

THE SHAPE OF PRIESTS TO COME

**(An essay on the long-term policy of which the promotion of the priesting
of women in the Anglican Church forms a part)**

Geoffrey Dobbs, Ph.D., A.R.C.S.

Introduction

Perhaps the most difficult of all the instructions that Christians have received is that to love our enemies, and it is made almost impossible to carry out if love is confused with a cowardly or indulgent acquiescence in threats or in hateful acts, or if our enemies are not recognised or acknowledged as such because they masquerade as friends and allies.

There is all the difference in the world between the forgiveness of sinners and a sympathetic acquiescence in their sins, to which we are peculiarly prone when the sins in question are those to which we ourselves are especially tempted; but this is a difference which seems to be increasingly ignored by those who speak most loudly in the name of Christianity today. The forgiveness of sins at the least recognises that there is something to forgive, and if it is accepted it involves some repentance on the part of the sinner. Even if it is not, it is an act of love which gives him an opportunity for repentance; but if the sin is denied and the forgiveness withheld, then however 'kindly', 'sympathetically', 'caringly' or indulgently treated, the sinner is not helped, but thrust down further; and this is an act, not of love, but of enmity.

We know that the language of love can be far from compassionate: it can include "Get thee behind me Satan!" and "Generation of vipers!" as well as the use of a whip when the occasion demands; though it is also true that those who are always in a righteous rage of denunciation have a tendency to end as self-righteous hypocrites as bad as those whom they denounce. Pre-occupation with any particular evil tends to infect those who are preoccupied with the same evil, though in a form which they do not recognise. Salvation is a positive; there is no salvation in the mere rejection of evil; but, nevertheless, this is necessary if the potential for salvation is to be retained.

This preamble may seem irrelevant to an essay which rejects the ordination of women to the Anglican priesthood, for there is no salvation for the Anglican Communion in the rejection of 'women priests'; but there may be in the revival and rethinking of that positive faith which requires the rejection of 'women priests'. It is this, therefore, that I hope to stress in the ensuing pamphlet.

* * * * *

It is unlikely that I should have become so concerned with this matter had I not been, with my wife, on a fellowship in California, studying certain aspects of politics and economics, during just that period when the Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. was being torn apart by this issue. Later I visited friends in Canada who were deeply involved in it. What struck me at once was the familiar stench of politics about the whole business, and the all too recognisable use of the routine devices for

inducing a radical and undesired change by pre-empting and outwitting the politically unsophisticated rank and file of church people who had no desire for a change in the *status quo*.

What was and is particularly noticeable has been throughout the masterly technique whereby those who are determined to destroy an established tradition use political means to present themselves as the Establishment, the defenders of the *status quo*, thus publicly thrusting the onus and the blame for conflict and schism upon those who have merely not been moved. Moreover, with the main forces of patronage, finance and communication in the hands of the 'revolutionaries', it is always possible to overawe and persuade the majority of objectors that the issue is not worthy of the dreadful trauma of exile from their Church and familiar spiritual home, leaving only a relatively few heroic souls with the faith to stand firm and face the accusation of being extremists and bigots.

A failure to conform with the will of successful politicians is habitually referred to as 'reaction' or resistance to 'change' which, we are commonly told, is the real cause of conflict and violence. There are, of course, two sorts of 'change', and it is true that failure to adjust to one of them, namely natural change such as growth and maturation and ageing, is fruitful of disaster; but reaction against the other, destructive, sort of change — the kind which is imposed by violence, or by political intrigue and propaganda, and which violates the essential nature of the things changed, is not only the reverse of harmful or obstructive to progress, it is essential and vital for the survival of the *status quo* and its continuity, without which all further progress is impossible. The attempt to impose 'women priests' is a change of this destructive sort; it violates the nature of language, of the biological creation, and of the Apostolic and sacramental priesthood. It must be resisted not only in the name of the conservation of tradition, but in the name of progress and of the liberation of mankind, starting with that half of it which is the more fully human, and the more advanced towards that service which is freedom.

The Anglican priesthood needs no defence from me; there are so many others who are better qualified to do it, and have done so or are doing it. But if the pressure for this change is resisted only on this narrow front, it will be swamped and sidetracked, for the case for 'women priests' is not based upon considerations of the priesthood at all, but is an extension and application of a fashion of thought which has originated neither in the Church nor in the Christian religion, but in the secular world, dominated as it has been in recent years by various forms of humanism, money-worship, employmentism and dialectical materialism.

The Difference that is Life

It is remarkable how readily our existentialists and 'situational theologians' tend to ignore the actual, existent, situation, and substitute for it the current fashion of thought among intellectuals, or the mass-prejudices of the contemporary population, which are determined rather by those who control the media and by the expediencies of money and power than by any consideration of fact. The overwhelming fact about the religious world situation is that Christians have been in craven retreat for more than a generation before the advance of atheistic materialism, which now openly dominates more than half the world, and has reduced Christianity to a minor influence in the other half. In Britain the Churches have, in general, readily, and even passionately, co-operated with various sorts of atheists, agnostics and humanists in transforming the country from one which was united on a broad basis of Christian principles into a multiracial, multireligious, ambisexual, and increasingly collectivist mass of humanity, united only by common subjection to the same Government and linguistic and visual influences, and the same legal nationality.

To a very large extent the 'ethos' derived from Trinitarian Christianity, with its precise insight into the diversity as well as the unity of the ultimate reality and of His Creation, which therefore placed the particular and the individual above all groups and collectives while fully acknowledging our unity one with another, has given place to a vague, unbalanced religion of egalitarian 'social justice', which has substituted 'Community' for God, and values the gifts of 'Community': money, status, social and political power and influence, above the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

This has been achieved very largely by the corrupt and perverted use of language, in which the Church has collaborated with enthusiasm. Of this the term 'woman priest' is a minor, but typical example, implicitly contradictory and destructive of the accepted meaning of both words. A more basic, and satanic, example, is the deliberate, politically motivated inversion of the key word 'discrimination', which truly signifies that precise discernment of the nature of things, and especially of people, which is the essential property of love, and which summarizes, in one word, the chief aim of all education.

This verbal crime is now incorporated in our law, especially as applied to race and to sex, and is being used as a weapon to stir up hatred of all precision of thought, all discernment of excellence, of goodness, of understanding of the special and wonderful qualities and differences which are the peculiar glory of men and women of different sorts and races, which understanding necessarily offers the sole hope and basis for love and harmony between both races and sexes.

This inversion is leading also to an inversion of the meaning of the word 'love', from the love of *others*, that is, of that precious and unique character and personality which makes them themselves, and not a mere extension of ourselves, to a generalised 'love of humanity' because of its identity with ourselves. Along with this, within the churches, has gone a retreat from the Trinitarian Vision, with a trivializing of the trinity and an unbalanced stressing of the unity of the Godhead, thus limiting the Love of God to the apotheosis of Eternal Self-Love as the ultimate reality. And it would be blind indeed if one were not to perceive that this is running parallel and serving the purposes of those who are striving to establish the centralised domination of the world by one World Government, on the psychological basis of one World Religion of Universal Human Brotherhood.

