

12-2017

The Paradox of Privilege: Fr. Gregory Boyle, S.J., Relational-Cultural Theory, and the Expansion of the Margins

Linda Land-Closson

Regis University, llandclosson@regis.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://epublications.regis.edu/jhe>

Recommended Citation

Land-Closson, Linda (2017) "The Paradox of Privilege: Fr. Gregory Boyle, S.J., Relational-Cultural Theory, and the Expansion of the Margins," *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal*: Vol. 6 : No. 2 , Article 21.

Available at: <https://epublications.regis.edu/jhe/vol6/iss2/21>

This Praxis is brought to you for free and open access by ePublications at Regis University. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal* by an authorized administrator of ePublications at Regis University. For more information, please contact epublications@regis.edu.

The Paradox of Privilege: Fr. Gregory Boyle, S.J., Relational-Cultural Theory, and the Expansion of the Margins

Linda Land-Closson
Instructor, Peace and Justice Studies
Regis University
llandclosson@regis.edu

Abstract

Drawing heavily upon an interview with Fr. Gregory Boyle, S.J., this article uses Relational-Cultural Theory (RCT), a model of psychological development, to explore how privilege typically functions paradoxically to disadvantage those with privilege. RCT's critique of prescriptive models of psychological development reveals how standards of self-sufficiency and independence necessitate disconnection within relationships, and this article explores how these prescriptive ideals intersect with privilege. After developing this critical understanding of privilege and exploring RCT as an alternative, *descriptive* model of psychological development, the article then turns to Homeboy Industries as an example of how to work in the margins in descriptive ways that expand the margins to include all.

Introduction

After teaching Fr. Gregory Boyle, S.J.'s *Tattoos on the Heart: The Power of Boundless Compassion* in a number of courses, I had the opportunity to co-coordinate Regis University's Faith and Justice Immersion spring break trip to East Los Angeles for the past three years and co-lead it for two of those years.¹ During this annual trip, Regis students and trip leaders stay in Boyle Heights neighborhood, an underserved part of East LA that includes public housing communities where we stay with families for a portion of our week.² The week also includes a day at Homeboy Industries, "the largest gang intervention, rehabilitation, and re-entry program in the world," which Boyle founded, originally under the name Jobs for a Future, in 1988.³ Seeing Homeboy in action is powerful. Visiting Homeboy humanizes individual (former) gang members and exposes the tragedies of gang life beyond what is possible through a book. While I imagine most visitors find being at Homeboy deeply moving, the experience also caused me to bring what I encountered at Homeboy into conversation with theoretical models of human development and behavior in hopes of understanding Homeboy's success. Initially, I speculated relationships were the source of success; however, I now suggest Homeboy's success resides in a paradoxical function of privilege within the context of relationships.

Each of our Faith and Justice groups has consisted of students for whom, prior to our trip, urban poverty, racism, and gang life existed in books only, and each group also has consisted of students whose lives have been, at least in part, formed by some or all of these dimensions of life. Although our weekly meetings throughout the semester (both prior to and after our trip) allowed space to discuss these differences, living with a diverse group of college students in a marginalized neighborhood for a week brought about an inversion of privilege I did not anticipate and had not encountered in our group discussions on campus. During our trip, students who struggled to feel comfortable and included on our college campus (i.e., students in the margins at Regis) tended to feel empowered in new ways and during situations that often overlapped with moments when students with more privilege felt very out of their element while in Boyle Heights.⁴ And after helping students navigate these dynamics during two trips, I assumed I understood this inversion of privilege. What I did not realize, however, was that this inversion merely scratched the surface of privilege; I needed to dive much deeper in to the function of privilege in order to understand work in the margins.

