

Women as Dictators



Lesson 7



I am really enjoying digging up all these old articles. They shed more insight on the current state of women than I could have ever imagined. We all too often think the feminists of 100 years ago were well intentioned women just trying to get the vote. Seems innocent enough. However, I keep uncovering article after article that shows their true radical side. What we are dealing with today are the great-grandchildren of these women dictators.

Women as Dictators By MRS. OLIVER H. P. BELMONT President of the National Woman's Party (Reprinted from *The Ladies' Home Journal*, September, 1922)

Women as Dictators

By MRS. OLIVER H. P. BELMONT
President of the National Woman's Party

(Reprinted from *The Ladies' Home Journal*, September, 1922)

TWENTY-FOUR hours after the dedication of the Woman's Parliament in Washington a representative of THE LADIES' HOME JOURNAL asked me what I really meant when I said that henceforth women are to be dictators. She was the fortieth or fiftieth person who had put the same question to me in that very limited space of time.

I meant then and mean now exactly what I said.

The end of the dictatorship of the world by men alone is in sight. We women have lived long enough in the cramped confines of a misfit social structure. We have been forced to sit still too long. We have been powerless for such an endless time that we have accumulated enough stored-up energy to shape any structure to our will.

We know we can manage the house. We can reconstruct it. We can put on a left wing and a right wing. We can add a sun porch to let in the light. We could even tear the house down if we liked—and I think men know that too.

The time has come to take this world muddle that men have created and strive to turn it into an ordered, peaceful, happy abiding place for humanity. In its present condition the world is its own worst indictment against the sole dictatorship of men. Men have always obstructed and suppressed the intellect of one-half of the human race. They have always worked for themselves. That is not sufficient. The error lies here.

By excluding women men have interfered for too long with the development, interests and intelligence of humanity. Men have always kept women in subjection. To acknowledge them as equals would have destroyed their own pedestals. They have opposed an even partially woman-governed world, fearing a limitation of their own undisputed freedom. Men have insisted not only that we live in a man-governed world but that we worship in a man-dominated church; and we can no longer accept this.

We are going to make the necessary changes, but not for the sake of women alone. I have no nearsighted idea that what is done for women and children is not to the advantage of men also. In short, we are not working against men, for women, when we speak of women as dictators; we are working for the human race.

The day is not far off when the Woman's Party, of which I am president, will be strong enough to impose any measure it may choose.

Our first task is an educational one. We mean to plant the idea of independence in the mind of every woman. Our party will be a woman's party, and a woman's party only. It will have no mem-



Photographed especially for *The Ladies' Home Journal* by Campbell Studios

MRS. OLIVER H. P. BELMONT

bers, no officers, no employees who are not women. I have no intention of repeating the experience of the American Red Cross, which, in spite of the fact that it was founded by a woman, is run entirely by men. Every big, high-salaried position in the organization is now filled by some man. It will never be possible for that to happen in the Woman's Party. There is a clause in the deed of gift of the property in Washington—the property on which the new parliament building will be erected—which provides that it reverts to my estate the moment any man is given official position, employment or salary. We will never get a balance of power except through rigid rules like these. The world makes its readjustments by swinging to extremes.

BY the way our membership is increasing it is evident that our organization will be a colossal thing in a very short time. We know the gigantic proportions of our task, and we are not afraid of it. We mean to free women from the indignity of hanging on to the old political parties.

Women have got to stop being followers. They will never get anywhere unless they begin to initiate. Perhaps there is something very glorious about being a helpmate, but if so it's time some man shared that glory. And if there is something very glorious about being a starter, an initiator, a



BEACON TOWERS, MRS. BELMONT'S RESIDENCE AT FORT WASHINGTON, LONG ISLAND

leader, it's time women shared that too.

The strength of man has always been in the union of men, and the weakness of woman in her lack of union. It is necessary to make women realize that until they have achieved some sort of solidarity they will never be able to impose their will upon the state.

Men have always tried to isolate women, to keep them as creatures apart. Men have always put women in houses, shut them away behind walls, kept them for themselves, detained them apart from the community.

