In Her Own Time

Women and Developmental Issues
in Pastoral Care

Jeanne Stevenson-Moessner, editor

Narratives of Harm:
Setting the Developmental Context
for Intimate Violence

Christie Cozad Neuger

The purpose of this chapter is to explore domestic abuse, especially partner battering, through a lens of resistance and prevention. My premise is that the way we shape the psychological, social, and spiritual development of boys and girls in our culture makes it almost inevitable that physical and emotional abuse will occur in heterosexual partnerships.

As we will explore, the cultural, theological, and familial narratives about gender in this society shape intimate partnerships between men and women in such a way that family relationships often become laden with abusive dynamics. The chapter will focus primarily on heterosexual couples, although violence occurs in a significant number of gay or lesbian intimate relationships as well. Usually, gay and lesbian children are raised within the dominant gender paradigms assigned to their biological sex and within heterosexual parental structures. Thus, they generally do not escape the gender training nor the relational paradigm based on heterosexual gender stereotypical norms that make violence likely.

This chapter focuses on these norms for gender and family in the hope that pastoral theology can find ways to counter these dominant narratives and thus resist and prevent family violence. I would argue that the primary model in pastoral theology for working with people who are suffering because of domestic violence has been a *response model.* Our focus has been on those who are victims of violence and on providing nurture, care, and protection for them. Although this response, rather than prevention, has been the focus for care, as we shall see, pastoral caregivers have tended to be generally ineffective when providing this kind of care for victims of domestic violence. Certainly the work of adequately responding to victims of domestic violence must continue and improve, but it needs to be joined by the work of resistance—especially resistance through changing the way we raise our children. My hope is that this chapter helps us to (1) develop better strategies for assisting the development of girls and boys in such a way that they will be better

able to resist the cultural norms of intimate violence; (2) develop better methods to respond to women and men caught in patterns of physical and emotional intimate violence; and (3) challenge the assumptions of our psychotherapeutic and developmental theories that suggest equality and trust are the normal contexts for girls in a culture that disadvantages them and puts them at risk for intimate violence from the moment of birth.

The Current Picture of Domestic Abuse

Talking about intimate violence as "normal" might seem extreme. It is clear that most religious leaders would prefer to believe that battering in intimate relationships is exceptional rather than normal. After all, most marriages in the United States occur because two individuals fall in love and desire to be good and caring partners with each other. Can we not assume that this motivation for marriage is an adequate antidote to domestic violence in most cases? We cannot. Even in the context of love and well-meaning intentions, the statistics about the occurrence of domestic violence force us to acknowledge its normalcy.

The United States Justice Department recently released a comprehensive study on the price of violence in our society. It attempted to include the costs of domestic violence and child abuse in addition to the kinds of violence more typically studied. The report found that "child abuse and domestic violence account for one-third of the total cost of crime."[1]

According to Margi McCue and the United States surgeon general, "[Domestic] abuse may be the single most common etiology for injury presented by women, accounting for more injury episodes than auto accidents, muggings, and rapes combined. A review of 3,676 records randomly selected from among female patients presenting with injury during one year, revealed that 40 percent of the women's injury episodes were identified as resulting from a deliberate assault by an intimate. Nineteen percent of the women had a previous history of abusive injury."[2] The American Medical Association estimates that four million women suffer severe assaults by boyfriends and husbands each year and that one in four women will be abused in her life. Estimates in a variety of studies range from two million to eight million women assaulted every year by partners and up to one in two women being abused sometime in her life. The American Psychological Association Task Force on Depression suggests that almost 40 percent of women in the United States are physically or sexually abused before the age of twenty-one, and McCue reports that medical personnel in emergency rooms think the number is more likely 50 percent or even higher.[3]

A Bureau of Justice report suggests, "Based on evidence collected in the National Crime Survey, as many as half of the domestic 'simple assaults' actually involved bodily injury as serious as or more serious than 90 percent of all rapes, robberies, and aggravated assaults."[4] And yet, only somewhere between 40 and 50

percent of domestic violence incidents are reported to the police.[5] The reasons given for not reporting incidents were (1) a fear of reprisal, (2) the sense that it was a private matter (the woman often felt that she must be somehow to blame), and (3) the feeling that the crime was just not important enough.

Again, according to the Bureau of Justice, African American, European American, and Hispanic women have approximately equivalent rates of intimate violence. Women who are between the ages of twenty-two and thirty-four have the highest rates of victimization and women who are college graduates have lower rates than noncollege graduates. Women in central cities have about the same rates of domestic violence as those in suburbs and rural environments. Somewhere between one-third and one-half[6] of all female murder victims over the age of fourteen are killed by a current or former spouse (compared to 4 percent of men),[7] although a study by Kesner, Julian, and McKenry says that 75 percent of all homicides of women are perpetrated by a male intimate partner.[8] Obviously many more women need shelter from domestic assault situations than are able to find it. According to McCue, "Shelters for battered women are only able to admit between 10 and 40 percent of women who apply. Shelter personnel believe that for each woman who calls a hotline or enters a shelter, there are at least ten battered women without a safe place to stay."[9]

Despite the prevalence of this crime, many women feel that they are the only ones who are experiencing this abuse. Further, they often feel they either deserve this violence or that they should somehow figure out how to prevent it, especially early on in their experience of battering. This sense of isolation and self-blame contributes to the difficulty women have trying to get out of these violent situations. Battering is a demoralizing, humiliating, dangerous experience. It is perpetrated by one with whom there has generally been an intimate and loving relationship. It frequently embodies a deep betrayal of trust along with the sense of isolation.

The Current Response Patterns of Religious Leaders

Although there are exceptions, the church, speaking generally, does not have a good track record in working with victims of family violence. Religious leaders tend to participate in the silencing of domestic abuse victims and their stories that the culture does. They have used theological justifications, particularly the sanctity of the family, to justify this silencing of domestic abuse victims. They have been in unquestioning collusion with patriarchy, assuming the normativeness (and believability) of males. And they have not wanted to participate in the kind of upheaval that it would cause to advocate actively on behalf of victims, especially because it is often the perpetrators who have the power and authority within local churches. For example, Marie Fortune warns pastors that when a woman comes in to tell you that her husband—who is also the chair of the board of trustees, an active church school teacher, and a large donor—has been battering her,

You will not be able to believe her. No matter how well intentioned you may be, what she is describing to you runs counter to your experience of that individual. What you have to keep in mind is that your experience with that individual is true and real for you and is public. Her experience with that individual is true and real and is private. Now with most of us, in the conflicting face of experience and information, we go with our experience. Remember, however, that in cases where someone is disclosing abuse by someone you know, there is another piece to this story that is the private person. Oftentimes the typical abuser has an exemplary public persona and yet in private engages in all sorts of behavior that seems unbelievable to you. Knowing that, our job is to press ahead and to believe that person—although it doesn't fit with what we know about the abuser—so that we can be present to the victim and ultimately to the offender.[10]

It is usually more difficult for us to side against a person whom we wish to believe is innocent of this kind of behavior than it is to believe that the accusation is a lie.

