

A sign up sheet for men in my church to substitute in the primary (kids under 12).

August 10, 2014 | 287 upvotes | by [thelotusknyte](#)

<http://imgur.com/ORIkxmN>

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

redgreenyellowblu • 65 points • 11 August, 2014 04:28 AM

The sad thing is that the church is acting in your best interest by doing that. You, as a man, or much more likely to be falsely accused, or have your reputation ruined by some dumb teenaged girl that decides to call you a creeper. The church is also acting in its own best legal interest. You can't change the fact that men are assumed rapists nowadays. It will be a long fight, but, in the meantime, everyone should do whatever necessary to protect themselves.

That being said, the church should have a gender neutral policy on this to both not insult men and to stop perpetuating the men as predators trope. No adult is allowed alone with children. Totally stupid policy but at least it's fair as far as gender.

I suggest telling the church you would love to volunteer but that you cannot given the offensive and damaging nature of their policy. Discuss with other men at the church and insist on a policy change.

60secs • 8 points • 11 August, 2014 06:35 AM

Those policies are church wide for millions of members, not for a specific parish.

baskandpurr • 8 points • 11 August, 2014 11:23 AM

I agree they church is doing the best thing but it does stop men from helping. I was asked to paint a mural in the hall of a local church, the mural was going to be very large and the priest wanted to get local children involved in painting it. I had to say no to whole idea.

Even if the children weren't directly involved, maybe I would be in room at the same time as those children. Maybe the children would talk to me about what I was doing. Maybe the mothers would get angry because their children weren't allowed to get involved. Maybe saying no looked suspicious, what was I hiding? Maybe they had a rule like this just in case I was tempted to molest the children. Maybe I could have asked for such a rule, imagine how that looks?

Accepting this rule amounts to admitting that its a risk. Of course I'm not going to harm those children so theoretically I should be safe. But that doesn't matter when the accusation is enough. I could not put myself in a position to be accused so I had to say no. It's a shame because I very much enjoy being around children, especially dealing with art, but the risk comes from the mothers and the stakes are far too high.

[deleted] • 0 points • 11 August, 2014 10:51 AM

Came here to say this.

AKnightAlone • -4 points • 11 August, 2014 10:19 AM

Considering how often sexual abuse occurs in church settings and because of males, I can almost say this is sensible. I hate ignorant discrimination, but even more, I hate ignorance toward reality. I wish men weren't discriminated against regarding situations of authority involving children, but abusive men will so often specifically seek out these positions.

[deleted] • 4 points • 11 August, 2014 01:36 PM

You got any numbers or a source for this?

20rakah • 0 points • 11 August, 2014 06:34 PM

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catholic_sex_abuse_cases

my finger got tired scrolling down that page

autowikibot • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 06:34 PM

Catholic sex abuse cases:

The **Catholic sex abuse cases** are a series of allegations, investigations, trials and convictions of child sexual abuse crimes committed by Catholic priests, nuns and members of Roman Catholic orders against children as young as three years old with the majority between the ages of 11 and 14. Many of the cases span several decades and are brought forward years after the abuse occurred. Cases have also been brought against members of the Catholic hierarchy who did not report sex abuse allegations to the legal authorities. It has been shown they deliberately moved sexually abusive priests to other parishes where the abuse sometimes continued. This has led to a number of fraud cases where the Church has been accused of misleading victims by deliberately relocating priests accused of abuse instead of removing them from their positions.

Imageⁱ - *Graffiti on a wall in Lisbon depicting a priest chasing two children, denouncing the child sexual abuse that rocked the Catholic Church.*

Interesting: Ecclesiastical response to Catholic sex abuse cases | Roman Catholic sex abuse cases by country | Catholic sex abuse cases in the United States | Media

coverage of Catholic sex abuse cases

Parent commenter can toggle NSFW or delete. Will also delete on comment score of -1 or less. | FAQs | Mods | Magic Words

anobaith • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 05:58 PM

So will abusive women. As time marches forward, and woman are given a chance to succeed or fail, reality shows women are just as bad.

