

## Faith and Social Intimacy: Learning for Life

Joyce E. Bellous

*In this realm one cannot prove anything, but one can point out a great deal.<sup>1</sup>*

*For it is by grace you have been saved, through faith—and this is not from yourselves it is the gift of God—not by works, so that no-one can boast. For we are God’s handiwork, created in Christ Jesus to do good works, which God prepared in advance for us to do. Eph 2:8-10*

### Introduction

What is faith? The question invites a modern, conceptual focus on identity. Our response to the question what is faith marks off its conceptual boundaries and distinguishes it from semantically related terms. In carrying out a conceptual analysis, faith is named and depicted as to what it is. Yet there is something static about asking identity questions and constructing analytical answers. Following those who spatialize knowledge, (e.g., Peter Ramus 1574)<sup>2</sup>, the question of faith’s nature introduces and stipulates an identity for faith and provides criteria for observing faith in the world. Unfortunately, faith may be trapped inside conceptual inquiry and domesticated beyond recognition. A second question about faith is equally possible. We might ask: How does faith operate? The second question follows post-modern critiques of modern prescriptions for words like faith and is typical, for example, of Michel Foucault’s analysis of power<sup>3</sup> or Jean Baudrillard’s critique of social relations<sup>4</sup>. The second sort of inquiry is dynamic and descriptive—faith becomes a moving target.

I propose we ask our questions sequentially: What is faith? How does faith operate? Faith is thereby depicted and dynamic. But a conflict remains that inheres in linking the two questions together. As we ask how faith operates, we contest its identity, challenging answers to the first question. The two questions start to spin as we ask what faith is; yet answers help us search for faith’s *modus operandi*. Asking our questions opens up reflective space in which we see aspects of faith and its operations in the world. Resolving conflict between the two questions allows our understanding of faith to move forward. Conflict is resolved by thinking. At the outset I will offer a conceptual approach by asking about the nature of faith. After stipulating definitions of faith, I speculate on how it operates in the world. Connecting the two questions will show how faith establishes the groundwork for social intimacy to build its home. If we identify faith and ask how it works in the world, we will see the bases for social intimacy. Faith builds toward intimacy because it holds confidence and vulnerability in tension. Faith opens up the possibility of hope. Intimacy likewise depends on hope. Intimacy is the developed capacity to be vulnerable and feel safe. Social intimacy adds to this definition the developed capacity for being near and different. In social intimacy we learn to value others who are not entirely like us.

I will make one request of the reader. I would like you to imagine, standing behind this inquiry into the nature and operations of faith and its connection to social intimacy, a relationship between an adult and a child. The adult desires to help the child discover and strengthen faith; the child longs for a spiritual friend. What may they hope? What might they learn together? Intimacy, hope and faith are not acquired apart from belonging to committed, constant and long-term spiritual friendships. Faith and social intimacy can only be linked through lived experience.

### What is Faith?

Every human being requires an education in faith. There are two aspects of the word that matter to education: the noun faith and the verb to believe. The first aspect comes through the

noun and its adjective. It is expressed in the following two sentences: The faith of her parents is Christianity. She is a faithful person. The second aspect is related to the verb to believe, e.g., in the sentence: He believes in God. Under certain conditions, the second aspect is an activity: we exercise faith. Faith as a noun or adjective is the confidence, trust, reliance or conviction that we place in someone or something. As an exercise, faith eventually becomes an attitude of the heart; it is a disposition. People who exercise faith can be counted on to act in certain ways because placing confidence in a person or thing alters thought and action with respect to that person or thing and to the world in general. Exercising faith is as changeful as is physical exercise.

I want to make a further distinction that follows from the one above. Faith refers to content, i.e., what is believed and also to a way of life. As content, faith is intellectual assent. Intellectual assent implies believing and affirming some content and suggests that a person has given assent to particular, consciously chosen statements about the world. These statements may be religious or secular. They may be as crass as the following: “Look out for yourself because no one else will do it for you” (i.e., the all-too-popular expression ‘Look out for #1’). This particular belief barricades the believer from social intimacy. Generally speaking, people who give assent feel bound to act accordingly with the implications of the statements they choose and prize. I say generally speaking because one of the interesting dynamics of exploring the nature of faith and its operations is precisely the relationship between what people say they believe and affirm and what they actually rely on. Affirmation implies conscious intentionality. Yet there may be deep cleavages between what we say and what we count on when the going gets tough. Observing on our own faithfulness (or its failure) requires noticing the conscious and intentional congruity between what is said and what is done, a continuity that is more elusive than we like to admit, but is the heart of the spiritual work of growing up.

As a consequence, there is a relationship between the content of faith and its exercise that is itself one of the issues faith poses. While faith is an essential part of being human—everyone exercises faith—establishing a happy continuity between what we say we believe and affirm and what we actually trust is a difficult part of being human. Faith as an activity or a way of life has to do with fidelity, with holding fast to one’s integrity and keeping one’s word; it is belief put to use. Further, faith as an exercise implies a kind of attentiveness: we observe ourselves acting congruently with what we claim to believe. As an example, faith may be expressed in loyalty to a religious tradition that has been consciously chosen as a way of life. Faith as feeling is a way of loving the world. It is an attitude that opposes itself to fear and is forward-looking. Faith makes peace with uncertainty because it is a comfortably certain grip on the picture of the world that each of us holds.

A final dimension of faith remains and is specifically religious. Faith is a comfortable grip on God; it is holding sure in God and is confident reliance on God’s own Self. From Christian perspectives, faith is not superstition but relies on Christ’s ‘once-for-all’ sacrifice on the cross at Calvary. It is based on a belief that the faithful are related to God via the historical events of Christ’s life, death and resurrection. Faith is grounded on God’s initiative from start to finish. Faith as holding sure in God opens the way for the faithful to enjoy proffered resources of God’s grace: forgiveness and a future. Our response to God’s generosity expresses itself in worship, integrity and service—of being a God-infused community and of offering ourselves to those who suffer the realities of ordinary living. From this perspective, faith is a new way of hearing and seeing the world and of perceiving our selves in it. Faith is a way of hearing and seeing. The activity of faith is to sense the world in a particular way. People see through eyes and

hear through ears of faith, or else they sense experience through a veil of despair. Believing is an outcome of faith: it is the action of faith—something like energy perhaps that affects ordinary experience. If people understand what it is, they begin to notice how they exercise faith. An essential human task is to learn to use faith in the right way, whether or not people place faith in God.

