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MY RELATIONSHIP WITH GOD BY HYPATIA

 I am a woman of faith, but I am also a woman with a deep compassion for ethics and the nature of it. Many of my male counterparts would call me rational and reasonable which also leaves a bitter taste on their tongue because they believe, a woman must be emotional and should keep busy with her inner self, a very subjective thought, I would say. It does not occur in their mind that a female could be interested in cold hardened facts and live by ethical standards which is normally only reserved for the masculine population. Faith plays a crucial role in my life because I believe in God the same way as any individual who is driven by subjective thinking and feelings. One of my male counterparts, a philosopher named Kierkegaard is driven by his subjective belief for God that is driven by an inwardness which could be described as a personal relationship with the divine. According to everyone’s expectations, I should have no problems feeling the same way because I am a woman, and females are known for their more emotional nature which many expect I would automatically have. If I am a man and feel this way, my contemporaries would be amazed by my devotion for God, and they would honor me for my sacrifice which a religious life would bring. As a woman, it is expected that such a behavior is shown and proved in society daily with the utter most passion. But I am a woman of reason, and I also believe in ethical behavior which needs to be shown, if I genuinely want to be faithful to God. I do not want to condemn my subjective thinking friend, but I want to be respected as a rational thinker who has a relationship with God from a more ethical point of view. Therefore, I will compare his thinking (Kierkegaard) with mine to prove my honesty against the divine.

 Who is God? He is to most people a male individual who lives in heaven and looks out for those who have faith in him. This sounds like a masculine ruler which is distance to us, and it is against Christian believe of love and understanding. But I also believe that God would understand the rational thinker who through ethical and moral behavior understands the love, God has for us without using him for self-pity. A deficiency which can be sometimes proved by individuals who are expecting God to solve their problems, and which can be a sign of a person with too much faith. In general, God is a being who can be seen through many lenses because everyone has a unique relationship with the divine nature of him.

 First, I would like to clarify the objective facts which are connected of being female in a world that is run by my male counterparts in a sometimes-doubtful way. A way in which ethics, morals, and of course faith have no place because why would one part of the population tell the other one how to conduct its existence. The female existence was always a matter of being conquered by male suiters who were hiding in the role of the protector which considered women as an easy target for their ambitions. Many women are victims, but the suiter is seen as an individual who became a victim himself because he was so overwhelmed with passion that he forgot the task of being a responsible human being. I might let it sound ironically because it is, and those males are always in luck to be successful. I wonder which point of view my male counterpart Kierkegaard would have to all my accusations which are not very ethical to think about at least not for a normal female if I may say so. Like I already mentioned, let us first see the female versus male side, and then we can go over to ethics with God in mind versus faith alone. I apologize for being sometimes on the opposing side of my very dear male companions, but they also deserve it in quite a few cases.

 I cannot speak for Kierkegaard directly which would not be behaving in a sense of fairness, but I believe that he would not understand the female species which has evolved over time to be compatible with the male gender. He is still the old romantic who sees a woman as a fragile object who he dares to offend in for him unethical way, if it would be in the matter of pure lustful passion which not even the most sensual individual would try to engage. But his engagement with the female sex is not driven by ethical standards which is his understanding of ethics and morals that I must protest. The following example comes into mind that ethical rules, even in the holiest institutions like marriage before God should have their place and not being ignored not even for so-called higher engagements. Marriage starts out with a promise to another person, and which is still the male’s calling to make such a promise, and my dear companion must agree on that. Taking this promise back may let the person feel better about himself, but it should be going against his reasonable understanding what it means to be ethically and morally acceptable. Of course, people have the obligation to keep a promise which should be done with their mind engaged but also should be understood as an obligation to society that they live in. Living by your own ethical standards, even if they are noble and agree with the individual’s inner self can collide with societal etiquette which is in some situations vital, if it pertains to the picture of the respectable woman. My learning friend should be aware of that because Jesus Christ honored women to the highest.

 Even if we part on the matter of ethics, there is still time to learn vital lessons and accept the fact that society has a watchful eye on us. Maybe being more on the watch for failing females than for failing in the same manner males, but it is safe to say that morals and ethical values are still considered problems of society. My learning friend wants to oppose to that and will oppose, if the conversation turns to God. Since my companion Kierkegaard and I have different opinions how to approach God, it would be time now to explain the entity which we both believe in just with different notions. On the beginning of the writing, I mentioned already the different nature of God and how he is seen. The next paragraphs will bring more light to the whole manner and how God is seen by the entire population, male and female.

 The relationship between God and women is not that new, and there are a lot of examples in the Bible who can verify that. But to have a personal relationship with a divinity makes women look like sensual in many eyes because God is a male being who is pure and untouchable. An intimate relationship with a female would question his seriousness and the integrity of the woman who could be accused of being in relations with the devil who is posing as God. It is not such a strange way to think about it that women who had the calling were accused of being hysterical or a witch which the latter had terrifying consequences for the female individual. A woman can have faith in God with all her passion that follows her inner self, but it should be done with distancing herself from the entity without proclaiming a personal and helping relationship which sees God in a loving relationship. Giving everything up for God and committing oneself to him could make her husband jealous because God would try to take his place, and only a few women were allowed to do this away from worldly male controllable behavior. This could be also the reason my more rational approach to God is a better solution for females to deal with God, even that males do not like females who are rationally minded and call them cold and distance.

