

Christian Social Ethics Under Gender Paradigm?

An examination of theological connectivity

There is a lot of emotionality marking the discussion about the position of the gender perspective in society and also theology, above all in social ethics. An artificial language of its own kind with scientific demand has evolved articulating semantics that can hardly be followed by the non-initiated. Colloquial language is to be “engendered” everywhere and all-comprising including the translation of the Holy Scriptures.¹ Besides the ladies’ and gentlemen’s restrooms there is to be a third variant in public conveniences. There are no more two but six or even eight genders. Frank Plasberg’s gender-talk in ‘tough but fair’ was put on again anew after massive protests and reproaches of discrimination aired by furious proponents.² There is a lot of public money available for newly established chairs focussing on the studies of gender. For its large research projects, the European Social Funds regard as a condition the mandatory examination by its own gender- checkpoint.³ Obviously, this theme is no longer a theoretical play with glass beads anymore. In practical terms, it rather impacts our everyday life and questions of justice as for example with the allocation of scarce public money. Here the normative power of the factual becomes effective. Science can never put up with such normativity. It must get to the bottom of things in order to understand. In this sense, this development is in need of a critical scrutiny. I do this here from the perspective of Catholic Social Ethics.

1. Two Questions Beyond Polemics

Are our corporeality and identity of a normative nature or a normative construct? This is what proponents and opponents of gender theories discuss about. One answer lays bare the scientific-theoretical value basis of the gender theory. In theological terms, the direct question springs up: Is this idea of Man and his body as a construct or as nature compatible with the Christian faith? Are gender theories enriching theological ethics or are they basically incompatible with it? With one answer, nothing less is examined than its connectivity to theology. “But a thorough discourse with identifiable positions hardly takes place.”⁴ Before such a discussion, unfounded polemics first must be moved aside on both sides. Proponents as well as opponents of accepting the gender theory in Catholic Social Ethics accuse the other side of a polemic reduction of their own position. Here, fundamentalist items are not the object of my discourse. Someone who does not shrink back from violence against the so-called “rightist” gender-opponents, as in personal threats or the violence appealed for in the Berlin theatre play ‘Fear’⁵, disqualifies him/herself. The same applies to those that condemn wholesale the ‘leftist’ gender proponents for allegedly opting for a society in which every human can choose his gender. According to the Münster social ethicist M. Heimbach-Stein, this does not meet the point of gender proponents in the context of social ethics in a serious manner.⁶ Someone who calls out the end of Western Civilization, at first must define contents in clear semantics what cohesion means to a values community enthralled in an encroaching process of secularization from Christianity. Following Heimbach-Steins, proponents of the gender perspective, in the first place, do not call for equality of the biological sexes, but rather for the social gender, i.e. the cultural embedding of humans in gender role models as prescribed by society.

Here you see a considerable deficit of justice that must be de-stigmatised to open the individual's eyes to himself and his identity beyond dogmatism and paternalism. The assumed feminine crisis of identity is focussed onto the social gender and decoupled from biological corporeality. Feminine identity is understood as under the conditions of biological difference whereas the social gender is to emancipate itself from merely being something different or even lacking in view of masculinity.⁷ Thus the biological gender should not be put in question as being merely a social construct.⁸ The attempt at a factual discourse from a theological social-ethical perspective sorts out polemics and only then focuses on the phenomenon and questions entailed. To start off, I will first examine the value basis and then the theological suitability. On this I will not discuss the plenitude of various gender theories. Instead I base my elaborations on the concise as well as lucid presentation of the Münster social ethicist M. Heimbach-Steins who brings to the point the basic matter of a scientific gender theory.⁹ Having answered the two questions and identified its encompassing normative demand, the natural law perspective will be reconstructed which the gender perspective wanted to deconstruct.

