

# WOMEN AS MORAL KEEPERS: PERCEPTION VS. REALITY

KIMBERLY BALDWIN\*

**ABSTRACT.** Concepts of morality are often described in feminine terms. Women have always possessed great moral power and influence on mankind, resulting in a positive or negative impact on society. Thus, women have been attributed the responsibility of moral keeping. Some cultures have refused to accept their impact and sought to limit their power, while some have embraced their guidance and valued their help. The reality of moral keeping is complex. This article will consider the gender and vocational virtue models and discuss historical and modern opinions of women as moral keepers. These perceptions are contrasted with the reality of biblical expectation. Moral keeping is not a venue to ascribe or regulate certain behaviors in society, nor is it a call to return to Victorian or Puritan eras. It begins as a call for reformation of the heart. Women can use their God-given ability and charge as *ezer* to uphold God's moral principles as the means of sharing the gospel. Moral keeping must point society to Christ, and how only He was able to complete the fulfillment of the moral law on mankind's behalf. Morality is a call to both women and men, but throughout history women have proven to excel in this role. Thus, women, made in the image of God, have an extraordinary privilege of advancing Christlikeness in society, not by claiming power to themselves, but by pointing to the one who has the power.

**KEY WORDS:** moralism, *ezer*, equality, legalism, gospel

## **Introduction**

Frederick Wright (1923: 1) penned, "Moral strength is the only thing that matters in history, and a nation has never yet succeeded merely by pure intellect or by brute force." Historians attribute the fall of Roman power to their decline in morals and virtues (Pooner 2008). Empires topple when the foundation of morality is broken, yet this damage is not limited to governments and nations. The rise of depravity, perversion, and corruption destroys businesses and decays societies. (Nuijten 2007: 1) One might assume virtue would carefully be respected and guarded, but history continues to show a declining respect for morality.

Traditionally, pure intellect and brute force have been attributed as male characteristics, while morality, including concepts of virtue, purity, chasteness, innocence, and wisdom has been ascribed as female. The expectation of morality and virtue has historically been laid on feminine

\* KIMBERLY BALDWIN (MA 2019, Grace College, Winona Lake, Indiana, USA; Ph.D. candidate, Aurel Vlaicu University, Arad, Romania) is Professor of Spiritual Transformation at Baptist Theological School, Novi Sad, Serbia. E-mail: kimberly.baldwin.bts@gmail.com.

shoulders, labeling women as the “gatekeepers of civilization” (Forsyth 2018: 160). Women, with their leanings toward virtue, guard this “gate” and protect mankind from the evils which yearn to rule. The role of moral keepers suggests women have a measure of influential power and responsibility over corruption. This moral influence may produce a positive or negative impact on society. Thus, the moral future of a society is determined by its ideal of womanhood (Wright 1923: 1). This article will introduce various perceptions of moral keepers, contrasting the male/female views and the historical/modern views.

In reality, what are female moral keepers expected to do? Moral keeping is not a venue to ascribe or regulate certain behaviors in society, nor is it a call to return to Victorian or Puritan eras. It cannot be based on personal opinions or cultural directives but founded upon a standard. This author asserts a biblical foundation and a redeemed worldview as necessary for positive, eternal change. The remainder of this article will discuss the complex nature of moral keepers, the breakdown of moral keeping role, and conclude with a call for reformation.

### **Perceptions of Moral Keepers**

#### *Male view*

Ivanhoe’s (2003) gendered virtue model suggests men and women have virtues based on their natures, and more importantly, lack certain virtues based on their sex. Women are necessary for moral keeping as “men, because of their gender, possess or are more prone to exhibit certain vices and women, because of their gender, possess or are more prone to exhibit certain virtues.” Stereotypically, men are dominant and aggressive, which allow the perpetuation of masculine behaviors (Skrypnek and Snyder 1982: 278). If a concept such as violence is stereotypically male, then the likeliness of a male to be violent is accepted as normal. Thus “male sins” are viewed as areas in which men are expected to fall, rather than areas that they must guard against. It is in men’s nature to be prideful, lustful, and power-driven. It is the women’s responsibility to keep boundaries around men’s proclivities. Women transform pride into character, lust into love, and power into protection. Some men welcome and necessitate the sanctifying intervention of women, claiming, “Man is neither safe in himself, nor profitable to others, when he lives dissociated from that benign influence which is to be found in woman’s presence and character” (James J 1995: 73).

