

Helen M. Alvaré,
Professor of Law, George Mason University
Arlington VA (USA)

It is an honor and a genuine challenge to be asked to present on the evolution of the image of the women, in light of the role of “entrustment” proposed in *Mulieris Dignitatem*’s as women’s essential vocation.

Even broaching the subject causes to flash before my eyes a panoply of scholars and authors, saints and activists, women and men... all of whom have addressed questions about the dignity and vocations of women, both currently and historically. Much has been said already.

So what can I offer you considering especially the “dangers” of reductionism, subjectivism, and stereotype ... the dangers of slighting historical periods or regions of the globe... all of which are inherent in any attempt to speak about women’s nature or roles? Not to mention the explicit rejection, post-Simone de Beauvoir and others, of the very *notion* that there is such a thing as “essence” or “nature” or “roles” or “vocation” where women are concerned... all such conclusions being claimed to flow from patriarchal control not only of society, but of all relevant academic disciplines.

With humility then, and in the brief time we have together, I offer the following:

First, I will speak of the major categories in which women have been “classified” “defined,” or “imaged,” particularly as distinguished from men, throughout most of recorded history (thanks to the marvelous philosophical and theological works of Sister Prudence Allen, Edith Stein, Michele Schumacher and others.)

Second, to identify and then *contrast* the way that feminisms -- especially of the later 20th and early 21st centuries -- “received,” and “interpreted” these classifications, with the way that *Mulieris Dignitatem* and some other works of the Church did so. Here I will highlight *Mulieris Dignitatem*’s teaching about the feminine vocation to “entrustment.”

Third, I will conclude with observations about re-proposing the framework and the innovations of *Mulieris Dignitatem* amidst our current situation and the signs of our times.

First then, regarding the major categories used to “classify” “define” or “image,” women, particularly as distinguished from men, throughout most of recorded history:

It is true that there are persistent images of women offered by the leading philosophers, theologians, satirists and saints throughout history. Not surprisingly, these images are often structured in the form of comparisons or contrasts between men and women. Here they are. Women are “first” (on the left side), followed by men.

Body/mind

Body/rational faculties

Matter/spirit

Domestic or private sphere/public sphere

Practical/intellectual

Intuitive/rational

Concrete/abstract

Detail-oriented/big-picture

Local/national

Linear-thinking/complex and wide-ranging thinking

Follower/leader

Passive/active

Dependent/independent

Receiver/giver

Invisible influencer/visible influencer

Gentle/rough

Weak/strong

Nonviolent/violent

Calming/provoking

Virtue/vice

Vice/virtue

Tempter/tempted

Tempted/tempter

Innocent/worldly

Relational/individualistic

Communitarian/individualistic

Collaborative/hierarchical

Scattered/focused

I am fairly sure you could add to the list if we reflected together on this for 10 more minutes. Now you can see from these categories, that it is only respecting a very *few* of them – perhaps violent/nonviolent, virtue/vice, tempter/tempted (the latter two which seem to switch places over time)-- that one might conclude axiomatically that women have been assigned the lesser place. And there are more than a few of these dichotomies, which --particularly with our modern sensibilities --would lead us to understand the woman to hold the *higher* place: maybe those characterizing her as intuitive, calming, innocent, relationally oriented, and collaborative. Some feminist authors and activists share the responsibility for gaining respect for these qualities.

Many of the dichotomies, however, do not immediately open the door to any judgment respecting superiority or inferiority except within particular historical or cultural frameworks, or following the acceptance of certain *a priori*s about what is good or useful. These might include the dichotomies: body/mind, private/ public, follower/leader, receiver/giver, and a few others.

We don't know if these judgments will persist. It depends in part upon what caused them, and how societies unfold in the future. Might such rankings disappear when the world no longer needs physical strength for as many crucial tasks? Or will they persist in a world which accords outsize value to power, material wealth, fame, and technological advances, or in societies determined to hold to earlier customs? Will the sex links reverse or perhaps alter in some cases as women perform nearly all functions previously associated with men? Whatever the future holds, however, I think, we can still say at this moment, that respecting almost *all* these dichotomies, perhaps *especially* in the West and in the North of this world -- though increasingly globally -- so-called feminine traits are still considered inferior – less useful, less intrinsically meritorious, less “appealing” – than those possessed by men. I think we can also say that in many places around the world, and on the bases of these dichotomies and rankings, women will continue to be excluded from education, and from roles in leading social institutions, and that their permitted fields of action will continue to be cabined. No matter what women may:

- Feel vocationally called to;
- Have a natural aptitude for;
- Or what they may *need* to access, in order to earn a living or help another.

