

Ursula Pfäfflin

Germany, 1998

A walk in a rosebush

Violence and sacrifice in feminist intercultural perspective of pastoral care and counselling

topics:

- patriarchal structures in family and society
- theological aspects of mutuality
- mutuality as an alternative way to stop sacrifice
- the theory of Rene Girard

source: *Intercultural Pastoral Care and Counselling No 4, 1998; pp. 55-60*

When Nalini Arles addressed her experiences and knowledge about scapegoating and victimisation of women in India (*cf. her article in this workbook, p. 163*) I thought: yes, I know phenomena and structures of that kind even though I live and have worked in two countries which claim to have equality between men and women and claim that both, women and men have access to public power. Yet, reality is different. To call yourself feminist is “out” nowadays, to talk about violence against women and children, taboo. I am glad that our society has dared to address the issue of the logic of violence and I thank all who have named important aspects of violence and theology of sacrifice. I would like to address some aspects which are significant in feminist intercultural pastoral care and counselling: the mystification of family in society, the mystification of guilt and endurance in Christian tradition, alternative interpretations of sacrifice, and new perspectives from feminist pastoral care and counselling which also have consequences for concepts of power, economics and politics.

A walk in a rosebush

Maria, a student of theology from Puerto Rico, delivered a paper when I taught Pastoral Care and Counselling at a seminary in the United States. She chose the title: *A walk in a rosebush* and started her paper with the words:

“This is the story of a nineteen year old adolescent who was in her third year of college. A happy teenager, with lots of dreams closely to get married. For about three months she was having a hard time with a man. This man who was a stranger to her was following her around the University and places that she commonly attended. One night he tried to have a very close encounter with her but she

had enough time to run. The story went this way until the man decided to stop harassing her, and she thought that he never would bother her again.

It was a beautiful October night, in one of the most beautiful islands in the world. That night she was working at the library and was planning to attend a welcome back to school dance. At the end of her work shift she was walking out of the University when suddenly the stranger encountered her. This time he had enough time to grasp her and put her in his car. He took her far away, and she was frightened. She begged him not to do anything to her and he promised he would not do anything bad to her. That naive nineteen year old adolescent believed that promise and even though she was frightened she was hoping and praying that he would keep his promise. That proves how naive a woman can sometimes be. After a long drive he stopped the car and started touching her; something that made her very uncomfortable. She felt dirty, like a prostitute. She started crying and begged him not to do anything bad to her. At this time he was closer to her. She tried to fight but he was getting aggressive and she really was afraid of losing her life. She thought that to stay passive was enough for him not to kill her. He had a very aggressive behaviour. He pulled her and touched her genitals and at that moment she came to reality. A cruel reality, the humiliation, the painful truth. No matter how much she cried or begged he would have sex with her. 'Stop, please, stop'. But he never stopped. He forced her and committed the sexual violence act. She cried and cried and to comfort her he promised her that if something happened he would be responsible. However, at that moment, she lost the capacity to trust. She felt humiliated, dirty, she died as a human being and that beautiful night in October became the ugliest one for the rest of her life. I am a Survivor of Sexual Violence. This is my story. A painful story which did not stop there because I was victimised again by my family. As a consequence of this violent act I got pregnant and for my family it was hard to deal with a single mother because they thought of it as a disgrace for the family. My family decided to deal with the social status and never listened to my story, they never allowed me to cry and take out all my anger, frustration and pain. They silenced me for almost the rest of my life. I also was a victim of society. People felt sorry for me but never offered any help. Then, a male therapist who in order to help me deal with my anger and my vengeance dreams, tried to convince myself that this criminal was a victim of society."

When Mary wrote this story she was at age thirty-four. After she had participated in one of my pastoral care and counselling classes she asked for counselling with me. She wanted to talk about her marriage and her situation as a woman from Puerto Rico in the United States. It took several sessions until Maria was able to talk about her real issue: the ongoing memories of the rape which she had not talked about to anybody during all these years. The feelings of rage and desperation, the sense of being dirty and of no value, even now after she had accomplished so much, in spite of being stigmatised by family and catholic church. She did not feel able to marry her fiancé after this event, she had given birth to her child all alone, she raised her son by herself, lost her career, and went to New York because he was sick. In New York she met her husband, married, got a second son, and was very respected by her community and the church. Thus she decided to study theology and become a pastor. She was an impressive woman, strong, influential to other students, convincing in her preaching and conducting of worship. Yet, during fifteen years, she had not talked about the most important feelings, thoughts and memories which moved her daily.

