

TALES OF TERROR AND TORMENT: Thoughts on boundaries and truth-telling

Denise M Ackerman
University of the Western Cape

An eye for an eye leaves the whole nation blind
- Praise singer Zwakhe Mbuli

...there can be no reconciliation without memory
- Richard von Weizsäcker

Abstract

This article centres on the highly contentious concept of boundaries as viewed from a feminist theological perspective. The point is made that the concept both hinders and helps women in their struggles. This is briefly touched upon with reference to feminist theory, ethical discourse and women's identity formation. The concept of boundaries is then applied to the proceedings of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and beyond, to the issues of accountability and awareness. A plea is made for a public lament as a way of accepting and acknowledging the past in order to create the space for transition - between the remembrance of the past and the hope for the future.

Introduction

When the theme of 'boundaries' was decided on last year for the workshop on Contextual Hermeneutics, I embraced it with enthusiasm. From a feminist theological perspective it is a highly contentious concept which calls for critical examination. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission's (TRC) hearings have highlighted certain ambiguities inherent in this concept as well as challenged theologians to think about adequate responses to the daily tales of terror and torment, responses which cross old boundaries and forge new ones.

At present I have two dominant images from watching the television over the past weeks. The first is of General Johan van der Merwe, erstwhile Commissioner General of the South African Police. He was a member of a panel interviewed by Sylvia Vollenhoven on the controversial issue of amnesty in terms of the TRC hearings. Among others, the panel included the son of Florence and Fabian Ribeiro who, together with the Mxenge and Biko families, intended bringing an application to stop the amnesty hearings. Van der Merwe's theme was simple: we have no hope of a peaceful future unless we can forgive and try to forget.

The other image is a composite one. Before me I see the faces of women: Nyamika Goniwe, Cynthia Ngewu, Hawa Timol, Joyce Seipei, Patricia Quin, Elsie Oliphant, Maggie Friedman, Sepati Mlangeni, Joyce Mthimkulu, Catherine Mlangeni and Cher Gerrard, stirring studies in grief, anguish and pain, alternating between tears and anger in the struggle to recount the gruesome happenings which changed their lives forever. These women, and indeed most of those testifying, also have a simple theme: tell us the truth so that we can decide what we shall do with it. As Babalwa Mhlauli, daughter of one of the 'Cradock Four'

told the TRC: 'We want to forgive, but we don't know whom to forgive.' (*Cape Times*, 26 April 1996)

What do boundaries mean at a time such as this? Which boundaries and whose boundaries are we talking about? Many issues surface: issues of difference in social location and context, identity and gender, issues of values and faith, issues of repentance, forgiveness and reparation. Further issues such as the relationship between boundaries and power, boundaries and identity politics, boundaries and discourse, boundaries in the dependence/autonomy or the centre/periphery debates, also arise which cannot be dealt with here.

Caught between a strong gut response to Johan van der Merwe and my own revulsion and pain as the stories unfold in packed halls in the Eastern and Western Cape, Gauteng and Kwa-Zulu Natal, my theology is challenged in new ways. It is not difficult to repudiate the self-righteous insensitivity of van der Merwe's plea. Clearly he has overstepped boundaries. But how do we deal with the Christian idea of forgiveness? How do I respond to these tales of terror and torment? Too often silence seems the only appropriate response. But is it?

In a recent, thoughtful work on politics and forgiveness entitled *An Ethic for Enemies*, Donald Shriver (1995:138) recounts an interview between a reporter and Professor Kiyoko Takeda Cho, professor of history at the International Christian University in Tokyo. 'In general Japanese tend to forget the past, thinking that it can be washed away', she said. 'But I always tell my students that recognizing what we have done in the past is a recognition of ourselves. By conducting a dialogue with our past, we are searching how to go forward'. The desire to go forward in a manner which is truly healing, prompts the questions raised in this piece.

Boundaries - a contentious concept

Boundaries are human constructions. We can, therefore, think of them in different ways: boundaries simply as the marking of limits, boundaries as barriers, boundaries as a social theoretical construct.

