1. The Feminist Case Against God

Elaine Storkey

During my student years I became a close friend of a Yugoslav woman. Her name was Boba. At a fundamental level we had little in common. She was a Freudian psychologist, an atheist and a Marxist. She had never known any evangelical Christian before and my own commitment to Jesus Christ was a source of some amusement and amazement to her. It's curious, I suppose, that our friendship ever got off the ground. But it did, and I loved her. She was a person without cant or guile, and her harsh analysis of our society was often close to the truth.

Our relationship grew, deep and warm. We shared much of ourselves and each found in the other a humanness always ready to respond. There were some interesting repercussions too, for although she disliked the Church intensely and saw it as a symbol of institutional hypocrisy and oppression, her affection for me meant that she was willing to come with me and watch the worship. She would listen patiently to the gospel being presented and subject all that was said, to her usual careful, analytic scrutiny. She always commented on the fact that every church we visited was populated largely by women, but inevitably led by men. 'What's in it for the women?' was her constant query, and she would build up theories to account for the anomaly. Her conclusion was often that the Church - and by implication, Christianity - was for women who needed male props, father figures, male authority. It was for women who needed to be subservient, to be told what to do. It was for women who were pleased for men to do their thinking for them, and cheerful to be excluded from decision-making. It was for women who had no social conscience and were happy to close their eyes to inequality and injustices. The problem was that her theory had some exceptions. Women out there might be like that, but the only one she knew well wouldn't accept her analysis. She gave her affectionately taunting laugh: 'So, OK Elaine, why have you swallowed the God system?' We would talk for hours about why I believed and why she couldn't. When I watched her struggling with that deep sense of cosmic meaninglessness I longed for her to know the peace and joy that Jesus Christ had brought for me.

Some time later she returned to Yugoslavia. We corresponded for three years. Then, one day, one of my letters was returned to me by the local psychiatric hospital where she had worked. I never saw or heard from her again.

Many years later all those arguments were to become very familiar. They were to become part of the massive rejection of Christianity by feminists. The external situation today is the same. The Church still gains most of its grass-roots support from women. Women still provide the unpaid but powerful back-up services of the Church and ensure that the next generation is acquainted with the Christian gospel. Yet outside Christian circles, and increasingly inside them, the gospel is under attack because of what it seems to be saying about women. The allegation is being made that although women have supported the Christian faith, the faith has not supported women. What is more, this allegation is receiving ever wider acceptance. And this could have quite alarming consequences. For if women, who have traditionally been so loyal, should heed the arguments and begin to turn their backs on Christianity, it would present the Church with a grave crisis. There is much more at risk, too, than losing workers for the church bazaar. Truth itself is at stake. For what is the gospel if it is not Good News for women? What are we as Christians if we are not salt and light in the world? If what most feminists say is correct, we Christians have not been concerned for justice, motivated by love and looking after other people's interests rather than our own. We have not brought liberty to the captives, recovery of sight to the blind, freedom for the oppressed, binding for the broken-
hearted and proclaimed the year of the Lord. If they are right, we have not in fact been living as the people of God.

But this is the irony of the situation, because radical feminists come up with a different conclusion – the very opposite conclusion, in fact. It is, they say, precisely because Christians do live as people of ‘God’ that injustice, oppression and inequality towards women persist. This is because indeed, our God, as they see him, is nothing other than a tyrannical male deity, erected by a patriarchal society with the aim of giving injustice to women a divine seal of approval. In other words, we are the people of ‘God’, but this god is woman-denying and evil.

With either response it would seem that Christians have a case to answer, and it is time to unravel that case in more detail. Why has the Christian gospel attracted so much anger from women who a generation ago might have been found in our church pews? Reasons lie on every level. Christianity in its structures, its attitudes, its social implications and its theology has been weighed and found wanting, for, it is claimed, where the Christian faith does not actively condemn women, it keeps silence. Like those pious plantation owners in the Southern States who read their Bibles whilst cruel employees beat their slaves senseless, Christians pray and worship and turn a deaf ear to those injustices and inequalities that are carried out in God’s name.

At this point we need to pause and mention that the term ‘feminist’ is too broad for the discussion we are about to engage in. I have spent much energy elsewhere* showing how many different kinds of feminist exist and would not want now to spoil that with generalisations. But for those familiar with the categories, most of what I will now argue would be found amongst radical, Marxist and ‘post-Christian’ feminists, although on very many points there would be assent among a much wider grouping than that.