Violence as a characteristic of patriarchal structure in family and society

The story of Maria expresses all the traits that have been brought to awareness and to public discussion from the work with victims of violence during the past decades by feminist research and therapy, by women's shelters and projects for girls. Violence especially against women and girls, and also against boys and oppressed men, does not only happen in terrible wars and torture, in hatred against foreigners and burning of their homes. Violence is done every day and globally especially against women and girls, but also against boys in form of sexual, physical and psychic abuse within the core or extended family and the well known context of the victim. As James Poling pointed out (*cf. his article in this workbook, p.314*), the family is by no means the safe haven and place of happiness we think it is, but the family is one of the most dangerous places of the world for women and children. In her excellent book on incest, the Swiss Analyst Ursula Wirtz writes: "That also means to say good bye to the myth of family, the heaven of trust. Especially the family has become a breeding place for violence... sexual abuse is fostered by the social isolation of the core family".¹

Of course, this is meant in regard to Western isolated family systems, yet, as we hear from Nalini, this is also true for other patriarchally structured societies.

Maria was an excellent student, she was looking forward to a career as lawyer in Puerto Rico. She was engaged. She was estimated as the eldest child by her father. The campus of the university was her home. She was rooted in the Catholic church. In all of these spaces and places to which she belongs and feels safe, she experiences an abuse of power which kills all of her hopes in one hour. She is raped in spite of all the strength she had. Not only the physical overpowering made her soul die within these minutes but also and even more the experience of absolute powerlessness: I have no more influence, my trust in everything I believed in is shattered. It is important for the work with traumatised to recognise that the physical damage is terrible. Yet it is the experience of powerlessness that is crucial: I cannot do anything anymore, I am delivered. So Maria says herself that the reactions by her family, the therapist and the church have traumatized her once more, and even worse. Her mother thought it was a disgrace to have her daughter be pregnant and advised her to have an abortion even though she was catholic. Her family wanted to hide her because an unmarried mother was a shame for the family. Her feelings got no space because the male therapist did not want to hear about her anger and asked her to understand the perpetrator. After giving birth, Maria wished to participate in the mass. Churchmembers were friendly, yet their looks were talking. One day she overheard a woman saying to another: She should not bring this child to church because he is the result of sin.

The mystification of family

How can we understand that traumatization by abuse of power has such dimensions in the most familiar spaces and places of our lives, in family, in mother-father-child-relationships, in therapy and church? The answer by feminist research is: violence against women and children is so pervasive because it is not the exception, a special accident, caused by sick or pathological persons. Violence is pervasive because it is made possible, it can be, it is ingrained in the structures of living and working which are functioning by patterns of unilateral, hierarchical

power. Violence happens because it is allowed to be and even intended to be in order to keep the structures of unilateral use of power and one-sided distribution of privileges in place and keep them going.

Ursula Wirtz indicates that the Latin word “familia” originally meant the ownership of a person by another person. Family had to do with a relation of ownership and meant a relation of domination which was founded on power and ownership. “Pater familias” was not the daddy or father as we use the word but a dominator in the meaning of master of his slaves. The word *patriarchy* stands for a legal regulation in which the “pater familias” (father of family) has all the power of the law up to the decision on life or death over women, children, slaves and animals of his household. In societies which are structured by this law and therefore are called patriarchal, daughters are put under the domination of their fathers and then, by marriage, under the domination of their husbands. Also in the laws of early Israel, witnessed in the Hebrew Bible, we can read that there existed a marriage of children which could be bought. The daughter was given from one owner to the next, from father to husband. She was an object. In this context, rape is not a violation of the human right of a person but sort of a crime of theft in regard to the one who “owned” the girl.² Therefore the daughter has to keep her virginity in order not to be possessed by somebody else because otherwise she is of no value for the husband (value of being new, unused).

This way of thinking exists up to now with the exception of a few societies and has been internalised even by women and girls themselves. Maria’s reaction to the rape demonstrates how much in her culture, she learned to internalise this view: immediately she feels dirty, a whore no longer worthy to marry the beloved fiancé. She herself dissolves the engagement feeling shame and desperation. She sacrifices her hopes for a happy partnership because within the structures of her society, her church and her pastor’s counselling, there was no other foundation to help a woman who has become a victim of sexual or other abuse.