However, in daily life, some men view female moral keepers as interfering and repressive, keeping men away from their natural bent. This is depicted in the “ball and chain” metaphor when a man’s autonomy is bound by marriage. Thus, the practice of the bachelor’s party represents the last night of freedom, allowing full abandonment to any moral restrictions. “Men, it

seemed were beyond redemption unless their womenfolk could get to them. Carousing and cavorting were accepted as an inevitable part of being male” (Wells 1993: 26). Whether appreciated or disapproved, the duty of women to be moral keepers. Gilder (1986: 12-13) explains, “Women domesticate and civilize male nature...The female responsibility cannot be granted or assigned to men.” Men in their natures cannot be expected to govern themselves properly without the benefit of feminine influence.

### *Female view*

In contrast to gender virtue, the vocational virtue model proposes that women, conditioned through years of male expectations, have been forced to work in caring and nurturing roles through which they have developed ethics based on compassion for others and the well-being of society. Motherhood is the central nurturing role and is the key to moral immortality as women primarily affect future generations, as aptly illustrated, “the hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world” (Wallace 1995: 153). Female virtue is not only imperative for the present, but for the future. As long as mothers stay pure and devote themselves to rearing children honorably, society will be moral. “Woman must be contemplated as giving birth to those whose principles, characters, and labors will deeply and permanently influence individuals in the domestic circle, and which will be felt by large communities, and in some instances, at least, by the whole population of the world” (Burns 2001: 230). Educator Charolette Mason was an active proponent for a mother’s influence on her children. She believed, “The presence of the slight, sweet, undefined feeling of dignity in the household is the very first condition for the bringing-up of loyal honourable men and women, capable of reverence and apt to win respect” (Mason 1904: 14).

A woman’s influence is not solely based on children and the future. Moral keeping also has a powerful influence over men. Stories, such as *Beauty and the Beast*, portray men condemned to outwardly represent their corrupt inward nature. The Disney version exploits this concept further as both the protagonist and antagonist are selfish and cruel. Gaston refuses to accept Belle’s influence and is driven further into his own madness and eventual demise. However, Belle has the ability to tame the Beast with her soft, feminine nature. Through her example and gentle exhortations, he metamorphoses into a civilized gentleman. Feminine power desires to convert something wild and alter its nature forever. This theme carries into adult fantasies as popularized in the *Twilight* and *50 Shades of Grey* series. The attractiveness of these books addresses the intrinsic desire to change men for the better. Clinical psychologist Jordan Peterson (2017: 4:03) correctly postulates the woman’s motive, “There’s no fun in taming someone who’s already tamed... but because it’s incredibly dangerous... it has to be civilized.”

Many women assume the mantle of moral keeper with the goal to control masculine unruliness.

*Historical view*

Authors and politicians have deemed female influence necessary for the continuance of society. Emerson (1871: 21) wrote, “I have thought a sufficient measure of civilization is the influence of good women.” de Tocqueville (1990: 198) recognized feminine influence as foundational, “No free communities ever existed without morals, and... morals are the work of woman. Consequently, whatever affects the condition of women, their habits and their opinions, has great political importance in my eyes.” The opposite also proved true. “Men become more uncivilized when women are either absent, corrupt, or immoral” (Forsyth 2018: 18). When women are morally active, society flourishes and when they are absent, it falls. Politically, women around the world have been instrumental in reforming society. Examples from the last century include: Suffragists who fought for a louder voice; Mary Mcleod Bethune, advisor to American president, opposed segregation and encouraged integration; Tosia Altman bravely organized resistance against concentration camps in Warsaw, Poland; the Mirabal sisters from the Dominican Republic spoke out against violence and repression; Corazon Aquino who established a congress in the Philippines to replace the dictatorial structure; Sadako Ogata, a Japanese diplomat with the United Nations, established humanitarian resources for refugees, and Malala Yousafzai who challenged the Taliban’s restrictions on education. Global communities have benefited from the moral influence of these women.

