**Logos Universality Mentality Education Novelty, Section:
Philosophy and Humanistic Sciences**

ISSN: 2284–5976 (print), ISSN: 2284–5976 (electronic)

Covered in: CEEOL, Index Copernicus, Ideas RePEc,
EconPapers, Socionet

**THE CONCEPTS OF “GREAT FEMININE
GOVERNANCE” AND “AGE OF HOLY SPIRIT”, IN
THE AXIOLOGICAL RE-ORDERING OF THE XXIST
CENTURY GLOBAL SOCIETY**

Madalina Virginia ANTONESCU

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18662/lumenphs.2015.0302.04>

Logos Universality Mentality Education Novelty, Section:
Philosophy and Humanistic Sciences, III (2), 39-54

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://lumenjournals.com/philosophy-and-humanistic-sciences/>

Published by:
Lumen Publishing House
On behalf of:
Lumen Research Center in Social and Humanistic Sciences

The Concepts of “Great Feminine Governance” and “Age of Holy Spirit”, in the Axiological Re-Ordering of the XXIst Century Global Society

Madalina Virginia ANTONESCU¹

Abstract

The present paper focuses on searching for a comprehensive definition of the “Great Feminine Governance” and “The Age of the Holy Spirit” paradigm. In addition, it attempts to make an approach on some of their features, such as there are connected to concepts of “power” and “authority” that can be re-defined in a completely new manner. The Age of Holy Spirit is the Era of the Great Change, when human beings become aware of exploiting and discriminatory, unjust effects (for the freedom of women) of insisting on believing in a patriarchal-imperial type of system. It is an Era of moving towards alternative models of human society organization, based on perspectives that have abandoned the imperial-patriarchal old vision about the world, about human being and about God. The pattern of Absolute Father, as “absolute patriarch/tyrant”, Who wants only a perfect obedience and Who is isolated from His Creation (a hypothetical divine attitude, from which derives the schizoid, fragmented lifestyle of humans, such as living in a continuous “state of a generalized war”) becomes obsolete, being replaced with visionary and creative, fertile and positive conceptions about the world, about the relation God-mankind and with new types of gender relations.

The article focuses on analysing the transfer from the model of a punishing and banishing divinity, to a divinity of inspiration, forgiveness and universal peace.

Keywords: *patriarchal system, gender studies, Absolute Father, Holy Spirit, High Governance.*

¹ Ph.D., scientific researcher, Romanian Diplomatic Institute, Romania, madyantonescu@gmail.com.

1. Introduction

From the very beginning, it is important to note that *there is no such thing as a perfect model of organizing the human societies*. It would not even be recommended to plead for a “perfect” model of social organization and political governance over the human societies of the 21st century (history has shown us many cases of repressive systems, which denied the creative potential of the human being, his/her unique nature and personality, by the very virtue of their claim to be “perfect”). Therefore, the starting point is the imperfection of the human being, his/her constant strive to assume values such as good, beauty, truth, justice, from becoming aware of the fact that the human being is prone to error, as a unique being who must aspire to perfection, but who must not give in to the temptation of creating monstrous systems of repression on his/her fellow human beings, in the name of perfection.

Therefore, *we will not make the mistake of creating a value-based hierarchy of the systems of human organization* or of considering that alternative models, rather than classical ones, are necessarily *eo ipso* “better”, as compared to the models “compromised by history” (according to the perspective created among the supporters of the alter-globalist theories, which we consider – without taking on an absolute approach – to be a strong trend at the beginning of the 21st century, in terms of virtues of “the terrestrial community systems”, as an alternative to the “pyramidal model”).

Thus, we will avoid a comparison between the alter-globalist system (such as “terrestrial community” built on strictly equalitarian principles) and the pyramidal system of organization of human societies and, by default, of power. However, we shall insist in our paper *on the inadequate use, i.e. in a profoundly discriminating, marginalizing down to isolation of certain categories of people (in this case, women), of pyramidal systems of organizing the society and the political power*. This inadequate use of this model, during the history, has led (according to the works of many authors in the field) to *a mistaking of the pyramidal power system for, practically an eo ipso discriminating system of exploitation, marginalization in the gender relations*, which was perpetuated, as pointed out by these authors, for millennia, under apparent normality and lack of opposition) (Miroiu, 1996, 1996, pp. 173-174; Evdokimov, 1995, pp. 171-172; Bucur, Miroiu, 2002, pp. 12-13; Gatens, 2001, pp. 124-125; Dworkin, 2001, pp. 47-53; Korten, 2007, pp. 80-82). We consider however that *the discriminating, improper use* by the masculine elites, of the pyramidal power

systems of power and organization of the society does not necessarily mean that the system itself is improper for adequate usage (non-discriminating a gender – be it masculine or feminine).

