THE SUBVERSION OF PATRIARCHY:
EXPLORING PASTORAL CARE WITH MEN IN THE CHURCH OF THE PROVINCE OF SOUTH AFRICA ON THE EAST RAND

by

DAVID HUGH BANNERMAN

submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of

MASTER OF THEOLOGY

in the subject

**PRACTICAL THEOLOGY – WITH SPECIALISATION IN
PASTORAL THERAPY**

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: DR. S. B. HESS

JOINT SUPERVISOR: DR. M. E. HESTENES

NOVEMBER 2007

I declare that 'The **subversion of patriarchy: exploring pastoral care with man in the Anglican Church in South Africa**' is my own work and that all the sources that I have used and quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

David Hugh Bannerman

To

JOAN

My wife and life partner
for
all her love and support

**"The play's the thing
Wherein I'll catch the conscience of the King."**

Shakespeare, *Hamlet,* II. ii.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation is concerned with pastoral care with men in the Anglican Church. It is grounded in the rapidly changing post-apartheid years in the East Rand region of South Africa.

It seeks to explore through participatory action research the negative effects of patriarchy as a discourse of power and entitlement on the lives of men of differing cultures in South Africa as victims and perpetrators of abuse.

It also seeks to explore ways of pastorally caring with men through the creation of participative care groups that enable personal stories of men to be told, invitations to responsibility for abuse made, and the negative effects of patriarchal cultural and theological discourse deconstructed, and alternate understandings of masculinity constructed and performed.

The work is done from a contextual theology, pro-feminist perspective, and collaborating with postmodern philosophers Derrida and Foucault, the social anthropologist Bruner and the narrative therapists White, Epston and Jenkins.

Key words
Pastoral care, post-apartheid South Africa, Anglican Church, patriarchy, discourse, power, entitlement, abuse, responsibility, masculinity, contextual theology, narrative therapy, pro-feminist, participatory action research, deconstruction, Derrida, Foucault, Bruner, White, Epston and Jenkins

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to express my deep appreciation to those who in different and important ways have participated in this research dissertation:

Joan, my wife, who has supported me throughout the work for this degree and dissertation, and encouraged me when my passion for the work grew dim!

Dr. Bridgid Hess, who with patience, humour and enthusiasm has guided me through this life-changing, and empowering degree course and the creation of this dissertation.

Richard, our consultant, who through his vulnerability, passion for care and many other qualities, has made this work possible. I thank him for the conversations, and for the change that that has wrought in my own life.

Mtr. Lynn Coull, Fr. Marcellus Conway, Fr. Hubby Kekana, Dr. Maureen Sithole, and Fr. Sindile Sithole who shared their time, experience, understandings and passion, in spite of their busy lives to enrich the text of this work.

Bishop David Beetge of the Anglican Diocese of the Highveld, who has supported and encouraged me in this research.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: MOMENTS OF PASTORAL INSERTION

1.1 Background

The second half, and more particularly the last quarter of the twentieth century has seen an 'insurrection' against the male-dominated discourse of the western world by the feminist movement. This is reflected in authors like De Beauvoir, Rowbotham, Segal & Wainwright, bell hooks, and McKinnon. This debate has in the last two decades or more become a part of the life of the church as patriarchal theology, its negative effects, both in the life of the church, and its collusion with male-dominated discourses in society, has been exposed and challenged (Neuger & Poling 1999:26). Whilst recognising the positive aspects of this discourse, the negative effects have also permeated and dominated theology, liturgy, church polity, relationships in family life and all aspects of the life of the church. Feminist theologians internationally, as well as in South Africa (Brown & Bohn 1989, Ruether 1983, Trible 1984, Graham 1993, Bons-Storm 1998, Ackermann 1994), have foregrounded this discourse and its negative effects in church, family life and relationships between men and women. It is into this debate that contextual theologians have joined (Poling & Neuger 1999).

It was whilst reading these disturbing, yet life-giving texts in my studies, that I entered into therapeutic conversations with Richard, an offender in an East Rand prison, who was sentenced to five years imprisonment for the near death of his wife, and seven year old son, by driving his car at them. It was the case study required for this current degree in pastoral theology. My therapeutic approach was a narrative one, externalising the problems that had dominated Richard's life (White & Epston 1990:48). As I questioned him, seeking to deconstruct the discourses that had constituted him to act in the way in that he did (Morgan 2000:45), we came to realise that there were, amongst others, two major discourses at work in his life, patriarchy and its ally, entitlement (Morgan: 2000:45).

Equally, as I reflected on my conversations with Richard, I came to realise through self-reflection that, though from a different culture as a white, 'colonial' male, those same discourses of patriarchy and 'entitlement'(Jenkins 1990:56) had played a part

in my own life, and continue to constitute my life and relationships, and the multiple power positions that I live out. I wondered, therefore, whether these discourses are being acted out in South African family life generally, and have a vital role in family violence.

In a society where so much 'entitlement' has been promised in a new democratic South Africa, and for different reasons has not been delivered, I also wondered whether there was a place to research, or theologically reflect on these discourses in our society, and their constitutive effect on the lives of men and women and in doing so assist the church in its pastoral care. In doing this reflection, I thought that it would be beneficial to reflect on these discourses within the church and their affect on believers, and on society's discourses.

This led me to think that it would be important to use a research design that was participative, or collaborative. I should like to hear not only the voices of expert contextual, theological reflection, but also the voices of women and men, who experience the effect of these discourses. Since Richard has been released from prison on parole, it would be important to hear his voice in the text. Amongst these voices would be my own, reflexive voice as a white, 'colonial', male priest, who holds a senior, and therefore power position, in an hierarchical church, with a tradition of patriarchy and its negative consequences. In doing this, we would be listening to the voice of expertise, but just as importantly, experience (Roussouw 1993:902). This participative approach would also be to ensure that if a 'new' group has an 'entitlement', we would seek ways to work together at collective accountability to those who are excluded.

I considered that it would also be beneficial to explore the ways in which these discourses of patriarchy and entitlement may promote practices that empower, as well as disempower people within the political climate of Apartheid from which we are emerging, and more importantly how we can assume a position of accountability to these practices that affect everyone in society. We would be 'voicing' the stories of women *by* women in the South African context to challenge the dominant discourses of our society, a feminist approach to theology (Ackermann 1996:32), but also the stories of men *by* men who have a problem with abuse, and are also

2

victims, needing liberation from the negative effects of those discourses that have imprisoned them. In doing that, we would also be involved in God's preferential option for the poor, and needy, as we seek to be collaborators with him in bringing about his reign of compassion and justice (Cochrane, de Gruchy & Petersen1991:64).

In my initial exploration of this idea I began to talk with people in the Anglican Church, and particularly the Diocese of the Highveld, where I work, to find out how relevant a study on patriarchy, entitlement and its effects might be. There has been a very positive response as to its relevance. In discussing this proposed research dissertation with the Revd. Lynn Coull, our coordinator of ministry to those infected and affected by HIV/AIDS in the Anglican Diocese of the Highveld, she reminded me of the fact that men and abuse were some of the major barriers to prevention of HIV/AIDS in women, and the value of a project such as this for the pastoral care of the Diocese. Bishop David Beetge, the Diocesan, offered financial assistance for this work should it be required, and has asked that when my research is completed that it should be presented to the Diocesan Board for Theological Education and Reflection to assist in the work of pastoral care in the Diocese.

In my conversations with Richard, self-reflection and discussions with others on the discourses of patriarchy, male entitlement, and their effects, I have been made deeply aware once again that to see pastoral care as concerned solely with the individual is a misrepresentation. Pastoral care has social and political consequences, and therefore the social and political dimension is an integral part of pastoral care (Pattison 1993:86). I have also become aware of the need, for example, to reflect critically on the language used in liturgy that perpetuate a patriarchal theology and it effects on men and women, both positive and negative. This in turn, would mean challenging those effects that are not life-giving, and creating other understandings that will transform men and women's lives and relationships.

Equally, pastoral care is called to be collaborative or participatory in that it is not *for* people but *with* people in need of care (Kotzé & Kotzé 2001: 7). It is a participatory process in which the care giver/expert collaborates with the care receiver/non-expert to challenge oppressive discourses, and negotiate new life-giving ways of living.

1.2   Literary survey

1.2.1 The global shift to a postmodern culture

As society shifts into a postmodern culture, which is both the product of and reaction against the empirical, rational and structural culture of modernism that has dominated western society since the Enlightenment (Roussouw 1993:895), there is, firstly, the recognition that there is in this global village no dominant truth, which has been taken from reality, but multiple meanings, or perspectives. Secondly, there is the need to be self-reflective, and to examine critically the effects of the 'grand narratives' of modern rationality to be found in society. Postmodern culture exhorts us to look critically at the taken-for-granted ways that we understand the world, ourselves, our relationships (Burr 1995:3). The feminist liberation perspective is one of these at work in both society and church (Neuger & Poling 1997:23).

1.2.2 Voicing patriarchal discourses within the church

In the past twenty years, the feminist theologians, as previously stated, together with some men, who describe themselves as pro-feminist, have become increasingly aware of the destructive impact of patriarchy, particularly on women (Neuger & Poling 1997:24).

Patriarchy is described in the Wikipedia (2006) as, 'the anthropological term used to describe the social condition where male members of society tend to predominate in positions of power, with the more powerful the position, the more likely it is the male will hold that position.'

From a feminist perspective, theologian Rebecca Chop says of patriarchy and its effects,

> Patriarchy is revealed not simply as a social arrangement, nor as individual acts of cruelty towards women on the part of men but rather as a deep spiritual ordering that invades and spreads across the social order – through individual identity to social practices, to lines of authority in institutions, to cultural images and representations.
>
> (quoted by Neuger & Poling 1997:25)

It is this 'deep spiritual malaise' (Neuger & Poling 1997:26), with its hierarchical and dualistic assumptions, that has created, amongst other phenomena, the dominant patriarchal power relationships within society, and more particularly within family life.

It is clear that discourses that have 'lived on' a patriarchal structure have been powerfully constitutive of those who are within the church. Patriarchal structures in themselves are not bad, but as with any platform of entitlement it is open to abuse, and the abuse of this power position is deeply evident in societies throughout the world. This research explores some of the abusive practices that have piggy backed on patriarchy, entitlement and its effects. This document also looks into the role that the church can play in dismantling some of the deep abuse that is so often unconsciously acted out. In doing this, the research looks at ways of finding new understanding of the South African context. On the assumption that we all live within dominantly defined discourses, *any* dominant discourse has the ability to become abusive.

In the South African context, there are those like Desmond Lesejane, a former pastor and theologian, who would like to see the restoration of the patriarch model, but in harmony with the values of equality, respect, human dignity and freedom enshrined in our Constitution (Lesejane 2006: 179) There are those also who would challenge this patriarchal, hierarchical ordering of society by religion and culture, such as feminist practical theologian Denise Ackermann (Ackermann 1996:44). I believe that there needs to be a "hermeneutic of suspicion" that is prepared to explore and deconstruct patriarchy in religion and culture and their collusion in South Africa, and to challenge those negative aspects of patriarchy in culture and religion that are not life-giving for both men and women. Conscious of the dualism, and the hierarchy that is assumed in patriarchy, we need to explore/discover new ways of understanding it. Through theological reflection on experience and culture, we need to explore new 'understandings' of patriarchy that are life-giving for both women and men, and create space for the performance of these new understandings or meanings (White & Epston 1990:32). This work seeks to address some of these issues.

In a society that, prior to 1995, was polarised into black and white, with a corresponding hierarchy, we need also to be discovering 'commonalities' in our 'colonial' and local patriarchal cultures that Richard and I found that can enrich our diversity, and empower pastoral care.

1.2.3   Defining male abuse and domestic violence

Male abuse against women has been described by different terms, and in different ways. In my reading I have found these two definitions used by Poling (1997) to be the most meaningful for me in terms of their focus on the behaviour of the perpetrators, and the consequences for the victims.

Male violence towards women encompasses physical, visual, verbal or sexual acts that are experienced by the woman or girl as a threat, invasion or assault and that have the effect of hurting her or degrading her and/or taking her ability to control contact (intimate and otherwise) with another individual.

(Koss et al: 1994.xvi)

Domestic violence is a pattern of assaultive or coercive behaviours, including physical, sexual or psychological attacks, as well as other economic coercion that adults or adolescents use against their intimate partners.

(Warshaw & Ganley: 1995.16)

Alan Jenkins in his book, "Invitations to Responsibility: The therapeutic engagement of men who are violent and abusive' (1990) suggests four explanations for male domestic abuse. Firstly, there are the theories that attribute the cause or causes to factors within the personality of the individual It may be explained, for example, in terms of biological or psychiatric illness, or personality profile. Secondly, there are those who believe that the causes lie in the individual's interaction with others. Causes for abuse can be seen in the pattern of interaction within families. An example of this understanding is that a male who abuses will see his action as 'justifiable' correction of his partner. Thirdly, there is another school of thought that places the causes within the individual's developmental history. Abusive behaviour is caused through learned behaviour in development, through observational learning, where

behaviour is reinforced by reward. Finally, there are those that would say that the causes for abuse lie within discourses of culture and society.

It is this fourth understanding of the causes of abuse that I have seen in the effects of discourse of patriarchy, and that has led me to formulate the participative research question or curiosity that I have, and its practical implications for the theology and ministry of the church, and more particularly my own church, in South African Society.

1. 3   Methodology

1.3.1 Research curiosity

In the light of the above thoughts, my research question has been: What are some possible ways that the Anglican Diocese of the Highveld could pastorally care with men in the light of the effects of patriarchy and South Africa's history?

1.3.2   Research aims

The aims of the research question have been:
1. to explore the negative effects of the discourses of patriarchy and entitlement in South African society through listening to the stories of those who have experienced the effects of these discourses;
2. to explore alternative ways in which they can be pastorally addressed, and challenged in both church and society;
3. to create a document for further theological reflection within the Anglican Diocese of the Highveld, which can hopefully lead to change in the ways in which we approach this topic in pastoral care.

1.3.3 Research in South Africa

There is recognition that the transition to democracy has had an effect on the gender ordering of our society (Robert Morrell 2001, Reid & Walker 2005, Richter & Morrell 2006). Therefore Reid and Walker write.

> The transition to democracy in South Africa has been accompanied by changes to the gendered ordering of society. An unquestionably patriarchal system has given way to new ideals of equality between

men and women, which are enshrined in the Constitution. The first decade of Democracy in South Africa has thus exposed previously hidden sexual practices and abuses, confronted and unseated traditional gender hierarchies, created space for the construction of new masculinities and catapulted matter of sexuality into the spotlight.

(Reid & Walker 2005:1)

There are those who in these changing times would be happy to quietly preserve the patriarchal status quo (Morrell 2001:33). They are to be found in both Church and society. It is in this kind of context that I ask my question, as we as the church seek to reflect, and empower our pastoral care.

According to Dissel and Ngubeni (2003), literature on domestic abuse in South Africa indicates that statistics on domestic violence in South Africa are notoriously difficult to obtain. They said, however, from studies done by organisations that support victims of domestic violence that the incidence of violence in this country is very high (Dissel & Ngubeni 2003).

It is out of this therapeutic context, and theological reflection on the discourses of religious and cultural patriarchy and entitlement within South African society, and the pastoral implications for the church 'doing theology' that I proposed to do this research.

1.3.4   Research design

As I have hinted at earlier, my approach to my research is qualitative, and I have used participatory action research as a model for this work. I chose this research method because I believe that it is a subject that needs to be grounded in "passionate scholarship" (Walker 1998:240). This means a deep engagement rather than 'by-stander' status. As a consequence of my work with Richard, his wife, my studies in social construction, and theological and self reflection, I have come to realise the constitutive effects of social discourses such as patriarchy, colonialism and entitlement, and their effect on individuals, their relationships and behaviour. It is within this passionate personal engagement that I make use of myself not as a

bystander, but as a participant within the process, thus making use of the personal pronoun 'I'.

As I said earlier, I decided, in the light of my therapeutic conversations with Richard, to ask him to become a consultant in this research project so that he would bring the voice of experience to this project, and which he agreed to do.

A participative action research project provides an opportunity for inductive, empirical research rooted in context (Mouton 2001:52). It provides space for those participating, including the researcher and researched, to objectify experiences/understandings of abuse, reinterpret them through theological reflection and deconstruction, and more than that, be a part of a participative process to change in a 'mustard seed' way the situation or context (McTaggart 1997: 40), the Diocese of the Highveld and beyond in the East Rand. Working with this idea of creating space for the research, it seemed important to work with Richard and his knowledge of abuse.

In a project such as this, 'participation' has therefore meant 'ownership' and 'agency' in the production of theological understanding/knowledge, and implementation of pastoral care (McTaggart 1997:28). In this research, pastoral care in the area of abuse has been implemented on the basis of knowledge produced by research not *on* people, but *by* them (McTaggart 1997:29). Initially, I had not planned for the chapter on Richard's story to become a drama (See chapter four.). It was only on reflection with Richard, the rest of the group and my supervisor that it seemed appropriate, and expedient to formulate it in this way. It was a way of attempting to capture something of the situation, and keeping as close as I could to his voice. Bruner has seen the importance of the metaphor of drama to explain experience in that he recognised that, out of the selected stories of our experience, we 'perform', 'act out' the meaning of our lives. He says: 'It is in the performance of an expression that we re-experience, re-live, re-create, re-tell, re-construct and refashion our culture.' (Bruner 1986:11).

