

POLITICS & DOMINIONISM

Tonight I have several different things on my heart that I would like to share. One of those things concerns the end of *our* world. Not the end of *the* world, but the end of *our* world. Another one, which is closely related to the end of our world, concerns the *two creations*—Adam and Christ. Also, since there's less than a month left till the elections, I also want to share some of my thoughts regarding that—and this will include the controversy surrounding Sarah Palin. So I'm going to try to cover a lot of ground tonight. If I don't get through it all, I'll finish it up next week.

Let's start off with the election. Americans, and especially most American *Christians*, live in a state of denial when it comes to our political process. We have been taught all our lives that America has a “two party voting system”. This may have been true at the beginning, but it is no longer the case. America has become a defacto “*one party system*”. If you doubt this, just look back over the last 50 years and try to find an administration—be it Republican or Democratic—that has even tried to stem the tide of Globalism, let alone reverse it. You won't find any. The only difference between Democrats and Republicans for many years now has been *the speed* with which they are leading America into a socialist, *Global Police State*. Regardless of all the lesser issues where they seem to hold different political positions, on the most important issue—America's sovereignty and liberty—there is no difference. Both parties are controlled by globalists interests, and both parties continue to lead us into a globalist state.

The recent past is a perfect example. Under Bush's first administration we had Republican controlled House, a Republican controlled Senate, and a Republican President who claimed to be a conservative *and* a Christian. Such a condition, even with all the gridlock of Washington politics, should have been to the advantage of conservatives and Christians. But look at the result. This country is marching into the One World Order faster than it ever has. Bush has supported everything conservatives oppose. It was Bush, the conservative, who did his best to end the sovereignty of America by establishing a massive new continental state called the “North American Union”—which would merge Canada, Mexico and the USA and introduce a new common currency (called *the “Amero” just like the Euro*). He did this in secret meetings without any input from the people of America or their representatives.

It was Bush, the conservative, who sought to turn America into a mongrel nation by effectively doing away with our national borders, the first step of which was his attempt to make hundreds of millions of *illegal* aliens US citizens.

Oh, and we mustn't forget how Bush, the conservative, tried to sell 90% of our major sea ports to foreign (*Muslim!*) nations. He should have been impeached and tried before a court as a traitor for such an act. But we have two generations of Americans now, who have been thoroughly indoctrinated into the globalists mind-set through the public school system, and as a result, they have no idea that what Bush tried to do would have been viewed as *treason* 75 years ago by most Americans.

I could go on but I think you get the point. It doesn't matter *who* you elect for President, it doesn't matter *who* you elect to the Congress or Senate, the results are *the same* because there is only *one* political party in this country. The joke is that this party has two pseudo names—Republicans and Democrats. The real name of *the* political party in America is the Internationalist (*or Globalist*) Party.

We have lived under *the illusion* of freedom regarding our political process because there are so many different political parties in America. But in reality, none of these parties will ever carry enough votes to defeat the Republicans or the Democrats. Even if most conservatives got sick of the Republican Party and decided to vote for the *Constitutional Party* this year, Globalist Democrats would still win. Even if most liberals got sick of the Democratic Party and decided to vote for the *Communist Party* this year, Globalist Republicans would still win. Regardless of who you vote for, the Globalists win!

So what are American Christians supposed to do? Every election cycle we are stuck between a rock and a hard place. Every election cycle we are faced with a choice between *two* Globalists—and this year is no different. This year the choice is between the Democratic Globalist, Barack Obama and the Republican Globalist, John McCain. Even if all the Christians decided to abandon the Republican party and vote for someone like Ron Paul, or some other, more conservative, anti-Globalist party, this would only *insure the victory* of the Democratic Globalist Barack Obama.

So this election is no different than the last election, or the election before that, or the election before that, an so on. Christians who realize what's going on, either don't vote, or they *vote against* the lesser of the two evils. Christians who don't realize what's going on, who still think America can be saved through the political process, end up putting their confidence in the current Republican candidate. They hope that somehow *this* one will be different than the *last* one they elected, which broke all his campaign promises and did nothing to help the conservative cause or reverse the march towards Globalism, after his election. These Christians don't simply *vote against* the lesser of two evils; they actually *vote for* the Republican candidate because they think he might be the one who will save America.

Just A Side Note: Albert Einstein once said: "*The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results*". Based on this definition, the Christian who continues to vote for a Republican candidate because they believe this one will be different from the last one, is insane.

However, even though this election is no different than all the previous elections with regards to there being no real choice between candidates—both of them being Globalists—this election is *very* different from all the previous ones in terms of the spiritual atmosphere which surrounds it. Two very significant religious developments have come into play. First of all, very few people seem to realize that Obama's rise to power was the result of *direct supernatural intervention* (and it wasn't the intervention of God!). Senator Clinton should have won the Democratic nomination without a hitch. She began planning her Presidential bid long before Mr. Bill even left office. With all that planning, and with all the power and money they had behind them, only something *supernatural* could have produced what we see happening.