As we said above, pastors, overall, have not been very useful to women and children who have experienced abuse in their families. Many studies that have been done about the usefulness of clergy in situations of domestic abuse find that clergy are rated as one of the least helpful resources compared to family, friends, psychotherapists, family doctors, and social service agencies. In a recent study, researchers found that clergy effectiveness is consistently low, and they speculated that this was probably due to clergy endorsement of traditional teachings concerning the sanctity of marriage. In addition, a research group sent out a two-page questionnaire to 5700 pastors, and fewer than 10 percent of the questionnaires were returned. The researchers concluded that pastors lacked interest in or were hostile to the notion of domestic abuse. They also noted that the clergy that did return their questionnaires seemed to be concerned about battered women but indicated that they were torn by theological perspectives that seemed to be in conflict with the best interests of the women.[11]

These are very serious issues if clergy are indeed feeling that they are not able to really be very helpful to victims of intimate violence, especially wife battering or spousal rape, because they are trapped by theological doctrine that mandates patriarchal power. Pastoral theology must commit itself to closing this gap between theological doctrine and the well-being of women. It is interesting that when pastors are used as resources in situations of domestic violence, those women who rated their pastors as helpful tended to be from churches that normally addressed social problems in general and that created an environment where women felt safe coming forward with their stories. They were also more likely to rate their pastors as helpful if they were willing to take action to intervene in the violence, not just to listen passively to them.[12]

Women who are committed to their religious traditions often turn to pastors for help when they experience problems in their families. Yet, it is also true that

women who have experienced intimate violence are much more likely to leave their religious practices and affiliations than are nonabused women, partly because they have only experienced revictimization through silence and silencing and partly because they experience the church's betrayal as symbolic of God's betrayal. In other words, when churches are silent about domestic violence or use stereotyped images of girls and women that encourage passive responses to abuse, women experience the church (and God) as having abandoned them. We will explore some of these issues further when we explore the power of cultural and familial narratives.

It is important to say, however, that there are some signs of progress in churches' response to and resistance against domestic violence. For example, the Center for the Prevention of Sexual and Domestic Violence, directed by Marie Fortune as an educational ministry, has had considerable influence in recent years. Many pastors, seminary professors, and religious educators have been trained to offer appropriate intervention into situations of domestic and sexual violence. In addition, several important texts in the last few years have indicated that religious leaders and church scholars are viewing family violence as a serious theological and pastoral issue. Marie Fortune and Carol Adams have edited a significant theological sourcebook for religious leaders who are seeking resources for addressing these issues of family violence. The sourcebook looks at theological, biblical, historical, liturgical, and pastoral perspectives on intimate violence in ways that lend themselves to pastoral practice.[13] John McClure and Nancy Ramsay have recently edited a book focused on preaching about intimate violence. The text provides important theological and social reflection and ends with several sermons to guide pastors in this form of intervention.[14] And Toinette Eugene and James Poling have recently written an important book on pastoral care for African American families who are experiencing domestic violence.[15] These texts and the examples they give about ministry in the midst of family violence give hope that the church will soon be able to give appropriate time and energy to this epidemic problem.

The Power of Dominant Cultural Narratives in Shaping Family Violence

I have referred several times in this chapter to the formative power of cultural and familial narratives in people's lives. When I use the word "narrative," I mean more than casual or haphazard stories. I am really talking about core narrative—the story line within us (or within a culture) that shapes the way we encounter, interpret, and make meaning out of all other stories or experiences. Core narratives have to do with the primary sets of assumptions about reality that we carry. Individuals have core narratives, which are formed early and then enlarged and detailed as time goes on. Cultures have core narratives—systems of truth and meaning—that shape how people experience themselves, one another, and the primary systems in their lives.

Cultural core narratives tell us who we are in the context of that culture. Our core narrative tends to form out of early experiences and authoritative sources. That narrative then serves as the filter for interpreting ongoing experience and integrating it into the core narrative. In this way, core narratives both describe the key experiences a person (or a culture) has had and determine which experiences will be seen as primary and worth remembering and which will be discarded or reshaped in order to fit with this core understanding.

If, for example, a person has watched her mother get battered by her father throughout her childhood, that experience will probably form a key lens in her core narrative. Not only will that story be important (although possibly lost from conscious awareness over time), but it will serve as a framework through which to make sense out of other experiences and relationships. It will most likely motivate her to understand other experiences of harm in the ways she learned to understand and interpret those early experiences. It will also most likely serve as a framework for seeing other relational interactions as potential reproductions of that early experience. This is not to say that other powerful experiences will not challenge that core narrative and even reshape it, thus providing new frameworks of interpretation. It is to say that these early core narratives have a lot of power to shape and interpret future experiences without much critical reflection. The longer the strands within core narratives develop without being challenged, the "thicker" they are, and the harder they are to deconstruct. Obviously, personal core narratives develop in the context of the variety of interpretive frameworks to which we are exposed—our parents and families; peer groups; institutional connections such as school, church, clubs, and the media—which probably offer some of the most powerful interpretive frameworks in our culture today.

Cultural core narratives function in the same way. If a cultural story has shaped itself, for example, around a belief in a binary or dualistic system, separating thought from feeling, spirit from matter, men from women, God from humanity— and valuing the first half of the pair over the second, then that core narrative will continue to find ways to support its own claims to truth and will ignore or minimize those experiences (exceptions) that do not fit. In our culture, this dualistic framework is one strand of a powerful cultural core narrative, and it certainly affects our understanding of gender relationships.