2. Value Basis of the Gender Perspective

2.1. Break with Natural Law

Since Thomas Aquinas, Catholic Social Teaching has followed an argumentation based on natural law for its value basis, which again was placed great emphasis upon by Pope Benedict XVI, for example in his speech before the German Bundestag.¹⁰ Such systematic is categorically rejected by gender theology as constantly emphasised by Heimbach-Steins in her writing. It is basically assumed that a normative concept of nature has incapacitated Man in a dogmatic way and thus is held responsible for a continuous injustice between genders. A role stereotype founded in a normative nature made people blind to unfolding their essential potentials and detecting related injustice. Here Aristotle is quoted who, with his teachings of natural law, justified slavery in society. As this philosophy, without a doubt, has moulded Thomas Aquinas and the Social Teaching of the Church, the conclusion is drawn that ethics based in a natural order or the nature of Man and thus also Catholic Social Teaching must be a pre-modern ideology to cement existing (gender-related) structures of power. This reproach of an ideological injustice of genders and social exclusion is especially aimed at those who refer to natural law. Gender theology follows the assumption that argumentations based on natural law of (gender) orders and rules have proved a failure in the course of time. Examples cited are references to human nature legitimizing despotic monarchies or unequal social treatment of man and woman. It is assumed that such meanwhile obviously obsolete interpretations falsify objective normative demands and make possible formulating human dignity as an objective normativity through unalienable imperatives. They finally result from a naturalist fallacy if, from the factual reality of a monarchy or concrete supremacy of a gender, one draws the conclusion of a normative legitimization of such conditions.

2.2. Break with Kant

With the deconstruction of the value basis anchored in natural law thus aimed at, the emerging vacuum must be filled. Gender theology (i.e. theological inquiry from the perspective of social gender) sees itself closely connected with the ethics of discourse and constructivism. Post-modern discourse paradigm is not simply taken over but rather put through a new construction. According to Heimbach-Steins following G. Marschütz, gender is "primarily a consequence of discursive practice and hence a cultural construction."¹¹ The assumed restricted view of natural law regarded as the reason for injustice is to be broadened

through a dialogue with the diversity of human empirical sciences. The connectivity of theological thought with secular ethnology, social and literary sciences etc. is said to be the suitable hermeneutics through which theology can redefine and enrich itself by drawing on its being different and, face to face, to overcome this difference in a process of fusion.¹²

Following discourse-ethical logic, this means that justice of the gender order must be negotiated anew again and again in a societal discourse by all people concerned. This sets free from dogmatism. Therefore, this power of deconstruction inherent in discourse ethics at first is broadly taken up. In this discourse theology, under the premise of methodological atheism, i.e. the assumption 'etsi deus non daretur'¹³ (Let's imagine there is no God) must reconstruct its arguments in order to be heard. From this results the conclusion: In lieu of nature and transcendence, discourse and world-relatedness of things social are the sources of ethics. It is this discourse ethics that its originator, Jürgen Habermas, employed to turn a leftist philosophy of society into Common Sense of German society. With its help, things theological are to be made connectable to the world of today. No place for things attributed to nature, things non-renounceable or eternally valid as can be read in Habermas' work. It is regarded as legitimate what has been decided on in discourse and needs abiding by certain rules. In this way, 'dogmatic ballast' can be thrown overboard which the Churches occasionally were reproached for by pre-modernity: under the premise of methodological atheism, secular and people of different beliefs could adopt the Church's thoughts on the social responsibility for our society. This sounds attractive.

Seen from the gender perspective, in regard to their social gender, people themselves should become the authors of their being humans which expresses their autonomy. Habermas is quoted as follows: "Human rights can be justified as moral as convincingly as possible. But they cannot be popped onto a sovereign quasi in a paternalistic manner. The idea of the legal autonomy of the citizens demands that the addressees of law can simultaneously understand themselves as its authors."¹⁴ Heimbach-Steins thinks, "The core of the matter is to recognize autonomy of the (also) gender-defined subjects as actors of their own (life) stories."¹⁵ Here autonomy is not to be understood, in Kant's sense, as abiding by the moral code. Knowledge and abiding by normative requirements of reason's thought presupposes reason without interest which, in following one's duty and complying with the objectively given categorical imperative, constitutes Kantian autonomy. But gender perspective wants to set free humans from the given normativity. Thus it does not only de-construct natural law as the theological basis of values but, with its term of autonomy, also bars Kantian ethics from access.

2.3. Objective Claim to Truth 2.0

The content normative dignity as autonomy, hence a social just order of gender, is to be negotiated in discourse. Human dignity (instead of normative nature) accordingly is the anchor of all ethics. It must never be violated. Autonomy as Kantian binding to duty as well as natural law arguments are not wanted in discourse.

