

# OpenTheo

## Analysis of First Wave Feminism

October 3, 2021



### For The King - Rocky Ramsey

Bryce has abandoned me to the pit. I will rouse myself and hold fast to the LORD in this trial, he will help me to fly SOLO this week on the For The King podcast. We have been slowly walking through a biblical worldview when considering gender roles. This week I use Zach Garris' book as a resource to quote a few feminist from the 1st wave in the 1850's. They knew what the bible CLEARLY taught about biblical gender roles and by golly did they hate it. I labor to expose you all to what they said about biblical principles and analyze what has caused them to say such things. Lets not let the feminist understand what the bible clearly teaches about the patriarchy be more robust and accurate than ours... \*ahem\* egalitarians/complementarians \*ahem\*.

Zach's book : [https://www.amazon.com/Masculine-Christianity-Zachary-Garris/dp/1735473901/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?dchild=1&keywords=masculine+christianity&qid=1633305579&sr=8-1](https://www.amazon.com/Masculine-Christianity-Zachary-Garris/dp/1735473901/ref=sr_1_1?dchild=1&keywords=masculine+christianity&qid=1633305579&sr=8-1)

Quotations from:

\* Harper, Ida Husted, 1851-1931, Matilda Joslyn Gage, Susan B. (Susan Brownell) Anthony, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. History of Woman Suffrage ... ed. 2. New York: Fowler & Wells, 1889.

\* Elizabeth Cady Stanton's, "First annual meeting of the womans state temperance society," in The American Nation: Primary Sources, ed. Bruce Frohnen (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2008). pages 373-374

\* Stanton, E. C. (1991). The woman's Bible. Salem, N.H: Ayer.  
<https://ecommons.cornell.edu/handle/1813/2585>

\* Anna Howard Shaw's, "The Fundamental Principle of a Republic," in The American Nation: Primary Sources, ed. Bruce Frohnen (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2008). pages 387 and 389

Website: [Forthekingpodcast.com](http://Forthekingpodcast.com)

Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/For-The-King-105492691873696/>

Contact: [fortheKingpodcast@gmail.com](mailto:fortheKingpodcast@gmail.com)

--- Support this podcast: <https://podcasters.spotify.com/pod/show/rocky-ramsey/support>

## **Transcript**

(music) Pilate asked him, "Are you the king of the Jews?" and he said, "You have said so." Hey, thanks for tuning in. This is the For The King podcast where Christ is recognized as the king. He is the king.

What he commands you to do is to bow the knee to him as king. So I want to remind everybody of that. We usually start the episodes this way.

A friendly reminder to bend the knee. Jesus is Lord. Jesus is King.

He is supreme, ruling over all. So why don't you bend your knee? He's going to bend it for you folks. So if you don't know Christ, listen to this podcast.

I implore you to bend the knee. Of course, this is a spiritual reality. We will physically bend the knee before Christ one day in our new bodies.

But as of right now, he has not come back. What we do is repent and believe and trust in Christ as he reigns in our heart. So bend the knee, both spiritually and also one day physically.

You can even do it physically now to represent the spiritual reality of submission to him as the king. So that's what happens on this podcast. Thanks for tuning in.

If this is your first time, you can check out all the other content, but just to catch you up on what is currently happening. We have been going through on these Sundays a look into biblical masculinity and biblical femininity, the gender roles. And our position here has been that God defines gender roles.

And yes, gender and sex is different. Oh, I said it. Whoa, that's crazy.

What does this guy think? Is he a biblical Christian? Yes, I am. Gender roles are assigned to us as God. Gender is the social way that the sexes play out.

So you have male and female and males are uniquely masculine and females are uniquely feminine. And God tells us what those gender roles are. They are not fluid.

God defines all things for us. He defines through the natural revelation, through the book of nature, what a man is and what a woman is. They have different bodies, different sexual organs.

That is what defines a man and a woman, you know, different types of chromosomes. What defines masculinity and femininity, how those male-ness and female-ness are played out on the earth. God also defines in his word.

And we have done that. We went through that. We defined masculinity and femininity in God's word.

And then we talked about masculinity and femininity in the home. Then we moved on to the church. And today was supposed to be in the civil society.