It has also provided an opportunity for 'those-of- theory' and 'those-of-experience' to collaborate with their understandings and experience, and to create new theological understandings and ways of care in context (Cochrane 1994:34). To do this, there

must be sensitivity to the issue of knowledge and power, scientific and theological, and the power relationships of those who participate in the research. This calls for the research group to be self critical in its research process, empowering one another to contribute to the common purpose (McTaggart 1997:35).

1.4   Research method

1.4.1 Group

I used the following method to set up my Participative Action Research group. Conscious of the fact that I have been asked to produce a document for theological reflection within the Diocese, as well as my power position with the Diocese as its Dean, I invited four members of the Diocese both clerical and lay, male and female to participate in the group, and to reflect on these discourses and their effects on questions of abuse, as well as the pastoral care of those affected. I was purposive, or judgemental in my sampling in the establishment of the group. (Van Rensburg 2000:159). In doing it this way, I was seeking to create an inclusive process (Van Eeden & Terre Blanche 2000:122) for those, firstly, who may just have a deep concern for the issue, and secondly, those who have experienced patriarchy's negative effects as either perpetrator and/or victim.

In this group I strove for a cultural diversity that reflects our South African community so that we could be enriched by one another's understandings, and at the same time to find that common humanity and united strategy that would enable us to engage with this blight in our society. I also strove for representation of both women and men in the recognition that it is both that need to be liberated from this discourse and receive care (Neuger & Poling 1999:26).

1.4.2 Meetings

In our initial meeting with those I chose from the Diocese, I was able, firstly, to share with them my research curiosity, and its background in terms of my conversations with Richard, my reading, theological and self reflection. Secondly I was able explain the narrative approach that I wanted to use in the research, and the pro-feminist position that I also wanted to take in the research. Thirdly I was able to speak about

the participative research process, what is important for the group in that, and the research dissertation for reflection with the Diocese that would be our end product. Finally we were able discuss, and begin to plan the sessions. This was to include the snowballing process as we brought others into the group for interviews. This was to change as we decided later on in the fluidity of research process to focus on Richard's story. It was through explanation and our authentic participation together that we found our way forward into this action research.

1.4.3 The initial participative action plan

In that meeting it was agreed that we create a preliminary plan to achieve the goals set out in the research curiosity and aims. The group's initial plan of was to deconstruct/reconstruct the term 'patriarchy' for ourselves as a group. There was a recognition that any understanding or definition was provisional and might change during the course of the research. We wanted to highlight the negative and positive aspects of patriarchy, both in terms of theory and experience. We thought that it would be beneficial as a group to develop questions for the external participants when they were interviewed. This would be followed by the interviewing of external participants. In setting the number to be interviewed, it was recognised that gender balance, age, economic sector had to be taken into consideration. We would then reflect on the responses of those interviewed. We would then evaluate the response of the church to patriarchy and its effect on people's lives. In the light of that we would then look at developing an alternative model for pastoral care in the light of the group's reflection on patriarchy, and the church's response, and the experience/understandings of those interviewed. Finally, we intended to ask exploratory questions about a possible pastoral care plan for the Anglican Diocese of the Highveld. This initial plan of inviting external participants, as I said earlier was to change, as we realised as a group that this plan was far greater in scope than could be contained by the requirements of this dissertation, and so at a latter stage in the process, we decided to only focus on Richard's story as our consultant.

With permission of the group, as my method of collecting data for the research, I used a flip chart, and an audio recorder. This data, together with the final research paper remains the 'property' of the group, and therefore the group was closely involved in

its creation and presentation as the various chapters were sent to them for their comments. A narrative letter (White & Epston 1990:125) was also sent to Richard, following the telling of his story and used as a reflective tool in the group. This research paper also becomes the property of the University, which becomes a part of the complexity of this form of research.

Because this is participatory action research, there has been a need for flexibility in terms of the process followed by the group so that there has been place for new ideas, and their consequences in terms of the action-outcomes for the dissertation and reflection for the Anglican Diocese of the Highveld.

1.5 Discursive position of the researcher

The reason for my usage of participative action research is because I place myself within the contextual approach to theology. I see the need for theology to be not only academic, but committed to, and grounded in the local situation of day-to-day human experiences and need, such as the violence and abuse in South African society. I believe in a theology that is prepared, in the light of Scripture, to listen to the voices, the stories of the abused and marginalised, for this is the church, seeking to fulfil its prophetic role 'to read the signs of the times' (Mt.16.3), and respond (Cochrane et al 1991:18).

I chose participative action research, because I believe that theology cannot be done from a position of neutrality (However much my natural inclination is to do that!) (Cochrane et al 1991:15) It begins with commitment to Jesus Christ as redeemer and liberator, and a commitment that is lived out in passionate engagement *with* the poor, and marginalised *for* transformative pastoral care within a particular context. It means responding to the 'signs of the times'. These, for the South African context, are HIV/AIDS, violence, and gender inequality (Ackermann 1996:43).

It is as a consequence of that, that I have decided to use the first person singular in the text, because I do not see myself as 'the researcher', distant and wholly objective, but as a participant in the process. In this I hold perhaps with mixed feelings Mouton's idea of standing back in a more objective way. I see myself as one who has

also experienced the constitutive effects of patriarchal discourse, and therefore in solidarity with others is prepared to change and be changed. I agree with the words of Dudley-Marling (1996:36) quoted by Kotzé and Kotzé (2001:10) who say: 'Hiding the 'I' is a pretence, a fraud that forces me to hide my passion, to deny who I am, and pretend that my words are separate from me. Acknowledging the 'I' allows me to reveal myself and my feelings.' It is this that helps ground research in lived experience.

But there also needs to be a certain amount of 'distancing' in the research so that passionate engagement can be balanced by a certain objectivity that will enable critical reflection. This is the inductive empirical approach that I spoke of earlier (Mouton 2001:52). It is this critical reflection on the negative effects of discourses such as patriarchy that create our social reality that will lead to the challenging of discourses, and the empowerment of praxis.

As contextual theology tells us, our theological reflection cannot be done *for* people but in solidarity *with* people, as 'theological theorist' and 'practitioner'. It is that reflection (theoria) *together* in a worshipping, participative, research group/community (poesis) that makes transforming pastoral care (praxis) at the grass roots possible (Bosch 1991:426). It is then that our theology/spirituality is 'done' in the hermeneutic of the deed.

I therefore placed the participatory action research at the point of insertion in the pastoral-hermeneutic circle, beginning with the experience of Richard's abuse (Cochrane et al 1991:13).

As someone who follows the contextual approach, and sees the need for social and ecclesial analysis, (Cochrane et al 1991:14) I believe that we need to reflect on the 'forces/whispers of death' that exist in the discourses of patriarchy that are a part of South African Culture, and our Judaeo-Christian heritage that I have heard in the voice of Richard, his wife, other men and women and my own. We need therefore to reflect with suspicion on our theological (Anglican) tradition and the patriarchal discourse that permeates our theology, polity, liturgy and pastoral care and identify what is oppressive.

In doing this theology I have also held a pro-feminist position, seeking to reflect on theology in the context of women's lives, and giving 'voice' to those who have been voiceless, the abused. But, I have also to given space to the silenced 'voice' of abusers, the oppressors that they might also find liberation through discovering new ways of understanding in pastoral care, and so that women and men benefit. For we need to seek justice, healing and wholeness for all *in partnership*.

In entering into this participatory research, I recognised the need for transformative change, not only in those participating in the research, but also, as the researcher, in myself. This involves the blurring of the boundaries between subject/object, self/other into a "participatory consciousness" (Heschusius1995:217), which involves re-imagining/change in the self as well as the other.

As I entered into this project of this participatory reflection and action, I am conscious that I have been immersed in the language of postmodernism and social construction that refuses to see the world as the a 'text out there', static, universally true only to be discovered and explained, but something to be engaged with, and changed, as we interpret it together, and anew from 'locals' knowledges that arise out of experience. That applies whether that text is the text of the physical world, the text of human experience, or the text of Scripture (Brueggemann 1993:10). This brings to our theological action reflection a provisional quality (Bosch 1991:427) as we seek to give understandings to the narratives of human experience in this particular cultural and historical context.

I believe that the ways we understand the world and ourselves are 'social artefacts' (Gergen 1985:267), constructed in language, through the creation of shared meaning/stories of human experience such as patriarchy. These meanings/stories are in turn performed, and the effects of which are experienced in lives and relationships such as abuse (White & Epston 1990: 40). As Bruner argues, it is not possible for narratives to encompass the full richness of our lived experience and that our experience is 'multi-storied' (Bruner 1986:143). We need therefore to be able to deconstruct, or take apart socially constructed artefacts such as patriarchy and its negative effects, and discover alternative, liberating ways of living in intimate

relationships. It is for this reason that the narrative approach to therapy used by Michael White and David Epston, and set out in their seminal book, 'Narrative Means to Therapeutic Ends'(1990) played an important part in both empowering those oppressed by patriarchy as abuser and abused, and in societal/ecclesial analysis.

Conscious of the need to use God-given critical reason, collaborating with tools used in other disciples is important for reflection. As a consequence, I have collaborated with the insights of White (1990), Gergen (1985) and Bruner (1986) as we reflect on patriarchy and its effects on abuse. I have also called on the insights of the French postmodern thinker Jacques Derrida (1978) on deconstruction, and the French historian of the systems of human thought, Michel Foucault (1980) and his analysis of discourses of power/knowledge in relation to patriarchy. I have reflected on the 'normalising' effect of knowledge/power in intimate relations and the need for the resurrection of other knowledges to challenge the negative effects of patriarchal discourse in Church and society.

1.6   Ethical considerations in doing research

There are a number of ethical considerations that I have to take into account when doing this kind of research.

Firstly, the participant needed to know as far possible what was required of her or him before the research began so that s/he could give informed consent to his or her involvement. This in turn is also a form of commitment to those participating in the research group. It is important that a contract involving everyone is created at the beginning of the research which includes what follows.

Secondly, there was the question of confidentiality in that the privacy of participants had to be maintained where there was sensitivity of information. For example, the use of pseudonym when the research involved an abuser or someone abused. There was also the need to be committed to confidentiality in terms of the work of the group.

Thirdly, there was the need for the recognition of the power relations within the group. This could be based on gender, race, or academics. It was therefore the

responsibility of those in the group in power positions to recognise this, and strive to create an environment where those who have been traditionally marginalised were able to have their experiences and understandings foregrounded. Equally, it was the responsibility of those who are marginalised to strive for the voicing of their experience (McTaggart 1997:14).

Fourthly, because of the participatory nature of the research, all the participants had right to 'ownership' (McTaggart 1997:6). Therefore they have seen the research as it has unfolded in written form, and were able to contribute, as they were a part of 'doing' the theological research. For this, as the research unfolded, the successive chapters were sent to the members of the group for their comments.

Fifthly, I needed to be ever aware, of being reflexive of my own intentions, selective attention and bias as the observer/researcher through gender, culture, level of education, past experiences and possible expectations of the research process. I needed to be open to the 'critical scrutiny' of the group (Walker 1998:242). It was then that the process became explicit, and as Walker says, 'issues of reliability and validity are served.' (Walker 1998:251).

Finally, as the researcher I was accountable to the institution that called for the research to enable its ministry, and therefore I reported on its progress to my supervisor at the Institute for Therapeutic Development as my co-promoter. In my case this has included the Anglican Diocese of the Highveld (McTaggart1997:14), as well as the University of South Africa for which purpose this degree is awarded!

10. Outline of chapters

Because this is participative action research, the group played an important part in the setting out the chapters and their content. Chapter one provides the introduction and background to this research. Chapter two deals the postmodern thinkers and contextual theologians that we bring to this research. It also introduces to you those who have 'collaborated' from the fields of theology, narrative therapy and social construction in this inter-disciplinary and participatory research. The third chapter focuses on our reflective conversations around patriarchy in our South African

context, with the use a flip chart and audio transcripts. Chapter four 'centre stages' Richard's story as he told it to our group. This is followed by a reflection on the response of the congregation of St. Peter's Chains Church, Kathlehong to the telling of his story of abuse. The fifth chapter is my interpretive reflections on the research, and conclusion. In the initial plan it was decided that there should be an appendix, which would be a document for theological reflection by the Diocese of the Highveld. We later felt that the whole dissertation should be read by the Diocesan Board for Theological Education and Reflection.

CHAPTER TWO: UNDERSTANDINGS IN COLLABORATION FOR PASTORAL CARE WITH MEN

It was in May of 2005 in a little room off a classroom in an East Rand Correctional Services Centre that my 'co-search' with Richard began - a search that has taken me on this research journey. It was as I heard Richard's story of violent abuse in my therapeutic conversations with him, and saw the dominant influence of patriarchy in his life, as well as mine, that I decided to theologically reflect on this with others, and hear the experience of other men and women. Those therapeutic conversations in that little room were the seed bed from which this exploratory initiative in pastoral care has grown.

2.1 Understandings in a changing world: Modernism to postmodernism

Roussouw says,

> 'Culture is the interpretive and coping mechanism of society.
> It is the way in which people understand themselves, their
> world, and the appropriate interaction with one another, and
> with the world they live in'.
> <div align="right">(Roussouw 1993:894)</div>

As I co-researched with Richard in that small room, and as I undertook with others in this project, in Benoni, South Africa, I was and am aware as I said earlier that it is done against the background of a transition in the way in which we understand our world, ourselves and one another, in other words, a shift in 'global' culture. It is the shift from a *modern* to a *postmodern* culture. It is a shift *from* a culture which understood the world in 'grand narratives' to a world that understands people from a particular context. It is a world that has moved from a humanist, objectivist, empirical, rationalist point of view, where there is no place for other understandings of human experience, and that has little place for value, meaning and ends, towards seeking meaning, rather than objective truth or reality (Roussouw 1993:897). The modernist view of man is that of a rational, thinking subject, creating that dualism that separates off, or marginalises the emotional, non-rational. Therefore Descartes in the 17th century could write, "I think, therefore I am." Postmodern culture is both a product and reaction against this culture. Freud at the beginning of the 20th century began to

shatter that understanding by saying that man is also emotional, non-rational, and that there is also the *un*conscious world. Postmodern thought also affirms the place of socialisation, cultures, ideologies and beliefs in our understanding of the human subject, and the formative influence of symbols, rites and rituals (Roussouw 1993:900). It is therefore a shift *to* a culture that has place for multiple understandings and perceptions of human experience. It is for this reason that Kenneth Gergen, the social constructionist, can suggest that we, 'populated the self'. In this culture there is no dominant, rational, organising truth, but many perspectives (Gergen 1991: 49).

This comes from an understanding that 'truth', or our knowledge of the world, is not to be discovered 'out there', and the product of objective observation, but is the product of social interaction as individuals seek to create meaning through shared understandings (Burr 1995: 4). It is these 'negotiated' or shared understandings that arise out of people's reflection on experience that create the knowledges, understandings or 'truths' that enable people to understand themselves, their world, how they should interact with one another, and the world they live in. This is culture, and it is that knowledge that is the product of negotiated understanding on human experience, and is the interpretive and coping mechanism of society (Roussouw 1993:894). It is these different cultural understandings that Richard and the members of the research group bring to this research, and he is deliberately fore-grounded as a consultant of direct experience.

As Richard and I sat in that small prison room, and as we as a group interacted with one another as a research group, I was conscious that though we brought different cultural understandings and perspectives to the discussions (eg. colonial, western feminist, African feminist, traditional, liberal), both within the group and within ourselves as individuals, that no one culture was 'right'. There was and is a need for a postmodern recognition of the 'global village', the need for plurality of understandings, and the recognition of the different responses to experience (Roussouw 199:904). In both the research as well as inside the prison, we were also busy creating a new culture which might embrace other cultural beliefs with it. I believe that this is an assumption that needs to be made as we seek to explore the ways in which we can effectively care for men in our South African context, where there is a plurality of understandings of what it means to be male and how that is lived

out (Reid & Walker 2005:1). This does not mean that 'anything goes' – there is a pastoral ethical response that in one sense is global, and in another cultural, allowing greater movement *within* our cultural understandings, and in the case of this research, violence and patriarchy.

A further aspect of postmodern culture is the affirmation that expert opinion is not the only factor to be taken into consideration in creating new understandings, and in making decisions. The world has suffered as a result of decisions made by rational, scientific experts that have had negative consequences for individuals, and groups within society. There is growing recognition that the non-expert, the non-literate, the person of experience also has an indispensable part to play in the making of valued, informed decisions. As Roussouw says: 'Expertise must be enriched and informed by the experience of those on the receiving side of expert opinion'. (1991:902). Therefore it is important that in this research project there should be place for both theoretical-knowledge, and experience-knowledge in the contributions of the participants of this project as we seek ways to respond pastorally to men as well as women experiencing the negative effects of patriarchy and entitlement. Hence, Richard's voice of experience plays a key role in this exploration.
.

