

Protestantism and the Family

Reclaiming Space in Contested Terrain: The Role of the Congregation*

Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore
*Professor, The Chicago Theological Seminary
Chicago, Illinois*

Church and Family: A Good Habit?

The family is in a state of flux and congregations have an important role to play. Congregations and clergy have important connections with the most intimate moments in people's lives over the span of the human life cycle. Hence, they stand in a significant position of influence.

Going to church was what my mother called a "good habit." Although I recall little explicit church teachings on the family, beliefs about the family were enacted. I recall vividly my ten-year-old cognitive dissonance when the church voted to allow women as deacons and then elders. To young eyes adapted to all men marching down the aisles in dark suits, these women looked starkly out of place. Now this memory simply serves to remind me of the extent to which antipathy toward women and resistance to inclusivity and change is deeply embedded in our human psyche and social systems, including religious traditions.

*This article was the third William Daniel Cobb III Lecture for 1994 at Lexington Theological Seminary. It is adapted from *Also A Mother: Work and Family as Theological Dilemma* by Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, copyright by Abingdon Press and used by permission.

On the other hand, that we, my mother, father, brothers, myself, worshiped together honored the value of human vulnerability and connection within the family fold. Going to church was one of the primary activities we did as a whole family, with few other parallels. My parents' care for my brothers and me, however limited by their human foibles, was an essential context in which they practiced what they believed and I learned about the love of God. The rites of passage of church education, youth Sunday, church camp, communion, and most significantly, adult baptism were offered to me as equally as to my brothers, with no distinction based on my sex, verifying my place as a child of God within life and within the kingdom. Our congregation created a new and different kind of familial community oriented toward looking beyond individual, familial well-being and working together in the wider community for the common good. Different from school and neighborhood, in church I made friends and commitments I might not have otherwise.

This final lecture draws on a grid proposed in the final chapter of *Also A Mother* to suggest the kind of reflection and conversation that must begin to take shape both in the pastoral office and among people in congregations. Congregations have at least three distinct, but interrelated roles in addressing work and family as creative theological dilemma: (1) a descriptive or pastoral role (this is how life is these days); (2) a normative or prophetic role (this is how life should be); and (3) a programmatic or proclaiming role (here are a few ways to get there). On the one hand, these activities cannot really be so sharply separated from one another. On the other hand, each act deserves its own delineated place.

While congregations must attend to important religious and ethical visions of the good life, they must avoid moving to this second action too quickly, before basic understanding is reached. This is a danger for many conservative and evangelical churches. At the same time, congregations must not forget about forging normative judgments on lifestyles. This is an equally tempting peril for many mainline congregations who wish to stress their openness and inclusivity, but then fail to adopt a clear position on critical family issues. Finally, dialogue must not remain at an esoteric or theoretical level, which is more the nature of the second normative step, while ignoring the third step of down-to-earth recommendations.

Congregations as Holding Environments

Congregations provide a fitting forum for listening and reflecting on the time pressures, work load, and dilemmas of families today. This first step, that of simply knowing the concerns that lie before members, exposes a few core problems: (1) the “conspiracy of silence,” in Janet Fishburn’s words, that enshrouds what happens in the family lives¹ and, I must add, the work lives of members, and (2) the apprehensions that surround really listening to the struggles, desires, and ideas of women.

Many mainline clergy and members have relegated family and work problems to the private realm. They seldom question deeply embedded conventions about family privacy and unwritten rules about what can and cannot be discussed. During “Joys and Concerns” in the small church worship service I attend, certain events like anniversaries, deaths, acceptable illness and hospitalizations are mentioned, but many authentic concerns such as divorce, infertility, abortion, domestic stress and violence, teen-parent conflicts, vocational conflicts and choices are taboo. As Fishburn points out, however, clergy can influence the topics of conversation in the congregation more than they know. Given the problems that most adults face, preaching on previously taboo crises of generativity is an utter necessity.