Both later 20th century feminism and *Mulieris Dignitatem* refused to accept these historically-received dichotomies on their face, with their “greater and lesser” rankings. One might think that this would endear *Mulieris Dignitatem* to a wide swath of feminists, but it did not. For by the time it appeared, while later 20th century feminism had taken a

variety of approaches to smashing the old dichotomies, the majority of its leading forms expressed hostility, or at best *indifference* toward any reflection on women which linked women and care for the human person in any special way. Consequently, no matter that *Mulieris Dignitatem* insisted upon women's equality with men, and affirmed a "feminine genius," its conclusions involving the "entrustment" of human beings to women were not embraced by the feminist establishment in privileged countries, or at international institutions with influence in less privileged countries.

It was surely to be expected that some feminisms could not resist extreme forms of reaction against these historical dichotomies... reactions born in some cases of righteous anger, and ready to destroy *whatever* existed previously and was "man-made." Some were even ready to destroy the most "telling" evidence of sexual difference - women's maternal capacities - a move which led, ultimately, to an attempt to silence religion, or at least convince women that the Christian God and his celebrated Mother, Mary, could not be friends to women. We saw such a backlash in the second half of the 20th century. I will first describe these reactions, and then turn to the innovative and unexpected response offered by *Mulieris Dignitatem*.

So here is my extraordinarily brief treatment of an *extensive* secular feminist reaction to prior images of women:

-First: Some feminists opted to recommend women's "putting on" any identified male traits she did not already possess. In some cases this was accompanied by the assertion that there *were no* essential differences between male and female, no matter any empirical or experiential data. All differences were rather products of social construction. In this view, complementarity is also a fiction, as is any kind of male/female interdependence, as it was projected that men lived really "independent" of women.

In some cases this was accompanied by advice to reject maternal roles in particular, as the surest path to *avoiding a* patriarchally-determined female role. In other cases, there was simply little attention paid to the matter of motherhood, but attention lavished rather upon a valorization of the workplace -- especially workplaces men had disproportionately populated-- and places of worldly power - business, politics, academics, media, etc. On the other hand, the kind of work that women had disproportionately assumed - teaching, nursing, social work, *etc.*-- was overtly or subtly disparaged by comparison with typically male work. In these narratives, women's work at home was valued for the most part because it highlighted her capacity to *do it all...e.g.* to do what men had traditionally done *while*

also doing what women had traditionally done...the *sum total of which* painted a picture of female superiority. Some feminists combined any concession to women's continuing to perform domestic work with a demand that men share *perfectly equally* in domestic and childcare labors. This remains a touchstone of current secular feminism.

Another feminist reaction valorized identified *female* traits as superior to male traits. There were women who took this second path to reaffirming women's undisputed suitedness for motherhood *beyond and unmixed with all* other tasks any woman could undertake. Sometimes they went further, and advised men to adopt identified female traits in order to be more virtuous. This was not a prominent reaction, and in some cases it was "over the top," - toward creating a situation in which children's real needs were obscured in favor of demonstrations of maternal accomplishments.

There was probably a somewhat more prominent response to the valorization of feminine traits, however: the notion that the superiority of the "feminine" could potentially "save" heretofore male-dominated institutions from the error of their ways as the influx of women would change their ethics and results. In my humble opinion, institutions formerly devoid of women have not really changed their ethics or results over the past several decades now that women are present there. A bit more on this later.

It should be observed in summary fashion that in the case of *both* leading variations on secular feminism, the path chosen was conflict, not collaboration, with men. It should also be observed that especially privileged men, speaking often from important public platforms, affirmed and encouraged one or more of these variations.

Now I will ask: what were some of the practical fruits of the secular feminist reaction to images of women?

