

Chapter Five

Born of Woman

The Bible and Religious Tradition may be considered as inspired contrived fictions. In the context of the cultures of the past, they might well have been deemed to be quite plausible. Some elements in them may have had definite factual historical associations. Some described phenomena of a scientific nature may still be observable and verified today. However, just because they were inspired does not mean they express absolute and unchanging truths and that inerrancy can be predicated of them. They express concepts which were meaningful to the mentality of the times and which were important, but only passing factors in the sequence of cultural and religious evolution. In the psychical realm, they were not meant to be everlasting. The human mind has an insatiable appetite for better and more profound knowledge.

A hundred years ago, excommunication and the threat of eternal damnation would have been the fate of any theologian who publicly stepped out of line with traditional Church Teaching. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955) was perhaps the first priest-scientist to put his head on the block and dare to question, in writing, the then official Vatican interpretation of the Genesis story. A new climate of greater intellectual freedom permits the voicing now of ideas that would have been unthinkable in the past. Catholic Biblical scholarship is only now recovering from being chained to backwards facing seats in the western halls of learning.

The patriarchal mindset is in the dock. Human beings have been on this Earth much longer than the male writers of the Bible and subsequent Christian theologians could ever have possibly imagined. Philosophers and ecclesiastical authorities of the past and present have always skewed their observations and spin-doctored their conclusions to fit in with their biased and prejudiced traditions.

Without telescopes, their knowledge of the macrocosm was astrological. Without microscopes, knowledge of the microcosm was non-existent and the understanding of sexuality and life processes was minimal and superficial. The Epistles and Gospels of the New

Testament and both early and later Christian Teaching and Praxis were expressions of pious make believe. They were built on the shifting sands of changing and progressive human understanding.

They were relatively true according to the mindsets of their protagonists, but in time they would be found to be inconsistent with evolving reality.

Scientific theories come and go. An authentic Philosophy and Theology must take account of what is empirically verifiable in modern Science and rethink itself accordingly if it is to have any real relevance and meaning for the generations to come. The teaching authorities of a former teenage Christianity, now reaching mature adulthood, must learn to accept that all worlds pass, their myths outknown, their creeds and cults outgrown. Linguistic and scientific explanations and new philosophical insights can replace the myths and mysteries of Christian Theology, linked inextricably from its very beginnings to cultural male prejudice, and shackled from its inception within the limiting constraints of pre-Christian Greek Philosophy. Churchmen had to invent and define the existence of *Mysteries* like the *Incarnation* and the *Trinity*, which did not follow their human logic but which were to be accepted as Articles of Faith.

As historians and archeologists are becoming more and more aware, past events have not always been as oral and written traditions generally pretended. Much extant literature of bygone days is biased and one-sided when it comes to controversial issues. This is becoming particularly relevant today in relation to the history of the early Christian Church and its formal beliefs.

Many people, past and present, worship the Bible or the Koran as being the inspired Word of their God. This author has no quarrel with them. The mindset which dictates their beliefs is based on what they consider to be valid religious foundations. No good is served by arguing with them about the pros and cons of their position. If believing what they do makes them happy and gives meaning to their existence, then why bother to upset them with modern Biblical Criticism. The merits of their religious theories can be assessed by the fruits they bear in real life behavioural situations.

All Scripture is inspired, but for the most part, it is only inspired novel fictions or purposeful temporary make-believe. The Bible, the Hindu Bhagavad-Gita and the Mohammedan Koran are authentic

religious scriptures. Their authors were not deceived about what they were inspired to write. It made sense in the context of the times when they were written. As such, they are inspired. But here again it depends on what is meant by *inspired*. The word *inspired* means what we want it to mean or what authorities determine it to mean. For this author, his books are his inspired brain-children. There is only one absolute truth, and it states “All *other truths* are relative”.

There are many people who maintain an open enquiring mind and are compelled by natural curiosity to learn more about the past and present world in which they live. Humans, with a question-able mind, take delight in questioning, solving problems, posing and answering riddles and unveiling enigmas. They empathize with many a child character in fiction, who wanted to know why a certain upstairs room was always kept locked by their parents and entrance to it forbidden under threat of extreme punishment.