### **Learning Faith**

Faith is never far from us. Every human being has the capacity for exercising faith. There are three parts to the activity. There is the agent of faith—the person that exercises faith. There is the object of faith—the something or someone the agent puts faith in. And there is the relation between the agent and the object. Suppose a young child exercises faith in her mother. As they go for a walk, they come to a playground. The little girl indicates that she wants to play on the slide. She climbs up the steps. As she sits at the top her mother stands at the bottom of the slide. The mother looks steadily at her daughter and says she will catch her little girl. The child fixes her gaze on her mother's face. The little girl glances down the slide and is afraid but looks back to the familiar face and pushes away from her safe resting spot, keeping her eyes on her mother. Her mother catches her. The relation between mother and child is carried through their mutual gaze and expressed in their shared joy at success. Faith addresses fear; faith is the opposite of giving in to fear. Faith tries things out, and failing or succeeding, goes on trying. While it may be possible to avoid slides in a playground, every human being learns to exercise faith. We put faith in our trust or in our mistrust of other people. This little girl is likely to put her faith in trusting others.

We learn about faith as infants. Consider an infant who plays a game of peek-a-boo with his father. The father, the game and the baby constitute an activity in which the infant is learning that his father exists even though the baby can no longer see him. As they play the game the baby learns to have faith in things unseen. Faith is active when we cannot make use of our five senses. Faith is the consequence of experimenting with trust. We put faith in something or someone with the result that we acquire certain beliefs about the world. If conditions are *favorable*, beliefs form about the world encouraging us to exercise faith rather than succumbing to fear and refusing to put faith in anything that we cannot see, smell, hear, taste or touch.

Human beings are compelled to put faith somewhere. We may even come to put faith entirely in our selves, or more accurately in a snapshot of our selves—an image we make into an idol. But we all inevitably exercise faith. We have faith that the sun will come up tomorrow and that the seas will stay in place. We put faith in the roof over our heads and that the weather will bring sun and rain to make our fields produce food. We put faith in other people. If we did not put faith in ordinary things we would not have enough energy to go on living. People who cannot put faith in the predictability and orderliness of the world are unwell. They become neurotic or psychotic. They are overwhelmed by anxiety and crushed by the demands of living. Faith speaks to anxiety. Faith is built into reality and confirms the wisdom of having faith in the predictable length of days and seasons, in rain falling to water the earth and in the sun shining to warm it.

In order to organize reality meaningfully, we need a story to shape our perspective. This perspective is what we call faith. Faith is the story we tell ourselves about the world. Faith “does not create new things but it adds a new dimension to the basic realities of life. Faith brings our fragmented personality into a meaningful whole and unifies our divided self. It is the source of

inspiration for a searching mind, the basis for a creative community and a constant incentive for an on-going renewal of life.”<sup>5</sup>

The primary assumption then, is that every human being exercises faith. Faith cuts across secular and religious worldviews. Faith is an attitude that integrates the experience of a whole person—an entire self. In its integrative role, faith influences human action due to the hopeful way it organizes our perception of experience. If human beings want to be well, they are compelled to make sense of life. Faith fills in gaps in our experience between what we are able to touch, taste, see, hear or smell and realities that we cannot perceive or test empirically. Faith attends to depths that cannot be plumbed with a measuring stick. Faith organizes connections between what can be and what cannot be seen. This feature of faith is as true for scientists who study the atom as it is for those who trust an invisible God. Faith refers to a reality beyond mere seeing—a subject on which good science can only pay its humble respects.

### **A metaphor for faith**

Modern science was consumed with division and order—a place for everything and everything in its place. But while modern order explained aspects of human experience, it could not account for its sum total. Human experience moves beyond our capacity for summing things up neatly. In the aftermath of modernity, our spiritual task is to disturb the order of things sufficiently to let old ideas recover a rightful place in the human landscape and allow new ideas to emerge into the light of day. While we value the wealth that modernity made in the world, it suffered poverty as well. An enormous loss to humankind was felt in the field of faith. Modern secular voices embarrassed the faithful into silence. Science overwhelmed the faithful and left them with little to say in a marketplace tyrannized by empirical truth. Science believes it has the last word on experience and reality. In science, Reality is what is Measurable. Faith integrates experience but experience refers to more than what is measurable. Further, faith integrates the experience of a whole person—an entire self. Mature faith is flexible enough to integrate new knowledge within its frame of reference and keep pace with new discoveries of the human mind; what is essential for mature faith is the constant willingness to shift gears, to integrate new insights, to revise our positions.<sup>6</sup>

To pursue this inquiry, a prior question presents itself: how does human experience come to us? A useful image situates its integrative role and accounts for our need for faith as well. To say faith is an attitude of the heart it is to say it is ‘the responsive side of human consciousness’<sup>7</sup>; faith is found in mental states such as attention, interest, expectancy, feeling, imagination and reaction. Exercising faith is more than a mental state, it is expressed in action, but as an attitude, faith is “a subjective response to the power or powers that people conceive as having ultimate control over their interests and destinies”; it is an “attitude of a self toward an object in which the self genuinely believes,”<sup>8</sup> even if the ‘object’ is an object of thought, i.e., an idea, as it is in some faith traditions.

When we think of religion broadly, we can describe God as the Determiner of Destiny. Religious people attune themselves to the Determiner of Destiny—at the general and personal level. Destiny refers to what is going to happen to the world, humanity in general, as well as what is going to happen to you and me. We may also agree with Immanuel Kant (1793) that while there is only one true religion, there can be several kinds of faith<sup>9</sup> (e.g., Hindu, Christian, Jewish, Muslim); we might suggest further that there is faith that does not depend upon religious tradition, hence it is something we might call secular faith. Regardless of a particular tradition,

faith integrates human experience with respect to the Determiner of Destiny—or as many young people now say, they sense that there is Something There. The vagueness of their description of Ultimate Reality may be due to their inexperience with religious traditions hence the idea of Destiny itself may have too much attached to it for them to understand.