I had the opportunity to interview Fr. Gregory Boyle last May while he was at Regis University for our commencement, and our conversation

included the topic of privilege. While analyzing my material from the interview, I discovered a crucial, paradoxical dimension of privilege previously hidden by my understanding privilege from within traditional structures of power. More specifically, my conversation with Boyle, informed by my academic work and my experiences on immersion trips, revealed the following paradoxical dimension of privilege: privilege, as typically understood in our society, often functions to place one at a disadvantage when it comes to living with tenderness, mutuality, and connection—traits needed for faithful accompaniment with those in the margins. Additionally, privilege may prevent some from seeing that accompaniment is not about helping “the other” as much as it is about embracing one’s own brokenness and opening oneself to those in the margins who may guide one back to a relational and communal existence.

To explicate this article’s thesis, I begin with an exploration of privilege that rises from comments Boyle made about privilege during our conversation. Per the broader context of that interview, I explore notions of privilege initially from Ignatian spirituality, which Boyle cites as foundational to the work at Homeboy, and then I turn to Relational-Cultural Theory (RCT) to continue unpacking and expanding our understanding of privilege within the context of relationships.⁵ Moreover, with the help of RCT, I expose and explore the paradox of privilege. Once I have reoriented us regarding our understanding of privilege and the manners in which it functions, I then turn to Homeboy to explore ways through which we might resolve the paradox. Throughout this article, I use material from my conversation with Boyle as both a catalyst for new questions and analysis as well as a source for deepening our understanding of privilege.

Privilege

When discussing *Tattoos* in class, one critique I hear periodically focuses on Boyle being a white, well-educated man of privilege appropriating the language of gang members and others in the Boyle Heights neighborhood. Others question whether Boyle’s privilege causes his use of stories of gang members and culture to slide from education into exploitation. This article is not the place to explore these particular questions, but I do want to

promote thinking critically about an author’s social location and messaging as an aspect of quality scholarship. We need to question who is saying what and how the message is being both conveyed and received. Given that, we need to spend time exploring Boyle and privilege.

Although Boyle and his work cannot be separated from his privilege, and assuming he—like most of us—maintains places of blindness about his privilege, Boyle’s genuine sense of confusion about privilege spoke volumes as he shared with me unprecedented questions he receives and concerns he hears about privilege: “Students are so precious and so petrified and feel so guilty about privilege... [They] ask, ‘How do you lead from a space of privilege?’ And I’ve never heard these questions before.”⁶ Does this confusion reveal Boyle’s ignorance regarding the function of his privilege? Possibly, but our conversation left me believing he comes at this topic from a place—two places, actually—very far from ignorance.

The first place draws upon Boyle’s Jesuit formation: the Meditation on the Two Standards.⁷ Toward the end of our conversation, I asked Boyle whether the common Homeboy practice of having two rival gang members work side-by-side is a model to which the rest of us can look when we attempt to bridge divides between ourselves and others. In other words, might we at times be better served by working with “the other” toward a common, neutral goal than by attempting to reason our way through our differences? Boyle’s response to this line of inquiry eventually turned to the two standards. He shared that he gravitates toward this element of the Exercises and meditates on Jesus “standing in the lowly place” as representative of the standard of Christ.⁸ To address my question more directly, Boyle stated he meditates on what Jesus *did not* say while standing in the lowly place, with the outcasts in the margins of society. In Boyle’s words, “[Jesus] didn’t say, ‘Get your ass over here to the lowly place. What’s your problem? You’re not in the lowly place.’ Or ‘See me making a difference in the lowly place?’ No, it’s [that] he’s *standing* in the lowly place, and he’s not *saying* anything. And he’s visible; you see him there.”⁹ In Boyle’s experience, simply “[being] in the vicinity of people,” especially those in the

lowly places and those with whom we disagree, prevents us from “demonizing them.”¹⁰

But there’s a catch, of course, and this catch seems to offer insight into Boyle’s confusion regarding privilege and begins to explicate this article’s thesis. The Meditation on the Two Standards occurs near the middle of the second week of the Exercises, which, according to Kevin O’Brien, S.J., means “at this point in the Exercises, we’ve reckoned with both our hopes and our failings. We’ve reckoned with our sin and also the redemptive grace, the mercy of God.”¹¹ In other words, from Boyle’s Jesuit-formed worldview, we ought to choose the standard of Christ, to move toward the lowly place and into the vicinity of “the other,” *after* encountering our own brokenness in the light of God’s love and with a belief in mercy and redemptive grace, which calls us toward openness and humility instead of shame.

