

# WHY NO WOMEN PRIESTS<sup>1)</sup>

Reverend I.P.S.G. COSBY

Church of Ireland (Traditional Rite)

*E-mail: ivancosby12@gmail.com*

## **Abstract**

Because there is no provision for Priestesses in the Bible, there is no place for ordaining women to the office of Presbyter (Elders) in the Christian Church. The arguments for extending the office of Presbyter to women has to be sought elsewhere and can be traced to Western European philosophical ideas propounded by the Stoics, Epicureans, G.W.F.Hegel and the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory. Since religion is foundational, not superficial to the moral values of any given society, the ordination of priestesses into Christian Churches take on a pervasive quality that might otherwise appear incidental and of little significance in societies that are foundationally Christian. It is important, therefore, that the consequences of the logic used to justify priestesses be followed through to understand how that society is likely to develop. The paper argues that the logical progression is already leading to sexual depravity, bestiality, the demeaning of both womanhood and manhood, political and social anarchy and the confusion of Reality & Fiction, all of which will become the new norm.

1) An early attempt to justify the ordination of women was 'Why No Women Priests?' (Rt. Rev. W.G. Wilson, Lord Bishop of Kilmore, Elphin and Ardagh, 1988) The purpose of this paper is to remove the question mark!

## I. INTRODUCTION

### Aims

The aim of this paper is twofold: The first is to understand why the contemporary western secular world in general, and much of western liberal Christendom in particular, has bought into the idea that it is quite acceptable that there should be women priests / priestesses<sup>2)</sup> officiating and functioning as, or instead of, (male) priests in Christian Churches. This is a very recent phenomenon in the history of Christendom, having originated towards the end the 20th century. Nowhere in the Bible is there any reference to priestesses. As far as Christendom is concerned, the concept of woman priest/priestess has its roots, not in the Bible where the term does not exist, but in the so called ‘Enlightenment Era’ of Western Europe/America and has since spread to other cultures that are inspired by or are associated with ‘Western Civilisation.’ The first ordination of women to the priesthood in the Anglican Communion occurred when Bishop Ronald Owen Hall of Victoria (Hongkong & Macau) ordained Florence LI Tim-Oi in 1944<sup>3)</sup>. It is important to keep in mind that in the 2,000 years of its existence, Christendom has thrived in a myriad of cultures, a few of which have been matriarchal in character. Any one of these cultures, with long exposure to Christianity, had the opportunity of exerting a compromising influence on orthodox Christian teaching. Yet, the Holy Catholic Church has held resolutely to the ‘Word’ as being foundational to how it conducts itself.<sup>4)</sup> When elements of Christendom come to realize that they have absorbed or imbibed non-Christian principles, it has led in due course either to re-formation as happened in 16<sup>th</sup> century Europe or to extinction as occurred in the case of the *Kakure kirishitan* (隠れキリシタン in Japan. Throughout the Bible, priesthood has been reserved to men. These facts alone must make us wary of finding the justification for ordaining women to the priesthood in the Holy Scriptures i.e. The Word.

The Scriptures, both Old and New Testament, have been perused for a correct understanding of how Christians should order their lives for 2000 years. Until the latter

2) See below, p. 117, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. for an analysis on the subtle distinction between the terms woman Priest and Priest and the reluctance to use the latter term by those who promote the ordination of women to the priesthood.

3) This was a matter of extreme expediency, when the Japanese overran his diocese. Bishop Hall confided in Archbishop Temple, “I’m not an advocate for the ordination of women. I am, however, determined that no prejudices should prevent the congregations committed to my care having the sacraments of the Church.” See: Rose, Mavis (1996). *Freedom From Sanctified Sexism – Women Transforming the Church*. Queensland, Australia: Allira Publications. pp. 129–149.

4) A sample of Biblical references to the Word being foundational: e.g. 1 John 1: 1; Acts 19: 20; Romans 10: 8, 1Thessalonians 2: 13; 1Peter 1: 25. (NT). Numbers 22: 35–38 Jeremiah 7: 2; Ezekiel 12: 25 (OT)

part of the 20th century, at no time, has there been an attempt to re-interpret Holy Scripture to justify the rectitude of ordaining women to the priesthood. True, since the 1980s there have been attempts to find verses, invariably taken out of context, in Holy Scripture, that purport to support the argument for condoning the ordination of women to the priesthood.<sup>5)</sup> Christ never hesitated to correct the conventional wisdom of his day whether expressed in the Sanhedrin or by the groups of which its membership was composed (Sadducees, Scribes, Pharisees and Teachers of the Law.) When they had misunderstood or misinterpreted the Scriptures, He would challenge false teaching, and their presumptions, pointing out the error of their ways. It is a recurring phenomenon throughout the Gospels. Typical instances are to be found in chapters 7 and 8 of St John's Gospel. At no time does Christ give even the slightest hint or insinuation, that women should be ordained to the priesthood or eldership, despite there being well connected, seemingly eligible women around.<sup>6)</sup> If it had been the Will of Almighty GOD that women should be ordained, Christ would have clearly said so, and would have corrected any misconceptions or misogynous ideas Jews may have had on the subject. Because there is no valid biblical foundation for the ordination of women to the priesthood<sup>7)</sup>, it will not be surprising if the case for their ordination has to be found elsewhere. That it clearly can be, is the underlying premise and *raison d'être* of this paper. The righteousness of the ordination of women to the priesthood has its origins and justification in 18th century 'Enlightenment' thinking. As will be demonstrated, the ordination of women is founded on and is a logical development, not of biblical, but of humanistic philosophical principles.

The second aim, and equally important requirement of this paper, is to identify what the inevitable consequences of embarking on a change of this magnitude are likely to be, not just for Christendom, but civilisations such as that of Western Europe and America that are founded on Christian principles and values. Christianity has been foundational to the emergence of the phenomenon that is, for want of a better phrase, Western Civilisation, in

5) One of the most widely quoted is Galatians 3: 28.

6) When Matthias was chosen to replace Judas Iscariot as an Apostle, certainly the Virgin Mary, (as possibly did the mother of James & John, Joanna the wife of King Herod's Steward, *et al*) met the criteria for being an Apostle, which were: i. To have been with Christ from the beginning (his baptism) till his Ascension, and ii. To have witnessed the Resurrection. Yet, none of these women were shortlisted to be Apostles. See: Acts 1: 20–26

7) This term should not be confused with the 'Priesthood of all Believers, [ἱεροσύνη των πιστών] a reference to the believer's Sacrifice of Thanksgiving קורבן של הודיה, which all believers in good faith will enter into in gratitude for the Intercessory Sacrifice for Sin (קורבן למען החטא) which our LORD Christ achieved on the Cross whereby Christians have been redeemed (גאול) from sin. This has nothing whatever to do with the concept of Πρεσβύτερος (Elder) which the English word Priest means. See further Note 25 on p. 107, and 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of p. 98.

general, and the Anglo-Saxon civilisation in particular. That foundation is being replaced by a religion that is Humanist which, for the purpose of this paper, will be called Western European Humanism (WEH.) As the template for determining moral rectitude alters, it is essential to follow up on the logical consequences of a deviation in moral standards. It is essential to look ahead to see to what the logical outcome of this deviation will be. What is taking place is called 'progress,' which is itself a perjorative or 'loaded' propaganda word. A more accurate impartial description would be 'change.' What will be the logical outcome of such a profound shift in moral rectitude? The case for the ordination of women to the priesthood derives from the change that comes about from substituting a Christian/biblical moral order for a humanistic moral order. Once one understands that, one can understand how the move to ordain women to the priesthood occurred when it did and why.

## II. HOW WE HAVE GOT TO WHERE WE ARE

### 1. Hegel's Formula

The cultural world view of the Bible is founded on the *Principle of Absolutes* That means 'Right' is objectively and inherently different from 'Wrong.' We have the biblical statement: *So, God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.* [Gen. 1: 27.] Given the *Principle of Absolutes* it is possible to understand: GOD is not Man. GOD is Creator. Man is a Created-Being, Women are not Men. Such concepts are absolutely distinct and are not interchangeable or to be confused. Expressed algebraically 'a' = 'a,' 'b'='b,' 'a' ≠ 'b.' Then, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831) conceived The *Hegelian Principle of Relativism* whereby: Thesis and Antithesis combine to become a Synthesis, which in turn becomes a new Thesis with its corresponding new Antithesis, both of which in turn combine to create a yet more comprehensive Synthesis. It was this formula that enabled the Western Philosophical mind to dispense with the *Principle of Absolutes*, and to replace it with a '*Principle of Relativism.*' Consequently, it was possible to dismiss perceived differences as being incidental. Differences are now merely differences of degree and of no fundamental significance. It does not prevent one entity functioning in ways that are relative to or interchangeable with another, because there is now no essential difference between one or the other. What One is, the Other is or can be. The differences of role, purpose or function are not fundamental or foundational. Where there are differences, they are relative not absolute. It is, for example, no longer possible to say that it is appropriate/right for Men to do this, and for Women to do that. In other words, womanhood is no longer sociologically different from manhood. Both entities have become interchangeable. Both are an integral part of the 'synthesis.'