It is, of course, true that a common ground of unity is an essential prerequisite for love, but it is not the substance of Love. If that were so, if the love between, say, black and white-skinned people were directed merely to their common humanity, then the difference between them must be a cause of offence between them — as indeed it becomes increasingly when unity is thrust upon them. Racial harmony can exist only in so far as it is the differences between the races which are appreciated and loved; and that requires exactly what is most vehemently denied: racial discrimination in the true sense of the word. The corresponding truth is even more obvious as between the sexes; for here the slogan: "Vive la différence!" is especially applicable, since the difference is that which brings life into the world. It is no accident that the World Unity Drive is associated with the trivialization of race, of creed, and of sex, and in the last instance, with the defence and promotion of divorce, of contraception, of abortion, and of homosexuality and all influences towards sterilization. It is quite logical and natural that, if it is the common identity — the sameness with self — that we love, then the sexual difference may become repulsive, and it is our own sexual properties which become attractive.

God the Mother?

In its end-term, this direction of love towards diversity-in-unity becomes the love of the individual creature, and above all, of the human creature — but by no means in the abstract, for we have to encounter him and know him in order to love him; hence the commandment to love, not humanity, but our neighbour (and even our enemies!). It will be noticed also that, in this sentence, I have made the customary use of the masculine pronoun to cover both sexes, because the language provides no alternative, except the insufferably clumsy repetition of 'he or she', 'him or her' on every occasion. The fact that 'she' and 'her' could not be used alone in the same way is surely a reflection of the biological

difference between the sexes and especially the deeper involvement of the female sex in the primary functions of reproduction and nurture. There is a similar limitation in referring to God, which has nothing whatever to do with any supposed sexual limitations of God, but everything to do with the sexual limitations of mankind. To refer to God as 'He or She' or 'Father/Mother' implies a sexuality which is not implied by 'He' alone, or the image of 'Father' which, despite its masculine associations, is the only possible way available for summoning the thought of a loving, parental person, without confusing the mind with the inescapable sexuality of motherhood, which is the first and deepest experience of every child born of woman. I find it quite impossible to suppose that when Jesus instructed us to speak and think of God in terms of a loving Father he was merely trimming his sails to the contemporary prejudice against women, rather than giving us a clear guidance as to the way in which our limited human minds and languages could approach nearest to a grasp of the Incomprehensible.

In contrast, we all begin our lives for the first nine months within our mother's womb, and after emerging through her vagina have a prolonged and intimate association with her body which, whether or not it includes suckling at her breasts, certainly and normally includes a great deal of expression of her mother-love in kissing, cuddling and intimate handling, as well as feeding and teaching in the first and most important steps in life. In other words, a woman is inescapably a sexual being to all of us in a way in which a father is not. Thus she is an inappropriate symbol or ikon of God, who is not subject to the limitations of sex, or of Christ, who, for similar reasons, could not possibly have been born of woman as another woman. This last would have amounted to a gross identification of the Godhead with female sexuality, and a reversion to an earlier worship of the Great White Goddess, — a symbol of Mother Earth, from whose womb we came and to which we shall return again.

Many proponents of the female priesthood have made it clear that they want to change this image of God into something bi-sexual or hermaphrodite; which seems to me to ignore the biological facts of life in a peculiarly sentimental and namby-pamby way. Let me review them bluntly. In the male the reproductive organs are small, mainly external, highly sensitive to external stimuli such as vision, but quite ephemeral in their use. In no normal family do the children have physical experience of the sexual organs of their father, so that they have no image of him as primarily a sexual being. Where this does happen the sin of incest is almost universally regarded as peculiarly repulsive and is also a breach of the criminal law.

It was Henry Drummond, in his long forgotten but once popular Lowell Lectures in 1897 on *The Ascent of Man*, who first pointed out that organic, physical evolution has its parallel not only in mental evolution

which was dependent on the development of the nervous system, but also in spiritual evolution towards that potentiality for the love of others which was also accompanied by physical features. It is among the last animal phyla to emerge, the Mammalia, that this tendency is most fully developed. Both the womb and the breasts are organs which have the function of giving, nourishing, caring, protecting the young life, and he was surely right when he said that mother love is the archetype of all human love.

Father love must have been a later development; but the female half of mankind is that which is in the forefront of spiritual evolution in the capacity to love and to know the nature of love which is also the essential character of God. Women are, in fact, the fullest expression of humanity. As G.K. Chesterton put it: "Men are men, but Man is a woman." As we know now, every cell in their bodies is equipped with an extra chromosome, a second X as compared with the male Y, which is largely a blank. Their function, in bearing, nourishing, caring for, protecting and surrounding the family with love, and in making the place they live into a home, is the *primary* work of mankind. The whole of the rest of the work, which is mainly done by men: everything from hunting, cultivating, making, distributing — the whole of the institutions of the State, of Law, of Defence, of Industry, of Society, are secondary and subsidiary. They serve to supply, and to protect and defend the home and the people in it. The purpose of production is consumption, otherwise it is a purposeless and witless activity.

This distinction of function is not the less true because it is not absolute. Many men are perfectly capable of household work such as cooking, sewing, or changing nappies, while women are to be found outside the home in nearly every trade, profession and occupation, demonstrating that if they choose to set their minds to it, they can compete with men in most of them. This flexibility and give and take between the main functions of the sexes is nothing but good, so long as that major difference is not forgotten, and, in particular, that the *primary* work of women in the home does not take second place to the *secondary* work outside the home; but this is exactly what is happening. The whole attitude of the feminist movement, which now permeates our society, implies that the direct service of people is something undignified and degrading as compared with the 'rat race' of paid employment by large institutions; that it is altogether more noble and satisfying to be one hired underling unit among many thousands, serving the purposes of some remote and ephemeral political boss, or some equally remote and probably unidentified board of directors, than to be a housewife, mistress in her own home, which to a large extent is her own creation, serving with love, in her own way and at her own will, those who are nearest and dearest to her.

A woman who devotes her life to domestic service is commonly described, in tones of pitying contempt, as a 'slavey', as compared with one who has attained the glory of being employed as hireling no. 7,356 in a mass of, say, 500 tons of collectivised 'labour', producing, possibly, a seductively coloured and packaged substitute for a cake which she could have made herself at home with far more satisfaction and quality. The difference, of course, is the money. At home, she works for love, and it is her husband who has to hire himself out so that he can bring home the money. But in our present society money is more important than love; for money represents power, and it is power which is the crux of the matter.

Power versus Love

It was Dr. Johnson who said: "Nature has given women so much power that the law has very wisely given them little." There is no such inequality of power as that of an adult woman over a baby or a small child. It approaches the absolute far nearer than that of the most autocratic patriarch or dictator, and every one of us begins life in helpless subjection to it. Power tends to corrupt, and it is only the greater power of maternal love which can overpower that tendency; but where it fails to do so, then the terrible truth in the tag: *corruptio optimi pessima* is made manifest.

As if the evil done by men, with their greater natural tendency to violence, and greater understanding also of it, were not enough, we now have added to it the even more appalling corruption of mother love, multiplied by the entry of the centralised mind-conditioning media into the home, carrying a continuous and repetitive indoctrination in the religion of political and financial status and power, the religion which dominates the collective world into which women are being persuaded, or forced, to 'liberate' themselves from the relative peace and sovereignty of the home.