There is also within postmodern thought the understanding that the ways in which we understand ourselves and the world is dependent on when and where we live. It is the recognition that our ways of understanding are historically and culturally relative (Burr 1995:4). They are products of a particular culture and history, and they are dependent on the social, political and economic arrangements of that particular time. It is therefore important to be aware of this as we reflect on our understandings of patriarchy and violence in our context, and the assumptions that stand behind that as we seek to construct new understandings that can be performed. It is also important that we are aware of the changing political, social and economic scene in our own context, and with this changing backdrop, the need for re-understanding and re-interpreting culture, and our ways of living.

2.2   The life-giving subversiveness of Derrida

Within postmodern thought, there is the recognition that language is more than just a way of connecting between people. People exist in language (Kotzé & Kotzé 1997:4).

As Kotzé and Kotzé argue:

> Life is experienced within language, and how we experience
> is given meaning within the parameters of our language. The
> language we grow up with and live in within a specific
> culture, specifies, or constitutes the experiences that we have.

Therefore from a postmodern or social construction viewpoint, it is through social interaction that language is generated, sustained and abandoned (Gergen & Gergen 1991). In this way, language and meaning constitute people's lives (White 1992:.13) It is language therefore that is the 'lens' of taken-for-granted assumptions that make us 'see' and understand ourselves, and the world around us in a particular way, and how we should relate to it. It is also language that forms the distinction between subjects and objects, the researcher and researched. It is the kind of language that makes Richard, the object of research, in modernist terms, and I the researcher, rather than in postmodern language Richard, the consultant and co-researcher, and who by virtue of his experience shares in this participative action research. It is not research *on* Richard but *by* Richard (McTaggart 1997:29).

It is these assumptions that make us through language see the world, as Jacques Derrida, the postmodern thinker, points out, in terms of binary opposites. It is these languaged assumptions that have created terms like male and female, categorising and dividing individuals in terms of their biological function rather common humanity. These binary opposites have been 'overlaid' by other binary opposites such as thinking/feeling. These categorise men and women into clearly defined understandings of their identities and roles. But, more than that, Derrida would say that in each of these words, there is latent within them, by virtue of 'erasure', not only what it is, but also what it is not by the binary opposite. Thus, a man defines himself not only in terms of the role he is called to live out as 'male', but also the fear of being other than masculine – the binary opposite, feminine. It is these assumptions that play a vital role in the ways that men and women understand themselves, and seek to live out their understanding of what it is to be male or female in society. Contained therefore by language, we need to implode the walls in language that seek to maintain those binary opposites, and that seek to separate and define men as well as women into clearly defined exclusive opposites. We need through the stories of experience to

'unearth' 'old/new' ways of what it means to be male and masculine, female and feminine and discover within our culture/s new understandings of what it means to be masculine as we pastorally care for men and women within the South African context..

Equally, in Derrida's understanding, whilst recognising the diversity and difference in our cultures, we need to deconstruct and implode those 'dividing walls of assumption' that see things in terms of 'black' and 'white', 'us' and 'them' in culture in our South African context, and look for those commonalties that are part of our being human, whether male or female. Taking the famous drawing of the old hag/beautiful young woman (See appendix C), we have seen South African culture as black and white, and for so long the white has been the dominant binary with the others cultures being marginalised. With the changes that began in 1994, too easily we could move to the opposite equally 'unstable' position where black culture is the dominant beautiful woman with the white culture becoming the old woman. Maybe we have to recognise that this new hierarchy in the language of power is equally unstable, and we need to be able to see both understandings, cultures together and find the commonalities in them as well as discover new meanings. It is this that I would hope to do as we seek to begin to explore patriarchy and entitlement in black and white cultures in South Africa and find those commonalties, as well as differences, that are vital for effective pastoral care.

These dualism or binary opposites not only divide, as has been hinted at, but assign dominant and subordinate status to the differences, and are given differing values (Neuger & Poling 1997:27). It is these opposites, and attendant marginalisation in the hierarchical dualism in language that lead to 'oppositions', and then 'marginalisations' that are acted out in daily life. This applies to the 'centred', dominant role of male in binary opposites of male/female, and its implications for the relationships between men and women. It is as we seek to deconstruct, and therefore decentre 'male' and the cultural assumptions that hold it in place, and give 'centred' place to the marginalised opposite, 'female', that we create a hierarchical shift not only in language, but in power relationships as that language is lived out in daily life. This deconstruction therefore has political implications, if we understand 'political' to mean power relationships in culture. This exploratory work seeks to be a part of that

power process that deconstructs male and the patriarchal 'truth' discourse that surrounds it and to find new life-giving ways of understanding what it means to be 'male' and 'female' in the South African context. Therefore the text needs to be seen within the broader cultural socio-political context of power and its constitutive effects on lives and relationships. In doing this we need to be aware, as Derrida would remind us, that implicit in the text of this discourse of what is said, is what is not said, which also needs to be heard (Wolfreys 1998:7). As I said earlier we can so focus on the 'old hag' that we can lose sight of the beautiful woman!

From the perspective of the constitutive effects of power/knowledges, another post-modern thinker Foucault was deeply aware of the dominant effects of the discourses like patriarchy and their ability to oppressively silence any other understandings of human experience. He saw this in such discourses as mental health, criminology and sexuality.

2.3   The life-giving insurrection of Foucault

As I reflect on this exploratory process that we have undertaken, that small prison room was like a catacomb. There life-giving, subversive discourse and understanding was beginning to take place, both for Richard and myself. Michel Foucault, the postmodern French 'historian of the systems of thought' in his writings and interviews on *Power/Knowledge* (1980) argues that the way we understand our lives and live them out in relationships is the result of the constitutive power of 'unity or 'global' knowledges, dominant discourses or narratives. He asserts that we are all caught up in networks of power/knowledge (Foucault 1980:98). It is not possible to act apart from this network and we are simultaneously undergoing the effects of this power/knowledge which defines us, in our 'subjectivity'' as Foucault argues (Flaskas 1993:40), and enables us to exercise this power/knowledge in relation to others (White 1990:22).   These knowledges have the powerful effect of categorising what is normal in the sense that they construct norms around which persons are incited to shape, or 'normalise' their lives (White & Epson 1990:20), and at the same time marginalising the 'abnormal'. As I have said, patriarchy is one of those historically, deeply imbedded normalised way of 'knowing' in our South African context - the effects of which, we live out in relationships.

These unitary knowledges and power relationships flourish in particular geographical and historical contexts. They are the product of shared understandings in cultures that grow in power, and through power, are accorded 'truth' status, marginalising other fragmented, marginalised understandings that are the fruit of local experience (savoir de gens) (Foucault 1980:82). For Foucault, his studies were focused on the changing understandings around madness, criminality and sexuality in the western world, and the development of the 'modern man' as the individual. These different socially constructed understandings / knowledges in different periods of western history grew in influence/power, and in their ascendancy, they marginalised/subjugated and silenced any other knowledges/ stories/ experiences. Foucault argues that these modernist 'global' knowledges 'positively' constitute our lives and relationships. Within a modern form of power in which the individual acts, it is as if traditional forms of control have given way to what Foucault describes as the 'gaze', in which we internalise knowledge as individually 'owned'. We live under their 'gaze' and we seek to conform our lives to these dominant power/knowledges and their discourses. It is as we self-subject ourselves to these power/knowledges, and become 'docile bodies', that we also become 'vehicles' of that same knowledge/power to others. In so doing, we become the means by which that 'truth' or 'global knowledge is proliferated. This is true of patriarchy in the western world as it has constituted our lives through symbols, structures, institutions and relationships. But this power/knowledge or discourse is not confined to western culture. It is to be found in the Biblical cultures, and in African cultures. This discourse has taken a particular turn in our own post-colonial, post-apartheid South African context, which we are contextually addressing in this work

Patriarchy is such a cultural power/knowledge and discourse in the different cultures of our South African society. In that it has languaged into it qualities/norms for men such as 'self-contained', 'invulnerable', and roles such as 'head', 'protector' and 'provider'. Men as the subjects of this power/knowledge are 'judged, condemned classified, determined in our undertaking, destined to a certain mode of living or dying, as a function of the true discourses which are the bearers of the specific effects of power.'(Foucault 1980:94).

Like any dominant discourse, patriarchy has the possibility of constituting the personal discourses of people's lives with both positive and negative effects. On the one hand, the discourse can be used to help them understand themselves and empower them in their relationships with others. On the other, because the full richness of a person's lived experience cannot be captured in a single dominant discourse or narrative, other parts of the person's life experiences/ understandings are marginalised and not remembered (Bruner 1986:143). In these are the fragmented, subjugated, or silenced 'local' knowledges that are denied space to be heard and performed. They survive in the margins of peoples' lives, and also society and culture. For example, experiences of men as 'vulnerable', 'fearful', 'emotional' 'nurturing' are not to be found in 'normal' patriarchal understanding. It is these 'local', 'abnormal' understandings that we need to be digging for in human experience in our South African context that will challenge our understanding of what it means to be male, and how it should be lived out. In this we would have Foucauldian 'insurrection' of subjugated knowledge (Foucault 1980:81).

Foucault says it is through the recovery of these autonomous and disqualified knowledges, and in the provision of an adequate space for them to be performed that that we can develop an effective critique of the dominant knowledge of, in this case, patriarchy (Foucault 1980:82). I believe that in our readiness *as Church* to hear the subjugated experiences, the local, marginalised knowledges that are not told, that we will be able to effectively critique the dominant discourse of patriarchy. I believe that as we give Richard and others 'sacred space' to tell their stories that the dominant discourse of patriarchy will be critiqued and its negative effects challenged.

Foucault also argues for an ascending analysis of power (1980:99), and not a descending one. He proposes that techniques of power were not put into operation from above to transform those below. He proposes that the origins of these techniques occur at the local level (1980:100). These techniques were that of social control, 'of subjugation'. Because techniques of power, Foucault says, are developed at the local level, it is at this level that the exercise of power is least concealed and available for critique (Foucault 1980:97). Therefore he encourages the study of the history of power and its effects at the 'extremities of society' such as local organisations, churches and family life (Foucault 1980:97). It is partly for this reason that I chose to

do this co-search on patriarchy at the grass-roots level in inductive, grounded theory in the home and intimate relationships, because that is where it would appear to hold potential for change.

Thus, it is as we listen for the stories, the local knowledges that stand on the fringes of society's dominant patriarchal discourses that we can begin to critique and challenge the negative effects of these dominant discourses on both men and women. It is in 'sacred spaces' of therapeutic conversations, of men's groups that we can through conversation provide opportunity, firstly, to deconstruct patriarchal discourse, and its affects on their lives, secondly, to construct new life giving understandings for their lives and, thirdly, to begin to perform them. We would be providing opportunity for what Foucault would call an 'insurrection' of life-giving knowledge that challenges the whispers of death that come from the negative effects of our dominant patriarchal discourses in South Africa .

2.4 Language, discourse, narrative and therapy

Kotzé and Kotzé say that language, discourse and narrative are 'intertwined concepts'.(Kotzé & Kotzé 1997:5). For whilst people live within the constitutive effects of societal discourses such as patriarchy, which in turn effects their own personal discourses and lives, most people, as Kotzé and Kotzé point out, do not live in a reflexive or self- reflexive way within them, but in a narrative way.

What I mean by 'a narrative way' is this. In an attempt to give meaning and coherence to experience, people arrange "their experiences of events in sequences across time in such away as to arrive a coherent account of themselves and the world around them", as White, the Australian therapist says. He goes on to say "this can be referred to a story or self narrative." (White & Epston 1990:10). This story becomes the dominant story or narrative that takes hold of their lives. It is also strongly shaped by the dominant discourses of society. Other events, experiences are lost either because they do not understand them, or they do not have the language to articulate them (Bruner 1986:6), or because they are, as Foucault would say, the "subjugated" knowledge of that person's life, which has to be marginalised (Foucault 1980:81).

White (1990:19) has developed a therapeutic approach in which Foucault's concepts are translated into therapeutic language. In this approach a person's problem, or dominant story/ narrative is externalised in language in order that the person can gain distance and agency on the problem and its effects on his or her life. The negative effects of the person's story are explored as to the way it constitutes the person in language. But more than that, the discourses within the broader social context are explored, and the implications for the person's present, past and future. Narrative therapy is interested in joining with people to explore the stories they have about their lives and relationships, their effects, and the context in which they have been formed and authored (Morgan 2000:10).

It is through the curious, respectful questioning of the therapist that a person is assisted to deconstruct, or 'undo' the narratives, self stories or discourses that affect him or her, and at the same time, looking for other competencies, beliefs, values commitments and abilities that will enable them to change their relationship to his or her problem in life (Morgan 200:4).

It was in these kinds of therapeutic conversations, as I stated earlier, that Richard was able to externalise 'blind rage', which was the dominant story in his life, but also discover behind that 'rage', the dominant discourse of patriarchy, and its negative effects on his past, its 'subjective' definition of him in the present, and its consequences for the future. It was that kind of ongoing conversation that enabled him to discover marginalised experiences, knowledges, qualities and skills in his life that 'unearthed' new understandings of what it means to be male in a more reflexive and responsible way. He was enabled to see the way he had become a Foucauldian 'docile body', and victim of the negative aspects of patriarchal discourse and their effects, as he sought to live it out as the *unquestioned* 'blueprint' for roles and relationships in his family's life with tragic consequences.

2.5 Alan Jenkins

In having these therapeutic conversations with Richard, as I stated earlier, I was assisted by the writing of Alan Jenkins (1990), who takes a postmodern, social constructionist, narrative approach to therapy. He argues that most models for the explanation of men's abuse in intimate relationships are based on the search for

causes that are characteristic of the western tradition of empirical science (Jenkins 1990:12). To find the cause and rectify it is the best way to solve the problem. Find the 'cause' and we find out 'who', or 'what' is responsible, and what action needs to be taken. The danger of these causal explanations of abuse is that they promote the avoidance of responsibility by the perpetrator, and acceptance of responsibility by the victim and others, or events and things. This is exemplified in remarks like, "I knew it was wrong. I could not help myself.", "It runs in the family." and "If she wasn't so … I wouldn't have needed to hit her." The consequence is that others share the guilt and shame and responsibility for their own victimisation. Therefore Jenkins says that, 'the search for causal explanations can be severely limiting when it serves only to relieve, pacify and excuse the perpetrator of responsibility (Jenkins 1990:13). This for the perpetrator becomes an end itself. Therapists in their search for a cause can also assist in this shift in responsibility.

Building on the work of Bateson and White, who created an explanation for abuse based on a theory of restraint or negative explanation, Jenkins argues that perpetrators of abuse can be seen to hold traditions, values, beliefs and habits that act as 'restraints' to the acceptance of responsibility for abusive action, and the development of sensitive and respectful relationships with others (Jenkins 1990:14). The 'restraints', according to Jenkins, can be examined at four levels of context. Firstly, there are socio-cultural restraints, which take into consideration the male/female hierarchies of dualism created in language, which create patriarchal understanding and practice, and the socially constructed knowledge/power relationships in which we live, that in turn brings with them understandings of 'ownership' and 'entitlement' (Jenkins 1990:35). Secondly, Jenkins describes developmental restraints created by habits learned in home, school, and wider society that impede the development of respectful caring relationships (Jenkins 1990:45). Thirdly, he describes individual restraints, these restraints, rooted in socio-cultural belief and practice, have within them an imbalance between status and entitlement, and finally, there are the individual restraints, which relates for example to a man's inability to deal with emotional issues because he has been socio-culturally constituted to avoid them and rely on others to deal with them in family life, and other intimate relationships (Jenkins 1990:53). In all these restraints can be seen the negative effects of the power relationships that are, in turn the product, as Foucault would argue, of patriarchy.

These 'restraints' can be found in the self-narratives men have of themselves, and religious and cultural discourses that constitute them into acting in particular ways, and they provide them with a 'blueprint' for relationships within the family. These 'blueprints' such as those found within patriarchal discourse that have clearly defined understandings of what it is to be male (and also within that, as Derrida would remind us, what it is not!), see men in relation to women as the 'head', the 'provider' and the 'protector', and 'restrain' them from relating effectively with their families in other ways. They become trapped within the discourse, and yet sometimes find that they cannot perform within the discourse. If a man, for example, in patriarchal society such as South Africa finds himself no longer in a power position as the head of the house, because he has been retrenched, and cannot provide for his family, he can experience an increasing powerlessness and impotence. He therefore tries harder within the 'restraining' discourse by which he is constituted to maintain his 'headship', only to find himself in a self-perpetuating, worsening situation where his only power is grabbed and stolen in an abusive 'out of control' way, making him dictatorial. His efforts to help solve the problem become the problem themselves. This is made worse if his wife is in a job of some status, and is well paid. Implicit in this approach is the assumption that most abusive men do not want a relationship that is characterised by violence, and would prefer one of mutual respect and care (Jenkins 1990:69). It is also in keeping with the basic assumption that only the abusive man himself can change his beliefs and behaviour (Jenkins 1990:62). In this Jenkins focuses on a man's 'intentionality', or preferred way of living his life.