During the 18th century, the European world of philosophers and intellectual thinkers conceived a world order to describe which they adopted the propaganda word: 'Enlightenment.' Over the next two centuries this 'enlightened' civilisation bought into the above Hegelian formula wholesale to the extent it has become arguably the foundational principle of the contemporary Western Secular World and of those cultures that have allowed themselves to come under its influence. Given a civilisation or World Order, based on the *Principle of Absolutes* it is possible to say that it is wrong for women to be ordained. In a world based on the *Principle of Relativism*, it is not possible to say that anymore. If one were to, one would be out of kilter with the foundational principles of this 'enlightened' world order. This is the position in which Western Liberal Christendom finds itself in Western Europe and its offshoot on the North American continent. What can be identified as Liberal Christianity has come about because an attempt has been made to adjust Christian values, teaching and principles to conform to the relativist values of the contemporary secular society in which it finds itself in order, it is believed, to remain relevant. It is important to re-iterate that the driving force for women's ordination is not biblical. If it were, women's ordination would have been a *fait accompli* from the Apostolic era, and picked up at the Reformation when Holy Scripture was re-established as the foundational source as to what is the right way to proceed. It is not a question as to whether women are capable of doing what men do and vice versa, or should do merely because they are able to do so. Rather, it is a question of whether they ought, or that it is appropriate that they do certain things. The same applies to men, but in different respects. If this were not so, it would, and does, establish a very dangerous precedent. Put bluntly, for example, it becomes right for a man to murder someone, simply because he is able to do so. That is a Machiavellian principle propounded during the so called 'Renaissance.' It justifies sadism, which not surprisingly is becoming increasingly common place in post-Christian Western Europe and America. The point is not so much that the practice occurs, but that it is justified. The Marquis de Sade argued that it was right to seduce women so long as one was able to do so.

## **2. Enlightenment: Distortion of Two Biblical Concepts.**

The underlying norms of the European Enlightenment can in some respects be understood as being Christian heresy. Two deep rooted Christian biblical concepts have been adopted by WEH but redefined in a humanistic/secular way. The two concepts that are applicable to understanding and justify what is conceived to be the rectitude of the ordination of women to the priesthood are how one understands the two concepts of *Freedom* and *Equality*. As the French Revolution mantra, 'Freedom, Equality, and Fraternity' indicates, these concepts are foundational to the humanist religion of the

Europeans and their cultural offshoots. *Freedom* and *Equality* are for WEH the counterpart of the two foundational Christian Commandments cited by Christ as summing up the whole Law & the Prophets. (Fraternity, it is suggested, is merely wishful thinking inspired by Christ's Second Commandment to 'Love thy neighbour as thyself.')

The Enlightenment's re-interpretation of what is meant by *Freedom* can be traced to the Epicureans, and *Equality* back to the Stoics. Significantly, St Paul confronted adherents of both these philosophical schools at the Areopagus,<sup>8)</sup> and as subsequent history relates St Paul ultimately won the argument, and the Greek-Roman civilisation became Christian. Understanding the rightness or wrongness of the ordination of women to the priesthood ultimately depends on how one defines what '*freedom*' and '*equality*' mean.

### Equality

The Christian understanding of '*equality*,' which conforms to the *Principle of Absolutes* is that Men and Women are in every respect of equal worth (significance, importance, status) both before GOD and in the roles assigned to each sex. To accomplish what He required of them, GOD created them with different qualities specifically suited for what those requirements were. As children of GOD both sexes are created as being of equal worth, not sameness. There is no such thing as relative status, but there is, as GOD intended, equality of importance, significance and value. Furthermore, as descendants of Fallen Man, the sexes are equally fallen irrespective of sex. On account of the nature or prevalence of specific sins, one sex generally is more susceptible to one kind of sin than another, but there is no hierarchy of sin.

As can be clearly seen, foundational to Christianity is the equality of Men and Women, however their roles, qualities, and relationship to GOD and to each other are concerned. Expressed algebraically, the Christian concept of the equality of Men and Women can be written as 'a' + 'b' = 'a' + 'b.' In no respect is one lesser or greater than the other. The problem is that Humanists have bought into the concept of equality between the sexes, but have redefined what is meant by '*equality*.' The secular Humanist understanding of equality between the sexes is not equal worth but what might be called '*Essential Sameness*.' What differences there are, whether physical or mental, by which means we recognize or distinguish between what is male as opposed to female are incidental. Masculinity *vis-a-vis* Femininity instead of being inherently a characteristic of the respective sex, is deemed to have been deliberately nurtured for cultural reasons in the respective sexes, but now in our so-called liberated society are interchangeable

---

8) Acts 17: 16–32

between the sexes. If, as is believed, there is no essential difference between the sexes, there is no reason why roles cannot be reversed. To that end contemporary society has invested hugely in educating girls to function as and to do what boys and men do. To date there has been less investment or propaganda pressure (compulsion) in nurturing boys and men to function as girls and women. To justify the principle, there is pressure on husbands to function as mothers in the family. The underlying principle is that whether one is male or female ultimately it has no bearing on what men and women respectively choose, or tend to want to do and be. Put algebraically:  $a + b = 2a$ , because 'b' is actually the same as 'a.'

Freedom:

As with the concept of *Equality*, *Freedom* originally is a Biblical concept that can be traced back to the account of the Garden of Eden, and as such is far more ancient than anything the Stoics had to say on the subject. However one understands the antiquity of the first eleven chapter of Genesis, it is a concept in terms of Biblical understanding that goes back to the very creation of Man, or as the Humanist would say to the emergence of Man as an independent thinking being. Again, the problem arises because in the so called 'Enlightenment,' the Humanists having dispensed with GOD, and the *Principle of Absolutes*, have had to re-define what they mean by '*Freedom*.' The Christian understanding of *Freedom* is 'that within the parameters of the Law of GOD Man experiences *freedom*:'

*For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another...But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law. [Gal. 5: 13 ff]*

The humanistic world, on the other hand, has chosen to define freedom to mean 'The freedom to do what one likes' This actually is not freedom but 'whim.' The reader may recall the *avant-garde* musical 'Hair' in the mid 1960s, which makes this very point. The dramatic high point of the musical was when the heroine gave the hero, her partner (they were not married as that would have been bourgeois and a curtailment of their freedom) a yellow shirt. Her partner, to the great distress of the girl, immediately tore up the shirt and put it in the wastepaper basket. When the distraught girl asked why her lover had done that to her carefully chosen present he replied, "I do not like yellow!"

As with the humanist concept of *Equality*, if the rectitude of the humanist concept

of *freedom* is to be believed, namely the right to be and do what one wants, there is no case to be made against women being priests, particularly if they are capable of aping the role. The point is that it is a reality, not a fiction. In one case, it is a man exercising a manly role. On the other, it is a woman exercising and functioning as a man. That this is so, has given rise to a verbal distinction being made between Woman Priest and Priestess. To make the point, the dress of so-called women priests is kept precisely the same as that of the men's vestments. To do otherwise would give rise to the notion that a woman priest is somehow different from a man priest. It is logical that the dress for women should reflect their womanhood, as it does elsewhere in life. Just as water always finds its own level, so will womanhood in due course manifest itself in the functioning of the priestly role, rendering the term 'woman priest' anachronistic, and rendering the term 'priestess' a more accurate description of the office.

### 3. 'Critical Theory' of the Frankfurt School

The philosophical genre, generally known as the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School has, like the Hegelian philosophical concept of relativism from which it is descended, a direct bearing on how and why contemporary secular humanist society thinks the way it does and holds the values that it does. In short, the critical Theorists began as a movement of frustrated Marxist-Leninists. Apart from the failed German Putsch in 1923 and the Soviets revolution in Russia, the collapse of the capitalist world as predicted by Karl Marx and Engels failed to come about. The 'critical theories' that emanated from the Frankfurt School were an attempt to understand why this was so, and contemplated what needed to be done to bring about the overthrow of the capitalist world and its firmly entrenched establishments one of which was the Church. The movement's proponents set about making critical investigations of the institutions, ideals and prevailing principles that sustained the Western Civilisation's *status quo*. It was an attempt to undermine the infrastructure of the Capitalist West, by questioning the legitimacy of its institutions and established values.<sup>9)</sup>

The movement began with the founding of the Institute for Social Research by Karl Grünberg (1861–1940) at Frankfurt University. He was a Marxist Philosopher of Law & History. Also important in the movement was Max Horkheimer (1895–1973) who was interested in authoritarianism. What concerned him was the ability of militarism and economic forces to cause disruption and the adverse effects these forces had on the public

---

9) For a brief lucid introductory lecture on the subject, see: the L'abri Fellowship series of Friday Lectures, *Christian Reflections on Critical Theory* (Part 1: 17<sup>th</sup> July 2021, & Part 2: 24<sup>th</sup> July 2021.)

whom he called the Masses. This led to the development of his critical theories.<sup>10)</sup> Other pioneers of the movement included Theodore Adorno whose critique of modern society was to influence the European New Left. Other prominent members of the movement were Erick Fromm, Herbert Marcuse and Sigmund Freud. Failing to appreciate that Humanism is itself a religion the school, in particular Freud, was dismissive of what it perceived to be religion, in particular Christianity.