I cannot understand how so many of those who urge the Church to adapt her beliefs and her practices to the times can ignore the disastrous consequences of exactly those beliefs and practices which dominate the times; or how anyone who wants to change the 'status' of women in the Church on a plea of 'equality' with man can turn a blind eye to the large extent to which this so-called 'liberation' has in fact meant an equality in co-slavery with men, if not a greater enslavement for the women. There are two great changes which, in this age, alter the situation of mankind in a fundamental way, as compared with earlier ages. The first is the vast acceleration in the growth of our cultural inheritance of technology, which has greatly reduced the necessity for routine human labour, until a

large proportion of the work now done by employed people is valueless, in human terms, or even negative in value, and is undertaken solely in order to obtain bank notes or bank accountancy. There is a bitter irony in the appearance at just this moment in history, of a feminist movement which decries the primacy and sovereignty of the home, and urges women to get out into the labour market and demand equal rights with men, equal freedom to waste their lives as the hired underlings of remote bosses, and equal compulsion to become unit members of unions which are wielded as clubs against the family and the home in order to inflate prices and reduce services.

Of course, those relatively few women who have chosen to devote their main energies to a career outside the home have usually shown more than average competence at it. In some occupations they obviously excel, in others their sex neither helps nor hinders them; only in a few, mainly those which require manual strength or general muscle-power, are they at a disadvantage, which in some cases reaches the point of total inappropriateness (e.g. docker, furniture remover, coal-face worker). But the main complaint of the feminist is about promotion to the higher ranks of the employment hierarchy. What they want is a fair crack at the boss-whip, equality with men in whatever has hitherto been the predominantly male field of power to add to the superiority of power which 'nature' has given them in the personal and biological field. This they would deny; but they do so by jeering at the powers peculiar to womanhood, and implying that it is 'muscle-power' (mental and physical) controller-manipulator-intimidator power, which is wholly superior and worthy of seeking by everyone.

The whole world is now rotten with the worship of political, financial and managerial power whereby the few manipulate the many. Against this, the last, indomitable barrier has been the decentralised power of love and the common, practical sense of the free, independent woman in the home, protected from the direct pressures of monopoly by her husband. He, increasingly, has had to pay the heavy price of enslavement to useless, witless, or injurious labour, imposed upon him by remote controllers. For the majority, not fortunate enough to have a satisfying or worthwhile job, the sole justification for this has been the supply and protection of the wife and children, and the sole satisfaction and comfort has been the loving strength and support of a woman who is enabled to bear her own proper burdens in her own way by the independence of her sphere of action provided by her husband.

Is it still broadly true that the feminine half of the human race is not ambitious or deeply interested in the wielding of collective power. They know they have something more important to do in the personal sphere, and this is our chief hope for the avoidance of the ultimate in despotism and oppression through the centralisation of power.

The Dialectics of Compassion

Dr. Una Kroll, leader of the Christian Parity Group, when interviewed on the B.B.C. programme 'Profile' on August 5 1978, was quite frank about her main objective in demanding the Anglican priesthood for women. Apparently she is already a mother, a doctor, and a deaconess, but when asked why she could not be satisfied, for instance, by becoming an ordained minister in some Church such as the Methodist, which welcomes women without conflict or the threat of schism, she made it clear that this would not satisfy her aims at all. It must be the priesthood, not just a ministry, because the priesthood is traditionally male. Women are not allowed in the power structure of the Anglican Church, and this must be changed. That was the principle of the thing.

This, of course, is not a Christian policy, but one based on dialectical Marxism, the belief that progress arises from the confrontation of opposites — the revolutionary principle which is more and more blatantly adopted by the more aggressive publicists in the churches. But in any case, I wonder how many of us would be able to respect and follow the spiritual leadership of people of either sex who took Holy Orders in order to get into the 'power structure' of the Church. Is that what Christianity is about: power? It is certainly what politics is about, which is the main reason why politicians are generally regarded with increasing contempt by the ordinary citizen who suffers from no itch for power.

As Dr. Johnson said: nature has already given women much power over men, and if they are now to share men's power equally with them in addition, then they become the dominant sex, as they have been at certain periods and places in the past. There is an argument that goes thus: men with their tendency to violence and domination have made such a mess of the world, it now needs the women, with their more gentle, humble and compassionate natures and their greater preoccupation with personal things, to put it right. But this is a dire fallacy. It is not the gentle and humble women that out-do the men in the power struggle, but those in whom the maternal instinct of care and compassion for the weak and helpless has been perverted into a monstrous force. The tigress and the she-bear are notoriously ruthless and ferocious in defence of their young, and so also can be the human mother. Every virtue has its corresponding weakness. Even in personal, sexual affairs, the vulnerable point in a good, chaste, Christian woman is the appeal to her compassion, as every seducer knows; and almost every romantic novelist! Transfer the seduction to politics, and all that it is necessary to do is to substitute some abstract, verbal category of the allegedly helpless and oppressed for the appeal of her children to her maternal instinct, and she will wade through blood in her deep, caring, compassionate zeal

to protect them. One may add that, with the increasing trivialization of the sex difference and open defence and even advocacy of homosexuality the feminized male is acquiring a similar attitude, and it is this horrible perversion of the emotion of compassion, and the instinct to protect the weak, which now dominates the world. Its exploitation is the routine stock-in-trade of the oppressor, and there is scarcely a deed of deliberate and sadistic cruelty which is not committed under cover of the alleged liberation or protection of the oppressed.

So far has this now gone that there is developing, first a lack of interest, and then even a hostility to anything excellent, superior, healthy or wholesome among some, particularly women, who have achieved the power or the domination they yearn for. Thank God, there are still many who care for our unfortunates, in whom the fount of charity runs undefiled; but there seem to be an increasing number of young people nowadays, who want to go into 'social work' in order to dominate the weak, sick, crippled, or mentally or morally deficient — as a status-holding profession. They would never want to do it unless it was *de haut en bas*! As for those particularly aggressive and bossy women who have achieved high rank and power in politics — many of them have been peculiarly ruthless in the infliction of vicious penalties, allegedly for the protection of the underdog and the promotion of 'social justice'.

It took a woman, Indira Gandhi, to institute compulsory sterilization of men — something which no male dictator has actually achieved, at least outside the concentration camps. In Britain, it was Barbara Castle who carried her passion for the sick to the point of mercilessly driving out of the hospitals those who had insured themselves at their own cost. Shirley Williams has proved to be the most ruthless of our educational dictators in her determination to enforce the destruction of good, grant-aided schools, and to herd all children except those of the rich, compulsorily, into the huge comprehensives — all, allegedly in the interests of 'fairness' to the 'underprivileged'. Incidentally, this accentuates the politically exploitable contrast between the 'superior' private sector, available only to the 'wealthy' (or the self-sacrificing) and the 'inferior' State mass-production system. Good, compassion-rousing stuff, leading on, quite clearly, to a campaign to abolish the 'superior' in the name of 'social justice'.

