Contesting the Theo-ethical Rhetoric of Home: Feminist and Postcolonial Politics of Space

Contesting the Theo-ethical Rhetoric of Home:

Feminist and Postcolonial Politics of Space

A thesis presented

By

Stephanie Louise May

To

The Faculty of Harvard Divinity School

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Theology

In the Subject of

Religion, Gender, and Culture

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

April 2012

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL

DISSERTATION ACCEPTANCE CERTIFICATE

The undersigned, appointed by the

Committee on the Study of Religion

have examined a dissertation entitled

Contesting the Theo-ethical Rhetoric of Home:
Feminist, Postcolonial Politics of Space

presented by Stephanie Louise May

candidate for the degree of Doctor of Theology and hereby certify that it is worthy of acceptance.

Signature _____

Typed name: Prof. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza

Signature _____

Typed name: Prof. Leila Ahmed

Signature _____

Typed name: Prof. Susan Abraham

Date: April 23, 2012

Advisor: Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza **Author: Stephanie Louise May**

Contesting the Theo-ethical Rhetoric of Home:
Feminist and Postcolonial Politics of Space

ABSTRACT

Although the rhetoric of home is broadly used and may seem banal, it is a notion that has been significantly contested in recent decades. This dissertation critically analyzes the politics of space within the rhetoric of home by locating "home" within socio-economic constellations of power. To underscore the linkages between the domestic family home and the political homeland, I place critiques of home in feminist Christian discourses into critical dialogue with postcolonial critiques of home.

After beginning with a contextual discussion of the rhetoric of home in U.S. history, I thematically address the rhetoric of home in feminist and postcolonial discourses. Firstly, I examine the rhetoric of violence and the home. By engaging both feminist and postcolonial texts, I show how home is not only a site of violence, but also functions as a tool of violence. Secondly, I explore the rhetoric of work and home in feminist Christian discourses. Critically analyzing differing articulations of the relationship between work and home reveals alternative spatial models of the socio-economic dynamics that construct the social and material landscape. Finally, I show how the rhetoric of home and heaven in Christian discourses express utopian visions for dwelling together. Examining these discourses raises important questions about how the rhetoric of home functions to create ethical and cultural norms.

In conclusion, the dissertation surveys the range of strategies feminist and postcolonial discourses have used to intervene in the politics of space in the rhetoric of home. To these strategies, I add an argument for engaging the alternative rhetoric of "dwelling together." The rhetoric of home and homeland has a problematic legacy of violence and exclusion that masks critical intersections of race, class, gender, sexuality, marital status, and national identity. A feminist, postcolonial Christian rhetoric of dwelling together seeks to create a theo-ethical framework that more adequately addresses the ethics of spatio-socio-economic interrelations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my advisor, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, for her ongoing faith in me to persist in critically untangling the notion of home. By consistently challenging me to engage and incorporate the dynamics of violence, oppression, and politics within the rhetoric of home, her direction has significantly strengthened this work. I am deeply grateful for the gift of working together both on this thesis as well as with the *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion.*

As a white, middle-class, Midwestern "American," I have had much to learn about postcolonial thought. I thank both Leila Ahmed and Susan Abraham for their help in engaging this material not only as text, but as a "peculiar mindset." I thank Professor Ahmed for teaching me to carefully attend to the particular U.S. and Christian contexts of my work. I thank Professor Abraham for guiding me through the intricacies of the shifting, complex terrains of space, time, and identity.

For helping to set the groundwork for this dissertation, I wish to thank three ethicists whose courses and conversations have had lingering impact: Hille Haker, Joan Martin, and M. Christian Green. In addition, I thank Amy Hollywood for her role in shaping the earliest versions of this project. For broadening my engagement with the studies of women, gender, and sexuality, I thank Caroline Light and Linda Schlossberg.

As a single mom, I simply could not have done this alone. There are many who have helped in small and big ways within the Harvard and Cambridge communities over the years. I thank especially Katherine Bain, Deborah Whitehead, Nan Hutton, Katy Attanasi, and the RGCers past and present with whom I have shared many hours of colloquiums.

More than anyone, the support and steadiness of my partner Bill enabled me to make it through the program to the end. I thank him for his generosity of spirit and the gift of space-time in which to write—whether in a condo, a trailer, or, an office of my own.

And, finally, I thank my son, Alek. For him, I have sought a way to challenge narrow conceptions of home which would exclude him and me.

To my son, Alek
May he find his own way of dwelling in justice and love

INTRODUCTION

Space, Power, and the Rhetoric of Home:
The Problem of "Home" in Feminist Christian and Postcolonial Discourses

The rhetoric of "home" is both prevalent and powerful. We reside at a place we call home while also feeling "at home" in other places. We have homerooms, homeruns, homepages. The point is "driven home" in an argument or a statement "hits home." The rhetoric of home is everywhere. Yet, what—or where—is "home"? Is home indeed the "home, sweet home" to which we always seek to return? Is home really where they must always take you in? Is home our natal origin or a heavenly destination towards which we are headed? Do we have one home or many? Can a person be a home? Or a group? Or an idea? As this dissertation will seek to show, efforts to answer such questions provoke significant discourses. From family values to immigration to national security, the rhetoric of home circulates within religious, political, and social debates.

Feminist discourses have been a significant site of contestation over the rhetoric of "home."[1] For example, the "place" of women in the home has been a major issue of debate between conservative Christians and feminists—both secular and religious—in the U.S. during recent decades. While many feminists have generally fought for women's increased and equal participation in the "public" arena, conservative Christians have typically called for women to remain in the home with the "family." In order to resist the rhetoric of home intended to control and limit women to the care and nurture of others, many feminists have sought to deconstruct, subvert, or transform the rhetoric of home. These critical feminist efforts have been important

[1] Even when home is not placed in scare quotes, it should be read with the critical suspicion this analysis seeks to bring to "home."

for articulating a number of ethical issues associated with the rhetoric of home—including the patriarchal (heterosexual, married) family, motherhood, domestic violence, unwaged labor, as well as the politics of belonging to a particular place, group, or nation.

Such feminist critiques of home often address dynamics of space and place. Within (predominantly white) feminist discourses, home has often been presented as a space of oppression for women. In particular, feminists have critiqued a gendered spatial division of home and world that has served to keep women isolated in the home as their "sphere"—a legacy of the 19th century rhetorical construction of white womanhood and domesticity.[2] From a different socio-economic location, lower-class and/or non-white women have perceived their oppression not as *containment* in the place of home, but rather *exclusion* from an ideal of home constructed by socio-economic dynamics which excluded their experiences as women.[3] Moreover, the home has been exposed as a place of sexual and physical violence against

---

[2] For classic examples of white feminist critique of home see: Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1952); Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (New York: Norton, 1963); and Adrienne Rich, *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1976). For discussions of 19th century construction of womanhood and domesticity see: Gillian Brown, *Domestic Individualism Imagining Self in Nineteenth-century America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Nancy Cott, *Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000); Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture* (New York: Noonday Press/ Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1998); Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Colleen McDannell, *The Christian Home in Victorian America, 1840-1900* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986); Amy Richter, *Home on the Rail: Women, the Railroad, and the Rise of Public Domesticity* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005).

[3] Gloria Albrecht, *Hitting Home: Feminist Ethics, Women's Work, and the Betrayal of "Family Values"* (Continuum Publishing Group, 2004); Elizabeth Bohls, "A Long Way from Home: Slavery, Travel, and Imperial Geography" in Belinda Straight, *Women on the Verge of Home* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005); Katie Cannon, *Katie's Canon Womanism and the Soul of the Black Community* (New York: Continuum, 1995); Angela Davis, *Women, Race, and Class* (New York: Random House, 1981); Ruth Feldstein, *Motherhood in Black and White* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000); Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, *Righteous Discontent The Women's Movement in the Black Baptist Church, 1880-1920* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993).

women—servants, slaves, wives, daughters, and sisters.[4] Far from being a place of ultimate security, the home represents one of the more *unsafe* spaces for women.[5] Thus, for good reason, many feminists have been wary of "home."

Yet, feminist discourse has not been alone in developing a substantial critique of "home." Concurrently with the development of feminist critiques, a strong postcolonial critique of the rhetoric of home also developed. Whereas feminist critique of the notion of home has focused primarily on politics of gender with substantial attention also given to race and class, critical postcolonial discourses of home have also focused on the rhetoric of home as a tool to reinforce colonial power. The colonial trope of "home and abroad" functioned to divide the world into two unequal parts. In the wake of this bifurcation of power through the rhetoric of home, postcolonial critiques have critically questioned what it means to be "at home" within geo-spatial dynamics of colonial power that map colonial spaces as not-home. Furthermore, colonialism has effected a global movement of peoples. For many persons, this movement has disrupted easy articulations of the location of home. To describe these kinds of uneasy ambivalences of being "at home" in colonial spaces, Homi Bhabha deploys a notion of the unhomely.[6] In part a reference to Freud's essay on the *unheimlich* (or the uncanny—as it is usually translated in

[4] Katie Cannon, *Katie's Canon*; Joan Martin, *More Than Chains and Toil: A Christian Work Ethic of Enslaved Women* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000); Dorothy Roberts, *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty* (New York: Pantheon, 1997).

[5] Between 2001-2005, on average approximately 60% of non-fatal intimate partner victimizations occurred at the victim's home. "Intimate Partner Violence in the U.S.," Bureau of Justice Statistics, accessed March 29, 2011. http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/intimate/circumstances.cfm

[6] Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, (New York: Routledge Classics, 2004), 14-15.

English), this notion of the unhomely becomes picked up in a number of postcolonial discourses struggling to articulate ambivalence towards the colonialist rendition of home.[7]

However, postcolonial discourse has not simply been about unhomely dislocation and ambivalent belonging. Rather, a number of questions about socio-economic power are raised by postcolonial critiques of the rhetoric of home in nationalist and imperialist projects. For example, Anne McClintock argues that social categories of race, class, and gender become articulated in and through one another by colonial discourses of domesticity. In short, the "natural" hierarchy of the "Family of Man" is used to chart hierarchal differences of race, class, and gender.[8] Insofar as colonialism relied on domestic metaphors of the patriarchal family to define the socio-political order, the political economy of kinship and the political economy of nations were inextricably intertwined. In other words, notions of home functioned to reinforce particular constellations of socio-economic power in both the "family" unit as well as the national "family." In this way, notions of *home and homeland* are understood to be constructed together.

Although not all postcolonial discourses have been feminist, there are feminist scholars in postcolonial studies such as McClintock who have articulated gender as a part of the larger constellations of social power in notions of home and homeland.[9] However, these insights of feminist postcolonial thought have been largely unincorporated into critical feminist Christian

---

[7] Sigmund Freud, "The Uncanny" in *The Uncanny*, ed. David McLintock, and Hugh Haughton (New York: Penguin Books, 2003). Examples of the use of "unhomely" include: Sneja Gunew, "The Home of Language: Pedagogy of the Stammer," in *Uprootings/Regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration*, eds. Sara Ahmed, et al. (New York: Berg Press, 2003), 47; Cynthia Sugars, ed., *Unhomely States: Theorizing English-Canadian Postcolonialism* (Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press, 2004).

[8] Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather.* See especially, introduction, 4-9, and chapter one, 36-39. I discuss McClintock at greater length below.

[9] Reina Lewis and Sara Mills, eds., *Feminist Postcolonial Theory: A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2003).

critiques of home. In this dissertation, I address this gap by weaving together feminist Christian and postcolonial critiques of the rhetoric of home. The need for a combined feminist and postcolonial rhetorical analysis of home, homeland, and Christianity in the U.S. arises from the ongoing political effect such discourses have upon U.S. policy and peoples. For example, throughout the 1980's and 1990's, the conservative Christian culture of the "Religious Right" made "family values" a politicized catch-all to address a range of social and economic issues that were laid at the doorstep of "broken homes." Significantly, this same group of conservative Christians formed the political base of the George W. Bush administration that chose to rename the post-9/11 security apparatus *Homeland* Security. In this way and in many others throughout U.S. history, the rhetoric of home, homeland, and Christianity has been interwoven. By engaging both feminist Christian and postcolonial critiques of home, I seek to show the ideological and rhetorical connections between home, homeland, and Christianity.