Men used to put women in a harem; now they put them in a home. But the home, like the harem, has considered its own interests rather than the interests of the community, and in so doing it has jeopardized its well-being instead of fostering it. The home, like the individual, is insufficient when it stands alone.

If a man commits an indiscretion all other men protect him. If a woman is at fault, other women, instead of protecting her, are often the first to condemn. Women in the past have been afraid to lose the respect or the admiration or the love of men by opposing their wishes. In the last few years the suffragists have demonstrated that women do not lose the admiration of the worthwhile men by expressing their own individualities. On the contrary, it has been my experience that the modern man finds the intelligent, socially conscious, individualistic woman a more companionable person than her frightened sister who fears to speak or move lest she offend him. Women gain far more than they lose by an attitude of independence.

In my own experience I have seen a tremendous evolution in a very short time. Take the question of divorce. It is not long since no woman dared to openly criticize a man's behavior by demanding a divorce from him. Men have learned that they have to accept our criticism of them.


I was one of the first women in America to dare to get a divorce from an influential man. Up to that time divorce had been the prerogative solely of actresses. Rich men could marry women, treat them in any way they chose, and ignore them. That is no longer possible. I have gone down the aisle of the church when women I had known since childhood drew back in their pews and refused to speak to me. I have been the guest at parties where the hostess was the only woman in

the room who talked to me. Why? Because I had dared to criticize openly an influential man's behavior. That is all changed. There is hardly an influential family in most of the states whose women have not deemed it wise to divorce their husbands.

We have said to men: "You can't take us and

to me to make much difference if a woman is President or not. But if the right woman came forward—someone better fitted to head the government than any available man—I should say: "Make her President regardless of sex." I certainly think we have in this country, even now, women more fit to fill the Presidency of the

men hardly able to totter being helped to their seats in the Senate. Such men are not fit to make laws for normal people. We do not require that the men who go to the Senate be great mathematicians, scientists, or even college graduates, but we do expect them to have normal, healthy brains and sound bodies. When a man has reached the



National Headquarters of the Woman's Party, Washington, D. C. These Headquarters, which are directly opposite the National Capitol, were purchased and given to the Woman's Party by Mrs. Belmont for the permanent home of the organization.

use us as you choose, throw us aside and expect us to submit without a protest. We have a right to live, a right to be respected." Someone must pay the price in criticism, even in ostracism, for every advance which the world makes. The blazing of the trail by the pioneer is never an easy task. I have been put out of the fold so many times and taken back so many times that I have ceased to attach any importance to it. Today the world holds up its hands in horror over something which tomorrow it will have to accept as an established fact. Divorce was the cause of my first ostracism, then suffrage. When suffrage became respectable I was received back into the fold again. When suffrage divided itself into militant and non-militant groups, I, as a militant, was again in disfavor. These things don't matter. They are part of the development of the individual woman and, through her, of the development of woman-kind as a whole, and ultimately of the human race.

Men must cease to dictate everywhere: in the judiciary, in the Senate, and even in the White House. I do not urge now that a woman be made President of the United States. It does not seem

United States than the last few men who have filled it. But that is all a question for the future. At the moment it is unimportant. The important thing is to break down the barriers which prevent women from utilizing, for the good of the human race, all their energies, capabilities and talents.

If we are going to repeat the experience of men in politics we would do better to stay out. If we are going to scramble for jobs, instead of fighting for principles, I think it would be much better if we did not have a vote.

EUROPE has suffered no more under the reign of queens than it has under the reign of kings. Surely anyone who has listened to the debates of the United States Senate could not fail to admit that there are many women who would fill the chairs better than some of the men who occupy them at present. It is a crime for this country to be represented by some of the men who are there. I hope that one of the first acts that women will try to pass will be an act providing that the people who govern them shall be normal. I have seen

stage of palsy it might seem well to retire him in favor of a man with, say, fifty or sixty-year old arteries. I do not mean that age has anything to do with it. In fact, I believe that we must have more respect for age than we have. But fitness is not determined by years. Man has taken the position that he never grows old. When women grow old they are neglected. Health, not age, should determine usefulness.