The gender perspective supplements Habermas' criteria of legitimate discourse with an essential restriction and, through such a new construction, leaves this paradigm¹⁶: The discourse is a liberated search to define the "truth" of gender justice.¹⁷ Thereby is introduced a prescribed objectivity. The gender perspective itself is no more the object of the discourse. Rather is it positioned before the bracket creative origin of norms and thus elevated into the circle of Habermas' procedural rules taken granted as being objective. But that means: The

gender perspective becomes an objective condition for all legitimate social-ethical discourses as it is necessary for the thought process (or even normatively given by nature ..?) Dignity as autonomy in the sense of real equality of the genders means purifying the personal unfolding of the human being of found sexual mindsets of role models and in totality eradicating all residues in society (e.g. masculine formulations, gender-specific education and its advocates) as well as recognition of a plurality of the genders and sexual orientation with all legal rights involved (e.g. in regard to marriage, family, admittance to office of priest &c). Without doubt, this semantic is a construct itself claiming with its objective jurisdiction the replacement of the normative nature as a transcendently defined axiomatic decision for eternity. This perspective absolutely wants to be a normative value basis whose concrete terms are to be negotiated in discourse. Following the logic of discourse, the gender perspective normatively ranks higher than human rights. Its implementation requires a fundamental adjustment of the normative societal basis which already breaks through in numerous areas of life in our society. As a constructed objectivity it sets about becoming a binding element in the Western value community.

3. Theological Content

3.1. Locating the new objectivity?

Accepting the gender perspective as a challenge to society and to identify it as a new world view its high claim is one thing: what reason is there to analyse and critically comment on new normative paradigms and their impact on changing value foundations of societies. Doubtlessly, the issue of gender justice as a critical scrutiny of existing respectively crumbling social identities is the study object of sociology and social ethics. That is top priority with society's value foundation being at disposition. The question is if the gender perspective from its self-formulated claim can be grasped as an object (in the realm of science) or whether it has sprung up to be a subject (to the normative totality of science) thereby de-subjectifying other sciences i.e. normatively "gendering" them.

Establishing such a perspective with such a high claim as a theological category is a different matter. Here is demanded to fuse a worldview (the Christian one) with a new objective normativity. The question is if this can succeed without replacing the theological core of theology and in this way to deconstruct this discipline. Christendom stands for unalienable normative positions above humans and a just society. If the religious core only remains as an attachment to the dominating gender questions, it will evaporate more and more and Christian social ethics becomes superfluous. Theological orientation of social responsibility and justice must begin with an expressively Christian content and, therefore, with relating to God the starting point of relating to the world via love of oneself and fellow-human beings as questions of justice are to be understood. Can the gender perspective amalgamate with the religious core under theological conditions? That would be acceptable. If the theological element fused with gender consciousness, it would be unacceptable. Examining just this nuance is the issue of the scrutiny of the gender perspective in regard to its ability to connect to Christian theology.

To begin with, in a compatibility test, it is attempted to identify the constitutive nucleus of theological ethics.¹⁸

3.2. Capable of Connecting to Theology?

Should amalgamation under theological conditions succeed, the normative gender perspective must match the following framework. According to Christian view, God expects our answer to His loving summons to salvation. Thus social justice manifests itself in a rule, respectively

order, to make possible for every human being to unfold his/her God-given destiny of salvation. According to his/her potential, every Christian has the mission to form societal rules and, in the context of these rules, to responsibly give answers leading to salvation. We bear a three-fold responsibility:

- a.) toward God: it manifests itself in understanding our life in the light of our Creator and our being thankful for what He gives to us and, as moral beings, to unfold our liberty in this light;
- b.) toward ourselves: it manifests itself in our accepting ourselves in our corporeality with our undisputed likeness to the image of God as persons with unconditional dignity and, especially in weakness, to acknowledge undivided dignity;
- c.) toward our neighbour: it manifests itself in acts of concrete neighbourly love on the one hand, and, on the other, in our commitment to living together in the spirit of social love.