From a feminist point of view, the concept 'boundaries' both hinders and helps women's struggles. To illustrate the point, I want to touch briefly on three issues: first, the problems in feminist theorizing; second, certain moral boundaries and the problems they raise and, lastly, the importance of boundaries in women's identity formation. Discussing boundaries is complex. To muddy the waters even further, the idea of neatly demarcated and lasting boundaries is not tenable. Life, quite simply, does not allow for this. Boundaries have fuzzy edges rather than clean lines, but the fact that they look blurred at the edges does not mean that they do not exist as boundaries.

First, feminist theory has grown out of the attempt to end women's marginal status in society. Fundamental to this enterprise is women's experience as a source of knowledge. This has proved to be a complex business. The contradictions and inconsistencies in feminist thought alert us to the fact that feminism is deeply contradictory *because* women's lives are contradictory. As feminist thinkers (Ramazanoglu 1993:5 and Tronto 1993:14-18) have pointed out this is not because of the inherent fragility of feminist thought, but because the very diversity of women's experience poses problems of explanation which have not been adequately tackled by existing social theories. Fundamental is the problem of explaining power relations, a problem which social theories have failed to resolve. This is in essence a problem of boundaries.

The difference dilemma is a large problem for feminist theory. On the one hand, acknowledging difference is fundamental to feminist theorizing. On the other hand, when

differences become barriers between women, the global emancipatory thrust of feminism is fragmented politically according to local and specific class interests, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age and any other social difference. The central difficulty in feminist debate today is still the problem of generating a theory which can articulate and explain both the commonalities and differences in women's experiences. In this debate boundaries is a contentious but very present concept. It is, of course, possible to argue the above dilemma the other way around. Perhaps we need to recognize that boundaries have created problems such as the difference dilemma. We may then be in a better position to challenge them.

Second, boundaries is also an important though often ambiguous concept in ethical discourse. Two examples illustrate this point. The one has to do with the boundary between morality and politics, and the other with the boundary between the public and the private spheres of life.

Joan Tronto (1993:6) points out that instead of viewing morality and politics as a set of intertwined ideas, most contemporary political thinkers view the relationship of politics and morality in either one of two ways. One view asserts that morality comes first. Once moral views are fixed, political life should conform to these moral principles. The other view holds that politics come first. Here moral values should only be introduced into politics in accordance with the requirements of the political concerns of gaining and preserving power (as exemplified in the writings of Niccolo Machiavelli). So, either politics becomes a means to achieve moral ends, or morality becomes a means to achieve political ends. Most contemporary thinkers, according to Tronto (1993:8), fall into the 'morality first' category. The idea that politics and morality have similar ends and means is not entertained. The two are kept in separate realms; they are divided by a clear boundary.

The second familiar boundary from a feminist perspective, is the boundary between the political and the private. Although this boundary changes in different contexts and cultures, most Western thought is premised on a division between the public and private domains, with women being restricted to the private realm. Thus women's participation in moral discourse is effectively blocked. The boundary is firmly in place. Does this mean that we do away with the idea of moral boundaries? Or does it mean that we engage in efforts to redraw these boundaries so that women can become full participants in public life?

Third, much of women's struggles have been associated with creating boundaries where they did not exist before. Women have found it necessary to draw boundaries in order to create the space they need away from male dominance to find their own voices and to recover their own histories. In this struggle to find and to shape their own identities, women need boundaries which separate them from the prevalent male-devised stereotypes about what it means to be a woman. Identity formation, women have learnt, is related to boundaries and to power. Power gives the ability to create, move or remove boundaries. When women claim power to draw their own boundaries they frequently experience a power struggle. This struggle can be among women themselves, between different classes and races of women and it can be a struggle between those who are delineating boundaries and those in power (often males) who have different ideas about what constitutes legitimate boundaries. Boundaries, however, remain a necessity, both as a strategic device and simply as 'breathing space' for those struggling against discrimination.