Men and women, masculinity and femininity being played out in the civil society. Now here's some bad news and why you've just heard me talking and you haven't heard Bryce chime in yet. Because the man abandoned me.

He abandoned me to do this podcast by myself. But I will forgive him. I will forgive him from my heart.

And I have. So I'm flying solo this week, everybody. So thanks for listening and I hope this is bearable.

I don't do a lot of these by myself, but this one I am doing by myself and I hope that it is bearable. And I'm not going to move on to talking about masculinity and femininity in the civil sphere apart from my brother in Christ and also my literal brother. We're also flesh and blood brothers.

We have the same mother. So I'm going to wait for him to go to the civil society and as you can see in the title, I'm just going to walk through Zach Garris's first chapter of his book and just hopefully make you guys alive to what first wave feminism was really getting at and what was being talked about. So I'm just going to walk through some of the things that Zach Garris says in his book, Max and Christianity, some of the reporting he has done on some obvious hundreds of years old statements from some of these women that led this first wave feminism.

But even I used to, even I would say honestly six months ago I would say third wave feminism, the postmodern kind of feminism. That's the one that's bad. But first and second wave, there's some better things there because I was duped.

I wasn't very educated on this and that's what the goal of this podcast is, is to educate people to make people aware to an alternative viewpoint on certain topics. So with the masculinity and femininity thing, I want to make everybody aware that first and second wave was also evil and was also bad. And if you hold a view similar to I did a few months ago, you need to abandon it is what I would exhort you to do.

That's my encouragement and hopefully I can kind of lay out some principles that would help you to abandon that. So as Zach Garris laid out in his book, Masculine Christianity,

I'll put a link for that in the notes. But also he came on the podcast and I interviewed the man.

So if you want more information about kind of this line of thinking and from a really smart man that has thought a lot about this and what the scriptures have to say about this, go check out that interview and you can also listen to what Bryce and I have been walking through the past couple of weeks. But that's what I labor to do today and I'm just going to walk through some of that. So his first chapter titled The Rise of Feminism and the Erosion of Masculinity and he basically walks through what first wave feminism was saying and then moves on to what second wave and third wave was.

And if you go back and listen to the interview, first wave was dealing with the suffragette movement, women having the same rights to vote, having women, letting women have political individuality, political freedom outside of the home. They had more in mind, these women did, even sexually because they start to touch on marriage and things like that too. But some of these hopes of these women aren't really coming to fruition until the second wave of feminism during the sexual revolution in the 1960s, especially with the onset of contraception.

That is what really fueled that movement. Freeing women sexually where there's not really any baggage when doing sexual things with the other sex, contraception will free you from that. And we see that happening and people piggybacking on that immediately.

And that's second wave feminism. Third wave is postmodernism. You don't even have to really defend traditional views of what a woman was or even sexually.

You can be whatever you want as a woman or whatever a woman you think a woman should be. So yeah, I used to think that was the only evil part. So this is what I'm doing today.

So I'm going to keep this nice and short. I'm not going to go too crazy. And there's a...yeah, I hope this is going to be helpful.

So starting on page seven, this is what B.B. Warfield and Zach Garris is reporting on some of his writings is claiming about what is happening in this feminist movement, the very first wave. To Paul, the Apostle Paul, he says, "The human race is made up of families. To the feminist movement, the human race is made up of individuals.

A woman is just another individual by the side of a man. And it can see no reason for any differences in dealing with the two." So yeah, B.B. Warfield was a contemporary. He lived from 1851 to 1921.

So he knew of this first wave feminism. And a lot of who he quotes in this book is Warfield. So if you want to read some stuff, Warfield has some great thoughts on the foolishness of the feminist movement.

But yeah, so his point here and what has been really helpful to understand is that God never...He deals with you as an individual made in his image and saves an individual. But what he makes...yes, he makes individuals. He forms people in the womb.

But you belong to a family at all times until you're married and then you make your own family. And to the feminist movement, there are only individuals and there's never any need to be a part of a family or a part of any hierarchy whatsoever. And with families come hierarchies.

That's just how families are made, obviously. But they would reject that. They would want to keep everyone an individual.