What this tells you is that Obama is being empowered by *a spirit* that is more powerful and wicked than the one Hillary operates in. This should make you nervous because Hillary is an extremely evil woman who *hates* Christians. And while I don't believe Obama is the final Antichrist, what we witnessed this summer is exactly how it will happen when the real thing takes place. This years Presidential race is different from all previous races because, even though religion has always played a part in Presidential elections, none has ever been as blatantly religious as this one. People are hailing Obama as a modern-day Messiah—and he

is not only allowing this blasphemy, he is encouraging it by how he runs his campaign. Yes, McCain claims to be a Christian, but he's running a *political* campaign. Obama is running a *religious* campaign and it's blatantly antichrist in nature. So even though there isn't much difference in the politics of Obama and McCain, *religiously* speaking, there is a vast difference. McCain is running for the *political* position of President; Obama is running for the *religious* position of Savior Of The World.

This election is not about politics; it's about *religion*. The deluded masses of America have rejected God's Messiah and are running head-long after a political messiah. Since so many of them are worshipping this *thug* from Detroit as some kind of deity, we believe God would have us vote *against* him. We want to know that we did our part to defeat a man who encourages such blasphemy.

The second *religious* twist that makes this race different from all the previous ones has to do with Sarah Palin. Her pick as Vice President was a shrewd move by whoever gave McCain the idea. Unfortunately, I don't believe it's going to work because the guy who came up with the idea does not know what Evangelical Christians really believe. He is not aware of the fact that the majority of Evangelicals in this nation still believe the *Patriarchal system* is God's divine order; which means they don't believe a woman should have authority over men or be placed in positions of political leadership.

While some of these men are willing to compromise their convictions in order to see Barack Obama defeated, many others are *not*. This is why you see such a division in the Christian camp regarding Sarah Palin. Some Christian leaders and pundits are endorsing her as a Deborah or an Esther; others are against her because they believe God never approves of a woman being in any kind authority or leadership. Some of the articles that have been written about her by Patriarchal writers take great pains to make it clear they are not against her *personally*. They are simply against the idea of a woman being the Vice President. One article, which I am going to discuss in more detail, states that Sarah Palin is a very capable and admirable person; that she has high moral standards and good intentions; and that she is a true Christian who has fought many political battles in the name of Christ. Nevertheless, this particular writer views her rise to the position of possible Vice President as a "judgment" and a "curse" on America, and on the Church because he believes women should never be in *any kind* of leadership.

Just Another Side Note: Won't it be ironic if in the name of **Patriarchy**, Christians help Obama get elected. Apparently some people would rather see this antichrist in the White House as President, than a Christian woman in the White House as Vice President.

I'm *not* saying God is pleased with a woman being VP. And while I don't agree with those who say God raised Sarah Palin up as a blessing, neither do I agree with those who say God raised her up as a curse. *John McCain* raised Sarah Palin up in a last ditch effort to prevent a total blow-out come election day. He had *no chance* of beating Obama and he knew it. His pick of Sarah Palin was a shrewd—some might call it a shameless—political move to get Christians to vote for him.

However, I do agree with the writer of this article that Christians who place their hopes in *any* political candidate (including Sarah Palin) for the salvation of America are very foolish. In any case, I don't believe Sarah Palin will ever get a chance to show that she *can't* save America because I believe that unless God

directly intervenes in this situation, Barack Obama is going to win this election, hands down. I believe he is going to win because the majority of Americans are just as wicked as he is; and they are filled with the same Antichrist spirit that he is; and they are going to elect the candidate that reflects their present moral and spiritual condition.

However, even if God intervenes, and McCain does get elected, Sarah Palin isn't going to be of any help to the Christians because the Globalists will sit her down and put her in her place real quick. No individual politician can stand against the tide of Globalism that is sweeping the planet right now. Sarah *will be* compromised, of that you can be sure.

Having said all that, I would also like to say that I really like Sarah Palin. I like her because she's driving the "*feminists*" berserk; and her nomination as VP has caused them to show their true colors. They have demonstrated for all who have eyes to see that they couldn't care less about "equality" between men and women. They are simply using *the cause* of equality to promote their real agenda, which is liberalism, homosexuality, abortion, and humanistic education. Their bitter hatred of Sarah has revealed that it's not inequality they hate—it's the Christian faith they hate; it's the morality of the Christian faith they hate; and it's men they hate. It doesn't matter to them that Sarah is a woman being raised to almost the highest position in the nation. All that matters to them is that she is a *Christian*, a wife, and a pro-life mother—all of which they detest.

