

## The “F” Word

### The Challenge of Feminism and the Practice of Counselling Twenty Years On

Jeannie Wright, Sue Webb, Patricia Sullivan-Thompson,  
Elmarie Kotzé, Kathie Crocket, Sue Cornforth, and Nan Blanchard

#### Abstract

This article revisions feminist thinking from the point of view of seven practitioners/researchers currently working in New Zealand. It arises from embodied pain, passionate commitments, and a shared curiosity about purposeful feminism in our work. We explore the challenges for us as counsellors to express feminism in our practice in ways that will meet the needs of women and men. The article aims to challenge practice by performing a number of feminisms in response to particular contexts. It speaks our practices as women.

Seven women stand before a conference audience.<sup>1</sup> Sombre for the stories we will tell, we also warm with anticipation of the possibilities of feminist and performance research (see Burman, 2001; Denzin, 1997; Gergen, 2001).

The presentation has both a short and a long history. Coming to New Zealand, Jeannie had read Wendy Drewery’s (1986) foundational feminist article, written on the terms of second-wave feminism. Wondering what aspects of her international experience were relevant here, in 2007, to what she might teach counsellors, Jeannie put before us all the question of where we sit with feminism in our lives and our work in counselling. She asked us about the f(eminism) word: is it still relevant? Five of us met together, as we engaged with Jeannie’s question. Our conversation traversed the professional, political, and personal of a range of feminist concerns.

For this, our first research performance together, we reached down into stories of practice, into our own lived experience as counsellors and women. One by one, we now

speak our stories, offering unique expressions and shared resonance. But first we dance together, arms linked. Between each story, there is a further brief moment of music. It punctuates and connects the sombreness of the stories.



**Jeannie Wright**

*Being a woman is, it could be said, a risky business.*

(Nasser, Baistow, & Treasure, 2007, p. 4)

**Counselling at a Women’s Centre, 2007: A composite story**

Karen is 44 and lives alone. She was sexually abused from the age of seven to nine, and the man responsible, a member of her family, was prosecuted and subsequently went to jail for two years.

*I feel that nausea starting to rise up into my throat—how do I look to Karen?*

Karen has not been to see a counsellor before. She sits stiffly, holding her cellphone on her lap. Her goal is to lose weight and, she says, to look at the underlying reasons for her out-of-control relationship with food. She says she does not like herself very much.

*The poster on the wall behind us says:*

*“Can you pinch more than an inch? Do you give a shit?”*

*I feel very thin.*

The appointment was motivated by Karen’s lack of sexual feeling for, and lack of sexual intimacy with, her husband who has now left the marriage. Karen does not want to have sex any more, but wants to find out more about how the sexual abuse might have affected her family relationships. She came to the Women’s Centre for counselling because a course she attended included a visit here.

*She keeps smiling*

*I don’t know what to do with my face but we start to work.*

I choose to counsel in Women’s Centres. There is a comfort, perhaps, in the explicit messages—from the posters, photographs and artwork—that meet us when we walk through the door. As a daughter of second-wave feminism, the images and slogans are familiar to me from Women’s Centres in the UK, Fiji, and elsewhere. When I moved to live and work in New Zealand, I gravitated towards the Women’s Centre as if towards “the known”.

Working together now has been heartening, powerful, fun, mirroring some of the reasons why the women's movement managed to listen to individual stories and address political and social outrages—and that most-celebrated feminist challenge, “the personal is political”. There is some evidence that a new generation of women is coming together, both in the virtual and real worlds, to work on similar litanies of assault and injustice: the high incidence of rape and low conviction rates, violence against women inside the home and out, sexual abuse (see, for example, [www.thefword.org.uk](http://www.thefword.org.uk)).

Feminist theory and activism have made their mark. But I am sick of witnessing women's pain. After thirty years of the same kind of face that Karen's story shows, I'm wondering what we can do that will make a difference. Karen and I are both of European heritage. The intersectionality (hooks, 2000), or complex play of race, class, age, sexual preference, and other oppressions that might inform our work together, is partly addressed by the very centrality of gender—men are not allowed to work at the Women's Centre. Indeed, more generally in our profession, women are in the majority. And whatever the theoretical approach to working with Karen's so-called eating disorder that might be used (for example, Lock, Epston, Maisel, & de Faria, 2005; Nasser, Baistow, & Treasure, 2007), it seems to me that back in the schools, health centres, converted houses, and under trees, in counselling and other caring roles, women's low-paid (or voluntary) labour tends to the casualties of a world where women are still disadvantaged economically.

In her poem “I was a feminist in the eighties”, Anne Kennedy (2003, pp. 81–82) uses the satirical rather than the polemical voice:

*To be a feminist you need to  
Engage in mature dialogue with  
Your spouse on matters of domestic  
Equality, button your coat thoughtfully,  
Do the childminding, washing, shopping, cooking and cleaning  
While your mind is on higher matters ...  
Then a lion came prowling out of the jungle  
And ate the feminist all up.*

Eaten up? Regurgitated, feminism might have, or need, a different name. It might emerge in different places. Some of the changes we see in third-wave feminism (Enns, 2004) may lead to women not “doing it all” and not being eaten by the lion.



***Sue Webb: A starved heart***

Marilyn has bread but not roses. She cries quietly, trying to decide whether to leave Craig, thinking of her age and how lonely it will be when the children are gone. He shouts and criticises, but never hits. She worries about the effects of divorce on the children.

She tells, with a sudden lift, what a difference a job has made. She has money—to fund the children’s activities, school things, to buy them clothes, but nothing for herself. She reports Craig as saying that she spoils the kids. It is not just the money, but also a wider world, making a contribution, laughter and chat, a sense of competence and new skills—and new people to care for at work.