If we approach “the other” from this place of humble self-awareness, privilege begins to look different, and I believe we now glimpse the second “place” from which Boyle draws his understanding of privilege: his definition of success as faithful solidarity or accompaniment.¹² Through becoming aware of our brokenness, not only have we embraced a certain level of humility, but more importantly we have opened ourselves to the possibility of being changed more than changing others; faithful accompaniment means we become each other’s companions in a manner that presumes equal dignity and worth. As Boyle says, “I think part of the problem is because [some are] going to the margins wanting to make a difference. And that’s when [privilege] becomes problematic. But if you go to the margins to receive people, to listen to people, to be reached by people, to be changed by people, nobody cares about your privilege.”¹³ Without our brokenness, what Boyle calls “the great equalizer,” we risk entering the margins to save or rescue others.¹⁴ *This* is when privilege becomes a problem because we will most likely function as “separate and superior,” not “connected and compassionate.”¹⁵ Granted, from the perspective of the other standard, what Ignatius sometimes refers to as the standard of “the enemy of our human nature,” which values worldly goods and which is the predominant standard for our society, privilege

still matters greatly.¹⁶ Therefore, we cannot dismiss this offhand. I argue, however, that this is where we uncover the paradox of privilege, and I turn to Relational-Cultural Theory as a framework for exploring this paradox from a different perspective.

Relational-Cultural Theory

In 1981 Jean Baker Miller became the first director of the Stone Center, a center “dedicated to the prevention of psychological problems, the enhancement of psychological development, and the search for a more comprehensive understanding of human development.”¹⁷ This latter purpose forms the primary focus for this section of this current article.¹⁸ Also in that year, Miller presented a paper titled “The Development of Women’s Sense of Self”¹⁹ in which she critiques traditional theories of psychological development for “what she perceives to be a central and erroneous assumption embedded in these models: human psychological development is essentially a process of formation and maturation of a self that functions, ultimately and ideally, in support of a self-sufficient individual.”²⁰ This standard of an independent adult, in Miller’s clinical and academic expertise, did not match experience. Accordingly, Miller and her colleagues at the Stone Center began dismantling the prominent understandings of self and the concomitant goals of independence and self-sufficiency, labeling these goals *prescriptive* as opposed to *descriptive*. In other words, these authors argue,

All of us depend, and often through significant unawareness, on many other people in order to get through a day: someone to care for the children; someone to provide our food (farmers, farmhands, distributors, grocery employees, cooks in the home or at a restaurant); someone to make, clean, and mend our clothes; etc.²¹

Miller “argues self-sufficiency is an illusion based on a privileged perspective,” yet it is prescribed for all as an indicator of psychological health and maturation.²² Within the context of this article, I build on this element of her argument and postulate that this illusory goal of self-sufficiency

paradoxically places those with privilege at a disadvantage when it comes to accompaniment, specifically because striving toward this goal requires inter- and intrapersonal disconnection.

Gradually, Miller and her colleagues at the Stone Center developed these insights and critiques into what is now known as Relational-Cultural Theory (RCT), a model of psychological development presenting a foundational reorientation of the purpose of human development.²³ According to RCT, the goal of human development is “the increasing ability to build and enlarge mutually enhancing relationships in which each person can feel an increased sense of well-being through being in touch with others and finding ways to act on her or his thoughts and feelings.”²⁴ As Miller and Irene P. Stiver, her colleague and co-author, point out, this understanding of development represents an entire paradigm shift from traditional models, according to which a person exists as a separate self and engages in relationship with other separate selves.²⁵ In contrast, RCT shifts the focus of development from “static states of the individual...to the dynamics of relationships.”²⁶ Janet Surrey, another of the RCT theorists, articulates this shift as follows: “*Connection* has replaced *self* as the core element or the locus of the creative energy of development.”²⁷ One does not, RCT theorists argue, develop a self; instead we participate in the development of relationships that then provide a context through which we can act with increasing agency and mutuality. For the purpose of this article, I focus on four elements of RCT: a reconfiguration of notions of self and relationship, a reconceptualization of power, the function and impact of disconnection, and a critique of gratification as the primary motivator for human behavior.