Within the study of religion, critical analyses of home have also been present. Feminist Christian theo-ethical critical analyses of home began to emerge in the late 1980's and early 1990's. As will be shown in the following chapters, feminist theo-ethical discourses offer broad and sustained critical analyses of the gendered aspects of home—often in direct response to the conservative Christian rhetoric of home circulating in public, political discourses. In more recent years, some scholars in religion have also engaged a postcolonial framework to critically analyze how notions of home have functioned to create and sustain particular socio-political locations, relations, and institutions of colonialism "at home and abroad."[10] Although a handful of feminist

[10] For example, a 2009 AAR Special Topics Forum entitled, ""*Our Home and Native Land": Colonial Encounters and the History of Religion, Spirituality, and the Secular*." American Academy of Religion, Program Book, accessed online March 28, 2012, http://www.aarweb.org/Meetings/Annual_Meeting/Past_and_Future_Meetings/2009/default.asp?

theo-ethical scholars in religion such as Kwok Pui Lan or Laura Levitt have drawn from both traditions of critical analyses of home, much of the two sets of discourse have not directly engaged one another.[11] Religion scholars of space and place have also addressed notions of home in a minor way. Yet, religious studies scholarship framed in terms of space and place has often focused primarily on an anthropological approach of ritual and sacred space that has not substantially engaged the socio-political analyses of either the feminist or postcolonial strains. Conversely, feminist theo-ethical and postcolonial discourses on home have shown little dialogue with questions of space and place as theorized within anthropology or critical geography.[12]

Although the election of Barack Obama as president in 2008 suggested the waning power of the "Religious Right" in U.S. politics, the underlying conservative Christian discourses of a "traditional" home as white, patriarchal, heterosexual, married, and economically self-sufficient continue to be a sizable voice in sustaining a particular view of home and homeland. From gay marriage to "illegal" immigration to the economic fallout from the *home* mortgage crisis, notions of home and homeland continue to circulate within highly contested socio-political issues. As the following chapters will argue, the rhetoric of home/land plays a critical role in shaping the constellation of theo-ethical norms about how and which persons should live together. Thus, a

---

ANum=&DayTime=&KeyWord=our+home+and+native+land&Submit=View+Program+Book#results

[11] Kwok Pui Lan, "Finding Ruth a Home: Gender, Sexuality, and the Politics of Otherness" in *Postcolonial Imagination and Feminist Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 100-124. Laura Levitt, *Jews and Feminism: The Ambivalent Search for Home*, (New York: Routledge, 1997).

[12] For a recent feminist theological book that deliberately engages critical geographies of place, see Mary McClintock Fulkerson, *Places of Redemption: Theology for a Worldly Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 24-52.

critical feminist analysis of the theo-ethical rhetoric of home is a salient project for both feminist studies in religion and for Christian ethics.

For decades, the feminist Christian rhetoric of home has offered strong critiques of "home."[13] These feminist Christian discourses provide a crucial articulation of the injustices shaped by the rhetoric of home as well as the suggestion of an alternative feminist Christian rhetoric of home. Postcolonial critiques of the rhetoric of home help to build a more complicated critique of the rhetoric of home that incorporates political elements of nationalism often overlooked in the feminist Christian critiques of home. By engaging both feminist and postcolonial critiques of the rhetoric of home, I will critically examine in what ways a feminist Christian rhetoric of home may be challenged and rearticulated through the analysis of these postcolonial critiques.

Notes on Method: Feminist Critical Rhetorical Analysis

In a substantial way, this dissertation is a critical analysis of critical analyses. In other words, I write *about* critical feminist theo-ethical and postcolonial discourses while also critically engaging these discourses to *produce* a critical feminist, postcolonial theo-ethical discourse.[14] By choosing to focus on a critical feminist analysis of *discourses*, I understand my

[13] I have chosen to use the phrase "feminist Christian" rather than "Christian feminist." By electing to modify "Christian," I am underscoring an emphasis on plural kinds of Christianities, eg. feminist, conservative. In this way, the phrase "feminist Christian" stands as a rhetorical parallel to the phrase "conservative Christian." While using "Christian feminist" could underscore the point that feminisms are also plural, I choose "feminist Christian" to highlight the intra-Christian debates over the notion of home as well as to make it clear that feminist thought abounds *within* Christianity.

[14] In using the term "theo-ethical", I am first of all trying to reflect that the texts that I examine in subsequent chapters are categorized as both "theology" and as "ethics." Secondly, I use the term following the work of ethicist Joan Martin who writes, "By "theo-ethical tools" I mean presuppositions, methods, and strategies that inform the development of systematic, normative social ethic grounded in the biblical and theological traditions of Christian faith." FN 17, *More*

work to be situated within a critical feminist rhetorical method such as that put forth by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Rebecca Chopp, and others.[15] Within this framework, rhetoric is understood both as constituted by social context as well as constituting social contexts. In this way, rhetoric is understood as being implicated in the institutions, structures, and practices of a society.

Rhetoric can construct, reinforce, or challenge social structures and institutions. To understand how a particular rhetoric is functioning within a given socio-economic context, a critical rhetorical analysis asks who is speaking, for what purpose, and to what end. Implicit within these questions are the dynamics of power that shape who is able to speak as well as the purposes and end of a given rhetoric. Thus, as a *feminist* critical method, analyses of the structures of power that reinforce gender domination are a particular concern. However, because gender does not exist in isolation, it is necessary also to critically analyze the structures of race, class, gender, and heterosexuality that form a constellation of interrelated dynamics of power which Schüssler Fiorenza has conceptualized as kyriarchy.[16]

---

than Chains and Toil: A Christian Work Ethic of Enslaved Women, (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000), 159.

[15] Rebecca Chopp, *The Power to Speak Feminism, Language, God* (New York: Crossroad, 1989)*;* Chopp, "Feminist Queries and Metaphysical Musings" in *Modern Theology* 11:1, (Jan, 1995): 47-63; Chopp, "Prophetic Feminism and Theological Education," in *Shifting Boundaries*, ed. Barbara G. Wheeler and Eward Farley (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991), 67-89. Also, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999)*;* Schüssler Fiorenza, "Public Discourse, Religion, and Women's Struggles for Justice" in *DePaul Law Review*, 51/4 (2002); Schüssler Fiorenza, "Religion, Gender, and Society: Shaping the Discipline of Religious Studies" in Carl Reinhold Bräckenhielm and Gunhild Winquist Hollman, eds., *The Relevance of Theology: Nathan Söderblom and the Development of an Academic Discipline* (Uppsala University: 2002), 85-99**.** See also, Rosemary Hennessy, *Materialist Feminism and the Politics of Discourse* (New York: Routledge, 1993).

[16] Although Schüssler Fiorenza has been using the term for many years, for a good definition and discussion of this neologism see Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *The Power of the Word: Scripture and the Rhetoric of Empire* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 14. For a descriptive image of kyriarchy, see Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992), 117.

Because I am engaging a feminist critical method to analyze *feminist* discourses, it is important to further clarify this approach. By writing a critical rhetorical analysis of texts that are themselves often performing very similar methodologies of critical analyses, I understand my work as a critical continuation of their analytic insights. While there is clearly precedence for critical discussion and self-critique within both feminist and postcolonial scholarship, I engage in this work carefully with the hope of avoiding the reification of either anti-feminist or colonist discourse. Insofar as I engage postcolonial discourses to analyze the role of nationalism within some feminist Christian discourses, I do so only with the desire to strengthen the feminist Christian analysis of the critique of power. My aim in weaving together feminist Christian and postcolonial texts is to argue for an ever more complete articulation of intersecting constellations of socio-economic power.

Whereas a deconstructive analysis of the systems of power is a fundamental part of critical feminist analysis, the method must also proffer new ways of speaking and acting. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza writes,

> A critical feminist interpretation must be both deconstructive and reconstructive at the same time. It must unmask both the kyriarchal discourses of contemporary culture and those of the biblical text itself; it must also rewrite them by asserting the presence and agency of wo/men in kyriarchal texts, cultures, and religions. [17]

In addition to the articulation of power dynamics within the rhetoric of home, I also aim to "rewrite" how we speak of home in a way that foregrounds how women have resisted these dynamics of power—even leveraging the rhetoric of home to advance commitments to social and environmental justice.

A critical feminist rhetorical analysis assumes a connection between speech and actions. Rebecca Chopp explains, "ways of speaking have been structured into the ways of acting and

[17] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Sharing Her Word*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1998), 105.

vice versa."[18] Understanding rhetoric in this way raises not only the question of how a particular discourse has functioned to structure institutions and practices, but also how practices and institutional structures construct the ways we speak. For this reason, there is an exchange between altering how we speak and shifting how we act.

The articulation of the constellations of kyriarchal power operating in a particular rhetoric makes evident the links between speech, actions, and socio-economic structures. Rather than accepting a particular constellation of social practices as an unchanging given, the articulation of the elements that construct the constellation makes evident that dynamics of power have determined the shape and contours of social practices and structures. In this way, a critical rhetorical analysis can be a move to both deconstruct and subvert the power of dominant discourses while creating room for an alternative articulation of particular social structures and practices. Through this alternative articulation, the possibility of imagining different possibilities for the arrangement of social structures and practices also emerges. In this way, speaking differently can change ways of acting. Conversely, changing practices and structures may suggest—or even demand—alternative ways of speaking.

A critical feminist rhetorical analysis of home demonstrates both how socio-economic dynamics of power shape the rhetoric of home as well as the impact of the rhetoric of home on constituting the socio-economic landscape in which people act and speak. As a rhetorical construction, home is used to launch grand appeals to reify or challenge socio-economic institutions such as marriage, the family, and the nation. My goal is to articulate ways in which particular socio-economic dynamics of power have shaped what constitutes a ("model") home as well as who will and will not be welcome in that conception of home (and/or the terms of

[18] Chopp, *Power to Speak*, 93.

inclusion/exclusion). A critical feminist rhetorical analysis seeks to identify the constellations of power operating within the rhetoric of home to draw the links between speech, action, and socio-economic structures. As the following chapters will make clear, the notion of "home" is deeply implicated in constellations of power that function to shape social practices as well as the very material landscape within which we dwell.

The Politics of Space

> *"Moreover, and again as a result of the fact that [space] is conceptualized as created out of social relations, space is by its very nature full of power and symbolism, a complex web of relations of domination and subordination, of solidarity and co-operation."*[19]
>
> *-Doreen Massey*

"Home" is constituted by rhetoric, but it is also a materially constructed place. In speaking of the social contexts and the social structures of power that constitute the rhetoric of home, I also seek to understand these dynamics of power as material and spatial. In attending to the spatiality of power, I seek to make clear the very real material impacts that the rhetoric of home can have upon the everyday lives of persons as well as upon the political policies of a nation. As feminist geographer Doreen Massey argues, space matters in analyzing social processes. In the beginning of her book *Space, Place, and Gender*, Massey describes her work as "the attempt to formulate concepts of space and place in terms of social relations."[20] Massey's work represents a wide discussion in geography today to understand space and place in terms of socio-economic structures and social practices.

The spatiality of power in geographic terms has also appeared in feminist theory. For example, sociologist Ruth Frankenberg describes her work on white women's childhoods as

[19] Doreen Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 265.
[20] Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*, 2.

"social geographies of race."[21] This method enabled Frankenberg to engage "a complex mix of material and conceptual ingredients" that shaped the physical and ideological contexts of white women's understandings of race.[22] Likewise, I find that incorporating space and place in a critical feminist rhetorical analysis of home expands and strengthens the articulation of the dynamics of power functioning to construct "home."

A well-known example of the analysis of space and power can be found in Foucault's discussion of the panopticon.[23] The space of the panopticon is designed to allow a single central tower to view a number of individual cells which are always visible, but whose inmates are never certain of when they are being observed. This spatial organization establishes everyday relations of power between guard and inmate as well as the self-disciplining of inmates. While Foucault presents a ready reference to explain the relation of space and power, Marsha Marotta argues that the problem with Foucault is his presentation of space as "a static, disciplining space with no clear exit."[24] In contrast to this notion of space as "static", Marotta upholds the work of Doreen Massey and Henri LeFebvre who see space as "multiple and dynamic, space that is actively constructed and that can and should always be contested."[25] Whereas both views of space acknowledge that power and space impact one another, a view of space as multiple, dynamic,

---

[21] Ruth Frankenberg, "Growing up White: Feminism, Racism, and the Social Geography of Childhood," in *Space, Gender, Knowledge: Feminist Readings,* eds. Linda McDowell and Joanne P. Sharp (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc, 1997), 211-212. Previously published as "Growing up White: Feminism, Racism, and the Social Geography of Childhood," *Feminist Review* 45, (1983): 51-84

[22] Frankenberg, "Growing up White," 211.

[23] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (NY: Vintage Books, 1995), 195-228.

[24] Marsha Marotta, "Motherspace: Disciplining through the Material and Discursive," in *Motherhood and Space: Configurations of the Maternal through Politics, Home, and the Body*, eds. Sarah Hardy and Caroline Wiedmer (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 16.

[25] Marotta, "Motherspace: Disciplining," 16.

and contestable better opens up the possibilities of contesting and transforming spaces and places.