An image that explains how faith integrates experience is an archipelago.<sup>10</sup> Experience is like an archipelago—a landform in which islands are surrounded by an expanse of water such that the island surfaces can be seen and explored but roots and connections between one island and another cannot be seen, they must be imagined. As people look at islands that can be seen and are close together, it is reasonable to suppose there are connections between them. Modern science focused on landforms; faith focuses on what lies between. Landforms can be charted and measured; their materials tested. Experience of landforms is repeatable and hence measurable—to a great extent. Human beings cannot regard islands without making assumptions about deep waters—even casual observers sense that there is something there. Maturing, reflective faith takes account of the landforms but also imagines, speculates upon, believes in and narrates the depths beyond sight. Faith helps make sense of the geography of human experience and orients thinking about life as a whole.<sup>11</sup>

All people are compelled to make sense of experience. The stories we tell orient the way we think about the world and convey how to link events together. Explanations for what holds life together shift and change over a lifetime. Faith integrates the process of maturing implied in letting our mental landscape include the reality of measurable landforms and the reality of deeps that lie between them. Deep waters compel us to imagine and narrate a unity between land and ocean that constitutes human experience in its entirety.

### **The structure of faith**

If it orients thinking, how is faith built up? An analogy from Wittgenstein explains how faith might be structured and how it structures thinking. Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951) was instrumental in the demise of modern confidence in religious faith, yet notes he finished a few days before his death assert faith's inherent reasonableness. In his book, *On Certainty*, a collection of aphorisms, it is possible to organize an argument for faith or more precisely for believing as solid ground on which many reasonable people stand. It is important to realize he was writing at a time and for an audience that vigorously derided religious faith *per se*.

Wittgenstein explored the idea of what we can know for sure.<sup>12</sup> In doing so, he probed the structure of thinking about anything at all. In expressing his perceptions of problems associated with knowing, he used the following analogy to depict the structure of what we know. He began by suggesting that everyone has a world-picture. He pointed out that we do not get our pictures of the world by satisfying ourselves they are correct. Neither do we hold to them because we are satisfied with their correctness; rather the deepest layer of what we claim to know about the world is an inherited background against which we distinguish what is true from what is false.<sup>13</sup> The propositions that structure our knowledge are part of a kind of mythology. An analogy for the mythology of our mental life is that of a riverbed. Some inherited knowledge forms the bedrock of the river and is solid and firm, virtually unchanging, functioning as channels for other propositions that are not hardened; some propositions are fluid like the waters that flow over the river-bed, or else shift like sands that lie on the hard rock.<sup>14</sup>

Wittgenstein acknowledged a change of state was possible between the waters and the river-bed (some ideas that were once solid may become fluid), but distinguished between water

and river-bed in the following way: “the bank of the river consists partly of hard rock, subject to no alteration or only to an imperceptible one, partly of sand, which now in one place now in another gets washed away, or deposited.”<sup>15</sup> He later pointed out that “when we first begin to believe anything, what we believe is not a single proposition, it is a whole system of propositions,”<sup>16</sup> i.e., a mental system or a world-picture. The

child learns to believe a host of things. I.e. it learns to act according to these beliefs. Bit by bit there forms a system of what is believed, and in that system some things stand unshakeably fast and some are more or less liable to shift. What stands fast does so, not because it is intrinsically obvious or convincing; it is rather held fast by what lies around it.<sup>17</sup>

Wittgenstein pursued this line of thought. He noted that: “*Very* intelligent and well educated people believe in the story of creation in the Bible, while others hold it as proven false, and the grounds of the latter are well known to the former.”<sup>18</sup>

In making this point about beliefs held by reasonable people, he implied that all thinking is grounded on believing, i.e., on holding assumptions (propositions) we seldom doubt. Thinking must rest on a solid foundation. Even for the most thoughtful, some ideas are steady and reliable like the hinges on a door that allow the door to open. As he put it: “One might say that, ‘I know’ expresses comfortable certainty, not certainty that is still struggling.”<sup>19</sup> He spoke of comfortable certainty as neither hastiness nor superficiality, but as a form of life.<sup>20</sup> Believing orients thinking, because, as he put it: “knowledge in the end is based on acknowledgement.”<sup>21</sup> Further, “the rules of caution,” so characteristic of skeptical moderns, “only make sense if they come to an end somewhere. A doubt without an end is not even a doubt.”<sup>22</sup> Knowledge finds its resting place; it activates us according to a way of life that makes sense, so that we make sense to other people.

What do Wittgenstein’s aphorisms contribute to our discussion? Believing is built up by layering assumptions begun in infancy. His insight is linked to Hebrew understanding of faith. The precise meaning of faith to ancient Hebrews was “Hold God”<sup>23</sup> What is a faithful grip on God like? Also for the Greeks, Philo in particular, faith was a kind of certainty.<sup>24</sup> What sort of certainty is it? Wittgenstein’s expression elaborates these ancient contexts. A grip of faith holds God with comfortable certainty—it has stopped struggling. It is a form of life designed as world-pictures we get as children, reconfigured over time through personal and corporate experiences. When we ask the second question, how faith *operates*, we turn to specific narratives of faith. Faith *operates* within a particular form of life. I chose Christianity. It is an offspring of Hebrew and Greek perspectives. In Christianity, faith is material worked with and upon in an aesthetic of ordinary experience. It is an aesthetic of hearing and seeing I wish to explore. When we consider a concept of God, from the perspective of a particular faith tradition, the idea of God as the Determiner of Destiny shifts and changes so that God is known as much more.

### **Aesthetics of Faith**

Christianity has a unique perspective on faith and its role in religion. In addressing faith from a Christian perspective, I assume that Jesus of Nazareth, as human being, worked from an integrous center: as a consequence, his statements about a particular topic cohere in a meaningful relationship to one another. From the beginning of his ministry, he focused on faith. Jesus saw who had faith and who did not. His emphasis on the measure of faith was so pervasive, that the disciples at one point asked him to increase their faith. He responded to their request by saying that if they had faith the size of a mustard seed, which is extremely small, they could move

mountains. So on one hand, Jesus appeared to consider the measure of a person's faith to be central to their capacity to receive what they asked of him, on the other, a tiny amount of faith was sufficient to produce profound change. What is going on between Jesus and faith?

I suggest that in presenting faith Jesus used *complex irony*.<sup>25</sup> Complex irony is a figure of speech in which what is said both is and is not meant. Its complexity comes about through a set of conditions that are social as well as personal: irony moves people to think about what is being said in light of their current conceptions. Complex irony also conveys change in a concept so the idea can keep pace with something new—usually large-scale change. Complex irony requires that we understand simple irony. The purposes of simple irony may include humour, mockery or riddle. When irony riddles, it risks being misunderstood.<sup>26</sup> Complex irony riddles with a word's meaning, creating a break in our understanding of it, so new meanings may emerge.