RCT theorists did not start with the foundational shift from self to relationship. They first built on Miller’s early writings about power. In the now classic *Toward a New Psychology of Women*, Miller discusses the presence of power within the common construct of “domination and subordination,” arguing those in positions of domination not only define “normal” and, in the context of mental health, “healthy,” but they concomitantly define “abnormal” and “pathological,” which often coincide with

characteristics of those in subordinate positions. In Miller’s words, “Once a group is defined as inferior, the superiors tend to label it as defective or substandard in various ways.”²⁸ This ability to label inferiors—the other—illustrates the typical function of power. Again, I turn to Miller: “Power has generally meant the ability to advance oneself and, simultaneously, to control, limit, and if possible, destroy the power of others. That is, power, so far, has had at least two components: power *for* oneself and power *over* others.”²⁹ Clearly, RCT assertions regarding relationships are incongruous with this form of power.

Accordingly, although “power over” is present and does influence much of our society, RCT theorists do not acquiesce to its prominence, nor do they claim “power over” is our “natural” state.³⁰ Instead, they subsume Miller’s early working definition of power as “the capacity to produce a change” into the subsequent formation of RCT.³¹ As RCT theorists work with this understanding of power in the context of psychological development, the notion of mutuality becomes central to their conceptualization of both relationship and development. In *The Healing Connection*, Miller and Stiver define mutuality as “a way of relating, a shared activity in which each (or all) of the people involved are participating as fully as possible.”³² If the possibility for mutuality does not exist, space is created within relationships for “power over” and the accompanying notions of domination and subordination. Moreover, the function of “power over” operates hand-in-hand with traditional notions of an independent and isolated self.

The antidote, which RCT claims is *descriptive* of human development and functioning—even if latently so—is mutually-enhancing relationships. Interestingly, Boyle made a similar assertion when describing the spiritualities foundational to the work at Homeboy: “It’s kind of a marriage of Ignatius and Jean Vanier.... It’s kind of a simple way to accompany, and it also informs *how* we are. It’s not, ‘We’re going to do *for* gang members.’ ‘We’re going to *be with* gang members.’ And we always try to strive for what we call [at Homeboy] ‘exquisite mutuality.’”³³ Boyle’s statement seems to affirm RCT’s assertions regarding the developmental power and purpose of mutuality; doing for gang members is clearly power over,

while being with gang members is mutuality. As we shall see, however, this mutuality requires all participants to start from a place of their own brokenness, a stance seemingly incompatible with maintaining traditional notions of privilege and power.

Unfortunately, prescriptive notions of an independent self and “power over” remain prominent in our society, and while those prescribing to them often appear privileged by the standard of the world, I argue and suspect Boyle would agree, such people of “privilege” typically live with a great disadvantage stemming from being relationally disconnected from one’s own brokenness and/or from others. Miller and Stiver define disconnection as “a break in connection accompanied by a sense of being cut off from the other person(s)” and claim “disconnections occur whenever a relationship is not mutually empathic and mutually empowering.”³⁴ To this understanding, particularly for the purpose of this current work, I add the notion of internal disconnection, which occurs when we choose (consciously or not) to disconnect from certain aspects of ourselves and/or our experiences such as our brokenness, our failings, and our shortcomings. Ironically, and in a self-fulfilling sort of way, living prescriptively—living as if one is capable of taking care of oneself and does not need other people or help—necessitates experiences of disconnection with others and aspects of oneself. Within the context of prescriptive models for an independent self, one cannot admit shortcomings, failings, and needs because then one admits to being immature, a failure, or pathological.

