

1: Jesus Christ and Male Dominance

The Myth of Male Power: Why Men are the Disposable Sex is a book by Warren Farrell, in which Farrell argues that the widespread perception of men having inordinate social and economic power is false, and that men are systematically disadvantaged in many ways.

You may be wondering why I am mentioning this. The research tells us that leadership skills grow through a combination of experiential learning and study. In other words, you will want to reflect upon your own leadership experiences in the past and carefully assess your strengths and weakness. This is why I encourage all men who are seeking to amplify their inner alpha male to get a mentor or at the very least a professional coach. What I can do is encourage you to read more on this topic and be open to learning new things. One of the best books you can pick up to help grow skills in this areas is: Leadership by Maxwell. What I like about this read are the straight forward tips given by the author, primarily communicated through concrete examples. This one is nice because it helps you to identify your personal leadership style. It also provides insight into enhancing your communication skills while motivating your followers.

Protective Instincts Have you ever noticed that in the wild, alpha animals are very protective of their clan and territory? Think of wolves here, where only the alpha males and females are in charge of the pack. If a non-pack member so much as walks near an area controlled by the leaders, subordinate members of the pack sound off alarms. In turn, the alphas usually the male wolf will go on the attack. Some people call it an inner voice. Good instincts are key to personal safety Well-developed instincts are linked to strong leadership skills Healthy instinctual skills are attractive to potential mates One of the best ways you can develop and grow your instincts is to spend time studying the topic of situational awareness. I say this because when you think of an alpha male on a spectrum of characteristics, the ability to anticipate the moves of others and identify key threats is crucial. Courageous To be an alpha male is to be courageous. And I acknowledge here that this is a topic that requires a page all on its own. How to develop courage 1. Write down your specific fears 2. Look for the root cause of your fears 3. Develop a plan to transfer courage from one area to another 5. Engage in cognitive rehearsal as part of assertiveness training 6. Trust your instincts in decision making 7. Perhaps the most effective way to learn more about courage is to study it. One of the best books you will ever read on this topic is: Profiles in Courage by John F. Here, you will discover how the construct of courage manifests itself in the form of personal decision making; witnessed through the narrative lens of famous world leaders.

Alpha Males are Typically Strong 6. Physically strong One of the common traits of alpha males in the animal kingdom is physical strength. For example, alpha wolves are typically bigger and stronger than others males in the pack. Human alpha males can. Remember, to be an alpha you will want to focus on all areas and not just the psychological ones. Physically training your body through exercises hopefully resistance training needs to be part of the dynamic. If you want to grow your strength, I highly encourage you to get involved with plyometric exercise , regardless if you are new to the gym or not. It is also helpful to recognize that building muscle needs to be framed as something to look forward to and not a chore. Alpha men who involve themselves with strength training discover 7 unique benefits that are life enhancing. Here are some other tips in this area: The key to success here, particularly when first starting out, is personal accountability. This means letting go of long held, rigid thoughts and allowing for new possibilities. It also means asking questions and investigating the answers. One of the best ways you can do this is to pick a topic that holds your interest and start learning more about it. For example, have you always been curious about what makes certain athletes successful? Why not study the psychology of famous athletes to enhance your understanding? All I can say here is that alphas typically involve themselves with growing their knowledge base, which in turns helps to inform the other trait areas outlined above. You simply need to have a curiosity about the world around you and go about the business of learning. Be sure to check back and compare your response to other website visitors. Below you will find several of the common whoppers linked to alpha males. Alphas are restricted to men only Alpha men are bullies Alpha guys are sexually dominant Alpha men are born Alpha men are always heterosexual Alpha men are narcissistic.

2: The Alpha Dog Theory | Whole Dog Journal

The debate has its roots in studies of captive wolves gathered from various places that, when forced to live together, naturally competed for status. Acclaimed animal behaviorist Rudolph Schenkel dubbed the male and female who won out the alpha pair.

Origin[edit] Social dominance theory was first formulated in by psychology professors and researchers, Jim Sidanius and Felicia Pratto. These hierarchies have a trimorphic 3-form structure. This means that these hierarchies are based on 1 age i. Arbitrary-set hierarchies can be based on ethnicity e. Human social hierarchies consist of a hegemonic group at the top and negative reference groups at the bottom. More powerful social roles are increasingly likely to be occupied by a hegemonic group member for example, an older white male. Males are more dominant than females, and they possess more political power the iron law of andrarchy. Most high-status positions are held by males. Biological sex and dominance[edit] Consistent with the observation that, in patriarchal societies, males tend to be more dominant than females , SDT predicts that males will tend to have a higher social dominance orientation SDO. As such males will tend to function as hierarchy enforcers, that is, they will carry out acts of discrimination such as the systematic terror by police officers Sidanius, and the extreme example of death squads and concentration camps. Hegemonic group[edit] Social Dominance Theory is a consideration of group conflict which describes human society as consisting of oppressive group-based hierarchy structures. The key principles of Social Dominance Theory are: Individuals are stratified by age, sex and group. Group identification is based on ethnicity, religion, nationality, and so on. Human social hierarchy consists of a hegemonic group at the top and negative reference groups at the bottom. As a role gets more powerful, the probability it is occupied by a hegemonic group member increases Law of increasing proportion. Males are more dominant than females; they possess more political power the iron law of andrarchy. Most high-power positions will be held by males. Racism, Sexism, Nationalism and Classism are all manifestations of this same principle of social hierarchy. Group hierarchy[edit] The reason that social hierarchies exist in human societies is that they were necessary for survival of inter-group competition during conflict over resources. Social Dominance Theory explains the mechanisms of group hierarchy oppression using three basic mechanisms: Aggregated individual discrimination ordinary discrimination Aggregated institutional discrimination discrimination by governmental and business institutions Systematic Terror police violence, death squads, etc. Behavioural asymmetry systematic outgroup favouritism or deference minorities favour hegemony individuals asymmetric ingroup bias as status increases, in-group favoritism decreases self-handicapping low expectations of minorities are self-fulfilling prophecies ideological asymmetry as status increases, so beliefs legitimizing and or enhancing the current social hierarchy These processes are driven by legitimizing myths, which are beliefs that justify social dominance: Such acts are performed because they increase the actors self-esteem. This is an individual set of beliefs , sometimes viewed as something akin to a personality -trait, which describes the actors views on social domination and the extent to which they will aspire to gain more power and climb the social ladder. Marx described the oppressive hierarchy of hegemonic group s dominating negative reference groups, in his examples the bourgeoisie owning class dominate the proletariat working class by controlling capital the means of production , not paying workers enough, and so on. However Marx thought that the working class would eventually grasp the solution to this oppression and destroy the bourgeoisie in a revolution. Duckitt and right-wing authoritarianism[edit] This section needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. Punitive socialisation is hypothesised as a cause of social conformity. This conformity is predicted to lead to a view of the world as a dangerous, dog-eat-dog place. These correspond to high RWA beliefs, and in turn influence ingroup and outgroup attitudes. Unaffectionate socialisation is hypothesised to cause tough-minded attitudes. This promotes a view of the world as competitive, similar to the jungle of the evolutionary past. The need to compete is aligned with high SDO, and, again, influences ingroup and outgroup attitudes. These two streams of causation may co-occur. Parenting styles may be both punitive and unaffectionate, and a competitive-jungle worldview is compatible