Other examples, not especially promoted by women, have been the virtual elimination of privately rented houses and apartments, driving the young and the impecunious either into debt for the first half of their lives, or into homelessness. All done in the name of protection for the tenant, and thus providing another useful political category of compassion-worthy homeless young a good deal worse off than anyone with a roof over his head. Another is the exploitation of the shocking

state of children's teeth, due to indulgence in a starchy and sugary diet and lack of oral hygiene, as an excuse for compulsorily dosing entire populations with fluoride. In this, the perverted maternal instinct is peculiarly prominent; but there is no end to examples of this horrid inversion, not only of mother love, but of the very core and centre of the Christian religion, love itself.

It is this corruption of love which has been the main weapon of the declared enemies of Christianity, and of the two related religions of Judaism and Islam, in the wounding and weakening of our faith in God and the strengthening of atheism and the dualistic religion of dialectical materialism; and because of their greater aptitude and involvement in personal love, it is women who, once perverted, become the most terrible tools of this policy, with its deification of human power. In this also the substitution of centralised organisation for the unity of the spirit (i.e. of fundamental long-term purpose) has played a major part. The formation, for instance, of the World Council of Churches has meant that the policy of all its members has had to be, at the least, compatible with the long-term political aims of the atheist controllers of the slave Churches of the Communist half of the world. Not only has the W.C.C. consistently given a nominally 'Christian' support and moral backing, as demonstrated by financial grants of vastly greater propagandist than material importance to the agents of Soviet expansion in Africa, but the assembled bishops of the Anglican Communion at Lambeth (on August 11 1978) refused by an 'overwhelming' majority to dissociate themselves from the grant given to the Marxist-trained terrorists. Moreover, this was immediately after the massacre of Christian missionaries in Rhodesia which was one minor item in their systematic campaign of intimidation openly declared as a means of preventing a peaceful internal settlement. Furthermore, the bishops renewed their support for the World Council which gave the grant.

What makes one almost sick about it is that this moral support for organised racial murder, mutilation and intimidation is excused on 'anti-racist' grounds, that is, on the skin-colour, and the skin-colour alone, of those who have hitherto governed the country in peace, prosperity and racial harmony before it was reduced to misery and chaos by the murderous hatred of the combined Marxist and Capitalist Powers, supported by the World Council of Churches. The criteria adopted were not those of Christ, but of contemporary media-controlled mass-prejudice and of 'numerical egalitarian democracy'; but the most distressing and pitiable thing about it was this grovelling alignment of our spiritual leaders with the monstrous power which has conquered half the World and is in process of conquering the other half. Evidently, they think it is already expedient to go along with it; but is it necessary to join in trampling on the last resistance that still has the courage to stand up against it?

Anti-Pater

One of the hate-words used by the enemies of a predominantly Christian and civilized rule in Southern Africa is the word 'paternalism'. The white men, with their enormous technological superiority, including guns against spears, conquered the black men in Rhodesia, as the black Matabele, with their better military organisation and weaponry, conquered the Shona tribes; but there the comparison ends, for what followed in the second case was a despotic tyranny, in the first a paternalistic rule, under which the governed achieved a peace and prosperity never before attained, and multiplied their numbers ten times. This 'paternalism' was the best and noblest aspect of colonial rule, and may be attributed, not to the skin-colour but to the Christian religion of the conquerors. It involved many lifetimes of service dedicated to the people of the country — in some cases, as we see recently, to the point of crippling or martyrdom, and it was linked with the Christian belief in the paternalism of Almighty God, and hence of the heavy responsibility which goes with the holding of a natural power over others, such as a father has over children. The atheists who believe in no such thing have turned 'paternalism' into a propagandist hate-word.

Now black Marxists have guns too, but they did not acquire them naturally, i.e. by inventing or even making them, nor did they even teach themselves how to use them, so that the use they make of them is the very reverse of 'paternal'. But it is not surprising that the Lambeth Conference, having supported the World Council of Churches in its strong preference for the murderous rather than the paternal use of power, should also have approved at the same Conference the attack on the paternalism of God implicit in the ordination of women.

We are also told that the Conference has averted schism and retained the unity of the Anglican Communion by refusing to allow its organisational power-structure to be broken by division on such matters which, by inference, must be regarded as of less grave importance than administrative and institutional and nominal unity — to be further strengthened by regular meetings of the Primates. It may be taken for granted, of course, that the *action* of the Conference in 'overwhelmingly' allying itself with the W.C.C., despite its support of the most violent factions seeking power over Rhodesians, was provided with some verbal contra-cover in the form of a reaffirmation of the Resolution against War and Violence. This is now the most elementary politics, but must we now regard it as the most elementary 'Christianity'? It must not be thought that any single bishop could be as devious and as lacking in integrity as the collective episcopal tonnage assembled at the Conference, for this is the nature of mankind in the aggregate. The crowd, even of bishops, has no mind, no morals, no soul, no responsibility, and it is committees that commit the most monstrous deeds in the name of goodness or of God; except, perhaps, on those rare occasions, when the Spirit of Truth, acting

through one or a very few people, may leaven the lump, as it did in the great Ecumenical Councils of the early Church. But first we need our Athanasius who, in this Age, will find himself even more '*contra mundum*' than in that, for never before can the Faith have faced so great a danger and a threat, both from within and without. For if, indeed, the assembled bishops are convinced that the Holy Spirit is acting through them in such a matter as the priesting of women, let them take their stand upon their Apostolic Authority as Fathers In God, and either declare the agreement of the episcopate of the whole Catholic Church, or have the courage to assert that the Holy Spirit has communicated this truth only through the Anglicans. Then at least, we lay people would know where we stand in either accepting or rejecting Authority, rather than accommodating ourselves to political manipulation.

The Assault on Women

Douglas Brown, writing in the *Church Times* (August 4 1978) reported that a 'woman priest' when asked to what she attributed the near-revolution in the status of women replied without hesitation: "Birth control". If this is so, or is even thought to be so by those who urge that the Church should alter its structure and doctrine to correspond with this changed 'status', it becomes very important to look closely at the precise nature of this change. First of all, contraception is no new thing; it has merely become more convenient and less uncertain and dangerous, though not without its uncertainties and dangers. It is said to have 'liberated' women, but from what? It seems that it is from the 'slavery' of the glorious purpose of their created nature to the 'freedom' to yield to the temptation to trivialize their sex which has hitherto been the 'unfair advantage' of the male.

Volumes of false and sentimental verbiage have been expended in trying to convince us that women are not fully human as God made them until they have been 'liberated' from the consequences of their sex. They have, it seems, no will of their own, but are helpless reproductive robots, bound to produce endlessly unwanted foetuses in response to the sex urge! Such twisted arguments never take any account of the facts: which are, that, while every form of contraception including 'the pill' has its innumerable 'failures', chastity, since the World began, has never produced one unwanted child. (I would define 'chastity' not merely as abstinence, but as the exercise of complete sexual love with full acceptance of its potential).