A closer look at Massey's understanding of space and place can better elucidate the significance of space as multiple, dynamic, and contestable. Firstly, Massey holds that space is a "product of interrelations."[26] The key idea here is that space is not found or discovered in any absolute sense, but is "constituted through a process of interaction."[27] Constituted by a process, spaces are not static—although they may at times appear to be stable. For example, a road map of the U.S. may convey the boundaries of the nation as if they were fixed, stable, and "found," but the space of the U.S. has been constituted through centuries of socio-economic processes of power. Furthermore, the boundaries of the national space are continually being defined through a constellation of practices from maintaining signage and border patrols to enacting immigration, military, and monetary policies. This ongoing constitution of space *in time* leads Massey to speak not of space *and* time, but space-time. Massey insists, "Space is not static, nor time spaceless."[28]

However, instead of understanding space-time as a singular narrative or as one large shared stage, Massey argues for a notion of space that is multiple. "For there to be temporality (change) there must be interaction," argues Massey.[29] Constituted by interaction and interrelations, space necessitates more than one thing, a multiplicity. This multiplicity of interrelations means that space is not singular, but multiple. More than one space exists not only over time (e.g. different spaces of the U.S. from 1776 to 2012) but also at any one time, simultaneously (e.g. as a white, graduate student at an elite university my "American" space is

[26] Massey, "Spaces of Politics," in *Human Geography Today*, eds. Doreen Massey, John Allen, and Philip Sarre (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1999), 279.
[27] Massey, "Spaces of Politics," 279.
[28] Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*, 264.
[29] Massey, "Spaces of Politics," 282.

very different than the "America" of an undocumented immigrant from Mexico living in Arizona).

This understanding of space as simultaneously heterogeneous departs from colonial logics of grand narratives of progress that mapped the world in terms of "civilized" and "backward."[30] According to Massey, understanding space as simultaneously multiple also means that space is not a closed system but is open-ended. As such, she describes space as "disrupted and as a source of disruption."[31] It is this understanding of space as dynamic, multiple, and open to disruption that enables a politics of space to emerge.

Feminist geographer Daphne Spain foregrounds the importance and possibility of disrupting and transforming spaces in her book *Gendered Spaces*.[32] Spain's book focuses primarily on how particular spaces are gendered—both in the U.S. and in several cultures around the globe. Her key argument is to insist that spaces reproduce gender differences and signal hierarchies of gendered status. Changing the spaces can change the status of women. For example, she examines the gendered layout of U.S. office space and compares closed door spaces of privacy usually occupied by men with open areas of desks full of distractions usually occupied by women.[33]

Spain argues that such a gendered layout not only affects attentiveness to task, but also reflects a gendered hierarchy of status with most of the critical information about the business

---

[30] An example of postcolonial critique of a singular historicity is Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000). Within feminist thought, a challenge to a singular notion of modernity is found in Lara Deeb, *An Enchanted Modern: Gender and Public Piety in Shi'i Lebanon*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006). Ann McClintock speaks of "panoptical time" and "anachronistic space" in *Imperial Leather*, 36-42.
[31] Massey, "Spaces of Politics," 280.
[32] Daphne Spain, *Gendered Spaces* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992).
[33] Spain, *Gendered Spaces*, chapter 8, "The Contemporary Workplace," 199-229.

circulating behind closed doors. To access the higher status jobs, women literally needed to gain spatial access to the knowledge circulating behind those closed doors. This is but one example of how gendered dynamics of power shape the possibilities for women's lives. To open up alternative possibilities for women, the very material structures and spaces through which power operates must be challenged and changed. Although Spain's work focuses on gender, her argument nonetheless points to how a wider range of socio-economic dynamics of power can structure spaces and reinforce hierarchies and inequalities.

Not only do spaces reinforce socio-economic hierarchies, spaces themselves are arranged in hierarchical relations to one another. As Sara Mills writes, "I will be viewing space not as a given, but as a series of spatial frameworks operating at the same time in hierarchical relations with, and often conflicting with, one another, as many social spaces negotiated within one geographical place and time."[34] The spatial hierarchy of "women's spaces" and "men's spaces" in Spain's text is one example. Mills gives the example of colonial spaces in which "women and men, colonized and colonizer, negotiate their positions in space through their interrogations of their respective social positions."[35] Within the same geographical space and at the same time, not only gender but also race and nationality (as colonizer/colonized) interact in complex, differing ways. For example, whereas a Virginian slave owner and slave may have shared the same geographic space and time, the social spaces inhabited by each were arranged hierarchically.

Given this multiplicity of spaces and the hierarchies within and between spaces, it becomes clear that "space is encoded and policed/regulated in different ways for different groups

[34] Sara Mills, *Gender and Colonial Space* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2005), 26.
[35] Mills, *Gender and Colonial Space*, 27.

of women and men."[36] Addressing the inequality between spaces, Mills quotes anthropologist Henrietta Moore:

> The ruling or dominant groups in society always present their culture both as natural and as the culture of the whole society…The plurality of culture and the existence of alternative interpretations and values are not usually emphasized in the symbolic analysis of space, or indeed in the symbolic analysis of any form of cultural representation.[37]

The dominant group in a society often presents their cultural space as both "natural" and as the singular culture of the whole society. However, as Mills reiterates, there are differences among various groups' experiences and constructions of space. Furthermore, within the dominant construction of space (e.g. women need to be chaperoned in the public sphere because it is dangerous for women) there is both resistance (e.g. women travel alone) and variation (e.g. not all women experience threats/assault). Simply because a dominant group's view of space may have been presented as "natural" or singular does not mean it was accepted as such by all members of the society.

By understanding space as constituted by social relations, the multiplicity, fluidity, and inequality of spaces becomes evident. Space is not a static setting, stage, or "empty background against which we perform our quotidian activities, our power differentials, and our social maneuverings."[38] Rather, space as the "product of interrelations" is socially constructed and imbricated in the dynamics of power that shape socio-economic dynamics and structures.[39] As such, dynamics of socio-economic (in)equality function to construct spaces *and* spaces function

---

[36] Mills, *Gender and Colonial Space*, 33.
[37] Henrietta L. Moore, *Space, Text, and Gender: An Anthropological Study of the Marakwet of Kenya* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 74. Quoted in Mills, *Gender and Colonial Space*, 33.
[38] Sarah Hardy and Caroline Wiedmer, eds., introduction to *Motherhood and Space: Configurations of the Maternal through Politics, Home, and the Body* (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 2.
[39] Massey, "Spaces of Politics," 279.

to reinforce patterns and structures of socio-economic (in)equality. For example, in the spaces of housing—e.g. "slums" versus gated suburbs—inequalities arise from the dynamics of race, class, gender, and sexuality. At the same time, inequalities in the spaces of housing function to help spatially and materially reproduce a society structured by such inequalities (eg. access to good schools, employment, even food are spatially organized differently for "slums" versus gated suburbs.)

Insofar as a critical feminist rhetorical analysis seeks to analyze the social context of rhetoric, attending to the spatial and material context of rhetoric is also important—especially when critiquing the rhetoric about a space, such as the space of home. In the subsequent chapters, I will endeavor to show the inequalities that are reproduced in and through the rhetoric of home. Furthermore, I aim to show how dominant articulations of the rhetoric of home have not only reproduced the power of the "dominant group" in the U.S., but have also been resisted and contested.

By contesting a singular or "natural" notion of "home," I want to both make clear the dynamics of power operating in the dominant rhetoric of home as well as attend to the presence and possibilities of resistance to this dominant rhetoric. As Sarah Hardy and Caroline Wiedmer write, "allowing for the possibility that space can emerge and change over time …enact[s] one of the more liberating moves of space theory, the idea that conceptions of space as fluid and multiple and emerging result in the possibility of alternative political trajectories."[40] In other words, thinking of space as a "product of interrelations" enables the politics of space to emerge—including the possibility of liberation from unjust and violent conceptions of space.

[40] Hardy and Wiedmer, *Motherhood and Space*, 9.

As a final note, it is important to clarify the relationship between "space" and "place."[41] For many geographers and social theorists, these terms are used interchangeably, although a clear preference for one often emerges within a text. However, for Massey and others, a distinction is made between space and place. Broadly speaking, space is used to convey the entire complex "product of interrelations" whereas "place" signals a particular constellation of interactions. Massey writes,

> Social relations always have a spatial form and spatial content. … And it is the vast complexity of the interlocking and articulating nets of social relations which is social space. Given that conception of space, a "place" is formed out of the particular set of social relations which interact at a particular location.[42]

Significantly, this passage is taken from a chapter entitled, "A Place Called Home?" in which Massey argues against nostalgia for a singular, unchanging home. Acknowledging that changing landscapes of home can provoke anxiety, she nonetheless questions for whom and for what reason a changing place—such as the place of "home"—provokes anxiety? If the place of home is to be understood as a particular constellation of social relations at a particular time, then the disruption of the place of home is also a disruption of those (spatialized) social relations.

For this reason, a critical rhetorical analysis of home in feminist Christian and postcolonial discourses can help to articulate the constellation of social relations that function in a particular time and location of the contemporary U.S. to construct the notion of "home." By attending to the place of home as constituted by a spatialized process of social relations, the role that rhetoric and the rhetorical context of a particular time and location play in constituting "home" becomes evident. Conversely, the spatial landscape and layout of "home" as it is

[41] Of course these terms have been widely debated in geographic discourses. For a discussion and comprehensive list of references see, Ron Johnston, et al., *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, 4th ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000), 767-773.
[42] Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*, 168.

materially reproduced in particular times and places functions to shape the rhetoric of home. By critically analyzing the rhetoric of home, I aim to show the range of socio-economic dynamics, theo-ethical commitments, and material practices that intersect in the constellation of social relations that constitute the places called "home."

Chapter Outline

The rhetoric of home has been prevalent and multiple. Home has been depicted as a person, a place, an ideology, and more. Given this multiplicity of the rhetoric of home, it should not be surprising that critical feminist theo-ethical rhetorics of home have also addressed notions of home in a variety of ways. Although these varied discourses have been produced for decades, they have often been somewhat isolated and not treated thematically or systematically. For example, critical feminist discourse on the family and home has not always been linked to critical feminist analysis on heaven and the home. Thus, a primary goal of this dissertation is to trace the multiple ways critical feminist analyses of home have been deployed in recent decades. By presenting a thematic analysis of feminist theo-ethical discourse on home, I hope to investigate how critical feminist analyses of home function to articulate constellations of socio-economic power that constitute the rhetoric and space of home.

Because a critical feminist rhetorical analysis understands rhetoric as occurring within a particular socio-economic context, chapter one explores the context of the rhetoric of home, homeland, and Christianity in the United States. Before discussing the more recent appearance of the rhetoric of *homeland*, I critically analyze the rhetoric of home and nation in three moments in U.S. history: the rhetoric of *homespun* during the U.S. Revolution; the promotion of *homesteads* as a project of Christian civilization and U.S. expansionism; and the 19th century Cult of Domesticity with its rhetoric of "*home, sweet home."* Together these three moments underscore

how the rhetoric of home, nation, and Christianity are interwoven in the U.S. context. This historical background informs the emergence of the rhetoric of "Homeland Security" in the contemporary U.S. context. Analyzing these four examples demonstrates how the rhetoric of home refers not only to particular kinds of material spaces, but also to constellations of socio-economic power that reinforce inequalities among differences of race, gender, sexuality, economic status, religious, ethnic, or national identity.

Chapter two analyzes the rhetoric of home and violence by interweaving feminist theo-ethical critiques of domestic violence with postcolonial critiques of the political violence of homeland. Constructed by and constitutive of constellations of power, the rhetoric of home needs to be understood as a tool that can function to violently enforce particular patterns and hierarchies of power. Despite the association of the rhetoric of home with safety, violence in the home has been critiqued as a significant problem in feminist Christian theo-ethical discourses.[43] This chapter critically analyzes several examples of these discourses while noting the limits of their critiques in addressing matters of imperialism. Thus, the chapter moves to a survey of postcolonial critiques that unmask the political ambitions within the imperial rhetoric of home. At issue in this discussion is the idea that violence in the place called home is fundamentally intertwined with the violence of imperial projects of the homeland. The chapter concludes by examining two different engagements with postcolonial critiques of home in feminist studies in religion. These two examples raise the question of how feminist Christian discourses might

[43] Marie M. Fortune, *Sexual Violence: The Unmentionable Sin: An Ethical and Pastoral Perspective* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1983); Traci West, *Wounds of the Spirit: Black Women, Violence, and Resistance Ethics* (New York: New York University Press, 1999); Elisabeth Soto Albrecht, *Family Violence: Reclaiming a Theology of Nonviolence* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2008).

intervene in the politics of space to challenge patterns of hierarchy and violence in the rhetoric of home.

Chapter three focuses on spatiality in the rhetoric of home and work. With the rise of the 19th century Cult of Domesticity, a gendered, spatial distinction between the places of work and home became pronounced and has lingered in socio-economic structures. This chapter critically analyzes three feminist Christian theo-ethical critiques of women and work to illustrate the role spatial metaphors play in articulating different understandings of the dynamics between "work" and "home." The chapter argues that home as a spatial term is often used to draw out a particular map of how the world works, i.e. the proper arrangement of socio-economic relations to reinforce particular hierarchies. These spatial maps of home function to structure socio-economic relations within the household as well as within the national and global markets.