with world as a dangerous-place. This predicts high correlations between the two, with environmental origins. On top of this, outgroup and ingroup attitudes may reinforce each other. Unpredicted links included a direct effect of Dangerous-world beliefs on anti-minority attitudes. Unaffectionate socialization also had a negative correlation with social conformity—unaffectionate parenting style reduced social conformity beliefs. A replication of the study in South Africa produced broadly similar results, with differences in the level of overall prejudice higher in South Africa. RWA beliefs are activated by social threat or threatening out-groups SDO beliefs are activated by competition and intergroup inequalities in status and power RWA is a stronger predictor of prejudice when the outgroup is threatening When group status is unstable, SDO is associated with higher ingroup bias than when group status is stable Outgroup liking is best predicted by similarity to the ingroup, while outgroup respect is predicted by status and technological advancement Duckitt concludes that RWA and SDO have been well studied, and points out that this way of examining belief-paradigms and motivation-schemas could also be useful for examining anti-authoritarian-libertarian and egalitarian-altruistic ideologies. Criticisms[edit] Turner and Reynolds from the Australian National University published in the British Journal of Social Psychology a commentary on SDT which outlined six fundamental criticisms based on internal inconsistencies.

3: Roots of women's oppression | www.enganchecubano.com

Along similar lines, Jeffrey Snyder and colleagues reported that dominance was only attractive to females (for both a short-term affair and a long-term relationship) in the context of male-male competitions.

Women are more likely than men to be victims of violence. Men are twice as likely to be victims of violent crimes and three times more likely to be victims of murder. Nothing gave men security in their workplace. Showing our love by providing takes us away from showing our love by connecting. Hero or War Slave?: Women, Work, and War. When women on Navy ships become pregnant during work-up for deployment. Her body and mind are more genetic gifts. A married female executive has a husband who is a financial buffer. They do not provide an economic security blanket for women. Expecting work to mean "power" and "self-fulfillment. Pre-meditated murder is now self-defense--but only if a woman is accused; and only if a man is murdered. The "Depressed Mother" Defense: Baby Blues and Terrible Twos P. More a rationalization to free women than a prioritization to love children. A million crack-addicted children have been born since ; only 60 of the mothers have faced criminal charges. The "Plea Bargain" Defense: Women are seen as more innocent, their testimony more valued, leading prosecutors to offer them the plea bargain in crimes committed jointly by a woman and a man. Men have always exercised malevolent influence over women, and women seem to be soft touches for it. The Politics of Sex P. Tell the man directly. The Politics of Rape P. He is sexually rejected until he proves himself worthy of trust by "not going after sex," but sexually ignored until he "goes after sex. While we increasingly hold people more responsible if they drink and drive, we hold women less responsible if they drink and have sex. From Husband Sam to Uncle Sam:

4: Social dominance theory - Wikipedia

Thus the 'myth of male dominance' was created as compensation and reward (in a kind of social exchange). In addition, the Parkers assert that male dominance had adaptive advantages which were reinforced through time as societies became more complex, requiring ever greater levels of technological skill.

White-ground pyxis with a group of women performing domestic tasks. Made in Attica, c. The Origins of Gender and Class , edited by Stephanie Coontz and Peta Henderson, comprises five essays by a group of French and American feminist historians and anthropologists, in search of the sociohistorical basis of gender inequality. Male dominance is one of the earliest known and most widespread forms of inequality in human history. To some, the very idea of a book on the origins of sexual inequality is absurd. Male dominance seems to them a universal, if not inevitable, relationship that has been with us since the dawn of our species. A growing body of evidence and theory, however, suggests that this is not the case, and a number of scholars have begun to address the issue of male dominance as a historical phenomenon, grounded in a specific set of circumstances rather than flowing from some universal aspect of human nature or culture. The essays in this volume offer differing perspectives on the development of sex role differentiation and sexual inequality the two are by no means identical , but share a belief that these phenomena did have origins, and that these must be sought in sociohistorical events and processes. Before turning to these theories, we would like critically to review some of the alternative explanations of sexual inequality. A starting point for many theories of gender inequality is the assumption that biology is destiny: One common approach within this general framework of biological reductionism is to explain human sex role patterns and inequalities by reference to our primate heritage. The most popular model for this approach is the baboon. The scenario is as follows: With minor differences in emphasis and use of evidence, a whole series of authors imply that male aggression and dominance with their necessary accompaniment, female passivity or dependence are therefore part of our genetic primate heritage. Male aggressive instincts are also said to have served early humans well in their role as "predators. In the first place, there is much more variability in primate behaviour than these authors admit. Some species are highly dimorphic; some are not. Mating patterns range from monogamy to promiscuity by both males and females , while parenting and socialization behaviours are extraordinarily diverse among different species, or even in the same species under different environmental conditions. Intertroop encounters are rare, and friendly. When the troop is startled. Similarly, chimpanzees, with whom humans share ninety-nine percent of our genes and from whom we may have diverged as little as five million years ago, are highly social animals who display a very low degree of male dominance, hierarchy, or aggression. The male dominant savannah baboons live in game parks where predators and humans are concentrated in numbers far beyond those likely in aboriginal conditions. There is considerable evidence that such stressful circumstances, especially captivity, markedly increase hierarchy and aggression. Many scholars now suggest that the normal behaviour patterns of our primate ancestors involved sharing and cooperation rather than aggression, male dominance, and competition. Of course, the capacity for aggressive and dominant behaviour was undoubtedly an important part of primate survival, but this is not the same thing as having such behaviour determined by our genes. In general, research is demonstrating that the primates are capable of highly adaptive learning. A no less reductionist approach to the origins of gender inequality is found in the theories of sociobiology. Individuals are believed to be driven by their genes to maximize their "inclusive fitness"; they strive, that is, to maximize the number of their genes passed on to the next generation, even if this lessens their individual fitness. Thus there is a genetic base for altruism, and such behaviour will be directed toward those to whom the organism is most closely related, with proportionately less investment in more distant kin or strangers. Applying these theories to humans, E. Wilson suggests that occasional examples of helpful behaviour toward non-related persons are explained by an additional concept that takes care of the residual cases: Successful cultural behaviour is transmitted between generations and cultures through the genes. In hunter-gatherer societies, men hunt and women stay at home. This strong bias persists in most agricultural and industrial Societies and, on that ground alone, appears to have a genetic origin. My own guess is that the genetic bias is