I also like Sarah because for a short while at least, she scared the whole left-wing media establishment to death. The *Communist News Network* (CNN), and all the other media outlets which parrot it, went ballistic when they found out McCain picked a pro-life, conservative, reformist, Christian woman as his VP. It was such a shock to their system they couldn't control themselves. Their bias against her was so obvious, it gave the American people a chance to see the truth about our one-sided, left-wing media. The only people who didn't see that truth are the ones who have that same bias.

I also like Sarah because she really irritates Patriarchal men and Patriarchal church leaders. They speak the truth when they say she's a "curse" because she certainly is a curse on their *inflated egos*. Sarah irritates these guys so much they can't control themselves any better than the feminists can. Their *prejudice* against women comes shining through in their articles and sermons.

"*Where are the Christian men*" they cry?

Well, you may not like the answer.

A lot of the Christian men are backslidden because they have to spend 14 hours a day, wallowing in the filth of our Satanic American culture, trying to fulfil their proper role as provider.

"*Oh, but don't you realize it's a curse and not a blessing when women rule*"?

Really? You mean it's not a curse when *men* rule? Pray tell—how many *women* Presidents or Vice Presidents have we had in this nation over the last 100 years? Zero! How many *women* were on the Supreme Court when it banned prayer from our public schools in 1962? Zero! How many *women* were on the Supreme Court when it legalized abortion in 1973? Zero!

I don't mean to burst your Patriarchal bubble, but the fact is, this nation has gone down the drain under the rule of *men*, not women. And speaking of the nation going down the drain, let me digress for a moment. Some of today's self-proclaimed "watchmen" are saying it's the fault of the *Christians* that our nation is being destroyed. It's the fault of the Christians because they aren't involved enough in politics. Dave Daubenmire, founder of "*Pass The Salt Ministries*" in Columbus, Ohio, represents this kind of thinking pretty well. In a recent article (10/9/08) entitled: "*The Congregation Of The Dead*", Daubenmire blames spiritually dead Christians for what has happened to America. He says:

"We have no one to blame but the Church. I know that makes many of you nervous as you cling to your "dead faith full of dead works" believing that God is pleased with **your apathy** [*ie: political uninvolvedness*] towards the spiritual condition of this nation. **You, my Christian friends, are complicit in the spiritual coup that has swept over America.** Compromise is the birthing ground of sin. Savorless salt producing good-for-nothing Christianity. **It is easy to blame the sinner** as he proudly gallivants his debauchery for all to see. But it is the "compromise of the converted" that has paved the way for our national suicide. It is not the bold sinner that has destroyed our nation, **but the "Silent Saint" ashamed to speak the Truth.** And make no mistake about it....**we have only ourselves to blame.** We have willingly "wandered out of the way of understanding." We followed folly, "changed the truth of God into a lie and are reaping the whirlwind from our unwillingness to contend for the Truth. **Silence isn't golden, it's yellow.**"

Excuse me, Mr. Daubenmire but it was the those "silent saints" who gave George Bush his victory twice in a row. It was those "silent saints" who gave him a seldom-held advantage of a *Republican* House and Senate to back him up during his first term. Those "silent saints" did their job! They got the vote out and made sure the man who *said* he was a conservative and a Christian got elected. The problem was, the man the Christians worked so hard to get elected, turned out to be a liar and a closet liberal. Is *that* the fault of the Christians? This whole idea that the wicked are only wicked because the Church is failing to be the "salt" of the earth is a bunch of nonsense—and if you want to see just how *wrong* it is, just read the story of the *first witness* of this present age: the Early Church in the book of Acts.

Except for the ministry of the Lord Jesus Himself, there was no greater light or more saltier salt than the Early Church—and though many people did turn to the Lord as a result of that witness, Christianity never changed the wicked character of the Roman *government*. Even when Emperor Constantine supposedly became a "Christian", the result was a disaster because he proceeded to marry Christianity to the pagan religions of the Roman Empire, and it put the light of the Church out for over a thousand years!

Again, if you want to see how wrong people like Daubenmire are, just read the story of the *last witness* of this age: the Two Witnesses in the book of Revelation. I don't think you can be much more outspoken than this group of people! They are a fine demonstration of "salt"—yet the wicked reject not only their testimony, they celebrate when they are murdered by the Global Beast Government. I hate to brake the news to Mr. Daubenmire, but the wicked are wicked because they *like* being wicked. The wicked are wicked because they *love* the pleasers of sin. The wicked are wicked because they *hate* righteousness—and they will continue to hate righteousness, regardless of how much light you shine on them, and regardless of how much "salt" you force down their throats through legislation.