However, moral keeping for the benefit of society is a daunting task. It requires the careful protection of the personal virtue of the women themselves. For women to be called moral agents, they must have full moral capacities, self-respect, and ethical judgement and practice (Porter 1999: 21). When women become immoral, the results are devastating. Wells states, “it was felt that if women were in some way to fall as well, the very fabric of society would be rent” (Wells 1993: 26-27). Forsyth (2018: 18) agrees, “When women fall, men and families are doomed. Nations cannot stand for long without strong families.” John Angell James (1995: 72) warned that this role of women must be guarded, protected, and respected, otherwise society is at risk:

As long as female virtue is prevalent, upheld by one sex, and respected by the other, a nation cannot sink very low in the scale of ignominy, by plunging into the depths of vice. To a certain extent, woman is the conservator of her nation’s welfare. Her virtue, if firm and uncorrupted, will stand sentinel over that of the empire... but let the general tone of female morals be low, and all will be rendered nugatory.

To maintain a positive moral influence on society, personal moral standards must be upheld.

*Modern view*

Morality expressed in the past has been based on patriarchal societies and values. Ideal theories (traditional masculine morality) refer to perfect justice, but feminist moral theories give guidance in actual life problems which occur in imperfect societies (Held 1993: 23). Men assume an analytical approach based on right versus wrong, whereas women's ethics are based on caring and experienced intuition. Emotions and relationships impact feminine ethics, resulting in men and women having different styles of ethical reasoning. Gilligan (1982: xix.) defines moral problems as conflicts in human relations. The manner in which people relate to each other is more important than principles. Women "approach moral problems not as intellectual problems to be solved by abstract reasoning but as concrete human problems to be lived and to be solved in living" (Noddings 1986: 96). Therefore, a feminist view of morality is developed with an emphasis on *caring* for others, the oppressed, the sick, the children, the ones with needs, and for friendships. Studies cite female morals are based in compassion and sympathy (Holstein, 1976: 51-61). Emotions develop moral understanding, "helping us decide what the recommendations of morality themselves ought to be" (Held 1993: 30).

Biblical law, based on the perfection of a masculine God, may be considered "ideal" whereas feminists view moral experience as consciously choosing or refraining to act based on the individual's experience and feelings of what he or she accepts as moral. Instead of submitting to an impartial, absolute, abstract power, Held (1993: 35) suggests approaching morality from the view of relatable, embodied people because, "many of us conclude that moral inquiry can more fruitfully be conducted from the points of view of actual persons in actual relationships than from the point of view of an abstract individual agent." Morality is not to be determined by God or men in the past, but by the larger society of people and their needs. The feminist view is praised for listening to multiple voices rather than adhering to a "single truth of disembodied moral principles" (Hekman 1995: 30). In considering multiple voices, the problem of multiple accepted virtues arises. Feminists admit that moral theory and moral experiences do not always agree. One may act in a way contrary to their own moral belief but convince themselves that their actions are justified. Held contends that this may require a revision of moral beliefs instead of supposing that the actions were wrong. Moral theory does not depend on rationalization, but on an ongoing "appropriate internal dialogue aiming to continually improve one's moral understanding" (Held 1993: 27).

### Reality of Moral Keepers

Moral keeping is complex. From the beginning of time, women have been known for their influence on men. It started in the garden of Eden, after the woman was tempted by the serpent, she took the fruit to Adam and offered it to him. It was his free will decision to disobey God's command, yet when confronted he blamed Eve for her influence over him. King Solomon was renowned for wisdom. He knew the laws of God and studied them thoroughly, yet he fell away from God because of the influence of his foreign wives (1 Kings 11). Blaming women for the destruction of men, has been a common theme throughout literature. Females, such as Eve, Pandora, or Maya, are frequently regarded as the source of evil (Wessinger 2020: 112).

However, unlike fictional literature, God did not create woman as one to bring harm to mankind. The concept of women helping men stems back to the garden of Eden. In Genesis 2:18, God describes her role as a helper fit for him. Various translations describe that concept as a corresponding, complementary, or suitable helper. Traditionalists use the King James Version's description of "help-meet" clarifies that the term should not be labeled as a one-word description but as two separate words – help and meet. Woman "was created to be a helper (noun) who was meet (adjective), suited to Adam's needs" (Pearl 2014: 24). In this way, a wife encourages the husband morally and supplies him with the resources to be moral. Egalitarians emphasize that the original biblical word *ezer* means more than a helpmeet. *Ezer* is a term for all women, young, old, single, and married. It is more than a responsibility relegated to marriage, but it refers to a strong warrior helper for mankind, with the emphasis on strength (James C 2005: 35-36). God uses this military term to describe Himself, which proves that it does not mean a degraded servant, but rather a soldier. All Christians are called by God to fight in a spiritual warfare, and Scripture does not differentiate between men and women as they put on the armor of God (Ephesians 6; 2 Corinthians 10). Men and women are called to be united as they "stand firm in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel" (Philippians 1:27). Women are given the special task of helping men and other women fight this battle and strive toward godliness. Neither gender has been called to fight the battle alone.