Boundaries and the TRC - two responses

'Forgive and Forget'?

I have no desire to respond to Johan van der Merwe on a personal level. The question of

forgiving and the idea of forgetting raised by his comment do, however, merit a theological response.

As Christians we are aware that forgiveness is central to our faith. We are taught that forgiveness is virtually limitless, that our forgiveness is contingent on our ability to forgive and that forgiveness is possible because 'Jesus paid the price'. The manner in which these teachings have been understood has been singularly unhelpful for the victims of suffering (see Brown and Parker 1989: 1-30, Redmond 1989:70-88). Battered women of faith have, for example, been counselled ad nauseam by simple-minded clerics to forgive their husbands or partners and to bear their crosses lovingly, counsel which has too often ended in tragedy (see Fortune 1983, Gudorf 1992, Adams 1994). And now whites (and not only the likes of Johan van der Merwe) are calling on blacks to forgive and forget. Is this an example of 'politics first' disguised as 'morality first'? Whatever the motives for such a call may be, the question remains: how do Christians deal with the call to forgive in the circumstances of today?

Donald Shriver (1995:7) points out that there is a general confusion between the religious notion of forgiveness as exemplified in Christian teaching, and forgiveness as a political ethic. 'If', he argues, 'forgiveness is to escape its religious captivity and enter the ranks of ordinary political virtues, it has to acquire a more precise, dynamic, and politically contexted [sic] definition than it has usually enjoyed.' Writings on the proceedings of the TRC as well as utterances on the tales of terror being heard, too often confuse religiously understood imperatives with political realities. From a feminist theological perspective, which refuses to separate the political from the private, the question of forgiveness is approached as a religio-political concern.

First, for women and for all victims of oppression and marginalisation, forgiveness begins with memory. Memory is evoked by speaking out, by the public utterance of private pain. I agree with Shriver (1995:7) that such memory is 'diffused with moral judgment'. As such it is the reverse of a simplistic 'forgive and forget'. It is in fact as Shriver points out 'remember and forgive'. That is why it is 'dangerous memory'. Sharon Welch (1990:155) acknowledging the work of Johann Baptist Metz, describes dangerous memories as 'a people's history of resistance and struggle, of dignity and transcendence in the face of oppression'. The stories we are now hearing are the recalling of 'dangerous memories'.

The tales of terror and torment, the anger and the grief of those testifying before the TRC, are moments of recovered memories of wrongs, injustices and injuries. They are also powerful moral judgments. As such they are a call to political and religious action for all who are challenged by oppression. Shriver (1995:7) continues to argue that

Forgiveness, in politics or in any other human relation, does not require the abandonment of all versions of punishment of evildoers. But it does require the abandonment of *vengeance*, and this is its second constituent. Forgiveness gets its real start under the double impetus of judgment and forbearance from revenge. Forbearance opens the door toward a future that will not repeat the old crimes. Unaccompanied by forbearance in this very beginning, moral judgment often fuels new enmity.

The moral judgment and the forbearance from vengeance are the prerogative of the victims. The former commissioner of police has not only overstepped boundaries; he has, with blind arrogance, assumed the task of drawing them for the victims of oppression.

Second, forgiveness is a process. In this process, reconciliation cannot be spoken of except possibly as a word to describe what *may* happen at the end of such a process. Forgiveness takes time and it is not to be hurried. Anger and pain are expressed, over and

over again, articulated and experienced in a process in which the causes of suffering are probed, questioned and railed against by each victim according to her or his needs. Forgiveness is also linked to the need for justice, repentance and reparation. Repentance signifies accountability, a change of behaviour and an understanding of restitution. Once perpetrators repent, there must be the willingness to wait and to hope for the renewal of human relationship with quiet forbearance, accepting that one is never in the position of calling for forgiveness. When forgiveness meets repentance, reconciliation becomes possible.