In simple irony, what is said is not what is meant. Something contrary to what is said is to be understood. Taken in its ordinary sense, irony only works if what is said is not what is meant. Suppose a teacher is frustrated with a student's lack of progress, when the student is normally quite good. The teacher says: "You are being unusually clever today." If the statement were to be read as it stands, the teacher's meaning would not break through. If the student could not read the simple irony, he or she might think the teacher was offering praise. The student would be wrong. Further, if the teacher were trying to deceive the student, irony would not work. Irony in its simple sense only works if the hearer 'gets it', if the hearer comprehends that what is said is not what is meant. Irony requires us to think for our selves. Like all significant communication, irony puts the burden of communication on the hearer. But complex irony lays upon hearers an additional burden. Only those who have ears to hear, make sense of complex irony.

When Jesus said that the measure of one's faith matters and also said that faith the size of a mustard seed suffices, he was using complex irony. He both meant and did not mean what he said. He aimed our focus on faith as a centrepiece of spiritual relationship with God. Our relationship with God depends upon faith, specifically in Jesus, and grows more intimate with the increase of faith that comes about through each act in which faith is exercised. Faith is a complex irony. If we believe that our acts save us, we place confidence in ourselves not in God. If we wait for God and do nothing, our faith will not grow up. If we place our faith in God, and act out of believing, we move forward in faith toward maturity. Jesus' point seems to be that we must become aware of the measure of our faith, and however much we have at the start, faith must be exercised so that it can grow. Exercising faith matters very much. Yet it is always God and not our faith that saves us, so even a little faith can move mountains.

If we take its point, we notice that complex irony works with ambiguous terms such as faith. What makes complex irony effective is its relationship to ambiguity. Faith has more than one meaning. In addition, ambiguity is intensified under conditions of social change when meaning is actually changing. And not with words only, but entire social systems are under revision. Jesus was doing two things at once: he was honouring a system already in place (Judaism) and bringing about significant changes within that system through the use of complex irony. Jesus claimed that the changes were contiguous with the central and important message of the old system; others would disagree. The role of faith in Christian life is the core of those changes. Throughout the rest of the New Testament, early believers struggled with the meaning of faith and its application to a faithful life. For example, faith shows up 246 times in 227 verses in the New Testament. The early inquiry about faith was grounded on the investigation Jesus began in his followers. In effect Jesus asked the following questions: Where is your faith at this moment? What is the object of

your faith? What is the measure of your faith? What is the strength of relation between the object of your faith and your self? Can you see that your faith will grow as you use it? What might your faith accomplish if you put it to work? In all of this inquiry, the point for the believer is to engage in self-observation. How am I exercising faith at this moment? In whom am I placing my faith right now? What am I counting on? Self-observation is at the root of a faithful life. Educational issues regarding faith stem from self-observation. That is, Christians do two things simultaneously: they observe themselves carefully; they keep their eyes on Jesus.

In addition to self-observation, Christian scriptures say that faith comes by hearing, Rom. 10:17. What is implied in aural/oral transmissions of the Word for a person of faith? What does it mean that faith comes by hearing, specifically, by hearing the word of Christ? I am not asking a theological question. My question is educational. In terms of the teaching/learning relation, what does hearing suggest as a way of becoming a person of faith? How does hearing form faith on layers of assumption making from infancy onward that Wittgenstein described? In community, people tell stories and say many things. Personal human identity forms in association with a group and this identification is accomplished through an oral, embodied interaction of the whole. What we hear, we hear together; at times we hear with many people but always with at least two, even if the other is God, conceived as personal in Christianity. Yet hearing is also utterly personal: we hear what we are able to hear at any given moment.

Hearing *per se*, interiorizing sound, constructs aspects of human identity in a unique way through the ‘incorporating’ function of sound. Embodied learning is derived from embodied talking and hearing. Learning through talking and hearing is learning “by observing and listening, by repeating [what is heard], by mastering proverbs and ways of combining and recombining them, by assimilating other formulary materials, [and by participating] in a kind of *corporate retrospection*....”<sup>27</sup> Talking and hearing imply practice, until ‘doing’ forms a new member of the incorporating group. An outcome of oral learning is the developed capacity for empathy and solidarity among members. People draw near to hear one another. The metaphor for incorporating aspects of learning is the Incarnation of Christ. Christ exemplified the necessity of *being with* others as a way of becoming a person of faith. *Being with* engenders the empathy and solidarity that signify closeness, which is central to intimacy. As a result, members of a faith community learn to be near one another; neighborliness inheres in a community of faith, with all the reciprocal obligations that being a good neighbor imply. An oral way of learning leaves its impression on the interiority of group members. When fully formed, this impression expresses itself in the disposition to be a person of faith. As well, closeness is a by-product of incarnational learning, e.g., mentoring and apprenticeship. But social intimacy and healthy relational intimacy in general, require that people learn more than how to be close. They need to be neighborly, yet sustain important personal differences to grow in social intimacy. Intimacy flourishes as the child of two kindly parents: neighborliness and authenticity.

Hearing has the unique attribute that it is both corporate—we hear together—and personal—what I hear is my own. Our understanding of faith and its personal and corporate implications unfold over time. The meaning we currently attach to the role of faith in religious experience is a central differentiating aspect among the various faiths that flourish in the world. From a Christian perspective, faith comes by hearing: one must be actively engaged in thinking for one’s self, observing one’s self, learning through each exercise of faith and living a faithful life in the company of others. Hearing has these implications. Hearing also leads to seeing in a special sense. If hearing draws people close, an aesthetic of seeing allows them to stand back and

get a larger view of their authentic location in the group. Seeing combined with hearing, particularly as we understand a Christian perspective of faithful seeing, links nearness to difference. Christ came to model what it means to be near and different, i.e., social intimacy. Under these conditions, how does seeing work?

From a Christian perspective, faith is seen but is not sight. Seeing in a perceptual and philosophical sense is more typical of Greek than Hebrew perspectives.<sup>28</sup> 2Corinthians 5:7 says, “for we walk by faith, not by sight.” In Hebrews 11:1 “faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen.” Yet Hebrews also introduces a picture of the world in relation to heaven. The earthly city is a copy of the heavenly one. Faith sees the heavenly world with the eyes of the heart. Faith is related to hope and hope is based upon seeing what cannot yet be seen with the eyes.