This author accepts Christianity's intended male fertilizing and distinctioning role, for better or worse, in two millennia of cultural evolution. It is a passing role, designedly dynamic, not static, a part knowing a past but tutored forward by Selflife's Spirit of Existential Self-Other Relativity to contemplation's perceptual experience of god-mothering. Human selflife can only perceive the divine as an immanent god-mothering experience, analogous to the pregnant placental mammal. It is the *divine maternity in labour* in the human psyche who knows her human brainchild “You” as *the child of man* within.

In the light of the cultural and scientific advances of the last fifty years, the theological tenets of Judaism's motherless patriarchal monotheism have passed their usefulness for collaborating in future cultural evolution. So too, the reality of the same-sex all male sire-son “*Abba*” deity of Pauline Christianity is only relatively valid and is becoming academically untenable and educationally unacceptable. This book dares to assert the absolute primacy of Aseity, the Mother Self of the Cosmos.

The previous Chapter elaborated on the significance of the human female pregnant placental mammal with her begotten living other-self focused within her fertile womb. Her once singular “I-am” self, now become endowed with the conscious plural awareness of her enwombed otherself, of “We”, claims acceptance now as the goal

which Mother Nature has in view in biological evolution and by analogy in the psychical evolution of self-other consciousness.

It is logical then to infer that the human female placental mammal is begotten as the spaced time image and likeness of the evolutionary Mother Self of the Cosmos. It is also logical to contemplate the analogy between physical and psychical conception and gestation. In its earliest physical development, all human becoming passes through an unconscious transitive stage of life in the mother's womb. Relatively few humans ever become reflexively aware of their psychical development in the womb of the selflife consciousness of Aseity Herself.

Make fun of it and with it though we may, or sham shame at it, sexuality in its culminating woman-man duality, is Nature's most developed and symbolic expression of distinction and union. Stripped of its cultural taboos and trimmings and freed too from religious misunderstandings, existential sexual relativity can be experienced as the most meaningful revelation of *The Great Mystery of Aseity*.

There is something very profound and most mysterious about the relations in sexuality. Sexuality, not merely as a psychical relation, but as a physical reality, is two-in-oneness. It is known about and experienced as an act in which two *ones* should become *one* two. The sexual knowledge that a self has of an other reflects the nature of knowledge itself. To know is to become. Psychically, the self becomes one with its other. The two become one flesh. Sexuality is a very great mystery and its full meaning is only comprehended when the self, in contemplation, woos and weds its indwelling *other* within the womb of its own expanding true self-other-consciousness.

In Hebrew Mythology there are many hierarchies and classes of beings. Choirs of angels abound and heavenly hosts have their roles to perform. There is nothing wrong with these ideas as long as we observe that they are only mental constructs or contrived fictions. They were invented as plausible explanations of what had happened, and still was happening, backstage behind the scenes in the course of human history. The legendary biblical characters of Adam and Eve have been dominant protagonists in the evolving dramas of male monotheism.

Male Adam is said to have *sinned* in eating of the forbidden fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil. The female Eve, the Mother of all the Living, had first tasted of the fruit and found it good, but it was the man Adam who sinned by breaking the Natural Law ordering the respective roles of woman and man in the course of human propagation.

Contrary to Genesis 2/22-23 and to Pauline Christianity, Adam could not have been made first. As detailed above, the *human animal* has evolved through the self-functioning of the female placental mammal. The writer is not being facetious when he asks this meaningful but hypothetical question. When *Yahweh God built the rib he had taken from the man into a woman* did he notice whether Adam had nipples or not? These vestigial traces are a permanent and undeniable reminder that man is born of woman. In himself, man as father is not a placental mammal. Only his mother has a womb.

Sin is breaking the Law. Without a law, there would be no sin. In societies or any togetherness of human beings, there are various activities where laws are deemed necessary, as for example, natural behaviour as governed by Civil or Ecclesiastical authorities. There are the Laws of Nature, Scientific Laws et cetera.