I want to make the case that the primary "story we live by," the one within which we make life decisions in the culture, is a narrative that normalizes and even explicitly trains men to harm women in intimate relationships (especially when men feel threatened) and women to find ways to interpret that violence so that they remain in it. I am not making this case in order to demonstrate hopelessness or to posit an inevitable future of domestic violence. I believe that narratives are dynamic and can be rewritten, although not easily. I describe these cultural narratives of violence for two reasons. One is so that pastoral care ministries might be about the task of helping people (both perpetrators and victims) to examine the narratives

through which they build and interpret relationships, including violent relationships. The second is to deconstruct and reformulate violence-laden narratives at both cultural and individual levels for the purposes of prevention and resistance.

In our particular culture, a powerful narrative strand suggests certain people are more valuable than others. People are subtly and blatantly ordered according to a hierarchy of value based on various essential qualities (defined more or less at birth) such as skin color, ethnicity, sex, able-bodiedness, intelligence, sexual orientation, and physical appearance. The combination of these factors guide our placement in the value hierarchy to a large degree. The cultural narrative is the story that implicitly and explicitly defines and prescribes this hierarchy and shapes individual, familial, and societal compliance to it. Obviously, this process is not as mechanical or deterministic as I have made it sound. Many factors influence how individuals and institutions internalize and live out the dominant cultural narrative. Nonetheless, the narrative about who we are as individuals and in relationships is a powerful shaper of attitudes and behaviors. I want to briefly discuss two windows into the cultural narrative—popular entertainment and advertising media, and popular religious doctrines.

Popular Media Narratives

There has been an increase of violence, especially explicit violence, in the film industry in recent years. It is becoming more evident that violence against women, even when that violence is not explicitly sexual in nature, causes people to become desensitized to violence in general and to the violence of rape against women in particular. A set of studies by Linz, Donnerstein, and Penrod concluded:

> When subjects are continually exposed to graphically depicted film violence against women, individual feelings of anxiety and depression begin to dissipate. Material that was anxiety provoking became less so with prolonged exposure. Perceptual changes found in the study also proved to be reliable in later studies. Subjects reported seeing less violence with continued exposure. They also rated the material differently with continued exposure. Material once found somewhat degrading to women was judged less so after prolonged exposure.[16]

In this same study, these subjects also judged a rape trial victim more harshly after exposure to films depicting R-rated, nonsexual violence against women.

It might give us an element of hope to know that a later study by Donnerstein and Linz found that when viewers are carefully debriefed after this kind of viewing experience—when they are helped to recognize that the movies are fiction, that rape is a crime of violence, and that assaulting women is illegal—their more positive sensitivities toward women are retained, and that retention was long lasting. Certain forms of consciousness-raising about media depictions of violence against women, then, seem effective.[17]

When we consider both the quantity and quality of violence in today's "entertainment" industry, these conclusions become very important. In addition to film viewers, there are large numbers of pornography readers. (Pornography has been defined very helpfully by Gloria Steinem as sex being used to reinforce or create domination, pain, and humiliation. Violence, dominance, and conquest are the essential ingredients.) Pornography has also become more violent over the past ten or so years, and music videos have joined the violence movement. According to some studies, more than one-half of the music videos on MTV feature or suggest violence, present hostile sexual situations as acceptable, or show male heroes abusing women for fun.[18] In addition, there are more peepshows and adult bookstores in the United States than there are McDonald's[19] (four times as many, say Gary Brooks and Louise Silverstein[20]). One out of eight Hollywood movies depicts a rape theme. By the age of eighteen, the average youth has watched 250,000 acts of violence and 40,000 attempted murders on TV.[21]

In addition, the average American is exposed to over 2,000 ads per day. This sweeping form of education teaches us a great deal about who we are to be. Jean Kilbourne, an expert in the analysis of advertising, says, "Women are constantly exhorted to emulate the ideal of femininity (of young, thin, perfect), to feel ashamed and guilty if they fail, and to feel that their desirability and lovability are contingent upon physical perfection."[22]

Along with the various forms of advertising, television images, in general, are problematic for girls and women. A recent study by the nonprofit organization called Girls, Inc. (an association that has been operating for the past fifty years to improve the self-image of school-age girls) found that girls get their ideas about who they are or who they should be from television. Children in this survey of girls and boys in third through twelfth grades were found to watch television more than twenty hours per week.

The findings from this study are disturbing. Girls, Inc. discovered that the more television a girl watches, the more likely she is to think that household chores are women's work, and the more boys watch television, the more they agree with this assessment. The less television a girl watched, "the more likely she was to focus on career goals."

They also found that, except on public television, most children's shows are aimed at boys. In addition, television programs distorted the realities about women's and men's lives. For example, they said, "In the real world 80% of single households are headed by women, but on television, half of the single parents are men." In addition, they found that for every female character, there are three male characters in the average TV series, and on children's shows more than three-fourths of the adults are men. Finally, they revealed (to no one's surprise) that most of the victims in television shows are women.[23]

These are very serious findings. Television is one of the most significant influencers of self-image and relational expectations. In addition, television and other forms of entertainment media all shape our personal core interpretive narratives *and* reflect a cultural core narrative that portrays violence against women as normative and that demonstrates rigid gender stereotypes and the consequent power differences between men and women.

Maybe what is most compelling about this analysis is that we, as a culture, pay attention and money in order to receive these violence-laden messages. We do not, as a whole, protest these portrayals of unequal power relationships between men and women, nor do we protest the portrayal of violence against and objectification of women. By financially supporting these portrayals we affirm them as accurate and guiding strands of our cultural narrative. (See Pamela Cooper-White's chapter, in which she makes similar points about the culture.)

Popular Religious Narratives

A second illustration of formative cultural narratives might be found in certain dimensions of our theologies—especially as they are interpreted within an already existing cultural story of gendered hierarchy and power. It's important not to suggest that our religious foundations are necessarily negative about issues of objectification of and violence toward women. I believe that our theological heritage has deeply liberating dimensions. Much of our theological formulation, however, has been done in and by a culture already operating out of a normative narrative of patriarchy with all of its negative consequences.