Considering how homosexual activists continue to sabotage the MRM from the inside out(trying to start fights between African American and European American MRA's, empowering atheists to engage in religious bigotry and stoking political division between left leaning and right leaning MRA's), the reality of the situation is that the presence of individuals such as yourself, makes feminists mute. With MHRA's like yourself(and all MHRA), who needs enemies?

Shakimah • -3 points • 11 August, 2014 10:38 AM

The sad thing is is that the church is acting in your best interest by doing that. You, as a man, or much more likely to be falsely accused, or have your reputation ruined by some dumb teenaged girl that decides to call you a creeper. The church is also acting in its own best legal interest. You ca't change the fact that men are assumed rapists nowadays. It will be a long fight, but, in the meantime, everyone should do whatever necessary to protect themselves.

Have you considered the issue of sexual abuse of boys, by men, in churches? Do you think that that is irrelevant to this?

kizzan • 34 points • 10 August, 2014 10:00 PM

Does that sheet mean that a woman can be alone with a child but if it is a man, two adults need to be present?

GiskardReventlov • 15 points • 11 August, 2014 02:35 AM

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Exception_that_proves_the_rule

autowikibot • 9 points • 11 August, 2014 02:35 AM

Exception that proves the rule:

"**The exception [that] proves the rule**" means that the presence of an exception applying to a *specific* case establishes ("proves") that a *general* rule exists. For example, a sign that says "parking prohibited on Sundays" (the exception) "proves" that parking *is* allowed on the other six days of the week (the rule). A more explicit phrasing might be "The exception that proves *the existence of* the rule."

Interesting: [La Excepción](#) | [Bateman's principle](#) | [The Paltry Nude Starts on a Spring Voyage](#) | [Wizard's First Rule](#)

Parent commenter can toggle NSFW or delete. Will also delete on comment score of -1 or less. | [FAQs](#) | [Mods](#) | [Magic Words](#)

panda_samawich • 3 points • 10 August, 2014 10:17 PM

<https://www.lds.org/handbook/handbook-2-administering-the-church/primary/11.8#118>

kizzan • 2 points • 10 August, 2014 10:46 PM

11.8.1 says that men need two people unless the church is too small that it is impractical to do that. But my question is, is there a double standard? Is there a section that talks about women teachers?

Atkailash • 9 points • 11 August, 2014 12:18 AM*

That link shows the handbook, since it's not stated, a female teacher would not need another person. Also note that 11.2.2 exclusively uses the female pronoun, the leadership will be just women. I want to say that it's because primary is under the Relief Society which is the female group of the church (men have the priesthood) but I'm not sure.

kizzan • 9 points • 11 August, 2014 02:06 AM

Yeah I see that. To me it seems okay if men have different roles than women, but if men are treated like potential threats and need to have dual custody but women don't, that would be very offensive to me.

Atkailash • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 09:11 AM

That's what's happening here, it's not a role thing but an obvious different standard.

kizzan • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 03:02 PM

Well that sucks. Feminism even affects the Mormon church.

Atkailash • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 04:30 PM

Not really sure what that has to do with this really

kizzan • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 04:57 PM

Okay thank you!

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 10:52 AM

That is how I read it. If the rule was gender neutral then there wouldn't be anything to complain about.

kizzan • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 03:03 PM

Yeah you are probably right.

[deleted] • 0 points • 11 August, 2014 03:12 PM

The flip side of what I read.

After reading through the thread it sounds to me like this isn't the decision of a single church. That these are rules that have been handed out 'from above'.

If this WAS a decision from a single church, then I would suggest that coming to them, pointing out the discrimination and asking for it to simply be reworded would be worthy of your time. (as others have said, there is a bright side to this. it makes it harder to be falsley accused)

But the reality is it was handed down from on high. They won't budge.

