

What drives this thinksheet is my rising conviction that "our time," especially in the American liberal Protestant circles, is notoriously dishonest to man (male).

1. HONEST TO GOD Bp. Jn. Robinson and I, in an auto trip to somewhere (I can't remember where), had a good-natured argument as to whether he should let his four children live in sin under his roof (as, at the time, all four were doing, with sexual partners to whom they were not married). Loree and I were against the notion on the ground of territoriality: Cuius regio, eius morales (which Latin translates, roughly, as whosever property, their morals). Bp.R. thought this "oldfashioned and oppressive"--at which I laughed. Under common-law marriage (the old-fashioned legal definition of living in sin, which is the old-fashioned Roman Catholic definition of the condition), balls (i.e., testosterone, which comes from balls) are dysfunctionally demoted, slipping the culture into distressing and depressing matriarchy. (Which reminds me of, in my father's court, an Indian American female murderer, whose case I'm not about to relate.)

2. The immediate occasion of this thinksheet is the threat (though it is I, not he, who sees it so) of a prominent American religion-author to write a book observing (if not decrying) the feminization (and consequent enervation) of the current liberal Protestant church. I, who have an excellent pastor daughter-in-law, am not about to come down on the side of opposing female ordination: I have been, and remain, solidly on the side of it, and soon am to participate in one more of the many female ordinations I have been privileged to participate in. But (if it were not so, this thinksheet would not have been written) I am disturbed at the thoughts of (a) a ball-less church or (b) a butch (i.e., masculinized-female) church.

3. Not just liberal Protestant: Having taught hundreds of storefront preachers, half of whom are female, I conclude the superior power of the female spiritual leaders among minorities (black and brown, i.e., Hispanic). Here, too, I am distressed, for I am persuaded of the old bromide: Get the young men, and you have everybody; get the women and you have the women and children.

4. Out of excessive guilt over how we've treated women during "civilization" (i.e., the past five millenia), we males are in danger of being dishonest to ourselves (as gentiles are vis-a-vis Jews and "the rich" are vis-a-vis "the poor" and, to generalize, the ins are vis-a-vis the outs). I'm sick up to here at "Hit me again!" hyper-guilt. This excessive breast-beating is a new form of oppression, injustice, violation of truth and honor. And it delays getting on with the (real) revolution, which is about becoming human together on this small planet. Biblically, the revolution is about glorifying the God who made us male and female "in His (sic) image" (bez almo, Gn.1.27; here note tension: biblical religion, proclaiming male and female equal before God, sees God the Initiator as male, as spermatozoa initiate action with ova).

5. Helping girls become women is a huge project: helping boys become men is, in our present cultural atmosphere, almost impossible--yet the most important prohuman sexual action today. In addition is the transcultural fact, rooted in biology (viz., that the male is a further development of the female embryo), that the male-as-male is more fragile (and, partly consequently, more swaggering) than the female. Today women are doing many wonderful things, none more wonderful than making a man out of a boy.