed of this?

It's not going to be with the lazy christens. If you want a biblical church, find all the men in your area who want the same, take over a small sized church and vote out the heretics and vote into Orthodox faith. Nothing will change unless you as a man changes it.



Twenty says:

December 1, 2013 at 2:49 am

... *doesn't jive with feminism* ...

I think that “doesn’t jibe” is the more correct expression.



Church Is For Girls says:

December 1, 2013 at 2:57 am

The reason for the scripture twisting on submission is the same reason the American Christian church approves of easy divorce and subsequent remarriage. A secular professor can get it right but the religion workers are too gutless to do the proper exegesis. Read:

A Missing Front in the Culture War

<http://www.psqonline.org/article.cfm?IDArticle=18549>

Dr. Albert Mohler interviews this man here.

<http://www.albertmohler.com/2010/09/27/a-missing-front-in-the-culture-war-a-conversation-about-divorce/>



Chris says:

December 1, 2013 at 3:11 am

Twenty.... no. A Jibe is a way of correcting your direction when sailing downwind. Somewhat dangerous, but a standard thing for a sailing vessel.

Jive, however, is something musical and quite subjective.



Minesweeper says:

December 1, 2013 at 4:02 am

tz2026 says:

November 30, 2013 at 10:43 pm

Then there's 1 Timothy 2, verses starting at 9 and ending with "But women[c] will be saved(G4982) through childbearing

Not quite sure what you are getting at but its closer to meaning : made whole through child rearing (not spiritually saved)

G4982 from a primary sos (contraction for obsolete saos, “safe”); to save, i.e. deliver or protect (literally or figuratively). KJV: heal, preserve, save (self), do well, be (make) whole.

Which doesn't surprise me, the women who have been unable to have children that I've seen are so broken. Having and raising kids really does seem to do something, that doesnt happen in the male.



Minesweeper says:

December 1, 2013 at 4:14 am

Ceer says:

November 30, 2013 at 11:44 pm

I have a friend who was recently divorced.... From what I've heard, she thought of his social group as a competition for his time.

Haven't you heard ? Anything not submitted to her authority is grounds for divorce. Women are very envious of male hobbies for some unknown reason(how dare he take time off from meeting her needs), their desire to control every aspect of her man is overpowering. Failure of which leads her to initiate divorce.



infowarrior1 says:

December 1, 2013 at 4:17 am

@Minesweeper

<https://dalrock.wordpress.com/2012/07/10/feminist-territory-marking/>



Minesweeper says:

December 1, 2013 at 4:24 am

@infowarrior1 not sure that post applies to her jealousy of his hobbies as she wasnt trying to break in.



Twenty says:

December 1, 2013 at 4:57 am

@Chris

[No, it's "jibe".](#)



Feminist Hater says:

December 1, 2013 at 5:48 am

Well, it's so easy to justify divorce now. With Churchianity in full cahoots with the jezebels, all it takes is a little twisting of the scriptures to mean what they want them to mean and then twist a few more so that it all lines up to grant immunity and cash and prizes to the moxie women who apply the newly twisted scriptures to their advantage, ala Jenny 'Sluttart' Erikson.

If the 'lust after a person = adultery in the heart' and the adultery is grounds for divorce then every man is guilty of divorce at anytime a woman needs to get her game on.

I always laugh though, they say that adultery in the heart is but a scripture that shows that every single human being is a sinner and it's impossible not to sin with 'lust in ones heart' but then conveniently skip right over that definition of the scripture when it comes time to divorce hubby when he looked at porn or looked at another woman. Forgiveness goes straight out the window in that case and the 'impossible to live by' piece of scripture suddenly becomes the stick to beat every single man with...



joeG says:

December 1, 2013 at 6:20 am

"Which doesn't surprise me, the women who have been unable to have children that I've seen are so broken. Having and raising kids really does seem to do something, that doesnt happen in the male."

I think its the sacrifice. Or the oppurtunity for sacrifice. The foundational tenets of Christianity are laid out in John 3:16. Love, Sacrifice, Faith, Life. Modern women, even christians, tend to jump over the bit about sacrifice, even though its in our nature if we choose to submit to our nature. Men tend to want to sacrifice for something bigger than themselves, faith, family, country. Women naturally want to sacrifice for their children, and are left feeling out of sorts if they cannot make that sacrifice because of biology or their own life choices.

Additionally, I think women's biggest hindrance to being faithful to scripture is their own fearful nature. Choosing to submit to another human requires a huge leap of faith. It was easier for women to make that leap when the harsh environment of yesteryear forced them to. Today they have choices. Out of fear many would rather choose to avoid any possible peril that might come with such a leap.

 **Lyn87** says:

December 1, 2013 at 7:25 am

the women who have been unable to have children that I've seen are so broken

YMMV... my wife has always been barren, and she's pretty together... biblically-sound, smart, hard worker, red-pill even. Her two sisters both have three kids each, and at various times in their lives they've turned "making bad decisions" into an art form.



Mulier says:

December 1, 2013 at 7:43 am

Great post. This is one of the ways that Christianity is a scandal to the world. For a woman submission isn't always 50-shades erotic, and husbands aren't always clearly leading in the right direction. Sometimes it is very hard to go along with something that doesn't seem like a good idea, in earthly terms, and there is no guarantee from God that it will all work out for the best here in this world. But this is exactly what we are called to do, and there is sanctification and right ordering this way. Submission to your husband is about death to the self, and sometimes it works out that you find him more attractive, he carefully attends to your unspoken needs, and he was right all along. Other times, you find him infuriating, you feel like a slave, and you're not sure how your family is going to survive, financially. It's those more unpleasant times that you have to double down on submission and prayer, knowing that whatever may come, you've just been given a great opportunity to be faithful.



[kronbergweb](#) says:

December 1, 2013 at 7:59 am

The context for 1 Timothy 2 v 15:

1Ti 2:11 Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.

1Ti 2:12 But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.

1Ti 2:13 For Adam was first formed, then Eve.

1Ti 2:14 And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.

1Ti 2:15 Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.

The woman is to be saved from being deceived by bearing children; the responsibility of having children probably is to keep women from being in a position of being deceived by outside influences; and also under the eyes of a clear minded husband who has the understanding necessary to avoid being deceived.

This means that in a Christian marriage, the husband is to be scripturally grounded BEFORE marriage; yet, modern “Christian” women want to be the teachers of their husbands and control to which church the family goes; and this desire is enabled by choosing men who are bad boys or have status, power, and income; and by her rejecting the church raised male.



[kronbergweb](#) says:

December 1, 2013 at 8:10 am

@tacomaster2; November 30, 2013 at 9:01 pm

The groom should have put his foot down and stopped the ceremony and corrected the deceiver – which is what the pastor was – at once.

Perhaps this is a needed part of the Red Pill for Christian men: an understanding grounded in biblical truth and a realization that the pastor – a hireling – must be corrected when he is in error: a pastor is not the head of the family, nor of the man, nor of the wife; perhaps it is time to impress upon preachers et al. that to come between the husband and his wife is a usurpation: let’s call it spiritual adultery.



[Chris@QPC](#) says:

December 1, 2013 at 8:56 am

Great post.

I hear a lot of the “you need to love her before she can submit” argument. I’ve even heard a friend of mine bring up 1 Peter 3 on a wife submitting to a unbelieving husband, but said she needs help doing that. The excuses for a woman not having to submit to God’s command to submit to their husband is do numerous and ridiculous. Whenever I bring up 1 Peter 3 in a conversation, it usually is glossed over and the argument moves on to other things. I don’t think people know how to deal with that without actually acknowledging it as truth.



[aaronthejust](#) says:

December 1, 2013 at 9:03 am

Lydia McGrew is in full-scale meltdown.

Her latest comment to herself (isn't that the first sign of insanity?) is advising nice guys to stay away from the Manosphere lest we lose our access to young chaste women who won't be attracted to us due to use of game and pornography.

Why does pornography get Christian women all atwitter? I think the stuff is bad, but no worse for men than 2,500 calorie high carb diets are for women.



[aaronthejust](#) says:

December 1, 2013 at 9:07 am

@Ceer

Christian women are especially fearful of submission. The women in my soft harem are more submissive to me than my Christian ex wife ever was, and more submissive than any of the nice Christian girls I go on dates with.

They're terrified of it. The only way I've found to get them (Christians) in a submissive frame of mind is game and dominant sexual relationships—folks, this isn't good.



[aaronthejust](#) says:

December 1, 2013 at 9:10 am

@tz2606

Shut up.

We can't be fathers in a Marriage 2.0 environment. "Man up and pay that child support order!" is not fatherhood.

And I've been an expectant dad, a foster dad, and an adoptive dad before, so don't even bother with your shaming tactics or "you're afraid of commitment" tropes on me.



[empathologism](#) says:

December 1, 2013 at 9:38 am

The cottage industry is very effective at luring women into its fold. They scare women by telling them the lie that beastly patriarchy is spreading rampantly, then they offer their true interpretations as a way of combating the growing scourge of men dominating women. Read the article at patheos that has a man writing that its time we put this issue behind us, it is settled, there are no gender differences. Declaring victory and walking off. One reader commented that they choose churches based on women in leadership and having ephesians teaching right. Also, read Ephesians 5 in The Message paraphrase, there you will get the fullness of the twisted corruption



Great Books For Men GreatBooksForMen GBFM (TM) GB4M (TM)

GR8BOOKS4MEN (TM) IzoZozozlzo (TM) says:

December 1, 2013 at 9:40 am

Dear Dalrock,

What has happened is that the Frankfurt School has infiltrated our Churches and Universities and conquered the West and enslaved men to debt and servitude, while stripping them of their Natural Rights.

The remarkable thing is how many Churchians/Boxerboyz/etc. believe they are teaching of Christ and the Great Books for Men when they are teaching the very opposite.

The Frankfurtersz are to be commended for their supreme victory. In the end, the Boxerboyz/Churchianz proved no match, as they were so easily desouled and bernankified.

Ye shall know them by their fruits, and out of their mouths comes no praise for Christ nor the Great Books for Men, but only for the Frankfurters, as their government grows, their culture collapses, their families dissipate and 50,000,000 more are aborted and families are blown up, all the while Boxerboy focuses on the hairs on Freud's bunghole, splitting them and then proclaiming He is doing the Work of the Lord, as he preaches, "For truly the Frankfurters fathered Christ himself."

IzoZozoz



[Dalrock](#) says:

December 1, 2013 at 9:47 am

@Twenty

I think that “doesn’t jibe” is the more correct expression.