 It does not matter how a relationship to God is organized, it would always be seen as reason of doubt and suspicion in matter of personal nature where women are involved. Kierkegaard might understand it or not because he writes about his commitment to God and his inwardness to the divine, but he does not make a specification about women. His relationship with women did not touch the topic or he thought women cannot feel the same relationship with God like I already mentioned in the earlier paragraph. I guess when he entered the religious stage, a transformation overcame my philosophical friend, and he devoted himself to a life of spirituality and abstinence. This inwardness towards God and son Jesus Christ was for him a personal relationship which connected his inner self with God, something like a male spiritual bonding. I hope my learning friend Kierkegaard is not too much offended by my direct approach towards his male honor and forgives me in the aftermath. But this would also weaken his point of view on his relationship with God because he would feel, he must follow my regret and that would bring him slowly to my position of thinking. This is just a hypothetical thought which went through my mind and does not matter how he feels to God from his point of view as a man.

 Since I am focused on ethics and Kierkegaard’s commitment is towards faith, we should bring some interesting points to the discussion. First, we should decide the difference between ethics and faith from his position and mine without declaring one as the wrong approach just as a matter of fairness. Then we can bring examples where those ideas could be practically applied, and again it should be executed in an equal manner without minimizing or maximizing both parties. I am for fairness which is not common for everyone who engages in serious discussions because many of these so-called discussions are led by individuals who think because of their rank and connections, they are superior against the rest. A good example would be the high-profile academic against the student who is known to be smart, but he or she did not make a name of himself or herself. Such relations are ending often with the undermining of the student because of the higher ranking of the professional academic. Another example would be the female against a male opponent in a field which is a male domination like philosophical ideas and thoughts. There is no logical explanation why this phenomenon is occurring, but it does, and there is no end in sight. But let us go back to the actual topic and find the different goals of ethics and faith and their commitment to God which is not that unusual, if we talk about ethics and morals. If I did not mention it already, ethics does not mean, a person is not blessed with faith, it means that one’s commitment is more ethical nature.

 Since I have been engaged with ethics by ending the last paragraph, I will continue with my ethical belief and carry it over to this. Also, I made a commitment to ethics which also includes God and his belief in him, but I do not want to sound like I praise ethical standards as God-like entities. Ethics and morals are important to understand the goodness and commitment that God and his son Jesus Christ has for us. This determination should bring ethics and morals to the same level which is occupied by faith because to have faith is good on one side, but it needs to be also morally understood. Morals and ethics can be a result of learning or better willing to learn how to be an ethical individual who is prepared to sacrifice pleasures which are not considered as achievable because of their nature. For example, my learning friend considers himself as being faithful to God and makes a commitment on his behalf, but he engages to the same time in a questionable behavior by bashing a fellow philosopher named Hegel and calling him incompetent. This behavior is not of ethical nature and has no shred of fairness, and again I apologize for being so direct. But I am being honest which is also marked by honesty for God and faith.

 “Faith is the contradiction between the infinite passion of inwardness and the objective uncertainty” (207). What is the meaning of this? What is my learning friend Kierkegaard implying? As a subjective thinker, he is not driven by objective facts which could be entering his faith about God because he wants to have a relationship with God which is only the result of his inner self with the divine. God needs to be understood by one’s own soul, and through facts and proofs this relationship could be clouded like ethical standards or rules would do, written by society. Many individuals would make him out as a blind follower of the divine who has total control over his mind in a way that would reflect that of a zombie who follows his masters comments. But I do think that is not the case because he does it by his own free will without being influenced by any spell or magic which could be in use against him. His devotion to God is a result of pure devotion which I respect and secretly admire, even it is too personal between a human being and divinity. Kierkegaard should be agreeing with me because he admires a philosopher named Socrates, I have to excuse myself of not mentioning him earlier, because this philosopher shares my opinion on the relationship between God and humans. I will be writing more to this in the next section, and I am sure I get your attention.

 “When Socrates believed that God is, he held fast the objective uncertainty with the entire passion of inwardness, and faith is precisely in this contradiction, in this risk” (211). My learning friend is believing that Socrates shares with him the same passion about God than he is, but I do not think so. Again, I would like to apologize for not mentioning such a philosopher in my introduction, and I would like to add him now through this memorandum. Socrates was a man of his own will and ethical understanding which was influenced by society when it came to the matter of faith and divinity. It could be my counterpart’s dreaming that there was a different matter to be addressed like Socrates could form an inwardness with one of his god’s which was impossible. Following this fact, I claim that my learning friend understood Socrates to a certain extent, but it does not include the relationship between God and mortal. Socrates was ethically driven which is a notion he could follow given the circumstances which surrounded him.

 Finally, I reached my conclusion to a remarkably interesting topic and essay which challenged my ways of thinking and clarified my learning friend’s complex thoughts of our common passion for God just through different approaches. He touches everything with the idea of subjectivity, which is free from factual thinking, but it does not mean he denies the facts in the real world. His understanding of faith is a unique idea and needs to be understood because being committed to God is still seen as a matter of ethical behavior and rules which are dictated by society and traditions. My belief is based on a connection between God and moral behavior which is ruled by reason and rationality, but it is not a make-up of ethical standards which take over God and his divinity. There are a lot of other women who think more passional about God because it is more described female to do so instead of being rationally influenced. Since Kierkegaard is a male, I am wondering why nobody ever mentioned to him his rather passioned feelings for God, but this probably will stay unanswered. My Socratic memorandum in the essay was very spontaneous because I thought, I had to bring him and his thoughts into an interesting topic and why my learning friend admires him. But there is still a difference between the relationship with God and the one with the gods, specially if the contradiction involves Christianity and paganism which are built on two different principles of divinity. Maybe this also solves my understanding for God that is closer to the pagan than to the Christian involved love principle towards a divine entity.
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