What has changed, then, in the 'status' of women due to easier contraception is not, at least on balance, a gain, but a loss of their 'seniority' in the field in which they carry both the heavier burden of responsibility and of power and restraint to bear it. Their morality is now reduced to that of the less responsible male — and not only in the field of

sex and reproduction. We now have women libertines who boast of the number of men they have 'had' — as if any pitiful little schoolgirl could not out-do the sexual prowess of a Don Juan. But we also have girl muggers, girl bullies, women baby batterers and husband beaters, even women rapists. Venereal disease is now spreading in our schools, and 'unwanted babies', the prevention of which was the great argument for universal contraception, are now providing a vast and ever-growing, pitiful stream of pre-natal victims to be sacrificed to the Moloch of State-approved abortion. And our girls and women, with their mighty potential for maternal love, are having it monstrously inverted into the evil thought: this child within my womb is a mere part of my body, with which I have the right to do as I will. I am its Goddess and Empress, with power of life and death over it, and at my word, it shall die! — the ultimate in Absolute Dictatorship, recently supported by the Law in a case which confirmed that even the father had no right of appeal against the death of his own offspring if the woman willed it.

Something like this was the imagined power of the Great Earth Mother and the goddesses of earlier pagan times, for whom women, as priestesses, were the appropriate symbols. It is true also that in the patriarchal stage that followed, men thought of their children as property and extensions of themselves, but this was because they were under the misconception that women were mere 'vessels' in which the 'seed' of the man grew. The gods of that time, including Jehovah, were indeed imagined as sexually male, wielding the powers of a despotic father, and only with Christianity have we escaped from *that* image of the paternity of God.

God was incarnate on earth to show us that this is NOT His nature or His relationship with us. We are His creatures, but not mere extensions of His Self. But as C.S. Lewis put it: God is 'masculine' to us all, in the sense that the male gives the seed of life, the female receives, and the analogy is just in our relation to the seed of Grace, as well as being demonstrated by the actual mystery of the Grace of the Holy Spirit which gave life in the Virgin's womb. I think that the Church has not done enough to explain the sense in which we ought to think of our Father without thinking of Him in a crude sexual sense as male. Jesus, in any case, was literally male, and the error, especially in the young or simple-minded, in thinking of Our Father in the traditional image is surely less tragic and disastrous than a reversion to a maternal image of inescapable sexuality.

I have asked a number of Christian women from different Churches whether they wanted, or approved of, the ordination of women to the Anglican priesthood, or to the ministry in those Free Churches which have admitted them. With one exception they said "No!", but when asked could not say why, except that: "I just feel it is all wrong!" Even in

the Free Churches I could find no enthusiasm for women clergy; and certainly their admission has not been accompanied by any great burst of faith and vitality, or reversal of the downward trend, such as has been suggested might result from an historic new step taken at the behest of the Holy Spirit. The one exception, who wanted to see Anglican women in the priesthood, also could not think of any reason except that as they are now admitted to all the other occupations and professions, why not? Nowhere could I find any reason, or any truly religious purpose, which would justify disrupting the Anglican Communion, alienating it from both Roman Catholic and Orthodox, and destroying its spiritual integrity.

Most mature women of Christian faith and normal, feminine self-respect and sensibility, know very well, without having even to think about it, that it would be highly improper and offensive to others for them to adopt the dress and role of the male priesthood, stemming as it does in unbroken succession from the Apostles and from Christ Himself. To bring about such an interruption, at the deadly cost mentioned above, requires either a calculated hostility to the Church such as that shown by a handful of under-cover Marxists who have been 'planted' in the Western Churches, only slightly less blatantly than they have been 'planted' in those of the East; or, at the very least, an aggressive, pushing, self-will, and a thick-skinned insensitivity, which are, indeed, the necessary properties of any persons determined to force their way into a 'power-structure', whether of a Church, a Party, or a Government.

It is, and always has been, obvious that many men and women in the Anglican Church cannot accept that a woman can be a priest and therefore cannot receive the Eucharist consecrated by her. Others may try, in obedience, to overcome their distaste, and will approach the sacrament struggling to lay aside their repugnance for its transvestite confusion and distraction from its true purpose. But at the best it will be 'spoilt' for them. I do not think that many people who are in a true state of repentance and awaiting the moment of grace will want to be distracted by a female form where a male one should be, or indeed, to be distracted at all by the physical person of the celebrant. For some of these, the sacrament will lose its meaning, while others will cease to receive it, from a woman.

This means that if, as our Lambeth Fathers desire, the Anglican Communion remains substantially in administrative unity, and the North American schism does not spread to the rest of it, no ordination will ever be able to make a woman into more than a second-class 'priest'. Unlike the ordained men, who will be priests to all Anglicans, the women will be 'priests' only to the successful progressive, egalitarian, pro-feminist Party; unless, indeed, women should become bishops, or those bishops who ordain women are felt by some to have thereby destroyed the validity of their own power to ordain in the Apostolic Succession. In

that case we shall have a class of male priests also who are accepted as such by only part of the Church. Such a disintegrity must surely lead to schism sooner or later. If not, it can only reduce the Church to a feeble non-entity, contributing nothing but further confusion to a confused world, crying out for a rock of faith to stand upon. In any case, the woman-priesters will have done a highly successful hatchet-job on the Anglican Church, worthy of quite a few Orders of Lenin for the promotion of Godlessness!

The Marxist Hatchet-Job

I am not suggesting that all or many of those who are campaigning for 'women priests' are Marxists atheists, consciously working to sabotage the Christian religion, but anyone who faces the political realities must realise that a few of them are, and it would not be difficult to name some of them. It is commonly considered uncharitable to doubt the 'sincerity' of one's opponents, but there is a confusion here between mere strong 'feelings' and integrity of action with belief. In fact these under-cover Marxists who have been allotted the task of sabotaging the Churches are acting with greater integrity in the practice of their religion of dialectical materialism than those Christians who allow their passionate feelings to adulterate their Christianity with a quite incompatible policy. I also have 'strong feelings' in this matter to match those of my opponents, which provide the driving force for action in writing this, but in neither case any assurance that what we are doing is right or is inspired by the Holy Spirit. If this is what is meant by 'sincerity', then 'sincerity' is not enough. The aggressive driver who cuts in in front of me, driving with twice my force and violence, and forcing me to give way to avoid disaster for both of us, is 'sincere' enough in his 'dedication' to getting where he wants as fast as possible, but lacks integrity in thrusting his responsibility for our joint safety upon me; and this is not a bad analogy for what the she-priesters have done with their pre-emptive ordinations, thrusting the onus of schism or submission to their will upon others.

As Bishop William Sheridan of North Indiana told the Lambeth Conference (*Church Times*, August 18 1978):

"The ordination of women had bitterly divided the American Church, and there was growing schism. There were many heartbreaking ruptures and rifts between many bishops and their parish priests. An unprecedented number of priests were relinquishing holy orders, a large number of lay people had fallen away, and there was spiritual antagonism between many priests and lay people. Relationships with the Roman Catholics, Orthodox and Old Catholics had been ruined as far as any hopes of union were concerned."