Laws of courtship ritual abound in Nature. It would seem that, ideally, in Mother Nature's sophisticated plan, male superior strength was not intended to be used evilly to dominate or rape woman, but to be at her service to protect and to provide for the care and sustenance of the mother and her offspring. Knowledge of *evil* is had when

*Male man, alone of all creation's throng,
maltreats his mate and acts his sex role wrong.*

As outlined already on Page 34, in the dictates of the Natural Law, the male's ordained function is *to serve* the female as her *other term* in *sexistential relativity*. His role is merely ancillary, transitory and complementary to that of the female by providing distinctioning, fertilizing and custodial elements in moments of time.

With reverential worship of her charms
man finds his being's *good* in woman's arms.

Lurking in the minds of many of the Fathers of the Christian Church was the association, somehow or other, of *Original Sin* with Adam and Eve and sexuality. Some kind of such sexual linkage can be made into a plausible hypothesis if we consider original sin as

resulting from aberrant male genetic programming whereby the human placental mammal would be subject to the patriarchal arrogant and despotic refusal “I’ll not serve”.

Giving a human being a registered legal name entitles it to be called a legal person with legal rights and obligations. What actually is a human person? Labelling a zygote as a person does not make it become one. There is no physical formulation nor biochemical compounding which defines the concept *person*. Persons are what persons would like to think and say they are.

The existence and essence of personhood resides in the human faculty of language and speech. When it is given a spoken and written name, a human being receives its distinct human identity and is admitted into society as a human person. One of the contributing factors to the prevailing economic and ecological chaos plaguing human affairs is that Civil Law now gives to Business Corporations the status of *Person*.

For the Latins of antiquity, *persona* (a feminine word) was the mask that actors wore. Who are human persons? Human persons are Aseity’s otherselves, her *dramatis personae*, the actors, masked with spaced time, of her staged two-in-one act existential dialogue.

Scientists can cope quite adequately with giving names to past, present and possible future observable entities. They are dealing with *a posteriori* facts. They are not concerned with intangible and contrived fictional transcendent realities like a hypothetical human soul. It is not for empirical science to define what constitutes a person from metaphysical, political, legal and moral points of view. On the other hand, many biased expounders of bioethics use completely arbitrary *a priori* fictional considerations in defining their own terms.

Empirical Science in Biology observes and studies the phenomena of *Life*. It does not presume to define precisely what life is but only to describe it. We humans know what life and love are by living and loving. For most academics, the essence and existence of life and love, particularly in human selflife, is a mystery. For this writer, the essence of Aseity’s Life and Love is Existential Self-Other Relativity expressed verbally “I Am \leftrightarrow Thou Art”. “I love you”.

Aseity begets a unity of other selves in spaced time. Her selflife is a Set of all Sets, a spirit continuum which she shares with them.

Begotten physically as individuals, their bodies are destined to eventually disintegrate in observance of Nature's Law of Entropy. No actual or merely potential human being has the right to biological life. All life is shared life. The bodies of all human beings are predestined to die, stamped at birth with a *use-by date*.

Existential Self-Other Relativity in Modern Science can provide food for thoughtful human beings with consistent foundations on which to build for the future. It can also remove troublesome enigmas. *When does a human being become a person?*

The author has allowed the Grammar of person speech to speak for its self and to be definitive in this regard. The terms of speech are threefold. The triune set of persons has as its units, firstly the person speaking, secondly the person spoken to, and thirdly the person spoken about. Users of the pronouns "I and We" are first persons. Those named "Thou and You" are second persons. "She, He, They" are third persons. A human being who is able to say, or to think, "I am" or "We are" is a person. A human being who is known and called "You" is a person. Human beings spoken about as "They", are persons. Personal pronouns identify persons.

The Personal Selflife of Aseity is a set of sets, a Triunity or Trinity of divine and spaced time human persons, classified as sets of pronouns. As such it can receive added understanding from being viewed in the light of Mathematical Logic.

The author's book *Achieving the Impossible* achieves what was hitherto generally deemed impossible. For a Century the best mathematical minds in Academia have sought to remove the trivial but frustrating Paradoxes teasing the foundations and the formal structuring of a simple Theory of Sets in Mathematical Logic. Experts concluded it could not be done, due to the inadequacy of language to cope with the seeming contradictions of self-reference and not self-reference situations.