**The male as norm**

One of the strongest arguments levelled at the Christian Church is that we accept without question the idea that the male is norm in our society. We do this in many ways. In family life it is almost always the man’s career, the man’s interests, the man’s vocation, the man’s concerns which are followed through. Without even reflecting on this, Christians have taken it as somehow a Creation ordinance. The results have often been sad and destructive. I did a sociological study of policemen’s families some years ago in Scotland. What interested me particularly was the way in which men in one police force were constantly moved around, from area to area and house to house. It was this aspect of police life, more than any other, that their wives commented upon negatively. It left them feeling insecure, unable to put down roots, and constantly lonely as they would be separated from their own families and lose their local friends.

This situation is not, of course, peculiar to the police forces. Indeed, that particular force has now abandoned the practice – I hope because it was willing to listen to the results. But in almost all walks of life the requirements of the father’s job might mean disruption and sacrifice for many others in the family. The interests of employers and firms and the career interests of the man so often take precedence over what a wife might feel to be her own needs, or those of her family.

The same practice is very evident in the Christian Church. In many denominations even today it is assumed that only men have any vocation from God, whether this be in a lay or ordained capacity. A woman’s ‘vocation’ is to be his domestic and emotional support. Yet women also have concerns which need to be heard. Real mutuality of support is a very recent practice, and has not caught on in a big way in some circles! Single women are allowed some other kinds of vocation, but almost invariably still in a supporting role, and indeed are always somewhat ‘suspect’ for not being wives and mothers. It is generally true that women who feel called by God to exercise their gifts so often have to sit and watch.

There are other aspects of the male-being-the-norm syndrome which also have strong repercussions. Studies which have been carried out on expectations of men and women whilst at school or college have shown that whilst men make independent choices about their future work, women rarely feel able to make such choices without refer-
ence to whether they will marry, and whom they will marry. Many choose jobs or training which hold less interest for them than other areas, but which are compatible with getting married and being prepared to give this up for husband and family. No boy in any study I have looked at has suggested that this might be a constraint on his future.

It is not the preparedness to make sacrifices that worries me here. I feel that there is enough in Christ’s teaching that suggests that this is how we all should live. In the New Testament Epistles also there are constant reminders that we should be putting the interests of other people before our own. Women have often learned this well, and accepted it as part of their commitment to marriage and family life. But it is the one-sidedness of the sacrifice which needs to be examined. For the teaching is not only for women. It is for all who are prepared to bear the name of Christ. And as Christian communities we have been very slow to recognise this.

Another point follows quickly from this one. When it comes to interpreting the way women should live, or what they should feel, who decides? Most feminists point out that until very recently it has inevitably been men. Because male experience is the norm, most of the books on women, the sermons about women and the psychology of women have been done by men. When I was expecting my first baby, three books on childbirth were my constant reading. They were all by men. When I was actually in labour I realised how little they really knew! When my husband and I worked hard to look after our first two children, Baby and Child Care was our reference guide. It was of course written by a man. The classic text on ‘maternal deprivation’ was for many years a book by a male writer, John Bowlby. It was some time before the fact that he was a man awoke people to the enormous male bias in his work. Women have had themselves and their lives interpreted by men for centuries, and within the Church and Christian organisations it is still largely men who tell women what to do, how to live and what to feel.

It is not surprising, then, that many women feel a sense of ‘anomie’, feel that they do not know really who they are as women. Their own experiences seem so readily disre-
in proper (male) perspective. Women who bring rape charges, on the other hand, cannot so easily be understood. Why would they be alone at night? Why would they be walking down dark alleys? Why would they allow a colleague to buy them a drink? Why indeed, if they weren’t prepared to see what might result? Why indeed, if they weren’t actually prepared to be raped? Even in cut-and-dried cases where the rape takes place in a home and the rapists plead guilty, a male judge has been known to comment that the woman has not really ‘suffered’ all that much.

The implication of all this is, of course, worrying. Women are invited to see themselves through male eyes, to assess all their behaviour through male eyes and then to behave in a way that puts them beyond any danger from men. But as long as to be male is to be normal, there is no place of safety for some women.