As Girard demonstrates: the victim becomes the guilty. She is a shame for her family, her child a child of sin, her anger not justified. She should not have gone to the street, especially not to a dance, in the evening. Maria did not only have to carry stigmatisation and isolation but also all the psychic, financial and social costs for the enforced pregnancy. The perpetrator did not have to be accountable to anyone. He escaped into silence. Until today.

Also in German law victims of sexual abuse have to carry the burden of proving the crime done by the perpetrator. The victims have to prove that they have experienced violence. The perpetrators often switch the direction and accuse the woman or girl of being provocative or wishful. In our courts, perpetrators get sentences that are ridiculously small in comparison to crimes of theft. The costs for perpetrators of violence against women and children are extremely low, the immediate effect of their abuse of power is remarkable. In contrast, the costs for the victims to call to attention and defend themselves are very high and they risk a lot without any prospect for an effective cause. Therefore, many women and girls remain silent and do not talk at all.

The mystification of guilt

In a conference on violence against women and girls, my colleague theologian Julia Strecker from Cologne talks about the myth of the fall and how the original

sin and guilt of the woman is linked to the feelings of guilt and responsibility that girls and women develop in the experience of sexual violence. “The silence, the inability to talk is mainly caused by the internalisation of guilt. The myth defines women by their sexuality and creates an immediate linkage between guilt and female sexuality. Women who have been abused sexually in their childhood, even when they are still little, have a sense of not being treated and respected as children but as female sexual beings. If the myth that by woman sin has entered the world meets with the experience of sexual violence, women feel guilty within themselves. The Christian tradition reinforces the connection between female sexuality and guilt. As a result, the myth derives all problems of man and of the world from female original sin and guilt. The girl experiences sexual abuse as a threat for this world. Again, silence is in place: the experience has to be kept a secret because the perpetrator threatens her that she might cause the breakdown of the whole family, and a catastrophe if she would not keep silence. The girl and later the woman takes all the responsibility for her own fate and the unhappiness of her whole family... The myth connects the order of woman’s special availability with a demand for subordination of women in patriarchal marriage (see Tim. 1, 12ff: woman has to be available in a special way and has to be silent)”.³ Each part of the mystification, as I prefer to call it, reinforces the non-guilt of man and the guilt of woman and therefore stabilises the status quo and system we live in because this piece of Christian tradition has shaped the Christian image of woman and her self-image around the world, especially in former regions of mission, but even in our liturgies, songs and theological commentaries up today.

Maria wrote about herself: “What are the results of sexual violence? After experiencing sexual violence women, and in this case I speak from a female perspective, feel dirty, guilty, humiliated, and powerless. I remember that I showered three times or more a day only to feel clean. During all these thirteen years I felt guilty because I thought I could have hindered this event to happen, and because of the problems I caused for my family. Only after I went to counselling once more, I realized that it was not my guilt and I could have never prevented it from happening.”

Girard’s theses help reveal the mystification of the guilt of women for everything and since ever. But Girard’s analyses themselves remain too mythical where he does not name concrete historical and sociological facts. There is evidence that each, and everyone can become a scapegoat – but we cannot deny; and James Poling made us aware of that a couple of times, that the reality of the sacrifice of others has been perpetrated for one half of humankind to a degree which is hard to imagine. When Girard talks about collective persecution, of crimes, that are committed by a murderous crowd, it is not unimportant to raise the question, who really did initiate these persecutions and who participates in them in which way? I find it very intriguing that he reveals the structures of logic of violence that happens when systems feel threatened in their usual way of differentiating. But there is a danger in talking about structures and logics in that the specific historical and contextual differences are not seen from the point of view of the involved. The public silencing of women has made their own witness invisible for centuries and still is.

It is not an obsolete question to ask, in which amount and in which roles women are present in mass persecution. The differentiation of present systems has a logic of violence within itself as I have shown above: Women have to be controlled, because they – as sexually attractive beings – represent danger to men, because they lead men into temptation and therefore need to be subdued. This logic and

mystification of violence does not only happen in times of crisis but is in itself part of the normal formation of patriarchal societies and their family – and work structures. To recognize, to name and to describe these structures and their facts, we owe to women’s research worldwide.