The last dimension of prominent theories of psychological development addressed by RCT that I engage in this article is gratification, which contributes directly to experiences of disconnection. As Miller and Stiver point out, “[The need to be gratified by others] has long been a premise basic to psychodynamic theories and assumed in popular writings, though not usually explicitly. That is, most formulations begin with an *individual* whose basic motivation is to fulfill his drives.”³⁵ One need not spend much time with this assertion before seeing the interconnectedness between the presumption of gratification and the role of power in relationships

defined by a domination-subordination paradigm: I am in this relationship to satisfy my needs or desires, and the primary role of the other person(s) in this relationship is to increase chances of gratification.

Not surprisingly, RCT theorists challenge this presumption and present an alternative purpose for human relationships. Miller and Stiver credit the work of Alexandra Kaplan, another RCT theorist, when asserting, “*the* basic human motive, if we can speak of such a thing, can be better understood as the motive to *participate in connection with others*, rather than the need to be gratified by others.”³⁶ Again, I turn to my conversation with Boyle to help illustrate the distinction Miller, Stiver, and Kaplan make. While describing a conversation with a man attempting to work with gang members, Boyle shared, “He [asked], ‘How do you reach them?’ And I said, ‘Well, for starters, stop trying to reach them. Can *you* be reached by *them*?’ So it turns the whole thing on its head.”³⁷ Boyle challenges this man to let go of his desires to make a difference in the lives of gang members, to let go of his need for gratification, and he calls on him to participate fully in exquisite mutuality with gang members. Privilege, particularly privilege as understood under the standard of the world, may prevent this man from being effective in his efforts to “help” others. In other words, this man’s privilege makes his acceptance of help and accompaniment much more difficult than if life’s circumstances revealed his brokenness for him, which is what those in the margins experience regularly by nature of their social positioning. This is the paradox of privilege.

Overcoming the Paradox

So we live in a society that tells us maturity and mental health require us to pretend we are self-sufficient, which also requires that we remain disconnected, to varying degrees, from others and from our own brokenness and shortcomings. Yet according to RCT, as well as the spiritualities of Ignatius and Vanier, we develop individually and collectively by participating in relationships characterized by connection and mutuality, both of which require the acknowledged presence of brokenness in all, if not particularly in those with traditional forms of privilege. In other words, most of us are living in *prescribed* ways that are not,

in many senses, in our individual and collective best interest. So what do we do? We look to people, organizations, and systems that are attempting to live *descriptively*, or are attempting to create environments in which people may live descriptively. Homeboy Industries is an excellent example.

During our conversation, Boyle revealed Homeboy's "secret sauce"—a community of tenderness. "Of course," I thought. "You welcome everyone without judgement and with a tenderness they may not have experienced before. You provide a place of solace and healing by prioritizing relationship over the individual." And, of course, internally I was presuming this environment of solace and healing exists for gang members. What I came to understand, however, and only after later analyzing my conversation with Boyle, is that this community of tenderness embraces Homeboy staff members as well and calls them to acknowledge their own needs for solace and healing. This breadth of the community of tenderness seems to contribute directly to Homeboy's success.

In chapter 8 of *Tattoos*, Boyle defines success as faithful solidarity or faithful accompaniment, but success is not about those with privilege committing to journeying with those who "need help." Instead, success is about mutuality, about *mutual* accompaniment. Success is about upending our power structures to the point where those in the margins possess the power to change those of us with privilege. In Boyle's words, "[We're] not going to the margins to topple sinful social structures. [We're] going there because [our] guides are there...because God thinks these are the people who know what it's like to have been cut off. And because they have suffered that particular pain, God thinks they are trustworthy guides for the rest of us to arrive at kinship."³⁸ Those of us with societal privilege, which typically means those of us who try to function independently and with masks of self-sufficiency, need to be taught how to open ourselves to acknowledging our own brokenness and limitations. We need to be taught by those in the margins how to overcome our privilege.

