

A NO! against the collapse
of the masculine-historical-transcendent
back into the feminine-natural (Mother Nature, Mother Earth)

ELLIOTT THINKSHEETS

309 L.Eliz.Dr., Craigville, MA 02636

Phone 508.775.8008

Noncommercial reproduction permitted

"Today, stronger almost than ever, the heathen spirit in modern guise is wrestling against Christian thought and life, and it almost seems as if the questions of the time should be gathered up in the question: 'Shall we remain Christians, or become heathen again?'" The old word "heathen" is your only clue that this is not a contemporary statement. Almost five generations ago, Gerhard Uhlhorn raised the question about the cultured Europeans of his time (p.479, ca.1865, the German 1st ed. of his THE CONFLICT OF CHRISTIANITY WITH HEATHENISM, Eng.tr. from 3rd ed. Scrib/79). The biblical bidimensional paradigm of God--nature was romantically-philosophically collapsing into the neopagan monodimensional divine-in-nature....This from the previous page: "In the history of the church the ancient Heathenism is ever rising from the depths of the natural man to do battle against the new life of Christianity."....His original subtitle: "Pictures from the Past as Illustrations for the Present."

PURPOSE of this Thinksheet: To put radical feminism in the churches in the wider picture of said collapse....VIEWPOINT of this Thinksheet: The church must cease to tolerate, learn to say NO! against, this collapse & its corollary radical feminism. (Today's Ann Landers has this "gem": "Most of the trouble we face comes from saying 'yes' too soon and 'no' too late.")



BARTHIAN PIG

1 The NO! of this cartoon is reminiscent of Karl Barth's deserved reputation as a nay-sayer of whatever he saw as challenging or corrupting the gospel of Jesus Christ. He was the chief framer of the Barmen Declaration (1934) against Nazism, & that same year came out with a pamphlet titled NO! (*Nein! Antwort an Emil Brunner*--resisting the latter's overuse of Roman Catholic "analogy" as compromising Barth's radical doctrine of revelation). As for Barmen, here are words reflecting it in the 28 Jan 94 statement of "Confessing Christ": "CONFESSING CHRIST affirms faithfulness to the one Word of the triune God, Jesus Christ, which we are to hear and which we have to trust in life and in death."....The pig? From Jas. C. Taylor's hilarious spoof, A NEW PORCINE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION (Abingdon/92).

2 Both Barth & Brunner said NEIN! to the collapse of transcendence into immanence & to the empirical-mystical substitution of subjectivity for the objective reality of God's revelation. Together these two heresies are sufficient to account for all the aberrations in radical feminism as proclaimed, according to Susan Cyre's report (PRESBYTERIAN LAYMAN, Jan./Feb./94), in the WCC Nov/93 feminist convocation on "Re-Imagining 1993." Eg:

"Conference participants worshiped the divine in each other by marking red dots on their foreheads to signify their divinity, and then bowing to each other in an act of reverence....singing songs to the goddess 'Sophia,' the source of their divinity, the creator god who dwells within them and unleashes within them their divine power."

3 For all human beings, the widest angle of vision is the world-story, which answers such questions as Why is there something instead of nothing? How did everything come to be? Is anybody in charge? Why am I here? How am I to live? Where am I going? Notice that a cosmogenetic story, such as the Big Bang, responds to only the second question.

Now, the biblical-canonical world-story is clearly something other than the one that emerged in the conference. It's dualistic: God, who wanted there to be "something instead of nothing," is "in charge" of what he predates, viz everything (except, of course, himself). The world or universe is his creation, "nature" in the limited sense (the unlimited sense of "nature" being all Reality, Nature)..... Contrast the conference's monism: "The monism I'm talking about assumes that god is so all-inclusive that she is involved in every cell of those who are thoughts in her mind and embodiments of her image. There is no duality between the source and her manifestations" (Va. Mollenkott). It's religiomoral: There's something wrong with us that we can't fix but God can. Before acting we're responsible: after, we're accountable for our action & for our responses (eg, repentance or stonewalling). Behavior has consequences in this life & the next. And it's triumphal: God suffers with humanity, supremely on the Cross, through which we shall come to resurrection joy & God's decisive victory over evil in creation renewed.