In the final and fourth chapter, I critically examine how the rhetoric of heaven and home has functioned to convey a kind of theo-ethical "map" of ideal socio-economic relations. Also with roots in the 19th century Cult of Domesticity, notions of heaven as an idealized site of heavenly family reunion have left a lasting impact on the theo-ethical rhetoric of home. Chapter four examines the varied feminist Christian theo-ethical responses to the rhetorical legacy that links home and heaven. Whereas some eco-feminist Christian theo-ethical discourses have sought to relocate "home" from heaven to earth,[44] some other theologians deploy the rhetoric of heaven and home to articulate alternative visions of an ideal space.[45] Both strategies reflect how

[44] Sallie McFague, *The Body of God: An Ecological Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993); Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic: The Politics of Biblical Studies,* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999); Emilie Townes, *In a Blaze of Glory Womanist Spirituality as Social Witness* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995).
[45] Letty Russell, *Household of Freedom: Authority in Feminist Theology* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987)*;* Emilie Townes, *In a Blaze of Glory*; Namsong Kang, "A "Transit

the rhetoric of home and "heaven" can function to provide a framework of ethical normativity. The chapter concludes by exploring recent feminist discourses that seek to move beyond the rhetoric of both home and heaven to articulate an ethical vision for how to dwell together.

Ending Thoughts Before the Beginning

The notion of home is multiple, complex, and shifting. Through a critical feminist rhetorical analysis of varied notions of home, my goal is to articulate the structures, practices, and ways of speaking that reinforce notions of home and homeland that reify injustice and violence. Despite the widespread use of the rhetoric of home, home is not a banal idea. Notions of home and homeland frequently participate in the construction and policing of spaces to violently exclude or to enclose persons, places, and things. Indeed, the rhetoric of home is deeply imbricated in the dynamics of socio-economic power and a politics of space. Feminist and postcolonial critiques of home will show how the construction of the rhetorical and material spaces of home and homeland are implicated in these dynamics of power. By naming the dynamics of power at work in the rhetoric of home, my foremost aim is to deconstruct home as a natural, fixed space unconnected to socio-economic dynamics or politics of power. Rather, as we will trace, notions of home have always been changing and interwoven with a constellation of political and theo-ethical claims, practices, and structures.

By helping to shape the ideological and material spaces in which we dwell together, the rhetoric of home has not only functioned to reinforce particular socio-economic structures and social practices, but has also functioned to convey theo-ethical claims about the structure of the ideal society. In contrast to a conservative Christian rhetoric of "family values" with a singular

---

Home" Away from Home," in *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, 21.2 (Fall, 2005): 123-126.

ideal of a "natural" family, I argue for a feminist Christian ethic of "home" that promotes greater justice and multiple ways of dwelling together. By connecting the familial rhetoric of home to the political rhetoric of homeland, I argue for an ethical framework that traces the linkages among the ethics of marriage, family, and sexuality with the ethics of immigration, global economic inequality, and the U.S. wars on terror. In this way, I hope to suggest an alternative trajectory for an understanding of dwelling together that does not reproduce the hierarchies, violence, and injustices that have so often been perpetuated in the name of a Christian "home" and "homeland."

CHAPTER ONE

From Homespun to Homeland Security:
The Rhetoric of Home in U.S. Historical Context

Imagining a home is as political an act as is imagining a nation.
-Rosemary Marangoly George, The Politics of Home

Not all homes are alike. Nor are all ideas of home the same. Within the rhetoric of home lie elements of architectural design, theo-ethical values, and socio-economic power. Excavating and articulating these varied elements is far from simple. The rhetoric of home not only reflects variations in cultures, religions, geographies, and technologies, but, as Aamir Mufti and Ella Shohat argue, the very idea of home contains a "fundamental ambivalence" between notions of home as a place or as a desire.[1] In articulating this ambivalence, Mufti and Shohat gesture toward the spatialized social interrelations that construct human belonging in a particular place. "Home" can signify both spatial relations to a particular geography as well as a location within a constellation of (spatialized) social interrelations. In both senses—as place or as desire—the rhetoric of home is constituted by a politics of space that reinforce particular patterns of social interaction.

Distinguishing between home as "place" or as "desire" reflects a prevalent divide in emphasis within much of the rhetoric of home. Understood primarily as a "place," the rhetoric of home may draw upon architectural history—reflecting on changing styles of housing design, layout, and materials—or, upon elements of geography—tracking shifts in population density

[1] Aamir Mufti and Ella Shohat, "Introduction," in *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*, eds. Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat (University of Minnesota, 1997), 1.

and boundaries of political influence. In contrast, articulating the rhetoric of home as "desire" invokes political, religious, psychological and cultural discourses regarding belonging to a particular community of like-minded or blood-related people—of finding an ideological "home" and/or establishing identity. Rather than strongly distinguish between these, I seek to attend to how the material and spatial aspects of the rhetoric of home are interwoven with the articulations of social and religious belonging. To illustrate the interwoven rhetoric of home as place and desire, this chapter explores both the elements of the material history of "home" in the U.S. and the ideological rhetoric of home that has helped to construct this material and cultural landscape of dwelling in the United States.

Because there are multiple ways to articulate the idea of "home," the discussion that follows can in no way be a fully comprehensive account of the notions of home in U.S. rhetoric. However, to give some historical context to the contemporary moment in which the rhetoric of home and Homeland Security circulate, I trace three different rhetorical uses of home in the U.S. context: homespun, homestead, and "home, sweet home." Although my treatment of these three rhetorical variants of home will reflect a historicity, the aim is not to convey a narrative "truth" of the past. Rather, my goal is strategic: to show that the rhetoric of home is implicated not only in notions of gender, race, class, and religion but also in constructions of national identity and imperial projects.

In other words, the rhetorical constructions of home and nation are interwoven through constellations of power. In this way, the rhetoric of home and nation participate in the construction of socio-economic systems that privilege the "homes" of some persons while removing others from the "homeland." By tracing the particular contours of the rhetoric of homespun, homestead, and "home, sweet home," I aim to demonstrate the interwoven notions of

home, nation, and Christianity in the U.S. rhetoric of home. In conclusion, I demonstrate how these ideological maps of power inform the emergence of the rhetoric of "Homeland Security" in the contemporary context as a more recent convergence of home, nation, and Christianity.

To help articulate the connections between home and nation, I employ tools of postcolonial analysis to foreground dynamics of imperialism within the U.S. context. By engaging a postcolonial framework, I hope to unsettle assumptions of American exceptionalism. Rather than a notion of the U.S. as a nation unique in its divinely ordained democratic constitution, I will argue that U.S. notions of national identity emerged through a transnational context of imperialism that was heavily justified through Christian beliefs and practices. Not only did trans-Atlantic relationships with England and Europe shape the U.S., but so did the conflicts and relationships with the First Nations already present on the American continent.

Although notions of imperialism have often been used primarily to designate political relations between geographically distant places, I use language of imperialism in reference both to the U.S. national expansion on the American continent as well as the extension of U.S. power into territories beyond the geographic shorelines.[2] I understand imperialism as the (violent) imposition of political authority upon a place and/or people for the expansion of a particular system of power. In this regard, my efforts to critically analyze the rhetoric of home within a U.S. context seek to visibly locate the U.S. within global networks of power.[3] Tracing transnational networks of power is integral to articulating a story of home and nation. As the below analysis attempts to demonstrate, colonial and imperial power justified through racialized,

---

[2] For a discussion of "settler colonialism" see the introduction of Daiva Stasiulis and Nira Yuval-Davis, eds., *Unsettling Settler Societies*: *Articulations of Gender, Race, Ethnicity and Class* (London: Sage Press, 1995).

[3] Although using language of "global" networks of power, I am more interested in the work of transnational feminists than that of neo-liberal globalization. See Inderpal Grewal, *Transnational America: Feminisms, Diasporas, Neoliberalisms* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005).

gendered, Christian beliefs has substantially shaped the contemporary U.S. rhetoric of home and nation (homeland). And, in this way, the rhetoric of home has participated in the reproduction and maintenance of socio-economic systems that have generated violence and privileged some at the cost of others.

Homespun Revolution:
The Role of Domestic Production in the Creation of a Nation

In composing a brief narrative of the rhetoric of home, nation, and Christianity in the U.S., I start at the "beginning" of the nation. Before the "United States of America" was its own nation, the geographical territories that became the U.S. were colonies of England, France, Spain, and the Netherlands. Before the U.S. became colonial territory, the land was occupied by Native American peoples.[4] Thus, interpretation is already at work when marking a particular point as the beginning of a narrative about the United States.[5] For this reason, the project of constructing a narrative of U.S. history must be mindful of what Zillah Eisenstein articulates as a "*before* that I cannot completely ever know or recover."[6] *Before* Europeans "found" the space that would become the U.S. nation, there were people, nations, and cultures that cannot be fully known and recovered. In "discovering" America, the colonial processes of marking territory as

[4] In response to the Fall 2011 rise of the Occupy Movement, Native American activists countered, "THE UNITED STATES IS ALREADY BEING OCCUPIED. THIS IS INDIGENOUS LAND. And it's been occupied for quite some time now." Jessica Yee, "OCCUPY WALL STREET: The Game of Colonialism and further nationalism to be decolonized from the 'Left'," *Racialious* blog, September 30, 2011. http://www.racialicious.com/2011/09/30/occupy-wall-street-the-game-of-colonialism-and-further-nationalism-to-be-decolonized-from-the-left/ [Emphases in the original]

[5] Another example of the contested "pre"-history of the colonial U.S. is the story of New Netherlands whose fact of existence was nearly eradicated after falling under British control. Russell Shorto argues that the early Dutch colony had a lasting influence on the character of the U.S. that has been largely ignored. *The Island at the Center of the World* (New York: Doubleday, 2004.)

[6] Zillah Eisenstein, *Against Empire: Feminism, Racism, and the West* (New York: Zed Books, 2004), 24. On the politics of historical interpretation, also see Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995).

either "home" or "abroad" began a rhetorical narrative of locating the U.S. within political notions of home.[7]

In the beginning of the European colonial period, the Europeans generally failed to perceive the land as inhabited. Conflicting notions of how to dwell on the land and with one another rendered much of the land a vacant wilderness in the eyes of the Europeans. On the one hand, English civilization was marked by the clear demarcation of land ownership through clearing land, fencing, tax policies, and inheritance laws. On the other hand, the Native peoples of Southern New England practiced farming methods such as unfenced, irregularly shaped planting fields as well as burning forest undergrowth to promote berry production.[8]

Moving between coastal planting fields and sheltered inland sites, the Wampanoag of New England constructed seasonal *wetu* rather than maintaining year-round villages as the English. Without fixed boundaries marking property and purpose, to the English the land appeared unused and not marked by "civilization." Nor were Native spiritual practices located in a singular built structure—such as an English church—thereby raising doubts for the English about the presence of religious principles in the Native cultures.[9] Furthermore, the introduction of European diseases from earlier, itinerant traders and explorers had decimated the populations of the coastal Native Americans. In this regard, certain places simply did lack the presence of substantial populations of Native peoples.[10] Thus, in multiple ways, the English colonists read the text of geographical space against their own understanding of the built environment,

---

[7] Rosemary Marangoly George, *The Politics of Home: Postcolonial Relocations and Twentieth-Century Fiction*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 2-3.
[8] Kathleen J. Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1500-1650* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996), 15-16.
[9] Bragdon, *Native People*, 17.
[10] For a discussion of depopulation and disease surrounding early colonial establishment, see Russell Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: A Population History Since 1492* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), 71.

civilization, and religious observance. Although in a new space, the colonists brought with them the social practices that had long constructed their own English homes.

Examining the types of houses and built environment constructed by early settlers in the U.S. makes evident the effort to reproduce the European spaces of "home" in the colonies. House construction bore the marks of the homes left behind with early colonial settlement patterns and housing structures reflecting regional differences within England. Modeled upon their housing in East Anglia, Puritans built wooden, two–storied houses with the second story jutting out. However, the Chesapeake Bay gentry built houses "with great halls running through the house, resembl[ing] gentry manors in the south and west of England, where many of them originated."[11]

In the Spanish colonial lands of New Mexico, large houses around a courtyard reflected building styles of southern Spain, whereas northern Spanish style of shade-covered balconies and arcades were reflected in Florida houses. Although African slaves were often housed in structures designed by Europeans, houses constructed by slaves or free Africans often reflected African housing models with a 12 by 12 feet footprint.[12] Thus, in these varying ways, housing models reflected an ongoing connection to the "home" countries from which the colonists originated. Models of home were not simply left behind, but were reproduced in the New World.[13]

---

[11] William E. Burns, *Science and Technology of Colonial America* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2005), 66.
[12] For a discussion of Thoreau's cabin as modeled upon the houses built by former slaves in Concord, MA, see Elise Lemire, *Black Walden: Slavery and its Aftermath in Concord, Massachusetts* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 129-131.
[13] Gwendolyn Wright, "Prescribing the Model Home," *Social Research*, Vol. 58, No. 1 (Spring, 1991): 213-225.