Technically, the system takes the shape of its ruler (especially in the case of pyramidal power systems) and if it becomes victim of a tradition of discrimination against women, of a habit of vitiated use of this system (habit entertained for centuries, even millennia, thus being mistaken for the very system), it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to *disconnect the system as such from the habit of discriminating women and repositioning the system on the proper course (gender equality)*. Therefore, we will not contest in an absolute manner the systems of pyramidal governing; instead, we will criticize the elites (masculine, in particular) and the improper manner in which these systems were used by the elites, for the systematic marginalization of the feminine gender. At the same time, we shall not make absolute statements regarding the alter-globalist systems (network-based or egalitarian communities), because the theoretical model and its intrinsic virtues can be contradicted most visibly by a faulty practical and historical operation (from the viewpoint of gender relations).

2. Characteristics of the “Power” and “Authority” Models, in the Great Feminine Age: Moving from Civilizations of the Ego, to the Civilization of the Person

We consider that the “Great Feminine Age” is built starting from *a spiritual basis*, in terms of gender relations² (*reconsidering the relation between the woman and God³, seen as Holy Spirit* (Korten, 2007, pp. 217-219, 220-221), not as “the supreme man” (Miroiu, 1995, pp. 166-167), as credited by the

² The patriarchal period could be delimited (as a civilization focused on the concept of male “ego”, i.e. of auto-gravitational, self-sufficient “ego”, wherefrom the concepts of egoism, competition, rivalry, heroism, understood as emancipation as mother, from the feminine universe), from the post-patriarchal and ante-patriarchal period (generating civilizations focused on the concept of “person” as an ex-centred concept, a giving, compassionate concept, full of care, love, acceptance, forgiveness, with the “person” having multiple connections with the others and with divinity). See the difference between “ego” and “person”, in Vianu Mureşan, *Simbolul, icoana, fața*, Eikon Publishing House, Cluj-Napoca, 2006, pp.159-161.

³ Becoming “daughter of God”, through the work and message of Christ, through the freedom within the Spirit, through the second birth or spiritual filiations, which is superior (the second birth of the human being through water and Spirit, i.e. the baptism and the human being working in Grace with God) and which exceeds the blood-based filiations (the basis of the patriarchal society of the Old Testament). Galatians, chapter 4:1-7, 30-31. Chapter 5: 6, 13

priesthood elites, in order to acquire and perpetuate *the legitimacy for controlling and deciding on human societies, for five millennia* (Korten, 2007, p. 218). The spiritual basis in question regards *the woman as a unique human being, free, complex, with the same divine spark in her, as the man*, being as much as the man, according to the law of Christ, “daughter of God”, not “servant”, *equal to the man, in the spirit of the word of Christ*⁴ (Terestchenko, 2000, p. 24) (both considered “limbs” of His Church, with no difference in terms of rank, social status, lineage, ethnic group, gender)⁵.

Again, we insist on the model of *God as Spirit*⁶ – promoted by Christ as well, for that matter – *as inspiration, as Supreme Being, beyond the human power of assessment and imagination, therefore beyond the consolidation of the human being in the patriarchal model of “God-Supreme Patriarch”*, model based on which women have been oppressed, exploited and marginalized for millennia (Miroiu, 1995, pp. 146-148).

The societies in the *Millennium of the Holy Spirit* recover the *antepatriarchal experience, that of the civilizations based on the set of feminine values*⁷, plus the science of promoting life⁸, the arts revealing the beauty and harmony of life, of nature, of the human being, (reacquainting the alienated postmodern human *with beauty as norm of the Divine Creation* as well as *with the practice of virtues* – truth, communion, cooperation, communication, loyalty, mercifulness, giving, good doing, fairness, honour – which were excluded disdained, marginalized and disregarded *in the patriarchal-imperial systems focused on the cult of death, of force, on exploitation, alienation, destruction, pillage, oppression, irrational consumption, competition among the people and gaining profit*⁹).

The Great Feminine Age will pay special attention to *the promotion of arts, which help resurface the feminine values, learn and apply them*: love for the fellow

⁴ Galatians, chapter5 :6, 13.

⁵ Galatians, chapter3 :26-28.

⁶ *Credința ortodoxă*, quoted op., p. 55.