4 In the conference, any world-story would do--except the biblical! Consider, eg, two Sinics:... (1) Kwok Pui-Lan, "a World Council of Churches leader" (!): The Chinese reject the Christian belief in the depravity of all human beings who can only be reconciled with God through the death and sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Confucius "emphasized the propensities in human nature for good rather than evil.... We Chinese believe there is a genuine possibility for human beings to achieve moral perfection and sainthood." "We cannot have one savior... like the Big Mac... prepackaged and shipped all over the world. It won't do. It's imperialistic." Her 722 gods are better than 3 (the Trinity), which are better than one, which is "more oppressive.".... (2) Chung Hyun Kyung used the gnostic gospels to support her feminist-subjectivist-mystical view of salvation: "if you bring out what is within you, what is within you will save you. But if you cannot bring out what is within you, what is within you will destroy you."

5 If the nature of nature is that nature is all, then the religious version of I'm OK/you're OK is I'm holy/you're holy: there's no other possible locus of **holiness** than "nature," including us. Ergo, nature is sacred, humanity is holy. Contrast the biblical world-story: God say not I'm holy/you're holy but (Lev.19.2) "You shall be holy, for I the LORD your God am holy" (so 20.7; 21.8: "I who sanctify you, am holy"). Holiness is a commission, not a possession. And it is an association: God's presence makes the ground Moses is standing on holy (Ex.3.5), & the spouse of a holy one is holy (1Cor.7.14).

Now program this into your theological computer: "Everything that lives is holy" (V.M.). You can draw the inferences. One is that "the one divine presence would be recognized in everybody and by everybody" (V.A., *in loc.*).. Another is that the Christian gospel of redemption *into* holiness violates the law of parsimony, minimum hypothesis: who needs the Cross, the atonement? By this one false premise-assumption, the Christian religion disappears! What causes the Faith to disappear is the Faith's ultimate enemy. Yet some, apparently including the WCC hierarchy, are afflicted with *die Unabhängigkeit des NEIN!* (the inability to say NO!). "Enemies of the cross of Christ" (Phil.3.18) should be named & confronted. But the mainline churches have left theological confrontation to fundamentalists & (ironically) to militant secularists.... A third inference is that "sexuality and spirituality have come together" (lesbian Jane Spahr; NCC's Francis Wood: "the sacrality of sexual expression"; RC lesbian Mary Hunt: "our bodies are holy"): the reach of spirit has collapsed into the flow of flesh.... And a fourth: Replacing the Christian eucharist was a "milk and honey" ritual, which included this litany: "Our maker Sophia, we are women in your image, with the hot blood of our wombs to give form to new life... with nectar between our thighs we invite a lover... with our warm body fluids we remind the world of its pleasures and sensations... with the honey of wisdom in our mouths we prophecy a full humanity to all the peoples."

6 I began this Thinksheet with a brief commentary on an earlier irruption of the essential **paganism** I've been describing. Let's now take a look at a Christian (ordained as a "reader") who at age 20 went pagan &, when he became the sole Roman emperor, tried to revive-restore-renew (mainly by Christian ethical & organizational admixtures) the old Hellenistic (esp. Hellenic) world-story (& thus religion & life). Julian the Apostate (emperor only 18 mos., AD/CE 361-3), a closet pagan (as are many now in the mainline churches) for a decade, was six when his uncle Constantine the Great died & only 32 when he died in battle against the Persians. To stay alive during the murderous "Christian" struggle after his uncle's death (the mayhem that, together with his pagan studies during exile, turned him against Christianity), he developed a survival mentality that evolved into his pagan-revival mentality. While "the positive side of his plan" was "the restoration and reformation of heathenism," "the negative side was the suppression and final extinction of Christianity" (pp.47 & 50, Philip Schaff, HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH [Scrib/1884-9], III.39-59,75-81; 75: "Julian had no sense for the fundamental ideas of sin and redemption or the cardinal virtues of humility and love. He stood entirely in the sphere of naturalism," & exhibited "the bitter hatred of an apostate"). He worshiped solar energy, his Neoplatonism being much like today's New Age, with which the women's conference reeked.