As we are obligated to Jesus' gospel of salvation as Christians, we should make our contributions to a society that enables as many people as possible to shoulder this responsibility. The basis of this liberation before God is Biblical:

God's instructions in the Covenant with Man	Man's Answers Bringing Salvation	Biblical Sources
<i>Freedom, Friendship and Judgement</i>	moral responsibility for our life/overcoming coercion	Henceforth I call you not servants ...but I have called you friends. (Joh 15,15).So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.(Rom14,12)
<i>His Love</i>	of oneself, neighbour and God	Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,... and: Thy neighbour as thyself. (Lk 10, 26-27)
<i>Our Talents</i>	creative unfolding of our talents	As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God (1 Petr 4,10)
<i>Scarce goods of the Earth</i>	sustainable use and appreciation of creation	And the Lord God took the man, and put him in the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. (Gen 2,15)

The Christian content retains its relevance only if it does not lose its connection to God. Assuming the existence of God, the Christian view therefore is directed to the love of God. God endows every human being dignity and freedom, He provides community with us in His Covenant and the Church, He entrusts us with His creation, He gives us grace and forgiveness on the cross and, not at least at Easter, the certitude of a new life. The Holy Spirit is within us and enables us to live according to our God-given destiny. That is why, as moral humans, we firstly have a responsibility toward God whom we all will face one day. From this creed is deduced the responsibility toward ourselves and our neighbours. Both cannot be rendered apart if we want to understand our responsibility in a Christian way. Societal rules and order must make possible shouldering this responsibility. As inviolable human dignity cannot be

proven logically, it is a matter of faith. Christian justification for this human dignity, especially the weak, sick, disabled and unborn humans is a normative anthropology. It openly acknowledges inviolability as a matter of faith, justified in the Christian idea of likeness with the image of God and God's incarnation in Christ. Someone who understands a human being as a person in this manner, even the appeal to make his/her contribution to society is no form of coercion but rather the duty as human being. In this understanding of dignity – different to some Kantian interpretations (J. Nida Rümelin)¹⁹ – also the difference between human and animal law becomes clear.

Less clear is the theological compatibility with the gender perspective. Without any doubt, this view is based on a radical concept of gender equality as justice. Does this idea of human dignity correspond to God's mission of salvation? Heimbach-Steins seeks to justify this capability to connect in Biblical terms by referring to Gal 3, 26 and Mk 3, 31-36. Apostle Paul's call: "There is neither ... male nor female" is interpreted as gender perspective. The same applies to Jesus' laying emphasis on the personal decision before origin: "For whoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother." Thus Jesus himself – runs the interpretation – abolishes the (social) gender thereby introducing the gender perspective. In addition, in the spirit of the Second Vatican Council, it is a sign of our times challenging the Church to open its doors for it.²⁰ If this interpretation were correct, it would doubtlessly be authorized as theological.

Certainly, such an interpretation is not inadmissible. But it de-contextualizes Jesus' and Paul's statements of their central message of salvation. In their context, the focus is on Man's path to salvation, and on this path gender and origin are of no relevance. Primarily, it is a matter of the common profession of Christ which establishes community as a new form of family. This emphasis of decisiveness for Christ as a path to salvation is a foundation of Christian ethics and, therefore, steps before the bracket of theological discussions on justice. The feminist speculation eclipses this central statement. It is therefore to be understood as an exegesis which, in its hermeneutics, analogous to liberation theology, interprets with a pre-formed perspective and intention and reveals injustices of present times and fights them with Biblical justification. Such a politically motivated approach to the Holy Scriptures differs starkly from exegesis that – instead of reading normativity into the text- tries to read the gospel out of the text. In this light appear the alleged Biblical pieces of evidence for the gender theology. Substantial arguments from the teaching profession and tradition are lacking, therefore there can be no talk of a theological justification of the gender perspective.

However, after such a secularization of its basis of justification, the question arises if such a now sociological gender perspective is compatible with God's plan of salvation and thus conceivable as a symbiosis amalgamating with it. Now the speculative theological question emerges: Does God's plan of salvation match His understanding of equality, abolishing social gender and de-constructing normative nature? Naturally, gender theology affirms this. But such an assumption seems to mislead.