For virtually all theologians interested in issues of intimate violence—much of which is perpetrated by adult men against boys, girls, and women—language and imagery for God has been of central importance. The focus on language and imagery for God reflects the philosophical understanding that language does not just describe cultural reality, but also informs, influences, and to a certain extent determines that culture. How God is named, imagined, and conceptualized significantly affects how we understand ourselves and our purpose, how we order our social and familial relationships, and how we structure our culture. In other words, our understanding of God and our relationship to God, for those of us who have religious commitments, orders and grounds our core narrative. If we believe, for example, that there is a natural order or hierarchy of value that God has ordained and represents, then we create cultural structures that keep that order in place. If we believe that God is male and, thus, that the male is closer to the image of God than the female, then we value males more highly than females, and we claim that males are naturally created to do more "godlike" things than are females. We would use that rationale to develop theories about gender roles and power positions, designating men as dominant and women as subordinate. We would then use these theories to define separate characteristics and even separate worlds for women and men that reflect this similarity and dissimilarity with God. We would also make the maintenance of these characteristics and worlds a matter of divine obligation. We find this ordering of our world in

many dimensions of our society today, and we find it very clearly at work in many of the dynamics of intimate violence.

Another theological issue that has been pursued by both male and female theologians exploring the dynamics of intimate violence is that of the glorification of suffering sometimes culled from our theologies of atonement. Jim Poling's research and writing have been important in this work, as has the work of Joanne Carlson Brown and Rebecca Parker and Rita Nakashima Brock. Feminist theology, in particular, has demonstrated a heavy investment in exploring, deconstructing, and reimagining Christian understandings of Jesus' death and resurrection.[24] The investment has hinged, at least in part, on the recognition by many women and men of the epidemic levels of abuse against women and children, and the use to which Christian theology has been put in allowing that abuse to occur. Feminist theorists have long been aware that abused women and children frequently receive messages from their pastors, from Christian husbands and parents, and from "well-meaning" Christian neighbors that there is divine meaning in their experience of abuse, that the abuse itself is salvific or a means to deeper spirituality, that it is their place to suffer, that husbands or parents know best, that they are somehow at fault, or that it is a sign of deep Christian charity to tolerate being abused by a "loved one." The stories about these kinds of messages, told by battered women, incest survivors, and others are legion. Annie Imbens and Ineke Jonker conducted a study in the Netherlands of eighteen women who had experienced childhood sexual abuse and who had been raised in Christian homes and studied how the abuse and the Christian upbringing might be related. They heard over and over again that Christian images of women, the God-given authority of fathers, and the mandates of humility, forgiveness, and submission were contributing factors in both the occurrence of violence and recovery from it.[25]

These studies and stories convey some of the motivation behind feminist and profeminist theologians' exploration into theories of atonement. Obviously, these issues around Christology and the way suffering and redemption are understood are of major import in pastoral care work.

Another theological issue has to do with the qualities that have been defined as valuable for Christians and especially for "good Christian women." As Mary Daly once said, "The qualities that Christianity idealizes, especially for women, are also those of a victim: sacrificial love, passive acceptance of suffering, humility, meekness, etc. Since these are the qualities idealized in Jesus 'who died for our sins', his functioning as a model reinforces the scapegoat system for women."[26]

The theology of forgiveness is an important issue, too. There has been a tendency for churches to urge victims of violence, especially intimate violence, to forgive their abusers. Those who do so are seen as more Christian, more holy. Yet, as Marie Fortune suggests, forgiveness should probably be the last step in the healing process rather than the first. Using a helpful exploration of the biblical understandings of forgiveness, Fortune finds that without justice, forgiveness is an empty exercise. She

says, "Forgiveness before justice is cheap grace and cannot contribute to authentic healing and restoration to wholeness for the victim or the offender."[27] Some very important work is being done by feminist theologians on the issue of forgiveness.[28] As Hedwig Meyer-Wilmes summarizes:

> The religious inculturation of contempt for women is something that Christian women theologians have long criticized, by drawing attention to the fact that an insistence on the father god, the absence of women in positions of church leadership, and the exclusive language of liturgy, provide ideological and social support for violence done to women."[29]

Thus, we have identified significant strands in the culture that both reflect and form personal and cultural narratives that support and normalize intimate violence by men against women. One problem with core narratives is that they function as *truth frames*, usually outside our personal or cultural awareness. When new understandings begin to emerge that challenge the unilateral interpretation that comes out of an unquestioned core narrative, then new narrative strands that allow new interpretations and meaning-making can be constructed. That reconstruction is motivated by the hope that the resulting narrative is less problem saturated or more in keeping with a preferred future. In other words, we need to continue to deconstruct these violence-laden narratives, so we can construct new narratives that work against the likelihood of intimate violence.

Familial Narratives

Cultural narratives are significantly shaped by the dominant narratives of the subgroups to which people belong. For example, subcultural narratives for many people of color intentionally teach their members to be suspicious of many narratives of the dominant white culture. A subculture of radical feminism will hope to help its children to challenge and reconstruct dominant cultural narratives about gender. Churches that are self-conscious about dynamics of power and oppression will help their members to develop counternarratives that are liberating and empowering for all people. In similar ways, individual families and subcultures of families provide more particular narratives for their members that either amplify, support, or negate the core narratives of the dominant culture. Families that reproduce patterns of violence supported by the culture or that reinforce gender stereotypes held as normative in the culture will continue to normalize patterns that make domestic violence likely. Families that challenge traditional gender roles and demonstrate egalitarian power relationships among family members (including children) are more likely to diminish the power of the cultural narrative. Given the strength of cultural narratives to reproduce familiar power relationships, behaviors, and attitudes, counternarratives have to be intentional and have to teach people how to challenge and deconstruct normative assumptions. Only then will people find ways to resist the influence of cultural narratives of power and control.

Gender Narratives

It has been the assumption of this chapter that gender narratives are powerful and formative in our culture. They are binary and polarized. Women and men, girls and boys are defined over against each other. They are seen as opposites. This is one of the first harmful dimensions of gender stereotyping. Gender stereotypes teach girls and boys to relate to one another in ways that do not challenge the power organization mandated by the dominant culture. Girls and boys begin their education about how to fit into the dominant narrative from the moment of birth. Along with their pink or blue hospital caps, they are talked to more or less, played with more or less, and given more or less freedom of movement as determined by their sex.