A common response was the opening of various opportunities and institutions to women: Education at every level; citizenship in the form of voting and female politicians, employment of almost every kind... all of which gained acceptance in many nations, though not all. A variety of reasons account for much of the lack of reception of these ideas, among them cultural, economic, political, practical and religious reasons. It's also possible that reception of the better proposals of secular feminism was hindered, too, by cultures' and nations' fear of importing alongside these, what came *next* under the banner of feminism - more controversial proposals, still robustly disputed even in the countries legally enshrining them. By these I mean proposals to divorce sex, marriage, childbearing and family life, all in the name of women's freedom. The groups promoting this made them the *centerpieces* of efforts "for women," and devoted disproportionate resources and public attention to them. Efforts to achieve this next

set of goals as a matter of women's rights are very apparent at the United Nations, with the result that more privileged and sometimes less religiously self-identified nations seek to impose these ideals upon *less* privileged and/or more overtly religious nations via regional bodies and "customary international law."

This controversial set of goals proceeds under various banners or themes: for example "rendering women's bodies like men's" or "giving a woman control over her own body or her fate," or "voluntary" or "safe" motherhood. The bottom line was this: separating sex from procreation in women as it was separated in men - most particularly via contraception, abortion and so-called "reproductive-health" education without parental involvement. A second theme emerged over time alongside this first: sexual expressionism. That is: the celebration of any consensual sexual expression as happiness-creating, and even identity-forming ... as this was presumably men's experience of sexual expression. Contraception and abortion were deemed necessary for this goal, because the threat of procreation and childrearing itself, and perhaps even marriage, robbed sex of its potential for freedom, for joy and for *self*-expression. Claims for the "goods" of choosing prostitution or appearing in pornography, for sex-change surgery, for normalizing cohabitation and same-sex "marriages," *all* flow today from this goal.

Eventually, these "equality" or "privacy" or "nondiscrimination" rights respecting sex, were accorded the status of legally recognized *human* or *civil* rights for women ... rights which could not only command recognition from fellow citizens, but which, it was argued, the state should fund, including by coercing religious citizens and institutions' cooperation in some cases, as we are now experiencing in the United States.

By this logic did religion become the enemy of women. In the U.S. and at the U.N., in fact, authorities sometimes say that religion is "waging a war on women," because the philosophy of sexual expressionism - sex as a good in its own right, utterly disconnected from relationship not *only* with the child, but increasingly with the man - is contradicted by several leading religions, including ours. Any religion which speaks of *given* human nature, or *differences* between the sexes, of women "*receiving*" gifts from the hand of God or from men, of insisting that while biology is not destiny, neither is it infinitely manipulable, ... any religion which reveres a woman as the **Mother** of God (all the worse because she is a mother *instead of* God), the Mother of us all, the Mother of the Church, is problematic from this viewpoint.

But secular feminists were not the only group reacting to earlier depictions of women. Bravely -- to say the least -- and based upon decades of reflection *with* and *about* women and men,

John Paul II offered an extended meditation on women in *Mulieris Dignitatem*. How did it interact with earlier characterizations of women? This is hard to answer simply. Perhaps I could say that due to the sources it consulted, particularly Revelation, but also *due to the hierarchy of values it pronounced, it “transcended” preexisting dichotomies*. It succeeded in identifying the dignity and equality and special gifts of women *without harming* men or children. This was new. Previous advances for women were often purchased at the *expense* of, or by *ignoring*, others’ well-being. *Mulieris Dignitatem’s* “relational” framework, however, avoided this by characterizing each person’s identity and capacities as *gifts to be given to others* (as each person had *first* been gratuitously gifted by God). Here are some leading ways in which *Mulieris Dignitatem* accomplished what it did:

First and most significantly, *Mulieris Dignitatem* (and of course the Theology of the Body series), innovated our understanding of the meaning of being created in the “image and likeness” of God in two ways. Previously, human beings’ free will and capacity for rational reflection were the nearly-exclusively-celebrated aspects of our “imaging God.” This state of affairs advantaged men, given that the field of opportunity for men publicly to exercise these faculties was vastly greater than the field open to women, by law and cultural practice. But *Mulieris Dignitatem* and the Theology of the Body highlighted that human beings image God importantly in their being made in and for relationship... in relationship in the sense that women and man *together* image God, not one to the exclusion of or without the other. In *Genesis* we find the observation that before the creation of the woman, the man’s solitude was “not good.” (*Gen* 2:18). In both the Old and New Testaments, God is described with both paternal and maternal traits. Theologian Margaret McCarthy has a wonderful analysis of this relational aspect of *imago Dei*; she analogizes the relationship between men and women to that between Jesus and his Father, about which it is said that Jesus did “not deem equality with the Father something to be grasped”. (*Phil* 2:6) How could this be? Just as how could it be that women are equal to men “without grasping”? She interprets this to indicate that the question of men’s and women’s equality *must also be answered in a relational context*. To wit: the Father is a father by virtue of having a son and the Son a son by virtue of having a father. Applying this analysis to men and women: each is the only one fit to be of mutual help to the other in the ontological and other senses. Each is the only one who can make the other a parent with the “help of the Lord.” (*Gen* 4:1). Each needs the other to understand more about who God is.