Today you say to an intelligent American, "Why don't you go into politics?" He replies that it is so corrupt and vile he wouldn't think of it. Who has made it corrupt? Who is going to rescue it from its corruption? Someone must. If men do not choose to work for the common good, surely they have no right to bar us from working. We choose to work, we choose to give our time, to give our all to the human race, and the day has come when no man shall stop us. Men have demanded and held control everywhere. If they had controlled things in the right way we might have had no complaint. They have not done so, and we women are full of indignation and resentment.

TWENTY-FOUR hours after the dedication of the Woman's Parliament in Washington a representative of The Ladies' Home Journal asked me what I really meant when I said that henceforth women are to be dictators. She was the fortieth or fiftieth person who had put the same question to me in that very limited space of time.

I meant then and mean now exactly what I said.

There you have the brutal truth. Two years after women could vote and they are already claiming a dictatorship! They sure didn't waste anytime getting across their real message. At least these women came right out and said it. Call a woman a dictator today and you're deemed a sexist.

The end of the dictatorship of the world by men alone is in sight. We women have lived long enough in the cramped confines of a misfit social structure. We have been forced to sit still too long. We have been powerless for such an endless time that we have accumulated enough stored-up energy to shape any structure to our will.

Notice, "shape any structure to our will". That means, men, the courts, the family, marriage, politics, education, churches, the workplace, etc. Every arena out there is fair game. Nothing will be untouched by feminization.

We know we can manage the house. We can reconstruct it. We can put on a left wing and a right wing. We can add a sun porch to let in the light. We could even tear the house down if we liked--and I think men know that too.

The time has come to take this world muddle that men have created and strive to turn it into an ordered, peaceful, happy abiding place for humanity. In its present condition the world is its own worst indictment against the sole dictatorship of men. Men have always obstructed and suppressed the intellect of one-half of the human race. They have always worked for themselves. That is not sufficient. The error lies here.

A little full of themselves, wouldn't you say? The arrogance to think that they can come to power and all of a sudden make the world a "peaceful, happy abiding place for humanity". The world is far from peaceful and happy and even less so since women became dictators. Men have not "always worked for themselves", they work for their families. If men were really obstructing and suppressing a woman's intellect, then the Seneca Falls convention of 1848 would of been shut down and the women arrested. Real obstruction is to be found in the Middle East. American women will never know how good they have it. In 1870, [Ms. Cooper](#) recognized the following:

"In no country, whether of ancient or modern times, have women had less to complain of in their treatment by man than in America. This is no rhetorical declamation; it is the simple statement of an undeniable fact. It is a matter of social history. Since the days of early colonial life to the present hour--or, in other words, during the last two hundred and fifty years--such has been the general course of things in this country. The hardest tasks have been taken by man, and a generous tenderness has been shown to women in many of the

details of social life, pervading all classes of society, to a degree beyond what is customary even in the most civilized countries of Europe. "

She knew women had it good. So, why can't women in 2010 admit the same?

By excluding women men have interfered for too long with the development, interests and intelligence of humanity. Men have always kept women in subjection. To acknowledge them as equals would have destroyed their own pedestals. They have opposed an even partially woman-governed world, fearing a limitation of their own undisputed freedom. Men have insisted not only that we live in a man-governed world but that we worship in a man-dominated church; and we can no longer accept this. We are going to make the necessary changes, but not for the sake of women alone. I have no nearsighted idea that what is done for women and children is not to the advantage of men also. In short, we are not working against men, for women, when we speak of women as dictators; we are working for the human race.

I don't get how an article can be so harsh to men, yet in the same breath say they are working on man's behalf. They claim these "necessary changes" will not be for women alone. Yeah, right. Women as dictators are speaking for the entire human race. They think they know best. The very nature of a dictator is not to speak for everyone but for their self and then to rule based on their desires alone. Modern women, yes?

The day is not far off when the Woman's Party, of which I am president, will be strong enough to impose any measure it may choose.