Sandra Bem's perspective on gender schema theory is helpful for us as we look at the cultural contexts of gender narratives. Bem is most famous for her work in the 1970s on androgyny. She has since rejected her conclusions in that work and moved to a focus on gender schema theory. This theory suggests that children, from a very young age, internalize the lens of gender polarization into their own narrative frameworks. Within these narrative frameworks, people then resist challenge from experiences that do not support them and pay attention to any data or experiences that do support them, thus reinforcing the culturally supported narrative. Bem writes:

> Gender schema theory contains two fundamental presuppositions about the process of individual gender formation: first, that there are gender issues embedded in cultural discourse and social practice that are internalized by the developing child, and, second, that once these gender lenses have been internalized, they predispose the child, and later the adult, to construct an identity that is consistent with them."[30]

She goes on to state that girls and boys have to contend not only with gender polarization, but also with cultural androcentrism and with a mandate to pass this schema on through the culture from generation to generation. The cultural phenomena that reinforce androcentrism and gender polarization include such things as "generic" male language (including male names becoming the "family" name), child-rearing practices, advertising strategies, entertainment themes and images, and so on. Bem argues that gender polarization and its enculturation is so ubiquitous that even feminist theory building (such as the persistent emphasis on women being more relational than men) can perpetuate its legacy.

It is important to note that Bem begins here with assumptions very different from those of many developmental theorists. Her assumption is that children are formed in the cultural soup of gender norms and power arrangements. There is no emphasis here on an epigenetic principle of positive unfolding but rather an affirmation that children use the narrative material of their families, institutions, media, schools, and so on as the raw material for the way they shape their places

and identities in those systems. The theory also assumes that girl children are immediately exposed in this culture to narrative messages that deny them, at least to some degree, the ability to develop a comprehensive sense of trust, industry, or even identity, no matter how stable or affirming their family life or personality.

This developmental dynamic of gender shaping is a key factor in the promulgation of violent family narratives. It is important, then, to look at gender development in boys and girls in some detail.

Girls' Gender Training

Lyn Brown and Carol Gilligan have documented that many girls in late childhood and early adolescence seem to lose their "voice." Gilligan and Brown did a longitudinal study of girls moving from age eight into their early teen years. They found that younger girls were in significant relationships with their peers and would speak directly and clearly about violations and injustices done to themselves or to their friends. By the age of eleven, however, these same girls were moving away from their own knowledge, using the phrase "I don't know" much more frequently and expressing implicit and explicit knowledge of the rules they were to follow in order to be acceptable and "in relationship." Gilligan and Brown summarize their findings:

> At the crossroads of adolescence, the girls in our study describe a relational impasse that is familiar to many women: a paradoxical or dizzying sense of having to give up relationship for the sake of 'relationships.' This taking of oneself out of relationship in order to protect oneself and have relationships forces an inner division or chasm, it makes a profound psychological shift. . . .Women's psychological development within patriarchal societies and male-voiced cultures is inherently traumatic.[31]

Women and other members of nondominant groups have thus learned to interpret their own stories and experiences, needs and goals, through the lenses of the other—those they have been taught to please and appease. Often they have lost access to their truths and their honest strengths.

Brown suggests that the girls learn during early adolescence what it means to be a "good" woman, fearing that if they do not follow the rules of "femininity," they will experience abandonment, exclusion, or ridicule. Recently published books of "rules" for how young women can attract men make these rules explicit, but my experience has been that girls and women, almost without exception, know those rules by heart. And those rules about being feminine—quiet, nurturing, relational, supportive, full of caring feelings and empathy but rarely angry, and so forth—teach girls and women how to be part of the supporting cast, rather than actors or authors with voice and authority.

When a young woman does not follow the rules she pays a price, often humiliation or retribution. Maria Harris names the problem:

This dilemma—and the choices it suggests—can be described thus: (a) either to stop or hide one's own voice in order to become, or thought of as, a "nice girl," and so become alienated from oneself; or (b) to refuse to be silent and take the risk, perceived and real in this society, of becoming alienated socially and politically, of being ostracized as, for example, "brash," "loud," "aggressive," "bossy."[32]

Some girls do take the latter choice, refusing to give up themselves or their knowledge for the sake of an idealistic dream about being the perfect woman and the implications of that dream. Studies indicate that African American girls in particular are better able to resist the seduction of this ideal, in part because they are more aware of its falseness, and because they are raised in a community that teaches girls that, in order to survive racism, they need to be able to speak out against cultural lies. For some of these young women, the resistance they are able to express to the dual realities of racism and sexism helps to create possibilities for real transformation in their lives. As Tracy Robinson and Janie Ward discuss, however, there is a difference between resistance for survival, which often offers short-term gains but long-term problems, and resistance for liberation. They suggest that the role of the community is to foster the kind of resistance in young African American women that will lead to long-term liberation, not just survival.[33] Beverly Jean Smith writes, "As an African American, I grew up within a particular cultural context that values voice. African American culture demands that individual voices be connected to the whole and not just to go solo and fly off somewhere." She goes on to say that African American girls do not fall prey to the rules of femininity as often as do European American girls, because they do not fall victim to the myth of "Prince Charming."[34] These writers think that living in an African American community helped them to resist these cultural lies about the promise of true femininity because their voice in resisting racism was encouraged.

Many young women learn in adolescence what it means to be a "good" woman and to "forget what they know." They give up the ability to be in authentic relationship for the sake of being related in ways that minimize the risks of exclusion and abandonment. This process seems to be a subtle one that most girls identify in a positive way—claiming in Gilligan and Brown's studies that their previous answers (from childhood) were "stupid" and that they see things more clearly as adolescents. Many of the young women in their study were able to identify a vague sense of disquiet, that if they expressed themselves honestly, especially in ways that might hurt other people's feelings, their relationships would be lost. Even when there was no evidence that the relationship in question was that fragile, the conviction that honest expression of feelings would lead to exclusion was maintained.

All of these developmental processes put women at risk for violence in male-female intimate relationships. We will look more at this phenomenon in a moment.