Once this human imaging of the Trinitarian God as *relational* is brought to the fore, then not only are men and women essential partners in imaging God, but also the woman’s capacity to bear new

life, *and* her special gift of attention to other human persons can be identified and valorized. The old dichotomies' instinct to *rank* traits is transcended, in favor of seeing them in *light of* one another, and as interacting in the manner of mutual gifts.

Closely related to this first accomplishment is a second: while *Mulieris Dignitatem* eschews rankings of various gifts or traits, it easily affirms the existence of differences between men and women. This transcends the inclination of history to *rank*, and of secular feminisms to *avoid acknowledging differences* because of the belief that they inevitably lead to rankings. *Mulieris Dignitatem* accomplishes this by framing any differences as gifts received, in order to be given... by men and women to one another, and to all whom they encounter.

Third, *Mulieris Dignitatem* boldly asserts that love is the meaning of life and that women are first or "prior" in the "order of love," the first to be "entrusted" with new life (§§29-30), to acknowledge the presence of, to nourish, and to nurture, life. It bases its conclusions not only upon the fact of women's fertility, but also upon women's demonstrated gifts for acknowledging persons. This last is a source of real knowledge, alongside Revelation and the structures of our created bodies. This recognition of the woman's gift for loving other persons means, John Paul II claims, that the woman in a sense teaches the man his fatherhood. (§ 18). Teaches -- not to lord it *over* him, but to *enable* him to give the gifts men give to their wives and to children and to the world. This feature of *Mulieris Dignitatem* - its claim that women are gifted with a capacity for the person, and its simultaneous insistence that loving service is the meaning of life, "upends" the entire historical inclination to account feminine traits as lesser, both because they are feminine, and because the ranking assumes that worldly goods and power are the measure of success, rather than the capacity to love well.

Fourth, *Mulieris Dignitatem* "redeems" the body while not exalting it as higher than the spirit or the soul. Previously, because of the body's mortality, and its other limitations and failings, women's association with bringing forth new life, and caring for persons, were accounted against them. And from this flow what we see still see today: women's bodies treated as "things," as "property." Thus prostitution, thus violence against women, thus pornography, thus trafficking, thus demands in so many cases that women submit to uncommitted sex or cohabitation as the price of a "relationship" with a man. But *Mulieris Dignitatem* brings the body into the economy of salvation, teaching that it images a God-in-relationship, ... that it points toward the good of the male-female union, points *also* toward the social context of every human life, and shares in God's procreative

activity. So *Mulieris Dignitatem* does not agree or disagree with the old characterizations of women's association with the body; it rather *re-interprets* the meaning of *all* human bodies, and therefore women's and men's experiences of them, and their interactions with one another and with the rest of the human family.

Fifth, *Mulieris Dignitatem* identifies men's tendency to dominate women as men's original sin in relation to women, versus what many had *believed* that the Church taught: that male domination was the natural order. John Paul II has even asserted that because the world valorizes domination, men's original sin is rendered harder to overcome than women's (which is possessiveness of those given to them; and the willingness to try to establish a relationship with a man on a basis *less than* equality and mutual gift); women's sinful inclinations are *not* similarly valorized in the world. *Mulieris Dignitatem's* meditations on original sin have the effect of a tunnel dug underneath the entire edifice composed of the historical rankings of claimed differences between men and women. They indicate that such a building should never have been constructed in the first place and suggest an alternative blueprint (plan) for constructing a good building: acknowledging sexual differences, yes,... but for the purposes of mutual gift-giving between men and women, and between each of them and their "neighbors" in the world, both in thanksgiving for the gifts given each by Christ, and in reverence to Him. And likewise acknowledging that original sin colors male-female relations in this world.