It is therefore the restraining self-narratives and religious and cultural discourses that need to be examined that restrict a man from taking responsibility for his abuse, and at the same time from being part of a process that begins to empower his own relationships, and his own plan for his life, which has often been 'taken over' by the abuse. In talking of 'restraints', there is a tendency to promote an active consideration of alternatives to abuse, and what has been *stopping* the male from making them. He is 'invited' to focus on his own competencies to deal with his restraints to responsibility and life-giving relationships (Jenkins 1990:32). He is 'invited' to focus on what has stopped him in the past from taking responsibility for his abusive behaviour, and even more importantly what has stopped him developing respectful

and caring relationships with the victim and other members of his family (Jenkins 1990:57). This was the process that Richard began in his time in prison as he externalised his problems and their negative effects on his life, and which he was living out in his relationships with disastrous consequences. It was the effects of this restraining discourse that prevented him from accepting responsibility for his abuse, and finding effective ways to cease his violence.

It is here, as Foucault would say, at the 'extremities', or at the grass roots in the lives of men such as Richard in our South African context men's liberation needs to begin for men and women. It is here that we need to be 'doing' life-giving theology in pastoral care with others.

2.6   Towards a model for pastoral care

As I sat at the bedside of Richard's son and saw the violent consequences of his abuse within his family, and I sat with Richard, the husband and father, and heard the story of his life and the restraining effects of patriarchal discourse in his life, I was appalled, moved and challenged as a pastoral therapist.

2.7   Incarnational and passionate

For me, pastorally, it was a 'moment of insertion" as I came alongside what Richard and his family were experiencing (Cochrane et al 1991:17). And then, as I reflected on my own life story and the patriarchal discourse in my own western, colonial life, and the lives of others of different cultures with whom I have to pastorally care, I began to see the negative effects of this dominant discourse. It is these moments of insertion that are, for me, the basic point of departure for a holistic practical theology that does not concern itself only with the individual or family, but sees them as part of the greater context (Cochrane et al 1991:18). As I said earlier, our lives are lived out within dominant power discourses of which patriarchy is one, which can so easily become 'platforms of entitlement'. Therefore it is right that we should reflect on them, 'take them apart' or *deconstruct* them, and both challenge those understandings in the discourse, in culture and theology, that abuse and marginalise others, and at the same time look for, *reconstruct* life-giving ways in which this discourse can be understood and lived out for both men and women.

For me as a clergyperson and pastoral therapist, it was and is a 'moment of insertion', that assumes a prior to commitment to Jesus Christ, as redeemer, liberator and Lord, and the Reign of justice and compassion that he inaugurated (Luke). It is this commitment that is assumed in this research and in its reflection, spiritual discernment, evaluation and planning for praxis (Cochrane et al 1991:15). It begins with an understanding of an *incarnate* God (Phil. 2), who inserted himself into this world for its transformation, and who calls us to collaborate in that same work of liberation and transformation that he began.

Within that commitment is the commitment to follow Jesus' adherence to the Mosaic prophetic tradition of 'doing' theology, or what Brueggemann calls the 'liberatory trajectory' (Brueggemann 1983:304). It is a tradition that focuses on God's justice and righteousness, it has a concern for the poor, marginalised and oppressed, and therefore a concern for critical reflection, and social transformation that tend to be found in subjugated discourses. It is a tradition that is not prepared to accept the status quo as Jesus was not, when he challenged Pharisees, upholding the traditions of men, whilst misusing the Torah to maintain that state of affairs. Therefore, if we are to do our theology as pastoral therapists, there needs to be a readiness to move from a 'centred' position of control, objective, uninvolved in issues such as the abusive effects of patriarchy to a 'decentred' position of empathy and solidarity. This was the position of Jesus as he stood alongside women, the poor, the sinners, the sick, and the socially unacceptable. It was for him, and for us, the place of passion. It is therefore right that Ackermann (1994:44) calls for a *passionate* approach to the doing of theology as we respond to the 'signs of the time' in our South African context, and are collaborators with God and 'engage' with patriarchy and abuse in the 'mending of creation'.

It requires also a passionate solidarity that has blurred the bipolar self/other distinction and that is not patronising and objective, but is immersed in the words to "love your neighbour as yourself (Mark 12:31). Enriching our understanding of this text, the educationalist Lous Heshusius refers to what she calls 'participatory consciousness' (Heshusius 1994:17), in which relational selves do not come to understanding by means of objective separation, but subjective care and love. She terms this relationship the 'self-other', and that it requires an attitude of openness, honesty and receptiveness to create greater wholeness. It is a commitment to change and be

changed, to transform and be transformed. This understanding and attitude applies whether it is in a therapeutic conversation, a participatory research group, a parish home group, in family or any relationship. It is the way that we do theology, we do spirituality.

As I stated earlier, being aware of colonisation, oppression, marginalisation that has taken place in culture and religion through such discourses as patriarchy and the effects of these on people's lives, we do not need theology that is done by means of power/knowledge 'grand' narratives that have been imposed on us, and which we impose and constitute others. We need rather theology which is an *epistemological break* with traditional, 'grand' western theology, and find local theologies. We need to do it by listening to God in our local context through *our stories*, and the narratives and understandings of those who share with us, and are oppressed and marginalized: women who experience the abusive effects of patriarchy, and men who are oppressed or restrained by this discourse from living respectful, caring lives (Ackermann 1994:44). It is in this way that we would be externalising and 'reading' in the texts of needy individuals lives, as Jesus did, the 'signs of the times' (Mt. 16:3), or 'interpreting this kairos' (Luke 12:56). We would be putting peoples' lives into the broader picture of dominant social discourses like patriarchy, and beginning a process of critical, emancipatory social analysis (Cochrane et al 1991:18).

2.8 Collaborative, critical and constructive

I believe that we need theology that is *collaborative*. What I have written has been wrestled with in the quietness of my study in the early hours of the morning, but it has been a collaborative effort, as I have benefited from the critical insights of those in my research team and others. It also needs to take place in collaboration with those of other disciplines such as psychology, sociology, anthropology. As De Gruchy, says, '…they help provide necessary tools and resources for analysing the context within which the church is called to proclaim and live the gospel.' (1994:11). It is the insights of my collaborators like Derrida , Foucault, Heshusius, Gergen, White and Jenkins and others who have made a significant contribution to this explorative work of liberative praxis. We need theology which is contextual and liberative, as Jesus' was in his ministry, and which goes beyond 'thinking' theology, to 'doing', in praxis

with others for their liberation. Our theology must be *practical,* as it was *with* and *for* us in the ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus.

We need to look, explore with 'binoculars of the *hermeneutic of suspicion*' at how far grand, western theologies have colluded with cultures, western and local, to create a patriarchal discourse that has no accountability for its negative effects within society. As Neuger and Poling state, much feminist theology is motivated by the conviction that theological interpretation has a radically formative influence on culture, and equally that the shape of culture guides our ongoing interpretation of God , and God's intention for creation (Neuger & Poling 1997:26). And , they argue :

> So, a "sacred circle" has been established consisting of a God who is named defined, and empowered through patriarchal assumptions, and who, in turn, through human-created symbols and structures, names, defines and empowers (some) males. Women, in this scheme, become defined as "other". Men become defined as closer to God and as responsible for creating and maintaining systems of meaning. This dualistic system of valuing and devaluing does harm to the potential and divers gifts of both women and men.
>
> (Neuger & Poling 2001:27)

We need to recognise that distortions have been created as a result of the dominant patriarchal discourse in terms of religious symbols and theological interpretations as these understandings have colluded with cultural patriarchal discourse. These distortions have harmed every one. If we believe that theological discourse is to enable people to respond to God's call to wholeness and salvation for all, then we need to ensure our theology is grounded in the stories, the experiences of all, and critique those aspects of theology that are not a reflection of that inclusive call to abundant life.

Of cardinal importance to feminist and profeminist theologians in this constructive process is *theological language*, and their critique of patriarchal theology, its imagery and the language used to describe God. Dominant male theological power has been responsible for the creation of symbols, metaphors and language for God, and it is reflected in those dualist, hierarchical assumptions that centralise the maleness of God, and devalue and marginalise others experience and resulting understandings.

However, we need to remember that the name given to Moses at the burning bush was YHWH. This says that God is beyond human language. Any word we use needs to be placed, as Derrida might say under erasure. Therefore, as Sallie McFague says, to turn theological metaphors of God, such as Father and King, into a self-contained reality is the essence of idolatry (McFague 1982:145). Brian Wren in his exploration of the imagery of God in hymnody say that God is seen as male, all powerful, in control, father and king. We need to recognise that the spirituality and theology of Christians is strongly influenced by hymns. It is the systematic use of hymns that come from a patriarchal discourse that creates a distorted, or limited vision of God, and is constitutive in supporting male dominance in society. This constitutive effect is not confined to hymns, but to liturgy, and the language of the Bible. Some would say that it is the way God intended it, but I believe that we need to enlarge our vision of God through the unearthing of old understandings of God, and the creation of new ones that arise out of our experience of God in the present context that will reject male dominance in the cardinal area of theology, and as a consequence other areas of our experience and daily living.

We need to recognise that God cannot be contained by certain images or metaphors as this leads to the creation of a dominant understanding of God that arises out of one context of experience, and is then considered relevant and generalised for all contexts and times. These, such as western theology, Foucault might describe as 'global' power/knowledges (Foucault 1980:84) that dominate 'local' understandings of theology that arise out of the particular contexts. It is important to be mindful of this, as this is one of the signs of the 'global' times in which we are currently living. However, in holding on to certain views of patriarchy, for example, alternate experiences and understandings of God are marginalised. This applies in this research particularly to women's stories and experiences of God. For this reason, theology needs always be *provisional* as people in different times and contexts seek to co-construct differing 'local' theologies relevant to their contexts, and seek to 'language' their experience of God in ways that are meaningful for them. It is on this assumption that contextual theology takes a stand against under-contextualised theologies (Bosch 1991:426), and it recognises the need for continuing dialogue between the text of Scripture, peoples' lives and context (Bosch 1991: 426-427). Therefore it is in

therapeutic conversations with people like Richard and my research group that we seek analyse, to deconstruct, 'or 'undo' patriarchal theology in order to construct life-giving theological understandings for praxis, or pastoral care in our present South Africa context.

2.9 Prayerful

An essential part of the task is a commitment to prayer and *spirituality*, a spirituality of the Kingdom that acknowledges God's rule over every aspect of life, and therefore to see the spiritual life not only in terms of the personal, but also the social and political . Kingdom spirituality has at its heart the prayer of Jesus: "Your kingdom come, your will be done on earth as it is in heaven." (Matt 6:10). It is this kind of spirituality that enables us to discern or to hear clearly with others the 'whispers/forces of death', at work in their lives within patriarchal cultural and theological discourses, and equally to hear with them the 'whispers/forces of life' in the experiences of those who are marginalised and oppressed. It is also a spirituality that empowers us as individuals and as a group to begin to struggle for healing, liberation and justice in society Therefore we see the need for prayer, and not only for reflection, as they are both vital for the renewal of the church and its empowerment for ministry. It is also through the liturgy, preaching, teaching and church groups that this transforming work will continue in the lives of Christians. As Cochrane, de Gruchy and Petersen state, it is this spirituality of the Kingdom that should lie at the heart of pastoral practice (1991:77).

It is this kind of spirituality that Denise Ackermann, from a contextual feminist theological perspective, might describe as 'a spirituality of risk' (1994:207). The reason for her describing it in such a way is that it is committed to dealing with deeply entrenched traditional patriarchal discourses that have within them understandings of power and entitlement, which can lead to 'unpopular' activity, as power relationships and their effects are questioned and challenged (Ackermann 1994:207). That risk comes as we open ourselves to the perspective of the gospel on our human experience, seeing the 'signs of the times' in the abuse of patriarchy, hearing God through the stories of the victims of discourses, and are prepared to passionately engage with the repressive effects of this discourse.

There also needs to be vulnerability as, in self reflection, we examine the ways in which we have perpetuated the repressive effects of patriarchy, either as men who have assumed positions of power and entitlement, or women who have worked within it to our own advantage. In this way it becomes reproduced and maintained at the local level. As Ackermann also says, 'Self critique can also open us to learning from different perspectives and from others' histories.' (1994:208).

2.10 Hopeful

It is also called to be a spirituality of hope, because as Christians are empowered to struggle for justice, hope is evoked and kept alive for those who despair of social transformation (Cochrane et al 1991:82). To wrestle with the negative effects of patriarchy and to challenge them in both church and society is to "to seek first the Kingdom of God" in our time and context. In doing that, we saying that we believe in a God of compassion and justice despite the painful realities of patriarchy's negative effects in our society, and hope is kept alive for its victims.

2.11 Practical

It is as we prayerfully and critically analyse our cultural context, and the role that the church is playing within it, on issues such as patriarchy and abuse, that we are enabled to translate the gospel of the Reign of God, into the most concrete terms possible. It is this kind of theological reflection that moves faith into the commitment of obedience, as we live out in praxis what we have reflected on.

It is when we have done that, and then return after further moments of insertion of ministry that we reflect that model for pastoral theology and practice, 'the pastoral-circle', used by the Catholic theologians, J. Holland and P. Henriot, and developed in Cochrane, de Gruchy and Petersen's, 'In Word and in Deed' . In this pastoral-hermeneutic circle there is place for ongoing pastoral praxis, hermeneutics and theological reflection as an on-going process in the life of the church (Cochrane et al 1991:13) It is a circular process that, as I have said, includes: the prior commitment of faith directed towards the Reign of God, and the 'incarnation' of his compassion and justice in society; moments of pastoral insertion, when that compassion is placed within the lived experiences of individuals and relationships such as Richard; social

and ecclesial analysis, and in this case the analysis of the effects of the discourse of patriarchy in society and Church on the lives and relationships in Church and society; theological reflection; spiritual formation and empowerment; and pastoral planning and praxis.

2.12 Reflection on our methodology for transformative praxis

As I said in the previous chapter, the research method I am using is the participative research method. This means that Richard is not the 'object of research' *on* whom the research is done, but a participant consultant who has experienced the negative effects of patriarchy, and *with* whom we explore its effects and seek to make change.

According to Kurt Lewin the social psychologist who invented the term, 'action research', the practice begins with the general idea that some kind of improvement or change is desirable. It is that 'general idea' that arose out of my discussion with Richard and others in the Diocese as we reflected on the effects of patriarchy on men's lives and their relationships.

Participative action research proceeds in a spiral of steps, each of these is composed of planning, acting, observing, and evaluating the results of action (McTaggart 1997:27). It therefore complements the contextual as well as a liberational model for doing practical theology used by Cochrane and De Gruchy (1991:13), based on the 'pastoral-circle' used by Holland and Henriot (1984), and which is the model for this study.

This kind of research also recognises the need for flexibility and responsiveness as we deal with real life situations in the process of research (McTaggart 1997:27). Life situations do not fit easily into a prescribed model of practice. It was these life situations that we have had to deal with as we sought to bring together busy people from various parts of the Diocese and the problem of postponed meetings because of the busy schedules of the participants. Together, we negotiated and re-negotiated the research process as we sought one another's wisdom and knowledge. A part of the flexibility has led us as a research group to focus in greater depth on Richard's story, rather than moving to interviewing more people around the topic of abuse. There was a further surprise development when it was suggested, and agreed, that Richard

should tell his story to a congregation in Kathlehong on the East Rand. We felt it would be good to have some response from the congregation on the negative effects of patriarchy and the pastoral care with men. As McTaggart says, in our action research we as a group have had to organise the conditions under which we can learn from our own experience, and make this experience accessible to others (McTaggart 1997:27). We will make the experience accessible through giving this research to the Diocese for further theological reflection and transformative praxis.

CHAPTER THREE: DECONSTRUCTIVE/CONSTRUCTIVE TALK AROUND PATRIARCHY IN SOUTH AFRICA

3.1 Preliminaries

Our research group consisted of Lynn, Marcellus, Maureen, Richard, Sindile and myself.[1] After the second session Marcellus had to leave the group, and he was replaced by Hubby.[2] As mentioned in chapter one, the group was put together out of common interest or concern for this topic, and served a dual purpose of helping me with this research as well as working on a document for the Diocese. The group met in a particularly fluid way, which is in line with participatory action research, where the action plan is worked on together on a continually negotiated process. I had originally thought we would meet on approximately seven occasions. However, when we met as a group, for the first period of our time together as a group we tended to talk 'around' the question of patriarchy, and we had the difficulties of getting every one away from their busy schedules from the different parts of the Diocese. This was in line with the participatory research method that I had decided to use. I was conscious also that I was attempting to reduce my own position of power in order to allow others to participate in constructing ideas. Together as a group, we were seeking to find ways to address the issues of pastoral care with men. In addition to that, there was no sense that I was the 'outside observer' seeking to find answers to questions that I already knew, and had answered! I was participating in a process of reflective research, and I was aware that the way forward was open and tentative in terms of the goals to be achieved. This is an important part of this kind of research. There were, however, times when thought I might be losing the way!

3.2 Some understandings of patriarchy out of the South African context

As we began our work in Benoni I was conscious that we were doing this work in a society of multiple and shifting understandings, as I said in Chapter two. But, at the same time, we were bound together in a common faith and seeking in that 'shifting' to create a discourse of care for men. In our first session we shared our preliminary understandings of the word 'patriarchy'. These we placed on flip chart paper (See

---

[1] Rev. Lynn Coull, Diocesan Coordinator for HIV/Aids Ministry, Rev. Sindile Sithole, Coordinator for Theological Education, Canon Dr. Maureen Sithole, Richard, our consultant and co-researcher, Rev. Marcellus Conway, a priest in the Diocese
[2] Fr. Hubby Kekana, a priest in the Diocese.