In America these consequence could scarcely not have been foreseen; at Lambeth they were known facts which were taken into account in the overwhelming decision to proceed, without even a pause, towards the ordination of women. They merely covered over the bitter agony and injury they knew they would be causing with verbal appeals for tolerance, for continued 'dialogue' on the subject, and for a magnanimous attempt by the revolutionaries, on achieving their aims, to make the 'traditional Christians', confronted with the agonizing choice whether to leave or to stay on in half-hearted misery and distaste, still feel they themselves a part of the fellowship — as if words and attitudes could heal such injury, like putting ointment on a bullet wound.

But the damage goes much deeper than this, to the very core of the Faith, for among the strongest campaigners for the disruptive change there is a conviction that the violence they are doing and the suffering they are causing are 'good' for us and for the Church. What we need is a shake-up and a bit of agony to wake us up, and they know best what is good for us. Behind this is a horrible inversion of belief about the Cross, which was expressed very clearly by Canon Burgess Carr, general secretary of the All-Africa Council of Churches, which I take from a Christian Aid document reporting a conference in Lusaka, and quoted by Amit Roy in the *Daily Telegraph* of August 25 1978:

"...we must give our unequivocal support to the liberation movements because they have helped the church to rediscover a new and radical appreciation of the Cross.

"In accepting the violence of the Cross, God, in Jesus Christ, sanctified violence into a redemptive instrument for bringing into being a full human being."

If this means anything at all, it can mean only that we ought to crucify Christ in the persons of His disciples, and even of his innocent 'little ones' who have been kidnapped and murdered and trained into atheism and violence by the 'liberation' movements. This doctrine is Satanic, both in profession and in its practice, where it 'justifies' the ultimate in abomination. It is also very ancient, returning us to a Gnostic or Manichaeian Dualism — the worship of the both good and evil Devil-God, and is wholly consistent with Marxist-Leninist dialectical dualism, and with the Gulag Archipelago as a 'redemptionist' institution. It is also linked with the sexual perversion known as sado-masochism, which is encouraged in all revolutionary movements, just as egalitarianism is linked with homosexuality, and it enlists Christians in the army of those who do evil that good may come, which is, indeed, the very nature of temptation.

Truly, it takes only an inversion of the meaning of words to make the difference between Heaven and Hell. We are redeemed by the Love which expressed itself in the Act of Incarnation, and only culminated in

the *endurance* of the suffering of the Cross; the Love which also rejected the sword of Peter, the Zealot anticolonialist rebellion, and the intervention of the Host of Heaven. If it was the violence of an unjust and cruel execution on the Cross which is 'sanctified' one may well ask on what grounds those who believe this and support 'Liberation movements' justify their hostility to what they denounce as oppressive colonialist regimes!

The Gadarene Tramlines

Religion is not a collection of do's and don'ts, whether static or flexibly adjusted to the times. It is that which determines the *direction* of one's life, its long-term objectives or policy. A Christian believes that the ultimate purpose of the Universe is that of its Creator, and is therefore beyond his vision or comprehension. Nevertheless, in the course of nearly 2000 years the *direction*, despite many turnings aside and back along false paths, has been found and followed again and again, until it can be recognised; as also can that of the alternative religion which worships human power in the place of God. It is in the light of these two incompatible policies that we must judge every path which we are urged to follow, especially when it presents a clear divergence from that hitherto followed, as does a reversion to a female priesthood, characteristic of much earlier pagan religions. What, then, is the general direction in which this path leads us? What is the broad policy of those who advocate out taking it?

The demand for an end to the 'exclusion' of women from the male priesthood is a vital, but minor item in the general magnification of the field of collective power hitherto dominated by men, and the diminishment of the field of the power of personal love hitherto dominated by women. This is implicit in the use of words such as 'exclusion', 'injustice' and 'liberation', and in the complaint about the 'unfair' exclusion of woman from 'the power-structure of the Anglican Church'. Since sexual 'discrimination' is now a legal offence, it is even possible that a failure to comply might have brought the Church into legal conflict with the State. This policy, however, did not originate with Christians or within the Church, but is an expression of atheistic humanism, which seeks to 'liberate' humanity, by human power and wisdom, from the 'slavery' of the Creator — or rather, as they imagine it, of a witless and purposeless process of automatic natural selection on which humanity, with its clever intelligence, can look down from a position of superiority, especially those cleverest of men who have power over all the others.

A false analogy is often drawn by the misuse of words between the 'liberation' of women from their created nature and potential into properly male 'employments' (notably the priesthood) and the liberation of slaves from legalized chattel slavery into proletarian employment.

This confusing of the reality of the creation with the tyranny of man is a characteristic ingredient of the argument for 'women priests'. Indeed, there would not be much left of the argument if it were conducted on theological and ecclesiastical grounds without recourse to this wholly political 'Women's Lib.' element. The most that has been said on those grounds, and quite untruly, is that there are "no theological objections"; but if the 'theology' behind it is brought out into the open, it is found to be quite unacceptable to Christians.

It is a very easy verbal and mental twist from the humanity of the Godhead to the Godhead of Humanity — all the more so if doctrine and dogma are used as words of contempt so that their precision is abandoned. The neuron-paths must be very similar, but even so, there are many intermediate steps, well wrapped up in theological and philosophical jargon. Once this inversion is understood, it becomes clear why the Humanist feels such rage and horror at the exclusion of any human unit, or category of such, from its place in the structure of collective human power, for this is blasphemy against their God — the Ultimate or Highest Reality of their imagined Universe.

It is to be noticed that women have not been admitted, even in principle, to the power-structure of the Church of England until the clergy themselves have been absorbed into the power-structure of the Worker-State by being classified as 'employed persons' by its bureaucracy. This they have been forced to accept under the overwhelming pressure of another power, which might be described as the Catholic or Universal Church of Humanism, namely Finance — a power which, like the Church itself, deals in faith, though they call it credit, and which embodies itself in a policy wholly at variance with that of Christianity, but which the Church has always feared to examine too closely since money-power is so formidable. But since it deals exclusively in ideal, equal and identical units, when brought to bear upon the manipulation of mankind it naturally tends also to egalitarian homogenization, as must, necessarily, the bureaucracy of a State which is controlled almost exclusively by financial or statistical considerations.

Whereas with God we are always stepping forward adventurously by faith into the unknown, if we make a God of human power the path we must tread is fixed and pre-determined — not so much a Gadarene slope as a set of Gadarene tram-lines! It leads, step by step, to the homogenization of class, creed, race, sex and all other group of individual characters until the world-mass of humanity is suitable for centralized manipulation. A syncretic World Religion is a necessary objective for effective World Government. Already we have 'Judaeo-Christianity', and the World Council of Churches, with its Marxist orientation, is an obvious base from which to work for this aim, while the 'Christian' advocacy of 'sanctified' violence is an undoubted means for increasing social and religious entropy.

Since it is the feminine half of mankind which has the greatest aptitude for personal love which is at the opposite pole to that of maximum collective entropy, it is they who are scheduled as the main victims of egalitarian homogenization. They are to be reduced from women, who are whole persons, to 'persons' who are less than whole persons, being women minus their womanhood. The resources of science have been used progressively to interfere with and abort their special bodily functions which provide an entry into life of new and diverse human beings, and which lead to the expression of their maternal love and the care and nurture of the family in the home. The resources of the State and its bureaucracy have similarly been directed towards the elimination of the family, including the family farm and the family business, and every small association of people in personal contact, with no acknowledgement from the churches that this is not a 'partisan' but a fundamentally religious issue.