When I first suggested the idea of congregations as “holding environments,” I was drawing on a concept used in my own training as a pastoral psychotherapist. The idea of “holding environment” was coined by D.W. Winnicott to refer to the potential of parents to provide a context in which a child’s anger, frustration, and distress can find expression without losing the relationships upon which the child depends. On the best days, a good enough parent provides both space and freedom as well as limits and structure. A non-holding environment is either too intrusive or too distant and silent, and otherwise unreliable, frustrating, and discouraging.

Since proposing the term for this discussion, however, I have become more aware of its double and problematic meaning. The “holding environments” of families and congregations have also offered fertile ground for abuse. The benefits of a safe context for growth are turned into a situation in which the more powerful hold

the less powerful in ways that fundamentally disturb their healthy development. Second, Winnicott's view of the facilitating environment depends heavily upon the devoted attentions of what he dubs the "good-enough mother" who, in his descriptions, is oddly and unrealistically perfect in her ability to adapt to the child's need. This psychological theory has catered to the modern idealization and romantization of maternal capability and to the isolation and distance of fathers from their children.² These problems of abuse and dependency on women have also proven characteristic of some congregational "holding environments." Some have held women responsible for the holding. Some congregations have held too tightly and abusively.

Nonetheless, there is a real need to provide a "holding environment" in the best sense of the term, a safe, dependable, predictable, trustworthy, sustaining space that allows open communications about the current gender, familial, relational, marital, intergenerational, and vocational strife of everyday life for nearly everyone. Conversations initiated through study groups, workshops, retreats, growth groups, house-church gatherings, and sermons must include the voices of both women and men of different ages and must listen to peoples' concerns about the many changes in postmodern life-styles. They must look at present problems and at conventional answers, as well as the assumed religious doctrines.

In general, we tend to underestimate the immense anxieties that surround these issues, especially when changes in images of generativity, work, and family mean giving women new voice and authority, and diminishing the assumed priority and prerogatives of men and men's work. What happens when, as a woman in an editorial on abortion in *Christian Century* requested of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, we ask men "to retreat from public debate for a while"?³ What happens when we claim that only mothers can know certain things, or that fathers ought to enter the domestic world for a while? If nothing else, for many men women's equal participation in life remains an intrusion and a hassle. But more, the "sheer audacity," family theorist Morris Taggart honestly confesses, "of introducing a WOMAN as . . . commentator and fellow yearner" calls "everything . . . into question." "How can I deal with the anxiety," he reveals, "that comes from feeling like a guest in (what I had assumed was) my own house?"⁴

Some of the apprehension is also intergenerational. Most congregations are communities of many generations, and members are most resistant to changes of any kind that expose generational differences. Changes in gender relations today do just that. As in many congregations, two different groups characterize my congregation: those born after, and those born prior to World War II. By and large, the latter group assumes, even if its members do not practice, a homogeneous, unified moral code. Among other things, this moral code prohibits masturbation, premarital intercourse, extramarital intercourse, and homosexuality, and it discourages interracial marriages, divorce, and even discussion of suicide, adultery, children out of wedlock, and other misfortunes. The younger generation is less likely to be imbued with most of these same moral ideals, professing a relative acceptance for many, if not all, of the behaviors that those born before World War II forbid or dispute. For most of the younger people, "no moral issue had the kind of black-and-white clarity . . . that it had for those who came of age before 1960."⁵

People across the generations may never fully understand or accept the other's worldview. Just recognizing and talking aloud about the generational differences in beliefs about work and family, however, can go a long way in increasing understanding. This is particularly true in an aging congregation, with a young minister whose vocational, sexual, and familial choices differ. Usually, people prefer to operate as if nothing has changed. But a great deal has changed, and people must notice and talk about the overt and hidden value gaps. Older members must grant greater allowance and acceptance to younger members whose work and family lives follow new moral codes, in which sexual relations have changed, in which the woman is no longer the "Keeper of the Springs,"⁶ and in which unexpected, unheard-of complications arise. Greater awareness on the part of the younger generation of the ways in which the older members may take offense or experience disappointment is also needed.