Whether defined as a help-meet or *ezer*, women adhering to their intended purpose would be a benefit to men, as Proverbs 31:12 states, "She does him good, and not harm, all the days of her life." Biblical examples of such women are Abigail and Esther, ones who risked lives to protect the welfare of not only their husbands, but also their household, community, and nation.

Unfortunately, sin and pride affect the appreciation of morality influence. Instead of valuing the gifts good women bring, many men shun their input. Lillie, a suffragist, claimed that God tried to make women as a helpmeet for men. "I wish he had done it! I wish he had made one whom man would have recognized as such, and would have allowed her to become a 'help meet for him.' I wish she could now take her proper position as such!" (Lillie 1889: 67). What Lillie experienced and feminists observed was that men (both religious and secular) defined helpmeet as one who does the men want. Lillie (1889: 58) explains, "Everywhere the male predominating and holding supremacy, decides all questions of social life as best suits *his* inclinations." Men are allowed to dictate what they want women to do for them, instead of allowing God to move in the woman's heart to help him, and ultimately society, achieve the heights of godly living.

Men were not solely to blame for the disrespect of morality. Influence, no matter how virtuous it may appear on the outside, is tainted by unbiblical motives. Lucy Bland suggests the desire for a greater civilization or morality could be related to the upper and middle classes' fear of a working-class uprising. Morality or a "social purity movement" merely could have been an intervention of the elite upon the lifestyles of the poorer, "dangerous classes" (Bland 1992: 398). The inner motivations of moral reformers in the past can only be guessed. Some may have done it out of selfish ambition, political advantage, economic gain, or genuine concern for the well-being of fellow humans.

Women were also not united in the call for strict morality. Virtue was determined by circumstance rather than on an absolute authority such as the Bible. An example of this is the testimony of Josephine Butler, a feminist in the 1870's, who considered moral reform against prostitution as "repressive". Butler disdained the morality concept as a show of inequality, forcing one group's standards and version of morality over the lives of others. She alleged:

Beware of "Purity Societies"... ready to accept and endorse any amount of inequality in the laws, any amount of coercive and degrading treatment of their fellow creatures in the fatuous belief that you can oblige human beings to be moral by force. (Bland 1992: 400)

Political reform acts dealing with prostitution closed brothels and sent offenders to prison instead of offering hope and sanctification. Thus, morality became more concerned about reforming behavior than in the soul of the person committing immoral actions. Moral keepers were disdained as those who offered only judgement without optimism, and concepts of equality gained popularity.

In response to the equality movement, many fundamentalists responded harshly. They realized that women, who previously had kept society in check, were shifting their position and appearing to abandon their virtuous influence altogether. The religious response made the matter worse. As an overreaction, enforced legalism took over morality and developed unbiblical ideals of submission. Traditionalist men assumed the mantle of moral keeper and relegated those women who were being faithful to the shadows and told them not to talk. To encourage the situation further, they praised and upheld the subdued women as ones who exhibited godliness by remaining silent and submissive. In essence, men told women not to regain their status as moral keepers, but to allow the men to fix the problem on their own.

The result was a backlash of Christian women who became frustrated and sickened by the restrictions and “quick fix” the men were attempting. This created a rise in Christian feminism and a realization that women were called to be more than quiet observers while the world morally fell. However, instead of fighting against the sin in society, many turned the battle toward the ruling men in the church. There was a need for church reform, but the religious civil war damaged many lives. Men and women should have been fighting immorality in the world, but they lost their focus and started attacking each other.

All moral keepers can do is point out sinful tendencies and behaviors. They may stand up and be a voice for what is right, they may lobby for changes and laws to be enforced, they may sway public opinion about a specific topic, but they cannot change the attitudes and wills of others who are unwilling to change. The reality of moral keepers is that women and men must be moral themselves. When that is lost, disintegration begins.