Thanks (fixed). Per the link you offered I am convinced that you are correct.



feeriker says:

December 1, 2013 at 9:53 am

@ Mr. J: *If anyone finds a REAL church, let me know.
All I've found are “baptist” cults run by criminal dictators and feminist freakfests.*

If it owns its own building, has branded itself (e.g., “First Missionary Baptist Church of Clownsboro”), is headed by a full-time, salaried “pastor,” and has some sort of state-sanctioned tax exemption (here in the U.S., that would be an IRS 501C3 exemption), then you know for certain that it is NOT a “real” church. This, of course, characterizes 99.99 percent of all bodies that now call themselves “churches.” These are, rather, churchian franchises, headed by corporate CEOs and a boards of directors, and run like for-profit businesses. Since for-profit businesses, in order to both attract and retain paying customers, have to cater to their customers’ wants and sensibilities rather risk offending them, even if it’s for the customers’ own good (when was the last time you heard a supermarket manager lecture an obese customer on staying away from the bakery department and instead insistently guiding them to the produce department?), you will NEVER hear a churchian franchise’s CEO tell his customers hard biblical truths, even though their salvation depends on it. Hard, unpleasant biblical truths that run counter to the popular culture don’t lead to full collection plates on Sunday morning.

If you’re looking for a “real” church, either gather together believers of like mind and spirit (i.e., those who take the Bible and its clear meaning seriously, strive to live in accordance with its message and worship accordingly) and meet in someone’s living room or basement, or do what Jake suggests at 1/1/13 @ 1:5AM: take over an existing body full of misguided heretics and make it whole. These are really your only two alternatives for finding a “real” (i.e., bible-believing) church.



aaronthejust says:

December 1, 2013 at 10:05 am

For those of you looking for a church:

Hint: church didn't always meet on Sunday. The modern church came to be when Constantine's wife begged him to stop persecuting Christians and convert—and the poor sap did, and now look what happened.



Longorso says:

December 1, 2013 at 10:13 am

Check out this [FB pic posted by a Christian radio station](#) (KSBJ). In Christ you are a new creation, so you can ditch anyone or anything that fails to “bring out the best in you”.



Feminist Hater says:

December 1, 2013 at 11:08 am

It has a little heart written on the end. Tells you everything that there is to need to know about who wrote it and why...



[gunner451gunner451](#) says:

December 1, 2013 at 11:19 am

Good luck getting anyone in the main stream churches to support this, no way no how will they do that. It seems to be a blind spot (Intentional or not) by the boomer generation as every bible teacher that I've listened to from that generation seems to have the same canned response to any of the new testament teachings about women (both submission and their role in the church).

Good example of that is one guy (Chuck Missler) I listen to who is very conservative and emphasizes that we should take the Bible literally when at all possible. Yet consistently he will shrug off any passage dealing with women as a cultural artifact that (he implies) should be ignored. I found it interesting that in his writings he also hints at marriage troubles in the 1970's which suggests that his wife had threatened to leave him which may be why he treads so lightly on this subject and gave her such a big role in his ministry. Ran across the same thing with Chuck Colson and a few others from that generation. About the only one that I've heard that tells it like it is (on the radio) is John MacArthur of Grace to You.

Looking at it I think that the crux of the problem is that most of these ministers have wives that are anything but submissive and in order to keep their marriage together they've compromised on this particular point. That plus the pressure from women in the pulpit makes this a no win situation for any man teaching the Word of God. It's sadly one of the main reasons why I no longer attend church.



Longorso says:

December 1, 2013 at 11:20 am

I left this FB comment out of my original post:

Who cares what it is "supposed to mean"? Are you the author? No, quit being so judgemental, sometimes you can see a verse and God gives you a different meaning than the original, that's what is so awesome about the bible and God! AND I'm here to tell you you can fight and fight for your marriage, but if you're the only one trying, it's time to get out, when one person continuously breaks the covenant, God doesn't mean for you to be stuck in a tortuous situation, He loves us



sunshinemary says:

December 1, 2013 at 11:22 am

aaronthejust:

Christian women are especially fearful of submission.

This is true and represents a good chunk of the problem, but their fear is no excuse for their disobedience:

5 For this is how the holy women who hoped in God used to adorn themselves, by submitting to their own husbands, 6 as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord. And you are her children, if you do good and **do not fear anything that is frightening**. (1 Peter 3:5-6)

We are to submit and not worry about the outcome.

In addition to that, it seems there are more than a few Christian men who are eager to have wives who *don't* submit to them:

My wife is my equal partner, not my child. I don't want to lead her, I want to walk beside her.

Why? I think it is because they, too, are afraid. They are afraid that they might make a wrong decision. They have already seen the fate of men who expect their wives to submit to them but then inadvertently make a wrong decision. They don't want the pressure of always having to be right, so I guess they just tell their women that they get to be in charge now.

Although in a way, that might prove to be corrective for some women, I don't know. One time when we were driving in heavy traffic, I was nagging at my husband about the route we were taking and criticizing his decision, and he finally pulled over by the side of the road, got out, and said, "Get in the driver's seat. You're driving now." I hate driving in heavy traffic, and at first I refused, but he held the line, and I finally had no choice. I cried all the way to our destination because driving in traffic jams stresses me out. But I don't mouth off to him in the car about the route he chooses anymore.

So maybe there is a place for men to say, "You want to be in charge? Fine. Do it and see how much *you* like it." But I'm not sure if that would work in the bigger picture sense...



Ton says:

December 1, 2013 at 11:29 am

Christian women are the worst. They get the default dosages of you go girl, it's him not you etc that every woman gets, then they hear that message again on Sunday. Expect on Sunday that message comes with, what they believe to be, the moral authority of God.



Mr. J says:

December 1, 2013 at 11:40 am

.

@ferriker

Strangely enough, the "baptist" cult church that we got involved in wasn't 501cwhatever and the "preacher" spoke against being such and there were no "elders", etc...He was a dictator unto himself who said all the right things and made all the right noises, (ex.-"men are the head of the family, wife submission, etc)...he used it all to the hilt in cult-like fashion to steal and deceive.

We thought it was a great "church" until we woke up and after this we've been DONE with "churches".

..

It seems to be either cults or feminist freakfests.

.



JDG says:

December 1, 2013 at 11:56 am

tz2026 says:

November 30, 2013 at 10:43 pm

What husbands that are refusing to be fathers are you referring to? Who is dismissing 1 Tim 2:15?



feeriker says:

December 1, 2013 at 11:58 am

Aaronthejust said *Hint: church didn't always meet on Sunday. The modern church came to be when Constantine's wife begged him to stop persecuting Christians and convert—and the poor sap did, and now look what happened.*

Don't even get me started...

Even a cursory glance at history shows us that the destruction of the New Testament church began almost EXACTLY 1,700 years ago when one conniving Roman politician named Constantine decide to (pretend to) “convert” to Christianity – for purely practical, political reasons (note that his “post conversion” behavior as “the first Christian” Caesar differed not at all from that of his pagan predecessors). Persecuted believers at the time, apparently forgetting the Savior’s messages about persecution of the righteous, gullibly became elated that Caesar was now “one of them.” It all went downhill from there and only continues to get worse.

@Mr. J:

Yes, that was my and my family’s experience with Baptist franchises too. These are NO places for anyone with a functioning brain stem, and IQ north of 5, or a knowledge of what the Scriptures actually say that will serve to check the megalomaniac impulses of semi-literate, biblically illiterate control freaks with messiah complexes. Better to “home church” than to subject yourself or your family to such heretical cults.



JDG says:

December 1, 2013 at 12:11 pm

They scare women by telling them the lie that beastly patriarchy is spreading rampantly

May it not be a lie, and may patriarchy return ever so swiftly. But all according to God's will.



Mr. J says:

December 1, 2013 at 12:23 pm

@feeriker

The guy is actually quite biblically literate.....He's probably the insidious of the insidious.....The evil-genious "preacher" who can fake the ultimate in sincerity.



Mr. J says:

December 1, 2013 at 12:23 pm

genius



tbc says:

December 1, 2013 at 12:38 pm

Why do they twist scripture? Or why have so many men in the church succumbed to the scripture twisting? Because scripture seems impractical and they have adopted a more or less pragmatic view of Christianity as something that should 'work to make your life and the lives of others better'. It is of course, no such thing, but persecution for righteousness sake doesn't sell many books or fill pews and in post-war affluent America of the 50's & 60's saying 'no' to daddy's little angel was probably the worse thing imaginable. So they said yes and we're living with the daughters and granddaughters of those they said yes to.



empathologism says:

December 1, 2013 at 12:43 pm

SSM, men saying they do not want a submissive wife and all that is not from fear. its much more basic. Its simply lift chasing. They get lifts by stating that, and they get real lifts from their wives in the short term.

I have done the “you drive/do it” thing many times. I will never stop using that tool. I also have, when she starts explaining how I need to do xyz in the realm of say some complicated financial/legal matter with one of the businesses we own, Ive walked her through her recommended action and let her reach the conclusion that her idea is naive or flat wrong. Sniping from the sidelines is a favorite of women.

We got a real tree this year, we have an amazing artificial tree (2 actually) but she wanted a massive real one. I explained the trouble that such a large tree would bring, getting it situated and balanced at the point where it is straight is a problem. We got the big tree, I got it set and up, and she insists its unstable, I needed to redo it for the 50th time. I invited her to lay under it and try, she declined. It is always obvious to me that this dynamic means women try to foist their plans onto things because they are never the ones to deal with the consequences of wrong decisions.

That’s why these “equal” marriages are anything but. It means a guy is willing to be constantly cleaning up messes that he could see coming, but allowed to happen. I know couples that joke about this....”my husband lets me screw things up and he fixes it, yuk yuk yuk.” More lift



[empathologism](#) says:

December 1, 2013 at 12:47 pm

Longorso (is that an uncertainty about the dimensions of something? Long is, after all, subjective)

What does your post mean? What is your point about when one is trying and the other not they should leave? I disagree. “One” cannot really make the call about whether the other is trying, honestly. “One” has an agenda. “One” is calling the lack of coopetration a breaking of covenant, which is code speak for all manner of divorce rationalization. It usually precedes the claim that “the divorce was a formality, we were actually divorced long ago”

Please explain



James K says:

December 1, 2013 at 2:02 pm

@Church Is For Girls

Thank you for the link to the article by Mark A. Smith on divorce as the “missing front in the culture war”. There are some surprising facts there about American history and how the attitudes of the Protestant churches have changed over the years. It is essential reading for anyone who intends to influence a church’s policy on divorce.



Carlotta *says:*

December 1, 2013 at 2:27 pm

May the Lord let in the wolves. It is the only way to see who is a hireling and who is the true Shepherd.

I do not say this lightly.

I say this with grief. As a last resort. As a last hope at mercy.

Once they throw off the sheepskin and the sheep are out of the fold, it will be too late.

Let them flood in, let them run off the hirelings. Let His sheep see the wolves and run to the one true Shepherd. Before it is too late.

And by His sweet mercy, let His sheep start to recognize Him among all others. To teach others how to recognize the wolves. May we start to guard each other.



[empathologism](#) *says:*

December 1, 2013 at 2:45 pm

Secular writers have nothing to lose. Mahler et al will pander saying the words are sharp and true, they will over intellectualize the matter to keep it from really becoming something to act on, or not. It should be the cry of all Christians that divorce is a scourge on the church and especially on children. It, divorce, and hence the church, is indeed hindering the walk of the precious young. There was an article by one of these fakes about children leaving church when they leave home. They made no connection between the kid shuttling between houses for 10 years as little kids and teens, attending two churches, or one every other week.

The family is like stuffing, it’s all the leftovers after people finally discover their favorite foods, then scrape the rest into a bowl and call it an entre.