Appendix A). I need to say that our discussions were a rich text, which cannot be totally covered in this dissertation, but I have sought to draw out from it those aspects that are relevant to this research curiosity. It was long process as I sat over a number of evenings with my head against my computer screen listening to those quiet voices as they slowly gave language to the stories and understandings from experiences that maybe they had hardly of spoken before. This is experience-knowledge that is vital for a meaningful response to pastoral care with men. Was this life-giving subversion as the 'unspeakable' was spoken?

3.3 Patriarchy in the family

The initial responses focused on this word, '*patriarchy*' in relation to the family. The first response to this sharing of understanding was recorded as '*head of the household (male)*'. Then, there were responses such as, '*system defining the family*' this led to reflection on its constitutive effect on roles within the family in terms of '*male/female', 'husband/wife'*, and '*parent/child*'. As I said in previous chapters, these words, and the language/discourse of which they are a part, have no meaning on their own, but are dependent on a subtext of prior experience, and in the very ordering the words as they were written on the chart, they speak of a bipolar hierarchy of patriarchal discourse.

3.4 Patriarchy in the wider context

There was then a shift to reflect on it within the wider context of society and history. Words such as '*historical', 'cultural (rigidly entrenched beliefs)', 'structural*' and '*institutional*' were used to describe its influence on our lived experience. The word '*biblical*' was also placed there, acknowledging the influence of Judeo-Christian religion. We came to the understanding that patriarchy is the '*defining of the world from a male perspective' in both Western, colonial and African culture*'. It is a discourse that separates male and female, and says that to be male is to have '*greater value*'.

3.5 Negative effects of patriarchy

The effects of this 'global' understanding and discourse, we then began to explore as we shared around this word, 'patriarchy', as we had come to experience and understand it in our Southern African context.

As we shared ideas and reflected, we learnt from Maureen that in African culture, the man is the head and his function is to procreate, and the woman is called to be the child bearer. A man has only fulfilled his role when he has fathered '*a male child*'. Only then is he welcomed into the family. It is the males that carry the family name and inherit the family estate. In the South African context the patriarchal system was sustained by the law in the Marriage Act of 1927 that once a male child was born he inherited everything even if he had an elder sister.

I said that in the community of property law in relation to marriage in the white community, we saw a similar understanding, where the woman is deemed to be the minor. In this we saw the commonalities between black and traditional western culture in the practice of the handing down of the family name and the inheritance. We heard from Maureen and Sindile that in many traditional black communities, young girls are not educated, because *'there is no value in being female'*. Young women are seen as property to be purchased by Lobola, and then to become the property of someone else. When a married woman bears a boy, she looses her name, and doing that, her identity. She is simply, 'the mother of ALB'. If the father should die, the son becomes the head of the household and has to be consulted by the mother, when decisions have to be made. Males in traditional black culture are also required to be better educated. Although this has become a dominant narrative within a traditional African context, no story can be totalising, and within a narrative there will always be gaps and subversions to a given dominant text. One such story from our group illustrates this in the following paragraph.

3.6 Maureen's story of life-giving subversion

In the midst of our discussion around patriarchy and its negative effects, Maureen began to tell the story of her own education. She told the story that her parents divorced when she was very young. After the divorce, her grandfather said, "You will go to boarding school. You need an education more than your brothers." She said that she went to boarding school at St. Peter's, Rosettenville in Johannesburg, and they went to the township school. Her grandfather said to her, "For you to lead an independent, better life - better than these- because they are men. They will always make it, because they are men. You need an education." She said that was how she

got to boarding school and remained there until her matriculation. It was because her grandfather, many years ago, had known the negative effects of the patriarchal system. Even though her uncle and the rest of the family did not understand, and were opposed to it, her grandfather recognised that her only salvation would be her education, and she was given preference.[3] In this way the very underpinnings of cultural belief are challenged from within, indicating the instability of any given cultural value. Talking about this within the group also played the constitutive role of consolidating such knowledge through those who witnessed it. It was a life-giving subversion of the discourse, from within.

As we reflected on her story we saw the life-giving subversive position that her grandfather had taken against the dominant patriarchal discourse that has enabled her to succeed in the ways that she has. We also recognised the way in which she, as well as other members of her family, are now ready to question and challenge patriarchal discourse and practice. Others in her family have taken on similar understandings and practices, and are seeking to live them out in their home life. We wondered what place there is in the family of the church for creating groups that will from their experience create new understandings of what it means to be a man, and be given the space and support to live it out in life-giving ways for themselves and others.

3.7   Richard's question and the negative effects of patriarchy since 1994

Richard then said to the group, "In the light of what we have said about male domination and patriarchy, I ask myself the question, with the advent of the new democracy how do you suppose a male, an African male, sees himself, because I understand the white male is saying, "There is balance now of equal weight … the one now is equal to the other". Maybe there are those that are revolting. But how is an African male feeling now after 1994? You see how patriarchy is falling apart, and it's creating a lot of confusion to the extent that males –young and old – feel threatened because that system is not beneficial now". In these words of Richard's text, there is a sense of being 'confused' and 'threatened' amongst African men as they see traditional, patriarchal power discourse and its 'entitlements', or benefits challenged by South Africa's new Constitution. This 'confusion' and 'threat' has also been

---

[3] Her brothers were educated in the township school and then went on to university.

created by the consequent foregrounding of women's rights in our country. It is this sense of bewilderment, fear and threat that I have heard in the voices of other African men in my ministry, when their role in the family has been discussed. In this we see the assumptions of patriarchal binary opposites that polarise us into male and female, and see the liberation of women as a challenge to men's centred role and entitlements, rather than a movement to realise in a deeper way our common humanity as women and men. As I said earlier in chapter two, in day-to-day living we see in the hierarchical language of binary opposites being 'lived out'. The acknowledgement by Richard that the white male is also facing the challenge of changing gender expectations points to 'common ground' or 'undercurrents' affecting men in our context. I wonder if St. Paul, in spite of patriarchal background, knew how subversive and life-giving he was being, when he wrote, 'In Christ there is neither …male nor female…but all are one in him.' (Gal. 3.28).

We then moved on to ask the question how does the African male see himself since 1994 in this new democracy conscious of this patriarchal discourse. We spoke of a growing sense of empowerment, 'entitlement of black men and women' in the new South Africa. This arose out of the 'disempowered', and 'non-entitled' Apartheid years. Together with that was the growing sense of individuality, self-sufficiency, and independence of women. We spoke of women's entitlement to freedom. Women who had previously been economically disempowered in the family could now speak. However, within Richard's text above is perhaps a sense of uncertainty, fear and resistance of change amongst African men, who have already experienced such disempowerment within the historical, political structures of apartheid South Africa.

We recognised also within our society the disempowerment of many white males as a result of the labour legislation that seeks to redress the imbalances of the past in the labour market, where whites had dominated. This, we recognised was the consequence of a new South Africa, and its new Constitution. This also indicates a fear amongst white males of both loosing privilege, and moving into a particularly vulnerable position, where they cannot be the traditional 'head' and 'provider'. We saw that this is particularly true in white cultural communities where there is a strong patriarchal discourse at work. This is in line with my research paradigm, where I am

working towards inclusivity, rather than exclusivity, these undercurrents are particularly important.

We also recognised that many men in South Africa had been constituted by a 'violent masculinity' as a result of the political 'struggle', the migrant labour system and the mining hostels. This also had allied to it, a strong understanding of 'entitlement'. I have also wondered if that 'violent masculinity' was there not only in black male society, but white male society as well, as men found themselves caught up in the 'struggle' from another position and perspective through their national service commitment within South Africa, and beyond its borders. What constitutive effect has that had on South African white men, and their relationships with their wives, families and the wider community?

I then spoke from my own white, English, colonial cultural background about how as a boy and young man I had been constituted by culture and its discourse to be 'self contained', 'invulnerable' and 'lack emotional sensitivity' often expressed in phrases like, 'Sticks and stones will break my bones, but words will never hurt me!' It is these qualities, which we recognised were in both Western and African patriarchal discourse, that can create 'distance' from the rest of the family, so that the wife becomes responsible for the relationships, and the husband becomes a distant authority figure used to effect when he comes home! Because of a lack of socio-emotional skills many men find it very difficult to handle the emotional relationships within the family, and the woman can easily find herself assuming responsibility for the emotional life of the family, and even more important, she takes on responsibility for his lack of socio-emotional skills. He performs well in the office, giving directives as the 'head' in charge, in control, but is often disempowered, and in a sense dependent in his home on the support of his wife, who holds him in position as 'the head'. This may be reflected in that text, 'He is the head, but I am the boss!' It is in a statement such as this, expressed in an 'extremity' of society (1980:102), as Foucault would describe the home, that we see the exercise of power/knowledge such as patriarchy least concealed. It is also here where it is subverted, if the text is inherently unstable, in that power is always in relation with resistance.

3.8 The entrapment of patriarchy

Thus, we saw that despite the changes in South Africa since 1994, men of different cultural backgrounds are still constituted by a patriarchal discourse that has constituted them to be solely responsible for their families, protecting and providing for them. When retrenched /unemployed or earning less than their wives, they find themselves 'trapped', 'disempowered' by patriarchal understandings and discourse in family life. In an attempt to regain power, this can 'lead to abuse', emotional, physical and sexual. This 'entrapment' is made worse when women believe that it is God's will that the man should be the 'head', the 'protector' and the 'provider', and that she is entitled to these things in terms of the patriarchal discourse. When this happens within the patriarchal discourse, it is then that the woman assumes a power position, and the man is further disempowered by the patriarchy itself. He becomes a 'victim'. A possible victim of emotional abuse not only within the family, but also in the wider community in relation to his failure to live out his patriarchal role under the gaze of other patriarchal men, and the wider society. The abuser is a victim, and the victim, an abuser. We wondered whether men's inability through poverty/unemployment to marry, have children and establish households and provide for them – out of their powerlessness and a frustrated sense of entitlement in the new South Africa - has led to the high increase in rape. This in turn, we realised, has implication for the spread of HIV/AIDS.

3.9 Lynn's challenge and seeking 'the common ground'

In the course of the discussion, Lynn said, "I cannot see what is good about patriarchy. If you have a system that prevents another from growing, that oppresses. I cannot see anything good in that!" Maureen responded by saying that there are good aspects of patriarchy, but that the different models of upbringing that had brought out the negative aspects. She then went on to say, "Education for women does not mean that you should become a feminist. In a marriage situation, it does not mean that you will want to have your 'say' to be the last 'say' within the family. I believe that you should find a way of balancing issues instead of the one being patriarchal and the other feminist. Because, if you want to take the strong feminist approach, you will destabilise the family." And Lynn said, "I agree with that." I wonder where it is in that common ground between the discourses of patriarchy and its bipolar opposite matriarchy, that life giving-ground is to be found?

As I have reflected on the word 'feminist' I wondered whether we read the word in opposition to male, assuming that it is a word that stands for an all-good matriarchal discourse and power that is seeking to challenge the all-evil patriarchy. In doing that, we create an embattled polarity. We need to recognise that patriarchy is neither good nor bad, but is a power system in which, as with any system, power is never equally distributed. The important thing is that we seek to deconstruct it, challenge its negative aspects and effects and reconstruct new understandings that will be inclusive rather than exclusive of women's experiences and understandings.

It was this deconstructing and reconstructing that Richard hinted at when he said, "Is there another way in which we can define the family? Is there another way in which we see what needs to be done without breaking patriarchy? Or is it right to break down patriarchy? If it's for the good, let's break it!" After this, there was period of silence on the tape, and I wondered then, as I wonder now, whether that was a kind of break through. Richard spoke of his time in prison as a time of release, a time of letting go of the patriarchal restrains of being the sole provider, and that he was able to begin to look at money and his role in the family differently.

3.10   Richard's appeal for pastoral care

Richard then said, **"**There is feeling out there that everything is against men…the church and politics. All the laws are for women. The church needs to create safe places for men to discuss their issues. To help men reflect on rapid industrialisation /urbanisation/ globalisation. To help men understand the influence/power of culture, and the assumptions that are constituting them and their relationships."   In these words of Richard we heard words of deeply reflected experience that are a vital part of what this research all about. The collaboration of the voices of theology, postmodernist thought, narrative therapy and experience to construct grounded ways of pastoral care with men in our South African context.

In this initial time of collaboration, the group grew in understanding and respect of one another's perspective and positions and trust which enabled us to voice them; white, black, feminist, conservative and liberal. In this time the voice of Richard slowly came to the fore, and was listened to with respect, because of his position of experience.

In the light of the changes in South Africa since 1994, this led us to questions like, "What is it to be a man?', 'How do we help men? How do we liberate men? How do we liberate one another in the context of marriage? How do we do theology to enable that?' How do we preach? How do we teach in, for example, the Guild of Bernard Mizeki (Anglican Men's Guild)?" In this I heard the echoes of my research curiosity, and I felt excited, and relieved!

3.11   Sindile's call for new language and interpretation in theology

We moved on to look at the place of theology in the discourse of patriarchy and Sindile spoke of the need to be using new language to communicate on gender issues, new ways of interpreting the scriptures in liberative ways, because for a long time people have used scriptures to oppress women. We felt that our interpretation of Scripture, and even our language in the liturgy enforced this gender theme. We were of one mind that this process will help us to look more closely at the way we think about and express gender in liturgy.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE 'CENTRE STAGING' OF RICHARD'S STORY

4.1   Setting the stage

As I said in my first chapter, participatory action research is characterised by fluidity, and flexibility, and we needed therefore as a group to be prepared for those surprises in our research process that change the course of the research as we encountered surprises that led us to things, life- giving and liberating. One of these surprises that was not originally planned was the way that Richard wanted to talk about his story.

Arising out of our discussion with Richard, he said that he would like to tell his story. As a group we decided to 'centre stage' the painful drama. In other words, it was to foreground his voice in the text in relation to the other participants. After a group discussion, we decided to focus on both his experience of the negative effects of his entrapment in patriarchal discourse, and his time in prison. It was further agreed that I said that I would write a narrative letter (White & Epston 1990:125), drawing out from the text of his story, themes that drew my attention, This letter (See Appendix B) would then be used as a reflective tool for the group, and a witness to Richard's story. It could then be used by the group for further reflection on our research curiosity (Morgan 2000:101). The group would also be free to pick up other themes as we reflected on his story in relation to our research curiosity. This would also continue the process of enriching the newly-rediscovered story, or sub-plot in Richard's life drama. Through writing this down it would also thicken alterative descriptions of him that had become subjugated. These descriptions would be designed to empower him to practice living with care, rather than abuse.

With these guiding principles in place, the conversation began with an acknowledgement from the group that because of his experience of the extreme negative effects of patriarchal discourse, that he was the expert amongst us. We also asked if, as he told his story, we might ask 'respectful questions', when appropriate. We suggested this because we wanted to take a stand with him in terms of our own experience of the negative effects of patriarchy in order that he did not carry this label alone. This connects with the idea that it is not the person who is the problem but in this instance, patriarchy (Morgan 2000:17). As I listened to the drama of Richard's experience after the session with my head to the computer, I felt like a Shakespearean

player listening to the principle player from behind an arras. I have therefore edited and linked his words through selecting certain texts or scripts to be performed, and I have linked these texts together with 'asides' to the 'audience'.

4.2   The performance of a story

Richard enters, centre stage.

Richard: *When I was invited to share in this research, I gladly did so in the hope that the mistakes, and pitfalls that I had to go through, will be used in terms of assisting other people. As I understand that the church wants to be involved in building up families that are being torn down by the irrationality of alcohol, and other drugs. I hoped that my experiences will help us notice the 'little nuances' that are there when you are in the sort of trouble that I was in.*

He goes on to speak about the 'frustration' he experienced as a man without employment, and the need to turn to something that would 'help' him. He speaks about the effects of his drinking, and the effects of 'blind rage' as he came to name it in our therapeutic conversation and 'laughing water' (alcohol) had on him, and the fact that it took him into a 'deep pit, the deep hole of not caring'. This 'not caring' meant not caring for himself, his family, his church and wider family. This finally led to the 'accident', the effects of 'blind rage' allied with 'laughing water'. He tells how he went berserk and drove his car at his wife, missing her, but hitting his young son. The consequence is prison.

Richard: *My time in prison was time to reckon with myself, and ask myself - what am I doing here? And I came to the sense that it had been orchestrated by me – myself. When I was in prison, first, I had the opportunity of listening to myself and talking to myself. Second, I had the opportunity to read the Bible, not just as a book, but with deeper understanding, that there is someone out there who is ready to assist those who are oppressed. Thirdly was the fact that I had to come out of prison a better person. I needed to go back a little bit in my life, and find out what has happened in my life before I went to prison. I was responsible "110%" for being there.*

Carrying full responsibility seems such a harsh life sentence to walk alone, analysing his past. And, here I am listening to him finding his way to awareness, and that my pastoral care in visiting him, and our therapeutic conversations had helped in that process. They included an invitation to accountability (Jenkins 1990:59) that I spoke of in an earlier chapter, inviting him to address his violence, the negative restraints of discourse in his life and inviting him to take new action.