Behind Marilyn’s story, I catch a glimpse of Craig’s too, his mounting cholesterol levels and beer consumption in the safe company of mates. Bored with the sameness of his job and envious of Marilyn’s shiny new career, at home he sits alone, channel-surfing in the next room as he waits for his tea, fearful that his children, together with his wife, no longer respect him. Feeling bewildered, unimportant, and unloved, he’s no longer a hunter-gatherer like his dad, returning with warm banknotes for the family’s sustenance. His needs hide behind instructions, powerlessness behind control.

I talk to Marilyn of grief and care for others, set her to discover more about who she is and what she wants, help her express her anger. Without thinking of feminism, we address moral issues, boundaries, and independence.

But I would really like to work with this couple. Possession of the television remote and the ironing board need revisiting. Set roles around parenting could change. How might they sit in the same room? Can Craig make the link between influence and responsibility at home that women have always understood? Can Marilyn let go of the power she acquires through caring?

Sisters may be “doing it for themselves”, but isn’t it time for someone else to butter the bread and tend the roses, and for women to find ways to let them?

When first we discussed this research, I wondered if my feminism might have become contested in the last twenty years, along with its place in the academy (Patai & Koertge, 1994). What reassurance, then, to discover that feminist thinking seemed to underpin much of the work with Marilyn. With hindsight, I had Gilligan (1982) on women’s moral development, Lerner (1986) on boundaries, and even Woolf (1929) with

her room of one's own beside me, all of whom had impacted on my own life in time.

However, much of what both first- and second-wave feminism lobbied for still seems incomplete and problematic. I reflect on my own struggle to set limits on caring, my lone mastery of the new washing machine's digital cycles, despite a limited grasp of the TV remote's functioning. I found myself imagining Marilyn marching with Clark, Cartwright, and Gattung, banners broadcasting the right to work, equal pay, reclaiming the night; not arm-in-arm but trudging along behind, thinking of her daughters. Have I too abandoned some of my own desires in the hope that the next generation will do better? And do my daughters, and also my sons, understand that there is still a fight to be won (Aronson, 2003)?

However, in 2007 the pressing need seems not to be the unfinished battle for equality in the workplace and for financial independence. Instead, it is the postmodern dilemma of an overload of selves that women must now mediate (Williams, 2002), and the way that intimate relations have yet to change to match new roles in the world beyond home. This aspect, too, I discern in my own life, and its accompanying dilemmas of maintaining household control, taking responsibility for children, and acquiring caring roles in the workplace (Crawford, 2006). These parallels are likely both to hone my empathy, and to risk my being blind to some of my client's issues (Webb, 2002).

I have also considered my preoccupation with the unknown Craig. Was this a concern for what sounded like serious mental health issues; or a recognition that without addressing his part the relationship was doomed; or my historic tendency to be drawn to attend to the needs of men? I suspect all three. Heterosexual feminists often struggled in second-wave feminism to justify their commitment to relationships with men, but also articulated the need for men to change. Recent feminist family therapy (Norsworthy, 2000) has asserted that powerful social forces impact on family lives, and that families need to respond functionally to exterior changes. Reflection on practice in supervision enables me to challenge the unthinking inheritance I bring with me and the social context that supports it (Hawkins & Shoheit, 2000).

The battle for a better life for women, wherever in the world, continues. The family remains, however, the crucible of enduring change.

*Our lives shall not be sweated from birth until life closes;  
Hearts starve as well as bodies; give us bread, but give us roses!*

(Farina, 1976)



**Nan Blanchard**

As he comes into the room, Raj says, "You won't be able to help me, no one has." I immediately want to be the one who famously succeeds where no one else has.

Raj tells me he hasn't been able to sleep since he got here, which is over three months ago. He's from India, an international student at the college. His wife and three young children are back home, and it's uncertain at this stage just if or when they will be able to join him in New Zealand.

He's tried everything to get to sleep but nothing works. He needs his wife. He tells me he "uses" her to get to sleep.

My mind slips away to a woman in India. I imagine her through the eyes of Arundhati Roy, Bharati Mukherjee, Monica Ali, and Kiran Desai.<sup>2</sup> She is slim and fragile-looking. I imagine her at bedtime. Does she think of her husband far away? Or, after a long day mothering, preparing food and keeping house, does she experience relief at being able to just fall asleep?

I ask him if he's tried masturbating and he has, he says, but he can't, he feels guilty because it's against his religious beliefs. And nothing else works; he needs his wife.

I look at him and wonder what to say next. Clearly he is sad: lonely without his family, and lost and frightened in a foreign country.

He doesn't want to talk about his sadness. He wants to talk about not being able to sleep.

I can't convince him that masturbation is okay. Nor can I produce his wife. I am in the category of those who can't help—where I was before we started.

I am sick in my stomach. I feel shocked, miserable and inadequate. I worry that I have missed an opportunity to confront something that may be, at worst, rape, and at best, compliant sex. I worry that what I have decided is that rape or compliant sex (and I'm uneasy about the difference) is an interpretation of another woman's experience. I worry that my interpretation is culturally bound. And at the same time I hear the echoes of women's voices through the writing of Roy, Mukherjee, Ali and Desai. I know I am negotiating complexities of culture and gender. I am concerned about just how easily I lost sight of Raj and his struggle, and became preoccupied with his wife. I am disturbed by my pleasure at losing sight of him and at my fierce grip on this guilty pleasure. I am surprised to feel that a compassion for Raj lingers alongside my rage.

Segal (1999) asks, “Is the time for the renewal of feminism long past, given the remarkable shifts in gender relations?” (p. 2). This question can be extended to a reconsideration of the value of feminism in contemporary counselling practice in the light of Drewery’s (1986) article. In my view the answer is, yes, feminism is relevant in counselling practice today, even given the remarkable shifts in gender relations, which still cannot be assumed when the intersectionality of class, race, age, and sexual preference is considered (Ritzer, 2007).