⁷ See the open discussion on the true feminine virtues, unaltered by Patriarchalism and its vitiated senses, in Mihaela Miroiu, *Convenio*, quoted op., pp. 146-147. David Korten, quoted op., pp.220-221.

⁸ About overcoming sciences and arts which cultivate chaos, destruction, war, death – all being included in necrophilic, anti-civilization pattern of a perverted masculine.

⁹ About the necrophilic nature of the patriarchal civilizations, see Paul Evdokimov, quoted op., pp. 172. Mihaela Miroiu, *Convenio*, quoted op., p.64. For example, the aspects based on disregard for the politics of the High Science of Governing, in applying certain “Machiavellian principles” in the internal and international relations, taking immorality, lack of scruples to the rank of political quality and thus perverting politics, one of the fundamental dimensions of human civilization, and implicitly the models of economic, social, cultural organization and the history of humanity for five millennia. David Korten, quoted op., pp. 55-66.

human being, love for nature, love for God, harmony and kindness, mercifulness and giving (*feminine energy being a giver of life, wherefrom glorifying the art of future, of beauty, uniqueness, complexity of life, God as Life Giver and the woman, as giver, carrier and protector of life*). These values of the Great Feminine Age will have to be represented and shared with the people *through an entirely different type of elites (priesthood, political¹⁰, cultural elites)*, different from the elites serving the underdeveloped systems, discriminating, oppressing systems of the patriarchal-imperial Long Dark Ages. This does not mean that the men should suffer from discrimination or oppression in the Great Feminine Age, but that *they will be educated in the spirit of values protecting and perpetuating life, not in the spirit of values oppressing, stifling, destroying life* (the change is represented by detachment from Patriarchalism, as a *vitiated* vision of the universe and masculine energy).

In the vision of *rebalancing* the relation between the feminine and the masculine, the latter is no longer associated with symbols of death, destruction, pillage, oppression, domination, egoism and profit. *In the Great Feminine Age, the Masculine learns again to be himself, i.e. a partner of the feminine energy, a complementary part of her, necessary for the creation, protection and promotion of life. Life is a contribution of both types of energy* and the men have to learn again how to perceive themselves *as masculine energy, loving, creative and protector of life, not as an energy opposed to it*.

The Great Schism of Gender, the Great Division between the feminine and the masculine energy, maintained and perpetuated for millennia, in order to prevent the human being from accessing his/ her true identity, a plenary, co-creative identity – in which both energies *cooperate in a sense in the spirit of God, i.e. close to God, as Spirit, as Spring of Life¹¹* – is doomed to failure and it will be dissolved in the Age of the Holy Spirit. In order to avoid major failure of the human civilization overall, to avoid self-destruction, humanity will have to become aware of and overcome a millenary system of manipulation and control, of prevention of its real *evolution towards the plenary human being*, in harmony with his/herself, with the two cosmic-divine energies (masculine and feminine), with the planet, with the entire divine creation and with God.

The Age of the Holy Spirit is therefore *the Age of the Great Transformation*, a new time, in which the human beings realise the oppressing effects (for the freedom of the human being and, in this context, of the

¹⁰ The elites in question are enforcers of the High Politics, not of the traditional Machiavellian, dominating the patriarchal pattern of civilization, until the present day.

¹¹ *Credința ortodoxă*, quoted op., pp. 114-115.

woman) of continuing the patriarchal-imperial system. It is an Age of moving on to *alternate models of organizing human societies*, based on *perspectives which abandoned the patriarchal-imperial vision of the world and the human being, of God Himself*. The model of the Absolute Father, in the sense of “absolute patriarch”, who is owed obedience without a murmur and who is isolated from His Creation (wherefrom the model of schizoid living of the human being in the patriarchal-imperial model, *i.e. in a state of war with the other*, between the man and the woman and between the man and God, from Whom “he is separated”) becomes obsolete.

This model is replaced by another model, also existing in the Holy Scripture (especially, the New Testament, which sheds a completely different light on the Being of God and His relation to the human beings, different from the vision of a discretionary, despotic God, isolated in the skies, vengeful and angry, vision persisting in the Old Testament).

This model different from the “absolute patriarch” (Korten, 2007, p. 217)(pattern used by the masculine elite to legitimate its behavioural, axiological and social model, in relation to the woman in the society, in the religious, cultural, political, economic framework) is also called ***the model of “God as Life Creating Spirit”¹², i.e. transcendent, elevated above materiality and therefore above any attempts to separate (and discriminate) the masculine and the feminine***. This type of model, present in the New Testament, was promoted by Christ as key-model of His message of universal love, among all the human beings, irrespective of the criteria based on gender, wealth, lineage, social origin, rank and all sorts of other functional criteria, in organized societies, based on the opposite pattern (patriarchal-imperial)¹³.