intense enough to cause a substantial division of labor even in the most free and most egalitarian societies. Even with identical education and equal access to all professions, men are likely to continue to play a disproportionate role in political life, business, and science. This is reinforced by the different genetic strategies required by males and females in order to maximize their inclusive fitness. Since males produce literally millions of sperm, any male has a better chance of fathering many individuals if he spreads his sperm widely rather than investing in a few children, who could be killed. There is thus a genetic base for male promiscuity. Females, on the other hand, can produce relatively few eggs over a lifetime. The sociobiologists thus argue that it is an adaptive genetic trait for females to desire a monogamous union. Women also, they assert, have a genetic bias toward concentrating their reproductive interest on men who are socially, economically, or educationally superior to them, as well as physically fit enough to provide for them and their children. Thus patterns of male domination and female subordination, as well as the sexual double standard, are seen as an outcome of genetically determined mate selection. This assumption suffers first of all from a confusion of analogy similar traits due to similar functions with homology common genetic ancestry. As Richard Lewontin, specialist in population genetics at Harvard, notes: The logic is circular. For one thing, it is well known that in societies based on kinship as an organizing principle, expediency rather than actual blood relationship dictates the interactions between individuals. Through the fiction of adoption, complete strangers are assimilated into the group and treated as if they were brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, etc. Although mutual aid is certainly a factor in most relationships between people, genetic relatedness is clearly not the primary factor in such kinship systems. Among the Lakher of Southeast Asia, a child is considered related to his mother only by virtue of her marriage to his father. If they are divorced, the cooperation and interaction of mother and child cease. In some African and Native American tribes a woman becomes a female husband, and is considered the parent of the children her wife bears by various lovers. And in many societies, of course, loyalty and sharing extend far beyond the family. In answer to these criticisms, sociobiologists have recently attempted to explain cultural variability through the theory that genes and culture "co-evolve. As various critics have shown, this theory is seriously flawed. Moreover, the mechanisms of inheritance are complex and poorly understood. Biologists are beginning to recognize that they are an outcome of the dialectical interaction of biology with environment. Such an atomistic view fails to take account of culture as a system of interrelated traits. It is an explanation that discounts the inventiveness of human minds and ignores the fact that lack of genetic programming is probably the most important adaptation humans have made. There is evidence from recent ecological research, for example, that rates of change in the incidence of genetically determined traits in a population are very low, and that it takes even longer for a trait to become established at the level of the group than in the case of individual selection. If it took genetic changes in a population to adapt to new circumstances, humans would probably have died out long ago. Most acquired cultural behaviour is thus likely not genetic even if it is adaptive. The evidence suggests only that the big brain provides the potential for problem-solving ability such as the invention of the aeroplane, not the determination of specific behaviour such as male promiscuity, however widespread its manifestations in time and place. In most though not all populations, the average male is taller than the average female, both at birth and after puberty, though the average difference between the sexes is a matter of inches, while the normal range of variation within each sex is more than two feet. Males are also heavier and seem to have greater physical strength, though again the variation among individuals of the same sex is far greater than the average variation between the sexes. But physical sexual dimorphism cannot explain the different roles of the sexes, and far less male dominance, as Leibowitz points out in this volume and elsewhere. Among a group like the seventeenth century Iroquois, a strong emphasis on male physical prowess was fully compatible with a high position for women, and indeed there is little evidence that men in most foraging societies use either their strength or their weapons as a means of controlling women. Although recent studies have repudiated the idea that there are significant sex differences in intellect, analytical powers, social skills, or personal motivation, there does seem to be a strong difference in physical aggression that appears at least as early as the kindergarten years. High levels of the male hormone testosterone have been correlated with high levels of aggression, and injections of testosterone increase fighting behaviour in rats. Margaret Mead found that women among the Tchambuli were more

aggressive than men, that women and men were equally fierce among the Mundugamor, and that neither men nor women were aggressive among the Arapesh. The explanation of social behaviour such as aggression by a single biological factor, moreover, reflects a central weakness of almost all biological determinism. Studies of humans do not show consistent correlations between hormone levels and aggression. When low dominance monkeys are placed with monkeys toward whom they can safely act aggressively, their testosterone levels go up; when they are returned to an established group to whom they must defer, their testosterone levels fall dramatically. When this was stimulated electrically in laboratory animals, increased fighting resulted. However, when this was done in monkeys who were released into the wild the result was increased grooming behaviour. But the dominance in humans of the cerebral cortex means that what we do with our biological capacities is almost entirely a matter of learning. The difference in aggression between boys and girls should be considered in light of the different socialization given them. The vital impact of expectations can be seen in studies of persons born as hermaphrodites: This was true "even for those individuals whose sex of rearing contradicted their biological sex as determined by chromosomes, hormones, gonads, and the formation of the internal and external genitals. Even where such differences may be established, it is by no means justified to assume, as most of these theories do, that a sex difference explains a sex inequality. This is a conceptual leap made by a number of other authors, who start from the fact that most societies do recognize and define different social and symbolic functions for the sexes. According to this school of thought, cultures tend to interpret or organize motherhood in ways that accentuate differences between the sexes and lead to sexual asymmetry. There are quite a number of variations on this theme, offering a cultural or symbolic explanation for gender inequality. One such variation is the psychoanalytical interpretation that postulates a universal male fear of female reproductive powers. Starting from the fact that large numbers of primitive societies believe menstruating women to be dangerous to men and animals, proponents of this view argue that men fear and hence attempt to control female sexuality and reproduction. This suggests that fears about female sexuality and reproduction are less cause than symptom of social tensions in male-female relations. Girls learn their gender identity by imitation of a particular, individual female, which leads them, she argues, to relate to others in a particularized and personalized way. They become more present-oriented and subjective than boys, who must learn to identify with a sex that is frequently absent and less accessible and who can only do so by learning an abstract male role. Although Chodorow perceptively analyzes the reproduction of sex roles in male dominant societies, her work does not really address the origins of male dominance, as she assumes much of what needs to be explained: Even where women are primarily responsible for child care, however, and males do work away from the domestic arena, it does not follow, except in an already sexist society, that a boy should move from defining himself as not-woman to denigrating women in general; and it is even less logical that such childhood denigration which females also frequently direct against males could in and of itself produce the institutionalized subordination of adult women. Another theory based on reproductive roles emphasizes symbolism rather than psychodynamics. Nature, she argues, is in turn seen as lower than culture, so that women are perceived as lower in the social scale and subject to the restrictions that culture puts on both nature and the domestic unit. Ortner and Whitehead assert that "the sphere of social activity predominantly associated with males encompasses the sphere predominantly associated with females and is, for that reason, culturally accorded higher value. In the first place, the association of women with nature and men with culture is far from universal. Many ancient societies had androgynous deities that reflected an integration of both male and female principles with natural and cultural forces. Among the Sherbro, children are considered close to nature, but both adult men and women are associated with culture. Sperm, incidentally, are thought to belong to a kin section designated as passive and associated with the moon, calm water, and temperate weather. For the Haganers, the wild and domestic "are in an antithetical rather than a hierarchical, processual relationship. It is true that men tend to be associated with the political sphere in most societies where this sphere exists. The political arena, however, is not the only public arena in non-state societies, for many vital collective decisions are made within the domestic grouping.