Faith requires hope. Faith is aware that people are damaged in their humanity and is challenged by this insight. Faith understands that our fundamental commitment as human beings is to try to be human, even when it is hard. We try; God gives the outcome. Hope produces a certain sort of person we might call as hopist. A hopist is neither an optimist nor a pessimist. The pessimist sees that nothing can be done; the optimist sees that everything can be done. The hopist has courage to perceive that some things can be done and sets about seeing what this might be. The hopist says to the pessimist that if something is to be done, we have to be attentive to the potential in things and not dismiss them in advance. The hopist says to the optimist that life is complex: there may be degrees of accomplishment in what we are trying to do. Faith cannot exist without hope. Hope is rooted in our awareness of our incompleteness (our knowing only in part). Hopelessness is a sorrowful form of silence. Hope moves us beyond our settled opinions to search for what is worthy. Hope amounts to expecting something good to come from our efforts.

If faith is grounded on hope, what is seeing by faith? Seeing by faith is an aesthetic skill in the same way that an artist can see a picture she will paint and realize her vision in the final product. Faith’s seeing is like a gardener who observes his garden each year, confident that next year this or that plant will be even more beautiful. Faith sees like an interior designer who knows what a room will look like when he is done even though the rough materials clutter the room at present, or are not even purchased as yet. Seeing with the eyes of the heart is like a dress designer who takes shapeless material and sews it into garments that fit the body and soul of another woman. Faith’s manner of seeing comes through practice in the company of faithful people. Faith is the capacity to see what is not yet visible and work for its realization with sustained and sustaining passion. Faith allows the materials at hand, and people close by, to be part of the fabric of the final product. Faithful seeing is the heart’s intellectual work. Faithful seeing brings the intellect to bear on the problems of life.

### **Faith is not Magic?**

Faith addresses problems of life with courage and hope, but is it magic? In Christian scriptures, specifically in the Gospels, the Pauline writings and the Johannine writings, faith is explored in practice. The initial records of the Church, found in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles (Acts), detail relationships that believers have with other forms of power. These forms of power include the State and social relations as well as the field of magic. The New Testament sets parameters around power but points to Christianity itself as a site of power. What sort of power is Christianity? In Acts we encounter examples that demonstrate the use, source and manifestations of power that continue to operate as guidelines. I do not intend to explore aspects

of Christian power exhaustively at present, yet fundamental relationships among aspects of magic and power must be managed by the faithful, for two reasons. All social relations are relations of power: believers must understand how power is exercised in domestic, political, economic, juridical, cultural, sexual, racial, and spiritual forms if they would be wise. Secondly, we all grow up in a realm of power we are compelled to address if we hope to grow up. Children live in a magical world that is hard to leave on the shelf. The point is that faith and magic are powerful. We have to inquire of our selves about how to use power to see more accurately why we do what we do.

The book of Acts begins with a powerful occurrence referred to as the Coming of the Holy Spirit, Acts 2. After this event, Apostles are able to heal the sick and raise the dead, Acts 3, Acts 5: 12ff, Acts 9: 32ff and Acts 20:7-12. In Acts 8: 9ff we hear of Simon the Sorcerer who witnessed power exercised by Peter and wanted this power for himself because it seemed greater than his own. In Acts 13: 6-12, a Jewish sorcerer, Elymas, was confronted by Paul. Acts 16:16-38 tells of a slave woman who had a gift for fortune telling. She followed Paul and Silas continually, shouting: ‘These men are servants of the Most High God’. Paul became so troubled that he turned around and said to the spirit, ‘In the name of Jesus Christ I command you to come out of her.’” At that moment, the scriptures say, the spirit left her. The business she created for her slave masters collapsed. Due to their economic loss, they attacked Paul and Silas, who were then thrown in jail. An earthquake hit the jail cracking walls and chains. Paul and Silas were free to leave. But they did not run away because the jailer, fearing for his life if the prisoners escaped, tried to kill himself. Paul called out to him and told him his prisoners were still there. The rest of the story is intriguing. In Acts 19: 11-16 there is a confrontation between Apostles and some Jews who practice the art of driving out evil spirits. The thread of these accounts conveys that Christianity is powerful, identifying the source of power and its effectiveness in the person of Jesus Christ—his name, his life, his death and his resurrection. Believers that wish to grow up into the fullness of God must reconcile faith, power and magic.

Whether or not we witness acts of spiritual power, we all experienced domestic power through the magic years of childhood. Faith whispers to the magic of childhood and woes it to mature. Yet Christianity also compels us to keep our childlikeness so we can continue to believe in God’s Magic, to use C.S. Lewis’s expression. Spiritual power is conveyed by signs and miracles reported in scripture and throughout Christendom. Odd, isn’t it: To believe and not to believe—these are in tension. Faith is complex. But by the magic years of childhood, I want to be precise. Children are magicians. In their earliest conceptions of it, the world is magical. They believe their actions and thoughts can bring about events. They extend their magical system: they find human attributes in natural phenomena and see human and supra human causes for natural events and ordinary occurrences. Slowly, children learn to distinguish varieties of causes for events and are freed from imagining themselves at the center of the universe.<sup>29</sup> To leave behind the magic of childhood is to be liberated from the burden of carrying the whole weight of the world alone.

As Ana-Maria Rizzuto has shown,<sup>30</sup> during childhood, in the midst of a magical universe, every child concocts representations for God. Ideas for God are not text-based; children are not little people of the Book. Life experience and care-giving personnel constitute sources for their feelings about and images for God. Rizzuto demonstrates the wisdom of Wittgenstein’s insight about the structure of thinking. For example, a mother’s face is present to a child to provide a perspective on his or her own being. A child that does not experience responsiveness comes to

see the mother's face as a thing to be *looked at* but not into so that the freedom and confidence to go beyond or into the mirror is limited.<sup>31</sup> These children cannot move into the mirror to see the real mother or to get a clear reflection of their own real self. When deprived of responses that give them emotional sustenance, children remain so vulnerable as to feel utterly unsafe. On the other hand, if parents exalt their children, the young acquire a bold, bloated and unreasonable sense of personal worth. These children attribute excessive powers to the self; they become so *invulnerable* that they are beyond assistance from other people and are relationally malformed.