Through Christian discourse, the construction of housing and the material civilization of the colony were invested with more than the need for shelter. For example, the call of Massachusetts Governor John Winthrop for Boston to be a "city upon a hill" functions rhetorically to link housing patterns with religious and political purpose. Building a city (colony) was not only a material construction project, but was understood as a very public material manifestation of a religious commitment. Winthrop's evocation of the Biblical book of Matthew can be understood as a *warning* to the Puritans to create a charitable, Christian community lest their story be passed around the world as one of *failure*. For the Puritans, the "empty" land had been a gift of God's Providence for which they had become responsible. Constructing this new place—the metaphorical and literal city—would convey to the world their religious, social, and material commitments.

Thus, constructing a new city in this land not only signaled a legitimate claim to ownership through establishing a built environment, but also fulfilled their religious duty of constructing a successful Christian community. In this way, the material transformation of the land upon the model of an English city participated in the project of creating a Christian civilization. Public housing historian Lawrence Vale explains, "The Biblically grounded claim that the land belonged to those who dwelled and labored upon it transformed the humble home of the colonial pioneer into a sanctified gesture."[14] For the Puritans, building a new house and constructing a city was both an act of religious devotion and a claim to ownership.

With faith in the religious project of inhabiting the "empty" land to establish a Christian commonwealth, the European population grew and spread in early colonial New England.

[14] Lawrence J. Vale, *From Puritans to the Projects: Public Housing and Public Neighbors* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 22. To make his point, Vale quotes Winthrop's matter-of-fact claim that "God hath consumed the natives with a miraculous plague whereby the greater part of the country is left void of inhabitants."

However, as the nations of Native peoples faced increasingly restricted land use, the "empty" *before* refused to be silenced. In 1637, the outbreak of King Philip's War both killed hundreds of English settlers and destroyed dozens of towns. In her account of the war, historian Jill Lepore argues, "English possessions were, in a sense, what was at stake in the war, for these—the clothes they wore, the houses they lived in, and the things they owned—were a good part of what distinguished the English from the Indians."[15] By attacking the houses, farms, and villages of the English, King Philip's men challenged the legitimacy and superiority of English settlement on American soil. For the Colonists, losing these lands and possessions signaled a rupture in their sense of faithfully reproducing the English model of home. Despite Puritan efforts to recreate English towns, commons, and churches, policing the boundary between the European and the Native American erupted in violent contestation over access to and patterns of dwelling upon the land.[16]

As with the Puritans of the north, the southern plantation colonies also mingled notions of home, English identity, and Christianity. Faced with a hot, temperate climate, the landscape clearly reflected that English settlers were no longer at home in England. Although slavery existed in all early American colonies, the large African slave populations of the southern plantation states such as Carolina created demographics that clearly failed to resemble the

[15] Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity*, (New York: Knopf, 1998), 79. Although Lepore titles her book "King Philip's War," her central question about "the name of war" circles around the idea that winning a war also enables the victors to name the war. Thus, in her opening pages she recounts and suggests alternate names but inevitably reaches the same place as Eisenstein in questioning the irrecoverable *before.*

[16] Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005), chapter 1 and 3. For a related discussion of Native peoples' relationship to land as home in Australia, see Michael Jackson, *At Home in the World* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995).

English metropole.[17] Within this context, the ritual and space of the Anglican Church functioned to reinforce an English identity and connection to "England, a place they plaintively continued to call 'home.'"[18] Even the architecture of Anglican churches followed the model of Anglican churches at home in England—including a layout of designated pews and entrances to signify social status.[19]

Although the Carolina churches faithfully reproduced much of the ritual of Anglican churches, many Anglicans preferred that rituals of baptism and marriage be performed at *home* despite the proscription of the Book of Common Prayer for a church ceremony. Moving the practice of baptism and marriage rites to the place of the privately owned familial home functioned to legitimate the domestic life of Europeans while marginalizing access to these rites for free blacks and slaves.[20] Furthermore, by re-locating the Anglican rites *from* the English "home" *into* the colonial familial home, domestic Christian baptism functioned to conflate the two senses of home/land. The English identity of heterosexual, married, reproductive home life became linked to the home/land through the legitimating practices of the Anglican Church whereas free blacks and slaves were excluded from notions of the legitimate, Christian home.

In brief, the place of "home" both reflected and affected the shape of social, material, and religious interactions in colonial America from New England to Carolina. When these diverse colonies found themselves questioning their economic and political relationship with England, they also faced a substantial reorientation of their understanding of home. Because the rhetoric

---

[17] Nicholas M. Beasley, *Christian Ritual and the Creation of British Slave Societies (1650-1780)*, (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2009), 6.
[18] Beasley, *Christian Ritual, 12.*
[19] For a discussion of the architecture of Anglican churches in the South and the patterns of social hierarchy as well as English identity, Louis P. Nelson, *The Beauty of Holiness: Anglicanism and Architecture in Colonial South Carolina* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008), chapter 9.
[20] Beasley, *Christian Ritual*, 54.

of home had been a significant part of labeling the colonial relationship between metropole and colony, severing this relationship forced the need for a different rhetoric of home—a move to identifying the U.S. as *home.* The Whig rhetoric surrounding the need for homespun fabric functioned in just this way. Although the Boston Tea Party and taxes on tea have become a popularized part of the story of the American Revolution, the politics of homespun cloth also played a sizable role the creation of a new national identity that would include not only male soldiers and politicians, but women and Christian clergy as well.

Before the U.S. was its own nation, it was a set of colonies whose commerce and politics were under the sovereignty of the English crown. The creation of wealth was central to the colonial project. For this reason, the English government controlled which products could and could not be sold within and beyond the boundaries of the colonies. For example, the British government limited the ability of the colonies to produce its own cloth. The English forcibly protected both their wool cloth industry and market by passing legislation such as a 1660 ban on the export of sheep from England to the colonies. This was followed by a 1699 prohibition on the export of wool yarn and cloth from the colonies to anyone but England.[21] Homespun cloth of linen, cotton, and wool had been produced in the colonies in the decades preceding the Revolution. However, it would typically be traded to England for resale elsewhere in the Empire with the proceeds being used to purchase higher quality, imported cloth from England.[22] Through these patterns of exchange, homespun and woolen cloths were an important part of the imperial economic and political relationship between the colonies and England.

---

[21] Leora Auslander, "The Politics of Silk and Homespun," in *Cultural Revolutions: The Politics of Everyday Life in Britain, North America, and France*, (New York: Berg, 2009), 82.
[22] Michael Zakim, *Ready-Made Democracy: A History of Men's Dress in the American Republic, 1760-1860* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 16-17.

Because of the role cloth played in the imperial relationship between England and the colonies, the production and consumption of cloth became politicized throughout the Revolution. In an attempt to strain the imperial economic and political relationship with England, the first Continental Congress in 1774 urged a policy of "non-importation, non-consumption, and non-exportation." As Michael Zakim explains, this policy was "far less concerned with asceticism and self-denial than with encouraging American arts and manufactures, 'especially that of wool.'"[23] In other words, the aim was to withdraw economic support of English goods in favor of goods manufactured in the colonies. It is within this context that the promotion of homespun cloth takes a dual meaning as cloth produced "at home."

The rhetoric of "homespun" signaled both the production of cloth within the home as a domestic space *and* the production at home in the political space of the U.S. rather than within the economic, political space of England. In this way, the promotion of homespun cloth in the context of colonial manufacture of goods helped to shift the rhetoric of home as signifying England to the creation of a new national identity of the "United States of America" as home. In other words, as the socio-economic relations of power shifted, so did the rhetoric of home. For the U.S., becoming its own nation required a reorientation of the meaning of "home."

Even more particularly, the rhetoric of homespun helped to shape a sense of U.S. national identity as self-sufficient and industrious. Wearing more expensive cloth imported from England reinforced a colonial identity of political and economic dependence upon England as well as a preference for luxury. In contrast, wearing homespun signaled domestic industry and political independence. Thus, the rhetoric of homespun signaled not only a shift in geographical locus of

[23] Zakim, *Ready-Made Democracy*, 17. For a text of the "Association" of the first Continental Congress see Jack P. Greene, ed., *Colonies to Nation, 1763-1789: A Documentary History of the American Revolution* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), 247-250.

home, but also in the values and social practices that constituted the home. Within the rhetoric of homespun, the value of self-sufficiency referred not only to the severing of trade with English goods, but also to the image of independent yeoman farmers whose households were able to grow flax, prepare the fibers, spin the yarn, and weave the cloth. Although the production of homespun required multiple steps and household members, the role of women in the manufacture of homespun as spinners became highly politicized.

The associations between women's spinning bees and Christian clergy also functioned to rhetorically link industry, patriotism, and Christianity. Throughout the Revolutionary period, newspapers recounted numerous spinning bees and lauded the virtuous industry of the women who participated. As with all of the rhetoric of homespun, the dual sense of home as spinning in the domestic space and for the political, economic gain of the U.S. were essential to the project of spinning bees. In Laurel Thatcher Ulrich's account of spinning bees in *The Age of Homespun,* she specifies that the location of many of these bees were in the homes of clergy.[24] For example, newspaper reports of spinning bees—often penned by ministers—repeatedly reference the virtuous woman of Proverbs 31 who "layeth her hand to the spindle." By connecting the patriot women's spinning of yarn to scripture, the political efforts of the women were grounded in religious virtue.

By promoting and participating in the homespun movement, the combined efforts of male clergy and patriot women sought to not only change the economic and political relationship with England but also the means of accomplishing this goal. Many patriot women and clergy promoted spinning bees and the production of homespun rather than directly engaging in tactics of war. Thus, Ulrich describes the spinning bees as "an early example of an alliance between

[24] Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, *The Age of Homespun: Objects and Stories in the Creation of an American Myth* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001), 184.

clergymen and women in an attempt to influence public policy."[25] Within the larger political rhetoric of homespun, the role of women and clergy in spinning bees functioned to support the political aims of "liberty" promised in the Revolutionary movement. In regards to the manufacture of cloth in the U.S., "liberty" signified independence from English political control as well as economic policy.

By using Christian imagery to extol the virtues of the women's manufacture of homespun, the political and economic project of independence from England received a rhetorical blessing from Christian clergy. In this way, not only making homespun, but making the U.S. into the political and economic "home" could be understood as an effort for faithful Christians to pursue. Put otherwise, being industrious in promoting the political and economic independence of the incipient nation reflected Christian virtue. Within such rhetoric of homespun, both Christian virtue and industrious production of the family home were linked with the trans-Atlantic political and economic project of an independent nation.

Through the rhetoric of homespun, women at their spinning wheel became a symbol of an emerging national identity of liberty, self-sufficiency, and industry grounded in Christian virtue. However, the appeal of homespun fabric also conflicted with desires to reflect social distinctions of "class." For example, in the city of Philadelphia, the cultural and political capitol of the colonies, homespun had been contested throughout the war as the young nation attempted to establish its diplomatic status with European powers. Because clothing functioned as a symbol of wealth and power, dressing in homespun risked hiding this privilege. In contrast, the

[25] Ulrich suggests that the male clergy may have felt it easier to support the industrious virtue of these patriot women than the rum-drinking mobs of patriot men roaming the streets. Ulrich, *The Age of Homespun*, 183-184. For a discussion of the alliance between women and clergy in the 19th century U.S. see Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture* (New York: Noonday Press/Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1998).

transatlantic diplomats were impressed by the elite ladies of Philadelphia fashionably attired in expensive European fabrics.[26] Significantly, within the diplomatic game of transatlantic imperial powers, the sartorial national identity reflected hierarchies of class and economic power.

Although diplomacy may have relied on elite patterns of dress, homespun still carried political currency within the nation. However, after the war there was also an increasing emphasis on high-quality homespun cloth capable of being competitive in the transatlantic market. When George Washington was inaugurated, the newspapers reported that he "appeared dressed in a complete suit of homespun cloaths[sic]; but the cloth was of so fine a Fabric . . . that it was universally mistaken for a foreign manufactured superfine cloth."[27] A close analysis of the rhetoric of this newspaper account of Washington's inauguration reveals a number of significant shifts in the emerging U.S. national identity.

By reporting that Washington wore homespun, the newspaper accounts indicate the ongoing politicization of homespun cloth as an important patriotic symbol in the new country. Furthermore, comparing the quality of cloth to "foreign" manufacture rhetorically sets up a contrast between home(spun) of the U.S. to the "foreign" manufacturing countries of Europe, particularly England. British colonial rhetoric repeatedly mapped the imperial relations between England and the colonies as "home and abroad"—with colonies providing the raw goods as well as the markets for the products manufactured at "home" in England. Understood within this context, the rhetoric of U.S. homespun contrasted with the "foreign" manufacture of cloth seeks to relocate the U.S. within the imperial map from a colonial periphery to a center of its own.

[26] Kate Haulman, "Fashion and Culture Wars of Revolutionary Philadelphia," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 62.4 (2005): 43.
[27] Zakim, *Ready-Made Democracy*, 25.

"Home" was no longer abroad. The U.S. could now function as its own center capable of engaging in the transatlantic market as its own nation.