Jason says:

December 1, 2013 at 3:06 pm

Rycamor and MarcusD, it's perfectly legitimate for a blogger to use a pseudonym, for the reasons you've mentioned (also The Social Pathologist has written eloquently about the good reasons for blogger anonymity against The Cathedral). What I object to is the merciless language Dalrock uses against church leaders (I've been reading Dalrock's blog for two years or so now, so it's not some new development), constantly abusing them and accusing them of cowardice in no uncertain terms, while showing none of the equivocal willingness to show any such public courage himself except apparently counseling a few friends here or there (the easiest thing in the world to do). Aside from the lack of charity of it all (although no longer a believer I once was, and I have known many decent ministers, priests, and pastors who were flawed and theological deficient in some way but in all essentials were very devout, yet were endlessly backstabbed by congregations who expected nothing less than perfection), I find it to be utterly shameless, and I find it amazing that I'm the first to call Dalrock on it. Dalrock is the prototype of the whiny Christian who smirks at his wife during a service when a pastor says something mistaken and then endlessly complains about all the horrible pastors on his private blog, and does this for years and years on end, yet lacks the simple decency to ever (ever!), say, have a private word with the pastor, or to discuss publicly to his congregation why he thinks they are falling short on a certain issue. To be fair Dalrock may be doing such things, as well as more daring ones such as putting up those signs that say 'This is a Divorce-Free Church' (although I tend to doubt it) in his private life, but even if he is he still falls far short of the bar that he thinks church leaders themselves should be reaching for. In plain English, Dalrock has forgotten something quite fundamental, that it is easy to condemn others for not risking enough when your own family's livelihood and well-being isn't at stake.



JDG says:

December 1, 2013 at 3:43 pm

Why do they twist scripture? Or why have so many men in the church succumbed to the scripture twisting? Because scripture seems impractical and they have adopted a more or less pragmatic view of Christianity as something that should 'work to make your life and the lives of others better'.

I don't know why. I just know that it is done so often as to be the norm. During a music practice some time ago, a colleague from a different congregation and I were trying to schedule another time to rehearse for a project. He said he needed to ask his wife for approval. I asked him why he didn't just make the necessary plans for his ministry as the scriptures are quite clear that he is the head of his family, and she is supposed to be helping him.

He quoted Eph 5:21 out of context as the reason for checking with his wife first. I explained in some detail how 5:21 is speaking to the congregation and 5:22 is speaking to married women. He had nothing to answer with. The scripture says what it says. Nevertheless, his last comment on the subject was “I’m still going to listen to my wife”. The context of his comment was that he felt it was necessary to get her approval before making a commitment.

I don’t write this as a condemnation of him, but as an example of what I have seen all too often among Christians. At the church I attend there is a genuine effort to remain true to the scriptures. Male headship is taught. Wifely submission is also being taught, but not yet to the extent it should be. None of us is perfect, and there is so much from the world that needs to be weeded out.



Anonymous age 71 says:

December 1, 2013 at 3:48 pm

We don’t criticize Dalrock because for the most part he is correct. You are not.

Jason, it is obvious you have never been a public activist, as for example I have done. You can spend years of your life on your crusade, and no one changes their views. Dalrock is correct and you are not.

Dalrock cannot change pastors. All he can do is try to save men from the evil those pastors do. He does well at that.



Blake says:

December 1, 2013 at 3:53 pm

@rycamor, I was expecting either clarification or name calling in response. The money was on name calling.



AnonymousManosphereBlogger says:

December 1, 2013 at 3:57 pm

What I object to is the merciless language Dalrock uses against church leaders (I’ve been reading Dalrock’s blog for two years or so now, so it’s not some new development), constantly abusing them and accusing them of cowardice in no uncertain terms, while

showing none of the equivilent willingness to show any such public courage himself except apparently counseling a few friends here or there (the easiest thing in the world to do).

Yeah, sure. Whatever pal. Dalrock is too smart to fall for such a pathetic attempt to doxx him. Give it up, tool.

Dalrock has been getting regular Instalanches in the past year. He is literally the only source of substantive, biblical-based criticism of the Christian church (all denominations!) and it's decades long slide in conceding to feminist and secularist cultural influence. He's making a real impact, which is why asshats like yourself are now trying to get him to out himself. He's gaining momentum and influencing the narrative. Dalrock should continue to do exactly what he's doing, it's WORKING.

And oh yeah, he's doing far more than "counseling a few friends." He's gaining real traction and calling the multitude of frauds and false prophets to account, and he simply uses the Bible to clearly demonstrate how these so called leaders, pastors and preachers are preaching false doctrine. And let's not forget all of the good works he's done in helping to keep families together by advising women out of frivolous divorcing over at Yahoo Answers.

Aside from the lack of charity of it all (although no longer a believer I once was, and I have known many decent ministers, priests, and pastors who were flawed and theological deficient in some way but in all essentials were very devout, yet were endlessly backstabbed by congregations who expected nothing less than perfecrion), I find it to be utterly shameless, and I find it amazing that I'm the first to call Dalrock on it.

Yes, amazing.

Beat it, troll.



Christians 4 Christ! says:

December 1, 2013 at 4:12 pm

“For one thousand years, this principle has guided Western civilization. Simply stated, that principle is this: the groom dies for the bride, the strong suffer for the weak, and the highest expression of love is to give one’s life for another. The men aboard the Titanic recognized their duty because they had been raised in a culture that implicitly embraced such notions. Only by returning to these foundations can we ever hope to live in a society in which men will make the self-conscious decision to die so that women and children may live. This is the true legacy of the Titanic.”



retrophobia says:

December 1, 2013 at 4:15 pm

Jason: The Federalist Papers were also published under pseudonym. Making assumptions about authorial hypocrisy is unwarranted, and to demand amazing works instead of merely exceptional works... well, I'll put it this way: I'm lucky when I can pry my lazy carcass out of bed on a saturday, much less research, write, and maintain a blog that's meaningful to thousands upon thousands of people.



Tam the Bam says:

December 1, 2013 at 4:15 pm

“it is easy to condemn others for not risking enough when your own family’s livelihood and well-being isn’t at stake.”

And let’s avoid the awkward questions implied by the fact that in an ostensibly free country, a man has to risk these things. Just for talking “out loud”.

Never mind being *paid* to talk, and displeasing the punters. That’s just stupid. Customer’s always right.



James K says:

December 1, 2013 at 4:32 pm

The best a blogger can do is make sure the Red Pill message is out there. It will never become the mainstream narrative; but if it is there, those who seek will find it, and the message will be heard. No one should be asked to risk sacrificing their career in return for the privilege of blogging.

Getting the message out does have an effect. The previous post reported Lydia McGrew’s post, in which she said:

There is an attitude I’m running into occasionally among men, even young men who have not had anything terrible done to them, and I think it’s highly, highly unfortunate. It seems to be based on this statistic one hears over and over and over again: “Women initiate x% of divorces.” Usually the statistic is 80%.

Yes, young men are starting to get realistic information about their prospects for divorce, and the likes of Lydia McGrew really hate that.

Keep up the good work.



Jason says:

December 1, 2013 at 4:33 pm

I'm not trying to out anybody, AnonymousManosphereBlogger: don't bear false witness against me on that front. Read again what I wrote more carefully, especially the first few sentences. Concerning the issue of success on Dalrock's part in the way he is reaching out to a large audience, that's a good point and as I suggested at the beginning of my post there may be a legitimate tradeoff there, but I don't think that was essential thrust of what I was trying to say. Rather I was suggesting something that I think has been forgotten by many, which is that if you want others to maul themselves in battle, at some point you need to dirty yourself. And if you're not willing to take that step, well fine, but if you have any self-awareness you'll be less condemnatory other others unwillingness to not take steps that you yourself are also not willing to take.



JDG says:

December 1, 2013 at 4:41 pm

Jason says:

December 1, 2013 at 3:06 pm

You are making a false comparison. Dalrock is not criticizing all Pastors, nor is he criticizing Pastors for a little mistake here and there. This is a huge issue and one that needs to be addressed, but few people are.

I also don't like it when I see Pastors criticized, but when men are teaching what is false from the pulpit in the name of Jesus Christ, something needs to be done about it.

Yes if a Pastor makes a teaching error, calling him on it should be done privately and discreetly. But that option is not always available. Especially with those in the media. Sometimes these men are unavailable for private talk and often they believe something contrary to what the scriptures plainly say.

At some point one must ask if a teacher that is perpetuating a false teaching is a false teacher. I am not saying every Pastor that caved to feminist ideology is deliberately in error, but I am

saying that those who perpetually teach contrary to what is written in the Bible need to be held accountable.

Yes we all fall short of perfection, but that does not mean that none of us can point out the faults of others when the need arises. You don't have to be perfect to tell me when you see that I am doing something wrong.

Let a righteous man strike me—it is a kindness;
let him rebuke me—it is oil for my head;
let my head not refuse it.



Boxer says:

December 1, 2013 at 4:58 pm

Dear Free Riker:

If you're looking for a "real" church, either gather together believers of like mind and spirit (i.e., those who take the Bible and its clear meaning seriously, strive to live in accordance with its message and worship accordingly) and meet in someone's living room or basement...

Yes man!

Since GBFM, "anonymous" and others seem so interested: Herbert Marcuse, the German-American philosopher and off-again, on-again member of the Frankfurt School, advised exactly this! He said that when the establishment controls all the institutions of discourse (the publishing houses, media, churches, etc.) then people who want to agitate for social change need to make their own institutions, to describe a more authentic relationship between themselves and their world.

Interestingly, The Frankfurt School approach includes an admonition against directly protesting the churchian congregations, as people are encouraging Dalrock to do. This may seem like a short-term success and the people who do it get a nice ego boost, but what it actually does is allow the system to enter into a dialogue in which it can either demonize the dissidents or buy them off over the long term.

The best thing to do is simply to gather together and start acting like Protestants (or Catholics or Jews or whatever), study the religious texts and hold your own services, and forget about the sellout congregations and their turncoat man-hating, divorce encouraging ministers. Don't give them any money, and definitely don't give them any time or attention (that includes

protesting them, or going to disrupt their services). Let them become irrelevant, and build your own authentic institutions to replace them.

While I would like to see family men of all religions (and atheists too) do this, the Jesus character also advised this in Christian scripture. Matthew 18:20 is what I am thinking of. No less an authority than Jesus himself encourages men to ignore the hucksters who make a profit out of turning their collars around, so Christians are less restricted than most other believers.

or do what Jake suggests at 1/1/13 @ 1:5AM: take over an existing body full of misguided heretics and make it whole. These are really your only two alternatives for finding a “real” (i.e., bible-believing) church.

This would be fun to see also. Many of these churches and synagogues have boards and people can get elected to help run them. I'd really enjoy seeing some “band of brothers” types becoming sleepers and orchestrating the takeover of one of these phony churches, and the subsequent using of their resources to start teaching authentic values. That would probably take a much longer time than starting one's own home congregation, but some of these churches are fabulously wealthy. The anglican diocese in the town I grew up in has tens of millions of dollars in investments (back in the day, they sold several hospitals).