And even if you come together in marriage and you want to sexually express yourself or you want a companion or whatever your reason is for the feminist, you still are not...there's no hierarchy there. The man and woman are just living together to benefit from one another, but there is no authority there. The woman is still allowed to go out by herself and vote completely against what her husband thinks or to do the responsibilities or the jobs that was usually cut out for a man.

Instead, she can go out and fulfill her husband's role while the husband doesn't fulfill his role, that kind of thing. So that's kind of the thought being articulated here. That is bad.

That is not how God has made humankind. You always belong to a family and you have never ever been thought of as just an individual. And God doesn't think of you as an individual.

He thinks of you as a member of two parties. Either you're a child of Satan or you're a child of God. You belong to a family and God treats you as belonging to that family.

That's why we're exhorted to come together in the family of God, the assembly of God, to do good to others, even especially those in the household of God at the end of Galatians 5 there. So I want to highlight that. This is God's idea.

This isn't my idea or what I think humans have traditionally acted this way, therefore I think it's correct. No, the reason that traditionally a lot of people have acted this way is because God taught that and ingrained that in mankind and Adam and Eve being made in the image of God. We're supposed to live in community because God is trying.

He is a community. This pre-existent eternal self-love between God and the Trinity, loving one another and glorifying himself in the Trinity, in community, Father, Son, Holy Spirit. We live that out as well as humans.

So I just want to highlight that and that's kind of the backdrop of this first wave feminism, which is why it gives birth to second wave, third wave, and then I don't know what, maybe we'll see a fourth wave. I don't know what could come next, but I don't

know, maybe fourth wave is female robots. I don't know.

We don't know what can happen. Okay, let's continue. On page nine, he starts to expose what these women were saying in the mid-19th century.

He says, here's a quick synopsis of the leaders of the first wave feminist movement. They were not Orthodox Christians, but heretics and radicals. Elizabeth Cady Stanton was raised Presbyterian, but became an atheist and attacked the Bible's teaching on gender roles.

Another feminist leader, Lucy Stone, was a Unitarian and Susan B. Anthony was a Quaker who most likely became a Unitarian later in life. So these women are not Christians. And if you're a Christian that agrees with them, you have to give a rationale for why you are somehow deriving principles and ethics and worldviews that perfectly align with what a God-hating woman has conjured up on what she thinks is best for her sex and her gender.

So I would like you to think about that. If you have trouble agreeing with what Bryce and I lay out, I would like you to consider that. And it was eye-opening for me to read this book.

It was very helpful. And I think this is a helpful thought. You need to consider if you're consistent when you agree with these women and how they apply the Bible.

And I'm going to get into that in a second. On page 11, this is a quotation from Elizabeth Cady Stanton. She was the most radical of the early feminists.

She drafted a Declaration of Sentiments that was adopted by the Seneca Cause Conference in 1848 in New York. So I remember reading about that in public school, the Seneca Falls Conference, where these women got together to draft a document that was espousing what their views are about what they think women, how they should be treated, their views on females. This document attacked mankind for limiting women's rights in the church.

And here's a quotation from Elizabeth Cady Stanton, a history of women, women suffrage at volume one Rochester, New York. That's the publishing company pages 70 to 71. This is what she says.

He allows her. I think this is talking about either God or the church. He allows her just women in general in church as well as state, but a subordinate position.

So she's allowed to be there, but she can never be in positions of leadership, claiming apostolic authority for her exclusion from the ministry and with some exceptions from any public participation in the affairs of the church. Okay. So some of this is obviously an dramatization of what actually scripture teaches.

But she, I just want to remind you guys, she understands very well what the Bible teaches about leadership, patriarchy, that kind of stuff. And she's attacking that. So she has a great, she understands and has a great view of what the Bible teaches.

She just rejects it and hates it. So if you find yourself agreeing with her, her hermeneutic, her application of scripture, how much she thinks about scripture, she understands very well that women always hold a subordinate position in the state, in the church. And we're going to get that.

We're going to make a case for that in the civil society. And this does not mean that we hate women. This is God's clear teaching of what he made man and woman for, masculinity and femininity to play out in a society.

And the goal of that in God's mind is to make one be the leader and one be the follower. And this is what God has taught in his word. And she understands that very well.

And she obviously hates it and they claim apostolic authority for her exclusion from the ministry. Yes, that's exactly what the apostles taught. Like Bryce and I have been going through 1 Corinthians 14, 1 Timothy 2, 1 Timothy 3, Titus 1. Yes.