The notion of patriarchy

We may now be in a position to understand the central focus of the feminist attack on Christianity. For what is behind this fact that the male is norm in our society? Is it part of the inevitable structure of human relationships, or is it a distortion of them? Most of the feminists we have been talking about are in no doubt. What is behind this situation is a ruthless demonstration of power. But the demonstration is not limited to individual men. It is embedded into all aspects of our society; it is part of patriarchy. For patriarchy – the dominance of men over women – is structured into all social relationships. It is there in work, marriage, family life, business, the professions, the law, education. It is there in male violence and sexual abuse. It is strong in the Two-Thirds World as well as in the industrial West. With the possible exception of a few small communities, patriarchy exists everywhere. We find it in the White House, the Kremlin, the Poliburo, the Broederbond, the Vatican. It is present in our financial empires, our universities, our political parties, our trade unions, our legal structures, our economies and our churches. It undergirds all human systems, whether capitalist, Marxist, tribalist, Hindu, Islamic or Christian. Mary Daly, herself a former Catholic theologian turned radical feminist, sums up their case: ‘Patriarchy is the prevailing religion of the entire planet.’

This point is the important one. For if it is true, what does that say about the distinctiveness of the Christian faith? Is Christianity at root no different from any other religion or human system?

Is Christianity patriarchal?

There can be little doubt that within Christianity there is a legacy of strong negative views about women. The early Church Fathers wrote some things for which even Christian feminists find it hard to forgive them. Tertullian, Chrysostom, Augustine, Aquinas, Clement of Alexandria and so many others all taught that not only were women more or less to blame for all the sin in humankind, but they were here as ‘defective men’, or ‘not in God’s image’, or simply as agents in procreation.

Nor were these views limited to the early Church Fathers. They have reappeared in different guises within the Church throughout the centuries and in some quarters are with us still. Maybe the language is a little less enthusiastic than John Knox’s First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women, but under contemporary sophistication and gentlemanly manners the same kind of attitudes still lurk in many a male Christian breast!

But it is not merely the traditions of Christianity which the attack is focused upon, nor even the attitudes we have looked at earlier. The very structures of the Church – male hierarchies and dignitaries, male ‘shepherds’, papal edicts, houses of bishops – all echo the male centrality and open us up to the allegation of patriarchy. So, of course, do our liturgy, our language, our practices. But it is at Christian theology that some feminists want to launch their strongest attack.

For their claim is that our very theology is sexist. The view apparently held and undoubtedly propagated by people in the Church is that God is male. The Trinity is male. Christ, the male Son of a male Father, comes to earth to die for
men. Then, of course, the Jewish patriarchs were male, the twelve apostles were male. The Bible writers were male. For many women this is the final statement of the irrelevance of the Christian faith for them. The Christian faith proclaims, endorses and affirms a male-centred universe. It accepts patriarchy wholesale, and in doing so goes along with all other ideologies and religions. In the words of one sympathiser, 'If God is seen as simply and exclusively male, then the very cosmos seems sexist.'

Another writer puts it differently. She points not to the current life of the Christian faith, for she believes it to be non-existent, but to the legacy which Christianity has left 'behind'. Wryly, she suggests that 'even the god we no longer believe in is still envisaged as male.'

The weight of this position must hit us all. For if the Church is in the business of worshipping a male god there is no way out of patriarchy. For here, in the very focus of our commitment, in the author of all reality, the sustainer and upholder of the universe, the principle of male power is upheld and justified. Inequality for women, subservience, and lack of full humanness is structured into Creation itself. If this is true, then to be a Christian must mean accepting it as a fact of life.

Agreements and disagreements amongst Christian feminists

Not all Christian feminists do accept this as true, however. What I have been saying here is deliberately introductory and general, but these allegations have been around for many years now and have been discussed in considerable depth by a large number of feminist Christians from many different theological and cultural traditions. There is probably considerable assent among us that Christianity, as it is practiced and preached, is a patriarchal religion, and that although women are large in number in the Church, they are small in visibility within the Church’s leadership. The assent would go beyond the kind of traditional approach which looks at ‘the role of women in the Church’ and thereby suggests, as Elizabeth Fiorenza points out, that ‘women and not an institutionalised male Church [are] the problem.’