Compulsory State education, with de-Christianized 'Religious Education' adapted to a political aim of a multiracial, multireligious society, has been followed by de-Christianized 'sex-education', arousing a premature, practical curiosity in coitus, which in turn has produced its consequences in increasing bastardy, venereal disease among children, one-parent 'families', premature marriages and marriage breakdowns, with concomitant exploitation of 'compassion' to demand contraceptive instruction and provision for children, easier abortion, and easier divorce, with a side-line in provision for battered babies and wives. The consequent trivialization of sex and reduction in respect for marriage is being ruthlessly used to undermine the freedom of women in the home, to drive them out into the market place, and to depict the service of people, as distinct from collectives, as some sort of servile drudgery. Moreover, to some extent this psychological assault is achieving its aim, by virtually abolishing domestic service — even the 'daily help' nowadays, so as to isolate the wife in the home from the companionship of another woman as well as the lightening of her labour where it may be an excessive burden.

The policy of Humanism is so clear, and the path so well trodden, it is amazing that so few can see it as a whole. Artificial insemination, as with cattle, can now separate the consequences from the act of love, as contraception does it in reverse. Third parties — the medical technicians — can now exercise the power of choice in mating, and if they so choose, multiply the offspring of any selected stud male in any number of selected wombs. Conception outside the woman has now been achieved and a child successfully brought to a Caesarian 'birth' after re-implantation in its mother's womb. In the case referred to the womb used was the true mother's womb, and the sperm was her husband's, and the whole procedure has been presented as an advance in the overcoming of infertility, giving the joy of parenthood to childless couples, as no doubt

it has in this case. But this success has greatly stimulated research in this general direction of the 'test-tube' baby, and such research, nowadays, is dependant upon financial support from the State, or from financial institutions. Its policy is to take away, progressively, from men and women their most intimate, ultimate and sacred power of procreation through love, leading to those expressions of love known as maternity and paternity, and to centralise them in the hands of the agents of State or other monopoly. There are still many 'difficulties to be overcome' before the complete laboratory baby can be produced, with its 'fascinating' possibilities in multi-racial experimentation, and even an ape-human cross; but the point is that there is already considerable human purpose and determination directed towards overcoming them. Perhaps the final development to be desired by the humanist is the successful 'cloning' of human beings, producing identical offspring from single cells without any admixture with another person — which would appear to be about the terminal limit in self-love. This is a long way off, but is already being sought; and if these future developments are derided as being 'science fiction' it should be remembered that 'science fiction', ninety-nine per cent. of which is inspired by a Humanist deification of mankind, is now massively forming the imagination of the younger generation, as it directed that of earlier generations towards the present 'achievements' of science.

The Church — Leader or Follower of the World?

The pitiful thing is that the Church, which claims to be the Body of Christ and the special vessel of the Holy Spirit of Truth and Life, and therefore ought to be leading and directing the spirit of man adventurously upwards towards the Kingdom of God, seems to be content to follow, in part with enthusiasm, the rest grudgingly and unwillingly, resisting, but with no alternative to offer, the lead given by those whose God is Human Power. Each step, such as that of ordaining women to the male priesthood, is feebly and ineffectively resisted as if it stood alone, and were not part of a long-term policy, so that, inevitably, it is outflanked even if the resistance stands for a time. Yet all the time, the Holy Spirit, through His inspiration of the scientific imagination, has liberated both men and women from a vast amount of unnecessary labour and subjection to the will of others, and opened up possibilities of physical, mental and spiritual choice beyond the dreams of our forefathers, or of our contemporary humanists who look down, rather than up, at that which brought them into being.

The spirit of egalitarian anti-racism and anti-sexism which now dominates our Society is no more than the opposite pole and mirror image of the racial and sexual prejudice against which it protests — a blatant example of the workings of dialectical confrontation. I can see nothing of the Holy Spirit in the current attitude of ill-tempered,

aggressive, whining complaint that "It isn't fair! He has more than me!" which masquerades as the spirit of 'social justice', or in the willingness to smash Society, the economy, the Church or any other institution in the name of equality. In the case of women's envy of men, there is a brief stage in the growth of children when the boys begin to get bigger and stronger and to exclude the girls from their rough games, and some of the girls resent this and complain about its 'unfairness' until, in a year or two, their own feminine powers begin to develop and their own wonderful world to expand before them. What is so unbalanced and insane about this is not that it should occur, but that, as in a recent case of a girl of twelve refused membership of a football team, the law should be invoked and award her money for 'injury to her feelings', thus encouraging the perpetuation into adult womanhood of this childish phase of immaturity, now so rampant in the 'Women's Lib.' movement.

Of course, every mature person of either sex has always known that there is a big overlap between the sexes, and that some women can, if they are so ill-mannered, put some men to shame by exhibiting greater strength, courage, or endurance at what are considered to be male pastimes or occupations; but the normal woman has more important things to do, and is also possessed of what is sometimes called feminine tact, which in fact is the reciprocal of what in the male is called chivalry towards the other sex — a quality particularly derided by the insensitive trivializers of sexuality, who delight in barging their way with the aid of police, law-courts, politics and publicity into male gatherings, clubs and other institutions, in pursuit of their perverted aim of power over other people.

The relatively few women who have been publicly pursuing the priestly path to power in the Anglican Church, irrespective of the consequences to that Church, have (with one or two notable exceptions) exhibited some of the properties of a rather sour-tempered female rhinoceros, which are, no doubt, the properties necessary for success in such a venture. In contrast, the much larger number of men, including most of the bishops, who are determined to impose this fate upon the Church, seem to be actuated rather by a misguided form of chivalry — a wish to be 'fair' and considerate towards the other sex. Whereas the twin evils of 'racism' and 'anti-racism' arise from the gross perversion of the natural preference for one's *own* race (without which no race could survive) the similar, parallel evils relating to sex arise from the gross perversion of the natural preference for the *other* sex (without which humanity itself could not survive). Perhaps the worst aspect of the exaggeration of these natural and essential preferences is that they stimulate, in reaction, the denial of their importance; which, because of their survival value, in turn leads to an even more violent counter-reaction. It is no accident that the current attempts to suppress, by law, 'discrimination' between races, and sexes, should be accompanied by

growing racial antipathies, and the encouragement of sexual perversions, especially homosexuality.

What a mean and petty 'ideal' is this of egalitarian 'social justice' in respect of pay, employment and 'status' on the ladder of power. There is, of course, some truth behind it, but it is grossly misapplied. Is it really 'justice' that we seek? If so, which of us shall be saved? And where is the place for grace in our social system? Since we were all created different and unique in our talents, our powers and potentials, and as we mature and develop them we become more different still, the 'ideal' of equality leads to a bitter hatred and envy of all differences, and especially of excellence, of merit and nobility, and, indeed, of life itself, and of love, which is denounced under its other name of 'discrimination'. To everything that pertains to our personalities, our work, our merit, our contribution to society, the application of 'equality' is a denial of our 'quality' and a monstrous injustice; but Christians, of all people, ought to realise that there is one respect in which we are, or should be, rightly treated as equal, since it has nothing to do with our personalities or our merits, and that is in our collective inheritance from the past. This includes such things as the right to a fair trial, and the cumulative justice of the Common Law, but also the vast inheritance of past invention in science and technology, as well as of language, literature and art.