CONCLUSION:

So I hope I have established that some very powerful images of women's roles or traits have persisted in history, some to the present day. I have also stated that these were "received" quite differently by John Paul II, and by various feminist thinkers operating outside a Christian framework. I would now like to conclude with a few thoughts about where one might go from here on the matter of women's "roles," in light of the signs of our times. Obviously, this is a *huge* topic to which I can bring only preliminary reflections for your further consideration.

I will make seven points:

First, I think the word "roles" may be irreversibly tainted in the modern world. Pope Benedict XVI has suggested elsewhere that this might be the case. It may be wiser then to speak about women's *gifts* or *capacities* or *fruitful fields of action*; all in relation not only to her own happiness and freedom, but always *also* in relation to her God-given

vocation and to the happiness and freedom of all those who might benefit from her gifts, both in the family, and in the larger society.

Second: future reflections about women gifts need to be framed far more often in the context of the *gifts that men and women bring to one another*. Thanks in particular to John Paul II and to Benedict XVI, and to lay and religious women and men writing about the gifts of women over the last 40 years, there is a burgeoning literature on women. But the world is changing for men, revealing some new difficulties not only in labor markets, but in “marriage markets” if you will. One would not wish to see a movement concerning men which repeated a leading failure of some feminisms – *e.g.* failing to think of men and women as *necessary collaborators versus combatants*.

In this same vein, society has paid *some* but too little *expert* attention to the workings of complementarity between men and women in the context of marriage and parenting. Insights from Revelation could significantly illuminate such research. But *still* almost *nothing* is done on the question of what complementarity means in every *other* arena in which men and women are regularly operating together today. Demands to welcome more women into various spheres are weaker than they would be if we better knew what women and men *together* could accomplish. As I noted earlier, there was early speculation that feminine traits would leaven a wide array of arenas newly open to women, yet there is pitifully little exploration of this topic, still. A further exploration of this subject might reveal, for example, that women’s gifts and experience *do* and could *further* significantly assist the *Church and the world* respecting health care, education, pro-life, charitable services, anti-war and anti-capital punishment movements, and perhaps *especially* today in services to the elderly and in addressing global migration and trafficking problems, considering women’s capacity to enter into the sufferings and needs of some of our currently most defenseless global populations.

Third: the secular feminist response to women’s historical inequality is hurting poor and vulnerable minority populations and children the *most*; this needs to be shouted from the housetops. Rejecting stable relationships with men, rejecting marriage, and normalizing nonmarital childbearing – all are among the leading causes of poverty, sexually transmitted infections, shorter life span, violence against women, child suffering, and intergenerational downward mobility. No policy regarding poverty can hope to succeed without attending to this. This has become clear over the last several decades’ “natural experiment.”

This is all the more unjust as the economically and educationally privileged *themselves opt for marriage and marital childbearing*, and more often *avoid* cohabitation, violence, abortion and divorce. But

they refuse – in the words of American sociologist Charles Murray -- to “preach what they practice” from the pulpits available to them as heads of every leading social, political, academic, media and economic institution. There should begin something akin to a *new civil rights movement* for vulnerable women who are called to marriage and children, but effectively prevented from attaining these due to *harmful or absent* economic, educational, familial and other policies and customs applicable to women and men in poor, uneducated and minority communities. Here, there is a *particularly* urgent need to move past secular feminist agendas toward *Mulieres Dignitatem’s* anthropology of women.

Fourth: women have to be active participants in the movement for *religious freedom around the world*. This is because religious freedom is threatened in the name of women’s rights, and also because women’s rights are sometimes threatened in the name of religion. In *developed* nations in particular, religious freedom is threatened on the grounds that religious opposition to sexual expressionism harms women. Women have to be seen and heard witnessing otherwise.

In *less privileged nations*, women need to participate in the complex task of both promoting religious freedom, while simultaneously *opposing* tendencies to obscure or *deny* women’s God-given dignity which may proceed under the banner of religion. In these latter situations, there is important work to be done in assisting some authorities both within religious and secular institutions, to understand that they can and should embrace *authentically pro-women reforms*, while denying false claims that women’s equality *requires* the deinstitutionalization of marriage and the family, and the rejection of children via abortion and massive social contraception programs.

Fifth: we have had a more or less “natural experiment” over the last several decades, allowing us to observe what happens when a substantial number of women can choose how they wish to spend their lives. Here are some preliminary results:

-One: women still wish for the most part to marry and to have children.