Boys' Gender Training

A lot of important, gender-conscious research has been done in the past ten or fifteen years about masculinity and men's psychological and spiritual health. This research has focused on the problems men experience that might well be a direct result of their attempt to conform to male gender roles. Ron Levant writes that these new approaches to understanding masculinity have provided a framework for a psychological approach to men and masculinity that questions traditional norms for the male role, such as the emphases on competition, status, toughness, and emotional stoicism and that views certain male problems (such as aggression and violence, homophobia, misogyny, detached fathering, and neglect of health) as unfortunate but predictable results of the male role socialization process.[35]

James O'Neill says there are six patterns that are a result of gender socialization in men. These are:

1. Restrictive emotionality
2. Socialized control, power, and competition
3. Homophobia
4. Restrictive sexual and affective behavior
5. Obsession with achievement and success
6. Health-care problems

He goes on to say, "How men are socialized produces sexist attitudes and behavior that explains much of the personal and institutional sexism in society."[36] O'Neill suggests that normative masculinity sets up persistent worries about personal achievement, competence, failure, status, upward mobility and wealth, and career success in men's lives as well as a drive to obtain authority, dominance, and influence over others. There is an emphasis on striving against others in competitive ways. Restrictive emotionality suggests that men have difficulty and fears about expressing feelings and difficulty finding words to express basic emotions. Ron Levant says that emotionality (boy babies are more emotional than are girl babies) is socialized out of boys very intentionally and this has four major consequences. First, boys develop a form of empathy he calls "action empathy," which is the ability to see things from another's point of view in order to predict what they will "do" (not what they feel) and is usually employed in the service of the self (different from emotional empathy). Second, boys become strangers to their own emotional life, and most develop at least a mild form of alexithymia (not having words for emotions). Men who are in the presence of an unrecognized emotion often experience only the bodily sensation of its physiological component. Third, boys pour their vulnerable emotions out through the channel of anger—one of the few emotions boys are encouraged to express. Fourth, boys learn to channel their caring emotions through their sexuality.

We need to recognize some of the important negative consequences for men of gender-role strain. For example, probably all four of the gender-role conflict factors correlate positively with depression in men, and restrictive emotionality

correlates positively with depression at all life stages of men. Higher levels of gender-role conflict correlate positively with low self-esteem. In race studies, European American, African American, and Hispanic men all reported problems with success, power, and competition; restrictive emotionality; and conflicts between work and family relations. Results of several studies indicate strong correlations between gender-role conflict and negative attitudes toward seeking help.[37]

Other consequences of gender-role strain include the fact that women live, on average, seven years longer than do men, and gender-related lifestyle choices are part of this shorter life expectancy (for example, between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four, men die at three times the rate of women, mostly because of high rates of violent death among male youth). Women are more prone to anxiety disorders and depression, but men show more evidence of antisocial personality disorder and alcohol and drug abuse.[38] Men also participate in violence in very destructive ways that can be clearly related to gender-role training. In a recent study of 518 college men, 34 percent reported that they had engaged women in unwanted sexual contact, 20 percent reported they had attempted unwanted intercourse, and 10 percent reported they had completed unwanted intercourse. Forty-six percent said they were at least somewhat likely to force sex if they would not get caught.[39]

This discussion leads us into the connections between gender training in a world ordered by dualistic power assignments and intimate violence in heterosexual intimate relationships.

Implications for Male-Female Violence in Intimate Relationships

Women who stay in or return to battering relationships, especially early on in the battering, tend to feel responsible for the relationship failure. There is debate in the literature on domestic abuse about how much self-blame women take on in a battering relationship, but it does seem clear that for women who stay in the relationship and for women in relationships in which the battering has not been going on for very long, self-blame is high. In addition, women in battering relationships tend to be and become depressed and to experience low self-esteem.[40] Certainly low self-esteem, which is the reality most closely tied to women's experience in battering relationships, is related to both a lack of a sense of entitlement and a lack of hope for creating something new. These same dynamics also make women vulnerable to the pervasive problem of "hands off" battering, or emotional abuse, which always accompanies physical battering and which might exist in relationships in which no physical battering takes place. (Emotional abuse might also serve as a precursor to physical violence in a relationship.) No matter what the pattern of emotional abuse, the abuse generates deep damage in its victims.

Women who are in battering relationships tend to look diligently for an explanation for a presumably aberrant situation. They engage in mind reading. Lempert

suggests that "violence is not a generally expected marital interaction. Cultural expectations of love and marriage do not include the 'stories from hell' that are the lived experiences of abused women. It is the unexpected nature of the violence, its seeming unpredictability, that makes it difficult to assimilate."[41] As a result, women look for an explanation that fits their core narrative. Piera Serra writes:

> If the woman perceives the violence she is subjected to as the expression of her partner's inner world, and she considers the act as a symptom or a message, she will tend to disregard her own suffering and physical helplessness. Most of the women we interviewed who were still living with their partners interpreted their partners' violent behavior as a sign of distress.[42]

The impact of this mind reading and interpretation favoring the other person is that it gets in the way of moral evaluation and self-care. Psychologically, it also gives the woman the illusion that she still has a chance of fixing this problem in the relationship (which, of course, is not a problem in the relationship at all but a problem in her spouse). Lempert suggests that "women in a battering relationship cannot afford to relinquish beliefs that they exercise some control, however minimal, over their lives because their survival depends on those beliefs and on continued use of whatever personal power they possess. With the erosion of these personal and social resources comes increasing demoralization."[43]

Serra concludes her discussion with the statement that women turn to outsiders to help end the violence in order to preserve the relationship. Yet most caregivers, whether police, clergy, counselors, or friends, help only by suggesting that she leave the relationship. They do not think they have the authority or right to make the batterer stop battering. Thus, when the batterer expresses contrition, mild affection, or even just temporarily ends the violence, she takes this as a sign of change, and the bonding between them that might result is usually more satisfying than any outside help has been.[44] In this way, her training to be relationally responsible, to sacrifice self-interest in order to care for others, and to hope nurturing and love will be forthcoming if she follows the gender rules is often temporarily fruitful in the period between violent episodes by the batterer himself.

It's also important to look at men's gender training and its relationship to violence in marriages. Remembering O'Neill's work and Pleck's work mentioned above in the discussion on gender training for men, we can begin to see some connections. Numerous studies have linked the inability to express vulnerable feelings with a strong tendency to engage in interpersonal violence. Other studies have shown clear linkages between socialization for aggression and interpersonal violence.[45] Paul Yelsma, in his work on intimate violence, names several factors that he calls triggers for abuse in batterers. Those factors include: alcohol abuse, need to maintain authority, excessive need for control, high need for power, dependency conflicts, fear of intimacy, poor self-concept, witnessing abusive behavior in family of origin, experience of abuse as a child, a tendency to label all emotions as anger,

sex role rigidity, emotional inexpressiveness, intellectualizing of emotions, spouse-specific inassertiveness, tendency to experience suspicion and jealousy, social isolation, low levels of inclusion, and emotional dependency.[46]