Set Theory is a relatively modern topic in Mathematics and provides both fresh insights and also the terminology necessary for the formal logical analysis of self-reference systems. Known simply as *The New Mathematics*, it has a unique and vital role in cultural evolution. Little children in their first years of Primary School are taught that *a well-defined collection of distinct things is called a Set*, like the set of children in the class or the set of chairs in the room.

Such a collective whole is made manifest by enclosing the distinct units in a pair of bracket-like braces { }. The identity sign \equiv can be used to *identify* a set. For this writer, in more abstract terms, a Set is a well-defined Unity of distinct Units in intentional Union. A set of two things is called a two-in-one or a biunity: a set of three things is called a three-in-one, a triunity or trinity: a set of many things is called a many-in-one or polyunity.

Sets have subsets which are well-defined sets of some specific and distinct members of the original set. The set of letters of the English alphabet has the subsets of five vowels and twenty one consonants. There are also sets of sets. The set of letters of the alphabet can be written {{vowels}, {consonants}}. The set of all possible subsets of any set is called a power set. With the inclusion now of the word *all*, complications arise from the unlimited use of *all* in the concept of a *Set of All Sets*. Granted that a Set of All Sets is a power set, there emerges the problem whether such a Set is an element itself of this Set of All Sets. If X stands for the Set of All Sets, and Y stands for all sets other to X, then $X \equiv \{X, Y\}$. Is X an element of X? This may seem only a trivial question, but in reality it is pertinent to the nature and existence of Aseity, the Mother Self of the Cosmos, the Selfset of all Selfsets. Theology in the future will have to take cognizance of this algebraic abstraction.

Those who comprehend $X \equiv \{X, iY\}$, and identify X as the maternal Selfset of the pregnant "I AM" and identify iY as the set of all her begotten "You", her spaced time "i am" real image other-selves, would anticipate the concluding sentence of Stephen Hawking's book, *A Brief History of Time*. They would know the mind of Aseity, the Self of the Cosmos, Mother of us all, gods and goddesses alike.

Sets only exist in the mind of a self who identifies its one self with some other or with all others in the one act of knowing. In the human self, all knowledge results from such self's conscious willed unity of both reflexive self-being and transitive other-self-becoming.

All self's knowledge can be expressed as the psychical unity or set {reflexive self-being, transitive other-self-becoming}. Such togetherness is experienced when the self knows both its own self reflexively and its known other-self transitively in the one act of self-other knowledge. In its ultimate analysis, knowledge is experienced as the

spaced time becomingness of the being of a conscious self-functioning-feedback-system where the reflexive self knowingly projects itself onto and identifies its own self transitively with the now-known other.

With reflexive attention, a pregnant woman knows her own selflife now as a set that includes her own self and also the foetus in her womb. Her former singular "I am" becomes eventually aware of other selflife within. She has a personal experience of biunity's two-in-oneness. She can monologue with her otherself as a "you" because the latter is sharing now in her plural person selflife of "We".

A pregnant placental mammal can be classified as a self-and-other-containing biunity or set of distinct units in physical union. It is a self-other-functioning-feedback-system whose unique functioning self directs the distinct relational self-other-feedback functionings of both subsystems of mother-self and her embryonic or foetal other-self. There is only one totally shared self in the system which ultimately undergoes a form of aseistic biological fission.

It has been left to modern mathematical logic to take the mystery out of religious traditions and to express in algebraic abstraction the essence and existence of divine, human and animal maternity. Not only has it opened up new horizons in our understanding of unity but it has also shed new light on infinity. What is *infinity*? As various techniques for counting improved, so numbers were invented for bigger and bigger collections of things. Finally, it was realised that there were no limits to human thought and that no matter how big a collection was, it could always be added to in theory. *Infinity is not numerical bigness, but a self's inexhaustible self-other subsetting divisibility, a self's limitless iterative distinctioning of units in union in the unity of self-other existential relativity.*

In Chapter 4, Page 40, reference was made to certain arithmetical considerations which are relevant to aspects of the assigned respective parental relations in the course of biological evolution. In non-sexual cellular reproduction, a mother-twin-daughter iteration prevails. Being asexual, gender distinction of male and female does not come into consideration and homosexual and heterosexual relationships are non-existent. There is no relation of parent to offspring, simply because there are no parents. A single unit begets a plural unity and only the begotten new potential mothers persist in this unity. This sequence will

be labelled further on as *motherhood procession*. It is essentially the endless sharing of maternal selflife. It is the selflife story of Aseity.