People like Daubenmire don't believe the Bible when it says a *God-hating spirit* will sweep this planet, just before the return of the Lord. They ignore what Jesus said in Matthew chapter 24, where He predicted that after the "beginning of sorrows", *all nations* will hate, afflict and murder Christians. It doesn't matter how much salt and light you give the wicked in the last days, most of them will not respond because they will be under the influence of a powerful, God-hating spirit. This God-hating spirit, which is even now sweeping the world, is being manifested through Barack Obama.

The Daubenmires of this world are also ignorant of the past record of Christian involvement in politics. I *personally* know 4 *women* who worked for months prior to that Supreme Court decision back in 1962, writing letters to their congressmen, writing letters to the local news papers, and going through their entire district getting *thousands* of signatures for a petition to stop that court decision. But guess what—it didn't do any good. You see, the leaders of this nation, even at that time, were wicked *men*, and they were determined to implement their will, regardless of how loud the Christians yelled; and the same is true today.

So quit dumping on *the Christians* because the country is being run by a bunch of criminals and traitors. Back in the 50's and the 60's, many thousands of Christians tried to stand against the tide of Communism and liberalism. It's not their fault they lost the war. For 30 years they fought an uphill battle against an extremely powerful political system which was run by *male* humanists—and they didn't have any support from the average *unsaved* American citizen because the average unsaved American couldn't have cared less about what the government did, as long as they were prospering and living the good life. In those days, it was *the silence of the wicked* that empowered our ungodly rulers; not the silence of the saints.

You find this same type of twisted reasoning in the articles that are currently circulating about Sarah Palin. They are a mixture of truth and error because even though they correctly state that Christians are foolish for placing their hopes and trust in any government official—and that includes Sarah Palin—they also claim *the answer* to all of America's problems is that *Christian men* get involved in government.

So the only difference between the Daubenmires and the Patriarchs is that the Daubenmires lay the blame for what has happened to America on the *whole* church. The Patriarchs lay all the blame for what has happened specifically on the *male portion* of the Church. The Daubenmires say *all Christians* should be more involved in politics, and because they're not, the country is going to Hell in a handbasket. The Patriarchs say *only male Christians* should be more involved in politics, and because they're not, the country is going to Hell in a handbasket. And of course, one of the greatest signs that the country is going to Hell in a hand basket is that we have women in political leadership positions.

Such is the view of the Reverend Philip L. (Flip) Benham, director of the famous pro-life organization, Operation Rescue/Operation Save America. Mr. Benham recently (9/26/08) penned an article entitled: *Sarah Palin – a Sign of God's Blessing or God's Curse?* He starts the article off by saying:

"There can be no doubt about it; Sarah Palin is God's man! With countless biblical and historical illustrations paving the way before her, she is yet another fulfillment of that old passage in Isaiah 3:12. *As for my people, children are their oppressors, and **women rule over them**. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths.*"

Isaiah 3:12 seems to be latest *mantra* in the Patriarchal camp. Several articles that are circulating the Internet have it as part of their opening statement. Last week I talked about false weights and balances with regards to the Scripture. Well, here's another example. God was *not* saying what these writers and preachers would have you think He was saying. But before we examine this passage, I want to look at Benham's article. His main point is that the rise of Sarah Palin to the possible position of Vice President is a judgment on the Church and the nation. He makes certain *not* to attack Sarah personally. In fact, he specifically states that Sarah is not the one who is in rebellion against God in this whole matter. Rather, it's the church which is in rebellion. Concerning Sarah the person, he says things like:

"Sarah is a Christian who actually believes the God of the Bible. She is one of us."

"Sarah fought battles and won them in the strong Name of Jesus in her local PTA. She took on political corruption in her city. She battled the state and city bureaucrats of Alaska and, with God's help, brought a measure of integrity back to a government that had become a political cesspool. Many of the most corrupt folks she exposed were oil executives and members of her own Party. Sarah is indeed, God's man."

"Sarah Palin is a dynamic Christian woman who has proved faithful in the little and is now being moved to a position to be faithful in the much. She is ready! She has lion and bear stories that have brought her through God's refining fire as pure gold. She is capable."

Sarah the person is wonderful, says Benham. She's a good Christian; she's capable; and God Himself has raised her up to this position of prominence. But the question is: Is she a sign of God's blessing or God's curse? Of course, she is a sign of God's curse.

"Youths and women will always lead **when men fail to**. It is a sign **and judgment** from God that His people are moving away from His divine [Patriarchal] order to one of their own making."

"Sarah Palin is also a sign **and judgment** from God upon His church. Sarah has been appointed **by God Himself** to demonstrate that all is not well in the Church of Jesus Christ".

"God **looked for a man** and He found a woman. This should not be a cause for rejoicing in the church. It is not sign of progress. **It is a sign of rebellion against God's** [Patriarchal] **order**. It is not Sarah's rebellion – it is the rebellion of God's church".

"**When women lead, it is a sign of God's curse**—not blessing. **Irresponsible men** retreat and only women are left to fight".