Forgiveness in a political context, then, is an act that joins moral truth, forbearance, empathy, and commitment to repair fractured human relation. Such a combination calls for a collective turning from the past that neither ignores past evil nor excuses it, that neither overlooks justice nor reduces justice to revenge, that insists on the humanity of enemies even in their commission of dehumanizing deeds, and that values the justice that restores political community above the justice that destroys it.

- Shriver (1995:9)

Johan van der Merwe and the likes of him, are called to account by the words of Manes Sperber (in Shriver 1995:63) : 'How can one forgive those who make it impossible for us to forget - so far as we dare forget- because they on their side are determined to behave as though they no longer know what there is to forgive and forget?'

Lastly, the matter of forgetting is simply not an option. The underlying impelling force for having a TRC is the cry 'that this will never happen again'. The question for each of us is: What must never happen again? In his remarkable speech to the Bundestag on May 8, 1985, the president of the Federal Republic of Germany, Richard Freiherr von Weizsäcker cautioned Germans that those who closed their eyes to the past become blind to the present. 'Whoever does not wish to remember inhumanity becomes susceptible to the dangers of new infection' (in Shriver 1995:110). Young white South Africans like young Germans have been bequeathed a heavy legacy and 'all of us, whether guilty or not, whether old or young, must accept the past'. This we do in order to be able to embrace the future.

Beyond the TRC - Two further responses

Accountability and awareness

Can there be *accountability* without understanding and without knowledge? To those who plead ignorance, who say 'But I did not know', the answer, in the words of Adrienne Rich (1986:148) is: '[We] are born both innocent and accountable'.

We are innocent in the sense that we do not choose the place, time and condition into which we are born. We all carry within ourselves the behaviour patterns and assumptions, the privilege or the powerlessness of the group we belong to. At the same time all of us are in the process of making history. We have a choice to become consciously historical. I can, according to Rich (1986:145), become 'a person who tries for memory and connectedness against amnesia and nostalgia, who tries to describe her or his journeys as accurately as possible - or to become a technician of amnesia and nostalgia, one who dulls the imagination by starving it or feeding it with junk food'. I agree with Rich that life consists of constantly making choices. We choose 'to know or not to know, to fight if necessary for the past that has been withheld from us or to remain ignorant, hoping perhaps that 'if I don't know, I won't have to move'' (Rich 1986:153).

We do not know because we choose not to know. Dorothee Sölle in her moving work *Suffering*, quotes Rabbi Bunam: 'The sins which man commits - these are not his greatest

crime....The great crime of man is that he can turn at every moment, and does not do so' (1975:3). By choosing not to know, by knowing a little and saying 'What's the use of protesting anyway?' and, in Sölle's words by 'screaming too softly', we deliberately choose powerlessness and apathy. The dominant whites and those who supported them in the old regime, were hardly without power, specifically power over people. Yet they lacked moral and spiritual power, that reciprocal and collaborative energy which engages us personally and communally with God and with one another in such a way that power becomes synonymous with the vitality of living fully and freely. According to Sölle, embracing apathy (which in Greek literally means 'nonsuffering') means opting for 'a social condition in which people are so dominated by the goal of avoiding suffering that it becomes a goal to avoid human relationships and contacts altogether' (1975:36). Apartheid was the perfect system for creating apathy by its many mechanisms which prevented contact among people. Yes, we can be a mixture of innocence, ignorance and accountability.

The work of the TRC is an exercise in accountability. It seeks to restore a culture of accountability by allowing the truth to be spoken and responsibility to be taken for wrongdoing in the past. I believe that it also stands for something more universal than its particular prescribed tasks for the next few years. It offers all South Africans the opportunity to reflect on our individual and communal accountability for actions which have fractured relationships, which have been unjust, oppressive, discriminating and lethal.

As I write these words, I know, with a deep sadness as a woman, that hearing truth and becoming reconciled can only happen when we have the courage and insight to face *all* manifestations of lack of accountability. Once the particular vulnerability and suffering of the poor, of women, children and old people under oppressive, discriminating political and social practices is heard and understood, we shall be on the path to true reconciliation.