The demystification of sacrifice and violence – are there alternatives to “sacrifice of other”?

“The mass always has a tendency to persecute”, says Rene Girard. “They look for a cause, which can satisfy their hunger for violence”.⁴ In this kind of sentences there is the assumption that everybody, regardless of the person, can be violent in a society. Girard emphasises that there is a pattern of collective violence regardless of culture⁵ and that persecution exists even in mythic-ritual societies, which is mirrored in their myths. I appreciate that Girard reads myths in a historical way and not just as a condensed expression of archetypes. On the other hand, I find it important to differentiate between so-called mythic-ritual societies, and to have a closer look at: what forms of violence are perpetrated and indulged in which places? One study that helped me a lot is an analysis of family violence worldwide. A Canadian institute analysed agrarian societies in how far violence against women, children and the elderly is allowed. They found out, that indeed there are 16 societies in the world in which violence is not allowed, is immediately stopped and the adults deal with conflicts in a different way. In these societies the roles between men and women are also defined in a different manner: both women and men have equal access to the fruit of labour, to sexual pleasure before marriage and to divorce. Women work in the community of other women and men, therefore they are not isolated and exposed to isolation and silence.⁶

From these kinds of tribal societies we also know of a different interpretation of sacrifice. Because there is close interrelation between cosmos, nature, women, men and all living beings, that which grows in your environment is not used as a commodity but is seen as a gift, that is given by the earth. Sacrifice is understood as offering, a response to the gift: what was given to me creates a reverberation in me, a response. I return part of what keeps me alive and gave life to me. Dedication is not – as in our Christian ascetic tradition – the sacrifice of all sensuality, needs, desires and lust, but offering something of everything I have received. As has been shown by research in matriarchal societies, there have even been human beings, who have given themselves back to earth in this meaning. But this was not, as Girard says, a sacrifice of other, but a giving of oneself in correspondence to the context. There even are examples of this interpretation of sacrifice of offering yourself and rededicate some of what you have received before in the bible: for instance in the story of intercultural corporation by Hebrew midwives, the mother and sister of Moses and the Egyptian princess; in the interpretation of love in the song of songs, in the anointment of Jesus and in the donation of the coin by the widow etc. Pracha has indicated, that in Thai-society, the tribal life was founded on this view on life and spirituality within community.

Mutuality as an alternative way to end the sacrifice of other

One thread leading through the writings of women from different classes, races, cultures and religions is the call for mutuality. My thesis is, that this call for mu-

tuality in relationships and in the structures of work and life holds an alternative to the logic of violence. For mutuality as a process counteracts the construction of unilateral and linear differentiation of power. Women and men, who are willing to recognize their needs mutually, do not differentiate in a rigid manner (Girard uses the word “differentiate” for the order of a society or a group, and the word “de-differentiate” to describe the breakdown of the family order). Women and men, who perceive their needs mutually, do not experience de-differentiation as an existential threat, because their boundaries are clear, yet not shut. So: boundaries can be changed by mutual perception.

What does mutuality mean?

In the writings from the Stone Center in the U.S., women psychologists and therapists have developed new concepts of therapy. In these writings mutuality is described as openness for influence, as an emotional presence, as a changing pattern of reacting of others and influencing others. Instead of using other people as containers of our own projections or as a source of satisfaction of needs, in mutuality empathy and active interest in the partner as a complex person is developed; an ability to acknowledge the “otherness of the other” and to even strengthen it. “If empathy and engagement flow in both directions, there is an intense affirmation of self and paradoxically also a transcendence of self. A sense of being part of a greater unity of relationality”. (Stone Center, p.82)

Another term for this is inter-subjectivity. Inter-subjectivity goes beyond mutual empathy. She also includes the motivation to understand the other’s system of sense from their own frame of reference. Good interaction depends on “holding” the subjectivity and the needs for community of others. Mutuality does not mean a formal balance following the motto “I do as you do” and vice versa; it does mean though a reciprocity in intensity of both, engagement and true interest, an investment in exchange, which holds gratification for both. Such mutuality indeed is demanding; the word “sacrifice” therefore can be used. But it is not to be seen as a total surrender for the other, as it is over and over again – basically and almost naturally – asked from women; Nalini describes the demand for total surrender to the husband, even when he is dead, in the maintaining of the Sati. Such mutuality is giving of the self in the process of mutual perception; an openness towards change; the other’s boundaries not interpreted as an attack on oneself (like Cain interpreted God’s reaction to his offering) but as an otherness which can be accepted and known; mutuality requires a surrender of manipulation because it is interested in the forthcoming of the other. This concept of mutuality relates to an alternative concept of power, which is exercised and called for by women in various political, social and therapeutic environments; instead of using unilateral controlling power: to live power from within, power as mutual influence, and to share power: power coming from different voices, which by confluence form a new truth.