Female Forms of Power and the Myth of Male Dominance: A Model.

Matriarchy is usually defined as a political system in which women are the dominant political actors, as opposed to patriarchy, in which men are the exclusive or primary heads of families, social groups, or political states. But matriarchy has always been a controversial term, since whenever it is mentioned, there are debates about whether matriarchies are imagined utopias or real societies, whether they existed at some time in the distant past or could be re-created in a possible future, and how the definitions of gendered power themselves might have shifted in relation to varying social and historical contexts. The idea of matriarchy has served to inspire a whole series of legends and myths, experiments in alternative lifestyles, feminist spirituality, and woman-centered collectives, but it has long been rejected within mainstream anthropology. In the early twenty-first century new field research in Indonesia, Melanesia, and China has raised new questions about the definition of the term itself, and reinvigorated debates about when it can be used responsibly.

Nineteenth-Century Evolutionary Theory J. Bachofen began the modern debate about matriarchy with his book on "mother right," in which he argued that one early social formation was a family which traced descent through the mother, and in which "government of the state was also entrusted to the women" p. Bachofen developed a three-stage model: In the barbaric or hetaeristic stage from the Greek hetero, meaning both, neither men nor women had control, and people engaged in indiscriminate sexual activity, worshipping Aphrodite and valuing the erotic above all else. Then women tired of this system and banded together for their own defense, creating a matriarchy in which Artemis and Athena emerged as the main deities. Agriculture was developed during this period, and so were the stories of Amazons and Furies. Bachofen argued that "matriarchal people feel the unity of all life, the harmony of the universe" p. In the final stage of the development of civilization, men seized control from women, and their struggle to assert their domination was reflected in stories of Zeus triumphing over the Titans, Hades raping Persephone, Perseus slaying the Medusa, and Oedipus killing the Sphinx. Bachofen interpreted mythical accounts of sexual conflict as evidence for a historical transition from matriarchy to patriarchy. Friedrich Engels developed a materialist version of this theme in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, arguing that matriarchy developed from a situation of group marriage, in which paternity was uncertain so only female blood lines could be traced reliably. Early human societies were presumed to have been egalitarian, and various forms of inequality were introduced in conjunction with the emergence of private property. When property rights came to be invested in men, the development of patriarchy was tied to the birth of capitalism, in which laborers were no longer the owners of the products of their labor. Anthropologists working on comparative evidence from a number of societies tried to develop a more rigorous definition of matriarchy. He later reconsidered this position and decided that the term maternal family would be preferable to matriarchy, since "it takes too much for granted that the women govern the family" p.

Twentieth-Century Gender and Kinship Studies In *Matrilineal Kinship*, David Schneider reexamined several decades of scholarship on the subject and concluded that "the generalized authority of women over men, imagined by Bachofen, was never observed in known matrilineal societies, but only recorded in legends and myths. Thus the whole notion of matriarchy fell rapidly into disuse in anthropological work" p. Twenty years after that statement was published, several contributors to the Rosaldo and Lamphere book specifically recanted this assertion, but none of them went so far as to embrace the idea of matriarchy. Sherry Ortner writes that in the early s, when interest in feminist anthropology began to grow, she and many other anthropologists were asked about matriarchies: With a reasonable degree of unanimity, anthropologists said no. Here there was somewhat less unanimity among the anthropologists, but by and large no professional scholar in the field was willing to make a strong claim for any past matriarchies either" p. But she noted that the anthropological consensus fell apart completely when the issue of egalitarian societies was raised. A belief that men are superior to women may be posited in mythology or even institutionalized in the formal ranking of social groups, but it is never total. In many cultures, women have a great deal of power that actually counterbalances claims of male prestige, and notions of charisma and social value are always subject