How to practise feminism in counselling is another issue. If men and boys are now (arguably) victims of gender relations as much as women (see Lashlie, 2005), then working with men, and incorporating purposeful feminism into our work with men, is relevant too. And yet this response smacks of women’s traditional caring role and the assumption of responsibility for the wellbeing of others. At the same time it contradicts key dictions of feminism: for example, “the personal is political”, “women as sex class”, and “women-centred analysis and political concerns”, that arose out of consciousness-raising in the 1960s and 1970s (Eisenstein, 1984). However, it can be argued that if we don’t work purposefully with men, we ultimately disadvantage women. Also, I don’t know if I want to disadvantage men. After all, I have a son I love, and I live with a man I also love. I want to work with men towards a vision of a better future of intimate relationships.

There are “new” ways of understanding and negotiating these sorts of dilemmas. Feminist poststructuralism, for example, is concerned with disrupting and displacing dominant (oppressive) discourses (Gavey, 1989). It is also concerned with deconstructing “truth”; dismantling stable conceptions of meaning, subjectivity and identity; understanding existing power relations; and identifying areas for strategy and change (Weedon, 1987). How this translates into counselling practice is another matter. Narrative therapy is an obvious fit in terms of feminist poststructuralism, but I am surprised by my paralysis with Raj.

Perhaps my response is a product of a complex set of social, cultural, and historical circumstances that relate to the contradictions at the heart of feminism. These contradictions are difficult to negotiate but, as Joan Scott (1996) says, while feminism has only paradoxes to offer, it doesn’t make it any less relevant.



**Elmarie Kotzé and Kathie Crocket**

We three take our gender project<sup>3</sup> to Norway.

A woman from South Africa and New Zealand,

A man from the United States,

And a woman from New Zealand.

Feminists all of us.

Our project a feminist project.

We show our DVD.

On the DVD Ireni speaks of the backlash.

Another man from North America watches the women's stories and tells us that he does not think the backlash is a useful concept.

On the DVD, Barney speaks of the pain that has contributed to the stories he tells of negotiating gender in his life.

Another woman from South Africa watches the men's stories and weeps for Africa, for men and for women.

We three, feminists all, notice that the men's stories are more hearable to our audiences:

the men's stories invoke compassion.

The f(eminism) word. Does it work any more?

In our hotel room in Kristiansand the Norwegian language magazine tells a story of Esben Ester Pirelli Benestad.<sup>4</sup>

Esben Ester—medical doctor, sexologist, family therapist, father, bi-gendered.

At the conference Esben Ester introduces to us mothers who love and support their little boys who want to be little girls.

We see the child's paintings as the little boy becomes the little girl he desires to be—paintings no longer black and bleak; now multi-coloured and hopeful.

The g(ender) word. Does it work any more?

In our seaside cottage in Langesund there is another Norwegian magazine.<sup>5</sup>

It tells a story  
from Africa.

Women,

Beautiful glowing faces.



Beautiful glowing faces  
that belie the breasts below,  
skin dry and wrinkled,  
ulcerated,  
ironed flat,  
a product of the p word.

The p(atriarchy) word. It still works.  
Women in Africa with breasts ironed flat.  
Women in New Zealand still working to make our stories hearable.

The g(ender) word. We still need it.  
The f(eminist) word. We still need it, too.

On the DVD, *Telling and retelling gender stories*, Averill reminds us:  
“There won’t be any change without the conversations to speak it  
into being.”

“Spaces between” (Lather, 2006) echo in our presentation. There are spaces between certainties and uncertainties. We hold to the certainty of the importance of a political analysis of gender power relations. At the same time, we reach for new language and ways of thinking that might take us into uncertain spaces where new, different, and local responses might be shaped in response to lived experiences of gender. Other “spaces between” include the following:

**Different feminisms:** Our quest is for the feminism that is fitting for the context. Bronwyn Davies (1998, p. 136) explained how she calls on a discourse, perhaps liberal feminism, when it is most appropriate to her particular purposes. We want to keep finding our ways between feminisms.

**Gender:** In-between spaces make the queering/querying of gender possible (Benestad, 2007; Heath, 2007). Stories of transgender journeys (Okumura, 2007) remind us that negotiating gender is more than negotiating binaries: “I consider myself both straight and queer” (Benestad, p. 68).

**Geographic spaces:** Our presentation speaks of crossing geographical spaces. We speak our New Zealand gender project in Norway, and people from China, Africa, North America, and the UK cross spaces when they speak in response. We then speak our Norwegian experience in this New Zealand presentation. We notice that we are two white women speaking what we witnessed, as we read a magazine in Norway, of the lives of women in Cameroon.

**Spaces between men:** When a man at our Norway presentation speaks his criticism of the idea of the backlash because of its association with essentialism, another man speaks his commitment to listening other-wise (Levinas, 1981), so that he might hear the pain of women's speaking.

Our purpose here is to highlight stories in the spaces—spaces such as those which queering/querying produces; those in which African and New Zealand women live their lives; between genders; between performers.



**Sue Cornforth**

Where to start.

There's Jane—not her real name—the silent one.

So earnest, so intent, so voiceless.

So indescribably, but indelibly, Chinese.

Inclusion my goal.

Laryngitis her response.

We dance around each other. Touch by glance, by smile.

Little by little her story—a waterfall at the end—

Emerges.

Only child of hard-working parents, Jane is left alone from babyhood.

Here is the clock. Time to get up, time to get your meal, time for school,  
time for homework, time for bed.