Richard: *If you are to pick yourself up, you need people who seek to visit you, not blaming, but seeking to understand.*

So how did he find people who could visit and understand? I listen to him speak, and remember the role that the narrative approach to therapy played in the process, inviting him to take responsibility for his abuse used by Alan Jenkins. (Jenkins 1990:64). In his own words he seems to have been helped in his telling through the externalising of the problems for himself, and naming it as 'blind rage and 'laughing water'. I remember helping him name those qualities that he wanted in his marriage, and finding in his life experiences, qualities such as 'tolerance', 'courage', 'resourcefulness' and 'adaptability', and discovering another, life-giving narrative in his life with these qualities that others in his life would not have been surprised by - like his grandmother and former headmaster. Jenkins places great importance on the qualities that a man desires in his married life before focusing on the effects of abuse (Jenkins 1990:69). In this way it scaffolds an alternate identity for a man. How important it is in pastoral care to ask relevant questions that open space for him on this 'stage' - these were qualities that he used in the hardships of prison life, but also as he now faces the challenging realities that follow his release. Above all, I hear the acknowledgement of that "110%" responsibility for his actions.

Richard: *As I said at the beginning there are 'little nuances' that one can look at when a person is frustrated. The one is joblessness. This is very high in the country. The other is the role that the church can play in that there are many households that are 80%-90% dependent on women, and some of us as males do not want to accept that. Because my wife is earning much more than I am doing, 'they' would think that I am a failure. And then they would down themselves in unreasonableness and drinking.*

Does this mean that men's non-acceptance might be a denial, or frustration? It seems to be such a viscous circle and so many spaces and gaps and needs within the church. He seems to speak men's non-acceptance as a denial of the loss of power and control in their relationship, which is an important part of the patriarchal discourse. As I think about Richard's statement, I see also the constitutive societal 'gaze' of culture in that 'they' construct what is acceptable and 'normal'. A man must be the 'head' and provide for his family, and in a position power and control. To not be able to do this is to be 'abnormal' and a failure. Who might 'they' be? I think of the peer pressure, and competition of other men, who in their banter maintain this power discourse in the face of which 'powerful' men are 'powerless'. Hence, the 'perpetrator' is at the same time the 'victim'. A man is restrained by the negative constitutive patriarchal understanding of himself and his role in the family. These negative effects of patriarchy restrain attitudes of respect, love and care. And so, my curiosity created a question concerning the origins of what he calls this frustration.

Richard: *You know, it's sort of a viscous circle. You are frustrated because you don't find employment. Or because you are not able to do certain things in your house, and at the same time, the frustration leads you not to be able to do certain things for your family. You are also feeling guilty about not being ready to be employed.*

The others in the group listening intently to his story until Sindile wants to know more about his inability to support his family.

Richard: *Yaaa …I would say that one of the most frustrating things is to look at the family, and see that I am supposed to be doing 'xyz' and I am not able to be doing it. And then you end up saying, "OK! How can I stop thinking about this constantly?", and you go out and find yourself a beer, and then it's another beer….and another beer, and all that. And, when you wake the next day, the situation is the same, or even worse".*

In Richard's words, frustration seems to team up with self-anger that comes from being made doubly powerless and ineffective by a discourse that as a man he must be in control, in power and provide and protect. I wonder whether it is not through the

'self-intoxication' by cultural patriarchal discourse, and in an attempt to re-establish control and regain his entitlements that a man abuses a woman. Alcohol merely blurs judgement. Lynn joins the conversation by asking about his experience in Correctional Services, and how it connects to unemployment and frustration.

Richard: *I have accepted the fact that if I am to look at problems realistically, one needs to be sober-minded. And, I am not going to touch alcohol that is the first decision I made.*

He goes on to talk about a greater readiness to listen to and be tolerant of other people and their problems that they are causing him. Into this I insert a question about this 'thing', that Richard calls 'frustration'. The question seems to take him back in his story to when his parents left South Africa for exile and he was left to care for his brother and sister. The question seems to have its own trajectory, going backwards and forwards in his own life, linking moments and times that he connects as significant to his life, concerning his role of being the 'provider', and what this meant and means to him.

Richard: *This is one of the causes of frustration not only in me, but in many African men. If things have not been done 'by me', or 'my financial strength', I would not feel happy about that …I was young when my parents went into exile, and at that age you have a tendency of growing very early, and maybe the influence of that time is carrying on, because if things are not done by me or my financial strength, I would not feel happy about them. Maybe as an African person, as an African man you must look after your family.*

As I wondered before in this research, I wondered again, how men as the 'powerful' are also the 'powerless' in South Africa's shifting political, social and economic times. In this way, as a team we build on his knowledge of how he managed to overcome these obstacles. I continue to wonder out loud to Richard about the effects of unemployment on a man when his wife is earning, and the reversal of 'providing' roles, and what it did to him.

Richard: *You worry that you cannot do things for the house; you cannot pay school fees; buy the children's food. You must know where the money comes from, as a man you are responsible for everything in the house…to eat without knowing where the food comes from. For the African man, it is even worse than hunger…. You will feel so guilty that you won't eat the food! This plays a big role in demeaning or down playing the role of the man in the house.*

So then, what is the role that he can play in his family? How might he find enough structure to fit a new identity? What role can the Church play in supporting such a different structure?

Richard: *He is the head of the house, and the sole provider. If there is a new pair of shoes bought, he must know where the money comes from.*

An echo of African solidarity and agreement comes from Sindile who says that the man must provide with a great nod of his body. It is as if Richard, within a small group, is finding an embryonic structure for him to live differently with himself. Not as someone conscripted into a predetermined role, but as someone who lives in a responsible relationship with his family and society. I think of my own role as a male, and his yoke that has prescribed that he be the sole provider, material provider and a soul provider. Who decides if this is a man or woman's role, and how has it been socially constructed in such a way? This construction is changing; his wife is the main bread winner, prison has altered his perceptions, and conversations with myself and the group are constituting him in a different role, as well as his understanding of his faith position upheld in his reading of scripture.   How has his understanding of his role as a man in the family changed during his time in prison, his relationship with his wife?

Richard: *My relationship* (with my wife) *has changed in the way I look at it, and the way that I behave at home. I look at my wife's strength as a blessing … not as a pointer to my failure. I read the Bible a lot with a deeper understanding of myself and my role in the family which I was not fulfilling through your help* (My therapeutic conversations). *Now, I have to fulfil my role as a father, a motivator and as a support to my wife. Because she is supporting me, I need to support her as well. I think if we*

change the perception of men in terms of their relationships in the family scenario and men as husbands, I think we would have done a very big thing.

In the words 'a deeper understanding' of himself and his role in the family, I see a shifting to a new understanding of the need to receive and give emotional care and support, and a new reading of patriarchy within the texts he selects in order to make sense of the new ordering in the family. It speaks of mutual care, and inclusivity of women's experience and understanding. This new understanding, the fruit of experience, is supported in the conversation that follows, corroborated by Lynn's continued curiosity about his changing understanding and its affects on him and his family.

Richard: *I think for her...whatever problem she has, she can come to me, even if it is financial one, by coming to me, by sharing it, voicing it out to me. I believe that men have a bigger role of being supportive to their wives and children. We often see our roles as antagonist partners, but we need to be supporting one another. Then will have better relationships.*

Sindile in another act of solidarity and care draws near and exposes some thoughts concerning his wife's perception of him as the man in the house before his rage induced crime, suggesting and asking about experiences of disrespect, and being demeaned because he could not provide. This allows multiple and contradictory descriptions of him as a man, avoiding any label that casts him away as unacceptable.

Richard: *Sindile, my wife ... has never demeaned me. She has always respected me…… the whole problem was with me, more than it was with her. She shouted at me like any women would, if her husband was drunk, and he was driving his car. She never made me feel small, the problem was with me! The heart of the matter is that you will never improve until you admit where you have gone wrong.*

Richard moves on to speak about the necessity for change in his life during the time in prison, It is an act of genuine interest where Richard, as the author of his own life and accountability, is woven into his skills, qualities and abilities that can be harnessed for

the future. We are curious to know in what ways he was able to influence the people around him in prison?

Richard: *In the fourth or fifth month I was moved to the school as one the teachers there. All the people were interviewed by me and I told them what was expected of them. I also changed the code of dress in the school. As role models I asked the teachers to dress cleanly in the presence of their students. Fellow prisoners in my cell block would come to me for advice, and I advised and challenged them in different areas of their lives. In a way I was a change agent.*

It is as if his own value and agency is beginning to build itself into an alternative identity of himself as a respected member of the prison community, who is beginning to find a life-giving identity within a new and unusual narrative in which he is needed by other men in need, thus challenging another dominant story of helplessness. These asides continue to thicken an alternate version of himself performed within our own witnessing group. It makes me wonder what role Richard might play as a 'change agent' as a consultant, as a result of his experience, in pastoral care with men in the Diocese. Lynn seems so absorbed within the performance of Richard as a man who had escaped the clutches of alcohol that she asks him about his naming of the problem.

Richard: *Alcohol had to 'sweat it out' in prison. I had to face the reality ……and see my life as solution and not as problem.*

It is as if in order to consolidate his new identity, Richard revisits his role as protector and provider, and reorders it in relation to alcohol, unemployment and control. He focuses on his own lack of control through taking control, and being unreasonable and abusive. His own inner dialogue was languaged as he talked of this false control. We enter this dialogue, thickening his preferred story and asking what he is now doing differently, seeking his knowledge in this matter.

Richard: *That is one difficult question that you are making! Men need to respect their houses in terms of their wives and children. And they must see themselves as a unit. To ill-treat the child is to ill-treat the wife, to ill-treat the wife is to ill-treat the child.*

If you break things in the house, you are also breaking the people in the house. We need to bring back respect. It will bring back a sense of being a part of the whole, which is a family. And if we break ourselves (as men), we break our families. It so easy to disassociate yourself from your family and when you do that - it is easy to get angry, it is easy to beat them, it is easy to go out and drink, because you disassociate yourself from that unit. If you can come back and be part of the family it makes you as the family whole, it makes you as the father holistic.

The team listens intently, giving respect and space to the impact of his words. We repeat words like "holistic" and "respectful", and think about how these words constitute such a different reality when added to his previous male identity. On there own 'head', 'protector' and 'provider' seem to have no accountability to the 'other' They become distant and aggressive to their wives, and aggression is not necessarily physical as Sindile so rightly points out, for the 'head' can also be absent unavailable, while being present in the fear and control he evokes in his family. Is it to these places that men might go, whether you call it 'shebeen', 'bar' or 'kroeg', when for different reasons they feel powerless to be self-intoxicated not by liquor, but the negative patriarchal understandings of other men as they escalate their own self-righteous thinking, feelings of blame towards their partners and self-justification for abuse? Out of this reflection Lynn, forever practical, is curious about the problems that lurk behind abuse.

Richard: *One can go beyond alcohol, and say that this is the problem that I had – I could not address the problem of not being able to provide, and I am going to address this one. I am going to look to look for a job, and not hide behind alcohol.*

In these words I see Richard 'trapped' by language …. powerless in the face of the negative constitutive effects of a cultural, patriarchal discourse. It is discourse that has no words for an aspect of Richard's life experience so that he cannot voice it, and the resultant pain that it causes. Is it in discourse that so many men feel entrapped in our rapidly changing political, social and economic life in South Africa? What place does the narrative approach to therapy, of helping a man to tell his story, externalise 'entrapment' in its context in pastoral care with men? The team reflects on Richard's vulnerability, suggesting that it puts him in a very powerful position. Lynn suggests

that in the telling of his story there is a subversiveness that will cause other men to do the same, and enable pastoral care with men.

Richard: *I could tell them that I have learnt the 'hard' way, but I can help them to learn the 'soft' way.*

(In Richard's words there is a passion that can be used for pastoral care in the Diocese! Reflecting on Richard's vulnerability, the team moves on to reflect on the expression of emotion by men, and on the fear of being anything other than masculine. Hubby says that when you are a man and you want to show emotion, you are not permitted. Richard in solidarity with Hubby acknowledges that patriarchal gaze.)

Richard: *They say, "Get your act together!"*

Is patriarchal discourse is so strong that there are experiences and feelings that a man is not permitted to talk about or express? To be vulnerable as a man is not possible. It is languaged out! Richard then speaks of 'another person' that he has come to know.

Richard: *When I pray there is another person there and I need to get in touch with that other person. You need to get in touch with yourself first, and then after getting in touch with yourself .... Then you can understand the circumstances in which you find yourself. It is then that you feel empowered ... whatever problem is there. There is another person who is in me and there is another person helping me get through this.*

I wonder whether in prayer Richard has become aware of that 'other person' that language has denied. It is as if prayer allows him to go beyond the boundaries of language. I wonder if he is saying, "a knowledge and acceptance of all aspects of myself, 'masculine' and 'other', and a knowledge of God is vital for my growth as a man."? The team then wonders whether there should be workshops/weekend experiences for men, giving them space to tell their stories.

.Richard: *If we were to call it 'Men Alive!' Men would say, "They are taking about to other men and I might be included in that. If I do as those men do, maybe I should go and find what they are doing, and I am not doing." We want to give men space say out the things that are troubling them.*

This is where the Church has got to be in its pastoral care with men, giving them space, and subverting and challenging the negative aspects of patriarchal discourse. Because these understandings were created by a very different culture, and South Africa has changed and is changing for men of all cultures in South Africa, and we need to look at them anew to ensure that they don't have in them the whispers of death. Is this 'doing theology', which is incarnational, prophetic, collaborative, passionate and subversive?

4.3   Richard tells his story in Kathlehong and congregational response

Once again, conscious of the fluidity of this kind of research, as I said earlier, there was another surprise. Shortly after Richard told his story, Sindile came to me and asked whether Richard might like to tell his story again on Father's Day at the Church of St. Peter's Chains, Kathlehong. We consulted with Richard, and we thought that it would be good to conclude the research work with that. This was an unexpected and spontaneous response. We decided that we would ask certain members of the congregation to respond to Richard's talk, and so I hurriedly completed a response form that would attempt to capture something of the meaning that emerged from the telling of his story. This would be given to the congregation for comment.

We reflected together as a group on the response forms, again positioning ourselves not as the expert interpreters of these texts, but as co-constructers together with Richard on some of the meanings attached to what was written. At the beginning of the session to reflect on the response forms, I asked Richard what the time had meant for him. He responded by saying that he was surprised at the number that he had to talk to. He thought that it would be about thirty or forty. He said it was forty … times ten! He said that he had spoken to the young person who had taken him home after the service, and Richard spoke of genuine need "specifically for young guys, who are new in marriage…how they can be effective in their homes as fathers…to see their wives not just as partners, but as fellow human beings." He went on to say that, once again,

58

he was aware of the need to create a forum to discuss men's 'health and problems'. He said that there is a necessity for this kind of forum for men "…from stopping other guys from drowning in that very same dam that I drowned in".

I asked Sindile, as the Rector of the Parish, about the response. He said that it had been "quite overwhelming". He then said, "It was interesting to see a man talking about his pain, and sharing his emotions. It was not just a story. There was pain and emotions. That was very interesting because men are divorced from their emotions".

We then went thorough the responses question by question looking for the common themes. The questions asked were:

(1) Was Richard's telling of his story for you a meaningful experience?
(2) If so, in what way?
(3) Was it not meaningful?
(4) If so, in what way?
(5) Do you think that other men are experiencing life in similar ways to Richard?
(6) How do you think that the church could pastorally care for men as they seek to live out their lives in family life?
(7) Any other comments/suggestions.

The answer to the first question was a unanimous '*Yes*'.

In response to the second question, one person wrote, '*I learned that in everything I do, I must involve my family, and seek their help. It is never too late to change from what you are doing.*' This person had, like some others, internalised what Richard had to say. Another person wrote, '*It was done in a way for ordinary people to understand and also to relate to.*' In this we saw the importance of the story, through which people are able to connect in their own experience, and the importance of story telling in this kind of collaborative pastoral care. In the responses most saw alcohol as the problem, and they did not appear to hear it as a symptom of Richard's powerlessness in the face of unemployment and more particularly patriarchy. I wondered if they were ignoring, did not have language for it, or were not 'permitted' to see it as that, by patriarchal discourse. Or, would they lose 'face' by admitting such a 'weakness'.

59

Questions three and four had no response.

In response to question five, there was the recognition that other men are confronted with similar situations to Richard, and are having similar difficulties, if not to the same extent. In the light of this, we looked at the question of how men might care for one another.

In response to question six there was a call for participatory care expressed in words like *'support groups'*, *'workshops'*, *'have a programme of discussion groups around a man's role in family life'*, *'have a professional come twice a year to address the subject'*, and *'let the church be a place with other men to face up to their responsibilities'*, We saw in these words an expression of need , and a call for places where men can collaborate with one another to create new understandings, and new life.

The responses to question seven had similar ideas to what was said for previous questions.