to individual adjustments and reevaluations. Women can in fact have significant amounts of power, authority, autonomy, and prestige in systems where men are the formal leaders, and systems that appear "hegemonically egalitarian" may also contain subtle ways to give men the edge over women in a number of informal contexts. Looking in some detail at a series of myths about the rule of women in Amazonian societies, she found that the myths themselves justify the rule of men "through the evocation of a vision of a catastrophic alternative—a society dominated by women. The myth, in its reiteration that women did not know how to handle power when in possession of it, reaffirms dogmatically the inferiority of their present position" p. Men stole the sacred objects that gave women supernatural power, and women have since been "forever the subjects of male terrorism," so that these "myths of matriarchy" are in fact arguments for patriarchy. The myths and legends that Bachofen surveyed were indeed told in patriarchal Rome and Greece in order to justify the abandonment of matrilineal kinship and certain female-centered cults. But the idea of a simple reversal of gender roles within a similar system of domination and control may obscure other possibilities, which are not so easily reducible to a looking glass inversion of male domination and female subjugation. Women have served all these centuries as looking glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of men at twice its natural size. That is why Napoleon and Mussolini both insisted so emphatically on the inferiority of women, for if they were not inferior, they would cease to enlarge. That serves to explain in part the necessity that women so often are to men. Examined from this perspective, gender as a principle of contrast for social classification does not carry a consistent positive or negative valuation as part of its conceptual baggage. As Third World women and "native anthropologists" become more involved in academic discussions of gender equality, many of them criticize what they call the "false utopias" of the search by European-American feminists for hope and inspiration from exotic others. As Shanshan Du argues: After all, there is always an unbridgeable gap between a utopian fantasy and a real society because the latter never operates on seamlessly coherent principles" p. She notes the example of the Crow Indians, who have many egalitarian institutions and ideologies, and where women are at least as prominent as men in many significant rituals. However Western anthropologists described the Crow as "male dominant" because of the existence of a menstrual taboo, although later studies have shown that menstrual taboos are complex and can also serve to empower women and grant them access to certain spiritual powers. Du calls this a "Eurocentric bias" which sets its own standards for sexual "political correctness" and is not sensitive to contextual meanings and configurations. Matrism, Gender Egalitarianism, and Diarchy In order to expand the conceptual tool kit of anthropologists for understanding gender relations in other societies, several writers have proposed alternative terms designed to avoid the simplifications implied by matriarchy. Riane Eisler argues in *The Chalice and the Blade* that patriarchy and matriarchy are "two sides of the same coin," because both of them involve "the ranking of one half of humanity over the other" p. She prefers a partnership model that is "primarily based on the principle of linkage rather than ranking," so that gender differences between men and women can be spoken of in ways that do not equate them with either inferiority or superiority. Instead of matriarchy and patriarchy, Eisler proposes the term gylany for societies where gender relations follow the partnership model, and androcracy for others characterized by male dominance and ranking relations. Her title derives from symbols for these two paradigms: She represents the Neolithic as an era of peace when people worshipped the goddess, which was then destroyed by the invasion of Hebrews and "Kurgans. These terms have not been widely adopted, and they are based on the work of Marija Gimbutas, who has excavated hundreds of female figurines from the period to b. Several archaeologists, such as Ruth Tringham and Margaret Conkey, have argued that her interpretations are highly speculative, but they have had tremendous popular appeal, and her ideal of an early cult of a fertility deity represented as a large, possibly pregnant, woman has been widely disseminated. Gimbutas writes critically of the "indolent assumption" that ancient societies must have resembled those of the present, and presents her own theory that these figurines were produced by groups of people whose social forms she describes as "matristic": Indeed we do not find in Old Europe, nor in all of the old world, a system of autocratic rule by women with an equivalent suppression of men. Rather, we find a structure in which the sexes are more or less on equal footing. Graves argued that goddess worship coincided with the time when calendars were primarily determined by the moon, and noted the correspondence of the

lunar and menstrual cycles, and that the Earth Mother was associated with the Moon Goddess. He traced the changeover to patriarchy with the changeover to the solar calendar and the worship of a solar deity. His work is more a poetic vision of artistic inspiration than a work of scholarship, and has been widely discredited. Eisler and Gimbutas consider themselves "revisionist" historians who have brought together neglected evidence of a nurturant, female-centered society, but they like the nineteenth-century evolutionary theorists base this universalist theory solely on evidence from Europe and the Middle East. Even within that area, their scholarship has been widely criticized as biased, selective, and unscientific, and most anthropologists consider their work to present a view of the "matrist" past as unlikely as their utopian vision of a partnership future. The phenomenon of these revisionist feminist visions is itself of great interest, however, and has proved important in inspiring the neopagan movement, Wicca, and best sellers such as *The DaVinci Code*. Anthropologists have invoked a number of other terms that are close to matriarchy but not exact equivalents: David Hicks describes the patrilineal Tetum of Viqueque, East Timor as having "a maternal religion," in which men dominate the affairs of the upperworld, but women play a central role in rituals of death, birth, and regeneration. Annette Weiner describes the Trobrianders of Papua New Guinea as giving value and autonomy to women through their matrilineal institutions, while men travel from island to island to seek renown and political positions of power. She has specifically argued that Bronislaw Malinowski failed to pay attention to certain crucial ways in which Trobriand women played important roles in their society because he focused too exclusively on a male-dominated politics: The discovery that Trobriand women have power and that women enact roles which are symbolically, structurally, and functionally significant to the ordering of Trobriand society, and to the roles that men play, should give us, as anthropologists, cause for concern. Maria Lepowsky claims to have discovered on Sudest Island "a sexually egalitarian society that challenges the concept of the universality of male dominance and contests the assumption that the subjugation of women is inevitable" p. The example of the Vanatinai shows, she argues, that gender equality is possible when there is little emphasis on class, rank, age grades, or other forms of social stratification. The decentralization of political power allows for the equal treatment of all categories of individuals, allowing for a much greater sense of personal autonomy for both women and men, and little formal authority of any one person over another. Strength, wisdom, and magical power are valued as characteristics that enhance communal solidarity, and individuals who have these may become "big women" or "big men" without gender bias. Descent is matrilineal, but its influence is buttressed by gender blind institutions like a bilocal pattern of postmarital residence, in which married couples live alternately with their two natal families for many years. So this egalitarianism is defined more by a respect for idiosyncrasy and the absence of formal structure than by a positive value attached to women. Studies of bilateral societies in Indonesia where gender receives relatively little emphasis, such as the Wana of Sulawesi Atkinson or the Meratus of Kalimantan Tsing, also document a lack of any formal ideology about male supremacy, and ideas of gender crossing male "pregnancy," female shamans speaking in male voices that suggest gender is not conceptualized as fixed. Ortner compares these to the example of the Andaman Islanders, who had a clear but balanced division of labor men hunted, women gathered, and a spiritual world in which supernatural beings of both sexes played significant, generally complementary, and sometimes reversible roles, with one deity of variable "but usually female" gender who seemed to represent fertility. All of these societies can be described as gender balanced and flexible, in which men and women were allowed to participate equally in all forms of social relations, but men nevertheless tended to emerge as leaders in some of these domains. Feminist scholars such as Ortner, Atkinson, and Tsing stress religion and ideology in their portraits, while scholars in the Marxist tradition build on the work of Engels to argue that nonstratified societies in which both sexes have control over the means of production and their own labors are gender egalitarian. Eleanor Leacock argues that many precapitalist societies were egalitarian, and Karen Sacks suggests that, when relating to each other as siblings rather than spouses, men and women can be institutionally equal even in patrilineal, patrilocal societies. Two early-twenty-first-century ethnographies by Chinese scholars bring together Marxist and symbolic approaches to argue that gender equality is possible and often found in the minority groups of the Chinese highlands. She argues that mythology and religion reflect a "dyadic world view," based on cooperation between men and women, since "a single chopstick cannot pick up