All these are the pure gifts of the Holy Spirit through the inspiration of our predecessors. They can be transmitted to us from those who received the original gifts only through the labour and effort and initiative of contemporary workers and enterprisers, who are, indeed, entitled to their return; yet neither the worker nor the entrepreneur, as such, nor both together, can rightly claim that vast increment from past invention which enables a man to-day, with less labour, to produce a hundred times more than his grandfather. Even in farming, probably the hardest of all work, it is not the farmer who makes the crops grow. In all our wealth there is always an element of grace, of the free gift of God over and above any deserts we may think we have, and in the contemporary world this has become the major factor in the economy.

In the Christian support for our Welfare State, and the increasingly aggressive movements for 'liberation' and 'social justice' there seems to be a vague and distorted realisation of this fact — distorted because it follows, instead of leading, the policies derived from a worldly politics, which knows nothing of grace, and equates compassion with compulsion. When it comes to practice, why must Christians always follow the lead of other beliefs than their own? When a particular proposal comes up, the first consideration always seems to be to allot it its place in the political spectrum: is it conservative or traditionalist or reactionary, or liberal, or in accordance with the consensus of progressive thinking? — *not*, is it right or wrong as seen in the light of the Gospels and of the traditions of the Church?

Can any Christian suppose that the Kingdom of Heaven on earth could in any important respect resemble the world of contemporary politics and economics, or that our religion is limited to the choices offered by the contemporary world? Have we nothing better to offer than those? To be sure, a Christian ought to be far more conservative than the Conservative Party about those good traditions and institutions which ought to be conserved; far more liberal than the Liberals about those things in which freedom is essential; far more socialist than the Socialists about the defence of the poor and the helpless against injustice and oppression, and about equality, where equality is just and proper, i.e. where our qualities are not denied, because they are not involved in the receiving of that which is freely offered to all

Partisanship always involve a division of the truth, the whole of which is necessary for right action. Thus, for instance, it is obvious that all three party attitudes are essential, in their proper balance and relationship, for any correct approach to the problem of technological advance and employment, which clearly involves questions of common inheritance, of economic freedom and of equality. Christians who want to bring their religion into social affairs ought to be taking the lead in resolving, not in participating in, the current political and dialectical conflicts on these matters. They alone have been given the knowledge of that grace which alone could redeem the irredeemable debt into which our civilization is sinking.

Our Vital Inheritance

But there is a greater inheritance than that of technological invention of which many of us, and our children, are being deprived, and this is the greatest 'social injustice' of all, for it is from this that all the other 'goods' which we have so freely received and taken for granted, have been derived. I mean the Christian religion itself, which used to be, in some sort, the common inheritance of us all, if not always directly through our parents and the churches, at least indirectly by the general acceptance of its principles as the common background of our society. This gave us a common faith in the honesty and charity and good faith of the vast majority of our fellow-citizens which was the binding force which united us in relative peace and order; and still is, in so far it is still an inheritance from our Christian past, not yet entirely eroded by the progressive abandonment of the ideal of a Christian society for that of a multiracial, multireligious or irreligious society, bound together by universal compulsion rather than love. There are now many who call themselves Christians for whom socialism is a passionately held 'truth', while Christianity, and especially our inheritance of Christian belief from the past, is no more than a set of temporary opinions which it would be 'unfair' to teach in our schools as if they were 'true' as compared with other sets of opinions.

Outside the churches, the State is now depriving our children of their vital inheritance of Christian faith, which was the binding force of our society and of their family and working lives; and within the churches every foundation of our social faith is being attacked, including the divinity of Christ, and the Holy Trinity, upon which our Christian Constitution is founded. It is against this background that we must view the aggressive political campaign within the Anglican Communion for 'a fair share in the power structure' for women, at the price of destroying the vital inheritance from Christ Himself of a specifically male apostolate and priesthood as symbolizing the Fatherhood of God and the Sonship of Christ. With these essential images, goes also the integrity of that Sacrament which has united the Catholic Church through the centuries, and which, again, was a free gift of grace to us from its beginning, owing nothing to our wisdom, conscience or merit.

Disinheritance is of the essence of that mean, bitter spirit which now governs us, under which, it should be noted, free gifts to others are treated as offences which are punished with punitive taxation; and in this case of the priesthood, the intention is quite deliberate, as it will not do for these women to join the ministries of those Free Churches which will not be violated by their action. It is insisted that the tradition of the priesthood be destroyed, and hence the Church divided and either weakened by its division, or driven into schism. For this purpose the language also is to be further mangled by changing the meaning of the word 'priest', hitherto a male term, to incorporate the existing word 'priestess', which is rejected. And although the Holy Spirit is freely quoted as a powerful backer of the political campaign designed to obtain a numerical majority in the Synod, against whom, indeed, it would be a fearful thing to be opposed, it does not appear that the spirit which inspired it can be that of love and of truth.

Mere counter-politics will be worse than useless, for that involves an acceptance of the false values of the politicians, including the authority of the Synodical vote on such an issue. The spiritual division in the Anglican Church already exists at too deep a level to be covered over by administrative unity. It now goes far beyond 'churchmanship' into the fundamentals of the doctrine concerning God and Man, and has merely been brought to a head by the ordination of women. Yet in earlier ages it was the battering of the faith by heresies on all sides which moulded it into the balance of truth; and what is to be hoped from this present chaos is the emergence of a Church similarly clarified and re-established in its faith and policy, and thus able once again to lead the World confidently into new ground and ways of thinking and doing.

Christianity is the religion of the Incarnation of God through a woman, of Redemption and of the Trinity which comprises diversity in unity. It is therefore, above all, the religion which is expressed through

life more abundant, through expansion and exploration and growth, which is the sort of continuous change that enlarges and changes without altering the essential nature of the life.

After less than two thousand years only a handful of people have even begun to glimpse some of the glorious possibilities which lie before us if we continue true to this Faith and apply it in the World around us. In this sense Christianity is the most radical and adventurous of religions, and ought to be about its business as the husbandman of the Kingdom of God; but there is need for conservatism also, for there is another sort of change, represented by the invasion of an organism by an alien virus which destroys or mutilates the heritable characters and hence its future potential. And this is what is clearly happening with the virus of the dreary, deterministic religion of human power, which has now entered deeply into the Anglican Church, and most of the others as well.

Even so, there remains open the way of redemption, not by adapting the Faith to tolerate its disease, but by re-birth, and a new growth from the original living inspiration.

Printed for the
FELLOWSHIP OF CONCERNED ANGLICANS

The Reverend Dr. Lynn Millar
48 High Street,
Chislehurst,
Kent.

The Reverend Richard Salter,
S. John's Vicarage,
7 Monmouth Street
Watford WD1 1QW.

By
A.C.T. PRINTERS, CHISLEHURST, KENT.