Think of what you could do if you tapped these resources to start a “Men's Resource Center” or “Father's Legal Aid Society”...

Regards, Boxer



Jason says:

December 1, 2013 at 4:59 pm

Oh that's bullshit JDG – walking up to a pastor and saying that you disagree with him is too much (or better, after you have attended the church for a while and have developed a relationship)? Are all of you so scared of the Cathedral that you're not willing to do even that? To allude to what was said above about political movements and things like the Federalist Papers (although I would point out there that shortly after the Papers was published Jay, Hamilton, and Madison all entered the arena and defended publicly what they had argued for privately, no mean thing at the beginning of a nation when there are always dangers), yes obviously there is a need for prudence and all that, but good grief. And if you think the Church is mistaken then you go to another, and if that doesn't work then you establish your own – as Americans have done since the beginning of the republic. Fuck, Rod Dreher helped set up a little Orthodox church in Baptist and Catholic country a few years ago, no easy thing, and yet

you guys can't start of new sources of worship in evangelical metropolises like Dallas? Really, what's stopping you?!! Nothing!



JDG says:

December 1, 2013 at 5:00 pm

Jason says:

December 1, 2013 at 4:33 pm

What must Dalrock do in order for you to consider him “mauled in battle”? Does his marriage have to blow up? – May it never happen.

Does he have to lose his job for blogging against feminism? Again – *secundum hominem dico*.

Are you arguing that he should become a Pastor? Elders are supposed to be chosen, not self appointed.

He already does more then most lay people. What am I missing here?



JDG says:

December 1, 2013 at 5:12 pm

Oh that's bullshit JDG – walking up to a pastor and saying that you disagree with him is too much (or better, after you have attended the church for a while and have developed a relationship)?

You really don't know what you are talking about. At some churches (mega) you can't even get near platform let alone the Pastor. And as for the smaller churches, what is a guy to do, drive across the country and visit every single church he can find, or start a blog where thousands of readers can pass along the message for you?

I myself have walked up to many a Pastor and done just what you said. Would you care to compare how large of an impact I have made vs the impact Dalrock has made?

At the church I attend we have dismantled much of the feminism that was instilled. But that work took quite a while and only reaches so many.



Boxer says:

December 1, 2013 at 5:12 pm

Dear Jason:

walking up to a pastor and saying that you disagree with him is too much (or better, after you have attended the church for a while and have developed a relationship)? Are all of you so scared of the Cathedral that you're not willing to do even that?

It's not about being "scared of the Cathedral", it's about using one's resources wisely. Herbert Marcuse called this sort of thing "the defeated logic of protest".

Dalrock could go shout down his minister if he wanted, but that would put him in dialogue with his minister, and by definition, the state would subsume him into its own superstructure (I use these terms in the Marxian sense). The state would have its media give him an interview, or at least review his protest if it was noteworthy; and perhaps, if he was persistent, the state would offer him a position in its ideological apparatus which we know as "the church", and then he'd be part of what you call the cathedral. (Marxists call it the state, manospherians call it the cathedral, and I guess I know both languages, so I'm using them interchangeably, but they mean the same thing).

From this angle, don't you think Dalrock is doing the more authentic thing, by writing his blog? He gets to keep his independence from the establishment, and not only be a social critic, but also give those of us who are "lost" a place to gather.

Furthermore, it is easy for a guy like me (and perhaps yourself) to talk about publishing stuff under one's own name. If I had a wife and a little kid, I'd probably be much more anonymous than I am now. The cathedral doesn't usually directly attack us (this is the difference between "domination" and "hegemony" that Gramsci talked about), but there are a lot of nutjob feminists in the world, and these other people don't need to be hassled when they are out on the street. Dalrock's kids don't need to be screamed at, just because the butch dyke at the grocery store doesn't like daddy's opinions on abortion. You know?

Anyway, what do you think?



Bobbye says:

December 1, 2013 at 5:13 pm

The 'church' is comprised of the individual followers of Christ. Many of those followers are assembled right now on this blog, and other similar blogs. Here a believer gets to do what is seldom allowed in those buildings, called Churches, where they meet on Sundays. Dalrock offers a 'sermon' and the 'church' gets to discuss ideas and Scripture with a freedom I have never seen in one of those Churches. Even unbelievers get to join in, and all ideas, experiences, and criticisms are heard. In this way the 'church' is edified and made mature. I wish this type of experience could be had in the mainstream(I'm sure someplaces it is) but these blogs are a blessing and a goodly gift. I thank God everyday for these blog owners and their hard work.



[empathologism](#) says:

December 1, 2013 at 5:24 pm

Anonymous, I have done as much face to face work on this stuff as anyone, i am sure of it. I have gotten audience with mega church pastors, I have challenged smaller church pastors, in fact i challenge every pastor I hear in person, whether its local or i am traveling and attend a church. In addition, i go looking for them online, find their sermons, parse them, and rebuke them in detail. I have used Dalrock's blog for source text many times. I know the futility of the effort yet Ive persisted for nearly 10 years. I cannot figure out what your point is.

Either you are Lydia McGrew
You are some other women
You suffer envy
You are easily distracted by irrelevance
More than one of the above

Serious unrelated question:

Why are men so prone to using historical references as penis extenders?



JDG says:

December 1, 2013 at 5:31 pm

although no longer a believer I once was

This is the greatest tragedy.



JDG says:

December 1, 2013 at 5:37 pm

empathologism says:

December 1, 2013 at 5:24 pm

Was this for Anonymous or for Jason?



Patchasaurus says:

December 1, 2013 at 5:38 pm

My wife is divorcing me right now and all of her strategy and affirmation came from a guy called Steve Arterburn, a pastor and so-called Christian counselor, author of the insidious Every man's Battle franchise. He is twice divorced and he is 57 and his new wife is 34, a wounded bird whom he picked up at one of his own conferences. She's having his baby. This guy won't even be around to guide his kid when he comes of age. He is twice fit for hell..



empathologism says:

December 1, 2013 at 5:40 pm

Lydia McGrew is:

She includes a link to her CV

<http://www.lydiamcgrew.com/LMCV.htm>

She has written : Internalism and Epistemology: The Architecture of Reason. With Timothy McGrew.

She says she is a home school mom who does "analytical philosophy" in some of her spare time. Oy. Looking at her site you see a link to Tim McGrew, a professor of philosophy somewhere I think in Michigan. He is husband or brother.

Then read her blog entry: ["A Rant Against the Men's Rights Attitude"](#) and the comments that follow and you have to really wonder....is she a phony? The level of discourse is beneath sophomoric, lower than a "T" or some of the other's who have left footprints here. she besmirches Dalrock and the rest of us as having poisoned minds, and that reading and writing in the sphere has ruined our critical thinking skills. She moderates comments yet picks from them and rebuts them, disingenuously. Shamlessly, she shames and insults, twists words and assumes intellectual superiority for herself as she graces us with her wisdom.

I had to write a screed about her. Man's got his limits



[empathologism](#) says:

December 1, 2013 at 5:41 pm

Jason.....my mistake....sorry



Random Angeleno says:

December 1, 2013 at 5:48 pm

@Jason you're trying to dox Dalrock. That's all there is to it. Understand you are likely the first to address Dalrock as stridently as you do. With that tone in your words, it is easy to read between the lines to ascertain your true purpose.

Recall the Federalist Papers were originally published under pseudonyms. Benjamin Franklin wrote under pseudonyms from time to time as did Alexander Hamilton. Thomas Paine wrote his seminal work under a pseudonym.

Why not Dalrock? Not saying he is the equal of those great voices, but anonymous writing has long been a part of free speech expression.



Cane Caldo says:

December 1, 2013 at 5:57 pm

Jason, you are the reason. Lydia is the reason. It's not because the the "bad guys" attack, but because the "good guys" abandon.

<http://canecaldo.wordpress.com/2013/11/19/changing-the-subject/>



[empathologism](#) says:

December 1, 2013 at 6:02 pm

TFH, Its strange/funny you wrote this, that you did not want to be lumped into being vulgar etc. I had that thought when I read your comment using that diminutive. But it is not generally your style to do that so I didn't remark



empathologism says:

December 1, 2013 at 6:08 pm

Yea, literally is an overused word isn't it.



Tarl says:

December 1, 2013 at 7:18 pm

I was amused at my RCIA class when the priest said that the Ephesians passage meant that husbands and wives should be in "mutual submission" to each other.

My response was:

- (a) That's not what it says, and
- (b) "Mutual submission" is a contradiction in terms.

I was told to talk to the hand, time for the class to move on, we can discuss this after class if you want, etc etc.



empathologism says:

December 1, 2013 at 7:32 pm

I do not think she is tradcon. I also would suggest that she closed the comments because some of the more....um.....crass comment makers blew into her yard. I do blame her for not posting after moderation. She cannot edit, she says, but im sure not all the comments were salty. Mine were not. In fact her treatment of me was far more rude than anything i stated to her. he condescension is a case study in why men would generally not choose to marry women with lots more formal education than them. I suppose it can work when it is a man and woman who are both sequestered nerds with liberal arts PhD's. But a regular guy, take me for example, a mere Chemical Engineer, if I spoke with a woman who measures herself by the list of letters following her name, it would take Tim the tool man to modify the viagra that I would need. they love hearing that, that we men are intimidated by the strong smart woman.

Not so much.

Just annoyed, like debating the high school valedictorian who has been told they are going to feed the world, cure cancer, and be President.



rycamor says:

December 1, 2013 at 8:16 pm

Blake says:

December 1, 2013 at 3:53 pm

@rycamor, I was expecting either clarification or name calling in response. The money was on name calling.

Not sure what you're getting at. I know him from a couple other blogs and he is quite a smart guy, just tends to get a little tedious on the Catholic thing.



Caspar Reyes says:

December 1, 2013 at 8:36 pm

I am a smart guy, but I lack the patience and experience to analyze the arguments of Empath and Lydia are using against each other, confirming to me that I remain one of the foolish things of the world to shame the wise. Like with the Matt Walsh to-do of late; I observe Matt's post has 2,500 comments, a thing that would be the envy of any manosphere blogger. Empath, you got in a tiff with one RiRi at Matt's on the order of he_said-she_said, and I had to quit reading; although I admire no end your chutzpah in engaging, and although I don't have the savvy or training to come up with cogent arguments. In the end, Cane-dog demurs FTW: to paraphrase, it doesn't matter whether sex is a need or a want; it is your right, and no further discussion should be necessary.

This points up is a reason the Apostle says that the women should keep silent in the assembly and ask their husbands questions at home: at some point, the discussion has to end and you have to move on. If Lydia were a Ph.D in Greek and Theology and you, her husband only had a GED (that's a high-school diploma earned long after high school, for you non USA dwellers), then you should nonetheless be teaching her Bible 101 at home, and she should be asking you the questions. She is the weaker vessel regardless of her schooling, and knows less in many ways than you do, where it counts. I am responsible for my house and none other, and that is difficult enough without trying to correct all the other women out there. Those of you who rule your houses well and then engage the world have all my admiration.



empathologism says:

December 1, 2013 at 8:41 pm

I dont recall RiRi,. As I said to someone else, its a weakness of mine, not proud of it. i will say that its fine to take the position (not that you are doing so) that a certain level of discourse is beneath us, futile, uninteresting, whatever.....all likely true, but no one else is doing it. If you noticed after several of my mini debates there some guys would post saying “right on, great arguments, thats what I’ve been thinking and not saying, etc” That’s why I bother, as childish as it seems, and sometimes is.