-Two: women are happy to exercise their talents outside the home as well as in it.

-Three: when they are mothers, most women prefer to work part-time, or in cycles responsive to their children’s needs, although there are always some who wish to work full-time, as well as many who *must*, economically speaking. This is a growing and strong feature of our present times.

-Four: still, for the most part, governments have asked women and children and families to make the greater sacrifices if they wish to have children, rather than enabling women and men to put their families *first* if they are also working outside the home. Governments have rather emphasized women's freedom *not* to have children or to have fewer children via contraception and abortion. Leading feminist groups have adopted the same priorities. Both governments and self-described women's groups need to be called to account for this. The opportunity costs of these priorities are the dearth of policies in most --though not all--countries which value the caretaking work of full-time at-home mothers, or the caretaking work of mothers and fathers working also outside the home.

Sixth: women are still voting with their feet disproportionately to work in the classic "caring-professions" - teacher, nurse, social worker, etc. -- and are now adding to that list, lawyers, doctors and politicians. There is no doubt that several of these are historically underpaid, perhaps because they were populated by women. But while it is not only fair to open all manner of employment to women, and while it is true that women bring a necessary perspective to every field they enter, the caring professions should not be denigrated on the grounds of pay or power. It is possible to address the matter of fair pay, *and* to insist upon increased social respect for caring work, without denigrating the *essential* good of such work or women's apparently perennial attraction to it. Furthermore, modern empirical data is confirming the beneficial effects, not only of attending to the importance of stable relationships in personal lives, but of participating in labor imbued with meaning as human service.

Seventh and finally: women seem naturally suited to communicate Pope Francis' stunning calls to re-energize the Church's mission to serve the dispossessed of this world, a mission involving rejecting materialism, in favor of a renewal in *all* institutions of the model of servant leadership. Women's natural gifts --as interpreted by *Mulieris Dignitatem* -- as well as their centuries of experience of work directly with the marginalized... also women's example of enduring love, in the model of Mary our Mother- make them natural leaders and communicators in all of these areas. Interestingly, although Popes John Paul II, and Benedict XVI Francis have made few *detailed* observations about the shape of a new Christian feminism... *all* have observed that its method is not "domination" or "machismo." That is, it is not by way of imitation of men's original sin. A *successful* new feminism would rather be one which would cause the world to take seriously the notion that progress and freedom and dignity are achieved when persons and institutions operate according to the rule of losing oneself in the service of God and one another. Women are brilliantly placed so as to

communicate the power of the Gospel to free human beings from man-made strictures, by way of the power of love as a cycle of entrustment and fidelity. ___

An important caveat here. Many admirable theologians has written about an opposing phenomenon. Not only John Paul II in *Mulieris Dignitatem*, but also Marguerite Peeters and Cardinal Walter Kasper have noted that the struggle for the cause of the human being is often waged *first* via the woman. This is the *underside* of her role as the one to whom the human being is first “entrusted.” Around the world today, it is the *woman* who is urged – often by self-proclaimed women’s champions, but of course also by men -- to abort her child; it is the *woman* who, in many countries, is urged to distrust men generally; it is the woman who initiates divorce proceedings even in the majority of marriages not marked by violence; it is the woman who is assured that nonmarital childbearing is morally neutral, and that labor market accomplishments are more important than children. *In short, it is women who are urged to deny the fundamental truth -- which they are rather gifted to express in a privileged way -- that human life is fundamentally about relationship, not autonomy.* This is *not* an absolution of men, who, as John Paul II has emphasized, are regularly the invisible participants in women’s sins. But -- keeping my focus on women’s obligations as a function of her gifts -- it is an identification of areas where women could be exhorted to *lead the way*, to move *toward prioritizing again* the demands of love. Interestingly, empirical data indicates that women, *were they to understand their power and to act in concert*, hold the power of the “seller” (if I might) in the marketplaces for sexual relationships, marriage, and labor. Were they to act accordingly and to make demands of men, of employers, and of governments... they would serve not only their *own* interests, but also the interests of the neediest – including children and poorer women– and vindicate the cause of the human being to a greater degree.

It is not weakness, not bowing to the “demands” of the Church, for women to do this, but cooperation with internal logic of the laws of freedom, which is coextensive with the law of love. Women, not men, have the power and therefore the duty, to so insist.

Thank you.