They have certainly been imposing any measure they choose, i.e., abortion, gay rights, sexual harassment laws, workplace discrimination laws, family laws, domestic violence laws, etc. "Woman's Party", is the word used before feminism became popular. As you are reading, insert feminism instead of "Woman's Party" and you will see that in most cases it fits. The "Woman's Party" as it relates to politics is basically the democrat party. They really made that party their own.

Our first task is an educational one. We mean to plant the idea of independence in the mind of every woman. Our party will be a woman's party, and a woman's party only. It will have no members, no officers, no employes who are not women. I have no intention of repeating the experience of the American Red Cross, which, in spite of the fact that it was founded by a woman, is run entirely by men. Every big, high-salaried position in the organization is now filled by some man. It will never be possible for that to happen in the Woman's Party. There is a clause in the deed of gift of the property in Washington--the property on which the new parliament building will be erected--which provides that it reverts to my estate the moment any man is given official position, employment or salary. We will never get a balance of power except through rigid rules like these. The world makes its readjustments by swinging to extremes.

The "idea of independence". Thats what started it all. They recognized this was the key to imposing any

measure; by convincing women that it will make them independent. This is how divorce became not only allowed, but popular. They were told by divorcing you would become independent. If the "Woman's Party" is suppose to be for women only, I don't see how that encourages equality. Ah, but it isn't about equality, its about revenge. They already don't like organizations that are run by men and someday they will fix all that by 'imposing' women in the workplace and further 'imposing" high-salaries as just desserts. In the "Woman's Party", men will not rule an organization or dare have the nerve to steal those high salaries. Power comes by "rigid rules". Wow, does this ever remind me of the modern workplace. It is the women who make up the rules. The love for rigid rules flows into other arenas as well; marriage, for example.

BY the way our membership is increasing it is evident that our organization will be a colossal thing in a very short time. We know the gigantic proportions of our task, and we are not afraid of it. We mean to free women from the indignity of hanging on to the old political parties. Women have got to stop being followers. They will never get anywhere unless they begin to initiate. Perhaps there is something very glorious about being a helpmate, but if so it's time some man shared that glory. And if there is something very glorious about being a starter, an initiator, a leader, it's time women shared that too. The strength of man has always been in the union of men, and the weakness of woman in her lack of union. It is necessary to make women realize that until they have achieved some sort of solidarity they will never be able to impose their will upon the state.

It's cute and all to be a helpmate, but I want more! Women are initiators and leaders in the domestic sphere. How else would anything get done? But its not just being a leader they seek, but a manly leader, doing manly things. This is scary, "impose their will upon the state." This is why modern women ban together. Their banner of solidarity, based in feminism, gives them the power to "impose their will upon the state". This is why they tell young girls, "you still need feminism". Without the solidarity, without the sisterhood, they loose their power to impose.

Men have always tried to isolate women, to keep them as creatures apart. Men have always put women in houses, shut them away behind walls, kept them for themselves, detained them apart from the community. Men used to put women in a harem; now they put them in a home. But the home, like the harem, has considered its own interests rather than the interests of the community, and in so doing it has jeopardized its well-being instead of fostering it. The home, like the individual, is insufficient when it stands alone.

If a man commits an indiscretion all other men protect him. If a woman is at fault, other women, instead of protecting her, are often the first to condemn. Women in the past have been afraid to lose the respect or the admiration or the love of men by opposing their wishes. In the last few years the suffragists have demonstrated that women do not lose the admiration of the worthwhile men by expressing their own individualities. On the contrary, it has been my experience that the modern man finds the intelligent, socially conscious, individualistic woman a more companionable person than her frightened sister who fears to speak or move lest she offend him. Women gain far more than they lose by an attitude of independence.

Women do not condemn other women anymore. It has reversed. They now protect her and rush to her side no matter how wrong she is or if she is lying. This has been one of my biggest frustrations with girlfriends is that to your face they 'protect', but when you aren't around then they have no problem condemning. It was much better when women called them as they saw them. I have to say the reason why immodesty and the slut culture is so rampant is because women do not condemn other women. I have bitten my tongue one to many times with the friend who sleeps around, yet at the same time complains about why she is not married. I once made a critical statement about a friend of a friend's lifestyle. She was quick to say, "if you're going to judge her then I'm not going to tell you anything". Some women need to be judged, its the best thing that could happen to them.