In biological corporality we find embodied the moral and thus normative identity of the human being. Separating the two is tantamount to tearing the human being apart. The human being as a whole is called for salvation which includes his/her biological corporality. Dissecting biological sex from social gender corresponds to a constructivist de-personalisation of the human being. Separating into co-evolutionary systems is being hostile to the body and competes with the idea of human unity of biological body and the personality of the human being conceived of as normative in God's plan of salvation. The essence-to-be of Man and therewith its normative nature is constituent with the Christian view of Man. Its

de-construction would have to deny God's mission to Man. Without doubt, the semantic definition of normativity remains worthy of a discussion, but not its essentially given being and its bond to the biological difference of the body.

As to semantics: In the Book of Genesis we read that God created Humankind as Man and Woman. This difference of bodily identity is of a different quality than for example the colour of hair or the height of the body. Such minor features are not mentioned there as they are part of someone's individuality but not of great import in the human being's response to the love of God in His plan of salvation. Things would have been simpler for God by His creating Man analogous to a sexless flower. Then the gender perspective would have been resolved from the root. The difference between Man and Woman is expressively highlighted in the Book of Genesis and (leaving out those remaining unmarried for God) commissioned with the normative task of giving life to descendants if possible and heeding the laws of the Old and New Covenants, and accepting, in the family in loving faithfulness to one another, the roles of mother and father. Without doubt, these roles are part of social gender constantly re-interpreted. From the point of view of a gender perspective, these differences are to be levelled. Does such a de-construction of the roles of father and mother not end up in the normative recommendation of childlessness because the difference of roles can thus be cancelled in the most radical way? Such a consequence clearly runs counter to God's plan of salvation who loves children. In the teaching and tradition and, last but not least, in the Church's understanding of the sacraments is there any evidence for levelling the social gender by abolishing the difference between father and mother and normatively sanctioning the openness for children. It is just the opposite.

The fact that the normative demand of educating boys and girls without any gender-specific components leads to a suppression of the biological nature of given gender-specific potentials for realizing and freedom is something that I can only speculate on and claim as such because I start off from such a fundamental difference. A normative levelling of said difference puts in the place of de-constructed normative nature a gender-totality, now, in its turn, the image of Man. Such a notion of freedom smacks of F. Engels' demand to lead people from the realm of necessity to the "realm of freedom". But a freedom that has little to do with God's freedom.

The gender perspective cannot be proven as an ingredient of God's plan of salvation as understood in Christian terms. Not only are lacking arguments from theological sources of knowledge such as the Bible, official teaching and tradition. Systematically, this perspective additionally sees itself in a strained relationship to the normativity of Creation. Therefore it cannot, as demanded by its self-image, become a binding perspective of theological reflection on justice. Such a gender theology is a contradiction in itself.

4. Instead of De-Construction: Re-Construction of Normative Nature

Under the suspicion of pre-modern dogmatism, mighty Catholic Social Ethics "Beyond Catholic Social Teaching"²¹ has sorted out to a quite an extent natural law. In the same way it is done by gender theology. This attempted de-construction is to be opposed by the re-construction of normative nature forming the basis of Catholic Social Ethics in order to be able to administer a social-ethical adjustment after the de-construction of gender theology. The normative notion of nature is not at all a counter-concept to the absolute dignity of Man As claimed by gender perspective advocates but rather its most convincing justification.²² Identity, corporality and sexuality of Man gain their untouchable dignity through the normative nature of Man. Their semantics are recalled at this point.

All being has been created by God and is grounded in Him and His justification. It thus is a part of nature (in essence) of the created being to be deeply grounded in the uncreated Being of God. Against this backdrop, it becomes understandable that all creatures are part of a divine plan and are given a context of meaning drawing on natural law.²³ Things Man ought to do is not deduced from his being. It is already immanent in being.²⁴ Being means ought to! Man bears in himself his purpose: “*Bonum enim et ens convertuntur*” says Thomas of Aquinas.²⁵ Accordingly, through his own nature, Man is obligated to his destiny of salvation thus, when there is talk of human nature, normativity is considered as well. Natural law is a reasonable justification of an objectified legitimacy of absolute human dignity which, without saying, equally applies to woman and man. Especially via Catholic tradition did it become the Christian point of reference in settling issues of justice. Knowledge, based on natural law, independently follows metaphysics in its justification of an objective human dignity denying subjective inclinations as it was laid down by Plato and Aristotle and as theonomously integrated into a Christian context by Thomas Aquinas via the Islamic philosophy of Averroes. It assumes as given truths beyond their physical explicability as well as recognizable the given nature of Man from which normative conclusions for the implementation of human dignity may be drawn. This path to understanding requires a natural destiny for all human beings which needs be discerned clearly to help adjust to it a legitimate societal (gender) order. The totalitarian claim to truth by the gender perspective for itself cannot concur with this. Human dignity as an absolute, objective standard derives from an ontological normative image of Man. It ranks as (divinely) given so that the mission of objective ethics sees itself in recognizing normativity of human nature as a truth in order to align legally and objectively with it the legitimacy of law and ethics and thus with justice. The personal and transcendent God has become immanent in this world through Jesus Christ. He has remained world immanent through the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit enables Man as *Caritas in veritate* to direct his loving reason to God and His eternal order (the *lex aeterna*), to recognize it analogously and to make timelessly valid statements about the essence of Man, his corporality, the expression of his identity as dignity, his essential rights and duties. This is meant by the normative nature of Man.