"**Sarah Palin is God's judgment** upon those of us who claim His Name in America".

"We say, "Thank God for Sarah," never realizing that **she is a sign and a judgment upon irresponsible Christian men**".

Pretty clear, is it not?

Through out the article, Benham has some less-than-flattering labels for the men who have allowed the “curse” of Sarah Palin to come upon the nation, the Church, and most of all, upon the *male ego*. He calls them slothful, lazy, apathetic, cowards, irresponsible and rebellious. He is clearly upset by the fact that all these worthless men are allowing the *women* to have a place of prominence in the home, in the Church, and in civil government. And what is his remedy for removing the curse of Sarah Palin? Remove the women and replace them with men.

“Sarah Palin is God’s judgment upon those of us who claim His Name in America. He is calling **Christian men to repent** of their natural propensity toward apathy and sloth, and run to the roar of the battle in the name of Christ. Authority always follows responsibility. When **Christian men** repent and **return to their rightful places** of responsibility (priest, provider, protector) all authority will return to them. **Men** will lead once again. And **the gates of hell will not prevail**”.

“**What is our hope?** It remains the same as it was in Isaiah’s day. **We must repent** of our sin, and take our rightful place of responsibility at the exposed places of the city, and **rebuild the wall**”.

[Sarah Palin] is God’s call to repentance for **Christian men** to return to our rightful place of leadership in **the family, church, and civil government**.

In case anyone needs some interpretation, I’ll provide it. When Benham says “*We must repent of our sin*”, he’s not calling *all people* to repent of the kind of sins that usually come to your mind—drinking, gambling, murder and rape, drug abuse and alcoholism, and so forth. He’s talking *specifically* to the men, and also to male church leaders. He’s telling these *males* that they must repent for allowing the females to leave their proper place of *subjugation* in the home, in the church, and in civil government. Men must remedy this situation by putting those uppity women back in their place and take back the leadership of the home, Church and government. Again, the Daubenmires blame the condition of the country on spiritually dead Christians (both men and women), the Benhams blame the condition of the country specifically on lazy, cowardly, irresponsible Christian men.

Of course, the kind of attitude Benham displays towards women in his article is to be expected from those who believe the Patriarchal system is God’s divine order; so there’s really nothing new in all that. However, there is an *underlying ideology* in his article which is very subtle, and which has probably escaped the attention of most of those who have read it. That ideology can be seen in certain statements he makes, if you know what to look for.

When Benham calls men to return to their “*rightful place of leadership in civil government*”, he seems to have forgotten (or maybe he has just overlooked) the fact that while Christian men may be able to force their women back into subservience in the home and in the church, they will never be able to return to their quote “rightful place” of leadership in government *unless* they are elected.

Sorry, Mr. Benham; you can't rule over the American people like you do your wife. The American people have to elect you to a government position—and those who think Fundamentalist Christians, or even Pentecostal Christians, can just go out and get themselves elected to office in today's America are disconnected from reality. The majority of the American people want *nothing* to do with real Christianity—especially the kind Benham represents. Why do you think *Obama-mania* is sweeping the country? Americans want a spirituality that is devoid of all moral standards and responsibility. They want a religion that doesn't require obedience to anything or anyone. So good luck trying to get Christian men to take control of the United States government!

You see, Mr. Benham is a Dominionist—or to be more precise, he is a Reconstructionist. So as not to confuse those in the room, let me explain that there are *two kinds* of Dominionism being propagated in the churches right now. The first type is called *Reconstructionism*, and it comes from the more Orthodox wing of Christianity. It's the "We've got to take back our country back from the humanists variety. The idea is that God wants Christians to take dominion over every aspect of our culture—art, politics, education, economics, communication and government. All these areas are ground that must be re-taken for Christ and controlled by believers. The vehicle that is to be used to implement the reconstruction of American society, and the societies of all nations, is *political action*. The goal is to gain *political power* in America, and eventually in all the nations, and to ultimately establish an Old Testament Theocracy over the entire planet.

The other kind of Dominionism is called *Kingdom Now Theology* or *Dominion Theology*, and it comes from the Pentecostal/Charismatic wing of Christianity. It's simply the Pentecostal version of the more Orthodox Reconstruction movement. Its goals are identical. The difference lies in the way it seeks to accomplish those goals. Kingdom Now Dominionism relies on *supernatural power* and the great end-time revival to accomplish its goals, rather than political action. It says the Church will be a mighty army in the last days; ruling nations, displaying awesome power, emptying hospitals, and filling sports stadiums—all of which will enable them to do the same thing the Reconstructionists will do through political power, which is establish an Old Testament Theocracy over the entire planet.