The model of “God – Life Creating Spirit”¹⁴ (sending us again to the Third Hypostasis of the Holy Trinity, to the Holy Spirit and Its feminine aspect¹⁵, constantly ignored by the theologians and by the masculine priesthood elites, in the interpretation of the New Testament) suggests a type of relation between the human being and God, above the gender difference among the human beings, as gender paradigm (which would predispose some – men, in this case – to “access to transcendence” and would exclude the other – women, in this case – from such transcendence, practically “incarcerating”

¹² *Credința ortodoxă*, quoted op., p. 130.

¹³ Galatians, cap. 3:26-28.

¹⁴ *Credința ortodoxă*, quoted op., p.114-115.

¹⁵ See the parable of the of the Divine Wedding, in the Book of Apocalypse, chapter 19:7-9, chapter 21:2, 9-11. Also see *Credința ortodoxă*, quoted op, pp.132-133

an entire gender, in the material plain). The New Testament suggests a universal love, a possibility for *all* human beings to reach God¹⁶, to get communion in the presence of God.

Christ, both as God and as man, explained the best to the human beings *the inefficiency of dichotomist thinking*, denying the relation of tension, hostility down to ontological hatred, between men and women (*maintained and benefiting from divine legitimating through the model of the “Absolute Father”, of the “supreme patriarch”, by the elites of the patriarchal-imperial pattern*). He insisted on an attitude of the man towards the woman based on respect, authentic, spiritual love (agape), on understanding the deep complementariness between the men and the women “one through the other, towards completion”¹⁷), not on a relation of hierarchical, schizoid submission between men and women, as imposed by the opposite patriarchal-imperialist model (the Paulian thinking, influenced by Patriarchalism) (Miroiu, 1996, pp. 37-39).

Christ was the one who showed the people *how the Being of God must be interpreted under his paternal aspect (God the Father, as a loving, caring and merciful Parent*, not as a discretionary, vengeful, angry despot, isolated from the human beings). In the parable of the prodigal son, He uses *the image of a forgiving Father*, Who receives His son with open arms, despite the errors committed by the latter and his distancing from Him (equivalent to an entire pattern of behaviour and mentality of the alienated postmodern human being).

This second model (“God-Spirit”), from which the Great Feminine Age begins, *repositions the Spirit at the centre of attention* and sets the grounds for *creating new models of human post-patriarchal-imperialist societies*. The Spirit is “life-creating”, Maker, Wise, Loving Mother, Comforter, Healer and Soother. It is associated with peace, soothing pain, return, acceptance, forgiveness, love, mercifulness, love shared with everyone, while *spiritual conscience (starting from the model of God-Spirit) is the highest level of the human conscience* (Korten, 2007, pp. 46-47), bringing the human being in communion with God as Supreme

¹⁶ Galatians, chapter 3:26-27.

¹⁷ See Christ’s attitude towards the sinful woman, whom the men (as public accusers) prepared to stone to death, a woman whose sins Christ forgives, urging her to spiritual elevation, for completion and deliverance. John, chapter 8:3-11. It is, in fact, an indication of the fact that Christ does not associate the woman with sin and he does not allow the man to judge the woman from a superior position, assumed publicly (public accuser, derived from the vitiated application of the model of God – Supreme Patriarch).

Being, as Eternal Spring of life (“*He Who Is*” i.e. the Eternal Being, beyond death, beyond time, the state of separation, mutation, change, dichotomy, opposition, isolation).

In the same manner, ***elevating the feminine by crowning and investing as empress over the entire Divine Creation and through her transcending***(the woman as “*Empress of the Light*”, *through the archetype of the Mother of God, as well as through the parable of the “Bride rising to the Sky”, in the “Divine Wedding”* from the Book of Apocalypse, therefore a clear transcending of the Divine Creation into its materiality, *a sublimation of the woman, presented in the hypostasis of “Empress”*¹⁸) signifies the change in the fundamental paradigm of human positioning in the 3rd millennium and practically entering the Great Feminine Age, the Age of the Third Hypostasis of God (the Spirit).