Women should be afraid to lose the respect and admiration for men. It is this fear, similar to the fear of God, that keeps us godly. Men may appreciate a woman's "individuality" and opinions, but only so as they do not encroach on his domain.

In my own experience I have seen a tremendous evolution in a very short time. Take the question of divorce. It is not long since no woman dared to openly criticize a man's behavior by demanding a divorce from him. Men have learned that they have to accept our criticism of them.

Powerful. A divorce is really a way to openly criticize a man. They are saying men need to just learn to shut-up, sit back and take a woman's criticism. This is woman as dictator.

I was one of the first women in America to dare to get a divorce from an influential man. Up to that time divorce had been the prerogative solely of actresses. Rich men could marry women, treat them in any way they chose, and ignore them. That is no longer possible. I have gone down the aisle of the church when women I had known since childhood drew back in their pews and refused to speak to me. I have been the guest at parties where the hostess was the only woman in the room who talked to me. Why? Because I had dared to criticize openly an influential man's behavior. That is all changed. There is hardly an influential family in most of the states whose women have not deemed it wise to divorce their husbands.

She seems so proud of her divorce and clearly it must have been for frivolous reasons. Had it been a real abuse situation, she would of openly said so. It is still considered cool to divorce not only a influential man, but any man. This is how women show who is really boss. In this documentary I watched on Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, there were times when both of them wanted to push for more extreme measures, such as divorce, but it was decided that they needed to focus on the vote because the vote was more persuadable. Once they had the vote, they could then tackle more extreme issues like divorce. From divorce, they went to abortion, gay rights, etc.

We have said to men: "You can't take us and use us as you choose, throw us aside and expect us to submit without a protest. We have a right to live, a right to be respected." Someone must pay the price in criticism, even in ostracism, for every advance which the

world makes. The blazing of the trail by the pioneer is never an easy task. I have been put out of the fold so many times and taken back so many times that I have ceased to attach any importance to it. Today the world holds up its hands in horror over something which tomorrow it will have to accept as an established fact. Divorce was the cause of my first ostracism, then suffrage. When suffrage became respectable I was received back into the fold again. When suffrage divided itself into militant and non-militant groups, I, as a militant, was again in disfavor. These things don't matter. They are part of the development of the individual woman and, through her, of the development of womankind as a whole, and ultimately of the human race. Men must cease to dictate everywhere: in the judiciary, in the Senate, and even in the White House.

I do not urge now that a woman be made President of the United States. It does not seem to me to make much difference if a woman is President or not. But if the right woman came forward--someone better fitted to head the government than any available man--I should say: "Make her President regardless of sex." I certainly think we have in this country, even now, women more fit to fill the Presidency of the United States than the last few men who have filled it. But that is all a question for the future. At the moment it is unimportant. The important thing is to break down the barriers which prevent women from utilizing, for the good of the human race, all their energies, capabilities and talents.

It wasn't time yet in 1922 for women to be in the White House, but now? You better bet. The one thing that they know best is to not rush issues. There is a time for all of their impositions and forcing them at the wrong time will only cause people to see the women as the dictators that they are.

If we are going to repeat the experience of men in politics we would do better to stay out. If we are going to scramble for jobs, instead of fighting for principles, I think it would be much better if we did not have a vote. EUROPE has suffered no more under the reign of queens than it has under the reign of kings. Surely anyone who has listened to the debates of the United States Senate could not fail to admit that there are many women who would fill the chairs better than some of the men who occupy them at present. It is a crime for this country to be represented by some of the men who are there. I hope that one of the first acts that women will try to pass will be an act providing that the people who govern them shall be normal. I have seen men hardly able to totter being helped to their seats in the Senate. Such men are not fit to make laws for normal people. We do not require that the men who go to the Senate be great mathematicians, scientists, or even college graduates, but we do expect them to have normal, healthy brains and sound bodies. When a man has reached the stage of palsy it might seem well to retire him in favor of a man with, say, fifty or sixty-year old arteries. I do not mean that age has anything to do with it. In fact, I believe that we must have more respect for age than we have. But fitness is not determined by years. Man has taken the position that he never grows old. When women grow old they are neglected. Health, not age, should determine usefulness.