LMS. Isn't LMS Mormons? Good luck fining a different place.

kizzan • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 04:52 PM

Yeah this is from higher up in the Mormon church. But don't Mormons say that men can marry multiple wives? I don't think this church is anti-male. I am not a member of that church so I could be mistaken.

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 August, 2014 06:14 PM

They haven't said that in a good long while. Except for a few fringe groups.

kizzan • 2 points • 11 August, 2014 06:57 PM

Oh okay.

[deleted] • 0 points • 11 August, 2014 04:55 PM

You make a good point.

[deleted] • 7 points • 11 August, 2014 02:07 AM

At least they acknowledge that men can be responsible adults, at least when watching over a suspect-by-nature male.

Given the hysterical nature of some countries over the issue, it seems like good practice to require this for *all* adults caring for children, regardless of gender; two adults minimum at all times. Too bad they can't just have

everything on surveillance, for iron-clad proof of whether an allegation has substance.

[deleted] 10 August, 2014 11:54 PM

[permanently deleted]

BlueDoorFour • 36 points • 11 August, 2014 12:51 AM

It's a double standard if they don't apply the same rule to women. I think that's the complaint here. It's not clear from the post that this is the case, though.

[deleted] 11 August, 2014 01:26 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 21 points • 11 August, 2014 01:30 AM

I agree with you. That being said, the very fact that male teachers need that extra protection was what drove me away from becoming a teacher. It is obviously another manifestation of the tired, and trite, stereotype that men are pedophilic rapists.

BlueDoorFour • 19 points • 11 August, 2014 01:48 AM

Agreed. They could accomplish the same with a gender-neutral rule. By making it gendered, they just reinforce the 'men as pedophiles' stereotype.

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 August, 2014 02:01 AM

From an efficiency standpoint, however, it makes economic sense to only apply this 2 teacher rule where it is necessary: i.e. with male teachers. This rule could also be a numbers thing, not an outright gendered thing. Why spend money where you don't need to is the mentality behind this interpretation.

BlueDoorFour • 9 points • 11 August, 2014 02:29 AM

See, I understand that you mean for the necessity of protecting against false accusation. I suspect most would interpret the statement "it's only necessary with men" as "evidence" that men are uniquely dangerous to children. That's the problem.

The rule really should be followed regardless of sex. Female teachers are just as much a danger as male.

[deleted] • 0 points • 11 August, 2014 02:38 AM

I agree that the potential for danger is enough to warrant the universal application of the rule. Also with everything else you just said. I always try to understand the people/ideas I disagree with...so I can more effectively work against them.

60secs • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 06:37 AM

With the exception of a few hundred general authorities, ecclesiastical positions in the LDS church are voluntary, not paid.

dicapary • 4 points • 11 August, 2014 05:10 AM

In your opinion, would it make more sense to make the rule apply to anyone, instead of being exclusive to a specific gender? I understand that the rule protects the men from potential problems, but why not just make it a standard rule, instead of singling out men?

In the same vein, do you not think that having this exclusive rule actually perpetuates the very stereotype we want to see changed? And if it does, how does keeping it in its current exclusive form have any long term benefit to men in society?

Endless_Summer • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 12:32 PM

You're missing the point. There is no need for gender in this rule. It's promoting hate. This is stupid of a church.

cashmunnymillionaire • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 01:27 PM

Can you source the data on 1/7 male teachers being falsely accused? I'd really like to verify that one way or another, so I can add it to my talking points.

tallwheel • 6 points • 11 August, 2014 01:14 AM

I understand the argument for protecting yourself from accusations, but that would only make sense to me if it was not an enforced rule in the first place and you were just bringing another person along to protect you. This is institutionalized discrimination.

Lawtonfogle • 2 points • 11 August, 2014 02:28 AM

1. It is only being applied to men.
2. Even the rule is a bit twisted. In this case, even a man and women who are not related cannot be teachers. You have to either have two men, or a man and woman where the woman is a family member or spouse of the man.