### **Breakdown of Moral Keepers**

Suffragette R. Lillie (1889: 62) claimed that it is women who provide “an inheritance of freedom, of justice, of equality to their children, when they shall stamp upon their unborn children such a high moral nature as will make it impossible for them ever to go out into the slums of vice and degradation.” The origins of the feminist movement valued morality, yet the reasoning was faulty because morality was not based on biblical foundations, but humanistic ones. (Lillie credits Spiritualism, not Christianity, for the movement in women’s rights, and further blames the “so-called religious” for the lack of reform.) However, the fall from moral influence did not start with feminism, as it is often accused, but in Eden. In her temptation, Eve was told that she could be like God. It was something she did not possess, so she took the opportunity to obtain what was not hers. Once Eve ate the fruit, she had disobeyed God and became sinful. Her action did not condemn the whole human race, yet once she was contaminated by sin, her first act was not to be



a helper to her husband, but a destroyer. Just as women today have the power to influence morals, they have the power to destroy morals. Adolphe Monod declares, “The greatest influence on earth, whether for good or for evil, is possessed by woman” (James J 1995: 72).

Romans 1 describes how the wrath of God falls upon the unrighteous. His judgement includes giving the ungodly over to dishonorable passions. The description begins, “For their women exchanged natural relations for those that are contrary to nature” and then describes how men follow in shameless acts. Mary Pride (2010: 27) suggests a misconception about the passage,

Theologians have often interpreted this passage to mean that when God gives up on a race or nation, first the women become lesbians and then the men follow their example and become homosexuals. This is certainly part of the truth, but I don't think its the whole truth. Historically men are more likely to turn to homosexuality, and to turn to it in large numbers, *before* women become lesbians. Nor need the passage be talking about lesbianism at all. All it says is that the females exchange their natural function for that which is against nature.

God designed the natural function of women to be a helper. Instead of finding their purpose in God's ordained role, women compared themselves to men. Instead of contentment in obeying God's command, they desired to not only switch roles with men, but do away with given roles and responsibilities all together. The liberation mindset of equality means “Every man, woman, boy and girl should be allowed to do that which is right in his own eyes” (Mack 1972: 3, referring to Judges 21:25). If men were not expected to uphold morals, then women should not either. If men were allowed to sin freely, then women should also. If men were raging sexual beasts, then women could rage more. Women lost the view that their role was to help men in their standing before God. Instead of helping men, they became worse than men, and men in turn followed their example leading to more shameless acts.

Demanding that men and women are equal in every way and fighting against a distinctly God-created feminine nature has encouraged a “uni-sex society where all distinctions between sexes are obliterated” (Mack 1972: 3). Caldwell, a former feminist, believed that the deterioration of society begins when women become masculine and men become feminine. She places the responsibility into the hands of women, “The decay and the ruin of a nation always has lain in the hands of its women. So does its life and strength, its reverence for beauty, its mercy and kindness. And above all, its men” (Caldwell 2018: 67). Forsyth, who labeled men as uncivilized without feminine influence, bemoans, “in any civilization where women are largely corrupt, God help the men” (Forsyth 2018: 18).

When women listen and believe the serpent's lie that God has restrained them and they deserve more in life and bite into the fruit of selfishness, placing their desires above their primary role of helping others, they follow in the footsteps of their mother Eve. By disregarding their call to virtue and abandoning their responsibility to influence others towards obedience to God, they encourage men to go deeper into sin, which men are all too ready to follow, until society is destroyed. When confronted by their actions they ask, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Is it too late for modern society to reform? Generations of women today were not brought up with the concept or responsibility of biblical moral keeping, so how can they teach as Titus 2:3-5 suggests how the younger women ought to love husbands, love children, and keep the home? Each generation seems to become progressively more depraved, resulting in the actions of recent American females wearing pink vaginas on their heads, pulling down their pants and defecating on police cars, describing their sexual activities on social media, and distorting any trace of uniqueness or specialness of femininity (Tuck 2017; Varghese 2020). Can the next generation be taught to regain back what has been lost? Has society gone too far? Is there any hope left? Margaret Nadauld (2000:15) makes a plea:

The world has enough women who are tough; we need women who are tender. There are enough women who are coarse; we need women who are kind. There are enough women who are rude; we need women who are refined. We have enough women of fame and fortune; we need more women of faith. We have enough greed; we need more goodness. We have enough vanity; we need more virtue. We have enough popularity; we need more purity.