Accountability requires *awareness*. The well-known Jesuit spiritual guide Anthony de Mello (1990), describes the spiritual quality of awareness as 'waking up'. In other words it is the opposite of apathy, the opposite of being uncaring and uninvolved with one's neighbour, being out of relationship. Of course most of us, whether we are a party to race, class or gender discrimination, do not want to wake up. We do not want to be happy unconditionally, we do not want to love unconditionally, we do not therefore want to be in unconditional relationship with others. We are ready to be happy and to love provided we have this, or that or the other thing, or provided the other is like this or like that. We believe that our happiness and our well-being are contingent on conditions. Then the day comes when the house begins to crumble. Harsh realities can contribute to our waking up. The old order changes and a new reality is 'heard'.

Now truth is being spoken. There are no guarantees that it will be heard by every one. Hearing truth does not lie in merely hearing words. Truth is sighted suddenly when an attitude of willingness to discover something new is born. To 'hear' truth we have to be able to unlearn almost everything we think we 'know'. We begin to wake up, we become aware. Openness to the truth, no matter where it is going to lead one, is *faith*. De Mello (1990:18) emphasizes that faith is not belief. 'Your beliefs give you a lot of security, but faith is insecurity. You don't know. You're ready to follow and you're open, you're wide open! You're ready to listen'. In order to be a fully awake human being one must have the readiness to learn something new. Perceptively de Mello (1990:28-29) points out that 'The chances that you will wake up are in direct proportion to the amount of truth you can take without running away'. He continues: 'nobody is afraid of the unknown. What you really fear is the loss of the known'. The entire apartheid edifice rested on the fear of whites that

they would lose the known. It was a condition of utmost spiritual apathy and lack of awareness. Patriarchy as a pervasive social system of male dominance also rests on fear of loss and also results in uncaring and unaware attitudes. As such its mechanisms are identical to those of race oppression. Awareness about the pervasive evils of race oppression is essential to the healing of our country. So is the recognition of and repentance for the evil of gender oppression. Waking up to the 'truth' cannot be restricted to a single self-selected arena of our lives.

We are accountable for our lack of awareness. Equally, we are capable of waking up. Being awake means that we will hear the truth, accept accountability and pursue reconciliation.

*Lament - a theological and liturgical response to the mothers,
wives and relatives of victims*

Adrienne Rich (1986:145) writes: 'Breaking silences, telling our tales, is not enough. We can value that process - and the courage it may require - without believing that it is an end in itself. Historical responsibility has, after all, to do with action - where we place the weight of our existences on the line, cast our lot with others, move from an individual consciousness to a collective one'. She cautions that we all need to begin with individual consciousness. Individual consciousness begins with awareness of suffering. It begins with waking up anew to the tales of terror and torment and then acting. But how?

As a white person, I want to suggest that *public lament* for the injustice and the torments of the past is a way of responding to the tales we are now hearing. Traditionally lament has been seen as the prerogative of the suffering victims. After all, one may ask, what have whites to lament? Yes, it is true that lament in the scriptures expresses the cry of the suffering. But I suggest that repentant whites need to cry out to God for deliverance from our murky past and for healing from the wounds that oppressors inflict on themselves. The particular suffering born out of the awareness of our role in the history of our country, should be lamented.

Public lamenting of this kind is not unknown in our history. For forty years a small group of white women found a unique way of expressing grief and anger over injustice and the need for change. I am referring to the Black Sash, a women's organization for human rights which, throughout its history, doggedly opposed Afrikaner nationalism and its apartheid vision. This the women of the Black Sash did in a number of ways: by protesting, informing, lobbying and by their indefatigable work in advice offices at various centres in South Africa. Their most visible and often most reviled public activity, was to stand silently in public places with black sashes across their chests, overtly lamenting injustice. These public 'stands' became a familiar part of protest politics in South Africa and once they were forbidden in terms of the Riotous Assemblies Act, the women continued to stand - not in a group, but ten metres apart! The courageous acts of these women as members of a secular body, prompt me as a Christian to ask what has happened to lament as a public act in the practise of our faith?