These authors became required reading on the syllabi of most western universities, particularly during the post-World War II era, giving rise to a whole generation of university graduates moving into positions of influence, such as teaching, the media, public relations and politics. The consequences of this has been that in western society at large there has evolved a quasi-intellectual class of professionals that sees itself as being progressive, mildly socialist, critical of tradition and of the Establishment. Such people tend to be dismissive of Christianity on the grounds that it is, more or less irrelevant, if not myth. The phrase ‘opium of the people’ coined originally by Karl Marx, was much quoted throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century as a remark dismissive of Christianity in particular. Christianity, if not dismissed as fiction, could only be contemplated as some form of deism or psychological crutch that degenerated into some expression of animism. The term ‘Gaia,’ the Greek mother goddess that is the living Earth, became *avant-garde*. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the liberation of its satellite states in Eastern Europe and the Baltic, this genre of semi-intellectual liberal, quasi-socialistic political class suddenly dropped what Bernard Shaw once called ‘creeping socialism’<sup>11)</sup> and became liberal-democratic in its politics instead.

Liberal enlightened society became overtly atheist in its religion, and saw ways to undermine deeply ingrained Christian values in particular. Not surprisingly, the Family as a concept came under the spotlight of adverse criticism. Faithful to the two commandments (See pp. 96 & 97 above) of the Humanist religion, the concept of family was critically undermined when primacy was given to the individual over and above the family. Christianity, like other traditional societies and established ‘religions,’ has historically upheld the family as the basic unit of society, having an internal hierarchical yet intimate structure. This has largely given way to the individual being the basic unit of society, in accordance with the values originally unleashed by the French Revolution. Other factors have also played their part, such as increased social mobility. True, the

---

10) See, *Eclipse of Reason* (1947)

11) See, Schwartz, Pedro. ‘George Bernard Shaw & Creeping Socialism’

individual in a Christian family has a unique relationship with God, but this also requires him to honour his Father and Mother (No. 5 of the 10 Commandments.) Where the Family is the basic unit of society, each individual is a fraction of the whole. Tax law was at one time skewed to favour and protect the concept of family. Since the latter part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, this bias is gradually being removed in favour of treating all individuals the same. There was a time, for example, when members of the armed services and company employees would be paid a marriage allowance, in recognition of the fact that when no differential was made, the quality of life of a bachelor would be significantly higher than that of a married man if their salaries were the same. It also recognized that the married man carried a social responsibility that the bachelor did not.

The Critical Truth genus, arguably has been the underlying force, and the one most responsible for attempting to undermine the traditional roles assigned to the sexes in how they relate to each other and in what each expects and requires of the other. This is in part done by taking terms and alluding to them in either a purgative, condemnatory way or on the other hand in a favourable, wholesome, respectable beneficial way. Take for example the term 'Patriarchy' which is perceived to be wrong, anachronistic, and unrighteous to the point of being evil. Whereas, 'Matriarchy' is something wholesome, to be aspired towards, is progressive and a feature of future good order, even righteous.

#### **4. Religion is Foundational, not Superficial**

The consequential importance of the Ordination of Women is not that it instigated, but that it reflects and has given credence to the *Principle of Relativism* as being a foundational principle of western secular civilisation. Why so? The contemporary secular world would have us believe that Religion is a superficial matter. That is to say it is something personal, which has no place in public affairs or in the determination of national policy. The state is a-religious. This of course is patently untrue, as will be explained below when one asks the question: What is religion?

Religion is a philosophical construct or paradigm that provides an answer to the fundamental questions of life, for example: Is there life after death? Does God exist? How did life begin? How should we live? etc. Religion provides credible answers to those questions. On the basis of those answers, a moral order evolves, which determines, at a profound level what a people understand to be right as opposed to wrong. It is that moral infrastructure and the beliefs that underpin it which evolves into and is the foundation of what we understand a civilisation to be. In other words, religion is foundational, quite the opposite to what the Humanists would have us believe. It demonstrates how facile is

the observation made by Alistair Campbell, when speaking of politics at Westminster, said, “We do not do God.”<sup>12)</sup> More significantly, for our purpose, Humanism itself is as much a religion as is Christianity. The essential difference between the two religions, which in turn determines what each considers to be moral rectitude, is that Christianity believes GOD exists and that eternal life after death is a reality. The Humanist religion (WEH) believes that GOD does not exist and that there is no such thing as eternal life after death. As such it is dismissive of Christianity. To be so, the humanists have to believe that the Resurrection of Christ is fiction. This, WEH has never yet been able to demonstrate or prove. As the western world increasingly subscribes to the Humanist religion of the Enlightenment, political legislatures are increasingly filled with members who subscribe to the Humanist religion, What were once Christian inspired Laws of the Land are steadily being replaced by laws that conform to the principles and morality of the WEH religion. Not only is this religion currently dismissive of Christianity, it is afraid of Islam, as the Salman Rushdie<sup>13)</sup> and Charlie Hepdo<sup>14)</sup> incidents revealed. As stated above Liberal Christianity is about being relevant to the values of a secular world (humanism,) but as has been shown, that attempt to remain relevant actually translates into adopting humanist principles and finding an intellectual way to square those values with Christianity. That cannot be done without compromising the integrity of the Gospel. If one attempts to do so, the price is to go beyond the bound of both truth and reality. As those subscribers to WEH progress along their chosen path it will in the course of time become glaringly self-evident that they are living in and believing in a world of fiction and of unreality.

### III. CHRISTIAN GOD/MAN RELATIONSHIP REVERSED.

Both in the civilisation of the Bible, as well as that of the contemporary secular world, the term man or manhood and woman or womanhood are iconographic. For example, the phrase ‘women and children’ is still used as a reference to those most vulnerable in society and in need of protection. If one were to include the word ‘men’ the phrase would change its meaning to that of ‘All.’ In a world that does not countenance any

---

12) Alistair Campbell, then Prime Minister Tony Blair’s Press Secretary and Director of Communications and Strategy made the comment on the BBC News programme on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2014.

13) Sir Ahmed Salman Rushdie, b. 1947 of Liberal Muslim parentage; Satanic Verses (1988) resulted in Fatwa being declared against him; He has described himself as ‘hard-line atheist.’ (Bill Moyers on Faith & Religion – Bill Moyers & Salman Rushdie PBS 2006). Knighted (2007), made a Companion of Honour (2022)

14) ‘*Charlie Hebdo*’ is a secular satirical publication founded in 1970 whose satire is directed *inter alia* against religion in general, Roman Catholicism, Islam and Judaism in particular. In 2015, Islamists attacked the publication’s premises in Paris killing the publishing director and 12 others.

distinction being made between men and women, the phrase becomes anachronistic as men are now as vulnerable as women. The Biblical phrase for the most vulnerable is *widows and fatherless children*.<sup>15)</sup> The marriage of a man and woman reflects the contractual bond that exists between GOD and Man

### **1. Authority is Hierarchical**

In the real world, where the phenomenon of authority is concerned, a *sine qua non* factor is hierarchy, a term which the ‘egalitarian’ world of Enlightened Humanism considers taboo. Yet, wherever there is the exercise of authority, there has to be hierarchy: *viz* those who are answerable for, and those who are answerable to. Such is the ‘enlightened’ world’s disapproval of hierarchy, it goes to great lengths to convey the notion that it is non-existent or not present. The fact is that in the real world, if there is to be an orderly social infrastructure of any size, there has to be hierarchy of authority. What matters is not that it exists, but how that authority is handled. Anyone who has been subject to authority will recognize the rectitude of what Christ has to say on the subject.<sup>16)</sup> Where Christian principles are upheld by society, particularly regarding the correct handling of Authority and its accompanying hierarchical order, it is an important reason for non-Christians to take Christianity seriously.

To the Biblical mind-set the concept of authority is both implicit and explicit. Almighty GOD is answerable for his Creation, and the Creation is answerable to Him. GOD is answerable for Man and Man is answerable to GOD, not vice versa. Christ is answerable for the Church, who is the Bride of Christ. In like manner in Christian marriage the husband is answerable for his wife and family, and his wife and children are answerable to him. At the most basic or primitive heterosexual level, a woman’s safety and wellbeing requires a man being answerable for it, not *vice versa*. This is not acceptable in WEH. The woman in the real world is not to be blamed for not looking after herself. In a world where the humanistic understanding of equality applies, it is a woman’s own fault if she does not look after herself. The reality is that there is a world of difference between rape and seduction. If a man rapes or is seduced, both are his fault. Whatever the state of the relationship, a man is responsible for the safety of the woman. If he allows himself to be seduced, it is his own fault for not looking after himself. In WEH, the man has no responsibility for the safety of a woman.