When it comes to questions about work, love, and intimacy, psychology has operated as a quasi-religious, culture-forming body of knowledge. When people turn somewhere for help in solving dilemmas, they look less to church or synagogue and to sacred scriptures and theologians, and more often to the self-help

bookshelves, popular talk shows, and therapeutic interventions that the modern discipline of psychology has spawned. People are talking about dire family conflicts within the sanctuary of personal therapy, whether pastoral therapy or some other kind. This is one place where the most intimate family issues are not taboo and where people very often find convincing and helpful answers.

In many cases, this is a good thing. But, I would argue, one of the first responsibilities of the pastor, pastoral counselor, and pastoral counselee is to try to return some of this intimate conversation to the congregation where it also belongs. Talking in therapy was never intended as a replacement for public discussion, but in many cases, that has indeed been the case. By providing a "holding environment" separate from the congregation, something absolutely necessary because these issues were *not* being dealt with to any extent in congregations and perhaps could not be dealt with there, pastoral counseling has effectively robbed many congregations of some of the most highly-charged, emotionally life-giving material that the congregation actually needs to care for itself and the people in its spheres.

By saying "return this intimate conversation to the congregation," I mean encouraging *public* discussion of some of the problems which have been heretofore taboo for many congregations. In a word, pastoral counselors should encourage those whom they counsel to return to their congregations either to speak up about or to ask for discussion of some of the intimate dilemmas about which they seek therapy. Pastoral counselors have an obligation to disturb the "conspiracy of silence" that enshrouds what happens in the family lives and to break the unwritten rules about what can and cannot be discussed during "Joys and Concerns" in many typical worship services.⁷

Given the deep-seated nature of these apprehensions, pure rational discussion is inadequate to the task of intellectual and practical change. This kind of conversation is bound to be conflict-filled and challenging for most congregations used to hiding family tensions. Pastoral skills of good listening and mediating will be in high demand. Pastoral counselors ought to share what they have learned so well in individual and family therapy settings with the wider congregational life, that is, how to create and sustain a trustworthy "holding environment." Such communication will require

a level of engagement, conflict, and empathy that many mainline or oldline congregations and families are bound to find most trying. But, in many ways, what better place to have such a conversation than where people of many generations sit side by side in an institution which is situated between private and public spheres of life, where there are opportunities for informal gatherings of many shapes and sizes, and where people have moral traditions and scriptures to call upon as proven resources and as new visions?

Congregations as Communities of Prophets and Visionaries

Of course, talking about “how life is these days” will constantly push people to ask difficult normative questions about “how life should be.” As the first step of listening, brainstorming, and holding has implied, a second, equally challenging and critical step for mainline congregations is to deliberate over moral values and visions. First of all, men and women need new ways to think about their commitments to work. Congregations have a crucial prophetic role to play in confronting the values of a materialistic “Protestant” work ethic that puts profits before people. Clergy and members know that there is more to life than money or they would not be worshipping. But just like Moses’s people, religious people today need occasional or constant reminders, especially in America’s gadget-oriented, product-hungry society. On this score, the needs of children must no longer be our lowest priority, jobs related to children our lowest status, worst paid positions, and caring for children something of little value. As bell hooks contends, we must guarantee the “right of children to effective child care by parents and other childrears,” and the “restructuring of society so that women do not exclusively provide that care.”⁸

Congregations must also begin to attend to, recognize, and proclaim the implicit connections between the interests of communities and families, and the interests of economics and politics. They need to critique social and economic norms of care that artificially separate public material productivity from private procreativity, nurturance, and tending, rewarding the former and disregarding and devaluing the latter. On a minor scale, they can value the latter and encourage people to try to adapt the work place to themselves and to the values of new life, nurturance, care, and

faith rather than adapting to male- and market-defined values, job schedules, and demands. I will mention some policy implications of this in a minute.