It appears that Western Christianity has lost its ability to lament and acts of lamentation have disappeared from our prayers and our worship. Yet, according to Claus Westermann (1981:259-280), lamenting was a natural part of life as depicted in both the Hebrew and the Christian scriptures. In the theology of the Hebrew scriptures, lamenting was usually related to events concerning the deliverance of the people of Israel although individual accounts of lamenting are also recorded. The act of lamenting formed a sequence as seen in Deut. 26:5-11 and Exodus 1-15: first a cry of distress, followed by a hearkening (promise of

deliverance) and then a response by those that have been saved (such as praise of God). Various psalms, such as 22, 73, 88 and 119 also attest to this sequence. Lament issues from the cry of the individual, 'Out of the depths I cry to thee, O Lord!' (Ps 130), or the people 'Then we cried to the Lord' (Deut. 26:7) seeking God's face in moments of need. Individual laments appear early in the stories of the patriarchs and their families. We find Rebecca lamenting (Gen. 25:22, 27:46), and we hear the cry of Hagar for her child (Gen. 21:16). Later in the time of the kings there is the lament of the childless Hannah (1 Sam. 1) and unique in the bible, the theme of lament throughout the book of Job.

National lament is tied to God's activity as saviour. Salvation, says Westermann (1981:260) is experienced as the hearing of the call of distress (Exod. 3:7). The ancient Jews were not afraid to ask how God could allow them, the chosen people, to suffer so much. In essence, lament is the language of suffering and its function is to appeal to God's compassion. As Westermann remarks (1981:264) there is not a single line in the Hebrew scriptures which 'would forbid lamentation or which would express the idea that lamentation had not a place in a healthy and good relationship with God'.

In the Gospels and indeed in the rest of the New Testament there is no suggestion that faith in Jesus Christ would prevent Christians from lamenting. Westermann (1981:264-265) continues: 'Certainly in the Gospels the actions of Jesus of Nazareth are characterized by the compassion he evidenced for those who implored him to help them in their need....In the passion story the lament of the ancient people of God (Ps.22) is placed on the lips of Jesus'. Why then is the idea of lamenting so foreign to modern Christians? Is it evidence of how Greek thought, in particular the ethic of Stoicism, has crept into western Christian thought which advocates the bearing of suffering without complaining or lamenting?

Sölle, whose work *Suffering* delves into the nature of suffering, identifies three phases necessary for understanding and overcoming suffering (1975:70-74). These phases are applicable in the South African context to those who have been the victims of suffering, to those who have remained silent, to those who have tolerated injustice and are now confronted with the truth and to those who mourn the evils of the past and seek change. The first phase is one of muteness and lack of comprehension. Once 'awareness' has dawned, we can move to the second phase, a 'language of lament, of crying, of pain, a language that at least says what the situation is' (1975:70). But lamenting is not an end in itself. No psalm ends with lamentation. It is always followed by a petition. According to Sölle (1975:74), this second phase is 'an indispensable step on the way to the third stage, in which liberation and help for the unfortunate can be organized. The way leads out of isolated suffering through communication (by lament) to the solidarity in which change occurs'. Thus lamenting presses beyond itself towards change. Change produces conflict, as the women of the Black Sash know only too well. Lamenting whites will face resistance, for the very act of lament calls for accountability and for awareness, not something everyone is ready for.

This is a time to move from muteness to lament. Lamenting offers whites a language in which to communicate repentance, pain, grief and disillusionment and to seek God's compassionate presence in the work of healing. It is a language which should be spoken publicly and how better can we do this than by retrieving lament in the ritual actions of communities of faith? Here, within the body of believing people, space and time can be made in liturgies for the engagement of the entire community in acts of lamentation, followed by liturgical acts of reconciliation.