---

15) *c/f* James 1: 27.

16) For example, see: John 13: 4–17.

If a woman is contemplating marriage to a man and does not find it within herself to respect the authority of that man sufficiently to trust that her wellbeing is enhanced by placing herself under it, she should not be marrying him. The selfless giving of oneself requires trust. The initiative to place oneself under any authority anticipates that one will be honoured for who one is, and metaphorically invited to be seated at his side as a consort participating in his authority, not superseding it. Because it is the woman who is undertaking to place herself under the authority of the man, explains why it is the convention for the man, not the woman, to ask for the woman's hand in marriage, not *vice versa*. It explains why women expect and want to be asked. Because it is she who is taking the initiative to place herself under his authority, she has to be asked whether she wishes to commit herself or not. The manner in which he handles authority must not only be something she respects and values, but she does so because she trusts that she will be strengthened, built up by, and made secure in that authority. In other words, the union will be As previously stated, if she does not have that respect, she should not be married to that man. The point is that all of Mankind, whether male or female, or grouped together in the family of the Church is iconic of what ultimately is Man's relationship to GOD. In other words, all of mankind is feminine, in the sense of being 'answerable to,' in its relationship to GOD<sup>17)</sup>. In this most vital of relationships, the woman is the role model, not the man.

Implicit in Womanhood, at its most primitive, is the willingness to give of oneself for another. In marriage, the most basic of human relationships, the manifestation of a woman's love is the selfless giving of herself to her husband and for her children. There is no place for adultery by either party, but because of the foregoing adultery on the part of the husband understandably is, and used to be, regarded as being particularly dastardly. Hence, when English Law first permitted divorce, it did not permit men to divorce their wives. Only women could sue for divorce. Womanhood, whether as a wife, or as a mother, is the iconic role model for all mankind to witness what is Man's relationship to GOD. A mother has an umbilical-cord relationship with her children that can never be undone, and which the father does not have. Consequently, a man can never be a mother to his children. At its most primitive, the mother's relationship is about nurturing. As soon as the child is born it gravitates back to its mother, who is the presiding/immediate authority over it. In a properly ordered Christian household, as the child widens its horizons within the family, it becomes aware that there is the more

---

17) The afore mentioned does not mean that man is effeminate, the human nature implicit in womanhood, in his relationship to GOD, but that in his manhood he is answerable to a higher authority. Similarly, the Sergeant who is answerable to his commanding officer is not, and is not required to be, effeminate in character.

distant authority of the father, to whom its mother is in turn answerable. As the child matures further, it becomes aware that its father, in turn, is answerable to a yet higher authority, GOD. The child witnesses this truth when it sees the father conducting family prayers on behalf of the whole family. In due course, an important aspect of maturing into adulthood is when the child, having reached the age of discretion, chooses to have its own direct relationship with GOD. Until the child reaches adulthood (the age of majority), that direct relationship with GOD does not in any way diminish its being answerable to Mother and Father within the family, as will be explained below. An important natural rite of passage, a part of adolescence maturing respectively into either manhood or womanhood, is when the father takes over primary responsibility from the mother as the child prepares to meet the real world beyond the family. Comparable to nurturing being the primitive nature of motherhood, the father's equivalent role is protection and provision. It is important for a mother to be in a position to say to her child, "You had better speak to your father about that." and for it to have qualitative meaning. Clearly, there exists a subtle, usually unspoken, hierarchy of authority, which binds the family together into a properly functioning social unit that is a microcosm of the world beyond.

Wherever there is a properly functioning authority, a *sine qua non* factor must be the capacity for 'Recourse' That is to say, a subordinate at whatever level in the chain of hierarchy, must have meaningful recourse to the authority above the authority to which it is immediately answerable. To use Christian terminology: Owing to the fallenness of Man and his capacity to abuse authority vested in him, a subordinate must always have recourse to an authority which is answerable for the authority to which the subordinate in question is himself answerable, the ultimate authority being GOD. The duty of the immediately higher authority is to assess how his subordinate has exercised his authority, and either to correct, or to affirm his exercise of it. Because there must be the capacity to make further appeal to a yet higher authority in the chain of hierarchy, there must ultimately be, as a last resort, provision for direct access from the bottom to the highest level of authority, e.g. the President of the university, in government the Monarch or President (Note that even republics have to have a President.) This principle is clearly understood, provided for, and demonstrated in Monarchy. All, regardless of status, are equally the subjects of the King. There is no intermediary between the King and his subject.<sup>18)</sup> This principle is being played out when the King visits his people, gives audiences, gives awards personally, when the crowds congregate to participate with the king

---

18) The Emperor Franz-Josef of Austria-Hungary, would reserve the first 20 minutes of his working day to give an audience to any one of his subjects that requested to speak with him.

in events of national significance, and when the public require the monarch's presence in times of tragedy, as happened in the United Kingdom following the death of the then Diana, Princess of Wales. In a Constitutional Monarchy where democratic governments prevail, the principle is further manifested in direct universal suffrage. Christ frequently refers to marriage in reference to the GOD/Man relationship. With good reason it is stressed in the Anglican Prayer Book service on what is the nature of marriage. I quote:

*Marriage [which] is an honourable estate, instituted of God in the time of man's innocence, signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and his Church...and for the due ordering of families and households, that children might be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord, and to the praise of his holy name.*<sup>19)</sup>

However, we are living in a largely humanistic world, which is dismissive of authority, abhors the concept of hierarchy, and rejects the idea of being answerable to anyone. The result is that with the break-up of properly functioning families, those that find themselves in positions of authority, having never been brought up in an authoritative environment, invariably abuse their authority. The tendency is to use the opportunity it provides to dominate, instead of serving those for whom the person is responsible, which is the biblical position. Importantly, implicit in the term 'subject' is the *sine qua non* principle of ultimate recourse. Significantly, it is a term rejected by republicanism.

In the Biblical world-order there is the world of Heaven that envelopes and is beyond the world of the physical Creation, both of which the Kingdom of GOD embraces. In the heavenly world of the Resurrection we are as the angels, neither marrying or being given in marriage.<sup>20)</sup> It would appear that physical maleness and femaleness will have become an anachronism, given that the purposes of these two estates, namely procreation in Earth and the respective duties required of each in the stewardship of that Creation will have passed.<sup>21)</sup> It can be understood that GOD is not male in any physical sense, but He is masculine in that He is answerable (i.e. Responsible<sup>22)</sup>) for Creation. The iconic physical representation on earth of what that means is Manhood, hence the rectitude of

19) See the Introductory Preamble for the Solemnization of Marriage, BCP 1662

20) *For in the resurrection, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.* [Mt. 22: 32]

21) Genesis 1: 28

22) All who exercise sovereignty e.g. king's/presidents of sovereign independent states etc, ultimately are answerable to GOD for their temporal authority. GOD is uniquely the source of all authority in that there is nothing beyond GOD to whom He is ultimately answerable, hence He is uniquely GOD Almighty, King of Kings, Lord God of Hosts, Lord of Lords, etc.

the pronoun “He” being applied to GOD. In this order of creation, physical male Man’s authority is restricted and confined only to the created order of things in this world. It is a particular and temporary headship applicable only to the affairs of this Temporal World. Woman and womanhood, on the other hand, is the iconic role model for what is Man’s relationship to GOD. This is not confined to the Temporal World, but applies to and reflects the GOD/Man relationship for all of eternity in the realm of heaven. Just as there is no giving in marriage in heaven, nor are there those given in marriage, there is also no subordination of womanhood to manhood in the relationship of one to the other. In the humanistic cultural order where neither GOD nor heaven exist, there is no place or function for the feminine role model. It is meaningless. All there is, is the iconic role model of manhood as being something of any value, because only the Created Order is believed to exist. It explains why the concept of womanhood in secular humanism is not just secondary, but essentially has no place or value at all. Hence, ‘Women’s Liberation’ has become shorthand for women being free to do what men do. Nothing could be more undermining and demeaning of womanhood. For the Christian, on the other hand the iconic role that is manifested in and designated to womanhood, it can be argued, far exceeds in value the iconic role model vested in manhood, which is restricted to the affairs of the temporal not to the heavenly world.