But how do we do this? How do we turn the tables and open ourselves in ways that are

countercultural and may seem counterintuitive? I believe Boyle provided some answers to this question while visiting Regis University. During his commencement speech, Boyle spoke about two of the main lessons he has learned from gang members involved with the program at Homeboy: humility and fidelity. Additionally, while speaking with me during his visit, Boyle shared that he recently came to the realization that "goodness is our preexisting condition."³⁹ These three elements—a belief in human goodness (even our own), humility, and fidelity—seem to offer the beginnings of a response to the question of how those of us with privilege open ourselves to mutuality with those in the margins.

If we believe goodness is the default for human existence, we begin to see and encounter ourselves and others differently. We tend to be more compassionate, more forgiving, and more merciful. We tend to take the time to look deeper for the goodness and for reasons behind bad choices and offensive behaviors. And if we look inward through this lens of goodness, we may allow ourselves glimpses of our own pains and fears and, more importantly, our deep longings for connection and mutuality. We may also see examples of when these pains, fears, and longings manifested in behaviors that brought about disconnection from ourselves and others. We may see our own brokenness. And we may be able to respond with tenderness.

Furthermore, if we recall O'Brien's description of where the Meditation on Two Standards falls within the Exercises, namely after experiencing God's love and reflecting mercifully on our hopes and failings, we see we are now ready to enter what Boyle calls "the lowly place." More specifically, we enter the lowly place with humility born of knowing our own goodness and brokenness, and with the knowledge that the same exist in all others. We enter the margins *not* with the intent to change others or to make their lives better. We enter the margins because we now know we are not better than those who reside there and because we long for connection, connection often unavailable outside the margins because it threatens the prescribed power structures of privilege. We also enter with the humility and openness that allow us to receive from those in the margins in ways that call forth

our latent relationality, a relationality that will hopefully and gradually supersede the prescribed primacy of the individual.⁴⁰ And we enter with a humble hope for connection with those who may be able to return us to ourselves by calling us out of our “privilege.”

This returning to ourselves, to our relational, communal, and connected selves, is very messy and takes unpredictable amounts of time. It takes fidelity. In the words of another famous Jesuit, it requires “trust in the slow work of God.”⁴¹ Moreover, it requires that we acknowledge and enter into the paradox of privilege by wrestling with and undoing the effects of prescriptions of self-sufficiency, independence, and disconnection. We must acknowledge our protective desires to disconnect and combat those desires with mutuality and side-by-side work *with* those in the margins. We must become co-creators of a relational and communal future by committing faithfully to the beautiful and messy work of expanding the margins until they become the place where we all reside.⁴²

Conclusion

Because of the success of Homeboy and *Tattoos*, Fr. Gregory Boyle has entered the spotlight in ways he probably did not foresee or intend. By all

accounts, *Tattoos* is a bestseller, and Boyle travels extensively to give talks and fundraise around this book and his work at Homeboy. He has been interviewed for numerous television and radio programs, and his second book was recently released after great anticipation. By the standard of the world, Boyle himself is a success. Yet Boyle is very clear in *Tattoos* and in conversation that over the years gang members have taught him a very different definition of success, which he interprets through the second standard: faithful solidarity and accompaniment. Even with this definition—or perhaps even more so with this definition—Boyle and Homeboy are undeniably successful; Boyle’s and Homeboy’s three decades of accompaniment seem to qualify as “faithful.”

Looking at Homeboy and Boyle’s work through an RCT lens helps explain their success. Instead of prescribing to and setting expectations of self-sufficiency, independence, and the disconnection required for that way of living, Boyle prioritizes relationship, mutuality, and connection. The success of Homeboy’s culture, which developed out of these priorities, supports RCT’s assertion that we were created to live this way. To do so, however, requires that we confront and resolve the paradox of privilege; we must embrace our brokenness and open ourselves to receiving those whose brokenness is exploited by society. ¹¹

Notes

¹ Gregory Boyle, S.J., *Tattoos on the Heart* (New York: Free Press, 2010).

² Boyle Heights is the neighborhood in East LA where Boyle pastored the Dolores Mission Church from 1986 to 1992 and is where many of the stories in *Tattoos on the Heart* took place. The name of the neighborhood and Boyle’s name have no connection.