Jane ticks, not talks.

Silent at school, she is assessed deficient by psychology.

Now words wash over her.

What of those parents—working hard long hours—how could they not see  
the effect of their abandonment?

Yet Jane has been loved—I sense the roots of her connection.

Equality in the workplace?

What pain do we inflict on our children and old people by working where  
they are not welcome?

What work is worth this?

What pain did my abandoned mother feel alone, as dementia advanced  
and I at work?

What pain my tearful firstborn daughter—"cuddles Mummy!"  
And yet, the agony of my earlier under-employed self.  
Harsh exclusion from affairs of state.

A divided house here—against itself.  
Feminism cannot, alone, unpick this dualism.

Wendy Drewery's (1986) article invites us to reflect on three themes: the relationships of power between counsellors and those they work with; the value assumptions underlying the practice of counselling, and the usefulness of the psychological theories that inform counselling interventions. These challenges remain alive for me, although they have taken a different shape. In the following paragraphs, I chase my shape-shifters.

My encounters with Jane left me powerless and puzzled. In some way I felt imbricated, drawn in, implicated. While strongly tempted to blame parents who leave a child alone, I cannot absolve myself from participating, and desiring to participate, in practices that separate home from work. I have laughed at posters on the ECE Centre door, showing a gleeful mother leaving her child behind, with the caption, "And mother said I'd feel so guilty!" I have chosen not to give up my work in order to care for an increasingly confused mother at the end of her life. I have sought promotion and personalised rejection. All these decisions leave me troubled.

**Duelling values.** A feminist lens might identify a dualism—a double world of public and private enterprise, powered by the different valuing of justice and care. Gilligan and Wiggins (1987) suggested that the values of justice and care were "two moral perspectives that organise thinking in different ways" (p. 20). To some extent, later feminist theory has remained fraught on this dualism (e.g. Held, 1995), with many philosophers still seeking reconciliation (e.g., Sterba, 2001). I wonder if the relative silence of the feminist voice in counselling may be attributed to the irreconcilable task of living with opposites (Chaplin, 1999).

From psychology to intersectionality. I was further disturbed by the cultural difference between myself and my student. Who was I to pass judgement on a generation of Chinese who had survived gruelling experiences during the Cultural Revolution? In what way was I competent to intervene in such a foreign and complex situation? It is here that the concepts of intersectionality and minoritisation (Burman, Gowrisunkur, & Sangha, 1998; Chantler, 2005) prove useful for me, for they take me beyond dualisms. Intersectionality allows me to see that women hold multiple positions. Jane's mother

was not just a working woman; she was also Chinese, with access to other categories, with other values, beyond my comprehension.

Several of our stories feature women from other cultures. We appeared to find embodied connection across continents, to resonate with the pain of those suffering the tragic effects of minoritisation in “the process of being positioned as a minority group” (Chantler, 2005, p. 244). It is striking to me how the feminist lens has widened. Feminism is no longer, for me, a white middle-class practice. It has global implications and takes its responsibilities seriously. While the concept of intersectionality has allowed me to track my shape-shifters to the slippery interfaces of culture, gender, race, and difference, the concept of minoritisation invites exposure of the relationships of power that perpetuate discrimination. Together they allow me to view oppression as existing in multiple dimensions. This view challenges traditional psychological theories, founded on the self-reliant, bounded individual, and shifts focus from individual subject to the practices within which people are offered subject positions. Where, previously, I might have debated the use of challenging versus supportive interventions, I now agree with Chantler who argues for “active engagement to address structural inequalities” (p. 254).



***Patricia Sullivan-Thompson: I will not die an unlived life***

Now in their seventies and married for nearly fifty years, they came together for their first-ever counselling session. When I asked where they would like to begin, she spoke first, calmly and quietly stating she wanted a divorce.

It was obvious by his response that this was the first he'd heard of this. Clearly she wanted someone else—a mediator—present when she made this announcement.

Five children and nearly fifty years later, she said she couldn't bear the thought of being buried next to him. She said little else except that she'd been miserable for years.

He was angry. Very angry, and blamed it on her going to “that crazy women's centre”. He asked her who was going to cook for him. He really did.

I wondered what finally gave her the courage to do what she said she had wanted to do for years.

I pondered on how his concern for his meals was the best he could come up with in the face of such an announcement.

I thought of her going to the women's centre and becoming aware,  
discovering her sense of entitlement,  
and how sad we have so few role models  
on how to be assertive without being aggressive,  
certain without being arrogant,  
and angry without being violent.  
I saw her about a year later at the supermarket, and hardly recognised her ...  
she looked so well. She told me he was still angry.

Two people in such pain sitting there in front of me, and I'm reminded of Markova's (2000) book, *I Will Not Die an Unlived Life*. In their seventies now, and with equal intensity—his anger and her resoluteness—I'm taken aback that the best he could come up with in such a serious moment seems to me tragic, sad, shallow, and yet somehow completely understandable.

I sit there, part of me personally struggling with the temptation to take sides and applaud her for the courage to leave, while telling her I'm amazed she could last so long. I am acutely aware of how their situation triggers my need for supervision: I acknowledge my frustration towards him (and men like him) as I resist falling into the abyss of my own family-of-origin issues and cultural upbringing from Southwest Louisiana. And I wonder who I'm cheering on for the courage to state that she needs more. I struggle to stay impartial and professional.

I want to shout: "Is that the best you can do? Do you not realise the seriousness of this present moment? Is it so very difficult to be real and acknowledge what is happening right now even with this situation? Life is offering you an opportunity here. I know you must be hurting but I can't see it anywhere!" I refrain.