In his speech in the German Bundestag, Benedict XVI reminded the audience that lived tradition conveys truth. Natural law is no monolithic block in the ivory tower, it is engaged in a dialogue with the world. In his search for truth and justice, Man’s view should “again be directed to the vastness of the world, heavens and the Earth.” This perspective is to be understood as a dynamic dialogue with the world under the dictum of “*Etsi deus daretur*”. Finding truth here remains a dynamic process. Augustine could bear witness for justice differently from the resistance fighters in the Third Reich. But both testimonies open equivalently windows on truth which is a yardstick for us. Benedict XVI’s social criticism of the oblivion of truth as a forgetfulness of humanity of our days is of a fundamental kind when the demanded “Ecology of Man” also enumerates the possibilities of human self-destruction as well as Man’s hubris to play Creator himself, all due to the lack of culture. Wanting to amalgamate God’s plan of salvation against this backdrop at least is no act of humility. Opposed to violations of God’s plan of salvation is the goal that humans, in their identities as persons, are to understand themselves as held in responsibility to one another and God. This also is meant by the orientation towards normative human nature.

For the knowledge about the being of Man and thus the justification of his dignity bringing with it his rights and duties, humankind does not merely depend on the Bible. Namely, reason and conscience are capable of truth: “...the man is become one of us to know good and evil” (Gen 3, 22). Timelessly valid rights and duties can be recognized with the help of reason. Active reason (Greek ‘nous’ as *intellectus agens*) can recognize, through its participating

with the divine spirit with the help of abstraction (as viewing essence), the regulation given by God. It makes use of its inherent signpost of the “right reason” (as *Ratio recta*).²⁶ It is meant that reason which, following conscience, does recognize what is in alignment with natural law and absolute human dignity. In this view of things, it is possible for right reason to touch upon natural human destiny through understanding but it cannot grasp destiny in totality. However, right reason is only part of divine reason, it is not identical. Thus the knowledge of human dignity and personality which are regarded as true and constituent of corporality not identical with divine truth, yet not completely different from it. That is why they are called analogous. In this sense, the question of gender justice is of theological relevance – realizing same dignity whilst heeding social difference of relevance to salvation.

5. Summary: Yes to Gender Justice – No to Gender Perspective

The sociological question of justice raised by the gender perspective is to be recognized as a challenge by theology and to be discussed. From the Christian vantage point, it goes without saying that Man and Woman enjoy the same dignity for both are images of God. Both sexes are called upon and enabled by social rules as well as virtues to freely realize their potentials and to live up to their moral demand to God in responsibility to one’s self and others. There must be no preference or discrimination in respect to such an entitlement to salvation. Such equality is not grounded in the deconstruction of any difference of the so-called social gender nor in a de-personalized de-corporality of the normative perspective. Rather it is about theologically tenable gender justice for realizing the same dignity whilst considering not only biological difference but also the social one which is relevant to salvation. Probing these and give a warning, if need be, a dialogue at eye level with social and human sciences can be a worthwhile task for Christian social ethics. Then this question is no totality but subject matter of theological questioning among others. If we take gender perspective’s claim to truth seriously, that would mean: gender justice is a question of theology beyond the gender perspective.