People also need new ways to think about their commitments to families. Congregations play an instrumental role in fostering parental inclinations, broadly conceived, and in widening the circles of caring labor. If parenting is an act of faith, and even a sort of ministry of service, congregations must assign value to what parents, and all those who offer care in other forms contribute, and must work to ease their burdens. Congregations can begin by simply talking about the use and abuse of power both inside and beyond their walls. This is a task to which most families and most congregations gave little, if any, time a few decades ago. Yet it is an invaluable step in human consciousness about relationships, freedom, and responsibility. There is much that can be said on this, from the power dynamics between children and adults within families and congregations (especially in terms of sexual abuse) to the power dynamics between husband and wife and mother and father. I limit my remarks to the latter.

If it is primarily or partly within the family and the congregation that children first come to have a sense of themselves, their relations with others, and their relations to God that is foundational to moral and spiritual development, then it makes all the difference in the world whether this experience is one of unequal altruism and one-sided self-sacrifice on the part of women and mothers, or of justice, mutuality, and reciprocity. Political scientist Susan Moller Okin makes this point powerfully in *Justice, Gender, and the Family*:

What is a child of either sex to learn about fairness in the average household with two full-time working parents, where the mother does, at the very least, twice as much family work as the father? What is a child to learn about the value of nurturing and domestic work in a home with a traditional division of labor in which the father either subtly or not so subtly uses the fact that he is the wage earner to 'pull rank' on or to abuse his wife? What is a child to learn about responsibility for others in a family in which, after many years of arranging her life around the needs of her husband and children, a woman is faced with having to provide for herself

and her children but is totally ill-equipped for the task by the life she agreed to lead, has led, and expected to go on leading?⁹

If children are to develop a commitment to love, justice, and just institutions, in particular, they must spend their formative years in an environment and in institutions in which love and justice are practiced, not in institutions that requires sacrifices of women that are not required of men. To Okin, I must add: The family is by no means the only place where injustice is learned and inordinate sacrifice is required, but it is one of the primary places. Families alone cannot institute equality in the tasks of caring labor in families when work structures, social institutions, and dominant ideologies all work against it. But if we want to liberate and transform lives, the redistribution of power in the contested terrain of the family is critical.

With children, the elderly, the sick, and others in need, self-giving is a necessary and inevitable part of life. But its unequal distribution between men and women is not. Mainline churches need to confirm this. They need to advocate greater justice between men and women in the home, as well as greater care in the workplace. This means changing distorted definitions of the “good mother” that equate goodness with self-sacrifice and dated definitions of the conventional family that rely so heavily on the domestic labors of women. It means praising the virtues of “good enough” mothers who give of themselves without losing themselves, and of “good enough” families and fathers who share the burdens between men and women as justly as possible.

In general, it will not be an easy task to debunk negative views of dependency and personal needs, and the high esteem with which most congregations and pastors still hold “disinterested love” and self-sacrifice. Nor will it be easy to challenge the inhumane, impersonal organization and pressures of almost all work environments and economic norms that put products and profits before persons. But, based on biblical and theological principles, congregations must participate in such movements. Of utmost importance, they must reclaim and offer new interpretations of biblical passages that have been wrongly used and abused by fundamentalist traditions to support oppressive gender relations, familial relations, and views of women. Resources that were not available even a few

years ago, like *The Women's Bible Commentary*, are now available and are invaluable in this process.