In the revelation of self-other distinction in Existential Relativity, heterosexuality engineers all biological evolution. Homosexuality can be meaningful psychologically, but biologically, it is generally infertile and sterile.

In sexual propagation, parental relationships exist. Biology, with its evidence of gametes and zygotes, can provide a perspective of what such relations are all about. There is an essential difference between the asexual mother-twin-daughter relationship of cellular reproduction and the parent and child relation of sexual propagation. The introduction of a male *other* element to the propagative process gives rise to the gender distinction of male and female. Female functioning now has a dual role, being essential to both cellular reproduction (mitosis) and also to species propagation (meiosis).

Philosophers in the past have spoken of the begetting of offspring as a parental procession. We distinguish a male parental procession from a female parental procession. In both the father-child and mother-child relationships, each individual parent unit contributes, though unevenly, to the begetting of an other individual unit and all three, mother father and child, eventually enjoy distinct existence. In propagation's parental procession the identity of each singular unit is maintained, whereas in reproduction's motherhood procession the original singular unit loses its singularity and becomes a plural identity. The oneness of the original maiden unit mothers or grows into a unity or togetherness of distinct identical units.

The most meaningful and highly evolved representation of the self-other archetype is this contemplated woman-man duality, in which the *man* then can also be linked with the principle of outside distinction of units, the external father or son, the transitive temporal *physical*, whilst *woman* as a placental mammal is linked with inner union, the pregnant mother with her otherself, internally and eternally in her womb, the reflexive *psychical*.

This distinguishing of parental relationships may seem just purely academic and of no consequence to human behaviour. Nothing could be further from the truth. Whilst modern social attitudes are becoming polarized as regards heterosexual and homosexual unions, it is thought provoking to observe that the patriarchal obsession with a homosexual

(meaning same sex) Father-Son deity still dominates all Christian theological discussion and liturgical expression. Past theologians of both Eastern and Western Christianity have argued and fought over the nature of the processions of the divine persons of the Blessed Trinity. Pauline Christianity evolved from its parent motherless Jewish Monotheism. Its mindset could not conceive nor would it ever have tolerated any inclusion of woman in an all male godhead.

It is interesting, even to the point of being entertaining, to study the various Doctrinal Creeds and Council Decrees of the Christian Church as it developed over the Centuries. Participating authorities struggled with the meaning of words in order to avoid inconsistencies and ambiguities. A word out of place or its meaning poorly defined and its user could be labelled a heretic with dire consequences. Liturgical prayers were addressed to God the Father and to God the Son in the Unity of the Holy Spirit. Any language precision defining the procession of the Son from the Father and the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son challenged the best minds in Christendom. The Trinity of three Persons (two of male gender and one neuter) in the one God was declared an incomprehensible Mystery. The patriarchal ecclesiastical authority guarded its male hegemony jealously.

History, nevertheless, shows that religious experience cannot be divorced from sexuality. Same-sex unions are an important aspect of sexuality and which are not new but which are much discussed in political and theological circles today. They threaten to split the Anglican Hierarchy worldwide and are also highly relevant to the official mindset of Roman Catholicism.

What are we to determine about same sex relationships? They are understandable in women and men as resulting from sexual abuse as children and also when married. What is not so understandable is the theological inconsistency of churchmen in authority with regard to same-sex unions when their own God, a patriarchal motherless deity, is decreed, without question, as a same-sex all male sire-son union.

The irony in today's official Christian attitude to Marriage is that though heterosexuality (woman and man) is demanded in the partners of a sacred matrimonial union, such union is contracted in the Name and with Blessing of a motherless all male Sire-Son God.