Today you say to an intelligent American, "Why don't you go into politics?" He replies that it is so corrupt and vile he wouldn't think of it. Who has made it corrupt? Who is going to

rescue it from its corruption? Someone must. If men do not choose to work for the common good, surely they have no right to bar us from working. We choose to work, we choose to give our time, to give our all to the human race, and the day has come when no man shall stop us. Men have demanded and held control everywhere. If they had controlled things in the right way we might have had no complaint. They have not done so, and we women are full of indignation and resentment.

Again, the arrogance. Men are the ones who made politics corrupt, and us sweet women can make it all better. Politics are corrupt because mankind is corrupt. The Fall applies equally to women and men. The feminists should be embarrassed that they did not rescue politics from corruption. Although, they will probably say they haven't had a fair chance yet since the patriarchy still exists. She further claims that men seem to not want to work for the "common good", but yet it was only two years ago he gave her the vote. Talk about no appreciation. If only men had "controlled things the right way", then maybe they wouldn't complain! Fat chance. I guess we too can complain now since the "Woman's Party" hasn't fixed everything.

In the past we had to sit still. There was nothing else to do. We have sat still long enough. We didn't have a stepping stone from which to go on. Now we have it. The vote is only the beginning of what we need. It is only our tool, our new broom, our pick, our shovel, our ax. But we have no intention of seeing these excellent utensils put in a museum. We mean to use them. Carrie Nation with a hatchet--almost any woman with a broom--gives, to my mind, a better picture of action than any man with a musket.

The vote is just the beginning! They recognized that through the vote they could control all else and impose those "rigid rules". The vote is their weapon. Give them an inch and they'll take a mile.

Today is no time to be bored. This is the time for women to want what they want and get it. And it is high time that men were looking around to see what women want. It is a great age in which to be alive. Without the vote we could do nothing. Now that we have it we shall do much. I say to the men: "We are tired of your monopoly of government. We are going to govern too." I am not working to put a woman in this place or that. I am only working to put women in a position where they can make of themselves whatever they choose to be and can be. I want to give women justice, and in giving it to them I do not want to take it away from men. They have never given us justice, but we will give it to them. They have interfered long enough with the development of the human race. We have been patient too long.

How can she be so disdainful to men and then at the same time say she does not want to take justice away from men? This is where they get you. This whole article goes back and forth from blaming to some warped feminist kindness. "They have never given us justice, but we will give it to them." They really think they are superior to man.

A MAN'S brain is only half a brain, and we are the other half, and the half of anything is not

worth the whole. A woman has a power that a man has not, and a man has a power that a woman has not. We know where they have been weak, and we will give them our strength; and where, perhaps, we have been weak they will give us their strength. The blending of the two will make a better whole.

"Half of anything is not worth the whole". So, I guess woman without man is not worth as much then. Interesting slip. Yes, we each have our own unique strengths and differences but they need not be swapped and shared between the sexes. The strengths and weaknesses were already blending together when the woman was fulfilling her home duties and a man his job duties.

Men have begun to fear women because they are surpassing them in so many lines of endeavor. Recently men have even considered barring women out of coeducational colleges. Why? Because women are carrying away the scholarship records, and men cannot stand to have their inferiority proclaimed. In education women have made tremendous strides. It is not so long since women freed themselves from their man-made belief that it was unwomanly for a woman to have an idea of her own. Once a woman has obtained her independence and come to value her self-respect, she will demand the recognition of her complete equality--politically, socially and in the laboring world.