Economic and political aspects

Mutuality is not only a concept of personal relationship. If we enlarge intersubjectivity to interdependency of different kinds of economic and political systems, it would mean to develop mutual interest in concrete traditions instead of unilateral

exploitation and manipulation. The history of diverse economic concepts and practices would be “held” and given value in their difference. Is it utopian to think of a global market in which influence would function as a system of mutual information and ex-change in which small economic units are as much respected as bigger companies, for mutual interests? A friend of mine, Sabine O’Hara, a feminist professor of economics in the state of New York develops some interesting alternatives to traditional concepts and practice in economics. She offers three principles to enlarge economic theory and method in order to reframe the conflictual relationship between production and sustainability: concretion, connectedness and diversity. These principles seek to point towards necessary re-definitions of both production and sustainability which help to bridge rather than separate these two concepts. Concreteness means that hidden assumptions in present economic concepts and that historical and cultural contexts are taken seriously. “Qualitative criteria like well-ness, mutuality, reciprocity or supportiveness in highly interdependent systems are to be added if we don’t want to risk that vital function go unnoticed or undervalued”. Connectedness addresses the relationship between economic and ecological systems, in which human individuals can flourish. “Human well-being is also influenced by the resourcing, recreational, aesthetic and spiritual contributions of ecosystems. The three dimension of this connectedness are: the complementarity of inputs, feedback from output to social structures, and feedback from output to ecological structures.” Diversity is a principle that criticises the homogenising assumptions of traditional Western production theory. “A shift from familiar androcentric and anthropocentric concepts towards less culturally biased and more ecocentric ones can only take place if the normative character of economics is recovered and ethics in economics becomes more than a support system of existing definitions... The stories and metaphors of cultures which have lived sustainably for centuries may offer valuable insights for our own sustainability. This is not to be misconstrued as a call ‘back to nature’ but rather as progress moving forward to new insights.”⁷

Theological aspects

Relating this interpretation to the image of God and to Christology, we find revolutionary changes to our traditional system of faith. A totally different perspective of God comes into being: God is not the total different one, the almighty, never-changing, who has all creation in his hands. After Shoah and the terrible persecutions and atrocities which still occur in our world, God is interpreted as the kind of power, who gets involved to the extend of total suffering, moving this suffering and Evil within Godself God is changed in relation as we are changed, as we get involved with each other mutually. I find Jim Poling’s interpretation of God as the ambiguous God very challenging. I would like to add one aspect though that has become important in feminist and womanist theology and Christology. God and Christ and Holy Spirit are not only interpreted as relational within the trinity but as relational in regard to humans and all creation. God is transforming and transformed, in Christ and with those, who are transformed by Christ: Christa-Community. This term Christa-Community indicates that even in the concept of redemption, healing and liberation the community of women, girls, boys and men plays an important role. Not Jesus is the Christ as a one person individual entity who is the exception and the saviour. But salvation and healing are seen as a process between, in, and with persons, Christ and God: Jesus is as much healed by the woman who touches his garment as she is healed by touching him. Christa-

community means mutuality in the becoming of the Christ-process or the Christ-structure of the world that we long for.

Intercultural pastoral care and counselling

Maria had not told her story in our first encounters. It took a good while, until our mutual sympathy grew into a good foundation of our relationship. She herself says: "In my case the worst damage is, that I cannot completely trust people. It is very hard for me to trust anyone. My first step was to recognise the need of help. Then, I asked for that professional help. I started therapy and I began to deal with the issues. Another thing that I have to recognise is that I still need help." After she found safe space for her grief and her deep anger in our meetings across cultures, she was able to change her more artificial strength and toughness and open herself to closeness in her family. She performed very well in her exams and we celebrated a wonderful ordination. Mary's story did not have a happy ending, only. She had no chance, to become a minister in her Hispanic church. The traditional roles of women and men did not allow for that. I do not know, where she lives and works today, but I know, that she had to struggle a lot in spite of all her powerful changes.