Christ drew attention to, and affirmed the biblical world order regarding the validity of Womanhood.<sup>23)</sup> When a young man asked what must he do to inherit eternal life, Christ referred him to the two Great Commandments<sup>24)</sup>: to love GOD with all his heart etc, and to love his neighbour as himself. Christ then went on to illustrate what it meant to fulfil those two commandments. He used a man and the parable of the Good Samaritan to illustrate what is Man’s duty to his neighbour. Immediately, in juxtaposition to the parable, St Luke cited Christ using a live woman, Mary, and the historical incident in her and Martha’s house, to illustrate what is to be answerable to GOD. Note that he chooses, Mary, a woman, to demonstrate the primary importance of sitting, metaphorically speaking at the LORD’s feet. By so doing Mary was giving herself unreservedly to the LORD, the role model of being answerable to Christ. This attitude is deliberately contrasted with the overbearing manner of her sister, who is telling Christ what should be the order of things. Telling someone to do something is exercising authority over that person.

---

23) Luke 10: 25

24) Mark 12: 28–31

## 2. First Order Heresy

It is in the context of the above that we must understand what is implicit in the ordination of women to the priesthood. Priesthood<sup>25)</sup>/Eldership is ultimately about headship. A priest (presbyter = Elder) is answerable for his congregation and the wider family of the parish. If there is a priestess exercising headship over a parish, or an arch-priestess is presiding over a diocese, it is clearly in violation of Holy Scripture<sup>26)</sup>. If a priestess is married, it begs the question, who is the head of her own immediate family, she or her husband? Furthermore, it raises the question as to which of them is the *de facto* although not *de iure* head of that parish or diocese. The same question would/could have been silently asked or insinuated of Mr Denis Thatcher, of Prince Philip, and was openly known to be the case with Prince Albert, husband of Queen Victoria.<sup>27)</sup> There is a requirement for complementarity, never more so than in the Church. What principles pertain in Holy Scripture should pertain in the parish, in the family and in the wider Church as a whole. There has always been female headship in all female societies, *vide* the Mother Superior of a Convent.<sup>28)</sup> The matter arises only in society involving both sexes. The observation noted here is that in the real world this principle does widely prevail in Western Humanist Society. However, it is a bone of contention, because it is firmly rejected in principle. This paper argues that the duty of responsible male headship is not only a requirement of Christianity, it is how the world actually is, i.e. reality. When that complementarity is not there, it undermines the integrity not only of the Church but society at large whatever its religion or culture. It will create social tensions which, if not attended to, will manifest themselves in unsocial behaviour such as bullying, broken marriages, truant children, irresponsible manhood, etc. all of which serves to undermine the integrity of family in the first instant and the integrity of society as a whole.

In the wider context of the parish, the overriding of male headship not only challeng-

---

25) The Greek word Presbyter (Πρεσβύτερος) meaning 'Elder' has in English morphed into 'Priest.' It still retains this meaning, namely 'elder' in the Church of England and where the term is still used in Anglican Churches. The Roman Catholic Church having adopted the English word Priest ascribe to it the sense of *Ἱερέας* (Literally Hierarch, but having the sense of 'Intercessor' (Μεσολαβητής), a concept strongly rejected in the Reformation, because, as far as Holy Scripture is concerned, there is only one Intermediary/Intercessor between GOD and man, namely Jesus Christ.

26) 1 Corinthians 11: 3 But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.

27) Charles Greville, Clerk of the Privy Council wrote in his diary, 'He is king to all intents and purposes...' (Greville's Diaries – vol. 5, p. 257) quoted in Fulford, 1949, p. 117

28) See, Acts 14: 15–16, 40 Lydia had her own household and international business as a seller of Purple, an expensive import item.

es Christian teaching on headship but emasculates a fundamental principle of Christian marriage. The parish with a priestess in charge, however capable, is now recognizing that the iconic role model, womanhood, is not one that represents being answerable to, but of being answerable for. The icon of Womanhood, as illustrated in Mary, is now functioning as that which is answerable for. It is giving rectitude to the conduct of Martha, and as such contradicts Christ's teaching. If the Church sees fit to contradict Christ in his matter, it begs the question in what other areas it might do so when Christ's teaching does not chime harmoniously with contemporary secular values. More significantly, the role reversal implicit in the ordination of priestesses now logically goes on up the chain of hierarchy. The Bride, the Church instead of being answerable to Christ, is now answerable for Him. At the ultimate level, GOD is now answerable to Man, and Man is answerable for GOD. In other words, Man is the inventor of GOD. That is precisely the foundational position of the WEH religion. For this reason alone, a woman by very reason of being a woman cannot be a Christian priest/elder. It is for good reason that in the whole of the Judeo-Christian biblical tradition, there has never been an order of priestesses. It is an offence to GOD. It is an office usually reserved for religions underpinned by fertility worship. The culture of Western Europe & America, and those that ape it, has for the most part become besotted with sex, co-habitation and abortion, a variant of infanticide, much of which conduct is stimulated by the confusion and reversal of the roles of the sexes, as explained above. These are the hallmarks of ancient fertility religions, and the ancient world of Rome at the beginning of the Christian era. It is not surprising that there is no place for recognizing priestesses. The Children of Israel paid a heavy price for embracing any other religion, let alone the fertility cults, such as the worship of Moloch, deeply embedded in which are extra marital sexual practices, and more ominously, the sacrifice of women and children. Is it so strange, rather is it not logical to find in a society where sexual promiscuity has largely become the norm, to find protest movements, of the ilk of "Me Too"? Such movements are, in effect, protesting the sacrifice of women on the altar of irresponsible male promiscuity, where men are, in the humanist understanding of freedom, exercising their male freedom to do what they choose to do.

It can be understood from the above that the decision to ordain priestesses not only is profoundly demeaning of women, treating the qualities of womanhood as being of less worth than those of manhood, but theologically it is a heresy of the first order, because it reverses the GOD/Man relationship rendering Man the inventor of GOD. It is wrong, therefore, to say that the ordination of women is a secondary issue. As will be demonstrated in the next section, the consequences of holding to such a view will be severe. A church that has chosen to ordain priestesses has, however unwittingly, bought

into the cultural order described above. It may be reluctant and conservative in going along with the logic of events, but along it is committed to going.

#### **IV. NATION, GIVEN OVER TO ITS SIN**

##### **1. Changing the Points.**

The importance of the Ordination of Women is not that it instigated, but that it reflects and gave credence to the *Principle of Relativism* as being a foundational principle of western secular civilisation. Why so? The ordination of women to the priesthood may seem, in the context of western secular developments, to have been a small and insignificant event. It was an attempt by those Churches who ordain them, to remain relevant to the society in which it operates. Nothing could be further from the truth. As previously stated, it has grown out of a secular humanistic mind-set, whose values owe their origin to classical Greek philosophy but emphatically not to the Bible. It is, to use a railway analogy, the issue that changes the points. The act of changing the points is of itself a small movement. The result is that the train is now headed in a different direction that is growing, increasingly far removed from where it would be had the points not changed. It is important to understand the magnitude of change taking place, since it is only beginning, but will grow ever more radical. It would be irresponsible if we were not to draw attention to this phenomenon.

Society, together with the liberal Churches in tow, is gradually cutting its ties with the Christian biblical world order that has been providing an anchor of reality and rectitude. Instead, Church and society are exploring and identifying with a new set of values, which WEH condones. It is incumbent on biblical Christians to be alive to, and watch out for, evidence of deviation from a Christian order, and in so far as one can, point to the consequences arising from this deviation.

As the Christian looks out across the opening up of the new proverbial landscape that is the contemporary western humanistic civilisation, it is difficult not to draw the conclusion that what he is seeing represents a world that has been given over to its sin. That is taken to mean that what is deemed to be righteous in the sight of GOD, is deemed to be wrong in the received informed opinion of contemporary westernized society. On the contrary, that which GOD deems to be wrong, is now deemed by contemporary secular Man to be right. There is an inevitability or logical progression of events that grows or emerges from the adoption of a certain given premise. It is important to be attentive to how this logic of events is working itself out. In the meantime, it is irresponsible not to

cite and even speculate, given the force of logic, as to where some of these changes of ethical value are inevitably leading.

