

The Messenger



“... How beautiful are the feet of those who bring glad tidings of good things!” Romans 10:15

A Weekly Publication of the Christians Meeting at
2291 Highway Z, Wentzville, Missouri
Website: westlakechurchofchrist.org

Dedicated to the Proclamation of the Truth in the Spirit of Love (Ephesians 4:15)

Volume 13, Issue 44

Evangelist and Editor:

Dempsey Collins

Nov. 18, 2012

Listen to PROVE ALL THINGS on 730 AM WKRE, Sunday mornings from 8:15 to 8:30

Radical Feminism: Anti-Bible, Anti-God, and Anti-Christ

by Allan Turner

According to Elizabeth Gould Davis, there was a “golden age” in “prehistory” that was gynocratic (i.e., woman-ruled), and that lasted for untold millennia (Davis, *The First Sex*, p. 66). According to Davis, in this civilization the woman was civilizer, craftsman, industrialist, agriculturalist, engineer, inventor, and discoverer. Humans were pacific herbivores, unacquainted with warfare and violence. She further argues that during this “golden age” the earth was a semiparadise of peace and tranquility, presided over by an omnipotent goddess (*Ibid.*, p. 65). Eventually, according to Davis’ feminist surmisings, women lost their supremacy when men, who were genetic mutations of women, formed into bands and overthrew the peaceful matriarchies, inventing rape and other forms of violence.

Needless to say, Davis’ book was quite controversial. Furthermore, she was unable to convince the historians that she was right, (she would, no doubt, remind us that they are just a bunch of “masculists”). Nevertheless, her theme has been incorporated into feminist ideology: “Women are different than men and women should be proud of these differences. In fact, even though we talk a lot about equality, it just may be that women are a bit more than equal to men.”

Even though Davis was unable to convince historians of what was, she certainly was successful in inspiring feminists with what could be. If the world was going to get better, patriarchy would have to be destroyed. “Any and all social reforms superimposed upon our sick civilization can be no more effective than a bandage on a gaping and putrefying wound. Only the complete and total demolition of the social body will cure the fatal sickness. Only the overthrow of the three-thousand-year-old beast of masculist materialism will save the race” (*Ibid.*, p. 340). Echoing this theme, Barbara G. Walker wrote: “A feminist believes a world where socioreligious and legal systems are governed by women would be a more humane world than the present one, which is governed by men. There would be less greed, injustice, exploitation, and warfare” (*The Skeptical Feminist: Discovering the Virgin, Mother and Crone*, p. 1).

Anti-Bible

According to Rosemary Radford Ruether: “Feminist theology must create a new textual base, a new canon...Feminist theology cannot be done from the existing base of the Christian Bible” (*Womanguides: Readings Toward a Feminist Theology*, p. ix.). In other words, before society can be thoroughly feminized, the radical feminists know they must eliminate any influence the Bible has had on our society. In doing so, the feminists refer to pre-Christian, non-Christian, and so-called post-Christian religions that affirm the image of the Divine as male and female. For instance Ruether’s book, *Womanguides*, is a collection of writings from the ancient Near East, Hebrew and Greek mythology, Christian Science, paganism, goddess worship, and the New Age movement. As Phyllis Trible wrote in *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*: “A feminist who loves the Bible

produces, in the thinking of many, an oxymoron ... After all, if no man can serve two masters, no woman can serve two authorities, a master called scripture and a mistress called feminism” (quoted in Mary A. Kassian, *The Feminist Gospel*, p. 109). These feminists, of course, do not just reject the Bible, but they reject the God of the Bible as well.

Anti-God

In her book, *Changing of the Gods: Feminism and the End of Traditional Religions*, Naomi R. Goldenberg wrote: “God is going to change,” I thought. “We women are going to bring an end to God. As we take positions in government, in medicine, in law, in business, in the arts and, finally, in religion, we will be the end of Him. We will change the world so much that He won’t fit in anymore” (p. 3). According to the feminists, “If God is male, then the male is God” (Mary Daly, *Beyond God the Father*, p. 9). Daly writes: “The symbol of the Father God, spawned in the human imagination and sustained as plausible by patriarchy, has in turn rendered service to (Patriarchal) society by making its mechanism for the oppression of women appear right and fitting. If God in “his” heaven is a father ruling “his” people, then it is in the “nature” of things and according to divine plan and the order of the universe that society be male-dominated “ (*Ibid.*, p. 13).

In rejecting Jehovah, the only true and living God, feminists sought a new symbol that would affirm the legitimacy of their revolutionary movement: the goddess. According to Mary A. Kassian: “Initially, feminists reacted with scorn to the goddess and goddess worship. Why would intelligent, self-defining women want to bow down to ancient idols of stone? But feminists learned that goddess worship was not worship of an external deity; it was, in essence, worship of oneself. The goddess was merely a symbol that acknowledged the legitimacy of self-worship” (*The Feminist Gospel*, p. 159). In modern feminism, Satan’s old Edenic lie, “*you will be like God, knowing good and evil*” (Genesis 3:4), has come full cycle.

Those who have tried to be feminists without giving up the Bible (something that is quite impossible) have insisted on the use of inclusive language. Rejecting masculine pronouns as limiting one’s understanding of who God is, and citing His “feminine” characteristics, feminists feel justified in calling God “She” or “Mother.” And although feminists claim that using female as well as male pronouns to address God has de-sexualized Him, in effect, the opposite has occurred. When feminists switched from masculine to feminine in their description of God, they reduced God to sexuality. They actually presented an image of a deity who is bisexual or androgynous rather than one who transcends the polarity of the sexes. In addition, in renaming God as She/He, feminists have stripped God of independent, personalized existence. The Bible teaches that Jehovah is an individualized, personalized Being who has chosen to relate to His creation as “male.” He is not merely a “force,” as the pagans have traditionally identified Him. Nevertheless, in transforming Biblical feminine metaphors into a divine name for God, the feminists soon discovered that they needed to extend this practice to other metaphors as well, i.e., God ought to be understood as a “rock,” “eagle,” “door,” etc. As a result, His personality was further diffused to encompass all natural phenomena. Renaming God in a way other than He had named Himself has ultimately led the proponents of inclusive language to think of God as a force with no independent personality. This is evident by their reference to God as “He/She/It” (Virginia Mollenkott, *The Divine Feminine*, p. 113).

Anti-Christ

Rejecting God as Father, the feminists have rejected Jesus Christ as Son. They have argued that Jesus’ maleness is inconsequential. In her book, *Women & Worship*, Sharon Neuffer Emswiler surmised, “if the society had been reversed and Palestine had been a matriarchy instead of a patriarchy, surely God would have sent her Daughter” (p. 31). Therefore, feminists urge their followers to change their language about Christ. In doing so, they reject “Son of Man”, which they consider too masculine, and encourage the use of the “Human One.” But, of course, such theological shenanigans have serious consequences. The Son of Man is a title indicating that Jesus was divine and those who heard Him refer to Himself by this designation understood that He was really identifying Himself as the “*Son of God*” (Luke 22:69, 70). Whereas the designation the Human One indicates that Jesus was merely an example of ideal selfhood or humanity. In other words, through the feminist theologians’ inclusive language, Christ is viewed as a model of the new humanity, the one sent by God to reveal to us what we can become, rather than God Almighty in the flesh, who took upon Himself the penalty for our sins.

Radical feminism is anti-Bible, anti-God, and anti-Christ. It does not liberate, rather it enslaves all those who embrace it to the bondage of sin. It is the Bible, and the Bible alone, that contains the real hope for the liberation of women. Knowing the Truth makes one free indeed (John 8:32).