4.4   Subversive murmurs of life-giving praxis

Arising from our reflection around patriarchy, Richard's performance and his story telling in Kathlehong we saw the need to create 'sacred spaces' for men to tell their stories, to reflect on the negative effects of patriarchy and other issues that affect them in as close near language as possible. Through contextually connecting with men in this way a great concern emerged, and was expressed for the care of the 'new' husbands and fathers. We felt that any initiative in pastoral care with men should not be elitist, but should be planned in such way that the context should be a primary concern. Using context in this way it becomes a grass-roots theology grown from local knowledges from the bottom up. A man from urban Edenvale, Tsakane or rural Daggakraal should feel equally at home in a group, and tell his story. The research team felt that the groups need to be grounded in the telling of stories rather than theological or any other kind of theory. This got us thinking about the ways that current men's groups in the Diocese maybe unconsciously reinforcing negative patriarchal views, and we spoke of the need to invite them to be involved in any

initiative for pastoral care. We also decided that the dissertation itself should be the document for theological reflection, and that after that a group bigger than the dissertation group should look at the practical aspect of taking it out into the Diocese.[4]

---

[4] At a meeting with Bishop David Beetge it was decided that I should make a presentation on this research to the Diocesan Board of Theological Education and Reflection at its November meeting.

CHAPTER FIVE: TOWARDS A LIFE-GIVING SUBVERSIVE INTERVENTION FOR PASTORAL CARE WITH MEN

5.1 Initial reflections on the process

Having been passionately engaged with Richard's grounded text and its performance, as well as those of the group members, as set out in the first chapter, there is a need now for a 'distancing' from the text to create balance (Mouton 2001:52), to enable further reflection, and seek ways to respond in life-giving praxis. My initial 'moment of insertion' was my therapeutic conversations with Richard (Cochrane et al 1991:17). The participative action research process with the group was a continuation of that research and theological reflection that I began with Richard. It was 'an attempt to understand the experiences that arise in 'moments of insertion' (Cochrane et al 1991:18) as we reflected around patriarchy and its effects in our ecclesial and social context. This participative process was a situation that I found difficult as a male senior priest who is used to being 'head' and in control, as I journeyed with the group and my supervisor in this issue of complexity. But paradoxically it was that 'being out of control' that permitted texts, understandings to be voiced, or performed out of our contexts of experience. It was that lack of control, participation and fluidity that enabled us to make the change of not interviewing a number of women affected by abuse, when we discovered that the research would become too complex for a dissertation of limited scope. It is this flexability to real life situations that is an important part of the participative process, as we respond to be listening and sensitive to the grounded experience of context (McTaggart 1997:27)

More importantly, it was also that freedom that gave us those 'kairos moments'. They were unexpected 'gifts' from God that came to us when we were out of control, and we were surprised by joy. The first was Richard's decision to tell his story. Through the gaps made by that lack of control came, in Bruner's terms, Richard's 'expression' or 'performed text', as he sought to interpret his own experience in expressive form, and as we collaborated in that interpretive, reflective performance (Bruner 1986:11). The second 'kairos moment' came to us was when Sindile asked if Richard would tell his story in Kathlehong. This 'gift' brought a new direction, dimension, to the research and empowered us all. For the church community in Kathlehong, it was a significant event as Richard, vulnerable and with emotion, told his story of frustration,

alcohol and 'blind rage', his time in prison and his 110% responsibility. In the written responses that came from the congregation, as we reflected on them, we heard in the text an urgent call for pastoral care with men. For me, this was a further exploratory and small 'moment of insertion' into the experience of men in the church and society as members of the congregation collaborated with us to seek ways of caring with men. These kairos moments seem to aid in the loosing of the bonds that restrained Richard from living a life of greater fullness and meaning, and these moments were all performed and held within a communal understanding of what it means to be a man.

5.2 A call for life-giving space

The origins of this subversive text and its performance began in little room or space behind a class room in a Correctional Services facility. It was a 'space' where, like Elijah on Horeb (1 Kings 19), a story of pain was told, and which became the space for an alternative story of life-giving meaning and empowerment. It is that same little space or room that is called for by Richard when he said, 'The Church needs to create *safe places* for men to discuss their issues.' It is a call that the research group echoes in this text to make possible the beginning of a similar transformation with, and in other men. It is a call that is heard again in the response of the Kathlehong congregation. It is described as 'workshop', 'discussion group, 'support group and 'spirituality group'. But, to foreground Richard's words as an expert, it needs to be a 'safe space' where a man can be protected from the 'gaze' of dominant discourses, particularly patriarchy and judgement, and he can language his life experience, even those experiences that do not conform to dominant patriarchal understandings. It is this in this kind of sacred, safe context that Richard's 'little nuances' are permitted to be voiced and that can lead to the transformation of lives.

5.3 A call for collaborative care

Within that safe space there is the understanding that it needs to be *with* other men as they tell and share their often painful stories. It needs to be a place of mutual care as burdens are shared (Gal.6:2). It is in that grounded telling/sharing that commonalities of experience and alternative life-giving texts of understanding, such as the narrative of Maureen's grandfather, are unearthed, and that begin to challenge dominant patriarchal understanding and their effects on men. It is this kind of subversion that has been a part of Maureen's family life, and which Richard calls for when he says,

'Men would say, "They are talking about to other men and I might be included in that. If I do as those men do, maybe I should go and find what they are doing, and I am not doing".' It is in these sacred, safe spaces that in the creation of new understandings amongst men, there can be scripted subversive performances for day-to-day living to challenge the negative effects of patriarchal discourse. It is a grounded, ascending, life-giving insurrection of understanding as Foucault would describe it (Foucault 1980:81).

5.4   A place of solidarity, care and invitation

As we listened to Richard's performance as victim/perpetrator, moved and appalled, hearing the issue of gender from another perspective, we move to a position of caring solidarity. This was shown in the resonating comments made by the men and women in the group, and curious respectful questions asked by all. In this there is the recognition of the need to take a position with people who are in need and suffering, but ethically this position also means a commitment to transformation. This means transformation of those suffering, and positioning oneself against the negative effects of dominant discourse, and in this case patriarchy (Kotzé & Kotzé 2001:3).

It is in those respectful, curious questions that we sought to understand without judging that enabled Richard, as he said of his prison experience, and later in the group, to re-understand his life-story, re-interpret, enrich and begin to perform it anew. It was those questions, which I had asked following Jenkins'(1990) and White and Epston's (1990) narrative approach to therapy, that had invited him to take responsibility for his violent abuse and drinking. They had given him distance and agency to examine and challenge the patriarchal 'restraints' in his life, and invite him to plan new ways of caring.

It is an invitation to move away from a role of patriarchal entitlement to one of mutual respect and caring. I believe that this approach needs to be a vital component of any initiative of pastoral care with men, whether in groups or in one-to-one situations. It is an approach that does not patronise from a position of knowledge and therefore power. It comes alongside in solidarity and care asking 'not knowing' questions, in a 'participatory consciousness' as Heshusius (1994:17) describes it. For Heshusius, we do not come to knowledge by separateness and objective observation,

but by love and care in our 'self-other' relationships. In this, we love our neighbour as ourselves - doing theology, doing spirituality - and are transforming, and being transformed in our relationship with others. This makes it not pastoral care *for* men, from a position of knowledge and power, but *with* men like Richard and others, as they from their experience are subversively, the experts. We as theologians and therapists, in 'decentred' solidarity and care, participate with them in the transformation of their lives.

5.5   A place of life-giving subversion
5.5.1 A need to subvert patriarchal masculinity
I stated previously in my research curiosity and aims that my purpose has been to explore the negative effects of patriarchy and entitlement, recognising that patriarchal structures in themselves are not bad, but as with any platform of entitlement it is open to abuse.

In Richard's 'call' as a young boy to be 'head', 'protector', 'provider', 'self-contained', 'invulnerable' and 'unemotional' as a man; with Sindile's agreement and in my own upbringing, I saw the patriarchal social construction of our lives in language (Kotzé & Kotzé 1997:4). I saw also men languaged into Derrida's binary opposites of male/female that clearly define men and women identities and roles. I saw also the anxiety of being anything other than what men are stereotypically languaged to be. Within Richard's life narrative there are also 'vulnerability', 'emotionality' and 'nurturing' that have been languaged out of his life by discourse, as belonging to the binary opposite These have now been recovered through the telling of his story and have been part of his transformation. Maybe it was that 'other man' that he met in prayer. Therefore there needs to be space to take apart or deconstruct patriarchal language that constructs men, abandoning those aspects that are not life-giving, and foregrounding experiences and new, life-giving understandings that transform what it means to be masculine.

5.5.2 A need to subvert the hierarchy of patriarchal dualism
"Now, I have to fulfil my role as a father, a motivator and as a support to my wife. Because she is supporting me, I need to support her as well. I think if we change the perception of men in terms of their relationships in the family scenario and men as

husbands, I think we would have done a very big thing." In these words of Richard is the recognition of the need for a greater mutuality and fluidity or 'free play' in the terms of roles in their relationship (Powell 1997:29). This is also the acknowledgment of the need to deconstruct languaged patriarchal, cultural binary assumptions that assume that male is superior and therefore that man is head, protector and provider, and that female is inferior is supporter and nurturer. It is our containment in the language of binary opposites, and our failure to see liberative consequences of Derrida's understanding of 'erasure': to say what something is also to say what it is not, that contains us in restrictive relationships. Equally, it is the recognition of the 'freeplay' within constitutive binary assumptions that in turn creates a greater 'freeplay' in our lived relationships in terms of mutual care and roles within marriage. It is these exclusive, opposite hierarchical understandings of roles that have lead men to abuse either from positions of power, but also as result of powerlessness, as was the case with Richard. In his words, 'To help men understand the influence/power of culture, and the assumptions that are constituting them, and their relationships.' Richard is calling for space to understand these assumptions that are negatively affecting their lives

5.5.3 A need to implode the separating wall of partition in male cultures

Arising out of this research is also the profound awareness through our shared reflection and my self-reflection, that patriarchal culture and its accompanying discourse of entitlement is not confined to one culture in South Africa or period of history.

In this research, as we deconstructed/constructed 'around' the word patriarchy in the first part of chapter three and in Richard's following 'performance' we were able to implode some of those dividing walls of assumption that created a division between stereotyped black and white patriarchal cultures as we found commonalties of understanding. In this process we saw beyond the binary opposites spoken of in chapter two of 'black/white' that creates an 'us/them' understandings of human experience, creating great value for the one as opposed to the other. Like looking at the picture of the young woman/old woman (See appendix C) , to see the one without the other is not to see the picture, the gaze has to skip from the one to the other

finding difference and commonality to really see, and hold the picture together. We saw the diversity, but also the commonalties that are a part of diversity.

We saw commonalities in our black and white cultures in terms of our understanding of head, provider and protector. We recognised the development of a common violent masculinity in South African history through the mines and both sides of the liberation struggle. More than that, Richard and I saw the similarities in therapeutic conversations that laid the foundation for this work spoken of in chapter one. In this there are exciting possibilities for groups of men of different cultural backgrounds to come together to tell and hear one another's stories and at the same time whilst recognising the importance of culture, supporting one another to find new understandings and challenging the negative effects of patriarchal discourse *within* our different cultures. It also means within our uniting discourse of faith, creating of one of care with men.

5.6 A place of life-giving insurrection

In Richard's life story and its performance we saw, as Foucault would say, the normalising effects of patriarchal discourse (Fillingham 1993:16). It was discourse that became an integral part of his life when his parents went into exile, and he, as the eldest son, assumed the role of head, provider and protector in his early years in Port Elizabeth. He self-subjugated himself to it as he lived under its cultural gaze in the wider family, his peers and society, and lived it out in his relationships as it constituted and empowered him. But that self-same discourse has entrapped and disempowered him and other men in the past, but also as South African society has changed and continues to change politically, socially and economically. As the hoped-for entitlements of many have not been fulfilled in the new post-Apartheid dispensation through unemployment and poverty, and as the entitlements of others have been rightly foregrounded such as women, many men have become confused threatened, and 'doubly disempowered' by patriarchal discourse in culture. This discourse has been upheld by alliance with the religious discourse of the church and other patriarchal religions.

Hence, Richard's performed words,

>"There is feeling out there that everything is against men…the church and politics. All the laws are for women. The Church needs to create safe places for men to discuss their issues. To help men reflect on rapid industrialisation /urbanisation/ globalisation. To help men understand the influence/power of culture, and the assumptions that are constituting them and their relationships."

In his words, "To help men reflect on rapid industrialisation /urbanisation/ globalisation." there is a resonance with the words of Reid and Walker (2005:1) in the introductory chapter. Men need to be helped to reflect on the rapid social, political changes that are occurring in our South African context. They need to be enabled to look with a 'hermeneutic of suspicion' at the cultural and religious discourses that constitute them and whose negative effects entrap them. It is important that if the church is be faithful to Jesus' following of the Mosaic tradition of prophecy, the 'liberatory trajectory' spoken of by Brueggemann (1983:304), it needs to be faithful to that call as an agent of liberation in its own life and our society. It needs to be a seemingly small but 'salty' agent of change as it seeks to externalise, deconstruct and challenge the abusive effects of patriarchal discourse, and so that the truth can set men *and* women free in our society. Liberation theologian Archbishop Tutu once said, "Because freedom is indivisible … our concern for black freedom was also, at the same time, concern for the freedom and liberation of white people."(Tutu 2007). It is vital that it is equally true of the gender issue. We cannot talk about the liberation of women without also talking about the liberation of men. We are in danger in our society of so focusing on the gender issues around women, that we lose sight of men. We shift from gazing at the hag (patriarchy) in a 'centred' way to the beautiful woman (women's liberation), and once again we have moved to a position of instability as Derrida would remind us, and we are not seeing the full picture, of both faces and what is elusively important in between.   As I said in the first chapter, this is a participative exploration in pastoral care so that men *and* women may benefit. It is in these spaces that new life-giving understandings can be unearthed out the text of human experience, the text of Scripture that can challenge and reconstruct our understandings of patriarchy. In these spaces that there can be planted the mustard seeds of a passionate insurrection of new/marginalised understanding of what it means to be a man in our church and society.

As I have said, pastoral care has social and political consequences as we care with people (Pattison 1993:86). I am aware that when men begin to live out, or perform new understandings of what it means for them to be a man, it has social consequences, as it did for Richard's family. Therefore this work of pastoral care cannot be seen in isolation. It must be seen as an integral part of the liberative pastoral care of the church in its care for individuals, families and the wider community. I am also aware that to live out new understandings of what it means to be a man in alternative life-giving behaviour in highly patriarchal cultures immediately constitutes a challenge to that power/knowledge or discourse, and therefore it is important that there is within that space mutual support and care. As Foucault would remind us it in the 'extremities' of society in the home, at work, in church and the local community that the exercise of power is least concealed and it there that new and marginalised understandings begin their insurrection against dominant global 'truths'(Foucault 1980:97).

5.7 A call for critical reflection on theology discourse

In the group there was a call for critical reflection on our theological discourse, and it is crucial that there needs also be a readiness to challenge the negative aspects of patriarchal theological discourse in the life of the church and the practices that support it. Firstly, as I said earlier, we saw the need to reinterpret scripture in new and liberative ways as this has been an instrument by which women have been oppressed in the life of the church. We saw the importance of reflection in church groups on texts like those highlighted in Trible's book, 'Texts of Terror'(1984) that highlights marginalised, or unvoiced narratives in Scripture. Secondly, we felt the urgent need to examine our theological language and create greater inclusivity in terms of the words to describe God so that patriarchal theological language is 'decentred' and other experiences of God are given expression in our reflection and worship.

It is of cardinal importance that those in leadership in the life of the Church begin to reflect critically with an 'hermeneutic of suspicion' on their theology and contexts with members of their congregations, because this has consequences for preaching, liturgy, the kind of pastoral care that is spoken of this research and other aspects of church life at the local level. It is in groups, as men and women of experience-knowledge engage with those with theological theory-knowledge, that the work of

theology is begun, which in turn leads to individual and social transformation (West 1994:17) when it is done! It is this that we were doing as a research group of clergy and laity, reflecting on Richard's experience, the importance of Scripture for him in that, and its implications for our doing theology, doing spirituality in transformative way for men and women in our South African context.

5.8 A place of spiritual formation and empowerment

In his time in prison, Richard's prayers were a sustaining and empowering part of his life. It is voiced in these words,

> "When I pray there is another person there, and I need to get in touch with that other person. You need to get in touch with yourself first, and then after getting in touch with yourself …. Then you can understand the circumstances in which you find yourself. It is then that you feel empowered … whatever problem is there. There is another person who is in me and there is another person helping me get through this."

For Richard, prayer became a journey into self knowledge, confronting the reality of his violence, but also getting in touch with other God-given aspects of himself as a person. As I said earlier, in prayer Richard has become aware of that 'other person' that language has denied. It is as if prayer allows him to go beyond the boundaries of language, and to get in touch with those experiences and qualities in himself that have been socially constructed into what is 'other' and therefore to be 'distanced from', or marginalised by patriarchal discouse. But these are life-giving parts of who he is as a man and human being, and need to be embraced. It is also that, and 'another Person' who has been the source of that spiritual empowerment and brought him through to where he is today with his family. As Richard says, "It makes you an even bigger man!"