There is considerable agreement with Gatherina Halkes, a prominent Dutch theologian, who sounds a resounding echo when she talks about the need for shalom — for peaceful and just relationships between men and women. Her emphasis on justice, and her vision of the new heaven and new earth of 2 Peter 3:13 are widely shared.

In a similar vein, few would dispute the suggestion that women are not the Wholly Innocents and free from sin. Rosemary Radford Reuther speaks for many of us when she says: ‘Women need to acknowledge that they share the same drives and temptations as men, not just sins of dependency, of which they have been guilty, but also the sins of dominion of which they have been less guilty, not for want of capacity, but for want of opportunity.’

There is not much dispute either on the reading of some post-biblical history. Most of us recognize and bewail the fact that the misogyny of the early Church Fathers came out of a particular philosophical stance known as Dualism. In fact, although it was introduced so early into Christian theology, there is still evidence of it today, particularly in the Catholic tradition, and it has had enormous implications for women. In this philosophy the body was degraded, and along with it an everyday, normal, working existence, and the ‘soul’ was elevated, and along with it the ‘supernatural’ area.

Women were then either to be seen as temptresses of reflections of the Holy Virgin. Most feminists, and indeed most other biblical scholars, agree that such a dualism is not an emphasis in the Bible itself, but that bodily life is there given a high priority.

Moreover, the suggestion that we might revise our liturgies and our language to include women would not find much opposition amongst Christian feminists. Nor would the plea that the traditional interpretations of many biblical passages should be looked at again, from a standpoint which assumed the fundamental equality of women, as in Galatians 3:28.

Yet as well as these areas of agreement, there are some important differences between Christian feminists. Interestingly, these are not necessarily along traditional denominational lines. Catholic and Protestant women will be found
together in each grouping. Instead, the areas of distance reflect more the differences of starting point and of biblical hermeneutics.

One of the ways in which those of us who want to be called biblical feminists find ourselves at odds with liberal Christian feminists is over how we approach Scripture. Although we might all agree with Elizabeth Fiorensa's suggestion that 'feminist theology begins with the experience of women struggling against trivialisation and oppression as well as for liberation and human dignity', the issue of where we go from there is the important one. For what interprets the 'experience' of women? Many feminist theologians outside an evangelical tradition want to maintain in some way that experience provides its own framework of interpretation. The whole Christian tradition, even Scripture itself, must be subject to the experiences women have of themselves and of their lives. Where there is dissonance between our experience and any of the biblical writings, then it would be inauthentic - even hypocritical - to hold on to 'dogma' over what we know to be true inside us. The idea of the Bible having some kind of authority over against our real experiences would not be tenable. So say many non-evangelical feminists.

This is already several stages removed from the kind of hermeneutic which wants to re-read or reappraise traditional interpretations of certain biblical texts. It is removed also from the kind of argument we see in Fiorensa, who can say that ecclesial exclusion of women is 'not the will of God or the intention of Jesus Christ'. She sees the legitimation of 'feminist theology in the eschatological view of freedom and salvation in the Bible. For the approach we are looking at would ask, Why do we need to focus so strongly on the Bible anyway? It is a human document, culture-bound, born into a patriarchal culture, and written by men. In what possible sense can God be said to be the author? It makes much more sense, in fact, to read the Bible as a piece of propagandist polemic, written to vindicate the activities of a certain group of people. Interestingly, the New Testament often fares rather more badly than the Old in this approach, for the writers of the Gospels and the Epistles are seen by these feminists as highly partisan, narrow, sectarian and antisemitic.

The conclusion drawn by liberal-Christian feminists, then, is that we must lie loosely with Scripture, and at times reject it altogether, if we are to understand our world and ourselves in a coherent and meaningful way. We can only start from what we know to be true, and that means from what we experience ourselves day by day.

What then, does it mean to these women to be called 'Christian' feminists? Certainly, it does not suggest anything distinctive or unique about Jesus Christ. Being Christian involves being religiously open, open to all the other cultures and religious traditions where freedom for women is being sought, and open above all to the possibility that Christianity might be wrong. It means being prepared to allow experience to sift through the traditions into which we have previously been seen ourselves and to work out a new hermeneutic which will make sense of this. In some cases it means being prepared to embrace a new paganism which will begin to incorporate the old female earth religions with a new non-patriarchal Christianity. Some liberal Christian approaches to feminism start from a similar position.