My own helplessness and anger shift from a rather judgemental stance to genuine empathy—for them, for myself, for us all. I wonder about his story, and how many years his practice of stonewalling has been necessary to stay afloat emotionally (Gottman & Silver, 1999), and how old his fear of abandonment is.

I wonder how his response (or lack of) fits with Freud's belief that much of our emotional life is unconscious, and feelings stirred within us do not always cross the threshold into awareness (Gilligan, 1997), or if, instead, his response fits with Beck, who believed our spoken conversation and our silent conversation could potentially poison a marriage (Goleman, 1995). Or was it her response (or lack of). I don't know. But what a cost.

If one of the keys to satisfying and authentic lives is for us to be able to hold many truths—which is a way of accepting not only our own experience of life but the experiences of others as well (Gilligan, 1997)—then those of us from dysfunctional homes may recognise the particularly challenging work with the denied and lost aspects of ourselves (Hendrix, 1992) that are manifested in intimate relationships.

Feminism? Or humanism? I listen and learn from my learned colleagues about feminist literature and the history and future of third-wave feminism; I sense broad global implications for what we're discussing on personal and cultural levels across generations. Equality, respect, and the concept of multiple truths will hopefully enable us to learn how to "show up" well before our seventies so as not to die an un-lived life.



### **Coda**

The music fades. The triumphant conclusion, the final display of feminist solidarity we initially envisaged is at odds with the impact of what we have witnessed/re-presented. Tears flow and we are unsure of our ending. What now? There is silence. We have created a gap, a space, a fracture. Do we now resume our old lives, enriched and energised by developing connections, raising the gender issue at various local sites? Have we become third-wave feminists?

Our stories lead us to conclude that gender issues remain alive in our professional lives, and that third-wave feminism does not provide the answers we seek in addressing the pain we encounter. In this project, we have had to confront/work past other voices that might relegate the feminist cause to an historical event. In the wake of transformative theorising and political liberation, we (still) encounter women (now) struggling with overburdened selves.

Our vignettes expose the slippery surfaces that exist between (discourses of) race, gender, class, and age. We also note further differences within and between feminisms, gender, race, class, and age. Feminism alone cannot account for the struggles to which we bear witness. Instead, we note the spaces and gaps. In this performance, we have striven "to create and recreate spaces and places for the exercise of agency" (Jackson, 1995, p. 144).

We have worked to speak the unspeakable in the hope that new meanings might emerge and inform new actions.

## Endnotes

1. This article was first presented as a paper at the 5th New Zealand Association of Counsellors' Research Conference, Hamilton, October, 2007. Our thanks to Steve Lang, who provided the background for the performers on that day.
2. Ali, M. (2003). *Brick lane*. London: Doubleday; Desai, K. (2006). *The inheritance of loss*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press; Mukherjee, B. (1975). *Wife*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin; Roy, A. (1997). *The god of small things*. London: Flamingo.
3. Kotzé, E., Crocket, K., & Gaddis, S. (2007). *Telling and re-telling gender stories*. DVD. Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.
4. See Benestad, E. E. P. (2005). Questioning sex and gender identity: Was it a girl or was it a boy? *International Journal of Narrative Therapy and Community Work*, 1, 59–61.
5. *Aftenposten*, 15 June, 2007.

## References

- Aronson, P. (2003). Feminists or “Postfeminists”? Young women’s attitudes toward feminism and gender relations. *Gender and Society*, 17(6), 903–922.
- Benestad, E. E. P. (2007). From gender dysphoria towards gender euphoria. *International Journal of Narrative Therapy and Community Work*, 3, 67–69.
- Burman, E. (2001). Fictioning authority: Writing experience in feminist teaching and learning. *Psychodynamic Counselling*, 7(2), 187–205.
- Burman, E., Gowrisunkur, J., & Sangha, K. (1998). Conceptualising cultural and gendered identities in psychological therapies. *European Journal of Psychotherapy, Counselling, & Health*, 1(2), 231–256.
- Chantler, K. (2005). From disconnection to connection: “Race”, gender and the politics of therapy. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 33(2), 239–256.
- Chaplin, J. (1999). *Feminist counselling in action* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Crawford, M. (2006). *Transformations: Women, gender, and psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Davies, B. (1998). Psychology’s subject: A commentary on the relativism/realism debate. In I. Parker (Ed.), *Social constructionism, discourse, and realism* (pp. 133–145). London: Sage.
- Denzin, N. (1997). Performance texts. In W. G. Tierney & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Representation and the text: Reframing the narrative voice* (pp. 179–217). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Drewery, W. (1986). The challenge of feminism and the practice of counselling. *New Zealand Counselling and Guidance Association Journal*, 8(1), 18–28.
- Eisenstein, H. (1984). *Contemporary feminist thought*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Enns, C. Z. (2004). *Feminist theories and feminist psychotherapies: Origins, themes and diversity* (2nd ed.). New York: Haworth Press.