### **Reformation of Moral Keepers**

Peter Marshall set forth this charge: "our country needs today women who will lead us back to an old fashioned morality, to old fashioned decency, to old fashioned purity and sweetness and for the sake of the next generation, if for no other reason" (Deen 1969: 46-47). Herein lies the problem and the need for reform. The goal is not to bring back a nostalgic feeling of the good old days when men were men and women were women; rather, the aim must be a determination to pursue the perfect state created by God in the garden of Eden. Moral keepers are not to yearn for Victorian or Puritan eras, valuing their standards to live by. Women, to be a true *ezer*, must fight to restore the perfection for which humans were created. While full perfection will not be possible before Christ returns, moral keepers are called to hinder sin at every possible level and to be valiant warriors against the evil that threatens our families, nations, and world.

In hindsight, when the equality movement fixated on amoral attitudes and resulting behaviors gained momentum, Christians should have

encouraged godly women to stand up, vocally and publicly, to rise up to their calling as moral keepers. If the men had called upon the women to reinstate their God-given role as strong helper, a warrior presence to dissuade mankind from sin, the outcome may have been different. Judith Miles (1975: 95) notes that “in a time of general moral decline, the influence of God and good is usually residual in at least some of the women. A return by women to solid virtue, a return to the Lord, will bring the men and children with them – by attraction, not coercion.” Moral keeping coercion is simply being the moral police of right and wrong. Attraction is about pointing others to the truth. Psalms 119:9 instructs, “How can a young man keep his way pure? By guarding it according to your word.” How then can a young woman help a young man keep his way pure? By pointing him to God’s Word, encouraging him to obey, and modeling the standards God requires. Deen (1969: 47) observes that “this is the special role, not of ‘beautiful women, smart women, sophisticated women, career women, talented women, divorced women, but of godly women.”

There must be a reformation in women towards personal holiness. Reformation starts with a call to repentance by admitting the ideal of complete equality as something to be grasped has overshadowed the responsibility to be like Christ. Philippians 2:5-7 states, “Have this mind among yourselves, which is yours in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, by taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men.” Jesus, who had absolute right to demand equality because He is God, humbled himself, even to the point of death on a cross, for the sake of redeeming sinners. He gave up a pain free dwelling in heaven, veiled His glory, and limited His divine attributes for mankind. All Christians (not just the men) are called to be imitators of God, followers of Christ’s example, ones who walk in the same way He walked. 1 Peter 1:14-16 challenges men and women, “As obedient children, do not be conformed to the passions of your former ignorance, but as he who called you is holy, you also be holy in all your conduct, since it is written, ‘You shall be holy, for I am holy.’” This is the challenge for women – become like Christ! If He was willing to give up so much for the salvation of men, cannot those who love Him do a fraction of self-denial? The mistreatment of women is an important topic and one that must be addressed, but equality must not be the objective, salvation is the aim.

Christian women have the opportunity to change the culture through godly example, through boldness, through witness, and through biblical training of the next generation. Women have more than the opportunity and

responsibility to revive society for the better; they have the responsibility to share the gospel of Jesus Christ. Jesus lived a morally pure life because humans cannot. Jesus died to pay the penalty for the moral failings of men and women. Jesus rose from the dead to conquer the power of immorality and offer life to those who believe in Him. The outcome of changed hearts will result in honorable treatment for men and women. Morality and decency are the side effects of a life dedicated to holiness. They are the blessed result, not the standard.

### Conclusions

This article opened with the question, what are female moral keepers expected to do? Women are not the saviors of men, responsible for transforming their base natures into civilized gentlemen. Women are not the tamers of men, responsible for curtailing their base, aggressive inherencies. Women are not the protectors of virtue, responsible as moral agents of society. Women are not the creators of morality, responsible for nurturing feelings into principles.

Women, like men, are created by God, fallen into sin with the rest of mankind, and dependent on a savior for redemption. They have the privilege of promoting virtue, not because they are intrinsically virtuous, but because they are image bearers of God. They become a true *ezer*, helper to all mankind, when they display personal godliness and reveal Christ.

Morality is a call to both women and men, but throughout history women have proven to excel in this role. Thus, women have an extraordinary privilege of advancing Christlikeness in society, not by claiming power to themselves, but by pointing to the one who has the power. May this generation of women be challenged to take up the mantel once again.