food" p. Lahu origin myths feature cross-sex twins who combine male and female attributes in an image of overarching power. This arrangement does give women greater autonomy than the traditional Confucian family, and also challenges the usual anthropological orthodoxy about the universality of male-female pair bonding. Hua argues that in this society "sexuality is not a piece of merchandise but a purely sentimental and amorous matter that implies no mutual constraints" Hua, p. The Na, like the famous Nayar of India studied by Kathleen Gough Schneider and Gough, are matrilineal, and have resisted communist efforts to bring them into mainstream values. The sibling relationship defines the household completely, and visiting lovers have no connection with the family, have no responsibilities, and do not acknowledge their fatherhood; the children, in turn, do not know their fathers. Another alternative to matriarchy that works with dyads and sibling symbolism is diarchy, which some scholars grouped with egalitarian structures as a form of "partnership societies. A doctrine of mutuality and shared concerns is expressed in ideas of delegation and oscillating rule. European travelers to the Amazonian jungle and the New Guinea highlands encountered "myths of matriarchy" that presented an apparent confirmation of their own fantasies of Amazon warrior princesses and Melanesian "free love. This pattern had first been documented in Indian kinship, where Georges Dumézil described the idea that "sovereignty aligns itself in two planes, at once antithetical and complementary," and it is also found in Chinese and Vietnamese popular religion. The division between spiritual authority and temporal power was predicated on the conceptual opposition between female and male, in a pattern also familiar in Polynesia. The complementarity of diarchic systems operates with the principles of male and female as abstract entities, and associates them with ideas of a proper balance of action and passivity. Women are typically associated with origins, fertility of the earth, and human reproduction, while men are associated with military and executive power, differentiation, and rank. Diarchic divisions assign to the female principle an equal role in the creation of the world, but at times the passivity of their role as Earth Mother may seem to place real women at a disadvantage, bound by the restrictions inherent to their ritual prominence. Among the Kodi of Sumba, for instance, the conceptually female priestess of the Sea Worms is secluded for several months before the rice harvest to protect the crop. In the early-twenty-first-century, a man, who is both empowered and restricted by the central symbolic role he plays, is cast as the priestess. Gender dualism, which can be defined for comparative purposes by the formal requirement that a female and male component be included in each unifying hierarchical entity, is found throughout Eastern Indonesia. It occurs in patrilineal as well as matrilineal societies, and coexists with polygyny, occasional violence against women, and male leadership, so it is not necessarily a vision of gender equality, but it does highlight interdependence and complementarity. The importance of opposite sex couples, portrayed as parents, siblings, or ancestors, in Eastern Indonesian sexual imagery is an index of the value given to heterosexual relations, and what can only be called a vision of sexual union—the bringing together of male and female in an act of pleasure, release, and potential reproduction. Are the Minangkabau a Modern Matriarchy? In Peggy Sanday revived controversies about the anthropological use of the term matriarchy by titling her study of Minangkabau gender relations *Women at the Center: Life in a Modern Matriarchy*.

6: Dog Training: Animal Experts Debunk the Alpha-Dog Myth - TIME

This historical notion that men are dominant, more superior, stronger, more capable, more knowledgeable and more logical than women is not natural. It is the way our society has been constructed over thousands for years.

How did men come to dominate women? Men and women have equal rights as citizens of the State and adopted children of God. But this equality of rights should not be confused with an identity of functions. In fact, both biologically and psychologically men and women are different. There are inborn traits which would seem to dispose them to different tasks in society. Underneath prejudices imposed by culture see e , there is a hard substratum of constitutional variance. In particular, men seem by nature to be better prepared for aggressive tasks and women for nurturative ones. In the human male the central and massive bodiness is formed by the chest. Man has broad shoulders and strong arms. Man has much stronger muscles than woman as is borne out by international sports achievements and projects an image of strength. Woman, on the other hand, possesses a body that is structured for motherhood. For woman the massive and central bodiness is constituted by the womb. The physique of woman is directed towards attracting the male partner by its beauty, and protecting the offspring by its reserves in natural energy. This different disposition has also been remarked by psychologists in the observation of children. Before boys and girls can have been inHuenced by prejudices of the culture to which they belong, they already show contrary attitudes to their environment. Generally speaking boys play more roughly, show more aggression, are more inclined to be obstinate, are more easily given to violence. Girls yield more easily and avoid physical fighting. They prefer quiet games and are more affectionate. These findings have been confirmed by studies in different social milieus and culture. The genetic factor is also proved by a comparative study of the behaviour of monkeys, especially that of primates which are close to man in the tree of evolution. Among gorillas and baboons the males impose their authority by aggression. The leader is always a male who claims precedence over others regarding space, food and females. Holt Rinehart Jc Winston, An interesting finding is that an injection of the male sexual hormone into young females in the foetal stage produces typically male, aggressive behaviour in the young monkey. Hormones and Sexual Behaviour, Science, 13 This kind of research, also performed on rats, seems to imply that sexual hormones have a decided influence on the behaviour of males and females. The different dispositions of men and women to aggressive and nurturative tasks would seem also the result of different hormone activity in the body. The innate difference of men and women can also be demonstrated to some extent by the actual division of labour in society. In practically all primitive societies aggressive jobs are done by men, such as hunting, fishing, metal working, weapon making, boat building, etc. The women normally grind corn, gather fruits and seeds, manu facture and repair clothes, and do the work at home. Although part of this may be culture-determined see e the fact that the same division of labour is followed in economically primitive societies from all over the world shows that it must be partly based on biological make-up of men and women. This conclusion was recently strengthened by experiments in Israel. In spite of concerted and explicit effort to give the same job to men and women in the Kibbutz communes, men and women are gradually returning to an acceptance of the traditional division of labour. Whereas men do work in the productive branches, more and more women join the service branches to do cooking, laundering, teaching and caring for children. Venture in Utopia, Harvard Univ. The central role of women in ancient societies 1. The disposition towards aggressive tasks obviously makes man rather than woman a likely candidate for leadership in society. The step from aggression to dominance, however, is neither necessary, nor was it universally followed. In many ancient, fruit-gathering societies it was woman not man, who was considered the centre of the family and tribal life. And although male dominance became the rule afterwards some societies have preserved a matriarchal organization to our own days. For ancient man the female, not the male, was the symbol of life and fertility. In the pre-agricultural phase people did not know the biological function of the male seed. Fertility was attributed to mother earth, from which life was seen to spring forth in so many different forms. Undoubtedly from this originated the belief in the mother goddess as the oldest and most fundamental divinity, a belief documented in the mythology of Oceania, Africa, North and South America, the