Obviously, these factors are not all present in all men, and they take vastly different shapes depending on other particularities such as race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, and even age or place in the life cycle. Yet, as Wayne Ewing writes, "When the question is raised, 'who is the male batterer?' the answer is sometimes given, 'everyman!' Without pushing too quickly, let me simply point out here that this observation is accurate."[47] Numerous studies have shown that the psychological profiles of violent men (rapists or batterers) are not significantly different from the psychological profiles of the general population of men. Male gender training, which is facilitated by families and other important institutions, is related to high risk for interpersonal violence. In fact, Ewing goes on to say, "The teaching of violence is so pervasive, so totally a part of male experience, that I think it best to acknowledge this teaching as a civic, rather than as a cultural or as a social, phenomenon. Certainly there are social institutions which form pieces of the total advocacy of violence: marriage and family; ecclesiastical institutions; schools; economic and corporate institutions; government and political institutions."[48] He concludes his article: "I used to think that we simply tolerated and permitted male abusiveness in our society. I have now come to understand rather that we advocate physical violence. Violence is presented as effective. Violence is taught as the normal, appropriate and necessary behavior of power and control."[49]

Certainly not all men (or even most men) are emotionally or physically violent in their intimate relationships. All men who don't engage in family violence, however, must actively resist cultural narratives of maleness that would predispose them toward it. Men must also be willing actively to protest the culture that makes it likely they will be violent with intimate partners. If men want to be seen as non-violent, it is important that they take a clear stand against family violence.

The issues of power and hierarchy are a foundational part of understanding domestic violence. We must not fall into the mistake that many battered women make of thinking battering is primarily a symptom of their male partners' personal distress or dysfunction. Michael Kaufman writes, "Men's violence against women is the most common form of direct, personalized violence in the lives of most adults and . . . is probably the clearest most straightforward expression of relative male and female power."[50] Joseph Pleck, who has been so instrumental in developing a new psychology of men, notes that men create hierarchies as a key component of the competitive side of male gender training, and those hierarchies determine value between men and over women. This hierarchical power system objectifies women in such a way that it makes violence against them more acceptable and likely.[51] In an interesting newspaper article from the *Seattle Times*, a lawyer is reported to have used the following argument to defend his client from being punished for the crime of sexual assault of which he had been found guilty.

The lawyer said, "Hostility toward women, I think, is something that is culturally instilled in men. It's part of our culture that has been for hundreds of years, that violence against women is not unacceptable. Consequently, my client should not be punished for being culturally male."[52]

Pleck suggests that women are used in male hierarchies in the following ways:

1. Women are used as symbols of success in men's competition. Therefore, when that success is threatened by a woman "failing to meet his expectations," violence is likely.
2. Women play a mediating role and smooth over men's inability to relate non-competitively with other men.
3. Women provide men a refuge from the dangers and stresses of relating to other males. When she is no longer willing to be a nurturer or best friend, either because of her own needs or in response to earlier violence, violence by him is more likely.
4. Women reduce the stress of competition by serving as an underclass (against whom men do not have to compete). This might help explain why women's successful movement into the public arena in recent decades might be related to escalating violence. It also makes very clear women's "otherness" and objectification.[53]

Ewing writes, "The ruling paradigm for male supremacy remains to this hour, physical violence,"[54] and it is often effective. McMahon and Pence have studied men who batter. They conclude, "When asked, violent men are quite clear about what it can accomplish: 'she would listen,' 'she would drop the order for protection,' 'next time she'd think twice.' Such men benefit from their violence. How much more seductive are explanations that say a man's violence is an expression of his insecurity or impulsiveness."[55]

Gender training within this context of power differences is a powerful narrative for violence by men against women in intimate relationships. It helps us understand that the work of pastoral care and counseling needs to attempt to reshape these cultural, formative narratives, not just work with the idiosyncratic stories of individual perpetrators and victims.

Pastoral Care Paradigms of Response

Pastoral response to victims of domestic abuse needs to include three elements. First, every religious leader who might have pastoral access to battered women needs to understand a basic crisis approach to women who seek pastoral care in the midst of active battering. Every pastor should have a thorough knowledge of the dynamics of battering and battering cycles and the ability to use that knowledge effectively in crisis situations with victims of intimate violence. Pastors should also have the ability to help women who are at risk of future battering to develop a detailed safety plan. The plan should be one the women can put into action when it

is needed. Pastors need to have done their homework, so they are not scrambling to find resources (such as women's shelters, legal resources, rape crisis lines, support groups, and the like) during a crisis moment. All pastors need to have a thorough referral list with resources they have personally evaluated, so they can be free to pay attention and tend to the needs of the person in distress. These are basic crisis procedures for victims of intimate violence.

It is common for a woman to come for pastoral care or counseling, however, not during the crisis of violence itself, but as a result of the longer-term effects of the trauma. This fact leads us to the second response element. Religious leaders need to be able to help victims of battering to move through a longer healing process after they are no longer at immediate risk. It is important to remember that the pastor might play many roles. First, healing care is not limited to formal pastoral counseling. Second, the pastor is not the only agent of healing in the church. Third, the pastor needs to be able to work in concert with appropriate community resources for the good of the care receiver. If the church gives clear messages through its education programs, sermon topics and illustrations, support group structures, and use of money (such as having a discretionary fund to help pay for healing resources in the community), then it is more likely that all three of these structures of healing will be able to work together for the good of the victim of intimate violence.

In keeping with both narrative theory and feminist principles, it is important in the healing process to focus on women's strengths and resources rather than assessing deficits and pathology. This is easier said than done. For one thing, counseling has been so steeped in a medical model of sickness and a behavioral model of problems that it is natural for caregivers and care receivers alike to approach counseling with those two lenses. Women who have been victims of intimate violence, however, generally are not in distress (even years later) because they have characterological or even behavioral deficits. They are in distress because (1) they have had minimal opportunity to process and integrate a traumatic history into the rest of their lives, and (2) they have skills and strengths that were of great help to them in surviving the violence but that now get in their way. Therefore, regarding the need to process and integrate the experience, it is important for the caregiver to find the best ways to hear the story of the violence and to believe and support that story fully (rather than to work with a pathology model that focuses on inconsistencies and errors in the story for the sake of symptom assessment). The caregiver also needs to help the care receiver to make sense of and find meaning in the story and to incorporate it into her ongoing life narrative. Regarding the woman's skills and strengths, the care giver needs to assist the care receiver to discover ways that her strengths can be used appropriately for their current context so that they do not cause further distress.

The third element of the response model is to make sure that the batterer is not ignored. He needs to be held accountable and helped to break his patterns of control and violence. Programs are available that combine consciousness-raising about gender roles and power, behavioral relearning, and the development of new

strategies for relating that can be very effective for male batterers. The problem is how to get men to stick with programs such as this. The willingness of the church to take a stand against domestic violence without giving up on batterers is key.