The folks making stupid arguments are accustomed to not being challenged.



Christians 4 Christ! says:

December 1, 2013 at 9:08 pm

“My wife is divorcing me right now and all of her strategy and affirmation came from a guy called Steve Arterburn, a pastor and so-called Christian counselor, author of the insidious Every man’s Battle franchise. He is twice divorced and he is 57 and his new wife is 34, a wounded bird whom he picked up at one of his own conferences. She’s having his baby. This guy won’t even be around to guide his kid when he comes of age. He is twice fit for hell..”

That may be true, but he sure as hell is an alpha male and for that we have to give him props.

How many of us could claim a 23 years younger wife or girlfriend? He obviously has game and knows how to work the ladies, as is evidenced by the hypnosis he has your wife under.



Dalrock says:

December 1, 2013 at 9:16 pm

FYI: I zapped some of the comments on Lydia and her husband. Please hold any further fire.



JDG says:

December 1, 2013 at 9:20 pm

That may be true, but he sure as hell is an alpha male and for that we have to give him props.

I give no props to a man who would use his talents to help destroy another man’s family. He doesn’t have my respect or admiration.



greyghost says:

December 1, 2013 at 9:54 pm

That may be true, but he sure as hell is an alpha male and for that we have to give him props. This isn't alpha game it is beta status game he is the highest ranking guy in the church and she is fucking him. Real game with be from the UPS guy (or who ever) that is fucking while he is at work preaching to the choir.



Christians 4 Christ! says:

December 1, 2013 at 9:55 pm

I googled Steve Arterburn and he appears to be quite the popular pastor-author-speaker-counselor-radio-talk-show-host. He even has a wikipedia page, so yeah, he is somebody. The vast majority of these famous rock star type "pastors" are Alpha Males with Dark Triad traits. The dark triad is a group of three personality traits: narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy.

Men like these become "pastors" so they can rule over men and cast spells on women. Our country and our churches are filled to the brim with them. With the latest Doug Phillips fiasco I'm beginning to think there is no other type of mega pastor.



Lucius Somesuch says:

December 2, 2013 at 1:09 am

Lydia McG writes in her comments: "I have seen it quite a bit in an academic context, where professor husbands are surrounded by amoral young co-eds, unencumbered by children and other such mundanities, and also very good at showing (or feigning) a flatteringly deep interest in the husband's intellectual passions which his wife may not share, making the younger woman seem more of a "soul-mate" as well as everything else. I cannot believe that there is no similar phenomenon in the business world. And of course in the world of politics the counterpart to the willing and passionate (in both senses) girl student is presumably the willing and passionate girl intern."

-I daresay this accounts for her presumed practice of "Analytic Philosophy". lolzlolz "AMORAL YOUNG CO-EDS"! Well, she's called it like she sees it, I guess



Lucius Somesuch says:

December 2, 2013 at 1:09 am

–apologies. I just saw the Dalrock notice above. Zap as required.



Jason says:

December 2, 2013 at 1:26 am

JDG, empath: actually I suspect that if your words were sincerely and thoughtfully expressed they did have an impact at least some of the time; if not at the time you expressed them then sometime down the road. I think it is very important to not eschew persuasion, even when such words may seem inadequate (I'm saying this as a general policy; there are of course exceptions).



Jason says:

December 2, 2013 at 1:47 am

Boxer, yes I think it's a very good thing that there are blogs like Dalrock's where disaffected Christians can gather. But really: wouldn't it be better if there were actual churches they could gather in where they could show their support for traditional families, rather than the constant petty venting online? And look, the U.S. is not Syria, where Christians are literally risking their lives for their faith. As I suggested earlier – notwithstanding your point about the state and all that, which I don't find at all persuasive – the ability for Christians to form their own churches is very open to them here. To argue otherwise is to assert a persecution complex and egotistical martyrdom that one has no right to here in this country (unlike again places like Pakistan, where young Christian children are becoming true martyrs by suffering under true persecution due to Islamic jihadism and fundamentalism).



Jake says:

December 2, 2013 at 2:24 am

@Boxer

You could do both. Form the small house church and then we you start getting to big pick a church to take over while continuing your own services at different times. Get the doctrine, loyalty oath, and structure of the church done while still in the house church state so that when you take over a church you'll already be firing on cylinders.



Minesweeper says:

December 2, 2013 at 5:17 am

@Jason

You truly have no idea how foolish you still sound. The vitriolic levels of hatred some feminists will display against any come back involving anything they hold dear has to be seen to be believed. They aren't known as feminatzis for fun you know.

Dalrock, is a voice in the wilderness and long may he be.

If he outed himself, all that would happen is instead of the highly intelligent discourse he manages to produce on a regular basis, he would instead be constantly defending himself against the femhord onslaught. Many other commentators have had to remove themselves from discussion because of this.

Go and read ALL his articles before commentating again, if you are fortunate you may obtain some wisdom, failing that you will find what you are looking for at jezebel and slate.



Minesweeper says:

December 2, 2013 at 5:23 am

greyghost says:

December 1, 2013 at 9:54 pm

That may be true, but he sure as hell is an alpha male and for that we have to give him props.

This isn't alpha game...

Doubt any alpha would 1) start dating a broken chick in her 30's, 2) marry the dumb broad.

As best she would belong to his outer harem possibly as a recruiter for his inner sanctum.

Pingback: [The Bible and Hamsterbation](#)



deti says:

December 2, 2013 at 9:09 am

It doesn't surprise me in the least that some twist scripture to suit their own ends. This practice of taking passages out of context, changing one word or two here and there, ascribing

odd or archaic meanings to words, and flat out ignoring some passages, is common now. It has allowed feminist pastors to create a complete false theology, particularly surrounding the arena of marriage and personal relationships.



[Dalrock](#) says:

December 2, 2013 at 9:15 am

@Jason

But really: wouldn't it be better if there were actual churches they could gather in where they could show their support for traditional families, rather than the constant petty venting online?

You pointed your browser to my blog and are horrified to find that it is *only a blog*.

Why?

Do you seriously not understand what a blog *is*? What bloggers *do*? We exchange ideas and make and hone arguments. If you disagree with the argument, you are welcome to comment here, go surf youtube, or even [start your own blog](#) to make better arguments. Yet you appear to like the argument so much you demand more. *Dalrock's arguments are so good, you pettily vent, that he clearly owes it to me to personally transform all of the problems traditional families are facing. Until then, why, I'll continue to go to his blog and be horrified each day to see that it is only a blog.*



[Rollo Tomassi](#) says:

December 2, 2013 at 9:30 am

Imagine if Peter's words were instead instructing husbands to:

- *Submit to their wives as Sarah submitted to Abraham (calling him her lord).*
- *Focus on winning their wayward wives without a word, through their untiring demonstration of purity and submission.*

Doesn't this pretty much sum up Christian-Beta game already? And SSM was wondering if all Christian men were naturally pussified, ..

@Jason, you really need to go read this post:

<http://www.rooshv.com/the-most-insidious-method-of-control-never-devised>

Then come back here and pop off all you'd like. Maybe Joesph from Jackson would like to chime in about his experiences in founding a ministry too.



Great Books For Men GreatBooksForMen GBFM (TM) GB4M (TM)

GR8BOOKS4MEN (TM) IzoZozozlzo (TM) says:

December 2, 2013 at 9:55 am

IzoZozolzo hey Jason Dalrock's blog rocks!! Jason—perhaps you could start a church of a blog too? get to work!

Hey Dalrock,

It is quite remarkable that Boxer keeps harping on about how the Frankfurters should guide Christianity and the Manosphere as they are the true fathers of the Church and Man.

The exact opposite is true. Do not take GBFM's word for it. Instead simply google, "frankfurt school christianity."

Boxer is calling these Christians liars and frauds:

<http://au.christiantoday.com/article/the-frankfurt-school-and-the-war-on-the-west/6233.htm>

"The Frankfurt school and the war on the west."

"The cultural and ideological battles raging around us do not exist in a vacuum, nor have they happened by accident. There are those who hate the West and want to destroy it and make it into their own image. Many groups and individuals are actively at work in this assault on the West. Many movements and groups can be mentioned, but here I wish to focus on just one. It has been hugely influential in undermining the West and bringing about cultural Marxism. Even though Marxism as a political force is greatly diminished, it is still alive and well in its cultural form. I refer to the Frankfurt School." Read it all

here: <http://au.christiantoday.com/article/the-frankfurt-school-and-the-war-on-the-west/6233.htm>

Also here one can see that the Pope denounced Boxer's heroes, "The School included among its members the 1960s guru of the New Left Herbert Marcuse — denounced by Pope Paul VI for his theory of liberation which "opens the way for [sexual] licence cloaked as liberty" — Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, the popular writer Erich Fromm, Leo Lowenthal, and Jurgen

Habermas. ” from <http://www.darkmoon.me/2013/satants-secret-agents-the-frankfurt-school-and-their-evil-agenda/>

The remarkable thing is how Boxer thinks Dalrock and his readers are complete idiots. Is he right?

Another article here: The West’s self destruction and the Frankfurt School

“Young children are being exposed prematurely to sexual matters in school including being indoctrinated with the idea that homosexuality is normal and harmless.²¹ This in spite of the fact that after homosexuality was declassified as a treatable psychological disorder in 1973 hundreds of thousands of male homosexuals became infected with HIV with huge numbers dying of AIDS in the 1980s. In 2007 a new highly infectious bacteria was discovered spreading amongst men who have sex with men. It is called MRSA300, is highly resistant to standard antibiotics and can be picked up from contaminated surfaces.²² Also there is now a second HIV epidemic among American homosexual men rising at the rate of 8% per year. But no one is talking about it.²³ Instead public attention is diverted by political attempts to end the definition of marriage as essentially heterosexual by homosexual ‘rights’ activists.”

– <http://www.anglican-mainstream.net/2012/11/13/the-wests-self-destruction-and-the-frankfurt-school/>

The reason why the manosphere is failing to affect any real change is because the Boxers of the world are winning the day and transforming Christ and the Church into their own likeness, as was the goal of the Frankfurt school.

Boxer would have you think that these guys are liars too, thusly bearing false witness again:

Boxer calls Bernard Chapin a liar:

The political correctness which has destroyed the family has its origins in the Frankfurt School. Boxer calls these Catholics liars too:



Rollo Tomassi says:

December 2, 2013 at 10:16 am

@Jason, ah what the hell, I’ll do the link-work for you:

<http://leticiamary.wordpress.com/2013/02/24/if-you-challenge-femdom-churchianity-the-white-knights-will-attack-an-update-on-joseph-of-jackson/>



Tam says:

December 2, 2013 at 10:26 am

“Until then, why, I’ll continue to go to his blog and be horrified each day to see that it is only a blog.”