ancient Middle East and Asia. Some of these little statues can be dated from 60, B. Among them 84 societies were found to be matrilocal, which means that after marriage the young couple resides with the parents of the bride, not with those of the bridegroom. Anthropologists link this social organization to an economic situation in which the main property and source of income is the field from which women gather fruits. The centre of gravity for subsistence is fertility. In India two matrilocal societies are wellknown: The Rise of Male Social Dominance 1. Most societies that exist today and those of which we can trace the history show a bias towards male dominance. The supremacy of man over woman may be due to the increasing need of physical strength and force in economic and political leadership. Favoured by genetic factors man assumed the leadership role in cattle husbandry, heavy agriculture and urbanization. The focus on masculine power asserted itself also in religious thinking. It is hard to overestimate the influence of urbanization on the life of human beings. Instead of dependence on what could be gathered freely or obtained by hunting, humankind was forced to obtain its living by continuous and hard work. People subjected animals to their use: People devised tools with which they could cut materials and build lasting homes. People fashioned weapons to meet the violence of robbers and enemies. The survival of the townships that arose depended on the strength of the workman and the valour of the soldier. It was natural that masculine power should assert itself in these new forms of society. For the urban revolution, see the excellent description in V. Among primitive societies which were specially studied, were found to be patrilocal, i. Also, membership in the families, with names and property rights, were transmitted through males in four out of every five societies. In all major societies known in the world at present, social organization evolves round the man not the woman. The new organization of society implied also a new vision of the world and a new understanding of God. From reverting attention on the earth and the power of birth man began to see the world as a large city created by a supreme power. All the creation myths of the ancient religions that are known to us speak of a strong male god who created the world by bringing order in the chaos. Such male gods are now considered to reign supreme. They are thought to rule from heaven, to display their power as warriors and supreme craftsmen. Marduk of Mesopotamia and Woden of the Germanic tribes have the same traits. Fertility too is understood in a new light. It is no longer the female but the male animal carrying the seed that is considered the symbol of fertility. The bull, not the cow, came to be worshipped as the giver of life in the Middle East. The difference also manifested itself in a new attitude towards sex. Polygenism became accepted in most societies. Analysing customs in societies it was found that man appropriated more freedom and privileges regarding sex and marriage. Women on the other hand were subjected to severe sexual restrictions. Harper and Row, New York , pgs , , etc. Sociologists can relate this unequal treatment of man and woman to the rise of autocratic agrarian societies. For a combination of genetic and historical reasons men acquired dominance in most human societies. It was natural that this dominance would, in the course of time, be shored up by strong cultural and social myths.

7: The Myth of Male Power - Wikipedia

A collection of Leacock's writing--essays, lectures, reviews and debates--titled Myths of Male Dominance: Collected Articles of Women Cross-Culturally has been reissued by Haymarket Books. The.

Wolves live in hierarchical packs in which the aggressive alpha male rules over everyone else. Therefore, humans need to dominate their pet dogs to get them to behave. See photos of a real-life hotel for dogs. She uses positivity as a counterpoint to dominance theory and reserves her aggression for the poorly behaving humans. The debate has its roots in studies of captive wolves gathered from various places that, when forced to live together, naturally competed for status. Acclaimed animal behaviorist Rudolph Schenkel dubbed the male and female who won out the alpha pair. As it turns out, this research was based on a faulty premise: It is leadership by showing a good example, not dominance, that AVSAB says owners should strive for in relation to their dogs. Nor even, AVSAB notes, among feral dogs, which live in small, scavenging groups without alphas controlling access to food and mates. House pets, on the contrary, bark too much, jump up on you, ignore your commands, growl and nip at you because they have been inadvertently rewarded for this behavior or because they have not been trained to act differently. See the top 10 animal stories of Both agree that punishment is only effective during or within half a second after the offending behavior: Both trainers obviously love animals. For one thing, rather than submit, your pets might lash out at you. Take the example of Atlanta couple Louie Newman and Judy Griffin, who already had two Lhasa apsos when they adopted a rescue poodle named Manny. Not only did Manny pick fights with the other dogs, he also would attack Newman whenever he went near his wife or even tried to hand her the remote control. Newman and Griffin thought Manny wanted to control everyone, but Stilwell told them he was just trying to figure out his status in the household. Who would have thought that? He acted like he owned the house. The question is to what extent they, or any dog owner, should put him in his place. With Stilwell gearing up for her third American TV season and Millan in the middle of his sixth, the answer may be a lot simpler and less dramatic than producers would have us think. Not an alpha, a leader.

8: 7 Alpha Male Personality Traits You Can Develop Based on Science | Guy Counseling

The male face as a communicator of dominance has received particular interest from researchers. Scientists have even found an actual measurement to assess these attributes in men: the ratio of.

Debunking the "Alpha Dog" Theory Exerting "dominance" over your dog is the wrong way to build a good relationship. While not all the sites are about dominating your dog, there are literally millions of resources out there – websites, books, blogs, television shows, veterinarians, trainers and behavior professionals – instructing you to use force and intimidation to overpower your dog into submission. They say that you, the human, must be the alpha. Every single one of them. Is this powerful dog dominant? The erroneous approach to canine social behavior known as dominance theory two million-plus Google hits is based on a study of captive zoo wolves conducted in the 1970s and 80s by Swiss animal behaviorist Rudolph Schenkel, in which the scientist concluded that wolves in a pack fight to gain dominance, and the winner is the alpha wolf. It was postulated that wolves were in constant competition for higher rank in the hierarchy, and only the aggressive actions of the alpha male and female held the contenders in check. Such an approach is analogous to trying to draw inferences about human family dynamics by studying humans in refugee camps. Occasionally two or three families may group together. As the offspring mature they disperse from the pack; the only long-term members of the group are the breeding pair. How did it happen that dog owners and trainers started thinking all that information and misinformation about wolf behavior had anything to do with dogs and dog behavior? Wolves live in hierarchical packs in which the aggressive alpha male rules over everyone else. Therefore, humans need to dominate their pet dogs to get them to behave. Much of this style of training has roots in the military – which explains the emphasis on punishment. As far back as 1917, Colonel Konrad Most was using heavy-handed techniques to train dogs in the German army, then police and service dogs. Koehler also initially trained dogs for the military prior to his civilian dog-training career, and his writings advocated techniques that included hanging and helicoptering a dog into submission into unconsciousness, if necessary. Perhaps one of these days. Published in 1969, this small, unassuming volume was intended as a self-help book for human behavior. The author never dreamed that her modest book, paired with a small plastic box that made a clicking sound, would launch a massive paradigm shift in the world of dog training and behavior. Forward progress was slow until 1980, when veterinary behaviorist Dr. Sophia Yin's membership in the APDT is not restricted to positive reinforcement-based trainers, included in its guiding principles is this statement: Things were starting to look quite rosy for our dogs. The positive market literally mushroomed with books and videos from dozens of quality training and behavior professionals, including Jean Donaldson, Dr. Karen Overall, Suzanne Hetts, and others. With advances in positive training and an increasingly educated dog training profession embracing the science of behavior and learning and passing good information on to their clients, pain-causing, abusive methods such as the alpha roll, scruff shake, hanging, drowning, and cuffing appeared to be headed the way of the passenger pigeon. Dominance theory was back in vogue, with a vengeance. And yes, that works with some dogs. With others, not so much. My own personal, unscientific theory is that dog personalities lie on a continuum from very soft to very tough. Harsh, old-fashioned dominance-theory methods can effectively suppress behaviors without obvious fallout although there is always behavioral fallout with dogs nearest the center of the personality continuum – those who are resilient enough to withstand the punishment, but not so tough and assertive that they fight back. Under dominance theory, when a dog fights back, you must fight back harder until he submits, in order to assert yourself as the pack leader, or alpha. Or they submit for the moment, but may erupt aggressively again the next time a human does something violent and inappropriate to them. Had they never been treated inappropriately, many might have been perfectly fine. This dog quickly shuts down – fearful and mistrusting of the humans in his world who are unpredictably and unfairly violent. Most crossover trainers those who used to train with old-fashioned methods and now are proud to promote positive reinforcement-based training will tell you they successfully trained lots of dogs the old way. They loved their dogs and their dogs loved them. I also would dearly love to be able to go back and redo all of that training, to be able to have an even better relationship with those dogs, to give them a less stressful life –