Moreover, Washington's suit may have been homespun, but the high-quality cloth had been manufactured at a Connecticut woolen company. By describing as "homespun" fabric woven not in a household but in a company, this rhetoric of homespun connects the domestic space with manufacture in the new "home" of the United States. Making something at home is making something in America. In this way, the politicized industrious Christian virtue of homespun made in a household became rhetorically associated with the early capitalist endeavors of a small business. The gendered, religious Revolutionary rhetoric of homespun had praised the Christian virtue of industry in the labor of women. Homespun signified patriotic duty and Christian virtues of industrious self-sufficiency that in some way included the labor of women.

Although homespun Christian virtues had been held up in contrast to the pampered luxury of "foreign manufacture," the move to tie the rhetoric of homespun to quality goods manufactured in the U.S. softened this opposition.[28] Thus, homespun signaled made at home—but rhetorically there was slippage between the gendered Christian virtue of the domestic household as homespun and the manufacture of goods competitive with a transatlantic market as homespun. Not only did this slippage produce linkages between buying goods manufactured in America and the patriotic Christian virtues of supporting the nation, but it also intertwined the rhetoric of home as a domestic household and of home as a political nation. By rhetorically twisting home and nation together in these ways, the new national identity was making room for

[28] Zakim, *Ready-Made Democracy*, 27.

the promotion of economic success and grounding it in Christian theo-ethical virtues of self-sufficient industry.

Homestead Occupation:
Western Expansion and "Manifest Domesticity"

As a geographic space, the U.S. has been created through socio-economic processes of acquiring and governing land in ever increasing amounts. From the first colonial charter to the repeal of the Homestead Act in 1976, governmental regulation over access to land ownership shaped both the geographical boundaries of township, county, and state as well as the demographic makeup of these spaces. Political dynamics, economic pressures, and powerful ideologies of religion, race, class, and gender constituted who was allowed to own land, at what cost, and in what quantities. The mythic image of a pioneer family headed west to claim their *homestead* must be critically analyzed to reveal these elements. As an appropriation of land, homesteads participated in a complex and contested system of land use. A seemingly archaic word, the notion of homestead has not only played a vital role in the constitution of how we understand notions of "America" and being "American," but continues to be salient in contemporary articulations of places called "home."

Prior to the Revolution, England had treated land in the colonies as a source of revenue by selling land for private ownership. Faced with sizable financial obligations from the cost of the Revolutionary War, the young U.S. continued this process of selling public land for individual settlement and private ownership. Yet, the legislation and implementation of governmental land policies arose within a complex context of competing ideological aims. A significant part of the inherited context of land use was the colonial policy of England to allow slow expansion into the western frontier. The acquisition of immense new holdings due to a 1763 victory over France strained this British policy. Opening this new land throughout the Ohio

River valley to settlement meant not only expansion of government regulation, but also of the cost of security to mitigate violence between Europeans and Native Americans. While transatlantic land speculators in pursuit of profits pressured the British government for new areas to be opened, poorer settlers chose to avoid the land speculator's prices by moving further West to territories deemed off limits by English authorities. However, living beyond the line of treaty between Britain and the Native peoples meant settlers were beyond British protection.[29]

The expansion of territory and profits were at the heart of the colonial enterprise. Doing so cultivated not only new political sovereignty over territory, but also what historian David Griffith describes as an imperial logic that sought to civilize the wilderness. Within this civilizing framework, the prevailing view within the British government declared the native population as childlike in their human development.[30] As children, the aim was to gradually teach and influence Native peoples towards civilized ways rather than to exterminate them outright. To preserve the goal of a civilized expansion, the British government sought a measured growth that could be regulated and protected by colonial government and troops.

For this reason, settlers crossing the line of treaty into lawless space of uncivilized wilderness were seen as problematic for the British imperial government. Within an ideological framework of civilization as the development of human capacity, the settlers who ventured beyond the line of civilization risked the degeneration of their civilized status through exposure to the wilderness. Evidence for this degeneration was seen in the outbreak of violence between the settlers and the Native population who resisted the European incursion. With the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, the ensuing anarchy further fueled settler violence against the Native

[29] David Griffith, *American Leviathan: Empire, Nation, and Revolutionary Frontier* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2007), 44
[30] Griffith, *American Leviathan*, 53.

Americans. The frontier settlers rejected a policy of civilizing the Native populations as requiring time they did not have and favored efforts of violently "removing" them.

For Amy Kaplan, the violence and anarchy of the frontier contributes to the process of constructing the U.S. Empire.[31] Although continental expansion of the U.S. has not always been seen as a process of empire, Kaplan argues that continental expansion should not be separated from overseas empire building. Both participate in the process of empire which aims to create a "monolithic system of order" upon "an extensive territory."[32] In contrast to the territorial dimensions of empire, anarchy rarely signifies "geographic location; instead, it conveys a sense of spatial dispersion and dislocation."[33] Despite the apparent oxymoron in a notion of the "anarchy of empire," Kaplan argues that empire is constituted through the transformation of the dislocated space of anarchy into ordered, bounded territory. In this sense, the "anarchic" space without clear boundaries functions as the raw material in the production of the ordered, bounded territory of empire.

Designating the boundaries of empire relied on rhetoric distinguishing the domestic empire, or "home," from the foreign, or abroad. The domestic space must be cleared of the foreign in order to maintain this distinction of domestic/home from foreign/abroad. For this reason, efforts to create and maintain spaces designated as domestic/home participated in the process of building and maintaining empire. In other words, the process of delineating a space of home by expelling the foreign elements and establishing a civilized order functioned to designate the very boundaries of the national empire. Or, in Doreen Massey's language, the space of

[31] Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).
[32] Kaplan, *Anarchy of Empire*, 13.
[33] Kaplan, *Anarchy of Empire*, 13.

empire was constructed through the "product of interrelations" between the colonizers and the Native Peoples occupying the land.

Given this critical function of domestic space to designate the ordered boundary of empire, Kaplan argues that the "female realm of domesticity and the male arena of Manifest Destiny were not separate spheres at all but were intimately linked."[34] While the female realm of domesticity reproduced the order of civilization within the household, the male arena of Manifest Destiny extended the reach of civilization into the anarchy of frontier—signaled by the presence of domestic homesteads. To describe these interwoven processes of creating the boundaries of empire, Kaplan coins the term "manifest domesticity." Through her notion of "manifest domesticity," Kaplan argues that continental expansion through creation of homesteads functioned to create and police boundaries of order between the civilized home(stead) and the anarchy of the foreign. By creating an ordered location of home(stead)s within the national domestic space, land use laws participated in the process of creating the U.S. empire through continental expansion.

After revolting against its location as a colony, the U.S. continued the imperial processes of expanding the line of settlement across the continent and ordering the anarchy of the land beyond this line. Although Virginia initially claimed sovereignty over all the frontier land, the state ceded the land north of the Ohio River to federal control.[35] With the 1787 Northwest Ordinance, the federal government opened the land north of the river to settlement. Although

---

[34] Kaplan, *Anarchy of Empire*, 17-19.

[35] For a comprehensive account of the Northwest Ordinance see Peter Onuf, *Statehood and Union: a History of the Northwest Ordinance* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987). Also, Paul W. Gates, *The Jeffersonian Dream: Studies in the History of American Land Policy and Development* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996). Marking the boundary of Virginia, the line of the Ohio River becomes significant in establishing the line of slave and free states. See Paul Finkelman, "Slavery and the Northwest Ordinance: A Study in Ambiguity," *Journal of the Early Republic*. 6, no. 4 (Winter, 1986): 343-370.

drawing a new line further west designating the boundary of settlement and Native land, the same practice of settlers establishing homesteads beyond the line repeated.[36] Earlier in 1785, the Land Ordinance had established the legal policies for settlement. Emerging from a committee led by Thomas Jefferson, the Ordinance bore Jefferson's intellectual stamp of prioritizing land ownership for individual farmers—or, in other words, a privately owned homestead rather than a feudal model of ownership concentrated in elite landowners. For Jefferson, the independent yeoman farmer was the antithesis to the European peasant; men would be loyal to the new nation through ownership in the land. In this way, the valences of patriotism, liberty (from tenancy), and self-sufficient industry again reinforced one another.

Unlike nations such as England that faced shortage in ample acreage to sustain the population on individual farms, the U.S. appeared to possess the ample land to making Jefferson's ideal a reality. To enable the transfer of property from federal to private ownership, the 1785 Ordinance put forth rules to literally map out an orderly grid of "six-mile-square townships, which were in turn subdivided into thirty-sex sections of 640 acres each."[37] Through this enormous project of surveying and creating boundaries of lots, the Ordinance reflects not only a Jeffersonian model but also Kaplan's depiction of the logic of empire as creating a "monolithic system of order" upon "an extensive territory." Furthermore, the Ordinance contained provisions for the establishment of land for schools, churches, and other institutions of

[36]As a child, I had been told that my great-great-great grandfather, David Clark Carey, had been the "first white child" born in Paulding County, Ohio—a part of the land beyond the initial line of settlement. In researching the Ohio lands, I discovered that his grandfather, Shadrack Hudson, settled in Paulding in 1819 before the land was sold by the Native Americans to the U.S. for settlement in 1820. Thus, I had received a celebratory story of white settlement and expansion without the accompanying story of displacement and violence. Prof. Everett A. Budd, *Historical Hand-Atlas: History of Northwestern Ohio and History of Paulding County, Ohio* (Chicago and Toledo: H. H. Hardesty & Co. Publishers, 1882).

[37] Vale, *Puritans to the Projects*, 96.

establishing "civilization." Finally, the Ordinance also required that land be cleared of the "foreign" Native peoples—by sale of land in treaties or by forced removal. To create new home(stead)s and expand the new nation, the foreign must be removed and the anarchy contained.

Although the early legislation suggests a democratic vision of equality through the transfer of land to yeoman farmers, the early legislation also contained provisions that revealed a preference for values of economic growth versus equitable and/or universal land ownership. With visions of ample land, the Land Ordinance of 1785 and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 mandated a minimum lot size but did not limit the number of lots a buyer could purchase. On the one hand, the minimum lot size set an economic bar that remained out of reach for those unable to raise sufficient funds to purchase land. On the other hand, the failure to limit the number of lots per buyer meant that land speculators could amass large amounts of land.

The federal land policies functioned to reinforce inequalities in land ownership. Seeking to make a profit, large (and largely absent) landowners would either rent the land or hold it for sale until the development of neighboring homesteads, township resources, and/or transportation infrastructure increased the value of the land. Also, the federal government would give first choice of land to states and railroads. These prime lands would then be retained and/or sold at higher than federal government prices thus keeping them unavailable to most settlers. Unable to meet the high cost of purchase or high interest rates for credit, western settlers turned to politics to pressure land reform in the favor of the settlers. Over time, various bills sought to limit the abuses of land speculation; to make land more affordable through lower prices or smaller

minimum lot sizes; and to grant settlers the right of preemption to arrive after the surveyor but before the bidding of sale.[38]

Then, in 1862, the Homestead Act changed the long-standing practice of selling land and began to give land away free to homesteaders. Although the Homestead Act of 1862 did designate sizable amounts of land as open only to actual settlers, large tracts of land were again designated for the use of rail and states. The Jeffersonian dream of independent yeoman farmers had sustained organized political efforts to promote the homestead efforts of settlers. However, the wider promotion of industry and national progress functioned to reserve prime land for use by railroads, states (education), as well as timber and mining interests. Thus, even in the Homestead Act, a tiered system of land distribution emerged that promoted public interests of education and infrastructure, but also functioned to reward wealthy investors.

The economic and political processes of settlement counter the myth of a frontier populated only by married, self-sufficient homesteaders. Rather, the need for labor in mining and timber industries as well as in larger farm operations meant that the west was also populated by single male laborers.[39] For other households, the need to vigorously pursue available land in front of speculators meant that families were sometimes separated as men journeyed out ahead of their families. In such cases, men relied on the labor of their wives and families left behind to sustain themselves as well as to possibly send money to help make the homestead work.[40] Thus,

---

[38] Gates, *The Jeffersonian Dream*, especially chapter 3, "The Homestead Act" and chapter 7, "From Individualism to Collectivism in American Land Policy."

[39] The importation of contract laborers, especially from China, led to efforts to curb and stop Chinese immigration through the Page Act of 1875 and the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1880. Thus, through both land use law and immigration law efforts to rid the new homeland of the 'foreign' were pursued. Martha Gardner, *The Qualities of a Citizen: Women, Immigration and Citizenship, 1870-1965* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2005).