By recent definition, pastoral counselors provide a space where moral imperatives, that normally operate in congregational settings, can be relaxed and temporarily suspended for the sake of further understanding. Yet, if a counselor believes a democratic relationship better than a hierarchical, dominating, oppressive, or exploitative one and believes that position to be grounded within religious tradition, that counselor has a relative obligation to claim and articulate this position. I say "relative" because I am not arguing that the counselor force, or even subtly convince a counselee to adopt this position. I am arguing that where a counselor stands on the pivotal issue of gender justice has a necessary and unavoidable bearing on the outcome of the therapy, whether articulated or not. At this particular historical moment, it is better to articulate one's position. Although I am not advocating religious moralism about egalitarianism, I am well aware that a little moralism in this direction will still not do much to alter centuries lived under the moralisms of domination and submission.

Congregations as the Living Body

None of these discussions should be removed from the real life of the living body and the different needs of different parts of the body of believers. Discussions in the first two areas should always point toward a third movement of programming and restructuring, which will vary from community to community, depending on the circumstances. The following comments, therefore, are suggestive of some of the possibilities.

If there is one common theme that runs through the lives of many people, it is the "speed-up" and the strife over determining domestic and economic responsibilities amidst the pressures of a fast-paced, status-conscious technological society. The public-private split whereby men work and women love has been challenged, but, ultimately, it has not changed. This domestic division continues to isolate husbands and wives from each other, to exclude fathers from family attachments, and to restrict mothers from personal and public investments. This threefold internal "divorce" is often a

prelude to an official divorce, and it is at the heart of problems of many families today.¹⁰

Clergy and pastoral counselors should not be so afraid to talk in greater detail about what democratic relationships between men and women actually look like in real life. Many people are hungry for stories by which to live. They want to know how to share domestic and economic labors, particularly in a society that typically forbids such equal sharing. A pastoral counselor should not withhold viable ideas about the actual logistics of redistributing household chores, a demanding and time-consuming task for many couples. How can people change the division of labor inherent to conventional gender role definitions? What have people tried? What works and what doesn't? How can people change the division of domestic labors in the congregation itself, which continue to presume that women will run the Sunday School, coffee hour, nursery, funeral meals, and assume positions of leadership both in the congregation and the work world? What will it take to teach men to tend to the chores of relationships, domesticity, and children, and as important, to reclaim the values of caring labor for both men and women in a society driven by the marketplace that devalues the taking care of children, elevates material productivity, places in jeopardy those in significant care taking roles, primarily women, and forbids men serious concern over friends, children, family, and domicile?

Congregations themselves must model changes in the internal distribution of their own caring labors. Although it is most difficult to change actual programmatic structures, the restructuring of tasks previously divided along gender lines is important. Sunday school, for example, which is normally relegated to women, usually the mothers of the church, might be co-taught by female and male teams and who may or may not actually be parents. Youth and men's groups can help with coffee hour, potlucks, or funeral meals on as regular a basis as women's groups, or these tasks can be distributed in entirely different ways. Broadly speaking, congregations cannot continue to move women into new positions of authority without also valuing their former contributions, and urging men to take on some of these tasks. Congregations can also oppose the tendency of women to become "giving trees" by thinking twice before relying on women and mothers to do the necessary chores. They may need to allow

for an initial labor shortage among members and alter traditional programs and structures to accommodate the changed lives of many members.

Most women's work loads would be cut dramatically, however, if men made stronger commitments to children and families in the home. Congregations can oppose the social trends and conventional pressures that alienate boys and men from the activities of nurture, and even help them develop the skills required to care for the dependent needs of others. This means the mundane task of teaching the young, especially young boys and men, how to engage in egalitarian relationships, how to tend to the chores of children, relationships, and domesticity. Younger families might study what a healthy parental leave looks like, help people institute policies in their work places, and support men in their responsibility to make use of them. Women and men might debate the inevitable problems of egalitarian relationships and share their working strategies for distributing household chores, an accomplishment that can be most demanding and time-consuming for many couples. They might share strategies to undercut the heightened time-crunch and to limit and control the pressures of extracurricular activities, work, and career advancement in general.