I have a modicum of sympathy for poor Jase. The wallpaper’s dismal and ordinary, and your chairs *are* pretty rickety. The craic is just sublime tho’



Eidolon says:

December 2, 2013 at 11:51 am

@deti

I think the twisting of scripture is an offshoot of the way we view historical writing. We so rarely look to those books to learn, but only to study. C.S. Lewis nailed this in his day and it has only gotten worse since then:

“Only the learned read old books and we have now so dealt with the learned that they are of all men the least likely to acquire wisdom by doing so. We have done this by inculcating The Historical Point of View. The Historical Point of View, put briefly, means that when a learned man is presented with any statement in an ancient author, the one question he never asks is whether it is true. He asks who influenced the ancient writer, and how far the statement is consistent with what he said in other books, and what phase in the writer’s development, or in the general history of thought, it illustrates, and how it affected later writers, and how often it has been misunderstood (specially by the learned man’s own colleagues) and what the general course of criticism on it has been for the last ten years, and what is the ‘present state of the question’. To regard the ancient writer as a possible source of knowledge—to anticipate that what he said could possibly modify your thoughts or your behaviour—this would be rejected as unutterably simple-minded. And since we cannot deceive the whole human race all the time, it is most important thus to cut every generation off from all others; for where learning makes a free commerce between the ages there is always the danger that the characteristic errors of one may be corrected by the characteristic truths of another. But thanks be to our Father and the Historical Point of View, great scholars are now as little nourished by the past as the most ignorant mechanic who holds that ‘history is bunk...’”

-C.S. Lewis, The Screwtape Letters



grey_whiskers says:

December 2, 2013 at 12:28 pm

@Rollo Tomassi says:

December 2, 2013 at 9:30 am

Imagine if Peter's words were instead instructing husbands to:

- *Submit to their wives as Sarah submitted to Abraham (calling him her lord).*
- *Focus on winning their wayward wives without a word, through their untiring demonstration of purity and submission.*

Consider that thought *stolen*. I'll be taking that one on the road.

(For a seeming apostate, you don't do too bad.)



[Boxer](#) says:

December 2, 2013 at 12:36 pm

Dear Jason:

Thanks for your response.

Boxer, yes I think it's a very good thing that there are blogs like Dalrock's where disaffected Christians can gather. But really: wouldn't it be better if there were actual churches they could gather in where they could show their support for traditional families, rather than the constant petty venting online?

I guess I didn't explain this well enough. I'll try it from a different angle.

As there are many ideological apparati, there needs to be a decentralized resistance to it if there's any hope for constructive social change.

The author of the Dalrock blog is engaged in building a new media apparatus. The new media will, we can hope, support the new church apparatus, where red pill dudes can gather and socialize and study and pray, but these are definitely different things. I think you'd agree that the establishment media is different from the establishment church in theory, even if they both form supportive parts of the same superstructure. The resistance to the status quo ought to proceed in the same way.

Regarding your rebuttal: you're right, the establishment won't send the police or the army after Dalrock for openly protesting his local counterfeit church, but again, in openly disagreeing, he'll lose his subversive credibility and become part of the dialectic which serves to maintain the status quo. He'd get some phony notoriety and I'm sure he'd make a good buck and get an ego boost, but he'd serve to siphon off discontent and flatten out any truly subversive content. This is the way the establishment works now. It controls consent through its cultural power, which is as effective as using force. What he is doing now is, objectively speaking, much more effective.

Best, Boxer



Christians 4 Christ! *says:*

December 2, 2013 at 1:02 pm

“Only the learned read old books and we have now so dealt with the learned that they are of all men the least likely to acquire wisdom by doing so. We have done this by inculcating The Historical Point of View. The Historical Point of View, put briefly, means that when a learned man is presented with any statement in an ancient author, the one question he never asks is whether it is true.”

This is so true! I find that there's an automatic assumption that because it is an ancient statement, it **MUST** be true. Better we deconstruct every piece of information that comes our way, whether it is new or old, written by a dumb ass or an assumed wise man, saint or prophet.



Sto12 *says:*

December 2, 2013 at 1:44 pm

I'm sure plenty of people criticized C. S. Lewis for wasting his time writing children's books instead of using his talents for a real ministry.

The modern definition of ministry is far too narrow. Too many Christians think that unless your work is associated with a brick-and-mortar institution that it isn't a “real ministry.” We see teens praised for taking mission trips and criticized for spending time online. Yet, which is more likely to further the cause of Christ: the glorified-vacation/mission-trip or expressing the Christian viewpoint on a secular forum?

Christians are gifted with many skills—including imagination and inventiveness. Instead of trying to rope everyone into your predefined notion of what constitutes a legitimate ministry, maybe you should step back and let those gifted with imagination run with it.



Eidolon says:

December 2, 2013 at 1:48 pm

@Boxer

I agree with your assessment. I also find it odd to say that Dalrock in particular ought to, and in fact is deficient in some way for not, start his own church or something of that nature.

Not all men are called to all purposes; as Christians we particularly believe this. Perhaps Dalrock is not called to be a pastor, but a writer spreading valuable information. If he does not feel called to head up a church, should he do so anyway? If not, does anonymity really get in the way of what he's doing or make it less effective?

If he is known as a particular man, he will be open to the common charge of hypocrisy if he doesn't live up perfectly to his principles. As an anonymous writer, only his ideas can be considered. That's exactly what is most valuable.

@Christians 4 Christ!

The modern tendency is to assume that all modern statements are true and all ancient statements are interesting for study but not relevant in terms of truth or falsity. The point of the excerpt is that we should look at ancient writings, the wealth of our inheritance, and consider whether they may have truths we ought to consider and learn from. We ought also to consider whether different attitudes in different eras may have been right where we're wrong, or if we are right where they were wrong. Moderns often don't even ask the question. It doesn't occur to them that to an earlier era abortion would be viewed as just as awful an abomination as slavery is to us now, and that perhaps both these attitudes are correct. Viewing one's time and the attitudes that attend to it as if from the outside, from the perspective of brilliant men from other times with different attitudes, can be a very constructive exercise which is rarely performed nowadays.



swampharrier says:

December 2, 2013 at 1:49 pm

@aaronthejust

"Christian women are especially fearful of submission. The women in my soft harem are more submissive to me than my Christian ex wife ever was, and more submissive than any of the nice Christian girls I go on dates with.

They're terrified of it. The only way I've found to get them (Christians) in a submissive frame of mind is game and dominant sexual relationships—folks, this isn't good."

Well what did you expect? Your christian wife did not submit to her religion by marrying unbeliever such as you. How would she submit to you then? In any case, those "christian girls" you talk of should not even be dating, much less submitting to, you.

"Hint: church didn't always meet on Sunday.."

Actually it did just that. As Sunday is the day of Resurrection.

greyghost:"That may be true, but he sure as hell is an alpha male and for that we have to give him props."

Says who?



Jason says:

December 2, 2013 at 3:50 pm

Dalrock, when I believe in something I actually act on I and try to show some courage in my own life (however flawed that is), especially when I consistently criticize others for the lack of it. I would be ashamed of myself if I didn't. Honestly, you're building a strawman out of my posts, as has pretty much everybody else. I don't have a problem with the fact that you blog, but what I consider to me your unwillingness to take the mote out of your own eye before judging, which I think affects your blog's credibility. If you disagree with me about that then fine, but can you at least address the arguments that I actually made? For instance, please respond to my key question: why are you not willing to show the same sort of courage that you condemn all other Christians from showing? If you think, for example, that there should be 'No divorces here' signs in churches, then why in the world would you not be promoting that in your own church? Why do you think your own actions in your Christian life should not match your tough rhetoric? Isn't it just because you're afraid of the whatever difficulties you might face (something, incidentally, that I think many commentators here exaggerate)? And if so, then again fine, I can respect that, but how can you then in the same voice so powerfully condemn and metaphorically kick church leaders in the balls – not too strong a word here I believe? Sorry Dalrock, but like I said earlier I have known quite a few church leaders who are flawed but do their best, and I just find your rhetoric to be really gratuitous and uncalled for.

Thanks for allowing me to say these things on your blog, which is generous of you. If you want, I'll let you, as Bill O'Reilly likes to say, have the last word.



Christians 4 Christ! *says:*

December 2, 2013 at 3:53 pm

@Eidolon, “The modern tendency is to assume that all modern statements are true and all ancient statements are interesting for study but not relevant in terms of truth or falsity.”

Perhaps in C.S. Lewis’s day. In our day however there is a tendency to quote ancient and medieval texts and accept them at their word, without question. You can see this tendency is very popular on Facebook updates as well as with the fascination for the “good ol’ days” and “wisdom of our grandparents generation”, “back to nature” etc.

The idealization of the past is in vogue.



Eidolon *says:*

December 2, 2013 at 4:10 pm

@Jason

Two points.

1) Dalrock can’t just be a layman? Who says he has the authority to put up signs in his church?

Lots of people write useful and incisive commentary about politics without running for office. It’s not cowardly. Either their interests lie in other areas, or their talents tend toward finding the flaws in things rather than building them. In neither case does that make their points less valid.

2) How do you know he isn’t doing what you say? We don’t know who he is, and we’ve presumably never been to his church. For all you know he’s done all of this. If he values his anonymity there’s no reason for him to tell everyone that he has done so, and he has not said that he hasn’t.

To sum up, you’re demanding that he be in charge of a church in order to implement his ideas, which he may not be called to do (and should not do if he isn’t called to it), in order to implement his ideas, which for all you know he has already done.

@Christians 4 Christ!

So our society automatically assumes that homosexuality is wrong, since nearly every civilization has rejected it? Do they automatically assume that natural law is real since many older thinkers thought it was? Do they accept the doctrines of Christianity uncritically because those books were written a long time ago?

I see a society that accepts anything that purports to be scientific and rejects anything that might be spiritual (unless it's silly and makes no demands, such as Feng Shui or astrology). Sure, they may cherry-pick some old books or writers that give them some faux support for whatever they wanted to believe already, but the main of Western thought is rejected out of hand as silly and old-fashioned. "Sure, they thought there was a big guy in the sky back then when people didn't know as much as we know now. But of course now science shows us that heaven isn't located in the sky, etc. Therefore all that stuff is silly, backwards nonsense."



Jason says:

December 2, 2013 at 5:34 pm

I read both of the posts you suggested, Rollo, which I think actually support the point I am making. Religious freedom and democracy do not happen on their own, but must be fought for constantly through the courage (and much more importantly, the action) of brave men and women. The pastor from the SunshineMary blog stood up for his beliefs and paid the price for it, showing his devotion to his faith (and apparently, people are following him to his new church because of the strength of his convictions: individuals know real guts when they see it) If Dalrock and other of his ilk simply engage in rhetoric but do not engage in action as this pastor did and actually try to imitate him, then religious freedom (and democracy for that matter) in America will fall, that's all there is to it (again, I must stress that blogs are good and prudence is called for, but it's not enough). If – conversely – they and others actually act on their convictions, although they may be difficult – then liberty will persevere. Really, it's as simple as that.