Maria's history is a history in which mutuality to her was denied. For the pastoral work with abused women and men it is important, that we do not label the symptoms of traumatising by using the traditional diagnoses of personality or character disorder. In this way clients or counselees would be pathologised.⁸ Instead we have to acknowledge the specific needs of safety and that is takes difficult and long term work in mutual awareness and transparency of the process. As Jim Poling has pointed out, co-operation with other professionals is detrimental.

We all are part of the denial of mutuality every day. To me it is important to mention the discussion about the diversity of women and the responsibility, we as white European privileged women carry in relation for colleagues and women from other economical, cultural and religious traditions. Sacrifice of other does happen between women everyday and is as unbearable as amongst gender. There is much discussion in feminist discourse on this issue but I can only mention it here. Violence amongst women, mothers, daughters, sisters, colleagues needs to be addressed. But the history of women shows also, that there have always been alternatives and they still exist. The Italian feminists call what they recognise as an alternative to violence and victimisation amongst women: *affidamento*. "A politics of liberation as we have called feminism has to create the basis for the freedom of women." *Affidamento* is the relationship between two women, who encourage each other mutually, like Ruth and Noemi in the Biblical book on Ruth. *Affidamento* contains the root of the word *fides* (faith), *fedelta* (fidelity), *fidarsi* (to trust one another) and *confidare* (to trust). In our intercultural counselling movement we are beginning to develop *affidamento* also between women of different classes, cultures and religions. This also is walk in a rose bush with many thorns, with pain but also with a lot of beauty.

At the end of our work we want to introduce to you a concept for training in mutuality, working with reflecting teams – a new method for supervision and working with life-stories in groups, developed in Norway and the United States, in which the gap between professional experts and counselees or supervisees is bridged by transparency of the process: all the voices are heard by every participant in the counselling system, all participate in the conversation, though in dif-

ferent steps. The main principle in this work is to acknowledge concreteness, diversity and the rich potentials of each person and system. The question is not to find causes and explanations but for people to ask themselves new questions. "All versions are neither right nor wrong. Our task is as much as possible to engage in a dialogue in order to understand how the various persons came to create their descriptions and their explanations. Thereafter, we invite them to a dialogue to discuss whether there might be other not-yet-seen descriptions and maybe even other not-yet-thought-of explanations... the structure of the reflecting team offers the possibility for those who consult us, as they listen to the team, to ask themselves new questions thereby drawing new distinctions". The participants of the process are invited to respect the integrity of the other persons, to listen carefully, to be honest yet not shaming or derogative, and to focus on the resources. Questions for the process are: What has impressed me in this person, theme or process? What did I perceive? What enlarging questions would I raise? "In this way, we see ourselves to be congruent with Maturana saying that instructive interaction is impossible. We can only offer a chance for a transitional structural coupling of mutual interest, and the exchanges of ideas that follow. And we like to emphasise the importance of mutual interest".⁹

References

- ¹ Ursula Wirtz: *Seelenmord, Inzest und Therapie*. Stuttgart: Kreuz Verlag 1989, 5th ed. 1992, p.25.
- ² Ibid. p.26.
- ³ Julia Strecker and Ursula Pfäfflin, in a book on Feminist Pastoral Care and Counselling, forthcoming 1998.
- ⁴ Rene Girard: *Der Sündenbock*, Zürich 1988, p.28. (Concerning the theory of Rene Girard, see the articles of R. Schwager and H.-M. Gutmann in this workbook, p.56 and p.302).
- ⁵ Ibid. p.33.
- ⁶ David Levinson, *Family Violence in Cross-Cultural Perspective*, Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1989
- ⁷ Sabine O'Hara, *From Production to Sustainability. Considering the Whole Household*, paper held at a church meeting in Nordelbien/Germany, 1995.
- ⁸ In this regard I have gained most by reading Judith L. Herman's book *Trauma and Recovery* (New York: Basic Books 1992) in which she suggests a new diagnosis which respects the complexity of symptoms of women and men who have been violated: *complex post traumatic stress disorder*.
- ⁹ Tom Andersen, *The Reflecting Team*, New York 1991, p. 38f and p. 40.