Again, the focus on independence and now self-respect. Modern women typically say things like, "no self-respecting women would stay with a man like that". So what is this whole deal with self-respect. I never really thought about it much. Its natural for both sexes to respect themselves so why do women feel like they have to use the term in a manner as shown above? It seems independence plus self-respect gives the woman the power to demand her equality.

The church has been very, very hard on women. It has done its best to keep us in subjection and to restrict us mentally. Women are beginning to feel very bitter toward the church or the men who control it. They haven't driven us away from the Christian religion. They can't do that. But by their dictatorial discrimination they are driving us out of the churches as they are organized--out of the edifices

Today, it is the churches driving the men out. Even a church with no women pastors is still heavily feminized. Many churches now have such things as hug or say something nice to the person next to you as a way to get us to socialize. Only a women could think of something like that. We have been in that situation and find it most awkward.

Women have given their time, their energy and their money to support the church. We are allowed to sit in the pews, but not to stand in the pulpit. The men of the church accept our support, but are not willing to share their exalted position with us. We are required to acknowledge man as our spiritual superior. We do not acknowledge him as such, and we know that Christ did not so acknowledge him. If man wants to make a little god of himself he will have to do it by himself and for himself. He may stand in the pulpit and sit in the pew, but we also must stand as well as sit.

A man may make a "little god of himself", but its no different than the countless women who make

goddesses of themselves. Again, the problem is sin.

SEX discrimination must be done away with in the church as well as in politics, in the professions and in the business and laboring worlds. Men say all priests must be men. We might retort that all priests shall be women. But we do not. We say the priesthood shall be filled by those best fitted to occupy the pulpit, whether men or women. I say: If you are worthy to be a priest be a priest, but if I am worthy to be a priest I shall be a priest too. We will both be priests. This is not working against man, but merely standing shoulder to shoulder with him.

Here come the sex discrimination laws. There is always great debate over a woman's role in the church. I don't want to get into it on this post, but you can read a summary [here](#). I believe that 1 Timothy 2:11-12 should be taken literally. There are a million other ways a woman can serve in her church. She can still lead various ministries, teach Sunday school, music direct, etc., just as long as she does not have authority over man. Her role is not less important it is just more in line with her God-given abilities.

Unless the men of the church realize definitely our claims we shall have to have our own priesthood.

They have their [own priesthood now](#). Yuck, words cannot express.....

Only the other day I read the decision of a convention of churches to exclude women from all positions of power and authority. They were not even to be allowed as members of vestry. That is rather astonishing in the twentieth century. We live in a man-made world and worship in a man-dominated church, and we can no longer be expected to endure it. When you think of the beauty of the Christian faith, which means so tremendously much to people who understand it, and see that even with it as an inspiration men have found no better way of settling questions than simply to invent the worst possible type of machinery to destroy property, to kill each other and to uproot everything settled, peaceful and intelligent, you realize how colossal has been their failure. What claim can any man who has so failed make to an understanding of the spirit of Christ?

No, you live in a sin-filled world and all too often worship in a sin-dominated church. That is why people are still killed and destruction is about. Even with Christianity as an inspiration for women, abortions are still performed.

Join the Woman's Party

Work with Women for Women

Help to Win for All Women:

* Equal control of their children

- * Equal control of their property
- * Equal control of their earnings
- * Equal rights in schools and universities
- * Equal opportunities in professions and industries
- * Equal pay for equal work
- * Equal opportunities in government service
- * Equal authority and opportunity in the church
- * Equal control of national state and local government
- * Equal rights after marriage to their own identity
- * Equal moral standard

In Short--Equal rights with men in all laws and customs

The article ends with this plea to join the "Woman's Party". Their goals still match up perfectly with the modern feminist agenda. Remember, we are not dealing with just women or just feminists, but with dictators. This quote sums it up nicely:

“Dictatorship is a constant lecture instructing you that your feelings, your thoughts and desires are of no account, that you are a nobody and must live as you are told by other people who desire and think for you” -Stephen Vizinczey


You might also like:



Women's Suffrage as Idolatry: A Letter to Christian Women & ...



What Socialism Would Do For Woman



Feminists as Mistakes of Nature: A Biologist's Perspective ...