- Farina, M. (1976). *Bread and roses*. Lyrics retrieved on December 20, 2007, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bread\\_and\\_Roses](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bread_and_Roses).
- Gavey, N. (1989). Feminist post-structuralism and discourse analysis: Contributions to feminist psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 1, 459–475.
- Gergen, M. (2001). *Feminist reconstructions in psychology: Narrative, gender, and performance*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C., & Wiggins, G. (1987). The origins of morality in early childhood relationships. In J. Kagan & S. Lamb (Eds.), *The emergence of morality in young children* (pp. 277–305). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gilligan, S. (1997). *The courage to love*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Gottman, J., & Silver, N. (1999). *The seven principles for making marriage work*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Hawkins, P., & Shohet, R. (2000). *Supervision in the helping professions* (2nd ed.). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Heath, M. (2007). Up the steep learning curve: Some things I've learned about sex, gender, and sexuality. *International Journal of Narrative Therapy and Community Work*, 2, 41–49.
- Held, V. (1995). *Justice and care: Essential readings in feminist ethics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Hendrix, H. (1992). *Keeping the love you find*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- hooks, b. (2000). *Feminism is for everybody: Passionate politics*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Jackson, S. (1995). Negotiating self-defined standpoints in teaching and learning. In S. Jackson & J. Solis (Eds.), *Beyond comfort zones in multiculturalism* (pp. 128–147). Westport, CO: Bergin & Gavey.
- Kennedy, A. (2003). *Sing-Song*. Auckland: University of Auckland Press.
- Kotzé, E., Crocket, K., & Gaddis, S. (2007). *Telling and re-telling gender stories* [DVD]. Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Lashlie, C. (2005). *He'll be okay: Growing gorgeous boys into good men*. Auckland: HarperCollins.
- Lather, P. (2006). Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: Teaching research in education as a wild profusion. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(1), 35–37.
- Lerner, H. G. (1986). *The dance of anger: A woman's guide to the changing pattern of intimate relationships*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Levinas, E. (1981). *Otherwise than being: Or beyond essence* [A. Lingis, Trans.]. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press. (Original work published 1974.)
- Lock, A. J., Epston, D., Maisel, R., & de Faria, N. (2005). Resisting anorexia/bulimia: Foucauldian perspectives in narrative therapy. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 33(3), 315–331.



- Markova, D. (2000). *I will not die an un-lived life*. Boston: Red Wheel/Weiser.
- Nasser, M., Baistow, K., & Treasure, J. (Eds.). (2007). *The female body in mind: The interface between the female body and mental health*. London: Routledge.
- Norsworthy, K. (2000). Feminist family therapy. In A. Horne (Ed.), *Family counseling and therapy* (3rd ed.) (pp. 515–538). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.
- Okumura, A. (2007). No turning back: Male to female transgender journeys: Of getting through tough times. *International Journal of Narrative Therapy and Community Work*, 3, 57–66.
- Patai, D., & Koertge, N. (1994). *Professing feminism: Cautionary tales from the strange world of women's studies*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ritzer, G. (2007). *Contemporary sociological theory and its classical roots: The basics*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Scott, J. (1996). *Only paradoxes to offer: French feminists and the rights of man*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Segal, L. (1999). *Why feminism? Gender, psychology, politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sterba, J. (2001). *Three challenges to ethics: Environmentalism, feminism, and multiculturalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Webb, S. (2002, May). "Caught in a story": A discursive analysis of women's narratives when women counsel women. Paper presented at the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy Research Conference, London.
- Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and post-structuralist theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Williams, E. (2002). Preventing and managing personal and professional role strain. In C. Juntunen, D. Atkinson, & R. Donald (Eds.), *Counseling across the lifespan: Prevention and treatment* (pp. 243–259). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Woolf, V. (1929). *A room of one's own*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.



## Interlude

### **The Editors**

As these women were speaking, the stories they told called forth other perspectives from some who heard them. As the echoes of the voices fade, and silence falls, an antiphonal chorus of different voices now speaks into the space that has been opened up. Amid resonances with the first speakers, different notes and new tonalities can now be heard.

# A Response to the “F” Word

Meera Chetty and Estelle Mendelsohn

This paper is an invited response to “The ‘F’ Word: The challenge of feminism and the practice of counselling 20 years on.” As two women who had not met before, we discovered that we had come from vastly different worlds, from different ethnicities, cultures, life and work experiences, and we came together holding different perspectives on and understandings about feminism and its relationship to counselling. In presenting a response to issues this article raises, we first speak individually about our backgrounds, work, and views of feminism, then we join together to comment on the challenges presented by feminism in relation to the practice of counselling at the present time. We identify some options for a way forward, while also encouraging further engagement with the topic.

In attempting to produce a joint response to “The ‘F’ Word”, we found ourselves engaged in stimulating and thoughtful discussions in which we came to appreciate each other as individuals and as women counsellors, savouring the areas of commonality and difference. We grappled with the topic of feminism, listening to and learning from each other, bringing to the dialogue the very different worlds we emerged from and our varied life experiences, as well as referring to academic literature. We came to new personal understandings and a thirst for further engagement on the subject. We also appreciated the transparency and reflective practice of the authors of “The ‘F’ Word” as they initiated what we consider to be a very necessary discussion among counsellors.

We recognise that this debate is multifaceted and complex. In sharing our musings about issues raised in the article, we hope to contribute to what will no doubt be an ongoing process of engagement with the implications of feminism for the practice of counselling. First, we introduce ourselves.



***Estelle Mendelsohn***

I was born in Australia, but have lived more than half my life in Aotearoa. Diversity is alive and well in our family in many dimensions. I trained as a psychologist decades ago, then as a psychodramatist, so I have a love for group work. My work has focused on moving beyond trauma survival, especially for women. Earlier on, much of my work concentrated on sexual abuse trauma, but it has expanded to working with refugee and immigrant women. Doing this work and writing it up for my MPhil made me become much more disciplined and focused on just how I operated as a feminist in a transcultural context.

As I talked with Meera, I remembered why the human rights umbrella was not enough for me. In my thesis (Mendelsohn, 2002), I quote some major feminist activists who point out that human rights organisations, from the United Nations to Amnesty International, have not readily addressed issues of women and oppression. I still want to foreground gender equity and power structures.

Whether I overtly call myself a feminist or not depends on where I am and what my purpose is, and there are times when I may choose not to use the term. Over five decades of professional practice, I have needed to revisit this concern on many occasions. I have also had to endure being stereotyped and misunderstood when I do call myself a feminist, but part of my decision is to honour the many waves of feminism that have gone before.