If there's any doubt that I speak the truth about Mr. Benham being a Dominionist, you can prove it for yourself by doing some simple research into the goals and beliefs of *Randall Terry*, the creator of *Operation Rescue*, and of Flip Benham, the man who now runs that organization, and who renamed it (Operation Rescue/Operation Save America) to avoid all the lawsuits that were pending against the original name. And by the way, you don't have to be a mental giant, or even have the gift of discernment, to *suspect* that a religious group with the name, "*Operation Save America*" just might possibly be a Dominionist group.

You can see Benham's Dominionist views in some of his previous statements. In the first quote, he says that once Christian men repent and take back the leadership of the home, Church and government: "*Men will lead once again. And the gates of hell will not prevail*". You can see it again when he asks: "*What is our hope?*" The answer is: "*We must...take our rightful place of responsibility...at the exposed places of the city and rebuild the wall*". That's Dominionist lingo. He's talking about turning America into a Theocracy. Since he assumes this is God's will, he's chastising *Christian men*—who (in his view) are the only ones who can possibly bring this to pass—for not rising to the occasion and doing what needs to be done.

And just in case you've missed Benham's double standard (or should I say hypocrisy), I'll give you a little hint. It's just as foolish for God's people to put their faith and trust in Christian *male* politicians as it is for them to put their faith and trust in Christian *female* politicians. So replacing Christian "Sarah" with Christian "Fred" isn't going to help the situation.

Just like Mr. Daubenmire, Flip Benham does not believe what the Bible teaches about the last days. I hate to burst these two guy's Dominionist bubble, but God is the one who is giving Satan the power to prosper in this hour. Get this truth into your spirits people: **IT'S GOD WHO IS GRANTING SATAN THE POWER TO PREVAIL IN THIS HOUR!** It's not the fault of Christians—whether they are spiritually dead or spiritually alive. And it's not the fault of the men who refuse to treat their wives like slaves and concubines. God has granted Satan the authority to establish one final Global Empire at the close of this age and there is *nothing* you can do to stop it. Nothing!

However, if people like Benham and Daubenmire want to try and stop it anyway, that's their prerogative. Have at it. I would never try to stand in their way. But I'm not going to waste my life trying to stop the thing that God is allowing. If the Benhams and the Daubenmires want to call me a dead Christian, or a silent saint, or a compromiser, or a slothful, lazy, apathetic, cowardly, irresponsible and rebellious man because this is what I have chosen to do; well, that's fine too. But they shouldn't be surprised if I expose them as the *Dominionists* they are. They shouldn't be surprised when I show people how much they disregard and pervert the Scripture.

Now, let's get back to this latest mantra of the Patriarchs—which is that it's a curse and not a blessing when women rule. With so many of these people writing articles and giving sermons on the subject, you'd think they would use a little *variety* and not quote the same old passage again and again and again and again. Well, there's a reason they constantly quote this one passage—there are no other ones like it in the Old Testament to quote. If there were, you would certainly see them quoted in their articles. Isaiah 3:12 is the only one that talks about "women" ruling over the people of Israel.

I'll have to refer back to Mr. Benham's article in order to show you exactly *how* these men put the "spin" they want on this verse. In the beginning of his article, after quoting Isaiah 3:12, he says:

"The nation Israel was turning away from God in Isaiah's time. **When women rule, it is a sure sign of this change.** Youths and women will always lead **when men fail to.** It is a sign and judgment from God that His people are moving away from His divine [Patriarchal] order to one of their own making".

Exactly what kind of picture do you get from Benham's description of the problem? He says that in Isaiah's day, Israel was turning away from God. Then he says when women rule, it's a sure sign of this change. It's a sure sign of this turning away from God. Next, he says that youths and women will always lead when men fail to lead. So the picture he is painting for his readers is this: *In Isaiah's day, the men were failing to lead, so it was left to the youths and the women to rule. This situation constituted a turning away from God. It was a sign that His people are moving away from His divine [Patriarchal] order.*

Does any body get a different picture from Benham’s opening statement?

Does any body think I am misrepresenting what he said?

Now let’s compare the picture Benham paints to the situation as described by Isaiah.

*Isaiah For behold, the Lord, the LORD of hosts, **takes away from Jerusalem and from Judah the stock and the store, the whole supply of bread and the whole supply of water; The mighty man and the man of war, the judge and the prophet, and the diviner and the elder; The captain of fifty and the honorable man, the counselor and the skillful artisan, and the expert enchanter. "I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them.***

Isaiah 3:1-4 NKJ

In chapter two of Isaiah, the prophet had denounced God’s people for putting their trust in idols, in material wealth, and in the *leaders* of Judah. Here, in chapter three, he tells of the judgment that will befall Judah for doing so. God is going to take away everything that they have trusted in for security and safety. Then Isaiah lists all the things God will remove from Judah.