Endless_Summer • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 12:30 PM

The problem is that women commit just as much child abuse, if not more than, men. Yet only men are noted as needing supervision around children.

Phototoxin • 3 points • 11 August, 2014 10:17 AM

That's surely the definition of sexist.

[deleted] 11 August, 2014 02:06 PM

[permanently deleted]

Xelnastoss • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 02:31 PM

in what third world contry can males not teach primary ages alone?

whats_up_doc • 2 points • 11 August, 2014 02:42 AM

This kind of an attitude has been creeping into the church for a couple of decades now.

[deleted] • 12 points • 10 August, 2014 09:54 PM

Ditch the church. Better still do not go to one.

[deleted] • 29 points • 11 August, 2014 04:02 AM

A faith community can be essential for men and women. Whatever your issues with the religious or non-religious don't just casually tell people to abandon there community.

j-dawg-94 • -9 points • 11 August, 2014 08:10 AM

Why are you even on here if you support a "faith community". Gender equality has never been a priority of the bible. haha

Endless_Summer • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 01:00 PM

Yeah it's funny. Reddit hates atheists, but is run by feminists, who clearly do not believe in any religion.

j-dawg-94 • 1 point • 13 August, 2014 03:04 AM

I'm sorry?

Garek • -10 points • 11 August, 2014 06:03 AM

Such communities shouldn't be based on what people believe.

[deleted] • 7 points • 11 August, 2014 06:05 AM

lol

[deleted] • 3 points • 11 August, 2014 06:34 AM

"based on"?

Dude, it's one paper flyer. You can't say that represents the basis of the beliefs of the church on any level.

If you disagree with it, go discuss it with church officials, and remember that while not all churches are bad, there's a hell of a lot more misogynist language being spread by churches than misandrist.

Endless_Summer • -4 points • 11 August, 2014 12:35 PM*

A faith community? Where you believe in feels not reals? Hmmm, now what does that sound like..... Tumblr!

[deleted] • -3 points • 11 August, 2014 12:39 PM

If their community shits on them, we can damned well tell people to abandon that community.

I would never set foot in one of these church's, because I have self respect.

duglock • 7 points • 11 August, 2014 04:43 AM

Church I attend just instituted a policy just like this due to the Youth Minister getting arrested for molesting 25-30 little boys. Pretty fucked up and with emotions running so high no one really gives a shit about the sexism. Think I will probably take your advice. Not the second part though.

[deleted] • -6 points • 10 August, 2014 10:34 PM

Small offense to drop an entire church for. Tiny offense to drop one's entire religion for.

Tmomp • 14 points • 11 August, 2014 01:11 AM

Sexism doesn't seem that small an offense to me, but each individual has to choose for him or her self, I guess.

[deleted] • 3 points • 11 August, 2014 03:49 AM

I think he was referring to that particular church and not "the church" as an entity.

[deleted] • 0 points • 11 August, 2014 04:13 AM

Yes, that was my understanding of his message - "the church" referring to a single building or complex.

ThePigmanAgain • 3 points • 11 August, 2014 01:20 AM

"Patriarchal" Christianity strikes again.

mawbles • 2 points • 11 August, 2014 04:48 AM

Not Christianity, that's actually from a mormon, as someone else posted above.

ThePigmanAgain • 2 points • 11 August, 2014 04:52 AM

Don't they believe Christ was the Messiah? And if so, why would that not make them Christians?

[deleted] 11 August, 2014 07:38 AM*

[permanently deleted]

ElSantoGringo • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 08:41 AM

No, it's not actually that complicated. Consider this quote from an academic book entitled "Anthology of World Scriptures" by Robert E. Van Voorst: "...the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints... see themselves as Christian, and most experts in comparative religions would view this labeling as basically correct. That they... accept the Christian Bible as their first cannon is a good indicator of this. Moreover, outsiders to [Christianity], such as Buddhists, would almost certainly recognize them as belonging to the stream of Christian tradition."