Paul the Apostle had never met the physical Jesus, the son of Jewish parents. He had a radical mindset changing experience of a Jesus the Nazarene Reformer in his recorded paranormal encounter with him on the road to Damascus. Celibate (?) Paul's admission of *a sting of the flesh* (2Cor.12/7) has given rise to speculation that he might have had a disposition to homosexuality. Converted Paul became the slave of his psychical construct Jesus the Christ whom he identified in his own mind with Jesus the Nazarene. The meaning of the original Greek *doulos* was a born slave (Rom. 1/1). The so-called Epistles of Paul were written a decade or more before any of the Gospels made their appearance. As far as we know, Paul was the first preacher and writerto speak of *Jesus The Christ*.

Genesis 1/27 can be manipulated as insinuating a heterosexual deity - *God created man in the image of himself, in the image of God he created him, male and female he created them*. However, Paul's theological understanding limited his concept of God to a motherless Father-Son all male union. In today's realm of real human affairs, not that of past mythological gods and goddesses with their folk lore and legends, empirical evidence now says there cannot be a father and son without a mother.

Many Christians may find it totally unacceptable, but it is not illogical for modern culture to construe such a Pauline conceived same-sex all male union as being literally *homosexual*, from the Greek *homos* meaning same. Paul wrote at times of the Spirit, but his Divinity was biune not triune in the full sense into which it would evolve later. Nevertheless Paul's Christology is the very essence of orthodox Theology and still dominates its thinking as it did for the scribes of the Christian Gospels and the Church Fathers.

Paul loved his brainchild, the motherless Jesus the Christ. He perceived and mothered the latter's spiritual presence within himself. He longed to be dissolved and to be with him. He spent the rest of his life preaching about the Mystery of God the Father and God the Son as revealed in Jesus the Christ. [In actual reality, it was *The Woman* in his psyche who conceived and sired his *Son of Man*.]

As young people become more aware of the empirically verifiable realities of Biological Science, teaching authorities must accept that it is time to free Religion Education from the contrived fictions, deceptions and aberrations in which patriarchal ignorance and

legendary make believe has implicated them over the course of the last few millennia.

Modern educated intelligent parents, real mothers and real fathers, rightly object to having their children christened (baptized) into an obsolete motherless all male Father - Son same-sex uniformity.

The emergence of a highly intelligent and dignified feminism and a sense of global pluralism associated with being the children of the same Great Earth Mother are not passing New Age intellectual fads. The yearning for increased conscious self-awareness and inner perceptual experience of the numinous, are laying the foundations of new cultural movements to replace the outgrown myths and outgrown cults of a conservative male-dominated Christianity. As it stands at present in this the Twenty First Century, the latter has reached its *use by* date. It has become impotent to fertilize the human psyche any further for good. The motherless child is abandoned by its former spirit of masculine uniformity. Stranded, alone, it awaits its call to return to the womb of Aseity from whence it first came.

Self's "I" and "Thou" are mystiered still more.

In speech, her "I" is Woman, Man as "Thee"
and She's enough of everything, save He.

When the "I AM" of unpronounceable YHWH speaks, she speaks as The Woman Eve, the Mother of all Mothers who share her selflife and her selfexistence. Fathers and sons are conceived as "You" in the biune psychical and physical wombs of the Mother Self of the Cosmos. They are born of woman. She is the self-functioning agent for all conceptioning, psychical and physical. Actuating the human psyche, she conceives concepts of what has been perceived through sense functioning. As the archetypal Great Mother, she acts in spaced time the pregnant human placental mammal. Her own selflife's continuum field spirit is androgynous, both bride and groom. It animates the selflife of all Existential Self-Other Relativity. It is this same selflife spirit that breathes its love in us and incorporates us into the blissful wondrous Oneness of Divine Togetherness.

In the past, Vatican authorities have defined, as Articles of Faith, the Assumption and Coronation in heaven of the Mother of God. With impaired intellectual vision, they were merely groping and echoing in the shadows of their human psyches the reality of Aseity and her Divine Maternity.