The stock & store	The diviner
The supply of bread	The elder
The supply of water	The captain of fifty
The mighty man	The honorable man
The man of war	The Counselor
The judge	The skillful artisan
The prophet	The expert enchanter

This is a pretty inclusive list. In other words, God said He was going to remove all the ones who had any kind of *leadership* quality. Men who were brave, military men, wise men, elders; prophets, judges; counselors, the honorable men, and so on. The only kind of people who would be left to rule the country would be “children” and “babes”. Now, how many think that when Isaiah said “babes” would rule over the people of Judah, he meant *literal* babies? When Isaiah says, “*babes shall rule over them*”, he is speaking metaphorically. He’s talking about grown men who will be babes in wisdom; who will be babes in experience; who will be babes in knowledge.

The same is true when he says, “*I will give children to be their princes*”. Although some of the kings of Judah *were* actually children when they began to reign, I believe Isaiah is again speaking metaphorically here of men who are children in regard to talent for governing; who are children in moral character (selfish, fickle, temperamental and capricious), and who are children in valor and bravery.

*The people will be oppressed, every one by another and every one by his neighbor; the child will be insolent toward the elder, and the base toward the honorable." When a man takes hold of his brother in the house of his father, saying, "You have clothing; **you be our ruler, and let these ruins be under your power,**" In that day he will protest, saying, "I cannot cure your ills, for in my house is neither food nor clothing; **do not make me a ruler of the people.**"*

Isaiah 3:5-7 NKJ

This is a description of the calamity and the anarchy, that would follow the judgment of Judah, once God removed the leaders, and all those with leadership qualities, from the land. The ones left would be leaderless; they would oppress each other; and all the social mores of society would collapse. It would become an *every man for himself* situation. The ruin of Judah would be so complete, the men who were left would have no desire to be chosen as princes and rulers of the people.

*For Jerusalem stumbled, and Judah is fallen, **because their tongue and their doings are against the LORD, to provoke the eyes of His glory.** The look on their countenance witnesses against them, and **they declare their sin as Sodom; they do not hide it.** Woe to their soul! **For they have brought evil upon themselves.** "Say to the righteous that it shall be well with them, for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woe to the wicked! It shall be ill with him, for the reward of his hands shall be given him.*

Isaiah 3:8-11 NKJ

Isaiah says that the people of Judah will come under this horrible judgment because "their tongue and their doings are against the Lord". The judgement will come because "they declare their sin as Sodom; they do not hide it". What sin is Isaiah talking about? Well, look back in chapter two:

*For You have forsaken Your people, the house of Jacob, **because they are filled with eastern ways; they are soothsayers like the Philistines, and they are pleased with the children of foreigners.** Their land is also full of silver and gold, and there is no end to their treasures; their land is also full of horses, and there is no end to their chariots. **Their land is also full of idols; they worship the work of their own hands, that which their own fingers have made. People bow down [to their idols] and each man humbles himself [before his idol]; therefore do not forgive them.***

Isaiah 2:6-9 NKJ

This then, is the reason God was bringing judgment upon Judah. This is the background of Isaiah 3:12. The picture Benham paints is a lie. In Isaiah's day, God's people turning from Him had nothing to do with them rejecting the Patriarchal social order and setting up women as rulers. It had nothing to do with men being unwilling to lead. Men *were* the leaders when Judah turned away from God. *Men* were

ruling Judah when the people began accepting eastern customs. *Men* were ruling Judah when the people started following the ways of the Philistines. *Men* were ruling Judah when the people began making their own idols and bowing down to them; and this kind of idolatry was so common, Isaiah says the land was “full of idols”. *Men* were ruling Judah when the people heaped wealth unto themselves.

In addition, it was the *male* rulers, and the *male* mighty men, and the *male* men of war, and the *male* prophets and judges, and the *male* elders, which the people of Judah were putting their trust in for security and protection, instead of God. These are the things that provoked the eyes of God’s glory and caused Him to bring such devastation upon the land of Judah.

When God says through the prophet Isaiah in 3:12—“*As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them*”—first of all, He’s not saying children and women are ruling because the men are too cowardly and lazy and rebellious to rule. If any women were ruling, it’s only because all the men who were capable of ruling had been removed *by God* as a judgment on the nation’s sins—sins that had *nothing* to do with allowing women to rule, by the way!

But the fact is, Isaiah isn’t speaking *literally* of children and women. He’s using the same kind of metaphorical language he used back in verse four. The ones who would be left to rule the land of Judah after God’s judgement fell would be incompetent, weak, and even effeminate *men*.

Somebody might say: “*Brother Daniel, you are only refusing to accept what the Scripture plainly says here because it goes against your anti-Patriarchal views*”. Well, my answer would be that I am not the only one who interprets this verse that way.

John Wesley said the term woman in this verse “means weak and effeminate rulers”.

The Geneva Study Bible Notes say the term women in this verse means the rulers of Judah “would be fools and effeminate”.