Congregations also stand in a good place to help create "good enough" communities that ease the load by providing avenues of mutual aid, assure women other means of self-worth, and expand the network of caregivers essential to a child's health. A wonderful example is the Roman Catholic tradition of naming godparents who assume responsibilities for guiding, nurturing, and caring for children. Whatever happened to the religious tradition of "adopting" children in other religious communities? What has happened to the importance of images of adoption that figure so centrally in the relationship between Israel and God in general? These traditions merit resurrection. If churches are to be communities of people who "suffer with one another," as Herb Anderson contends, then they must work to offer living networks in which intergenerational relationships are cultivated, and parents are "relieved of sole responsibility" for the faith and development of their children. When this happens, argues Fishburn, it will be "easier to see that the American ideal of a self-sufficient family is not only impossible it is undesirable."¹¹

As an integral part of this third activity, congregations must seek to understand and, when appropriate, influence institutional and political decisions, policies, and legislation that support children, parents, and a variety of current family forms. In almost everything I read on the problems of work and families, similar proposals are offered, despite sometimes widely divergent political stances. If nothing else, congregations must become much more aware of the nature of these public policies and more adept at providing educational and supportive networks for securing necessary changes. Clergy and members need to consider seriously several measures before us.¹²

A reallocation of government priorities and resources is suggested. Policies for raising the personal tax exemptions allowed for dependent children, which have progressively eroded since 1948, and for spending less on military buildup and more on parenting and child care have been presented. Divorce laws have also come under closer scrutiny. Foremost in needed policies are the changes advocated by many people that would insure the economic well-being of children and mothers. Some propose making payments from the absent parent, often the father, a collection process, similar to Social Security taxes.

There are other public policy needs that are pressing. We need more "family friendly" work places. This means family leave policies, child care services, and flexible schedules and definitions of promotion. We need educational institutions that design their programs to affirm shared parenting and respond to the constraints of dual income families, single parents, stepfamilies, and commuter marriages. We need male participation in these institutions, and in other institutions, such as day care centers, so that children do not grow up thinking only women are demoted to these apparently less valued, less profitable tasks.

Until unjust domestic arrangements in which the primary burden rests on women are restructured, we must also find ways to protect the vulnerabilities of women and ensure equal benefit. Where the one person, usually the woman and mother, remains economically dependent on her spouse, Okin and others have suggested "equal legal entitlement to all earnings coming into the household,"¹³ with employers making out checks equally divided between the earner and the partner. The partner is thereby reimbursed for domestic services upon which both the earner and the employer depend.

Some of these proposals are more drastic than others. Some, like Okin's equal legal entitlement, have complicated and problematic implications, are open to abuse, and are based on a regrettable lack of trust between spouses. Some will take extensive work, planning, and funding, whereas others will, as Sylvia Hewlett likes to say, give us the "biggest bang for our buck," costing less now than the alternative consequences in the long run.¹⁴ All are designed, however, to alter conventional avenues of generativity in work and families for women, men, and children. Power inequities between women, men, and children will not change, other than through such consistent systemic reordering.

At the same time, as I said in my second lecture, none of these proposals will have much lasting impact without a deeper desire for change on the part of American men and women. None of these public policies will be very successful without a personal and cultural crusade to deconstruct and restructure mature adult generativity. As Catherine Keller puts it, the changes require "more than a few considerate shifts of rhetoric and lifestyle. What is required is nothing less than our lives."¹⁵ In the meanwhile, while no concrete steps, no strategies of intervention, no new support group will answer all the problems, many interim designs, when seen as part of a broader reconstruction of modern ideals of work and family, have a viability that demands their implementation. It is not just a strategic matter of sharing labors fairly. It is also a matter of reconsidering what it means to be a generative person in society at large.