When this point is arrived at, it is only a short step from Christian feminism to post-Christian feminism. For some years this movement had only one main exponent, Mary Daly. But increasingly over the last decade others have begun to accept the same label. In some senses, of course, the label is misleading. The return to paganism and the ancient polytheistic goddesses are far more a symbol of pre-Christianity. But Mary Daly's own position is not replacing God by the goddess in any reified sense. Her aim is to go beyond God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit but not to anything else: 'A patriarchal divinity and his son are not able to save us from a patriarchal world.' But nor are there any other saviours outside ourselves; no powers, no spirits, no forces. There is nothing we can call 'God'. So her 'god' is not the name of anything at all, but a verb. 'God' is the Verb To Be, and will replace woman's present state of non-being or becoming with full being. In one sense her feminism is an
attempted total repudiation of Christianity, in another it is nothing more than a series of linguistic and literary devices. This, then, is the feminist case against God. And there are none who have formulated it as strongly as those who were once within the Church but have moved right outside. For them, the conflict between their own experience as women and the demands of a male-centred religion has become a total one. But for many the exit has not been a painless one. For all the hurt and anger, the disappointment and loss at this resolution of the struggle is thrust upon the departing God and on the Church which would enshrine him. Among the most powerful and vociferous opponents of the Christian faith are those post-Christian feminists who have tried and failed to accommodate the need for affirmation as women with a belief in God.

Some ways of responding

Have we then lost the case against God? I think not. Much of the rest of this book will be given to showing how we do not need to go in that direction. It simply remains for me to give some pointers as to how we might redirect our thinking.

We might start by looking very briefly at those feminists with whom we have already identified many points of agreement. Does being a Christian feminist entail that we must go in their direction and reject anything which cannot be validated by our own experience? The answer to this is much more complex than it seems. I have difficulties, in fact, in knowing what it means to allow experience to be its own interpreter. I do not think that those who hold this position operate on self-explanatory experience either. Behind liberal-Christian feminism lies a very specific theological stance which is usually unexamined, and it is this theological stance rather than undefined ‘experience’ which provides the framework of interpretation and evaluation. Post-Christian feminism is similarly not neutral, but starts from philosophical ideas derived from the Enlightenment two centuries ago. Even the idea that we must start from experience as our interpreter is itself an Enlightenment concept.

But what is this ‘experience’ of myself? What is a ‘self?’

We need to presuppose some answer to the basic and deepest question, ‘Who am I?’ and that is indeed the problem. For if all I am is the sum total of all that I experience, what is the ‘self’ that is doing the experiencing? It is in order to discover who this self is and what these experiences mean that we need to look beyond our raw experience for some clue to our identity.

The post-Christian feminists have already done this, despite any insistence to the contrary. They have found the principle of human autonomy which they now impose on experience, and say that fundamentally we are on our own, responsible to no higher authority. Biblical Christians have the opposite response. For us, the principle of dependency is the one with which we interpret our experience. The need for a framework of interpretation leads us back to Scripture, not away from it. But it is not to a few isolated passages taken out of context; we need rather the full biblical disclosure of who we are and what is our purpose in living. It is the disclosure that we are the creation of a personal, loving God which begins to make sense of our experiences of ourselves and shows us where we find our true identity.

Once we have established that, there are of course many other questions to answer, for the feminist case against this God still stands, unless we can meet it point by point. We need still to ask how we are to understand Scripture, for nothing has been solved by rejecting the extreme liberal position unless we can put something in its place. The next chapter, by Andrew Kirk, will be taking up this theme, but it is worth noting here that even amongst biblical feminists there are different emphases. Although they would all accept the Bible as the Word of God, there are several different approaches to the ‘difficult’ passages for women. This arises particularly with respect to Paul’s letters. Some (see Virginia Mollenkott) resolve the difficulty by pointing to a discrepancy between Paul and Jesus, and suggesting that although most of Paul’s teachings can be accepted at face value there are times when he lapses into a rabbinic position. These times are obvious from the text, when weighed up with other aspects of his teachings (1 Tim chapter 2, especially verse
Therefore we need not place the same kind of importance on these passages.