[40] Linda Peavy and Ursula Smith, *Women in Waiting in the Westward Frontier*: *Life on the Home Frontier* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994), 5.

as with the early colonial production of homespun, women's labor participated in constructing homesteads. Such knowledge belies images of self-sufficient male yeoman settling the frontier. Claiming a homestead meant navigating complicated economic and political processes as well as the very real possibility of failure. Notably, even the iconic cultural image of a homesteading—the Ingalls family of *Little House on the Prairie*—struggled fiercely against poverty, relied on labor and income from women, and once lived on an illegal homestead on land reserved for Native Americans.[41]

To sustain the risky and violent process of continental expansion, hopeful religious discourse promoted the project of "manifest domesticity." Like the Puritan faith in the "empty lands" that God had granted to them, the 19th century rhetoric of Manifest Destiny also drew upon religious imagery to justify the expansion of European settlement. To illustrate the connection between the religious rhetoric of home and the rhetoric of Manifest Destiny, Kaplan turns to Catherine Beecher. For Kaplan, Beecher's introduction to *A Treatise on Domestic Economy* "inextricably links women's work to the unfolding of America's global mission as "exhibiting to the world the beneficent influences of Christianity, when carried into every social, civil, and political institution.""[42] In other words, women are charged with a global mission of sharing the civilizing influence of Christianity.

Beecher writes, "[T]o American women, more than to any others on earth, is committed the exalted privileges of extending over the world those blessed influences, that are to renovate

---

[41] Joyce Zonana, *Dream Home: From Cairo to Katrina: an Exile's Journey* (New York: The Feminist Press at City University of New York, 2008), 152. See also Judith Thurman, "Wilder Women," *New Yorker*, August, 10, 2009, accessed March 28, 2012, http://www.newyorker.com/arts/critics/atlarge/2009/08/10/090810crat_atlarge_thurman

[42] Kaplan, *Manifest Domesticity*, 29. Quote from Catharine Beecher, *A Treatise on Domestic Economy*, (Boston: Marsh, Capen, Lyon and Webb, 1841), 14.

degraded man, and 'cloth all climes with beauty.'"[43] For Beecher, Christian women are responsible for "influencing" the globe into becoming a more civilized place. Civilizing the globe, however, starts at *home* for Beecher. For this reason, what follows the grand introduction on the purpose of women's labors is a manual for creating a strict order within the domestic household. In this way, Beecher connects domestic and global housekeeping as efforts to create and maintain a civilized order influenced by Christian morality.

Kaplan further connects Beecher to the rhetoric of Manifest Destiny by comparing Beecher's rhetoric with that of prominent Manifest Destiny proponent, John O'Sullivan. Returning to Beecher's introduction of *A Treatise on Domestic Economy,* Kaplan cites an architectural metaphor that describes the builders of a "temple" at length. Beecher's spatial metaphor describes the importance of all women's labors in constructing a "glorious temple, whose base shall be coextensive with the bounds of the earth, . . . and those who hew the lowliest stone, as much as those who carve the highest capital, will be equally honored when its top-stone be laid, with new rejoicing of the morning stars, of shoutings of the sons of God."[44] Kaplan notes that this passage in Beecher both unifies the women "builders" in the task of temple-building, while also preserving a hierarchy among them. This combination of social hierarchy and social unity reinforces the imperial project of unifying peoples into a hierarchal order. Furthermore, it is easy to see that Beecher's rhetoric of building a temple echoes biblical imagery of Jesus destroying and rebuilding the temple in Jerusalem. This biblical allusion combined with the congratulatory "shoutings of the sons of God" further reinforces the links between women's work and the spreading of Christian civilization.

[43] Beecher, *Domestic Economy,* 14. Quoted in Kaplan, *Manifest Domesticity,* 29.
[44] Beecher, *Domestic Economy,* 14. Quoted in Kaplan, *Manifest Domesticity,* 30.

Kaplan argues that the spatial rhetoric of the temple is also significant by bearing a "striking resemblance" to a passage from John O'Sullivan. Kaplan quotes:

> The far-reaching, the boundless future will be the era of American greatness. In its magnificent domain of space and time, the nation of many nations is destined to manifest to mankind the excellence of divine principals; to establish on earth the noblest temple to the worship of the most high—the Sacred and the True. Its floor shall be a hemisphere—its roof the firmament of the star-studded heavens, and its congregation an Union of many Republics, comprising hundreds of happy millions, calling, owning no man master, but governed by God's natural and moral law of equality.[45]

In both passages, the biblical imagery of the temple signifies a grand project of construction with Christian motivations. Kaplan writes, "The rhetoric of Manifest Destiny and that of domesticity share a vocabulary that turns imperial conquest into a spiritual regeneration in order to efface internal conflict or external resistance in visions of geopolitical domination as global harmony."[46] The rhetoric of Christianity, home, and empire helped to justify the imperial continental expansion of the United States.

The rhetoric of homestead must be understood within this context of growing national and imperial power of the United States. The continental U.S. was colonized through land laws that repeatedly sanctioned the removal of "foreign" elements so as to bring Christian civilization to the "empty" frontier. The West had become a patriotic "Home on the Range" with deer and antelope and no mention of any "foreign" Native Americans.[47] Then, the 1890 census declared there was no longer a contiguous frontier. In his widely discussed essay, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," Frederick Jackson Turner declared the frontier "closed."

---

[45] John O'Sullivan, "The Great Nation of Futurity." Quoted in Kaplan, *Manifest Domesticity*, 30-31.
[46] Kaplan, *Manifest Domesticity*, 31.
[47] The song "Home on the Range" first appeared as a poem in 1873 before becoming circulated as a popular song among settlers, cowboys, and others. Joseph Musselman, "An Anthem," The Lewis and Clark Fort Mandan Foundation, accessed online March 28, 2012, http://www.lewis-clark.org/content/content-article.asp?ArticleID=459. See also, Jim Bob Tinsley, *He Was Singin' This Song* (Orlando, Fla: University Presses of Florida, 1981), 214.

Significantly, Turner first delivered his essay as a lecture in 1893 at Chicago during the World's Columbian Exposition.[48]

Here at this Exposition that celebrated "civilization" and white imperial power, Turner argued that the ample land of the frontier had been the vehicle for the recapitulation of the stages of civilization from savagery to the Industrial age. Through this repeated process of civilization on the frontier, Turner argued that a uniquely American identity of individualism developed which promoted self-government and a strong democracy. In other words, the process of establishing homesteads across the frontier cultivated both a particular kind of civilized individual and a strong democratic nation.

In an essay discussing Turner's influence on the study of religion, John Boles writes, "[Turner] says only that the settled East, worried about the perceived social fluidity of the West, saw the region as a fertile mission field, and that in the comparative institutional void of the West religious sects flourished."[49] Significantly, Boles' reading of Turner suggests a pattern of the civilized Christian East—the site of much U.S. power in the early Republic—fearing the anarchy of the frontier. Rather than reproducing the mainline denominations of the East, Christian sects flourished on the frontier.

---

[48] Martin Ridge, "The Life of an Idea: The Significance of Frederick Jackson Turner's Frontier Thesis," *Montana: The Magazine of Western History*, 41, no. 1 (Winter, 1991): 2-13. Frederick Jackson Turner, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," in *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1921), 1-38. For a discussion of race and the narrative of civilization at the Columbian Exposition, see Gail Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*: *A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 31-41.

[49] John B. Boles, "Turner, the Frontier, and the Study of Religion in America," *Journal of the Early Republic*, 13, No. 2 (Summer, 1993): 205-216.

The flourishing of sects on the frontier and its impact on Christianity became widely debated and critiqued well into the 20th century.[50] However, in Boles' treatment of the debates of Turner within religious scholarly discourse, Boles did not critically analyze connections between Christianity and the colonization of the frontier. Rather, the religious scholarship on the frontier has focused on arguing whether or not frontier religion was unique, influenced by the "unique" circumstances of the frontier. In this way, early 20th century Christian scholarship of the frontier participated in perpetuating a sense of American exceptionalism generated by the unique experience of creating homesteads on the (anarchic) frontier.

Nearly 100 years after Turner's essay, celebratory rhetoric of the period of 19th century national expansion of "homesteads" continued to engage Christian themes. In a 1986 essay in support of "American singularity," Harold Hyman argues that the U.S. creation of "empires of reason" succeeded because the U.S. "not only imagined their heavenly city on earth, but, however partially and imperfectly, institutionalized it."[51] In broad strokes, Hyman invokes both the language of empire and the Christian rhetoric justifying national expansion through the ordered institutionalization of building home(stead)s and cities. On the one hand, Hyman's rhetoric of a "heavenly city on earth" invokes the post-apocalyptic vision of Revelations 21. On the other hand, this same rhetoric also echoes Puritan John Winthrop's rhetoric of a "city on a hill"—also invoking Revelations. Thus, Hyman's rhetoric draws upon a religious metaphor that has itself become saturated with the patriotic nationalism of our Puritan forefathers.

---

[50] Boles, "Turner, the Frontier, and the Study of Religion." Boles particular notes the works of Peter Mode (1923), William Warren Sweet (1930), Leonard Trinterud (1949). More recently, he discusses the counter-interpretation of Leigh Eric Schmidt (1989).

[51] Harold Hyman, *American Singularity: the 1787 Northwest Ordinance, the 1862 Homestead and Morrill Acts, and the 1944 G.I. Bill*,(Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986), 14.

Continuing the connection between Christianity and the national expansion, Hyman describes the Ordinance of 1785 and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 as enabling "a series of distributions that transformed successive Wests into stabilized promised lands."[52] The "West" here is represented as the anarchy that must be "stabilized" to become the religiously mandated "promised lands" for faithful Christian Americans. Furthermore, Hyman's language echoes Kaplan's depiction of "manifest domesticity" by arguing that the land use laws would "transform the frontier, where civilization was at risk, into settlements where morality and laws (including responsibilities to pay debts) would be honored and national cohesion maintained."[53] The projects of transforming the physical landscape into legally defined and controlled parcels under state control relied on the civilizing effects of "morality"—the province of religion and pious women.

Writing with a tone of celebratory approval, Hyman's interpretation of the early U.S. land use laws reflects a support for imperial logic rooted in Christian theo-ethical beliefs and practices. Except for a mild acknowledgement that implementation of the land use laws were "partial and imperfect," Hyman fails to adequately address the imperial logics that violently "stabilized" the frontier or the governmental preservation of privilege for those whose (white) "industrious" resources allowed them to purchase more.

In summary, the rhetoric of homestead functioned to construct notions of U.S. national identity around domestic metaphors that conveyed theo-ethical values of self-sufficient industry, patriotism, and Christian piety. Despite Turner's romanticized valorizing of the American individual who developed through life on the frontier, the creation of homesteads relied on both an ordered federal systems of surveys and deeds as well as the support of the military to violently

[52] Hyman, *American Singularity*, 23.
[53] Hyman, *American Singularity*, 24-25.

remove the "foreign" Native Americans. Far from simply benefiting the individual (male) yeoman farmers, continental expansion created fortunes for land speculators as well as investors and beneficiaries of rail and mining companies.[54]

As the benefits of land ownership flowed to individual white men with money, they were often denied to others. The land use laws assumed a white, male head of household. The minimum lot size helped ensure that even where legally possible, free African Americans or former slaves could not own land. Restrictions on women's ability to own property further cemented the privilege of ownership for white men with at least some money. Far from departing from systems of imperial power, the U.S. project of "manifest domesticity" relied on the same logic and practices of empire and protection of a hierarchy of white, male power.[55] The romanticized rhetoric of the pioneer homestead erases these connections between violence, nationalism, and Christianity in an era of "manifest domesticity."

[54] Kevin Phillips, *Wealth and Democracy: A Political History of the American Rich* (New York: Broadway Books, 2002). For a controversial, yet influential discussion of the history of U.S. wealth, see Matthew Josephson, *The Robber Barons: the Great American Capitalists* (New York: Harcourt, Bruce and Company, 1934). The book has remained in print for decades.

[55] Neither the practice nor the desire for homestead ended with the 19th century. Additional public lands were made available for homesteaders in the years following World War II. However, as the twentieth century progressed calls for conservancy of public lands increased due to rising values of aesthetic appreciation of wilderness, recreational desires, and protection of wildlife and habitat. Thus, it is significant that in close succession to the creation of the Wilderness Act (1964), the creation of the EPA (1969) and the Endangered Species Act (1973) that the Homestead Act was formerly repealed in 1976. Even now, the notion of homestead continues to have rhetorical power and influence with the repeated introduction of a New Homestead Act to repopulate the mid-west. Among the groups who continue to claim to homestead, one sizable group are those who claim to do so for religious reasons. Whether to avoid the dangers of a secular society or to seek a spiritual connection to nature, religious rhetoric continues to sustain the vision of independent life on the land. See Brian Q. Cannon, *Reopening the Frontier: Homesteading in the Modern West* (Lawrence: University of Kansas, 2009) and Rebecca Kneale Gould, *At Home in Nature: Modern Homesteading and Spiritual Practice in America* (Berkeley: University of California, 2005).

Home, Sweet Home: The Empire of the White Lady

A critical analysis of the rhetoric of home in the U.S. inevitably must address the 19th century Cult of Domesticity, or Cult of True Womanhood. The Cult of Domesticity participated in constructing particular notions of gendered space that would have lingering effects in the understanding of home as a distinct ("private") place from the ("public") spaces of politics or economics. Despite this claim of being a distinct space, the ideals of home within the Cult of Domesticity are clearly interconnected to the economic and political changes of the 19th century United States. As with the rhetoric of homespun and homesteads, the rhetoric of home as a haven—a "home, sweet home"—functioned to reinforce a particular constellation of spatialized social interactions of hierarchy and unequal power.