In order to reflect the diversity of thinking, especially across cultures, I underscore the need to talk about feminisms, rather than feminism. Fluidity is another key word for me, as it reflects the changes in my own thinking as a result of reading the work of Middle Eastern and Indian feminists.



***Meera Chetty***

I am a South African woman of Indian origin and have lived in New Zealand for the past twelve years. I trained as a counsellor in South Africa and have worked with both adults and teenagers. Since coming to New Zealand, my client base has been very multicultural, and my work now includes individual, couple, and group counselling.

In responding to the article, I had to consider my position with regard to feminism. My answer to the question of whether I would call myself a feminist was a somewhat tentative, "No, but ..." I felt the need to clarify my response with explanations about how I still believed in and practised many of the tenets of feminism in my life. I had never identified myself as a feminist. However, as I pondered this question, I realised that gender issues had never taken precedence in my life for two reasons. First, having spent most of my life under the oppressive system of apartheid in South Africa, racism and human rights were my focus. The rights of women were incorporated into that struggle. Second, I wondered to what extent I had been riding the wave of, and benefiting from, the work of feminists of the previous generations. It seemed as though life for women had changed significantly between my parents' generation and mine, so that gender issues were not a priority, certainly not enough to take priority over racism.

As a consequence of having been faced with racism in various forms for all of my life, and having experienced the impact of assumptions people have made about me or my life experience based on my ethnicity, I hold strong beliefs about human rights, about valuing diversity, and the unique experience of every individual. When working with my clients, I am careful not to make assumptions about the outer coverings that I see, reminding myself of the importance of getting to know each person, beyond the limits of my vision. I attempt to understand their experience of the world and to enquire about the meanings they make of their experiences, often asking questions to ensure that I have an accurate grasp of the situation.

My response here represents my current position, as well as my ongoing quest for further understanding of the relationship between feminism and counselling.

### **The "F" word: what does it mean today?**

We concur with the authors of "The 'F' Word" that it is important to raise the issue of feminism, and to encourage further discussion about the commonalities of definition as well as the diversities. Gender issues and inequities remain alive in our world, as do other forms of oppression.

As we explored literature on the issue of feminism, it was interesting to note that writers comment on the reluctance of many women to identify themselves as feminist (Crown, 2005; Dankoski, Penn, Carlson, & Hecker, 1998). Dankoski et al. (1998) found that therapists, even when reluctant to describe themselves as feminist, believed in and practised many of the tenets of feminist-informed therapy. They suggested that the

multiple, divergent definitions as well as stereotypes of “feminism” appear to prevent many therapists from claiming adherence to the label “feminist”.

Several feminist philosophies have emerged over time, including socialist feminism, academic feminism, Marxist feminism, radical feminism, activist feminism, lesbian feminism, multicultural feminism, and liberal feminism (Holman & Douglass, 2004). A definition that attempts to integrate and fuse various tenets of several of those philosophies, and one that resonates with both of us, is offered by Holman and Douglass (2004), who suggest the term *developmental feminism*. Their definition keeps gender as a central organising identity for men and women, which interacts with other identities such as culture, race, ethnicity, sexuality and class in diverse and overlapping ways, resulting in the dominant gender, male, having a disproportionate allotment of power and opportunity. However, the construct of developmental feminism is fluid and continually evolving, while allowing individuals to be accepted at their developmental level, and encouraged to embrace new knowledge and explore their unique feminist identities (Holman & Douglass, 2004).

The complexity and diversity of feminist issues become especially apparent when viewed from a multicultural perspective. As reflected in the preceding article, we are increasingly likely to find ourselves working in our counselling practices with clients from different cultures, given the effects of globalisation and migration. Evans, Kincade, Marbley, and Seem (2005) remind us of the key tenet of feminism, which has always been that the personal is political. They point out, however, that the nuances of what feminism means for individual women will differ on the basis of their particular racial, cultural, and class-related circumstances. Further, they warn that it is essential to construct theories and therapies that are “shared, inclusive; and culturally, racially, politically, and gender sensitive” (p. 8).

The concept of intersectionality also resonates with us in this regard, and reminds us to respect the individual experiences of women. Chandra Mohanty (1991) points out that the intersections of the various systemic networks of class, race, sexuality and nation all position us as women (Mohanty, 1991, cited in Mendelsohn, 2002). Speaking of “a theoretical gridlock that characterises much current feminist discourse about race, racism and ethnicity,” Susan Stanford Friedman (1998) observes that

*Scripts of denial, produced largely by white women for whom race has not been a source of oppression, cover a range of stories affirming female and feminist sisterhood that, in their exclusive focus on gender, covertly refuse the significance of race.*

(p. 41)

The "blindness to categories of race and ethnicity as coordinates of identity" that can arise from adherence to the feminist goal of an alliance of women everywhere against patriarchy, may be associated with denial of "the structural process of 'othering' by a host of other factors such as race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, religion, national origin, and age" (p. 41). In our work with our clients, we are in danger of replicating the power relations we intend to challenge, if the scripts we reproduce are determined by the way we create otherness through our white feminist lenses. These may inhibit us from seeing the nuanced complexity of our clients' identities and experiences.

In an earlier paper, Mohanty (1988) pointed out the danger of stereotyping both men and women:

*An analysis of "sexual difference" in the form of a cross-culturally singular, monolithic notion of patriarchy or male dominance leads to the construction of a similarly reductive and homogeneous notion of what I shall call the "third-world difference"—that stable, ahistorical something that apparently oppresses most if not all the women in these countries. It is in the production of this "third-world difference" that western feminisms appropriate and colonize the constitutive complexities which characterize the lives of women in these countries.*

Whether one is engaged in feminist academic discourse, or in attempting to build relationships with clients in our counselling rooms, "defining women as archetypal victims freezes them into 'objects-who-defend-themselves,' men into 'subjects-who-perpetrate-violence,' and (every) society into a simple opposition between the powerless (read: women) and the powerful (read: men) groups of people" (Mohanty, 1988). Discussing the development and importance of relational thinking about identity, Friedman (1998) explains the ways in which cultural narratives of relational positionality help us move beyond binary perspectives, and recognise the fluidity of interacting situational identities. "Power and powerlessness, privilege and oppression, move fluidly through the axes of race, ethnicity, gender, class, and national origin" (p. 49).