Half the things you mentioned as being Mormon beliefs are either flat out wrong or greatly distorted.

Mans_Right_To_Choose • 3 points • 11 August, 2014 11:36 AM

No. His examples of Mormon beliefs are accurate.

Source: Had Mormons to my house multiple times, asked them explicitly about such things, and went to their church a couple times.

[deleted] 11 August, 2014 04:02 PM*

[permanently deleted]

ElSantoGringo • -1 points • 11 August, 2014 07:16 PM

I'm also a Mormon, but I have the apparent advantage of knowing what the modern Mormon church actually teaches. Also, the advantage of not believing everything I read on the internet.

1) While Kolob is mentioned in the Book of Abraham, it has almost no theological significance in modern Mormonism. I can't remember the last time it was mentioned in church, except as part of the occasional joke. For example, of the 341 hymns in the Mormon hymnal, only one even mentions Kolob (0.3%).

2) The Journal of Discourses is not canonical in the Mormon church. It doesn't define our doctrine, and most Mormons have never read it. While it is true that some Mormons believe in "Heavenly Grandfathers" (for lack of a better term), many do not (myself included). Even Gordon B. Hinckley, a recent president of our church, expressed some

uncertainty about the idea a few years back. It's not at all central to our doctrine.

3) Mormons do sometimes use different terminology than other Christians. The phrase "man can become a God" (which is rarely used anymore) means something very different to a Mormon than it does to someone else. If you examine the meaning, though, the concept isn't all that different from the teachings of some other mainstream Christian denominations. Many other churches (such as the Greek Orthodox Church) have a somewhat similar concept of "theosis." Would you suggest the Orthodox claim to the Christian title is "complicated"?

It is true that Mormons are a different kind of Christian. They're not Catholic, Protestant, or Orthodox. But it's silly to suggest they aren't Christian at all, given their dedication to the teachings of Christ, the Bible, etc.

TL;DR: I think Robert E. Van Voorst (Professor of New Testament Studies at Western Theological Seminary) knows more about Mormonism's place in the Christian family than some random guy on the internet who knows how to copy and paste. :)

anobaith • -1 points • 11 August, 2014 06:03 PM

Then Buddhists are nowhere near as intelligent as the movies made them out to be.

Mormonism is a polytheistic religion, while every other type of Christianity, even misguided Roman Catholicism, is monotheistic.

That is just scratching the surface.

Endless_Summer • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 01:02 PM

Christianity and catholicism especially are poly theistic, you moron.

Endless_Summer • -3 points • 11 August, 2014 12:36 PM*

By your definition there are *no* Christians.

That is, unless somebody knows someone that actually follows Christ's teachings. But I know you don't.

Downvotes for being right are the best.

anobaith • 3 points • 11 August, 2014 06:06 PM

The devil comes to visit. Are you possessed or where you just born a psychopath?

[deleted] 11 August, 2014 09:20 AM

[permanently deleted]

lazydonovan • 2 points • 11 August, 2014 07:19 PM

Women aren't allowed to teach men. It says nothing of children. Anyhow, there's a growing thought in the differing denominations that this was Paul's personal opinion and not actual a directive from God.

autowikibot • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 09:20 AM

1 Timothy 2:12:

1 Timothy 2:12 is a passage from the first letter, *1 Timothy*, of the pastoral epistles in the New Testament. It is familiarly quoted using the King James Version translation: "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence". The excerpt is typically raised in opposition to women being **ordained as clergy** and holding certain other positions of ministry and leadership in **Christianity**. It is a key passage in the debate between **complementarianism**, which argues that women should have different and complementary roles in the church and in society, and **egalitarianism**, which argues that there should be no institutional distinctions between men and women. Application of the passage varies, with women in some complementarian churches being denied a vote in church affairs, denied the right to serve as teachers of adult Bible classes or as missionaries, and generally disenfranchised from the duties and privileges of church leadership, while other complementarian churches allow women to perform any role available to a *non-ordained man*—including that of **elder** or **deacon**.