So I guess that's what I'll say. And then he says, Stanton's view on female leadership in the church were made clear in her speech at a first annual meeting of the Women's State Temperance Society in 1853. This is what she says.

And this is, this is from obviously, like I said, Temperance Society, the first annual meeting in the American nation, primary sources. That's the book he's getting this from. And from 373 to 374, that's what the pages, the book by Bruce Fondin from Indianapolis, Indiana.

He says, it has been objected to our society that we do not confine ourselves to the subject of temperance, but talk too much about a woman's rights, divorce and the church. Let it be clearly understood then that we are a woman's right society, that we believe it is a woman's duty to speak whenever she feels the impression to do so, that it is her right to be present in all the councils of the church and state. Okay.

It is a woman's duty, obviously, to speak when she feels convicted to do so. Women of valor, women of resolve. This is what a biblical woman does, a godly woman does.

She does live a quiet and submissive life, but she does speak up when there are poor and oppressed that need to be spoken up for, obviously. Now that is always dictated by the words of God and what God lays out on what injustice is, not social justice, not social injustice is the way the world would define it, but what biblical justice is. So there's a place for women, obviously, to speak.

Now in the church, no, not, not authoritatively in the church. So here's, here's another

quote from these women. This is also Stan.

This, this was her, her take on divorce. "Any law or public sentiment that forces two immortal high-born souls to live together as husband and wife, unless held there by love, is false to God and humanity. Who shall say that the discussion of this question does not lead us legitimately into the consideration of the important subject of divorce, but why attack the church? We do not attack the church.

We defend ourselves merely against its attacks." So the clear teaching on divorce from the Bible, on the conditions of sexual immorality or death, is the grounds for divorce. She is attacking that, not because, not because of just what she thinks, but because she feels that she's being attacked against the church of what is true. And she says that any, any wall that forces two people to be together apart from, unless they want to be together by love, is against, is false to God and humanity.

What a full statement. God has told us that even if you don't love somebody, if there has been a commitment there, even when you don't love your family and they're on your last nerve or whatever, there's commitment there and you overcome anyways and you have no right to become an orphan just because you hate your family. So that's what a covenant is.

Even if one side is not loving or upholding their end of the bargain, you obviously still are supposed to uphold that covenant, your end of the bargain, even if they don't hold theirs. And that's what unconditional love is, which is a Godly attribute. So I also want to read, oh, this right here.

The point in all of this, this is on page 13 of Masculine Christianity. The point in all of this is that the woman's movement, along with its advocacy for women's suffrage, was tied up with the rejection of historic and biblical Christianity. Stanton even went so far as to publish the Woman's Bible, a commentary on the Bible that dismissed whatever passages she and her committee considered unfavorable towards women.

Stanton herself wrote two thirds of the work. She identified the teachings of the Bible on woman's subordination as evil. That is from Elizabeth K. Stanton, the Woman's Bible from Manola, New York, Dover, 2003.

And she said in the preface to part two of the book, "We have made a fetish of the Bible long enough. The time has come to read it as we do all other books, accepting the good and rejecting the evil it teaches." And yeah, so we obviously see the great evils of such a statement, a great evil of such a worldview, a great evil of such a hermeneutic that she is presenting here. So again, what am I trying to do here? Why am I reading these things? To show you guys that these women were attacking the clear teachings of the Bible, not returning to what the Bible truly teaches about men and women, they are atheist or just straight up religious heretics that are interpreting the Bible in a certain



way to fit whatever they want.

They're making a new commentary on the Bible. She passed a commentary that basically gets rid of all the teachings of a woman's subordination as evil, as the hierarchy is evil, all these things. And we ought to, as we do with all other books, read it and accept what we like and reject what we don't like, which is an absolutely foolish hermeneutic that will never get you anywhere on your road and your path to truth.

Yes, so I have a few more things to read and then I'll wrap up here. There is another woman in this movement. She was a Methodist.

Her name was Anna Howard Shaw. She lived from 1847 to 1919. She was the first ordained woman in the Methodist church.