Eidolon says:

December 2, 2013 at 5:56 pm

@Jason

You don't know that Dalrock isn't doing exactly what you say. If he was he wouldn't necessarily talk about it on the blog (especially since it might make some waves and possibly make it easy to connect blog to church to man). If he is a layman and is not called to leadership in the church, then there's only so much difference he can legitimately make in his own church anyway. You don't seem to be addressing these points, so hopefully you'll at least be quiet.



[innocentbystanderboston](#) says:

December 2, 2013 at 5:58 pm

Jason,

As far as I'm concerned the only "credentialing" that one needs to be a Pastor is to know the King James Bible, to be a man, and to teach the King James Bible to anyone who will listen to you. Thus, it the responsibility for every husband to be a Pastor to his wife in their home, his own "church." Perhaps Dalrock does not have a church outside his home, but as far as I'm concerned, his home is a church and he is the Pastor in it over his wife and children. So if he does that, he is acting on his own convictions.

The Joe of Jackson situation over on Mary's blog, that was a political decision not a spiritual one. Those two Pastors had to remove Joe because their income was in jeopardy. They both knew Joe was right but WOMEN of that congregation were the ones who picked that church and WOMEN were the ones who decided which church would get their tithes provided by their husbands.

When you make a living off teaching the King James Bible, you are instantly put into a position of a conflict of interest. **The size of your paycheck is almost entirely dependant on the number of people in the pews and how much spending power they have.** If that is your sole income, you are required to say what they want to hear to keep them there. That is why I am of the opinion that lay Pastors who work other professions (and preach on Sunday only to serve God and Christ) are the best.



[Christians 4 Christ!](#) says:

December 2, 2013 at 6:20 pm

@ Eidolon, "So our society automatically assumes that homosexuality is wrong, since nearly every civilization has rejected it?"

If you mean American society, gay marriage at least is still legally rejected in the overwhelming majority of states and it is a controversial and heated subject. It is by no means accepted across the board in our society.

"Do they automatically assume that natural law is real since many older thinkers thought it was?"

There's a lot of "back to nature" thinking. Go green!

"Do they accept the doctrines of Christianity uncritically because those books were written a long time ago?"

If I'm not mistaken, the majority of American citizens still identify as one sort of Christian or another.

"I see a society that accepts anything that purports to be scientific and rejects anything that might be spiritual (unless it's silly and makes no demands, such as Feng Shui or astrology)."

I don't see that.

"Sure, they thought there was a big guy in the sky back then when people didn't know as much as we know now. But of course now science shows us that heaven isn't located in the sky, etc. Therefore all that stuff is silly, backwards nonsense."

The majority of Americans are theists.



Rollo Tomassi says:

December 2, 2013 at 6:32 pm

@Jason, not for nothing, but why can't a blog be a ministry? There are more than enough douchebag pastors who consider their blogs an extension of (and often with greater reach than) their Sunday morning sermons.

As Innocent has elaborated, churchianity just follows a franchise marketing plan now. I understand the 'strength of conviction' heroic sacrifice for faith and principle horseshit, but what would be more effective – winning hearts and minds, spiritually, rationally and discreetly online that would change the perspective of men sitting in the congregation, making them more sensitive to the feminine imperative that stands in for the Holy Spirit now, or, to go the direct route like Joe of Jackson did with the same results?

I can tell you this Joe made far more impact online than he did with his sacrifice. You may think that's heroic, and it is, but it sure as hell isn't pragmatic.



Cane Caldo says:

December 2, 2013 at 6:40 pm

@Jason, Dalrock & Rollo

Who gives a damn about an apostate's notions about the needs of ministry? Jason, if you think a ministry should be done, then why don't you repent of your self-idolatry and start one?



Random Angeleno says:

December 2, 2013 at 6:55 pm

@Jason, I made the point earlier about famous Founding Fathers who took on pseudonyms. No acknowledgement on your part that such anonymity has an important role to play in free speech rights. For someone who talks about liberty and democracy, you seem strangely silent on this topic.



Caspar Reyes says:

December 2, 2013 at 7:55 pm

Maybe Matthew King and Jason should start a ministry together. As for me, I am profiting from the ideas of thinkers far more advanced than I.



Jason says:

December 2, 2013 at 8:40 pm

Random Angelo, yes I did respond to your point about the Federalist Papers – look at my one of my posts above and you'll see that it is in parenthesis (actually, 4.49 pm yesterday). Again, read all comments carefully, those of you who want to criticize! But to elaborate on above comments: C.S. Lewis and the Founders did not rely on merely on rhetoric – whether it be private or public – but mainly on their actions, of arguing for their beliefs in the public square. Benjamin Franklin didn't merely write things, but espoused them in Philadelphia, in Paris, and elsewhere. Most notably, he committed treason in defense of his beliefs by supporting independence; as he famously put it upon the signing of the Declaration of Independence: "Gentlemen we must hang together, for surely we shall hang separately." C.S. Lewis also lived out his beliefs, whether it be by lecturing, helping those who were do down-and-out, responding to thousands of letters. And he also paid the price for this, being affected by those colleagues who blocked his career because they didn't like his Christianity (a friend of Lewis' once heard a professor say to another: "Are we ready to vote against Lewis today?" i.e. against his receiving a full professorship at Oxford; only later in his career was he able to get a better

job at Cambridge), as well as those who were more sympathetic to Lewis but who thought he was too talented to write theology and should concentrate on his studies in medieval literature.



Bobbye says:

December 2, 2013 at 11:48 pm

@Jason:

The uniqueness of Christianity is its focus on the individual. A church, a tribe, a nation does not get 'saved'. Individual human beings get saved. Men, women, and children all get saved in the same way. Once 'saved' the individuals follow Jesus one by one ; or not. Each person takes up his or her own cross daily. Your cross is your public display that you humbly acknowledge that Jesus died on the cross meant for you, the cross you deserved to die on. Churches don't carry their cross, nations don't carry their cross, only individuals do. God deals with His children individually. The Church is dealt with by God in the summation of His dealing with the individuals in the church. Each individual will stand before God all alone as an individual for the Judgement. Dalrock is answerable to God and God alone for his life. If God instructs Dalrock to start a church, then he will. If Dalrock starts a church without God's leading, it would be sin;" whatsoever is not of faith is sin" STOP ASKING SOME ONE TO CARRY YOUR CROSS FOR YOU!



[LiveFearless on NBC](#) says:

December 3, 2013 at 12:11 am

@Jason I'm just beginning to listen to words you are embarrassing yourself with. Did you really mention the beast 'Bill O'Reilly'? You've got this way of idolizing people that will admit they've sold their soul (literally). Wait... 'Christians' cannot fathom that we are in a spiritual world, the morbidly obese pastor in the 501c3 controlled 'church' skipped over the important stuff like what entities 'rule the air' in this world. Are you really defending the low-level slaves of demi-gods. God gave 'em permission to deceive false prophets like you. You are deceived ... by choice. Are you one of those that believes Miley Cyrus chose all of the choreography her performances? Chose her wardrobe? Chose the scripting? Chose every detail of the shows and publicity that took years of planning? Did you think it was cute that she was playing with non-existent hair as she walked down the stairs... out of the belly of the bear? I know it's not within the realm of your purity, but you should find that replay from the MTV VMAs (2013). Maybe you should research why she was playing with non-existent hair. You claim to be 'christian' after all. Have you failed to learn why choreography plays out the way it does for shows that cost hundreds of millions of dollars to create. Are you of the belief that it's all random. It's not. Learn the truth, or, just keep believing you have influence.

You try to tear down brave men that blog with an alias as if this is a bad thing. Are you sure the idols you worship are using 'real' names. What is a name anyway? The divorce court you have a great chance of facing one day understands the definition of a name. Is it in all caps? Or is it lower case? Sorry, sorry, christian-ese turns the other cheek and finds it evil to study anything that's not happy, sappy or positive.

Do you do the 'step-up' 'man-up' testosterone-lowering dance of special demonic 'Dennis Rain-ey' ... Have you heard of the Rain Man? I've spent time with the music/media mogul that calls himself the Rainman. Seriously, he's impressive. You FEEL the presences. It's the same when I had a few moments with Beyonce. Yes, yes you'd find being around these people evil, and that's why you feel you must fight against your best allies like Dalrock and Rollo. You consume "Hollywood" with your Bill-O-W Rye Lee fetish as if he has more influence that Dalrock or Rollo. I can state with authority that B.O. does not have the audience that Dalrock and Rollo have.

There is no doubt that the demi-gods exist, the presence is strong and charming in ways that you'll never open your eyes to understand. It's ok for you to keep doubting truth like the 'christians' that justify their rants against me for what they think I do in my work here. People like you @Jason have failed to realize that the credits at the end of a movie include almost EVERY job title and job field. But the money-changers (like you @Jason) call "Hollywood" evil instead of leading global influence through "Hollywood" – the area 'chosen' to influence the whole world.

Go ahead, push others to build a ministry while you hide out in your building you call a church. If it has a building, it is NOT a church... it is an idol. The Jesus you claim to know was famous during his ministry and he's famous now. You'd call that evil. You would condemn Jesus for scene one: I know the kind of parties that are similar to that wedding, such have been a part of my life for most of my career. I don't drink or do drugs etc but I don't judge folks that do – in scene one... Jesus did the water to wine thingy. The most powerful dude there was like, "Jesus, why'd you wait until everybody's drunk of their (rear) to bring out the good wine." @Jason, you'd be telling Jesus what a fraud he is for making a beverage with spirits out of water! Plus, you'd tell Jesus his ministry is like a blog since he's at a freakin' party of a bunch of celebrities and elites! You're doing it with your ridiculous complaints about the only allies you have working FOR YOU (at their expense and time investment).

Remember, in scene one, Jesus was hanging with the famous and influential folk at a party everyone knew about, sort of like an after party here. E! News, TMZ and all the networks would be all over that. I'd be exhausted from the red carpet, but no doubt I'd admire that Jesus dude. Since you, @Jason, know Jesus so well, you'd be saying that Jesus is hiding something... you'd be skeptical of that whole virgin birth thing.

By your reasonable logic @Jason, you'd call Jesus out for being at the party at all. You'd demand he come clean about his real identity while saying he should start a real ministry. Your comments make it clear that a blog is not that. Forget that this one and Rollo's blog each rank near the top of global influence... according to Amazon owned Alexa. Forget that four million folks are affected by these two blogs every month. Forget the word of mouth teaching from man, to man, to man and so on spreading the message.

Do your little ministry @Jason. Limit your influence and get paid for it. That's what Jesus intended, let the message not reach too many people. Stick with your notions that Dalrock and Rollo are just bad boys that suck at fitting into your cubicle-sized box of Christian-ese. You are correct, you are better off to stick with the fat one preaching on stage. Sing that 'christian' music you idolize! I won't tell you that Interscope Records (Lady Gaga's music is on that label) and the biggest CCM Artists are on labels controlled by the same entities.