one filled with even more joy than the one we shared together. They know how impossibly inept we are, for the most part, at reading and understanding the subtleties of canine body language. We are equally inept, if not even more so, at trying to mimic those subtleties. Any attempts on our part to somehow insert ourselves into their social structure and communicate meaningfully with them in this manner are simply doomed to failure. The fact is, successful social groups work because of voluntary deference, not because of aggressively enforced dominance. The whole point of social body language rituals is to avoid conflict and confrontation, not to cause it. Watch any group of dogs interacting. Social hierarchies do exist in groups of domesticated dogs and in many other species, including humans, and hierarchy can be fluid. There are a myriad of subtleties about how those hierarchies work, and how the members of a social group communicate “ in any species. Today, educated trainers are aware that canine-human interactions are not driven by social rank, but rather by reinforcement. Behaviors that are reinforced repeat and strengthen. Author of numerous books on positive dog training, she lives in Fairplay, Maryland, site of her Peaceable Paws training center, where she offers dog training classes and courses for trainers.

9: Male Dominance in the Old Testament

Exerting "dominance" over your dog is the wrong way to build a good relationship. By Pat Miller, CBCC-KA, CPDT-KA [Updated May 23,] The alpha myth is everywhere.

Online Scripture Courses 1. Jewish society had developed its own social myth of male predominance. This social myth was quite naturally incorporated in Sacred Scripture. All relationships in the family centred round the father the patriarch. He could divorce his wives as he liked Gen 16, ; Dt 24, ; Mt 19, He decided on the future of his children and had absolute authority over them Gen 43, ; 2 Sam 13, ; Mt 21, He was in every sense the head of the family Ps , , ; etc. It was the man who received the family property see the exception of the daughters of Zelophehad, Num 27, ; 36, It was the man who as sole owner of the family property could distribute it to his sons Dt 21, ; Lk 15, Male predominance also found its expression in the Hebrew language. The workings of this myth can be demonstrated from the endless elaborations in extra-biblical Jewish thinking. Baba Bathra 58a; Lev. God created Lilith woman but for her he used filth and mud instead of pure dust Yalqut Reubeni ad. Litith refused to lie beneath Adam and eventually became the mother of many demons Num. The act of love is an evil thing which Adam and Eve only learned from Samael, the devil, after they had been thrown out of paradise Sefer Adam p. Hebrew Myths, London, Cassell , pgs, 65 We need not be surprised that the social myth of male predominance affected the following aspects of Sacred Scripture: For this reason it is only natural that Yahweh was spoken of as if he were a man and that Christ could not have been understood as an incarnation of God, unless he was a man. The rules restricting the priestly ministry to men in the Old Testament Lev 8 , allowing women access only to part of the temple and attaching ritual uncleanliness to childbirth Lev 12, Traces of this can still be seen in early Christian uneasiness about full participation of women in the liturgical assembly 1 Cor 11, ; 14, The duties of the father of a family towards his wife Sir 9, ; 36, or towards his children Sir 7, ; 22, ; 42, , of a wife towards her husband Sir 25, ; 26, and of children towards their parents Sir 3, ; 7, ; 25, are all explicitations of the social structure enshrined in the myth. The early Christian family code still reflects the same social values when it describes the role of husbands 1 Pet 3, 7; Col 3, 19, Eph 5, , wives 1 Pet 3, ; Col 3, 18; Eph 5. The image of the marriage between Yahweh and Israel belongs to this sphere Hos 3, ; etc. Idolatry is compared to fornication and adultery Ez 16, ; etc. God speaks also as a father punishing his children Is 1, ; 43, ; etc. From a Scriptural point of view it is important that we recognize this social aspect so that we may carefully distinguish it from the revealed message. It would be a fatal theological blunder to confuse the human medium of expression with the divine message itself.

Chronology: September 16, 1950- The Fastest Turtle In The West (Full House Michelle) Marys Tears in a River of Blood A beautiful mind: the making of home sapiens What Bobolino knew Learning to learn english a course in learner training Card Games (Collins Gem) American neutrality, trial and failure From one brand of politics to one brand of political culture TAKEOUT STAKEOUT THE MYSTERY FILES OF SHELBY WOO 2 (Mystery Files of Shelby Woo) The Rainforest Edge The coming of Hopalong Cassidy English aristocracy Fun things to make and do for 8 year olds. Alcoholism and Addiction (Joy Books) Christopher Hamptons Tales from Hollywood Sweet thing sheet music Gary Rhodes New Classics Pulse and digital circuits Manuscripts (including microfilmed manuscripts) No. 9 (July, 1902 Are vessels infected with yellow fever? Some personal observations, by H. R. Carter. Circumcisions not such a bad thing after all So much depends on reputation guard it with your life law 6. Effective Chinese Recipes You cant still be hungry Forest Days, Volume 2 Certified nurse assistant study guide Modern algebra book by arumugam Theres gotta be more! Six major types of delivery systems La Pollera Traje Nacional de Panama Lesions of the brain stem Managerial economics decision making Mary (How to Talk to Your Children About.) Early Letters, 1814-1826 Understanding Robert Musil Benin in world history Schedule of dissertations of approved candidates for advanced degrees with major and minor subjects. Vengeance of Mars by Robin Wasserman Writing Is a Communal Act