Interesting: First Epistle to Timothy | Pastoral epistles | Intercession | Catherine Clark Kroeger

Parent commenter can toggle NSFW or delete. Will also delete on comment score of -1 or less. | FAQs | Mods | Magic Words

Vegemeister • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 05:45 AM

I am deeply amused by how closely the quotation and citation style follows usual practice for bible quotes.

Karma9999 • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 10:58 AM

"Just say No"

td9red • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 03:59 PM

What are the requirements for female substitute teachers?

jaheiner • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 04:46 PM

Yeah, my church had a very similar rule.

A male teacher could not take kids to bathroom breaks either, had to be a female teacher.

Hard not to feel a bit put off of serving in that ministry as it felt like being accused of something.

I'm not sure what bothers me more though, the feeling like our sex is stereotyped to the point where things like this are necessary, or the fact that there is a part of me that (when the time comes and my wife and I have kids) would feel more comfortable with a woman taking them to the bathroom...

j-dawg-94 • 2 points • 11 August, 2014 08:13 AM

I die a little inside whenever this religious shit gets upvoted on a gender related subreddit. Like if you're in favor of almost all religion then you're going to have to forgo quite a bit of gender equality.

thescientist8371 • 2 points • 11 August, 2014 04:14 AM

You're trying to find reason and equality in a church? Good luck with that.

[deleted] • 0 points • 11 August, 2014 08:03 AM

That's about where I'm at on this. Like, if you're going to talk about double standards for gender, Christianity

kinda has a long history of dramatically more interesting offences, to all possible angles. Seems like a very odd context in which to care. Just like I explain when I'm telling people I electively only adopt entertaining good-luck superstitions, "No reason to expect something to be logically consistent when it's not logical in the first place".

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 August, 2014 09:16 AM

Why the fuck would any man volunteer under these circumstances?

To be honest, I have trouble understanding why men even go to church. I have never seen a church in America that isn't openly hostile to men, and mostly run by women.

cashmunnymillionaire • 2 points • 11 August, 2014 01:42 PM

You've never been inside any southern churches then. My liberal Presbyterian church had a balance of female and male clergy, sunday school teachers, and deacons/elders, and was never hostile towards men working with children, including teenage boys working in the nursery. Churches provide a lot of benefit when you go to one that focuses on the right things.

Also, as an aside, everybody who says they didn't need a church to instill morality in them either have never been in a church or are trying to minimize the role it had in their early development. I'm not institutionally religious anymore, but the best part about growing up in a church was the fact that I wasn't just relying on what my parents told me to figure out what was right or wrong. If that had been the case, I'd have become less of a critical thinker. Non-religious and Atheists[™] like to pretend that religious institutions are monolithic, which isn't the case, even in the rigid hierarchy of the Catholic church. A church community helps articulate nuanced views about moral grey areas because you interact with members of that faith community in a setting which forces those relativistic viewpoints on the table.

[deleted] 10 August, 2014 11:51 PM

[permanently deleted]

Okymyo • 12 points • 11 August, 2014 12:27 AM*

I'm an atheist but seriously, shut up.

Making him a nonbeliever doesn't make his life any better. Let him believe what he wants to. Unless he's making the world a worse place because of his religion, no reason to 'convert' him. Faith gives people hope, and more often than not, a reason to be good.

Believe whatever you want to believe, as long as you're not an asshole about it. For all I care, you can worship a pink unicorn.

[deleted] • 3 points • 11 August, 2014 04:06 AM

He's so fluffy I'm gonna die.

[deleted] 11 August, 2014 01:19 AM

[permanently deleted]

Minecraftiscawl • 3 points • 11 August, 2014 11:07 AM

You asked for it.