Here's the beauty of it. Since you are the money-changer type that Jesus was pretty angry about, you could ask your thought clone Matt Walsh for help in selling your soul for the fame of your message. Then you could skip having to create the content that attracts people to crave the knowledge and wisdom. The demons would, in exchange for your soul and your continued sacrifices, make you famous for material they channel through you. If you exist @Jason (wait a minute, is that an alias? Are there links to the person behind this 'Jason' name. How odd to call Dalrock and Rollo (actually have major global influence) for not using their real names.

With this sick hypocritical sentence vomit you've exposed yourself with, others would agree that you're a near perfect fit for the Matt Walsh. The Matt Walsh is a recent soul acquisition, and he's enjoying the sudden rise to 'fame' and the female attention from women that would never, in any lifetime, find him attractive beyond 'LJBF' ... well he's loving it. Kanye West required a higher price for his soul. Anyway, when Matt's wife divorces him, the two of you should plan to enjoy quality time together. The soul sale, however, doesn't really allow celibacy.



[LiveFearless on NBC](#) says:

December 3, 2013 at 1:11 am

@TFH says:

November 30, 2013 at 8:11 pm

Dalrock,

You need to, in a few years time, start a ministry of your own, that is both true to original scripture, and red-pill (since the overlap between the two is immense). It will be astronomically successful, and you will save millions from great suffering."

ROFL! Seriously @TFH ?

start a ministry of your own um... he has that with this blog, but the audience is exponentially larger than any fake, obese, demon-possessed mega church leader you can name... Oh, but wait, it's freaking blog – you can't see a church building with an obese leadership team – it's not gluttony after all, they use the church credit card under the 501c3 umbrella. No church building, it 'ain't' a ministry. It needs a building and a big belly.

true to original scripture... red pill... overlap um, he's already been doing that @TFH *It will be astronomically successful* um, wow, for sure Dalrock has had no success here, ignore the deca-millions of views/readers he influences through his work. Poor, poor, pitiful Dalrock only has had tens of millions of readers here without selling his soul to the devil (literally) like the Matt Walsh did for his MUCH SMALLER base of influence. Maybe one day Dalrock will find success and expand his 'ministry' LOL STOP DEFINING MINISTRY BY SOME RIDICULOUS SET OF RULES AND A FORMAT! When I am doing work at a major Hollywood studio that isn't deemed a ministry by any stretch of imagination, am I in the ministry? Hint: The answer is YES. Every day I am alive, everything I do, everywhere I go, every... your LIFE is a ministry. Because of this sickness taught to you by false teachers, 'christians' have pulled out of influencing through what they call evil. Therefore, ya get more evil. When you choose not to respect it if it's not themed 'ministry' you should look in the mirror. The one staring back at you is the evil you complain about. *(Your ministry) will be astronomically successful* Yes, yes this is like going to blogger, philanthropreneur, etc Tim Ferriss and saying with empathy, "Hey Tim, the stuff you share with such clarity works. It's too bad that since you launched that first book in 2007, you've only reached a few billion people. You should really take your best work... you know, helping people cut the crap via lifestyle design, outsourcing, focusing on what they love that they can become the best in the world at... you should focus your work on the fans of Cirque du Soleil – make THAT the business – get past this open blog thing where you give away so much great info that improves people's lives. You should make it official, then you can charge a bunch of money for what you give away for free. You can call it a charity, that's what the ministries do, and that will bring more success. Make no mistake. 'Dalrock' IS successful and this IS a SERIES of ministries already without framing them as such. But, in regular 'christian' mode, you've suggested he do what you want despite the FACT that calling it 'ministry' would alienate most of the people around the world. It's too bad 'christians' have such a problem with Jesus teachings.



Anonymous age 71 says:

December 3, 2013 at 11:18 am

Over the years of the men's movement, there has been a steady supply of men coming into an established function, that is, an established successful function, and shouting, "You are doing it wrong! You are doing it wrong!"

And, of course, these men never actually do anything themselves. We called them Destroyers.

Just so those who tell Dalrock he MUST do something different from what he is doing, are essentially saying, “You are doing it wrong! You are doing it wrong!”

I don’t even need to keep an eye on them. With 35 years of experience I already know they never do anything but criticize.

Thinking about this reminded me of the time a man came up to me. I was writing an extremely militant op-ed to the local newspaper, 90 of them over a 15 year period. He tells me, “It’s not what you write. It’s how you write it.”

So, I asked him, “So, how should I write it?”

He says, “Well, I don’t know, but you need to write it differently.”:

And, of course, he was wrong, I was doing a great job of getting the word out Everyone knew who I was, and what I stood for. It doesn’t get any better for an activist. And, a couple times a year, I’d get a letter from a woman congratulating me on speaking out.



Anonymous age 71 says:

December 3, 2013 at 11:21 am

My point is, don’t tell anyone he needs to do something different. SHOW HIM, by doing it the way you think it should be done. As Mark Twain said, you will be learning things very fast, things you will never forget, like the man who carries a cat home by the tail.



MattW says:

December 3, 2013 at 2:43 pm

Another great post Dalrock. I shared this one with my mother (married for 40 years and both her and my father lifelong devout mormons) who had this in response:

“...he’s right in saying there is (and probably always has been) a double standard. But the double standard itself is Satan’s twist on a principle, if you call submission a principle. I wonder if the words Paul used could be translated better? Submission to things is a necessary part of putting off (subduing) the natural man. It requires the utmost humility if the submission is warranted; but more than most people can summon if it is not. In this day of “boundaries” “passive aggressiveness” and “don’t let people walk all over you” “stand up for

yourself” and etc. submission is almost a nonsense idea, even nauseating to many. But there is a lot to it.

Did you ever read Middlemarch? By George Elliott — her best, in my opinion. Love that book. Dorothea is one of the finest people I ever met. She submitted to her husband, who was a boor, however much he was a Reverend or a Scholar.”

I had not heard to Middlemarch until this but the end of the plot summary on wikipedia says, “Her full nature [. . .] spent itself in channels which had no great name on the Earth. But the effect of her being on those around her was incalculably diffusive: for the growing good of the world is partly dependent on unhistoric acts.”



Christians 4 Christ! *says:*

December 3, 2013 at 8:42 pm

Dalrock will not and cannot enter into a mega ministry if he is not a Dark Triad Alpha Type. Large ministries are led by dark triad alphas looking to gain followers and start cults so they can rule over other men and seduce women.



SlaveofChrist *says:*

December 5, 2013 at 1:12 pm

Feminism is ultimately nothing more than rebellion. Rebellion is equal to the sin of witchcraft. Therefore, with feminism controlling the powerless and apostate modern church, the church itself is given over to witchcraft. Has anyone seen the new gender-neutral Bible?

2 Timothy 4:3 For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears;

Welcome to the age of Laodicea, folks.

Revelation 3:14-18 And unto the angel of the church of the Laodiceans write; These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God; I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked: I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment,

that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see.



[Rollo Tomassi](#) *says:*

December 5, 2013 at 3:40 pm

Here you go Dal, you're welcome:

<http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2013/12/04/fiery-pastor-doesnt-mince-words-on-what-young-men-today-need-to-hear-stop-smiling-because-youre-the-joke/>



[innocentbystanderboston](#) *says:*

December 5, 2013 at 4:05 pm

Good article Rollo. You can always pick on young men because..... Driscoll has nothing to lose. It is politically correct to do, they aren't giving him and his church any money, and worst of all, they aren't working so they aren't paying any taxes. No government wealth to redistribute to the repentant baby mamas to support their bastards. How can this Churchianity system continue if YMGTOU?

It can't.



[Rollo Tomassi](#) *says:*

December 5, 2013 at 5:47 pm

What's truly ironic is for all his Christo-White Knight shaming he still attempts to draw the same demographic he spits at into his Bro Church.



[innocentbystanderboston](#) *says:*

December 5, 2013 at 5:59 pm

You know what, I don't think so Rollo. I don't think he's the least bit interested in drawing in YMGTOU(as a "demographic") into his flock. I believe he has another motive, a far more sinister motive.

I'm going to say that he shames the YMGTOU **to gain chivalous Churchianity traction on the cheap**. The MSM (even if it is only Glen Beck) can run with what he is saying in some

way and Driscoll scores political points for shaming young men for which society has NO USE. Now, he can make a political statement saying something like “...yeah, see, I care women. I care. I feel your pain that you can’t find a good man. I did my part, so you can send me money. And if you don’t want to do that, **at least stop shaming me** because I am on your side now.”

You might be right Rollo, but I truly don’t think for a second that anyone in our society really gives a da-n for young men who have capitulated their lives in this way, least of all Driscoll. If your only role in this world is Wage Slave, and you utterly refuse to participate, you are going to anger those who ultimately depend on your slavery.



Chiyote says:

December 12, 2013 at 2:24 pm

“Is it because they lack faith that God’s instruction to wives is good and wise”

Um... no. It is that not everyone is naive and ignores the abundantly empirical evidence that shows the glaringly obvious fact that humans have compiled the Bible, not God.

Pingback: [How Porn and my Wife Ruined my Marriage | The Reinvention of Man](#)

Pingback: [Why Christian Men Choose Not to Get Laid Before Marriage | The Reinvention of Man](#)

Pingback: [What a Typical Christian Wife Looks Like | The Reinvention of Man](#)

Pingback: [Divorce is Good for Women and Families | The Reinvention of Man](#)



vasculari777 says:

February 16, 2014 at 12:48 pm

@IBB:

I agree with your assessment of the Driscoll motivation.

Pingback: [After Alienating Europe, FEMEN Looks to US - The Spearhead](#)

Pingback: [Worse than fear. Worse than malice. | Dalrock](#)



Shibboleth says:

July 24, 2014 at 11:05 pm

I wonder how many men complaining about unsubmitive wives have anti-Obama materials or otherwise speak negatively about him, in violation of 1 Peter 2:13 and many other scriptures. Speak about your political leaders with the same respect that you would want your wife to speak about you, and things will fall into place at home.



Robin Munn says:

July 25, 2014 at 1:12 am

@Shibboleth –

In the American governmental system, we the people hold the reins of power, and those we elect are supposed to serve us, not the other way around. To say that 1 Peter 2:13 and the other related Scriptures require us not to “speak negatively” about our elected officials, or have “anti-(politician’s name) materials” (that is, campaign flyers for the other party, or documentation of that politician’s lies) is to completely misunderstand both those Scriptures *and* the American system of governance.

Pingback: [Slow your roll | Dalrock](#)

Pingback: [The Types of Women in Church – A Primer | The Reinvention of Man](#)

Pingback: [Celebrating divorce by denying it's existence. | Dalrock](#)

Pingback: [This means war. | Dalrock](#)

Pingback: [Relishing sin | Dalrock](#)

Pingback: [How would you respond if your husband lead/loved you like Christ? | Dalrock](#)

Pingback: [Modern Christian culture's deep antipathy for fathers. | Dalrock](#)

Pingback: [Feminist self loathing | Dalrock](#)

Pingback: [Age of Cross-dressing.](#) | [Dalrock](#)

Pingback: [Reworking Malachi 2:16 for our feminist era \(part 1\).](#) | [Dalrock](#)

Pingback: [Abigail's daughters.](#) | [Dalrock](#)

Pingback: [Irrelevancy of the manosphere – v5k2c2.com](#)