The goal of public lament is healing. Healing is a very ancient aspect of religion and traditionally women have been primary healers in society. The Black Sash, as a group of women, earned themselves the tribute from Nelson Mandela of having been 'the conscience

of the white nation' by their public mourning and their dogged work for justice and their efforts in dealing with the wounds of the apartheid system. Women of faith can take a leaf from their book. We can, in our religious institutions, raise our voices in lament and seek the reconciliation we all need so sorely. Experience, however, has taught us that male dominance of church structures and liturgies is not friendly to change initiated by women. But, undaunted by the patriarchs, we must speak out, for this grave matter which challenges the very core of the Christian faith. No reconciliation is possible without repentance. For whites, this kind of lament is both confession of sin and a kind of cry of horror at what we have done and who we have become. Lament can find expression in our prayers, confessions and petitions (Miller 1994:44-45, 57, 89, 134,246). It is, according to Samuel Balentine (1993:189), crucial for maintaining the divine-human dialogue so important for the life of faith and so essentially part of our acts of worship.

To lament psychologically, culturally, socially and as people of faith because of shame, guilt, and disillusionment, is at the core of the contemporary struggle to find meaning and identity as whites in contemporary South Africa. By accepting and acknowledging the past, by integrating it so as to move out of its mindless grasp, lamenting will enable us to break the cycles of terror and torment. Then we can be released into the space of transition between our past and our hope for a reconciled future.

New boundaries and tales of terror and torment

The tales of the victims of apartheid are indeed 'dangerous memories'. They are tales in which the private and the political come together poignantly, critically and urgently. They are tales told in the service of political truth and moral judgment; tales which spring from the profound human need to have suffering heard and redressed in whatever way possible. Those who have come before the TRC have been agents for reminding our society of past evils. Theirs, as Shriver (1995:102) points out, 'is an 'epistemic privilege', for they are the authorities on what they have suffered'. This privilege is accorded to the mothers, wives and others who have spoken their grief. In doing so, they are breaking through moral, political and private boundaries and creating the space for new awareness which brings hope of healing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Carol J 1994. *Woman-Battering*. (Minneapolis, Fortress Press).
- Balentine, Samuel E 1993. *Prayer in the Hebrew Bible: The Drama of the Divine-Human Dialogue*. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press).
- Brown, Joanne Carlson and Bohn, Carole R (eds.) 1989. *Christianity, Patriarchy and Abuse: A Feminist Critique*. (New York: Pilgrim Press).
- Brown, Joanne C and Parker, Rebecca 1989. For God so Loved the World? in Brown and Bohn, *Christianity, Patriarchy and Abuse*, pp.1-30.
- Fortune, Marie 1983. *Sexual Violence: The Unmentionable Sin. An Ethical and Pastoral Perspective*. (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press).
- Gudorf, Christine E 1992. *Victimization: Examining Christian Complicity*. (Philadelphia: Trinity Press).
- Miller, Patrick D 1994. *They cried to the Lord: The Form and Theology of Biblical Prayer*. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press).
- Ramazanoglu, Caroline (ed.) 1993. *Up against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions between Foucault and Feminism*. (London: Routledge).
- Redmond, Sheila A 1989. Christian 'Virtues' and Recovery from Child Sexual Abuse, in Brown and Bohn, *Christianity, Patriarchy and Abuse*, pp.70-88.
- Rich, Adrienne 1986. *Blood, Bread, and Poetry. Selected Prose 1979-1985*. (New York: WW Norton).
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford 1985. *Women-Church. Theology and Practice of Feminist Liturgical Communities*. (San Francisco: Harper and Row).
- Shriver, Donald W Jr 1995. *An Ethic for Enemies: Forgiveness in Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Sölle, Dorothee 1975. *Suffering*, tr. ER Kalin. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- Tronto, Joan C 1993. *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. (New York: Routledge).
- Westermann, Claus 1981. *Praise and lament in the Psalms*, tr. KR Crim and RN Soulen. (Edinburgh: TT Clark).