

This thinksheet struggles for simplicity. It tries to be something useful to put in the hand of anyone asking *What is "intimacy"?* And it grows out of my many labors at trying to help those whose efforts at intimacy, in or out of marriage, have been disappointing to them--frustrating enough to have led them to the conclusion that *this effort, this time, was a failure: the game was not worth the candle.* In the flame of this pain and confusion, the spark of faith in the possibility and glory of intimacy may or may not have died. So to some random thoughts:

1. One demon against intimacy is FEAR:

(a) Fear of rejection. If I reach out, will my hand be cut off? In me, this fear was so great an anguish that the demon could be exorcized only by the expulsive power of a yet more painful anguish, viz., loneliness.

(b) Fear of sensuality. Here we are in business with both a demon and an angel. The demon struggles to keep us in aseity, self-encapsulation, the eggshell of soul-and-body virginity, and/or to hurl us into the opposite hell of loneliness, viz., promiscuity of soul and body. The angel fights for our preserving our natural awe of sexuality while reaching out toward the sexual other enough to "keep body and soul together" --to prevent either from subverting the other. In 1983 occurred a race that touched (thorough TV) millions of hearts: in a wheelchair race, the winner, and all successive "runners," waited till the last wheelchair got to the tape; then all crossed together! A model for the mutuality of soul (spirituality) and body (sensuality).

(c) Fear of spirituality. This is even more complex and elusive than the fear of sensuality. Some components: (1) *Mysterium tremendum*, the sense (the essential feeling of "myth") of being up against something that at the same time diminishes and ennobles us; embarrasses and affronts us to the point of raising the anxiety that all our dignity and even our being will be lost in a grand-scale cosmic battle on the small field of our own heart (e.g., Euripedes' *Medea*); (2) *Terror voluntatis*, fear of loss of control over our own lives, fear of God-possession (e.g., Jesus!) with all its inner and ourter consequences; (3) *Amissio voluptatis*, fear that all the pleasures and playfulness of life will be taken away (a dualistic illusion derived from a dessicated, juiceless, antiphysical notion of spirituality).

2. Another demon against intimacy is ATTENTION-UNDERDEVELOPMENT:

(a) We are still infants, even autistic, to the extent that we remain "all wrapped up in ourselves." Maturity is the process of shifting the attention-focus from self (Jesus' "lose yourself"). Expressions we use as we observe this going on are "falling in love," "adoration," "idolatry."

(b) Arrested development is the basic diagnosis for all forms of immaturity existing beyond "normal" time. If for any reason glands don't call to opposite-sex glands, the arrested developing is called "homosexuality" (an analysis having little to do with "gay rights," the legal sense of which I support). If one "falls in love with love" (imaginal masturbation) instead of with the person allegedly beloved, the beloved is from the start deprived of the privilege and right to be a whole person to a whole person (=my working definition of marriage). And if we love our species (collective narcissism) as an end in itself rather than as a means to the love of the Source and Destiny of All Things, we fail of our spiritual potential, break the heart of God, and pollute creation.

3. And a third demon against intimacy is FLAWED COGNITION. The pictures in our heads when reaching out for intimacy defeat, from the start, its possibility. The flawing is dual: inappropriate and deformed images (e.g., power-struggle) and skewed thinking (e.g., ego-incurvature). *over*

Why only demons? The angels fighting for our intimacy-fulfilment will require another thinksheet.

Much of the flawed cognition stems from body/soul split-thinking. Poet-healers of the split twist words to convey the feel of the self-alienation that condemns one to the loneliness of alienation from the Other/other; e.g., Auden (POSTSCRIPT, "The Cave of Nakedness"): "Our bodies cannot love:/But, without one,/What works of Love could we do?" This great God-loving and humanity-loving and creation-loving homosexual here indirectly relegates the body to lust (good sense, as in German)--thus making the integration project the dual union of lust (body) and love (soul): of the body, marriage (G.B.S., MAN AND SUPERMAN, IV, "Maxims for Revolutionists") "is popular because it combines the maximum of temptation with the maximum of opportunity" (i.e., physically, marriage is the maximization of LUST); of the soul, marriage maximizes LOVE potential (and so also the human potential for the opposites of love, viz., hate and indifference). The culture's false moralization on the split appears in love as good-holy-ideal and lust as bad-ugly-naughty-dirty-blasphemous-porno-boohiss (a words-split that continues, because of conception fear, to distort female sexuality more than it does male, but distorts both male and female by defect (i.e., false guilt against giving free play to glands) and/or excess (i.e., coitus is "nothing but" fucking--a view that leads, diametrically, to both inauthentic continence and promiscuity--both of which, as respectively gnostic asceticism and gnostic antinomianism, the early Christians--e.g., Paul--preached against))...Being language-gifted and therefore language-sensitive, I'm appalled at some Christians' Manichean notion that body language ("four-letter words," which were common in the original King James Version, which has been "cleaned up" in successive redactions) is unChristian: the very suppression of frank body-talk plays into the hands of those who dessicate Christianity by tilting it on the soul side, against the body side, of the balance. Nothing in traditional Christianity is as great a hindrance to evangelism as this body-hatred, body-suspicion, body-distaste. And it pollutes traditional Christian marriage. No religion is wholly good; and in this respect, traditional Chistianity is a bad religion. For the future of intimacy, the healthiest thing now happening in the American civilization is that the Cavalier-Dionysiac gains of "the sexual revolution" are not going to be lost as we enter the next Puritan-Apollonian swing of the pendulum.... Behind the deformed images and skewed thinking of flawed cognition is a wicked nest of false assumptions. Chief of these is the fiction that intimacy is "natural," automatic, "comes with the territory," so that you don't have to sweat it. Fact is, it's earth's hardest and most rewarding soul-body work; and almost no couple can manage it without help --a huge opportunity for the church's ministry in cognitive re-education.

4. Yet a fourth demon against intimacy is "SCIENCE," the scientistic assumption of the priority of the physical, a doctrine for which there is not a shred of true-science evidence, nor ever can be. Because humanity's yearning for transcendence is ineluctable, inherent, humanity with almost no exceptions has assumed the oposite, viz., the priority of the spiritual: materialism, which dominates the American public school and higher education, has almost never appeared in human history (exceptions include the preSocratic atomists and the EuroAmerican Enlightenment). Present-day biologism, even in its most romantic forms, is anti-soul reductionistic. This body determinism now controls how birth, sex, death are being taught in the culture, viz., at the esthetic level, "value-free" of the ethical and religious levels. "Sex" becomes a "need," which it demonstrably is not: the organism can get on very well without it (though of course it's necessary to species survival). As a "want," sex is optional and "no" is as "natural" as "yes"; but when preached as a "need," sex is necessary, and the "no"-sayer gets hung with the burden of being anti-natural, anti-joy, even anti-human. This false science weights the dice toward promiscuity and thus against intimacy.