Matthew Henry says the term woman in this verse means the rulers of Judah would “have as weak judgments and strong passions as women and children”.

Jamieson, Fausset & Brown says the term women in this passage refers to rulers who are “as unqualified for rule as children and as effeminate as women”.

Barnes says the term women in this passage “is not to be taken literally, but means either that the rulers were under the influence of the harem, or the females of the court; or they were effeminate and destitute of vigor and manliness in counsel.

Moreover, it’s not just scholars and Bible commentators who disagree with the Patriarchal spin that’s put on this passage. Some of the Hebrew terms in the passage itself are questionable and can be translated in different ways. This is why some translations are so much different than the KJV.

The Septuagint and Chaldee: “*Thy exactors strip my people as they who gather the grapes strip the vineyard*”.

Young’s Literal Translation: “*My people—it’s extractors are sucklings, and men have ruled over it*”.

New English Bible: “*Money-lenders strip my people bare, and usurers lord it over them*”.

New Jerusalem Bible: “*Oh my people, their oppressors pillage them and extortioners rule over them*”.

I’m sharing this information so you can see that when I say I believe the terms “children” and “women” in that passage are metaphorical, I’m not just giving you my own biased little interpretation. This isn’t just a “*Dan Mace thing*”. I’m in good company.

Of course, you may not put much stock in the opinions of Bible commentators and/or translators, and that’s okay. I take what they say with a grain of salt myself. So I’m not trying to use these examples to *prove* that I’m right. I’m simply quoting them to let you know that I’m *not* the only one who believes it’s wrong to apply what Isaiah said about “women” in it’s most *literal* sense.

Another reason we should understand that Isaiah was speaking metaphorically when he used the terms children and women is the fact that he was talking about what was happening right then. In verse 13 he switches from telling the people what is going to happen in the near future, to what is happening right now. The second half of that same verse says: “*O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths*”. This is a “right now” description of the situation in Judah. At that present time, the time when Isaiah was speaking these words, the leaders of Judah were causing the people to err. time, At that present time, the leaders of Judah were destroying the right paths of the people.

In like manner, Isaiah’s words about children oppressing the people and women ruling over them was a “right now” description of the situation in Judah. He wasn’t predicting that women would rule over them in the future. Neither was he saying that women had ruled over them in the past. He is saying right now, children are oppressing my people. Right now, women are ruling over my people.

Isaiah’s ministry took place during the reigns of four kings: *Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah*. So when he said what he did about children oppressing the people and women ruling over them, he was talking about what was happening under the reign of *King Uzziah*. Obviously, *Uzziah* was *not* a literal child or woman. So either Isaiah was saying *Uzziah* had the characteristics of a child and a woman, or else he was saying the leaders *under Uzziah*—that is, the local rulers, and perhaps even the religious leaders, were like children and women. The situation was probably one where the *civil leaders* who should have been protecting the people were instead oppressing them (mainly through taxes and extortion); and the *religious leaders* who should have been leading them in straight paths, were instead destroying those very paths by encouraging idolatry.

Now, getting back to the election; if what I shared in the beginning seems pretty negative, that's good. It was meant to seem that way because the situation we face right now *is* negative. If the picture I painted seemed to be rather hopeless, that's good too. It was meant to be hopeless because the situation *is* hopeless—politically speaking, that is—and it's only going to get *worse* from here on out. God is fixing to bring this Church Age to an end. He is getting ready to bring in the Kingdom Age—and in order for the Kingdom to come, the last day apostasy, the final one world government and religion, and all the other nasty things that we don't like to think about, must come to pass. Indeed, we should be *desiring* for them to come to pass; not because we love evil or want to see the enemy win; but because we want to see God's Kingdom come to this earth.

You see, people like Dave Daubenmire and Flip Benham are not interested in seeing *God's Kingdom* come to this earth. They want God's blessing on this earth, but not His kingdom. They are desperately trying to save America because the things *in America* are the source of their life.

I have no doubt that they believe they are fighting to restore righteousness in this country, and to keep it from being destroyed by the judgment of God. But the righteousness they are trying to restore is an Adamic righteousness. It's a righteousness that brings a *spiritual* blessing upon the *natural* (Adamic) man. They really don't understand how vast is the difference between the first creation (Adam) and the second creation (Christ). So they are desperate to save the first creation—and in order to save the first creation, they have to save *the nation* because it's the nation which is *sustaining* that first creation.

Unfortunately, they are not alone. I believe the majority of today's Christians have no idea how different the first creation is from the second creation. Therefore, they are not really pursuing the second creation, nor are they living in it. They may not be Dominionists, but they want to have God's blessing on the *first* creation; and like the Dominionists, they are not willing to let go of it. They want to drag the first creation into the second one.

To Be Continued