Therefore, in the Third Era, we witness the honouring, the re-crediting of the feminine energy (disdained, marginalized, considered unrepresentative for the “human”) *as life-generating energy, protective and caregiver of life*; at the same time, we witness *the sublimation of the woman, under the sacred hypostases of: creator of values* (giving life, protecting life, caring for and educating the human being, understood as *project assumed by the woman freely and in full awareness*, not as a position of any sort, “animal-like”) (Miroiu, 1996, pp. 169-170); *creator of civilization* (by building civilizations based on the *set of feminine values, in agreement with the Divine Creation*, with nature and its rules of operation); “*empress*” (the woman occupies the highest position of governing, of decision-making and command, in a divine-cosmic hierarchical system); “*Empress of the World*” (in the Third Era, the woman becomes the Protector, Comforter, Healer – The One Giving Back Life, The One Caring for Life, since life is associated with the Light and the Spirit, life is the expression of will and love for God).

The *Holy Spirit (as Dove)*, i.e. the Hypostasis of God, which is the symbol of the beginning of a new period in the history of humanity (based on the High Governance, on spiritual knowledge, on peace and on the sciences of peace and cooperation, on good understanding among people) is *above the woman*, in her sublimated hypostasis, that of “*Empress of the World*”.

¹⁸ See the symbolism in the icons, regarding in fact the Coming of the Comforter and His crowning, in his feminine aspect (as Bride, Hearth of the Church), the real scene behind the general name of these icons, as representing “the Coronation of the Virgin Mary”.

The second symbol of entering the New Age of the Holy Spirit is “the Divine Wedding”¹⁹, i.e. the model of rebalance between the masculine and feminine energies (***cosmic-divine wedding***, seen as wedding in heaven, divine wedding between Christ as Groom and the Holy Spirit as Bride, the Heart of the Church²⁰, therefore two Hypostases of Godliness – *the Word and Spirit, inspiration – uniting as man and woman – reference to the human being, as “face and likeness to God”, as They are One being, equal in grace, honour and in all the powers, to all eternity*²¹. This particularly complex symbol (of the “Divine Wedding”) reveals the necessity for the human being to reach a correct mutual understanding (that is *in harmony* with the laws of Divine Creation and with the love of God) *of the relation between the man and the woman, overcoming the Great Schism of Genders and to perceive themselves as elements of a unit, as complementary parts, without hierarchical organization, equal in the Grace of God, in honour and power* (the “Two” wear crowns and imperial clothes, equally elevating the feminine and masculine energies, sublimating them in a perfect union).

3. From Pre-Patriarchal Societies to Revaluing the Feminine Universe in the Great Feminine Era

As specialists in the history of culture acknowledge, during the *great societies of partnership*, which precede the “patriarchal-imperial age” (five millennia of oppression of women (Korten, 2007, p. 81), in which the women truly formed a distinct category, one of “secondary human beings”, “attached to the masculine universe”, of “imperfect human beings”, their existence “depending on that of the whole human being, the man”), *women had main roles in the development and application of basic technologies* (Korten, 2007, pp. 83-86).

These human societies, based on the principles of partnership specific to the pre-imperial period, *elaborated institutions of law, governing and religion* – the cults of Goddesses, of the Great Mother (bases for a complex social organization), *promoted arts* (dance, oral literature, architecture, ritual theatre) *and crafts* (pottery, basket weaving, textile weaving, leather processing, construction of boats, construction of roads, urban planning,

¹⁹ See the parable of the Divine Wedding, in the Book of Apocalypse, chapter 19:7-9, chapter 21: 2, 9-11

²⁰ *Creștința ortodoxă*, quoted op., p. 130-131.

²¹ Idem, pp. 53-54.

metallurgy)²². *These types of societies were never “primitive”* (as people currently describe those times in a condescending manner, *solely because they are based on different values, different patterns of organization and operation*, than the imperial-patriarchal systems, which represented and dominated the human history for five millennia).

Great societies in which women played main roles (ignored or minimized by the historic conception, impregnated with the patriarchal perspective – although, lately, we can notice other types of approaches in the history of humanity, which exit the pattern of patriarchal-imperial perception), *based on the principle of partnership*²³ (unlike the imperial systems, which dominated five millennia and which defined the human history, removing the women from entire areas of the social, cultural, political, military and religious life and condemning them to a marginal existence, one of “alter-ity”, which is not specific to “humanity” – a humanity shaped on the masculine view of the human being (Gatens, 2001, pp. 124-133, 181-190), are generally described allusively and discriminatingly, by the historians, leaving room for the interpretation that they were “primitive” (that is inferior to the subsequent forms of organization, of the patriarchal-imperial type), invalid and non-defining for the “history of humanity” (as it was and still is understood in the official patriarchal-imperial perspective) and “without chance of returning”, “of being resumed” (in adapted forms) in the third millennium (wherefrom the condescending view of this pattern of human organization).