Pastoral Care Paradigms of Resistance

Given what we have said here about gender stereotypes and power relationships as contexts for intimate violence, there are three primary strategies for resistance. The first is to bring to greater consciousness cultural narratives that make intimate violence more likely, so the narratives seem less like unilateral, unquestionable truth. This means that we as pastors and religious leaders need to take aggressive stands against gender narratives that make relational violence more likely between men and women. Gender training as it exists in our culture makes death-dealing violence more likely. The church participates in that gender training through its silence, uncritical use of antiwomen and hierarchical theology, complacency about supposedly normal boy/girl and male/female behaviors, and reluctance to boldly and prophetically deconstruct gender assumptions. For the church to stand against the narratives that precipitate family violence, it will have to take gender equality and flexibility seriously in elementary church school classes, junior high youth groups, premarital preparation sessions, adult Bible studies, and everywhere that cultural narratives about gender, power, and control are expressed implicitly or explicitly. The work of resistance against intimate violence requires disciplined scrutiny and the persistent deconstruction of damaging narratives in all church activities, including worship.

The second form of resistance is deeply supporting exceptional narrative strands—strands that work against the core narrative. When those exceptional strands are supported and made stronger, they are more likely to offset the power of the core narrative. So, for example, a key mission of pastoral care in this context would be to support those attitudes and behaviors that go against stereotypical gender roles, challenge unequal power between men and women (or among racial groups, sexual orientation groups, and so on), or immediately stand in the way of interpersonal violence. This support of alternative or exceptional narrative strands in people, institutions, and the culture at large is our most likely avenue for successful prevention of violence. I think domestic violence is one of the most powerful indicators for the mandate to work against sexism at home, schools, our media, and the church. These are not issues of political correctness; we are talking about lifesaving measures.

It is also important to recognize that women frequently engage in small acts of resistance to male violence in relationships and families. Those acts of resistance need to be acknowledged in ways that help women to see the possibilities of their own agency. Religious leaders need to find ways in sermon illustrations, teaching, and pastoral care to affirm all constructive forms of resistance to oppressive and harmful narratives and actions.

The reality is that it is not easy to deconstruct problematic core narratives. We are ambivalent about them, if we become aware of them at all. They make life more predictable and reliable. They fit with our gut experience, which we like to believe is true. They often entitle us to familiar power—to getting what we think we want or need. It is often painful to attempt to deconstruct even damaging core narratives because of their integrative and stabilizing power. Even the intensely negative aspects of our interpretive frameworks are interwoven with those aspects that have given our lives positive meaning. Consequently, when I talk about pastoral care as offering support for alternative narrative possibilities as they occur, what I mean by support is institutional, relational, and personal efforts to affirm and encourage the development of these alternative ways of being and interpreting but not deny the ambivalence in that process. That kind of support means we have to be willing to deconstruct our own violence-laden assumptions—psychological, theological, linguistic, relational, vocational—and to be held accountable when we act out of them. Preventive pastoral care will involve deconstructing and being held accountable for our own violence-laden core narratives (as leaders of the church) and then helping to support the development of exceptional nonviolent narratives in people, church, and society. Knowing how these more overtly violent narratives are interwoven with more subtle strands of stereotypical gender training, our various forms of entertainment, and our theological interpretation helps us to do this deconstruction and restorying at the deep, integrative levels required for change.

Finally, we have to be willing to join with other community resource people who are also attempting to find ways to resist the seductive power of relational violence. Churches and religious leaders need to join with the battered women's shelter movement, legal advocates, educators of all kinds, and others who are willing to speak on behalf of peacemaking in families. In addition, we have to learn how to be open to new expressions of and narratives about gender that break down the absolute dualisms of maleness and femaleness with their assigned roles. We in the church have often been afraid to open ourselves to new ways of understanding roles and relationships, much less gender. We need, however, to find models that help us to break down gender models based on complementarity, hierarchy, and control, and we have to learn from those new models how to live together as people—not just as women and men—with all our potential and all our limitations.

If we are to be true to faith commitments to peace and justice, we can no longer be satisfied with a pastoral theology and pastoral care that focuses only or even primarily on responses to suffering. The contemporary challenge in relation to family violence is to actively and aggressively resist those narratives in ourselves and our world that lead us to do harm to one another. We must settle for no less than transformation of those principalities and powers that seek to separate us from one other and God. We cannot afford to dismiss this transformative work as conformity to political correctness. Lives are at stake.

Opening the Eyes: Understanding the Impact of Trauma on Development

Pamela Cooper-White

"And I say, Hey, what a wonderful kind of day, When we can learn to work and play, and get along with each other." Arthur, the latency-age aardvark who wears his baggy jeans and horn-rimmed glasses cavorts on his TV program early each morning. Along with his little sister, D. W., he learns not-too-terrible lessons about friendship, lying, recycling, chicken pox, homework, responsibility, and the death of hamsters. His TV audience of five- to nine-year-olds is brought along with him to learn these lessons gently and vicariously: The world is good. Responsibility is good. Lying is bad. Friends come in all shapes and sizes, but we can all get along. You'll get sick, but then you'll get to go to the fair anyway. Mothers are kind, grandmothers think the best of you, and fathers are honorable, if a little detached. This is the world of children as we adults want to believe it, sometimes remember it, and hope to help our own children experience it. It is also the world of child development as it has been largely taught and written about from Piaget to the present day.

Just as a child moves through the developmental eras of childhood from one evolutionary truce to another and literally cannot conceive of certain aspects of logic or reality that belong to a later phase of development, so our culture has only recently emerged (or, it can be argued, reemerged) from a long incapacity to recognize the reality of childhood sexual abuse and trauma. A quick review of the subject index in each of the developmental texts with which we have become familiar—Erik Erikson,[1] Robert Kegan,[2] and James Fowler's now classic text on faith development[3]—reveals no mention of "trauma," "abuse," or "sexual abuse." These authors occasionally consider the idea of "crisis," but even this topic is generally framed as a naturally occurring disruption or loss that can eventually be accommodated, if not assimilated, as a growth-enhancing experience. Examples of crises include leaving home for the first time or losing a loved one. This exclusion of trauma and abuse is true even of Carol Gilligan's groundbreaking work, *In a*