In their mutual gaze behavior, children depend on appropriate responses from parents. When encounters continually go wrong, children may develop a false self: self-esteem and self-concepts suffer. When children suffer, concepts of God and the capacity to be a person of faith is impoverished as well. Self-important children believe they alone shape their destiny. In contrast, deprived children cannot believe the Determiner of Destiny takes any interest in them; even if *Something is There*, It does not attend to them. Based on experience, and due to the child's own reason, a disposition toward God, other people and themselves slowly forms along one of three pathways: indulgence, deprivation or justice/caring. On the basis of domestic power, and if they are fortunate, children also learn who God is according to a faith tradition. They mark boundaries around power, magic and faith as well as around ideas of the self and other that inhere in each tradition. If adults refuse to collaborate with concepts of God they produce on their own, and without nurturing reason, children are left to their hapless constructions—some of which produce terrified slaves, some which produce savage tyrants.

### **Faith and Trust**

Trust and mistrust are emotional, dispositional outcomes of a child's experience with power and faith. On the positive side, believing (the verb associated with faith) is a form of trust. As mentioned, under favorable conditions, children learn to put faith in the trustworthiness of other people. In contrast to the verb, the noun faith has layers that build upon the foundation the activity of trust established through experience. That is, faith is larger than trust because it has numerous layers or dimensions. In general, from a Christian perspective, faith is a perspectival concept; it is a way of perceiving the world based on the growing trust we place in God that expresses itself in relation to the believing community, the world in general; it is intimacy with God due to the promise of friendship with God and enables the faithful to grow up in the fullness of God.

The developing capacity to be a person of faith is related to and enhanced by the growing skill children acquire to be socially intimate human beings, i.e., by learning to be both near to others and different from them. Social trust, or social capital is an ingredient in the process of learning to be socially intimate. Faith and trust<sup>32</sup> have important links conceptually and experientially. As with faith as an activity, personal trust is based on deliberately cultivated, face-to-face relationships with friends, lovers and family.<sup>33</sup> Social relations and obligations inherent in them are mainly responsible for the production of trust, which in turn facilitates cooperation.<sup>34</sup> Trust is a public good. Historically, trust was supplied through shared common traditions, a sense of community, as well as through the Church.<sup>35</sup> Trust needs to be perceived as an active political accomplishment that will encounter the problem of skepticism. Trust responds to skepticism through its understanding of hope. Trust provides a range of benefits that are fundamental for stable relationships, cooperation, and change. Trust shapes all aspects of human life. When trust is damaged societies falter; if it is destroyed, societies falter and collapse. Trust

is essential for problem solving and for running a smooth economy. Communication based on mutual trust coordinates social and political interaction; without social trust, life is simply not possible.<sup>36</sup>

Conceptually, trust is related to confidence, as is faith and both terms include a condition of dependence and uncertainty. Faithful, trustful certainty is comfortable, not absolute; it is sure but not cocksure. Faith as trust always relies upon a vague and partial understanding of its object. It is not passive acceptance of the unknown; rather it is a strategic decision to take a risk under the conditions of some uncertainty. Faith as trust always has non-rational and incalculable elements. Faith by itself has an element of duty: we must keep the faith as the foundation of social life. Trust has the sense of promise attached to it; if we trust someone, perhaps they will trust us in return, although this aspect must not be allowed to break down into manipulation. Some uncertainty is common to both trust and faith. In this way, trust is a form of faith in which confidence vested in probable outcomes expresses a commitment to something rather than just a cognitive understanding of it. Confidence is firm trust—it is trust that has stopped worrying. The main difference between trust and confidence is the degree of certainty we attach to our expectations. We exercise trust on the basis of making a judgment about something or someone with respect to something else: We trust the milkman to deliver milk tomorrow. We trust a new colleague to reciprocate trustworthy communications. This second sense has more personal risk involved since we could go to the store if the milkman fails us. Anything that facilitates accurate judgment about whom to trust has important social value. The combination of interdependence and freedom make trust a complex social phenomenon.<sup>37</sup> Regardless of how hard we try to make good judgments about people and situations, trust by its very nature is a risky business.

Trust implies dependence upon something future or contingent so that a dimension of time is always involved: we trust now about something we must wait for in the future. Therefore, trust is more than intellectual assent; to trust is to believe despite uncertainty. To trust is to put our weight down on an object of trust. Trust involves action—like actually sitting in a chair that we trust will hold us up. Risk is involved due to our inability to monitor the behavior of others and have complete knowledge of their motivations, as well as to the vagaries of ordinary life. Trust operates by influencing our behavior on the basis of beliefs about the likelihood that others will behave or not behave in a certain way rather than by firm and certain calculation.<sup>38</sup> The relationship between trust and rationality is complicated and uneven: the complexity of this relationship is nowhere more evident than in the difficulties faced by all rational attempts to build trust.<sup>39</sup> As we practice trust, we develop expectations. Expectations accumulate by learning what happens when we work together and carry out mutual obligations (or fail to do so). In the social world there is always ambiguity: there are always those who act with integrity according to their obligations and those who ride for free. As a consequence, trust builds slowly from the ground up and can be destroyed easily and quickly.

In summary, trust has a cognitive dimension. We have certain assumptions about other people and the world in general, built up from childhood and through experience. Trust learns to discriminate among people and institutions by classifying them into trustworthy, distrusted and unknown categories. Trust always implies holding some expectations about the future.<sup>40</sup> Trust also has an emotional dimension based upon an affective bond among all those who participate in one's social world, those closest setting the groundwork for our beliefs about those who are more distant. In addition, trust implies the willingness to accept the pain of disappointment as part of life rather than as evidence that we were wrong to trust. Finally, trust has a behavioral

dimension: it is undertaking a risky course of action (inaction cannot be included here—trust must express itself in action of some kind) as we place some confidence in the behavior or disposition of someone else (perhaps our selves).<sup>41</sup> Trust is learned through experiencing others and acquires a sense of appropriateness about who and when to trust, and on what bases, if trust wishes to become wise. Personal trust is essential for the growth of intimacy and social trust is necessary if social intimacy is flourish.