Technically, the historians consider these types of societies to be conventional, “obsolete, once and for all”, “a primitive stage in the history of humanity”, as “progress” demands moving on to “stages of authentic evolution” (thus crediting the patriarchal-imperial experience and pattern of organization) which, “was maintained until presented day, as such” (Mitroiu, 1996, pp. 44-45, 172-174, 176-179). No accent is placed on *the negative and manipulating role of the elites* (represented during the long patriarchal-imperial age by many – with very rare exceptions) *in perpetuating this patriarchal-imperial pattern*, which provided them the only chance to maintain their privileges, power (formal and/or informal) over the forms of social, political, religious, cultural, economic and military organization.

However, the human history is not formed of stages objectively leading to an “inevitable” progress; instead, it is formed of a series of experiences, instances of enforcement of certain different systems and

²² Idem, p. 84.

²³ Ibidem, p.83-88.

models of human organization (the model of partnership society/the imperial model; the network or community model/the pyramidal hierarchic model; the cooperating model/the oppressive model; the biophilic/necrophilic model; the model of shared, renewed, given energy/the model of destructive, self-isolating, retained energy).

In the forms of the pre-patriarchal society, people lived in societies organized on relatively equalitarian principles, followed the life-giving and regenerating energies and relied on women for rule, in various aspects of the family and community life (Korten, 2007, p. 84); it is important that we note that *the imperial-patriarchal history*, persistently perpetuated as “sole valid model of organizing the human societies in history” (claim of their “intrinsic validity”), for five millennia, *with fundamental discriminations against the woman’s condition* (and more) *is but a stage (under no circumstances is it an “evolving” stage; on the contrary, it is a form of involution)*, because, through manipulation and force, it detached the human being from himself/herself, from nature as an ecosystem which includes the human being and on which the latter cannot operate without limitation and in a destructive manner, without having to face the consequences of his/her unnatural, schizoid state.

This patriarchal model segregated the human beings on the basis of the gender criterion and then (with the creation of cultures, by creating and perpetuating unwritten laws, traditions, habits, rituals, ceremonials and legal norms) *segregated them on the basis of a type criterion, regarding the woman as an adversary to the man (the second schizoid state, after the break of the human being from nature); it parted the human being from God*, misinterpreting His divine message²⁴, in a sense that supports the type of system promoted and approved by the masculine elites (patriarchal-imperial)²⁵.

²⁴ In a sense that hides Christ’s message of love and equality among people, in the Church of Christ, in a sense that introduces discrimination in gender relations, in the religious area and further, in other areas.

²⁵ The woman, as “attachment of the man” (in Mihaela Miroiu, *Convenio*, quoted op., pp.178-179). The only religion to which we refer here, out of the three monotheistic religions (Judaism, Islamism, Christianity) is Christianity and its use by the priesthood elites, to credit the divine legitimacy, to perpetuate in time, in the political systems, forms of oppression, domination of the weak, of the other, of the woman, both in private and in public life. Traditional Christianity, which borrowed a great deal from the Judaic way of thinking, starting from the model of the absolute Father (understood by the elites as “absolute Patriarch”, “the Master”, in the sense of “Supreme man”, the monarchic model necessary for creating and justifying the bases of the patriarchal-imperial system, with periods of great assertion in history, due to the type of interpretation assigned by the masculine elites – those who exercised the theoretical and practical monopoly of this vision over the message of Christ) had unfavourable consequences for the historical situation of the woman. Also see David Korten, quoted op., pp. 214-116. In its traditional sense (in

Practically, we can notice in the human history, as per authors such as Riane Eisler (in her work *"The Chalice and the Blade"* (Korten, 2007, pp. 83-86) *two great symbols* what subtly influenced the building and perpetuation of *two completely different models of human organization, from the perspective of the type criterion, with different sets of values: the feminine model of human organization (built on the chalice/goblet symbol), as symbol of the feminine power, which gives life, protects it, safeguards it, a symbol of the supreme creating power and, on the other hand, the patriarchal model of human organization (built on the "blade/sword" symbol), as symbol of the masculine destructive power, taking life, dominating, conquering an extinguishing life.*

Human history, as noted by the above-quoted author, is dominated by a dichotomist vision of the masculine and the feminine, implemented and enforced for millennia, permanently focused on erasing the myths, legends, stories and symbols of feminine power and on asserting (as "sole emblem of the human nature") the heroic-masculine myths, legends and symbols, to credit the patriarchal-imperialist perspective on the human being, the world and even God (the model of the "supreme Patriarch"). Thus, some sort of trans-historical cultural, social, economic and especially religious "cage" was gradually created around the woman, her universe of values, around the feminine as a type of cosmic-divine energy, with the purpose of restricting the "adversary", of removing "the competing values", putting a stigma on them or de-sacralising them, for the patriarchal-imperial model to be imposed in history and to continue to shape history and define the "human", millennium by millennium.