## 2. Sexual Depravity:

### i. The perceived rectitude of LGBT+

It clearly states in Holy Scripture that such a state is of itself intrinsically wrong<sup>29)</sup> but to a society underpinned by the Hegelian principle of ‘Thesis/Antithesis/Synthesis LGBT+ practices can be understood to be entirely regular. It is not the purpose of this paper to comment on, or discuss, the matter of homosexuality in its various manifestations. Rather, it is to draw attention to the inevitability of the association between the ordination of women to the priesthood and belief in the rectitude of homosexuality. Having forfeited the Principle of Absolutes, Relativism is the premise that underlies the supposed rectitude of the humanistic interpretation of what is meant by ‘*Freedom*’ and ‘*Equality*.’ (See above, pp 96,97.) Given those interpretations there is no case that can be made for opposing the ordination of women to the priesthood. On that basis, where Hegel’s principal of thesis and antithesis combining to form a synthesis, the relationship between thesis and antithesis is merely relative. Given the sexual spectrum extending from male at one extreme and female at the other, the relative area in between represents varying degrees of male and female sexuality, all of which are of equal value and rectitude. If one is to champion maleness at one end of the spectrum and the female at the other as being essentially of the same order, since they combine together to form a synthesis, it becomes illogical to question whether any combination of sexuality can be designated wrong or degenerative. Initially, the concern was restricted to homosexuality and lesbianism. However, in recent years, the male-female spectrum has been subjected to the proverbial microscope that has led to the discovery or emergence of a whole myriad of sexual states, whether transgender, sis-gender etc that come under the general banner of ‘LGBT+.’ The point being made is that if one subscribes to the rectitude and appropriateness of women being ordained to the priesthood, it is illogical to argue, in the particular, that the ordination of women is right and the ordination of homosexuals, lesbians or any variant of LGBT+ is wrong. In general, it is no longer possible to qualify any sexual state, however conceived, as being either right or wrong. It is not surprising, therefore, that within the space of between ten and twenty years the Churches that have unwittingly subscribed to the secular/humanist order of values, has progressed from approving the ordination of women to ordaining homosexuals, Lesbians and transvestites.<sup>30)</sup>

29) Romans 1: 18–32 for example. Because the word ‘homosexual’ and ‘heterosexual’ were first coined by Karl-Maria Kertbreny in a pamphlet published in 1869, there is no mention of these words *per se* in the Bible.

30) The Anglican Bishop of Chubu, Rt Rev. Francis MORI, having ordained a deaconess to the Priesthood, had no

## ii. Bestiality

It is important to remember, when one is considering the so called ‘march of progress’ that the Hegelian formula is a seemingly endless progression of every Synthesis becoming a new Thesis with its corresponding Antithesis. This begs the question what is the Antithesis of the Man/Woman Thesis. It is suggested that it is Animal. Currently bestiality is taboo/immoral in the same sort of way that until the middle decades of the 20th century, homosexuality was immoral. It begs the question whether we can detect signs that contemporary humanist society is moving towards condoning bestiality.

Artificial insemination has been practised in the stock breeding world for several decades without there being any serious debate as to the morality of such a practice, because there is a clear appreciation that animals are not human. There is a qualitative difference between these concepts. More recently, we have become used to the practice of women, for whatever ‘*bone fide*’ reason, being impregnated by an anonymous donor, frequently because she does not want the responsibility of relating to a husband. To ease condoning of such a practice, the resultant birth was called a ‘Virgin Birth,’ crassly likening these mothers to the Virgin Mary. The purpose here is not with the rectitude or otherwise of this phenomenon, rather to draw attention to the factor that it is generally accepted that it is appropriate that such donations of semen are anonymous. More seriously, the semen donor is not deemed to have any right to claim either to be the father or to assume the role and duties of one. In other words, the birth of children as a result of an anonymous donation of semen, should more realistically/accurately be called, ‘Doggie Births.’ Like a bitch, the mother is entirely responsible for bringing her offspring to maturity. The physical and actual father/donor has no more responsibility for, or role in, the rearing of the child he has fathered than a dog has in the canine world. The afore-mentioned observation, at the current time can understandably be considered insensitive, but the logic is indisputable. It remains insensitive only for as long as one regards humans and animals as being qualitatively different.

There is evidence that this qualitative distinction is currently breaking down. There is a persistent and growing movement to grant human rights to animals. Many nature programmes whether intentionally, or unwittingly, draw attention to the similarity between humans and animals. It may be a highly developed human-like personality, social order, language, devising and using implements etc. To an urban population that has

---

problem confirming the orders of the ordination of the rector of his Toyota parish, when the rector declared he had changed his sex from male to female.

little experience of handling farm, let alone wild animals, it is easy to slip into the notion that animals and humans are essentially the same. The differences are merely relative. In contradistinction, which is worth noting, rural man has been living and working with animals for countless centuries. In the process stockmen have often developed a personal rapport with their animals. However intimate the relationship, there is never any confusion or perception that the creatures they are handling are anything other than animals. There is a qualitative difference between the two with all the consequences that that implies. Once it starts being believed that humans are not qualitatively different from animals, only relatively different, it blurs the distinction to be made between human and animal rights, and it greatly strengthens the case for granting human rights to animals. Once this has been achieved, it becomes illogical to oppose bestiality.

The Christian biblical world view being based on the Principal of Absolutes is prevented from being exposed to the above order of progression. To illustrate the point reference can be made to the order of creation in Genesis 1. The qualitatively different orders of creation are introduced by the Hebrew word 'ברא,' ('bara') which is a reference to that which is created by GOD. The creation of Matter, Animal and Man are qualitatively three quite separate orders of creation. First, GOD created 'Matter.'<sup>31)</sup> This was followed by the creation of 'Animal,'<sup>32)</sup> which is 'Matter' plus a factor that constitutes life. It is this latter plus factor, that makes 'Animal' qualitatively different from 'Matter,' all the while that which is 'Animal' includes 'Matter.' The third qualitative order of creation is the creation of 'Man'<sup>33)</sup> He includes in addition to 'Matter,' and 'Animal,' a unique plus factor which is to be created in the image of GOD. It is this that differentiates Man from Animal. Like the biblical GOD, Man's world is what is philosophically called an 'Open' as opposed to a 'Closed Order,' particularly in respect of Creativity and Morality. It is the ability to know what is the difference between right and wrong, and being in the Image of GOD, part of which is that Man has jurisdiction over the world that is both 'Animal and Matter.' The final application of 'Bara' is in the creation of Woman, (Female) Man, in addition to (Male) Man, where male Man personifies the 'General', and female Man the 'Particular.'<sup>34)</sup> Both are created in the Image of GOD, but are qualitatively different in relation to each other in their purpose, and in their duties. Both are complementary to the proper functioning of the other and of equal value and significance in the sight of GOD and in their relationship to him.

---

31) Gen. 1: 6-19

32) Gen. Gen: 1: 20-25. Note that creation of plant life is on the Matter not Animal side. i.e. Plants are Matter not Animal. Photosynthesis is a process of Matter, as are the physical functions of Animals and Man. (Gen: 1: 11, 12)

33) Gen. 1: 26

34) Gen 1: 27

It is worth pointing out here that since humanist religions do not believe that GOD exists, they do not, and probably cannot believe that there is any qualitative distinction to be made between Man, Animal and Matter, let alone between Men and Woman. If that is the case, it becomes difficult to justify humans not acting like animals or distinguishing between animate and inanimate life. Francis Crick (1916–2004) who was in part responsible for the discovery of DNA, in effect understood the composition of Man as being merely a ‘Chemical Expression’<sup>35</sup>). Instead of Man being unique in Creation, having been created in the Image of GOD, and therefore having the facility to function in a philosophical ‘Open Order’, his whole being is now reduced merely to being matter. Crick railed against ‘Religion,’ Christianity in particular, but failed to realize that Humanism is itself a religion. Given the present order of Humanism with which we are dealing, it is pertinent, metaphorically speaking, to be alive to the extent to which contemporary society is allowing itself to be programmed, because there is no longer an underpinning philosophical order/religion that believes such programming to be wrong.

The so-called righteousness of the ordination of women to the priesthood is merely a manifestation of that humanistic world view. It owes its origin and justification to a way of thinking that is extra-biblical. It is a manifestation of a world order that purports to be Christian. Yet the basic primitive view to which it subscribes is that GOD does not exist. For that reason, the ordination of women to the priesthood is totally incompatible with Christianity, which reflects the real world and as such it reflects and accommodates the principle of Absolutes.

### iii. Masculinity v Femininity

There are two points to note in passing. What is universally called *Feminism*, which is the driving force not only behind the change in people’s opinion as to the rightness or wrongness of ordaining women to the priesthood, is actually a propagandist misnomer. A more accurate description of the phenomenon is *Masculinism*, since the driving force behind the movement is for women to be able to function and do the things that men do. Until now cultured opinion having been founded on a Christian view of life, has considered the masculinising of the feminine not just to be inappropriate, but to which it is degrading for women to have to succumb. As women embark on traditional male roles, there is a comparable tendency to display qualities and traits typically associated with manhood: strength, aggression, headship and manliness of style and dress, sweatiness,

35) For a more in-depth analysis of the idea that ‘Man is a Chemical Expression,’ the concept of Reality/Truth v Fiction, ‘Open Order,’ a ‘Chemical Expression,’ see Francis Schaeffer, *Trilogy (The God Who Is There, Escape from Reason, He is There & He is Not Silent)*, Crossways, 1990. ISBN-13-978-0891075615

etc. This is taken to absurd lengths in the field of sports, where women's bodies are being '*masculinized*' in order to achieve better results. The practice where women assume roles normally associated with, and often required of responsible manhood, is understood in terms of liberating women. In short, women are encouraged to believe themselves to be liberated if they assume the roles and functions of manhood. This begs the question, liberating women from what, to which the superficial answer is: from the world that has traditionally been seen to be feminine, or simply put, liberation from themselves. This of course is an absurdity. However, the consequences, after the novelty factor has worn off, will ultimately be to render what has traditionally been valued as feminine to be regarded as something secondary, undervalued, and in some sense inferior. This is quite contrary to a traditional Christian and biblical mindset, as it is for many other cultures and societies rooted in realism. As stated above, a foundational principle of Christianity is that in human kind there are in the real world only two sexes, male and female. There may be effeminate men and emasculated women, on which there will be opinions, but they are still respectively and factually men and women and nothing else. Each is capable of aping the other, to a degree in what they do, and there will be opinions as to the rightness or wrongness of this. Any evaluation of one over the other, if either sex is treated as being anything other than the sex it is, is of Man's own doing. If acted upon, let alone persevered in, it is a recipe for evil, and immeasurable suffering.