### References

- Bland L (1992) "Purifying" the Public World: Feminist Vigilantes in Late Victorian England. *Women's History Review* 1(3): 397-412.
- Burns J (2001) *Mothers of the Wise and Good*. Vestavia Hills, AL: Solid Ground Christian Books.
- Deen E (1969) *The Bible's Legacy for Womanhood*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- De Tocqueville A (1990) *Democracy in America*, volume 2. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Emerson R (1871) Civilization. *Society and Solitude and Other Essays* 21.
- Forsyth D (2018) *Fascinating Womanhood for the Timeless Woman*. Kindle edition. Springfield, MO: Axicon Circle.
- Gardner M (1995) *Famous Poems from Bygone Days*. New York, NY: Dover Publications.

- Gilder G (1986) *Men and Marriage*. New Orleans, LA: Pelican.
- Gilligan C (1982) *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hekman S (1995) *Moral Voices, Moral Selves: Carol Gilligan and Feminist Moral Theory*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Held V (1993) *Feminist Morality: Transforming Culture, Society, and Politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Holstein C (1976) Irreversible, Stepwise Sequence in the Development of Moral Judgement: A Longitudinal Study of Males and Females. *Child Development* 47: 51-61.
- James C (2005) *Lost Women of the Bible*. Kindle edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- James J (1995) *Female Piety: A Young Woman's Friend and Guide*. 1860. Second Edition, reprint. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria.
- Lillie R (1889) Woman. In *William B. Cairns Collection of American Women Writers 1650-1920*, 55-70. Boston, MA: Berwick & Smith.
- Mack W (1972) *The Role of Women in the Church*. London: Mack Publishing.
- Mason C (1904) *Parents and Children*. Third Edition. The Home Education Series 2. London: Kegan Paul.
- Miles J (1975) *The Feminine Principle: A Women's Discovery of the Key to Total Fulfillment*. Minneapolis, MN: Bethany Fellowship.
- Nadauld M (2000) The Joy of Womanhood. *Ensign* 30(11): 14-16.
- Noddings N (1986) *Caring: A Relational Approach to Ethics*. Second Edition. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Nuijten M and Anders G (2007) *Corruption and the Secret of Law: A Legal Anthropological Perspective*. Hampshire: Ashgate.
- Pearl D (2014) *Created to Be His Help Meet*. Tenth Edition. Plano, TX: Carpenter's Son Publishing.
- Porter E (1999) *Feminist Perspectives on Ethics*. Feminist Perspectives Series. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Price P (2016) Female Influence. *Universalist Union* 1, 1835. Reprint. Palala Press.
- Pride M (2010) *The Way Home: Beyond Feminism, Back to Reality*. 25th Edition. Fenton, MO: Home Life Books.
- Skrypnek B and Snyder M (1982) On the Self-Perpetuating Nature of Stereotypes About Women and Men. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 18: 277-291.
- Varghese J (2020) Pooping for Justice: Journalist Millie Weaver Tweets Photo of Woman Defecating on Utah Police Car. *International Business Times*, 2 June 2020.
- Wells D (1993) *No Place for Truth*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

- Welter B (1966) The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860. *American Quarterly* 18(2): 151-174.
- Wessinger C (2020) *Theory of Women in Religions*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Wright F (1923) *Feminism in Greek Literature from Homer to Aristotle*. London: George Routledge & Sons.

### **Internet Sources**

- Ivanhoe P (2003) "Woman and Virtue." History of Ethical Theory Course, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho. <https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/ngier/womvirtue.htm>. Accessed on March 15, 2021.
- Peterson J (2017) "Why Women Fall for Pirates and Vampires." Lecture on YouTube, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p8ePDKlF6T0>. Accessed on April 8, 2021.
- Pooner S (2008) "Why Rome Fell and Is the United States Next?" World History and Social Studies Curriculum, Yale National Initiative, Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, Yale University, [https://teachers.yale.edu/curriculum/viewer/initiative\\_08.03.07\\_u](https://teachers.yale.edu/curriculum/viewer/initiative_08.03.07_u). Accessed on April 8, 2021.
- Tuck L (2017) "Lady Part Costumes Ruled the Women's March," *Yahoo! News*, 22 January 2017. Accessed on April 8, 2021.