Spiritual formation and empowerment was also an important part of that space that we created in the little storeroom behind the classroom prison and our therapeutic conversation, and it was there in our work as a research group. Prayer and meditation, scripture and the sacraments have been an integral part of my formation and empowerment as I have done this work, as well as for Richard and his family in the

worshipping life of the Cathedral. It is our commitment to Christ that has brought us together. It is also through these God-given resources that we have received the vision and grace that has enabled us to do this exploratory research work of care. More than that, there is passion to see this continue in the life of the church.

Arising from Richard's experience, and that of the group, there is a deep conviction that if we are to create spaces for men to tell their stories in whatever form that may take in the different contexts of our Diocese, that prayer and teaching spirituality should be a vital part of that. It is so that those qualities in men entrapped by discourse can be can be touched, embraced, and men in their spiritual formation can be empowered to become the human beings that God desires them to be in their relationships with others. As I said earlier it needs to be a place of solidarity and empathic listening because it is at that place that men are vulnerable.

5.9 A place of risk and hope

As I continued to reflect on the section, 'a place of life-giving insurrection and challenge', I became aware that it is also a place of 'risk'. We risk as we tell our stories from our different perspective for our views may only be partial in society of different cultures. We risk as we voice what has been unspoken and 'other', as Richard has done. We risk as we seek to live out in our day-to-day living new understandings of what it means to be men and husbands in a highly patriarchal community. We risk as we challenge and subvert patriarchal discourse. Finally, we risk because the commitment and passion required to engage with patriarchal discourse could make considerable demands. Ackermann says,

> Justice is at the core of a spirituality of risk. The work of healing and the search for wholeness begins with the search for justice, itself a risky enterprise.

> (Ackermann1994: 208)

If we believe in a God of justice and compassion whose eternal Reign was inaugurated in the Christ and his will is healing and wholeness for humanity, then as collaborators with him in that Reign, we need to risk in order that men and women may find that liberation that is his will for their lives. For risk is at the very heart of our faith in the person of Jesus Christ.

Equally, to the extent to which we struggle in hope with others in caring solidarity for the justice, healing and wholeness out of a belief and trust in a God of righteousness and compassion, we will evoke hope in others, despite the realities of abuse and oppression in society.

5.10 Conclusion

Throughout this participative process of pastoral care to explore the negative effects of patriarchal discourse that began with a 'moment of insertion' in a prison, we sought as a group to work within the 'pastoral circle' spoken of in chapter two. It was an ongoing circle of insertion, reflective analysis, planning and praxis. It was participative process that by its very fluid nature, as it was sustained by prayer, was open to new possibilities. It has been done out of a passionate commitment to God's Reign and the transformation of lives of men and women

In all this, space was made for the enrichment of Richard's story and life. In the solidarity of care within the group, as our consultant, he has been, through performances of his story, taken to a place of 'deeper understanding' of himself, his relationship to his wife and children, and responsibility. We saw how an alternative identity was built in prison as a respected leader, and how that continued to grow in the group. In the space provided for him we have seen the development of a passion to help other men who find themselves in a similar position to him. As he said, "I could tell them that I have learnt the 'hard' way, but I can help them to learn the 'soft' way." In that passion is an 'agent for change' as Lynn described him. It is that same passion that made him announce to the group towards the end of   the 'performance',

> "If we were to call it 'Men Alive!', men would say, "They are talking about to other men and I might be included in that. If I do as those men do, maybe I should go and find what they are doing, and I am not doing." We want to give men space say out the things that are troubling them."

In the words, 'Men Alive!' he has voiced what pastoral care with him has meant, and the passion with which he wants to continue this subversive, transformative care.

In this time together as a group, Richard was able to name and live out a quality that is considered 'other', or feminine, and therefore subversive to the patriarchal discourse, 'vulnerability'. This quality he 'lived out' in his sharing in the group as he told his awful, painful story with emotion, and as he told it in Kathlehong. It is a subversiveness that will encourage other men to do the same, and is vital quality in any initiative in pastoral care with men. I believe that that quality of vulnerability was there at the inauguration of the Reign of God in Jesus.

As I conclude this reach, I am conscious of its limitations. By the very nature of the kind of research that it is, as I have been very close to Richard's story for some time, there is the possibility of subjectivity and bias in my reflection and in my interpretation through lack of distance. In the purposive choice of those who have share with me in the project, there are other voices and perspectives that have been excluded and need to be heard. It is for this reason that I should now stand back from the text so that others in the life of the Diocese can read and reflect from their contexts of experience, its relevance for them for pastoral care with men. The differing pastoral context of the Diocese will have to reflect on how 'space' is made possible for men to tell their stories. It maybe the regular meeting of a men's group, or weekend 'experiences' as there are various possibilities, but this will require further commitment prayerful reflection with others to make that subversive, life-giving care with men possible.

This work of deconstructing and challenging the negative aspects of patriarchal discourse on men and therefore women, as well as reconstructing new understandings in our South African context, is still at its beginning. There are considerable challenges as the church addresses its care with men not only in society, but in the life of the church itself, as it colludes with the dominate discourse. On the other hand, commitment to Christ and justice, the resources of Scripture and Sacraments and the solidarity of care in the fellowship of the church are the resources we have been given for this transformative work. I end with the words of Neuger and Poling, who in text have collaborated with me on the issue of the care with men and patriarchy, from their American context. They wrote at the end of their book, 'The Care of Men',

We are on this journey together as people who give and need care with one another. And, as theologian Nelle Morton has powerfully said, it is the journey that is our home

<div align="right">(Neuger & Poling 1997:235)</div>

WORKS CONSULTED

Ackermann, D 1994. Faith and Feminism: Women doing Theology in De Gruchy, J W & Villa-Vicenzio, C (eds). *Doing Theology in Context. South African Perspectives,* 197-209. Cape Town: David Philip

---1996. Engaging Freedom: A contextual feminist theology of practice. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 94, 39-42.

Bons-Storm, R 1998. Dominant Practical Theology and Feminist Perspective, in Meyer-Wilmes, H, Troch, L & Bons-Storm, R (eds), *Feminist Perspectives in Pastoral Theology,* 7-17. Leuven: Peeters.

Bosch, D 1991. *Transforming Mission. Paradigm shifts on Theology of Mission.* New York: Orbis.

Brown, J C & Parker 1989. For God so loved the world? , in Brown, J C & Bohn, C R (eds). *Christianity. Patriarchy, and Abuse,* 1-30. Cleveland: Pilgrim Press.

Brueggemann, W 1983. Trajectories in Old Testament Literature and the Sociology of Ancient Israel, Gottwald, N K (ed) *The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics.* New York: Orbis.

---1993. *The Bible and Postmodern Imagination. Texts under Negotiation,* 1-108. London: SCM Press.

Bruner, E M 1986. Experience and its expressions, in Turner, V W & Brunner, E M (eds), *The Anthropology of Experience,* 3-29. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Burr, V 1995. *An Introduction to Social Constructionism,* 1-16. London: Routledge.

Cochrane, J R, de Gruchy, J & Petersen, R 1991. *In Word and in Deed. Towards a Practical Theology of Social Transformation.* Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publications.

Cochrane, J R 1994. Theology and Faith: Tradition, Criticism and Popular Religion, in De Gruchy, J W & Villa-Vicencio, C (eds), *Doing Theology in Context. South African Perspectives,* Vol 1, 26-35. Cape Town: David Philip.

De Gruchy, J W 1994. The Nature, Necessity and Task of Theology, in De Gruchy, J W & Villa-Vicencio, C (eds), *Doing Theology in Context. South African Perspectives,* Vol 1, 2-14. Cape Town: David Philip.

Derrida, J 1978. *Writing and Difference.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dissel, A & Ngubeni, K 2003. *Giving Women their Voice: Domestic Violence and Restorative Justice in South Africa* [Online]. Available:

Fillingham, F A 1993. *Foucault for Beginners.* New York: Writers and Readers Publishing Inc.

Foucault, M 1980. *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and other writings 1972-1977,* 78-108 ed by C Gordon

Gergen, K J 1985. The Social Constructionist Movement in Modern Psychology. *American Psychologist* 40, 226-275.

--- 1991. *The Saturated Self. Dilemmas of Identity in Contemporary Society.* San Francisco: Basic Books.

Flaskas, C & Humphreys, C 1993. Theorizing about Power: Intersecting the Ideas of Foucault with the "Problem" in Family Therapy. *Fam. Proc.* 32, 35-47.

Graham, E 1999. From "Terrible Silence" to "Transforming Hope" The Impact of Feminist Theory on Practical Theology. *IJPT* 3, 185-211.

Heshusius, L 1994 Freeing Ourselves from Objectivity: Managing Subjectivity or Turning Towards a Participatory Mode of Consciousness. Educational Researcher. 23. 15-22.

---1995. Listening to Children: "What could we possibly have in common?" From Concerns with Self to Participatory Consciousness. *Theory into Practice.* 34, 117-123.

Holland, J & Henriot, P 1984. *Social Analysis: Linking Faith and Justice.* New York: Orbis.

Jenkins, A 1990. *Invitations to Responsibility: The therapeutic engagement of men who are violent and abusive.* Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Kotzé, E & Kotzé, D 2001. Telling narratives, doing spirituality, in *Telling Narratives. Spellbound Edition,*1-14. Pretoria: Ethics Alive.

Koss, M P, Goodman, L A, Browne, E, Fitzgerald, L F, Keita, G P & Russo , N F 1994. Male Violence against Women at Home, at Work, and in the Community, in *American Psychological Association*, xvi. Washington D.C.

Lesenjane, D 2006. Fatherhood from an African cultural perspective, in Richter L Morrell, R (eds). *Baba. Men and fatherhood in South Africa.* 173-182. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

McTaggart, R 1997. Guiding Principles for Participative Action Research, in McTaggart, R (ed), *Participative Action Research. International Contexts and Consequences,* 1-43. New York: State University of New York Press.

Morgan, A 2000. *What is narrative therapy? An easy-to-read introduction.* Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Morrell, R 2001. The Times of Change. Mne and Masculinity in South Africa, in Morrell, R (ed), *Changing Men in Southern Africa,* 3-33. Pietermaritzburg: Natal University Press.

--- 2006. Fathers, Fatherhood and masculinity in South Africa, in Morrell, R & Richter, L (eds), *Baba. Men and Fatherhood in South Africa,* 13-23. HSRC Press: Pretoria.

Mouton, J 2001. *How to succeed in your Master's & Doctoral Studies: A South African guide and resource book.* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

McFague, S 1982. *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Neuger, C N & Poling J N 1997. Gender and Theology, in Neuger, C N & Poling J N (eds) *The Care of Men,* 23-45. Nashville: Abingdon.

Pattison, S 1993. *A Critique of Pastoral Care.* 2nd ed. London: SCM.

Powell, J 1997. *Derrida for Beginners.* New York: Writers and Readers Publishing Inc.

Reid, G & Walker, L 2005. Masculinities in Question, in Reid, G & Walker, L. *Men Behaving Differently. South African men since 1994,* 1-20. Cape Town: Double Storey.

Richter, L & Morrell, R (eds) 2006. *Baba. Men and Fatherhood in South Africa.* HSRC Press: Pretoria.

Roussouw, G J 1993. Theology in a postmodern culture: ten challenges. *HTS* 49, 4, 894-907.

Ruether, R R 1983. *Sexism and God-talk: Toward a feminist theology.* Boston: Beacon Press

Trible, P 1984. *Texts of Terror.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Van Eeden, R & Terre Blanche, M 2000. Research Design, in Collins, K J et al, *Research in the Social Sciences. Only Study Guide for RSC201-H,* 122-143. Pretoria: UNISA.

Van Rensburg, G 2000. Sampling, in Collins, K J et al, *Research in the Social Sciences. Only Study Guide for RSC201-H,* 146-165. Pretoria: UNISA.

Walker, M 1998. Action research and participatory research in South Africa, in Mouton, & Muller J, (eds), *Theory and Method in South African Human Sciences Research: Advances and Innovations,* 241-253. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

Warshaw, C & Ganley, A L 1995. *Improving the Healthcare Response to Domestic Violence: A Resource Manual for Health Care Providers.* 16-24. San Francisco: The Family Violence Prevention Fund.

West G, 1994. The Bible and Theology, in De Gruchy, J W & Villa-Vicencio, (eds), *Doing Theology in context. South African perspectives,* Vol 1, 15-25. Cape Town: David Philip.

White, M 1990. Story, Knowledge and Power, in White, M & Epston, D, *Narrative Means to Therapeutic Ends,* 1-37. New York: W W Norton.

White. M 1992. Men's culture, the men's movement, and the constitution of men's lives, in *Dulwich Centre Newsletter* 3 & 4:33-53.

Wolfreys, J 1998. *Deconstruction. Derrida.* London: Macmillan.

http://www.american.edu/media/speeches/desmondtutu.htm.   [Accessed   9   October 2007]

http://www.csvr.org.za/papers/papadk3.htm. [Accessed 28 Jan 2006]

(http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Patriarchy/ 2006).

APPENDIX A : FLIP CHART NOTES

Words placed on the flipchart during the group's initial discussion around patriarchy in our context.

- Head of household (male)
- System defining family
- Roles male and female roles, parent/child, husband wife
- Standards within the system
- Historical
- Biblical
- Structural/institutional
- Cultural/rigid entrenched beliefs
- Defining of the world from the male perspective
- To be male has greater value
- Firstborn male inherited the estate. Daughters seen as property. Lobola paid. Daughters become property of someone else. Males concerned with their property. Males better educated. Females seen as inferior. Family name carried on by male children

How does man see himself since 1994? (New democracy)
- Self-sufficiency, independence of women
- Entitlement of men <u>and</u> women
- Men having difficulty in changing
- Broader concept of entitlement (men providers)
- Responsibility
- Provision of family
- Patriarchy good
- Patriarchy constitutes men, but disempowered, trapped leads to abuse
- Men feel disenfranchised

- Violent masculinity through struggle. entitlement
- Women – some expect to be abused manifestation of love

- Women in past not recognised on the same level as men – salary. This predisposed them to HIV infection

- Entitlement of men to have a child. Pressure on women (male heir)
- Men stuck in old understanding of what constitutes them

APPENDIX B: NARRATIVE LETTER TO RICHARD

3 May 2007

Dear Richard,

I write this letter to you, as we agreed, to pick up some of the things that you told us and caught my attention, and I thought we might explore further as we reflect on our research curiosity.

Richard, you spoke early on in your story of your going into the '*deep pit, the deep hole of not caring*', and I wondered what does caring mean for you as man for your wife, and for your children in the home situation?

You said you landed in prison, '*because of my own short-comings, frustrations*', and wondered what ideals that you had for your marriage, where they came from…from you… from others?

You spoke of '*reading the Bible with understanding*' - I wondered what meaning this book had for you in your time in prison?

You spoke of the '*nuance of joblessness*', and I wondered what that meant for you as a man in a society that has lived through a culture of white entitlement, and since 1995, a culture of black entitlement, and then the entitlement of women?

You spoke of the role of the Church in relation to joblessness, and wondered how you saw the Church's pastoral care in that area?

Richard you said, in different places in your story,

Frustration of unemployment and not being able to do things in your house …do certain things for your family

I would say that the most frustrating thing is not doing xyz for the family, and I am not able to do it (22)

*This is one of the causes of frustration in me and many African men…..if things had not been done **by me** or **my financial strength** (23.18) I would not feel happy about that.*

*May be you are right as an African person, as an African man, **I must** look after your family (23.33)*

*You are worried that you cannot do things for the house; you cannot pay school fees, buy children's shoes (25.30). Your **must** know where the money comes from and as a man you are **responsible for everything** in the house (25.43)*

To eat without knowing where the food comes from is worse than hunger for a man (26.57). We will feel so guilty that we won't want to eat the food. This is the great way of meaning a man's role in the house. (27.10)

*The man is **the head of the house** and he is **the sole provider** if there is new pair of shoes bought he must know where that money comes from....he must provide it ...yes.*

I wonder what the understanding of 'sole provider' does to a man who is not able to provide sufficiently, or is unemployed and powerless? I wonder what the understanding of 'head of the house' means to a man powerless and dependent in the face of others entitlement? I wonder if these understandings are 'restraints' to meaningful, self-understanding and life-giving relationships?

Richard you said of family life that you had come to see the importance of the need *'to respect and see ourselves as unit'*, and Sindile said, *Men alienate themselves from their families. They do less and less with their families. They just provide (1.01.15)* I wonder if, because a man has been socially constituted to see his role has 'head' and 'provider' that he has not been given the emotional skills, and is 'restrained' in his development, he therefore avoids social-emotional involvement?

Is it these 'restraints' that are found in patriarchal discourse that are at work when a man becomes abusive in his family, and he is the abuser and the abused?

Church needs to create situations, space where men can tell their stories, can talk about their roles...

I wonder how we can in the life of our Diocese create that 'space' with men who have difficulties in telling their stories and creating new, and maybe subversive, but life-giving understandings for their lives and relationships?

Richard, in making yourself vulnerable in sharing your story, you will encourage other men to tell their story. I wonder if male vulnerability is a subversive quality in a world that is dominated by discourse of male invulnerability?

These are just some reflections and questions from your text for further exploration, and you may have others.

I look forward to our time together.

Yours,

David

APPENDIX C: OLD/YOUNG WOMAN