It needs to be kept in mind that ultimately one is not dealing with jobs or tasks *per se*. There are many tasks and jobs that can be equally well done by men and women. Ultimately, it is about effects on relationships and roles that are required of men and women in their relationship to each other. To illustrate the point. If a branch bank manageress is married to the chairman of a major international bank, the careers of the couple concerned are not likely to put a major strain on the husband's duty of headship, and the wife's duty and willingness to recognize that headship. If the same manageress were married to the proverbial seller of the Big Issue and is the main bread winner, the pressure to maintain the traditional husband wife relationship will likely be somewhat different, and will require great strength of character on the part of both parties to maintain a natural, biblical, prescribed relationship. If on principle one chooses to ignore the propensity of certain types of job or career, which by their nature place a strain on, or test the duties of a man and women in their GOD given duties to each other, one should not be surprised if the strain of relating reaches breaking point. The same applies to differences in personal character. If the Christian husband/wife relationship is recognized and valued, the argument and belief is that it will have a long-term positive bearing on the longevity and happiness of that relationship.

The eulogising and aping of male aggression in women, is aptly illustrated in the picture below:



Fig. 1. Taken by the author at London airport, sometime between 2012–2016

What that advertisement is purporting to reflect is the belief that no distinction should be made between a man's world and a woman's world or in how they behave, because women should be able to function and behave exactly as men do if they so choose. The question posed is, why should they not play rugby? To which the answer quite rightly is, 'Yes, if they want to.' This is really the wrong question. The important and meaningful question is, 'Why should these girls want to behave in this manner?' The observation might also be made that their grand-parents would not have dreamed of wanting to behave in this way. The secular humanist argues that that former generation was not free, to do what it wanted to do. The reality and truth is more likely to be that the women of former generations did not at all think of themselves as being shackled in that way. On the contrary, they would not do what they would have considered mannish, and for that reason, demeaning behaviour for their sex. The reality of this picture is, of course that it is a bunch of girls aping the behaviour and mannerisms of male rugby players, because they think that by being manly, it is how they as liberated women should behave. The truth is that although they are women aping male aggression, they are actually still women, not a manifestation of the sexes having become confused. The 'joke' is not as the advertisement would have the viewer believe that rugby is not now confined to men, but that the girls in the picture are aping manhood. What is not a joke is the dillusion, a visual attempt to confuse two quite distinct and qualitative different sexes.

Furthermore, the eulogising of the masculine over the feminine has the effect of demeaning, or making secondary, qualities associated with femininity. It inevitably leads

to tension between rather than respect for the opposite sex. This competitiveness initially triggers an instinctive adverse male reaction on account of an innate sense of duty of headship. An adverse side effect of this trend is that men absolve themselves of any responsibility for women, which responsibility they perceive is not wanted anyway by women. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that we see following on from this so-called *feminism* (masculinising of womanhood,) a corresponding increase in sadism and laddish behaviour. To avoid confrontation, there is a tendency for men to move away if they can, and do something else leaving women to their own devices. As a result, when women fall prey to some male predator such as the American film director, Harvey Weinstein, the male response becomes one of little concern, since the women in question having assumed responsibility for themselves, should have looked after themselves. The logic of essential sexual sameness is that if women are independent, free and self-sufficient to do whatsoever they choose to do, so are men free to do what they choose to do. It is a recipe for creating a very unsafe world for women.

Having bought into the current Humanist concept of the interchangeability of the sexes, the UK Ministry of Defence wants to achieve a 40% ratio of women to men in the armed services. If the above observations are valid, the Ministry may achieve its target rather more quickly than it had anticipated. As the percentage of women entering the armed services increases, the likelihood is that men will decline to join the services preferring, instead, to do something else. They will not wish to be a party to the increased prevalence for bullying that occurs when the sexes are thrown together in confined quarters. Nor will they want to jeopardize a career, because of some momentary ill-judged sexual misdemeanour. The growing reports of women being bullied in the armed services is not surprising, given the thesis of this paper. It is a basic uncontrolled human instinct, all too often brought on when maleness is perceived to be undermined or thwarted. It is an unsurprising trait that is symptomatic of the imposition of policies influenced by a philosophical doctrine that fails to take into account the realities of human nature and interaction. The policy of obliging (forcing) the Armed Services, Police Services and Fire Services, *et al* to treat men and women as essentially interchangeable, open to all roles indiscriminately, is causing havoc in all the services. If the government insists on applying the humanistic algebraic principle that  $a + b = 2a$  (see above p. 97) in how the services employ their personnel, the worse the incidents of bullying and dis-functional social cohesion will become. In effect, men and women are being driven to behave as animals, which is the logical progression of this principle. (See above 'Bestiality,' p. 111.) The solution is not to increase the harshness of punishment for misdemeanour. Rather, it is to be guided by reality and not be governed by a particular philosophical principle that

does not take into account the reality of human life and interaction. The only solution to resolving the problem is to remove women entirely from the services concerned. If the government insists on the grotesque policy of putting its women folk on the frontline to be killed, it should have separate services for men and women. Women submariners, for example, should serve in submarines crewed entirely by women. The army will have to raise regiments composed entirely of women. The notion of all women Fire Service Stations highlights the absurd unreality, i.e. fiction (stupidity) of applying the  $a + b = 2a$  formula. Not only do the relationships concerned degenerate into bestiality, but those in authority who insist on applying the formula are living in a world of fiction not reality. There is a very limited auxiliary role for women in the services. This was exploited to its extremity during World Wars 1 & 2, but remained in conformity with the Christian principle of  $a + b = a + b$ . It should never have been taken any further or developed to conform with the current  $a + b = 2a$  principle. To a Christian biblical mindset, quite apart from the cross-dressing involved, the notion that a so-called civilised society should place its womenfolk in the front-line of battle and positions of real physical danger alongside, if not in place of its menfolk, is a distortion that is grotesque in the extreme.

The second point is that if you believe that the European Enlightenment/Humanist understanding of equality is correct,<sup>36)</sup> no case can be made against ordaining women to the priesthood. The feminine of priest is priestess. With respect to the above observations, it is not surprising that there is a reluctance to call ordained women priestesses. The first obvious reason is that priestess is quite rightly associated with heathen religions. As a Judaic-Christian concept, as stated at the outset, it does not exist in the Bible. It is suggested that the more subtle factor here is that woman priest not only reflects the fact that we are dealing here with masculinism i.e. women aping manhood, because there is a perception, however unadmitted, that the phrase 'Woman Priest' reflects the manhood nature of the office of priest/elder, which is superior to the seemingly demeaning term 'Priestess.' Similarly, in the secular world women are now actors, not actresses, manager not manageress, etc. In other words, we are all one sex now, and no distinction between them should be made. Here, it is important to lay to rest the argument often used to justify priestesses being priests. She is such a good preacher, much better than some men of one's acquaintance. Or, she is such a caring person. Of course, this can be the case in particular cases. Some women soldiers can shoot and kill more effectively than some men. As this paper has tried to show, one should not argue from the particular to the general, but from the general to the particular. It is important to understand the

---

36) See above, p. 96

wider context and what are the consequences to which the phenomenon leads. The forementioned qualities of priestesses alluded to, and others like them, have always been valued, but must be exercised in the correct context as they used to be.

#### iv. Law & Order

In a world of absolutes, it is possible to say that the plaintiff is either guilty or not guilty and for a judge to sentence a criminal accordingly. In the world of relativism, the judge may pronounce the plaintiff guilty, but the plaintiff can legitimately respond that the judgment is invalid, because there is no absolute or objective punishment since what is considered criminal is itself relative not objective. What the judge understands to be wrong, is different to what the plaintiff believes to be wrong. In a world where there are no absolutes, it becomes impossible to say whether the judge's opinion is more or less right than that of the criminal.