Other biblical feminists would feel less than happy with this argument, and would seek to show that although some teaching is specific it is also culturally relative. In other words, to concentrate still upon Paul, there are many passages in his letters which really apply only to the people to whom he was writing, and are not relevant in the same sense for us today. We already distinguish many passages in this way (the covering of head, eating of strangled meat, braiding of hair) and we need only to recognise that the list is far longer (see Paul Jewett, Nancy Hardesty).

Then a third, more conservative approach would want to maintain that we need to concentrate on a more accurate exegesis, which takes into consideration local practices and local heresies, but also is more faithful to the Greek text than we have often been before, looking at classical as well as New Testament Greek scholarship. When we begin to do this faithfully we will begin to realise that we have come to Paul through centuries of inaccurate interpretations and mistranslations (Catharine Clark Kroeger has done some excellent work here).

Finally there are those who would want to stress that the Scriptures were never intended to be interpreted in an 'academic' way, and that the Holy Spirit will bring to us a fuller understanding of the Bible if we sit under it with humility and reverence. Even the Old Testament underwent considerable reinterpretation when the Spirit interpreted it in the New Testament.

With the exception of the first possibility, I feel that each of these approaches enriches our understanding of Scripture, and each can open up the Bible for women in a living and worshipping way. They are important in looking at any passage, not just those which have traditionally been problematic for women.

There are, of course, other fundamental issues which we have to face. One of them involves asking if it is true that we are actually worshipping a male deity. The experience of isolation and alienation which many women feel in a church considered. How do we interpret this experience by Scripture? A biblical answer would have to be that if we are really worshipping the God disclosed by revelation, then we are not worshipping a male God. The fact that we call God our Father is no indication that God has any human gender. We are simply doing as Christ has bidden us. And what he was inviting us to do was address the sovereign Creator of the universe as Abba or 'Daddy'. There can be no doubt that the point Jesus has in mind is that we can approach this God as little children. We can come to God in trust and dependence, in love and peace. We do not need to be afraid. God is not a God who is distant, threatening or patriarchal. This no more implies a male God than talking of God as having wings implies that God is a bird. God, indeed, is the author of sexuality, and as such is beyond the things which have been created. God is not to be explained or identified by the things within Creation. The first commandment goes to great pains to warn us of the dangers of that.

A similar point can be made about Jesus himself. Although it is undoubtedly true that Christ came to earth as a man, the important point about him is that he was the Word made Flesh, not indeed the Word made Male. He came as anthropos (human being), not primarily as aner (male human being). The Church, of course, makes this so hard for us to experience. Jesus is so often shrouded in male mystery, served up by male popes and archbishops with male pomp and circumstance. Yet this is such a far cry from the Jesus of the Gospels. In that Jesus we see a man who derides hierarchy, warns his disciples against ambition and wanting to be in positions of prominence. We see a Jesus who, though he was God, made himself of no reputation. We see a Jesus who was a friend to women, the poor, the discarded, the rejected; a Jesus who washed the dirty feet of his disciples; a Jesus who died for people even whilst they were yet sinners.

What can we say, then, about the case against God? I think we can say that it is a case against the people of God. We are guilty of living as children of a sexist god. We have not been obedient to the Scriptures in the way that other contributors in this book will shortly open up for us. We have allowed a
name. Above all we have put stumbling blocks in the way of those who would believe. When women have come to us and said, ‘We would see Jesus,’ we have offered them a counterfeit, and then have been horrified when they have rejected this.

There are women who will not bow the knee, whose feminism has idolatrous roots, and an apostate direction. But God knows who they are, and we are not any woman’s judge. There are many others who are searching for God but who only find a Church which they cannot stomach. If we are to be God-carriers in our age and generation, we need both to call the Church - ourselves - to repentance, and to help people past the barriers we erect, so that they can begin to get a glimpse of the living God, in whom there is no male and female, but in whom there is liberty and reconciliation and fullness of life.

Questions for discussion

1. Which parts of the feminist case do you identify with most? Which do you identify with least?
2. ‘The reason so many women become feminists is because men don’t listen to them.’ Do you think this is true?
3. How would you introduce a feminist friend to church?
4. Have any of the issues in this chapter ever been raised in your own religious or church group? What have been the reactions if they have?
5. What do you think are the deepest needs of women? Of men?
6. Try to think through what it would be like to be a member of the opposite sex for a day! What do you learn from this?
7. How do you understand the importance of Jesus Christ for women?
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