In many cases, these three tasks or spheres of activity call for a much more directive style of intervention in people's lives than has been the typical non-directive counseling style advocated by those in pastoral and practical theology in the last several decades. In the conflicts over North American family models, structures, and dynamics, pastoral counselors cannot just sit back and listen. Although prescribing ideals before adequately understanding the problems is a peril to be avoided at almost all costs, oldline, reformist, and progressive pastoral counselors have a crucial obligation to forge a few bottom-line normative judgments on life-styles, and to get as clear as possible about their position on family issues.

While oldline Protestantism is reluctant to enter the fray of the culture war over the family, the battle will continue to determine North American images of the "good family" and the "good life," and religious belief will make a difference. In the culture war, the

influence of religious traditions on the family is quite a bit like the air we breathe and the gravity beneath our feet; we sometimes fail to notice how much we rely on them and how much force they really exert.

In the battle over who defines *the* Christian view, the sides are not equally well-organized and represented. Liberals are far more concerned with respecting diversity, racial, ethnic, gender, sexual, etc., than with arriving at a uniform family platform and theology. The press consistently gives greater coverage to conservation rhetoric on patriarchal family forms as representative of "Christian family values" rather than to the apparently out-of-fashion oldline Christian rhetoric of equality, justice, and acceptance.

Fair or not, the culture war over the definition of *the* Christian family continues. As sociologist Judith Stacey observes, we are living in the very midst of a "transitional and contested period of family history, a period *after* the modern family order, but before what we cannot foretell." We have come to a stage when the "logical progression of stages breaks down."¹⁶ These are perplexing times for Protestantism and family. If my reading of Christian history, of the paradoxes of "having it all," and of the role of congregational life is warranted, however, oldline, liberal Protestantism continues to have an important role to play.

¹ Janet Fishburn, *Confronting the Idolatry of Family: A New Vision for the Household of God* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1991), 141.

² See, for example, D.W. Winnicott, *Playing and Reality* (Tavistock, 1971), 141, where he writes that good-enough mothering "includes fathers, but fathers must allow me to use the term maternal to describe the total attitude to babies and their care. The term paternal must necessarily come a little after than maternal."

³ Susan Maloney, S.N.J.M., "Catholic Bishops and the Art of Public Moral Discourse," *The Christian Century* (May 9, 1990): 486.

⁴ Morris Taggart, "Epistemological Equality as the Fulfillment of Family Therapy," in *Women in Families: A Framework for Family Therapy*, eds., Monica McGoldrich, Carol M. Anderson, and Froma Walsh (New York: Norton, 1989), 110.

⁵ Fishburn, *Confronting the Idolatry of Family*, 30.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 141.

⁸ bell hooks, *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* (Boston: South End Press, 1984), 23-24.

⁹ Susan Moller Okin, *Justice, Gender, and the Family* (New York: Basic Books, 1989), 23-24.

¹⁰ Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr. and Andrew Cherlin, *Divided Families: What Happens to Children When Parents Part* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991), 28-30, 46-49.

¹¹ Fishburn, *Confronting the Idolatry of Family*, 172, 174; cites Herbert Anderson, "Christian Themes for Family Living," *Dialog* 28 (Summer 1989): 172.

¹² See, for example, Elaine Ciulla Kamarck and William A. Galston, with essays by Robert J. Shapiro and Margaret Beyer, "Putting Children First: A Progressive Family Policy for the 1990s," (Washington, D.C.: The Progressive Policy Institute, September 27, 1990) 7-8, 21-33.

¹³ Moller Okin, *Justice, Gender and the Family*, 180-81.

¹⁴ Sylvia Ann Hewlett, *When the Bough Breaks: The Cost of Neglecting Our Children* (New York: Basic Books, 1991), 243.

¹⁵ Catherine Keller, *From a Broken Web: Separation, Sexism, and Self* (Boston: Beacon, 1986), 4.

¹⁶ Judith Stacey, *Brave New Families: Stories of Domestic Upheaval in Late Twentieth Century America* (New York: Basic Books, 1990), 18.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.