### **Feminism and counselling**

We believe that a challenge exists for any counsellor who wishes to express feminism as a practitioner in ways that will enable her to meet the needs of both men and women: Is it possible for those beliefs and values to be held in a manner that allows the counsellor to engage respectfully with her clients? We see the vignettes in the "The 'F' Word" as illustrative of contexts in which counsellors may encounter this dilemma.

The problem is not inherent in the feminisms practitioners may identify with, but in the potential impact on their interactions and relationships with clients.

Based on the information provided in some of the vignettes, we were concerned with the ways in which counselling environments, counsellors' emotional reactions to client issues, and counsellors' assumptions and worldviews seemed to impact on the counselling processes. We offer some questions for consideration.

What are our obligations as counsellors to ensure that the physical environment in which counselling takes place is welcoming and inclusive for clients? In choosing the way in which we decorate our rooms, to what extent should we focus on what may be comfortable for our clients, rather than primarily for us as counsellors? To what extent could our assumptions or worldviews limit our ability to enter fully into a client's world? To what extent does the intensity of our emotional response hamper our engagement with a client? Could our generalisations and stereotypes about other cultures prevent us from entering into clients' individual life experiences? When might the lenses through which we see the world and through which we interpret our clients' experiences, and the filters through which we hear our clients' stories, limit our capacity to respond compassionately and competently as practitioners?

We also believe that the following questions need to be addressed. How do we stay present with and respectful of our clients? Would we have the courage to take these issues to supervision and would they be addressed there? Are there supervisors available who hold an awareness of, and sensitivity to, issues related to *both* feminism and multiculturalism? How do counsellors hold their perspectives as feminists while working with individuals from other cultures, in the counselling environment, who may or may not be feminists, or sensitive to feminist thinking? How do counsellors ensure that they do not impose their views of what it means to be feminist on their clients?

### *A way forward?*

It seems to us that, as counsellors, we need more opportunities to examine and reflect on our perspectives on issues related to feminism, as well as on the various forms of oppression experienced by women. This could happen in supervision, particularly as relevant issues arise in the context of working with clients. However, due to the risks associated with discussions of race, gender, and culture, it would be important that supervisors understand their own experiences and position on these issues, prior to engaging in discussions with supervisees (Nelson, Gizara, Hope, & Phelps, 2006).

Instead, it may be more productive and satisfying for women practitioners to

meet with other interested colleagues to have open discussions about their experiences as women in the world, and about feminist theories that may illuminate or challenge the ways in which we make meaning of these experiences. Particularly enriching would be having such discussions with groups of women from various backgrounds or life experiences, to provide us with wider perspectives. To be effective and ethical practitioners, we need to make every attempt to understand the individual experiences of women, rather than, however unwittingly, making "blanket" judgements about groups of women and men based on their ethnicity or culture. While acknowledging that we are always affected by our own particular cultural lenses, through which we see and interpret the world, developing personal relationships and engaging in genuine dialogue with diverse women is likely to enable us to be more available to our clients, and more able to explore their unique experiences with them. Only when rapport and relationship are established with our clients do we have a mandate to challenge or propose alternative viewpoints within the counselling process.



### **Coda**

Having engaged with this material individually as well as in discussion with each another, we have each evolved to a new but different stance with regard to the construct of feminism. Meera needs to have a human rights perspective, but now also sees the need to engage more consciously with the specific, gender-related needs of women and men in their social contexts. Estelle would still like to foreground feminism, as she is still not convinced that human rights, as currently constructed, pays sufficient attention to the needs of women. We join with the writers of "The 'F' Word" in hoping that through further debate and discussion, new meanings might emerge that could lead to new actions.

### **References**

- Crown, A. (2005). *Choice is the power of feminism*. Retrieved April 30, 2007, from Feminism and Women's Studies, <http://feminism.eserver.org/theory/feminist/Crown-Choice-is-Power.html>.
- Dankoski, M. E., Penn, C. D., Carlson, T. D., & Hecker, L. L. (1998). What's in a name? A study of family therapists' use and acceptance of the feminist perspective. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 26(2), 95–105.



- Evans, K. M., Kincade, E. A., Marbley, A. F., & Seem, S. R. (2005). Feminism and feminist therapy: Lessons from the past and hopes for the future. *Journal of Counselling and Development, 83*(3), 269–278.
- Friedman, S. S. (1998). *Mappings: The cultural geographies of feminist encounter*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Holman, A., & Douglass, M. (2004). *Counselor education and supervision: Is feminism alive? Exploring the feminist identity of counseling students*. Retrieved April 30, 2008, from Vistas Online, <http://www.counselingoutfitters.com/vistas/vistas04/32.pdf>.
- Mendelsohn, E. (2002). "Women New Settlers: Groupwork in resettlement." Unpublished Master's thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Mohanty, C. T. (1988). Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourse. *Feminist Review*. Retrieved May 11, 2008, from <http://social.chass.ncsu.edu/wyrick/DEBCLASS/mohant.htm>.
- Nelson, M. L., Gizara, S., Hope, A. C., & Phelps, R. (2006). A feminist multicultural perspective on supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counselling and Development, 34*(2), 105–116.