She was the president of the National American Women Suffrage Association 1904 to 1915. So Methodist minister, okay, she was ordained, but her ordination was revoked four years later by the Methodist church. It is clear Shaw sought more than just the right for women to vote, as she also wanted to overthrow male headship and male protection of women.

In a June 21st, 1915 address, Shaw said this, and this comes from Anna Howard Shaw, the fundamental principle of a republic in the American nation primary source on page 387. This is what she says, "Women have been the homemakers while men have been the so-called protectors in the period of the world civilization where people need to be protected." I know they say that men protect us now and when we ask them what they're protecting us from, the only answer they can give us from themselves. I do not think that men need any very great credit for protecting us from ourselves.

They are not protecting us from any special thing from which we could not protect ourselves except themselves. Now this old time idea of protection was all right when the world needed this protection, but today the protection and civilization comes from within and not from without. So she's basically saying there was an outside wild nature when men obviously being the stronger of the two sexes was needed, but now that there's no longer any saber-toothed tigers to be worried about, women can throw off this yoke of needing a man to protect them and now she can go live for herself.

But what Shaw is not realizing here is what we've walked through in our biblical masculinity series here is that there's not only physical protection, which there's also males that are evil that come and try to rape your wife or steal things from you or whatever. Yeah, you need to defend your wife against people like that obviously. That's what a real man does.

So there still is a physical element to it, but also there is a spiritual protection and that is the primary component even back then when there were saber-toothed tigers, men were

primarily to be the spiritual protectors of women because of the things that we've already laid out in 1 Timothy 2. We see that why was Adam the leader and Eve the follower because it wasn't Adam that was deceived by the serpent, but it was Eve. She is more prone to deception not because of her intellectual capabilities, but because of a spiritual reality of her being wired to be the follower. And that's why you see obviously like Bryson I've already mentioned cult leaders will usually be a strong male figure and a lot of the adherents will be women.

So yes, you see women in these positions being carried away by their emotions and being carried away by what they believe to be true and their emotions getting the better of them and they cannot see clearly because of that and men can be deceived as well. Men are deceived very often, but women are deceived in a unique way and there is a reason why men ought to be a leader because of that difference in deception. Shaw also says this, "They tell us that if women were permitted to vote that they would take office.

So long as it is a question of running for office, I don't think women have much chance especially with our present hobbles. There are some women who want to hold office and I may as well own up. I am one of them.

I have been wanting to hold office for more than 35 years. I have always wanted to be a policeman. If women vote, will they go to war?" That's from the same source I quoted before, the American Nation primary sources, but this is on page 389 that this is what she said in direct quotation.

So at the end of the day, what is the feminist movement about? A transition of authority away from male leadership even in and they recognize too that the civil realm is also to be applied from God's creative order and we'll get to that next week. Still tuned in next week for that, but at the end of this last quote I'm going to read, what is she getting at? She wants to hold office. She wants to be a policeman.

She wants to do what men are made to do. She wants to become a man basically. She wants to be a woman, but she wants to fulfill all the roles of masculinity without actually becoming a man sexually obviously.

She wants to remain a woman, but do all the roles, all the responsibilities, all the duties a man is supposed to be in society as God has given us. So I find it obviously inconsistent when Christians want to derive all their principles, all their political philosophy, economic models, everything from God's word, yet they also don't want to apply the biblical teaching on men and women, masculinity and femininity. So that is my challenge.

This is an episode that was just me. I hope that was bearable. Thanks for listening guys.

I'm going to read this doxology in a second, but I want to remind everybody to check out the Facebook page and give it a like and share on Facebook if you would be so inclined.

Leave a rating and review on Apple Podcasts. That would be greatly appreciated as well.

Share the podcast on any social media platform that you have or would like to that would help me out a lot. Check out the website. I uploaded another podcast or sorry, whoa, I uploaded another blog.

That's what I meant to say. I completed another blog talking about moral relativism. It's a very short read and hopefully it'll be edifying to you guys as well.

I think that's it. Yeah, thanks for listening guys. Pray for us.

Support us in any way you can. Thanks for listening to the For The King podcast. I'm going to end with this doxology that I always do.

1 Timothy 1, 17, "To the King of the ages of mortal, invisible, the only God, be honored in glory forever and ever. Amen. Solely, dayo, Gloria." For the king, for the king, for the king, Jesus.