#### v. Confusing Reality and Fiction

The consequences for a civilisation which ceases to be anchored to the underlying Principle of Absolutes, is that it begins to confuse reality and fiction. People at a very early age are capable of distinguishing fact from fiction which would seem to be intuitive. For example, child readers of Beatrice Potter's Peter Rabbit series know intuitively that the characters are fictional. Children enjoy them as such, but do not confuse them with real people, or with the family's cat. In the same way, children do not confuse Thomas the Tank Engine, Gordon and Edward the red engine with real people<sup>37)</sup>. It is not the first time European civilisation has given up on reality, seemingly incapable of distinguishing between reality and fiction. It occurred during the Middle Ages in Europe when it was believed, for example, that Astrology was reality. Arguably, it was the discovery of the need to live in the real world that led to the distinction being made between Astrology and Astronomy. This reformation was largely brought about by the Bible being read in the vernacular. Europeans re-discovered the world of Abraham, who had distinguished the God of the Bible from the human conceived gods and world civilisation of Assyria and Mesopotamia, a world view which had spread to Egypt and India, and aspects of which had spread far beyond.<sup>38)</sup> The foundation of modern western civilisation was, not

37) See Wikipedia: Thomas the Tank Engine, Ref. 8: Characters of the Railway Series. Thomas was an anthropomorphism of the 'Billington' 0-6-0 E2 class tank engine employed on the *London, Brighton & South Coast Railway*.

38) Consider the fairies in Pictish Scotland, the Garuda of Indonesia, the English Leopards and the Scottish Lion on the Royal Arms, the antecedents of which creatures are the 'Biting Animal' of the Central Asian Sythian culture. The motif was discovered and brought back to North-West Europe by the Vikings.

the Renaissance, but the Reformation. The rediscovery of the Bible and the capacity to read it in the local vernacular restored the Christian way of looking at the world and events as they really were or had been. More than causing the break from the Roman Catholic Church, the Reformation became the motivation for the development of western science and objective analysis of what was real and true. Both Christianity and Science are concerned only with real facts, by which it is possible to determine the truth and know how the World actually is. The main difference between the two is that the remit of science is confined to the Creation, whereas the remit of Christianity includes the world outside of, and beyond Creation, but within which Creation subsists.

As the western world has largely given up on Christianity during the course of the last century, that world has begun to revert to living and thinking in a world of fiction as if it were reality, as had become the case in the Middle Ages. It is not the purpose of this paper to dwell on this. Rather, it is to draw attention to the fact that it is happening. A case in point is the British Government's policy that fails to distinguish any differences between boys and girls. Clearly, that government is not living in the real world. The world we live in is essentially binary. If it is not patriarchal, it will be matriarchal. Not only is the latter contrary to the biblical Christian order, but the overall tendency is that where women encroach on what historically has been a male preserve, the reality is, as afore stated, men will tend to withdraw or disengage after initial resistance rather than remain competitive. Where there is a manhood that has conceded the duty of headship, or even senses it is being challenged, it easily becomes a dis-functional manhood, manifesting either domination or laddish irresponsibility<sup>39)</sup>. The current spate of copycat mass shootings by a deranged (frustrated?) man who then commits suicide may, to a degree, be a symptom of the current situation where a responsible manhood role model is absent. Lastly, it is a manifestation of a dis-functional imploding society when the sexes swap roles. The theatre world currently prides itself on being *avant-garde*, anticipating trends towards general confusion of the sexes. A manifestation of this role swapping is the current fashion for playing traditional iconic male roles, such as Macbeth<sup>40)</sup> or Hamlet<sup>41)</sup> by women.

---

39) Recent examples have been the inevitable widespread bullying of women in the Royal Navy, particularly in nuclear submarines; in the Metropolitan Police, and in Fire Services, all cases of which are serving severely to discredit the reputation of the services concerned. See, [Daily Mail](#). *Navy Probes Submarine Sex Pests Scandal*. 29<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2022, pp. 1, 4, 8, 9; [The Times](#). 30<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2022, p.1 *et al.* [The Sunday Times](#). *Female Firearms Officers Bullied Out by Boys' Club of Misogynists*. 27<sup>th</sup> November 2022. pp. 1,2,16,17.

40) See, McAdam, Ezekiel. *Macbeth Is Now a Woman: Why Gender-Swapped Casting Needs to Happen More*. <http://www.themarysue.com>

41) Actresses have wanted to play Hamlet since the 18<sup>th</sup> cent. (Howard, Tony. [Women as Hamlet](#). CUP 2007. ISBN: 100521864666. University of Warwick, ISBN: 9780521117210. Nevertheless, the recent film with Sarah Bernhardt

## V. CONCLUSION

This paper has served to draw attention to, and explain the *raison d'être* for the ordination of priestesses and the reason why such a phenomenon should have come about despite there being no justification for, or condoning of the practice, in Holy Scripture (The Bible.) In general, but for Christians in particular, it is important to understand why it is that this heathen practice has been widely condoned or justified in societies that are mostly western European and American. It includes certain Churches that purport to be Christian in these regions. It is important because there is not, throughout the Old and New Testament, even the slightest reference or suggestion that the practice was ever condoned. Furthermore, there is no reference whatever made by Christ that there should be such a phenomenon in Christendom, let alone any suggestion that it be condoned. This paper has, on the other hand drawn attention to passages of Scripture, and to the teaching of Christ that render such a practice wholly inappropriate if his teaching and morality are to be adhered to. This paper has made the case that the so-called current rectitude of ordaining women to the priesthood has to be found elsewhere other than Holy Scripture.

Although there is no justification in Holy Scripture, or in anything revealed or taught by Christ, the paper makes the case that the justification and rectitude of the ordination of priestesses can clearly be seen to have origins in ideas spawned by Western philosophical thinking generally, but most particularly in the outworking and application of Hegel's concept of Thesis, Antithesis, and Synthesis. The paper shows that during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the adoption and application of the ideas of what is collectively known as the Frankfurt School of intellectual thinkers, many of whose ideas can also be traced back to Hegel, have also been instrumental, if not influential in moulding values and opinions that are favourably disposed to the ordination of priestesses. There are other important factors that have contributed to the contemporary Western World having converted from Christianity to Humanism. The concern of this paper is only with the humanistic philosophical ideas that have contributed to, or caused people to think and believe in the rectitude of women being ordained priestesses. In addition, the paper has shown how the redefinition of what is meant by *freedom* and *equality* from a Christian definition of those terms to a humanist definition has altered the act of ordaining women to the priesthood from being one of irregularity to one of normality.

---

acting Hamlet arguably is inspired by contemporary 'Masculinism' see above page 113 ff.

Finally, the paper in projecting forward the consequences of these changes, has drawn attention to what social, or what today would still be called unsocial degrading practices, behaviour that logically will become socially acceptable and right in the not too distant future. Fifty years ago, in the early post World War II era homosexuality was widely seen from a Christian perspective. It was considered wrong, because it served to undermine Almighty GOD's intentions for the due relationship between the sexes, and how this reflected the GOD/Man relationship. It was also wrong on account of what was a natural wholesome stable physical order of procreation. It was, and arguably is, an anathema and understood to be destructive and undermining of natural social cohesion. The paper has tried to demonstrate that there has been a shift in perceptions and of values, not just from a Christian perspective, but from the perspective of what is actually real and true. The new order founded on humanist philosophical values, has consequences that are unanticipated. It is irresponsible not to look at the logic of progression to discover what these consequences will be. The point that this paper is making is that this Post Christian cultural order must project forward to consider to what, or to where their values are logically and ultimately leading. The paper has drawn attention to where it believes the current humanistic order of values is leading, namely to the rectitude of bestiality, a system of Law that denies any parameters to measure rectitude owing to the rejection of the principle of Absolutes. There are consequences to the reversal of the prescribed relationship and roles traditionally associated and reserved to the respective sexes. The same is true of a world where the concept of authority not only has become anathema but, in reality, is largely absent. When a world order cannot continue to function in any meaningful sense of the word, because the concepts of hierarchy and authority are anathema, there will be a general descent into chaos and uncontrolled violence. Human as opposed to 'animal' civilisation will have ceased to exist. Of particular concern, will be the emergence on the one hand of an irresponsible, dangerous, difficult to control manhood, because of the physical strength of men; and on the other hand, there will also emerge an effeminate manhood incapable of exercising either responsible protection or authoritative headship. We are already seeing how these two traits in manhood are emerging. We have only to draw attention to the mass killings taking place in the United States, and to where men and women are being confined to live in close quarters which potentially, or actually are physically dangerous situations, whether it be aboard nuclear submarines or attached to fire brigade crews. Cross dressing on the part of women is so widespread, that it has become the norm. The practice is still in its infancy in respect of men but it is being widely encouraged in certain quarters, and once this practice becomes mainstream, it will have a significant impact on what one expects of manhood.

The Christian world order understands that the function of men is to provide for, and protect their women and children. The same is true of other social systems and cultures of the world that are founded on reality and have some understanding of how the real world actually is. In other words, the greatest protection women have from the predation and violence of men, (and to a somewhat less extent violent or predatory women,) are men. In the first instant, it is the duty of a father, a husband and brothers, but in a safe world for women at large, it is the duty of men in general to ensure women's safety and well-being. That is the order to which a sexually stable and safe society aspires.