Thus, the Great Feminine Energy was disdained, removed from human history, by crediting a schizoid model, invalid from the cosmic-divine (*the patriarchal-imperial model, i.e. "phallic imperialism"* (Evdokimov, 1995, pp. 167, 171-177), defined here as aggression and denying the possibility and

which the patriarchal vision of the Old Testament dominated the message of Christ, as far as covering it), Christianity – as construed by the masculine elites in the theological and political space of the time – provided a social, political, moral, mentality and cultural framework *unfavourable for the woman*, compelling her to remain constricted within a private universe, one of domestic activity, disdained by men, unrecognized as bringer of social prestige, power or influence within the society; women were practically "handed into the care" of men who were regarded as "bread winners", while the monarchic model of Christianity (*patriarchal-imperial interpretation of God*) provided *the religious and moral grounds for the legitimacy required for the creation of hierarchical relations between men and women, relations of the master/servant, superior/inferior type, the creation of an entire dichotomist series, in which the woman becomes culpable ("the sin of Eve"), she is removed, disdained, marginalized, abused and excluded from entire areas of the society and from the rule of the state (with very rare exceptions, when women acquire the throne by succession or marriage and even then, by applying the monarchic model of God, i.e. acting under the same patriarchal-imperial pattern, based on the masculine rules, laws and habits).*

capacity of the woman to define herself, her natural right to make choices concerning her own body, her own mind, her own personality and *to freely form this personality*, without being manipulated into or constrained to adopt the masculine perspective, which is strange to her and her values) as “evolved”.

In this manner, for millennia, the women were compelled to adopt various positions (for their existential and cultural condition): *they tolerated the patriarchal-imperial perspective* thrown at them, pretending not to notice it or regarding it in a “detached” manner (a culpable attitude because it contributed *to the perpetuating* of the disdaining and discriminating mentality regarding women, *with their very approval*), *they chose to isolate from this model*, through their entire life (risking to be despised by the society) or *they confronted this blatantly discriminating model, bringing it to the public attention, questioning it, disturbing the promoters of the official vision of the “human”* (the elites, including the priesthood), *forcing the obsolete and degenerated system to change, in order to accept the feminine version of the “human”, as well.*

In this context, we enter the 3rd millennium as a Great Feminine Age, i.e. meant to rebalance the feminine and masculine energies, *after a long history dominated by an unnatural, schizoid model, based on force, aggression, the cult of death, of heroism* (understood in the martial perspective, of the winner in battles, the one eliminating entire populations or capturing several prisoners, plundering, the one pillaging the most), based on exploitation, egoism, competition, on the “law of the jungle”, “law of profit”, exploitation of nature, irresponsibility, lack of measure, arrogance, waste and domination.

The use of the Great Feminine Energy in the 3rd millennium removes these destructive effects on the human being, on the woman, on the complex relation between men and women, women and God, the human being and his/her planet. It proposes *alternate models*, based on which *other types of social organization systems, other forms of cultures and civilizations* are created, some based on the *set of feminine values*: generating life, safeguarding life, non-polluting technologies, respect for nature, preserving the resources of the planet, for the use of future generations, responsible manner of living in the society, practice of mercifulness and kindness (including the institutional level), balance, measure, peaceful solutions, momentum of diplomacy, irenology, cooperation among nations, strengthening of relations between ethics and politics (decline of Machiavellian politics), rethinking the forms of ensuring the security of human communities (including the discouragement of the

militarization among nations – the twilight age of the realistic perspective²⁶, applied for so long in international relations).

Special attention will be paid in this Age to ***non-toxic natural technologies, applied in agriculture and fruit farming*** (resuming the pre-imperial activity, from the old societies, called societies “of the civilizations of the Goddess, Mother Nature”).

Occupations regarding the cultivation of land and harvesting of its fruit (agriculture, fruit farming), as well as apiculture and fishing (the latter done without illegal, poisoning methods, but in conditions of preserving the species and ensuring that the ecosystems are not disturbed, through rational exploitation and observance of the obligation to repopulate the ecosystems where exploitation was made with the respective species) ***will be again regarded as essential, generators of social status, of prestige***, on the scale of such *societies focused on the ancient feminine value (cultivation of land, germination, renewal of land and aquatic ecosystems)*.