### **What is Intimacy?**

Intimacy has to do with the inner life. Erik Erikson stressed how careful balance between closeness and distance is a most critical psychological task of people emerging from adolescence as they try to develop lasting and productive relationships.<sup>42</sup> Maturity comes when a growing intelligence is animated by the desire not to suffer arrested development, but to keep pace with the intake of relevant experience.<sup>43</sup> Our interior lives are complex; life in the world is complex. If we engage with and attempt to clarify and understand it as best we can, complexity is a source for maturity. Yet there is continual tension between experience and faith. There are at least two sources of conflict that can shut down the progress of faith. On one hand, conflict between authoritative theology and a child's own experience, and on the other, contradictions between privileged theological ideas and a child's growing sense of morality and justice can be sources of doubt and disappointment.<sup>44</sup> Disappointment may produce rebellion against or rejection of the tradition but the way forward is through integrating experience with an encounter of the diversity inherent in all religious traditions. (Sometimes conversion to different faith is the only path forward for a particular person.) People of faith can learn to have the right closeness and distance from the dominant aspects of their religious tradition; they can search through the diversity of their own tradition to find an authentic location within it. Faith as trust creates the possibility of a religion of search.<sup>45</sup>

On its quest, mature faith fulfils a creative function: it is a unifying power, bringing together isolated realities of life and casting them into one meaningful pattern. Faith as trust is a unifying perspective; giving meaning and direction to life, it reveals a goal and creates a task to be accomplished. On the basis of faith as trust, intimacy secures an optimum grip on the future. Intimacy is more than mere closeness. It is closeness balanced by distance to achieve optimum proximity between people that matter to us. Intimacy is true and enduring closeness balanced by appropriate distance; it is not just intensity. Some people confuse intimacy with intensity. But intimacy implies both authenticity and vulnerability—it is both cool and intense, depending. With authenticity people are safe to be themselves, to talk openly and freely declare their limits. In intimacy, neither party silences the other; sacrifices are not total because the self is not betrayed; each person is strong and vulnerable, weak and competent in balanced ways. With intimacy it is possible to define a whole and separate self as well as establish a more connected and gratified unity among people. To be intimate is to have a relationship that does not operate at the expense of the self and does not operate at the expense of the other.<sup>46</sup>

A sense of optimum proximity is captured in a familiar tale of two porcupines wintering in a cave. As they seek warmth yet avoid getting poked by the other's quills, the animals move backwards and forwards until they find an optimum proximity to each other—one sufficiently close for warmth and reasonably distant to be safe from each other's quills. Optimum proximity is not static. Life brings new challenges. Shifting position vis-à-vis significant people is an

ongoing continual process. Likewise, faith as trust is an optimum grip on the future and prepares the ground for intimacy.

Intimacy is operative when we stay in relationship over time. I agree with Harriet Lerner that only in long-term relationships are we called upon to navigate the delicate balance between separateness and closeness, in which we address the challenge of sustaining both without losing either when the going gets tough.<sup>47</sup> As with porcupines, while intimacy is a desired state of affairs, it is also threatening. Intimacy opens up the possibility of being hurt and not having important needs met by others. Neighbors, friends, colleagues and family are sites for developing social intimacy. The way we think about the world we inhabit informs our capacity for social intimacy. In social intimacy, we take a long view of the earth's value in order to be neighborly.

When we experience social intimacy, we are comfortably certain that we are not alone in the universe, an awareness that becomes embodied knowledge so that we carry ourselves as those who are not alone. Intimacy involves reciprocal caring with people we recognize as being as significant as we are. In intimacy we want an understanding to exist between us, hence we cannot hide behind a façade. Intimacy implies having deep knowledge of the other.<sup>48</sup> As with faith, intimacy is inherently risky, especially at the beginning. Those who are intimate are open to committing themselves to and accepting others. Intimacy implies that we are moved by other people's interests as well as by our own. Intimacy recognizes that other people are deep and the surface we see does not capture their identity sufficiently. Over time, in intimacy there is no fear of being betrayed.

To be intimate with one's self is to be critically aware of our selves through self-observation that produces self-knowledge. But we often confuse closeness and sameness.<sup>49</sup> Often closeness operates to reduce or eliminate the differences between people: in order to feel safe, sometimes people think they must be the same as other people, and for example, have the same opinions. But the presence of difference is the only way we learn. It is our difference from others that helps us get a sense of our selves. In social intimacy, everyone needs to recognize their personal bottom line, a price they will not pay for the sale of their integrity. A bottom line position evolves from a focus on the self, from a deeply felt awareness (which cannot be faked, pretended or borrowed) of one's own needs and the limits of one's tolerance. When we focus on being a self, through self-observation, we become less of an expert on other people and become more of an expert on our selves—which is not the same as being self-absorbed.<sup>50</sup> A self-absorbed person is not self-observant.

In summary, enjoying intimacy means neither being suffocated, i.e., feeling much too close, nor being isolated, i.e., feeling much too far away from other people. Intimacy implies setting reasonable limits for reciprocation and obligation.<sup>51</sup> Social intimacy is a place of listening, recognizing, attending, smiling, greeting, waiting, respecting, helping, trying again, and ultimately feeling safe when we turn our backs in a group because we know we are valued. Social intimacy calls forth commitment. Hubert Dreyfus notes an interesting observation made by Soren Kierkegaard (1813-1855) as he witnessed the emergence of modernity. Kierkegaard saw that the public sphere was destined to become a detached world in which everyone has an opinion about and comments on all public matters without needing any first-hand experience and without having or wanting any responsibility. In observing the times in which he lived, Kierkegaard said: "The public is not a people, a generation, one's era, not a community, an association, nor these particular persons, for all these are only what they are by virtue of what is

concrete. Not a single one of those who belong to the public has an essential engagement in anything.”<sup>52</sup> To him, commitment was essential to the vitality of social life.

The combination of effortlessly offered opinion and the lack of responsibility for the circumstances surrounding the subject of opinion, opens up the possibility of endless reflection. If there is no need for decision and action, and no actual experience with the complexity of the situation, mildly interested individuals can look at all things from all sides and always find some new perspective. As a result, action can always be postponed. In his book, *The Present Age*, Kierkegaard offered the following motto for the press because he felt that media was at the core of his criticism: “Here men [sic] are demoralized in the shortest possible time on the largest possible scale, at the cheapest possible price.”<sup>53</sup> People are demoralized in at least two senses: they lose their integrity to indifference and idleness and they also lose the passion to make a difference in the world—they become calloused to their own potential to make life meaningful. While a position of endless reflection seems safe on the surface: the anonymous spectator takes no risks, has no fixed identity that could be threatened by disappointment, humiliation and loss.<sup>54</sup> I agree with Kierkegaard; superficiality is not the safety of social intimacy. In social intimacy one is engrossed, engaged, identified, capable of working from the authenticity that identity signifies, yet safe to be different. In social intimacy, people learn to be near and different.