³ “Father Greg,” *Homeboy Industries*, accessed June, 26, 2017, <http://www.homeboyindustries.org/fatherg>

⁴ I thank Anisa Fontes-Castro, Sherlynn Garces, Jorge Palacios, Jr., Paola Soto, Phyllis Tonna, and Keeli Wallace (among others) for helping me see these dimensions of the trip.

⁵ Boyle also cites the spirituality of Jean Vanier as foundational for Homeboy. Those familiar with Vanier will see his influence on my thinking throughout this article.

⁶ Gregory Boyle, S.J., interview by Linda Land-Closson, Regis University, May 6, 2017.

⁷ “A standard is a banner or flag under which the followers of a particular leader rally. Ignatius asks us to consider the opposing tactics and values of Christ and Lucifer (also known in the language of the Exercises as the enemy of our human nature, the father of lies, the evil one, the deceiver). We are asked to choose the banner under which we will stand,” Kevin O’Brien, S.J., *The Ignatian Adventure* (Chicago: Loyola Press, 2011), 168.

⁸ Boyle, interview.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ “Kevin O’Brien, SJ, on the Two Standards,” *Ignatian Spirituality*, accessed June 10, 2017, <http://www.ignatianspirituality.com/12722/kevin-obrien-sj-on-the-two-standards>

¹² Boyle, *Tattoos*, chapter 8.

¹³ Boyle, interview.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ O'Brien, S.J., *The Ignatian Adventure*, 168-169.

¹⁷ Jean Baker Miller and Irene Pierce Stiver, *The Healing Connection* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1997).

¹⁸ The remainder of this section draws directly and extensively from Linda Land-Closson, "Strings of Relationship and Community: A Dialogue Between the Early Years of Bede Griffiths and the Theories of Jean Baker Miller" (Ph.D., diss., University of Denver and Iliff School of Theology Joint Ph.D. Program, Denver, 2008).

¹⁹ Subsequently published as Jean Baker Miller, "The Development of Women's Sense of Self (Work in Progress No. 12)" (Wellesley, MA: Stone Center, 1984).

²⁰ Land-Closson, "Strings of Relationship and Community," 44.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ For details about the formulation of RCT, see Judith Jordan, Alexandra G. Kaplan, Jean Baker Miller, Irene P. Stiver, and Janet L. Surrey, *Women's Growth in Connection: Writings from the Stone Center* (New York: The Guilford Press, 1991); Judith V. Jordan, Maureen Walker, and Linda M. Harding, eds., *The Complexity of Connection: Writings from the Stone Center's Jean Baker Miller Training Institute* (New York: The Guilford Press, 2004); and Land-Closson, "Strings of Relationship and Community," 27-32.

²⁴ Miller and Stiver, *The Healing Connection*, 47.

²⁵ Ibid, 42-62.

²⁶ Ibid, 53.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Jean Baker Miller, *Toward a New Psychology of Women*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1986), 6.

²⁹ Ibid., 116. Italics in original.

³⁰ Miller and Stiver discuss at length the prominence and influence of "power over" in our society and relationships and acknowledge this dynamic remains the norm as opposed to the exception. At the same time, they offer examples of mutuality in relationships and continue to assert relationships characterized by mutuality, connection, and empathy are descriptive. (*The Healing Connection*, 42-62.)

³¹ Jean Baker Miller, "Women and Power" in *Women's Growth in Connection*, 198.

³² Miller and Stiver, *The Healing Connection*, 43.

³³ Boyle, interview.

³⁴ Miller and Stiver, *The Healing Connection*, 51.

³⁵ Ibid., 47. Italics in original.

³⁶ Ibid. Italics in original.

³⁷ Boyle, interview.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Land-Closson, "Strings of Relationship and Community."

⁴¹ Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, S.J., "Patient Trust" in *Hearts on Fire: Praying with Jesuits*, ed. Michael Harter, S.J. (Chicago: Loyola Press, 2005), 102.

⁴² I thank Fr. Fernando Álvarez Lara, S.J. for the suggestion that we not erase the margins but instead move into them, for moving into the margins prioritizes the lives of those relegated there.