Technologies of natural renewal of land, water purification technologies (for waters currently filled with the waste products of the industrial age), ***technologies of sorting and recycling waste products*** (toxic waste products, currently covering entire areas or recklessly discharged in the waters and causing severe effects, sometimes irreversible, for the human being and nature) ***will be again basic occupations*** of the Great Feminine Age, meant to break the planet from the involution perpetuated by the patriarchal-imperial model.

In the same manner, ***domains such as natural, alternative medicine, institutions of scientific research in the field*** (provision of pharmaceutical products based on natural, healing plants, based on honey and other natural substances, with beneficial effects for the human body) ***will generate social status and prestige***.

In this context, we must note that the patriarchal-imperial elites would be tempted to avoid moving on ***to the stage of authentic evolution of humankind: the Great Feminine Age, the Age of the Holy Spirit, the Great Age of Spiritual Knowledge. It is possible that these obsolete elites attempt to return to primitive systems of human organization***, which lie to the human being about his/her nature, to definitively discredit

²⁶ Because accepting a “wolf state” among the human beings would similarly determine an “international wolf state” in the relations among nations and peoples, i.e. “the right of the strongest”, with detachment from the ethical, spiritual dimension of the politics and human relations.

him/her (by becoming *monstrous, non-human or sub-human, in techné* (Colang, Gavrilescu, 2011, pp. 42-45), through the process of “adding to human”, i.e. transformation of the human being into a robot, a cyborg, denying or disregarding the spiritual dimension²⁷ of the human being, “numbing” the conscience through rituals, automatic, routine occupations or occupations not questioned). ***This is “ground zero” or what we call “the failure of the existence of the postmodern human being”, because this path of idolizing technology eo ipso, detached from the critical, lucid, ethical and spiritual dimension would lead to robotising, to the refusal of his/her uniqueness, the refusal of his/her personality and, finally, to becoming passive or aggressive (entering “the new Barbary”, instead of naturally entering in the High Civilization).***

Acknowledgment

The present article represents *only the personal opinion of the author* and it does not involve in any form any other natural person or legal entity. All the rights over the present text are reserved. The quotations from the present text are made by mentioning the author and the complete source.

References

- Bucur, M., Miroiu, M. (coord.), (2002). *Patriarhat și emancipare în istoria gândirii românești*. Iasi: Polirom Publishing House.
- Colang, G., Gavrilescu, A. (2011). *Portretul omului contemporan. Barbarul*. Bucuresti: Ed. Minerva.
- Dworkin, A. (1983). *A cui presă? A cui libertate?* In (2001), *Războiul împotriva tăcerii* (pp. 47-53). Iasi: Polirom Publishing House.
- Evdokimov, P. (1995). *Femeia și mântuirea lumii*, translated by Gabriela Moldoveanu. Bucharest: Christiana Association.
- Gatens, M. (2001). *Feminism și filozofie. Perspective asupra diferenței și egalității*, translated by Olivia Rusu-Toderan. Iasi: Polirom Publishing House.
- Korten, D. (2007). *Marea Cotitură. De la imperiu la Comunitatea Terestră*, trad. de Mihnea Columbeanu. Prahova: Antet Publishing House.
- Miroiu, M. (1995). *Gândul umbrei*. Bucharest: Alternative Publishing House.

²⁷ The „new primitiveness” would be given by the inferior condition of the human being, transformed into a robot that abandoned its dimension of „spiritual being”, in favour of the „robot condition”, “automatising” the human being, and turning him/her into a “machine”.

- Miroiu, M. (1996). *Convenio. Despre natură, femei și morală*. București: Alternative Publishing House.
- Mureșan, V. (2006). *Simbolul, icoana, fața*. Cluj-Napoca: Eikon Publishing House.
- Terestchenko, M. (2000). *Marile curente ale filozofiei politice*, translated by Dana Iurescu Lungu. Iași: Institutul European Publishing House.
-

Biodata

Mădălina Virginia ANTONESCU holds a Ph. D. in European Law, at Bucharest University, Department of Law (2009) and she is scientific researcher. At present, she is counsellor with Romanian Diplomatic Institute and honorary researcher with Romanian Institute for Human Rights. She holds a diploma of Paris I Pantheon Sorbonne University (1998) and a master of National School for Political and Administrative Studies, Bucharest, specialization “International relations and European integration” (2001-2003). Fields of interest: human rights, European law, international law, international relations, diplomacy, culture, civilization.