## Conclusion

How does Kierkegaard help us with the project of learning social intimacy? His perceptions of the social world inform the apprenticeship between child and adult mentioned at the outset: an adult who longs for a child’s faith to flourish; a child who seeks a spiritual friend. The starting point of faith is crucial if their spiritual friendship is to result in social intimacy. The child needs to see that elements of faith have a home in her own heart and are congruent with her most basic human needs. As Sue Phillips points out in her classroom research, all human beings have a need to celebrate, mark significant moments, tell their story, grieve and mourn, connect with the past, feel part of a community, make significant journeys, express themselves symbolically, seek purpose and meaning in their lives and ask ultimate questions.<sup>55</sup> These human needs are elements of faith and common aspects of human spirituality. They take a unique shape within specific faith traditions but must be introduced initially to children in a way that connects them to ordinary life. The learning that inheres in spiritual friendship between adults and children, like all apprenticeship models, must begin with context-independent attributes of the subject or skill to be mastered. So it is with social intimacy grounded on faith; Phillips provides a range of context-independent elements to help us begin. Wittgenstein also described the element of world-pictures that orient thought; his insights ground the transmission of faith and social intimacy that is possible through spiritual friendship.

Under the conditions of optimum proximity beside people that exercise faith and social commitment, children learn what it means to be fully human, intimate people of faith. With intimacy, they become able to observe themselves while keeping their eyes on those who share the apprenticing relationship with them. In the Christian tradition, they also learn to perceive Christ so as eventually to keep their eyes on Him. In order to be learned, intimacy must be incarnated—we must see it active in a person we come to know. We need others people to see what we might become. But the incarnating aspect of apprenticeship can also allow for the development of authenticity, of personal style and cultural know-how. The culture of the child is not the culture of the adult. Children must learn to negotiate their own landscape with wisdom

and compassion. As adults take on the task of apprenticing the young, they move the future towards its brightest and most hopeful ends.

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Martin Heidegger, *Identity and Difference* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1969), 22.
- <sup>2</sup> Catherine Pickstock, *After Writing: On the liturgical consummation of philosophy* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998), 49-57.
- <sup>3</sup> Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).
- <sup>4</sup> Joyce E. Bellous, "Reclaiming EvilTalk," in *Lire Baudrillard aujourd'hui/Reading Baudrillard Now Association canadienne de semiotique/Canadian Semiotic Association Vol. 16, Nos 1-2, 1996:27-47*.
- <sup>5</sup> Henri JM Nouwen, *Intimacy* New York: HarperSan Francisco, 1969: 19.
- <sup>6</sup> *Intimacy*, 13.
- <sup>7</sup> James B. Pratt, *The Religious Consciousness: A psychological study* (New York: MacMillan Company, 1956), 2.
- <sup>8</sup> Pratt used this definition and others to describe religion itself. His perspective is particularly instructive when applied to faith, which to me is the more appropriate term for the psychological aspect of religion that he wished to explain. See *Religious Consciousness*, 2-3.
- <sup>9</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) 118.
- <sup>10</sup> *Religious Consciousness*, 1-44.
- <sup>11</sup> Immanuel Kant, "What is it that orients thinking?" in *Religion Within the Boundaries*, 1-14.
- <sup>12</sup> Wittgenstein is responding to G.E. Moore's essays, "Proof of an External World," and "A Defence of Common Sense, both of which are in Moore's *Philosophical Papers*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1959.
- <sup>13</sup> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *On Certainty* (Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell, 1979), #94.
- <sup>14</sup> *On Certainty*, #96.
- <sup>15</sup> *On Certainty*, #97.
- <sup>16</sup> *On Certainty*, #141.
- <sup>17</sup> *On Certainty*, #144.
- <sup>18</sup> *On Certainty*, #336.
- <sup>19</sup> *On Certainty*, #357.
- <sup>20</sup> *On Certainty*, #358.
- <sup>21</sup> *On Certainty*, #378.
- <sup>22</sup> *On Certainty*, #625.
- <sup>23</sup> *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* George A. Buttrick, ed., (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), 222.
- <sup>24</sup> *Interpreter's Dictionary*, 228.
- <sup>25</sup> Gregory Vlastos, *Socrates: Ironist and Moral Philosopher* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1991), see pages 236-242 for his demonstration of the notion of complex irony. The analysis of the term is taken from 1-44.
- <sup>26</sup> *Socrates: Ironist*, 21.
- <sup>27</sup> *Spiritual and Ethical Orality*, 12.
- <sup>28</sup> Thorleif Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1960).
- <sup>29</sup> Selma H. Fraiberg, *The Magic Years* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959), ix.
- <sup>30</sup> Ana-Maria Rizzuto, *The Birth of the Living God: A psychoanalytic study* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979).
- <sup>31</sup> *Living God*, 187.
- <sup>32</sup> Barbara A. Misztal, *Trust in Modern Societies* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1996).
- <sup>33</sup> *Trust*, 3.
- <sup>34</sup> *Trust*, 5.
- <sup>35</sup> *Trust*, 6.
- <sup>36</sup> *Trust*, 12-14.
- <sup>37</sup> *Trust*, 15-16.
- <sup>38</sup> *Trust*, 19.
- <sup>39</sup> *Trust*, 20.
- <sup>40</sup> *Trust*, 20-23.

- 
- <sup>41</sup> *Trust*, 101.
- <sup>42</sup> Henri JM Nouwen, *Intimacy* (New York: HarperSan Francisco, 1969), 2.
- <sup>43</sup> *Intimacy*, 12.
- <sup>44</sup> *Religious Consciousness*, 101.
- <sup>45</sup> *Intimacy*, 17.
- <sup>46</sup> Harriet G. Lerner, *The Dance of Intimacy* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1989), 2.
- <sup>47</sup> *Dance of Intimacy*, 2. Lerner uses the word connectedness rather than closeness but I prefer closeness since I think our connections prevail despite physical distance.
- <sup>48</sup> Elaine Storkey, *The Search for Intimacy* (Michigan: Eerdmans, 1995), 60.
- <sup>49</sup> *The Dance of Intimacy*, 70.
- <sup>50</sup> *The Dance of Intimacy*, 209.
- <sup>51</sup> *The Search for Intimacy*, 45.
- <sup>52</sup> Hubert L. Dreyfus, *On the Internet* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 77.
- <sup>53</sup> *On the Internet*, 78.
- <sup>54</sup> *On the Internet*, 81.
- <sup>55</sup> Sue Phillips, "The Theatre of Learning: Five techniques to develop ten aspects of universal spirituality in children," a paper presented to the Third International Conference on Children's Spirituality, King Alfred's College, Winchester England, July 14-18, page 8.