Translated from the German by York R. Buttler 12/17

Notes

¹ Vgl. Schüssler Fiorenza – E., Gender, Sprache und Herrschaft. Feministische Theologie als Kyriarchatsforschung, in: Jost – R./ Raschzok – K. (Hg.), Gender Religion Kultur. Biblische, interreligiöse und ethische Aspekte, Stuttgart 2011, S. 17-35.

² Vgl.: Absurdes Ende einer öffentlich-rechtlichen Posse, in: Die Welt vom 8.9.2015, <http://www.welt.de/vermischtes/article146110641/Absurdes-Ende-einer-oeffentlich-rechtlichen-Posse.html> (6.11.2015)

³ Vgl.: Agentur für Gleichstellung im ESF (Hg.), Gender Mainstreaming im Europäischen Sozialfonds. Ziele, Methoden, Perspektiven, Berlin 2014.

⁴ Heimbach-Steins – M., Die Gender-Debatte – Herausforderungen für Theologie und Kirche. Köln 2015, S. 12.

⁵ Vgl. <http://citizengo.org/de> (6.11.2015).

⁶ Vgl. Heimbach-Steins, Die Gender-Debatte, S. 7.

⁷ Vgl. hierzu die Identitätsdiskussion im französischen Feminismus. Eine aufschlussreiche knappe Übersicht dazu ist nachzulesen bei Breger – C., Identität, in: von Braun – C./ Stephan – I. (Hg.), Gender@Wissen. Ein Handbuch der Gendertheorien, Köln³2013, S. 55-66 (hier: S. 62-65).

⁸ Damit grenzt sich eine solche feministische Gendertheologie ab von radikalen Dekonstruktionstheorien wie etwa von Butler – J. Gender Trouble, Feminism and the Subversion of Identity, New York 1990. Dort wird auch das biologische Geschlecht dekonstruiert und damit zugleich feministisches Argumentieren erschwert.

⁹ Vgl. Heimbach-Steins, Die Gender-Debatte.

¹⁰ Vgl.: Benedikt XVI., Rede im Deutschen Bundestag vom 22.9.2011, <http://www.papst-in-deutschland.de/presse/reden/> (6.11.2015)

¹¹ Heimbach-Steins, Die Gender-Debatte, S. 7 zitiert Marschütz – G., Trojanisches Pferd Gender? In: Schlögel-Fierl – K./ Prüller-Jagenteufel – G. (Hg.), Aus Liebe zu Gott – im Dienst am Menschen, Münster 2014, S. 432.

¹² Vgl. ebd., S. 13

¹³ Also: „Stellen wir uns vor, es gebe Gott nicht.“

¹⁴ Habermas – J., Über den inneren Zusammenhang von Rechtsstaat und Demokratie, in: ders., Die Einbeziehung des Anderen, Frankfurt a.M. 1996, S. 293–305, hier: 301.

¹⁵ Heimbach-Steins, Die Gender-Debatte, S. 13.

¹⁶ Breger – C., Identität, S. 73 nennt dies „die teilanaloge Abwendung von postmoderner Diskurstheorie“.

¹⁷ Vgl. Heimbach-Steins, Die Gender-Debatte, S. 14.

¹⁸ Vgl. Nass – E., ... weil das der Botschaft Jesu entspricht. Die missionarische Kraft christlich-sozialer Positionen, in: Anzeiger für die Seelsorge 11/2015.

¹⁹ Vgl. Nida-Rümelin – J., Bio-Ethik. Wo die Menschenwürde beginnt, in: Der Tagesspiegel vom 3.1.2001.

²⁰ Vgl. Heimbach-Steins, Die Gender Debatte, S. 14f.

²¹ Vgl. Hengsbach – F./Emunds – B./Möhring-Hesse – M., Jenseits Katholischer Soziallehre. Neue Entwürfe christlicher Gesellschaftsethik, Düsseldorf 1993.

²² Vgl. Heimbach-Steins, Die Gender-Debatte, S. 13.

²³ Vgl. Müller, Christian, Christliche Sozialethik und das Wertproblem in den Wirtschaftswissenschaften, in: Ordo 55 (2004) 77-97.

²⁴ Vgl. Messner – J., Das Naturrecht. Handbuch der Gesellschaftsethik, Staatsethik und Wirtschaftsethik, Berlin 1984, S.144.

²⁵ Thomas von Aquin, Summa Theologica, I-II, q. 18, a.1.