The 19th century capitalist industry expanded from the "homespun" woolen manufacture to the railroads and canals enabling the expansion of "homesteads." Whereas elements of the rhetoric of home in homespun and homestead valorized the economic contributions of the whole (male-headed) household, the rise of waged labor in the 19th century increasingly depicted economic activity as a primarily male activity outside of the home. Rather than the virtuous Christian *household* economies of early homespun production or frontier homesteads, the economic ideal within the industrial context shifted to a gendered discourse of separate spheres of work and home. Within this context, home became depicted as a safe haven for families apart from the burdens of waged work in the industrialized world.

The rhetorical power of the notion of home as a haven became widely expressed through the popular 19th century song, *Home! Sweet Home!* Originally performed in an opera in London, the lyrics came from an American actor working in England, John Howard Payne. One prevalent version of the song lyrics is:

Mid pleasures and palaces though we may roam,
Be it ever so humble, there's no place like home;
A charm from the sky seems to hallow us there,
Which, seek through the world, is ne'er met with elsewhere.
Home, home, sweet, sweet home!
There's no place like home, oh, there's no place like home!

An exile from home, splendor dazzles in vain;
Oh! give me my lowly thatched cottage again!
The birds singing gayly, that come at my call --
Give me them -- and the peace of mind, dearer than all!
Home, home, sweet, sweet home!
There's no place like home, oh, there's no place like home!

How sweet 'tis to sit 'neath a fond father's smile,
And the cares of a mother to soothe and beguile!
Let others delight mid new pleasures to roam,
But give me, oh, give me, the pleasures of home.
Home, home, sweet, sweet home!
There's no place like home, oh, there's no place like home!

To thee I'll return, overburdened with care;
The heart's dearest solace will smile on me there;
No more from that cottage again will I roam;
Be it ever so humble, there's no place like home.
Home, home, sweet, sweet, home!
There's no place like home, oh, there's no place like home![56]

[56] John Howard Payne, *Home, sweet Home* (Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1880). These lyrics are out of copyright and widely available on the internet. Accessed, April 1, 2012, http://www.poemhunter.com/poem/home-sweet-home/

These lyrics romanticize home as a place associated with family, nature, and comfort sheltered from the cares of political palaces and economic splendors.

Significantly, the lyrics of *Home, Sweet Home* are written from the perspective of one *not* at home. Alison Blunt points out how the song imagines home "as a unique and distant place that can neither be discovered nor reproduced elsewhere and thus remains a site of continual desire and irretrievable loss."[57] Sung from the location of not-home, the rhetoric of home in the song conveys home freighted with nostalgic desire for an idealized constellation of spatialized social interactions—a desire for a "thatched cottage" with "birds singing gaily," a mother, and a father. In this way, the lyrics of the song not only signal an adoration of the domestic space of "home" as a haven from worldly cares, but also illustrate how a description of the material space of home can function to articulate a desire for a particular structure of socio-economic belonging. Furthermore, such structures of belonging reflect particular theological and ethical commitments that help to constitute the social interactions that constitute home.

Understanding the particular theo-ethical vision depicted in *Home, Sweet Home* requires a critical analysis of the rhetorical connection between home and family in the nineteenth century U.S. and British discursive context. According to Anne McClintock in *Imperial Leather*, the trope of "family" in British imperialistic discourse depicted a *natural* hierarchy of power.[58] This *natural* hierarchy of "family" functioned as the connection between the rhetoric of domesticity and the rhetoric of Empire. Specifically, McClintock explores how the Victorian idea of the "Family of Man" served to warrant the role of the British Empire as a civilizing and domesticating agent.

---

[57] Alison Blunt, "Imperial geographies of home: British domesticity in India, 1886-1925," in *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* New Series, 24, No. 4 (1999): 421.
[58] Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

Drawing upon "scientific" discourses, the global human "races" were hierarchically arranged as a "Family of Man."[59] By mapping the "Family of Man" onto a branching tree of evolving races, the relationships between the so-called races were depicted as natural and as rooted in common ancestry. At the same time, the domestic family metaphor also bespoke of an assumed hierarchies of gender and age distinguishing father from mother as well as adults from children. By mapping race as a "family" affair, the hierarchies of gender and age within the domestic familial home functioned to legitimize white male leadership as the preeminent "Father" of the races within the global family. McClintock writes:

> Since the subordination of woman to man and child to adult was deemed a natural fact, hierarchies within the nation could be depicted in familial terms to guarantee social difference as a category of nature. The metaphoric depiction of social hierarchy as natural and familiar—the "national family," the global "family of nations," the colony as a "family of black children ruled over by a white father"—depended in this way on the prior naturalizing of the social subordination of women and children within the domestic sphere.[60]

Through the trope of "family," mapping social interactions became a complicated affair of complex, intersecting dynamics of power.

Given such intersecting hierarchies of social location within the "Family of Man," McClintock argues that conceptions of race, class, and gender "come into existence in and through relation to each other—if in contradictory and conflictual ways."[61] Within McClintock's depiction of imperial logic, simple categories of identity as "woman" or "black" or "poor" cannot be isolated from one another. Rather, the trope of family functioned to map not only hierarchies within the household, but also within global, colonial relations of different races. It is against this discursive and spatialized context of the trope of family that the politicized rhetoric

[59] McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 36-39.
[60] McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 357-358.
[61] McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 5.

of home must be read. As the "Family" functioned to connect domestic families with a national and global "Family of Man," so also did the domestic familial place of home become politicized. Within the colonial logic, "home" signified the location of the governing nation in contrast to the "abroad" of colonial spaces. As the space of the father—domestic or colonial, the rhetoric of home was imbricated in the colonial hierarchies of interwoven dynamics of power.

The discourses of scientific racism that undergird McClintock's discussion of the "Family of Man" in relation to the British Empire also circulated within the United States. As a settler colony whose national "home" was quickly becoming a shared geographic space with Native Americans and increasing numbers of immigrants from across the globe, the hierarchies of power were expressed both through the politics of geographical expansion and through the control of who belonged within the place called the United States. The question was not just where the boundaries of the nation would be, but who would be recognized as belonging within those boundaries.

From the first laws defining access to citizenship, eligibility for citizenship and immigration functioned as a substantive part of defining national U.S. identity. The Naturalization Act of 1790 established that a "free white person" of "good moral character" could become a naturalized citizen. The rights and privileges of citizenship were not granted to blacks and all other "non-whites." Although blacks would finally be granted access to citizenship with the 1870 Naturalization Act, Asians would continue to be deliberately excluded well into the 20th century through legislation such as the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act.

In addition to these race-based laws, immigration policy was also deeply shaped by gender, class, and sexuality. Relying on the requirement of a "good moral character," border official treated single women—especially "non-white" women—with suspicion as possible

prostitutes.[62] Economics also played a large role as border officials had the right to turn away immigrants that were likely to become a public charge or "LPC." Because border official assumed that only men would be able to earn adequate wages, even single women with skilled professions such as dressmakers could be rejected as LPC. Such policies not only reinforced gender and class hierarchies, but also reinforced heterosexual marriage as a critical factor in gaining access to the rights of citizenship. Accordingly, interracial marriage was also closely policed in an attempt to preserve a clear color-line between races eligible and ineligible for citizenship. In these ways, immigration policy and laws against racial intermarriage reinforced notions of the "family" that served the politics of constructing a national identity as white, heterosexual, married, and economically independent.

In discussing the trope of the "Family of Man," I have sought to emphasize that race, class, and gender were articulated in and through one another in linked discourses of domesticity, family, and nation. For this reason, the Cult of Domesticity must be understood as not simply about gender. Although the Cult of Domesticity and the Cult of True Womanhood are broadly used terms, the relatively benign rhetoric of both phrases belies its role in sustaining powerful hierarchies of gender, race, class, and nation. As an alternative phrase, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza uses the term "White Lady" to depict an ideological system of a gendered binary that reinforces not only masculine dominance but also hierarchies of race and class—intersecting hierarchies that Schüssler Fiorenza has aptly termed *kyriarchy*.[63] The directness of the term

[62] For an extended discussion on the themes of this paragraph, see Martha Gardner, *The Qualities of a Citizen: Women, Immigration and Citizenship, 1870-1965* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2005).

[63] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Sharing Her Word*: *Feminist Biblical Interpretation in Context*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1998), 36, 45,144-147. See also Kwok Pui Lan, "The Image of the White Lady: Gender and Race in Christian Mission," in *The Special Nature of Women?,* eds Anne Carr

"White Lady" immediately conveys both the relevance of race and a particular notion of gendered femininity that reinforced notions of "civility."

At the heart of the ideology of the White Lady is the role of *influence*—a notion whose logic presumes a view of human nature akin to that of Romanticism. In short, the Romantic view values nature, the natural, and the feelings invoked by nature as a moral guide. Rather than stress ethical principles, the Romantic view promoted organic and natural growth of character.[64] In her important work on the *Feminization of American Religion*, Ann Douglas notes a related notion of influence in Christian theology in the nineteenth century. Moving away from Calvinist notions of human depravity, ministers such as the influential Horace Bushnell promoted a positive, romantic view of human nature that could be shaped and guided towards good. Even within his understanding of atonement, Bushnell promoted an understanding of God as a loving parent whose "sympathy" for humanity brought Christ to earth to be a model of conduct and feeling to draw us to God.[65]

The idea of *influence* as a means to extend Christian moral instruction, development of character, and even salvation would have a profound impact on understandings of the home. As a primary place of both religious and moral instruction, the home became a critical space of influence. This influence of the home on religious and moral development not only included social interactions, but extended to the design and furnishings of the actual physical space of

---

and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (London: SCM Press; Philadelphia : Trinity Press International, 1991), 19-27.

[64] The classic text to illustrate this principle is Jean Jacques Rousseau's, *Émile, or On Education*, 1762, especially book five on "Marriage."

[65] Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture* (New York: Noonday Press/Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1998), 130. For a full discussion see chapter four, "The Loss of Theology," 121-164. See also, Colleen McDannell, *The Christian Home in Victorian America: 1840-1900*,(Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1986), 19.

home as well. As Colleen McDannell suggests, the home ceased to be a mere shelter once the domestic space was connected to visions of morality, class, and civilization.[66]

To aid in the meaningful design of a proper house/home, pattern books were available that not only conveyed housing layouts, but the rationale behind the designs. In these pattern books, theories of home life argued that the design of a space influenced the moral character of the inhabitants. Good design constructed good character. Within these designs, the importance of distinctions between rooms and occupants became important. Rooms were divided between uses for men and women; adults and children; as well as between "public" and "private."[67]

One such highly influential pattern book author was the Romantic John Ruskin. The sentimentality, sensuality, and nostalgia of Romanticism appeared in the appeal of Gothic housing designs that Ruskin and others promoted. Although the medieval influenced Gothic style evoked religion, for Protestant Christians this link could problematically be seen as an architectural reference to Catholicism. Thus, for Protestants, the Gothic style was said to have its roots in the beauty of nature, such as the arches that resembled the curves of tree branches. Notably, the depiction of the cottage home in *Home, Sweet Home* included multiple references to nature—birds, woodbine, and the moon. Ostensibly an evocation of ideals of nature, the Gothic architecture was a more costly, decorative style of design that marked that higher economic status of the family. Even the notion of "Lady" to refer to the potential inhabitants harkens to a medieval time of feudal hierarchies. In this sense, the Victorian domestic ideal of home did

[66] McDannell, *Christian Home,* 45
[67] McDannell, *Christian Home*, chapter 2. For discussion of social history in housing design see also: Dolores Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution*, (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1981); and Gwendolyn Wright, *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America* (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1981).

indeed mark a class status inaccessible to all but the higher rungs of society—to the white "Ladies." [68]

Within the home, the Romantic ideal of self-expression also took hold through the interior design. Women were charged with creating an interior space that both expressed their self and cultivated the proper moral environment for the household. Significantly, the expression of self required the acquisition of things. The furnishings of domestic interiors mark the clear example of what McClintock describes as "intricate filaments" tying domesticity, empire, and the market together.[69] Describing middle-class women in this system, Ann Douglas writes:

> [T]he two roles, saint and consumer, were interlocked and mutually dependent: the lady's function in a capitalist society was to appropriate and preserve both the values and the commodities which her competitive husband, father and son had a little time to honor and enjoy; she was to provide an antidote and a purpose for their labor. [70]

For Douglas, the Lady as saint provided the spiritual antidote for the corrupting influence of the capitalist market by preserving the values of family and religions. At the same time, the Lady as consumer drove the production of goods for household consumption. In fact, the two were materially intertwined through the consumption of religious goods from parlor organs to images of favorite ministers and priests.[71] Although touted as separate *from* the marketplace of the father (and other working males), the household cultivated and sustained the market through its material acquisitions.

In conjunction with discourses that lauded the feminine home as a haven from the masculine world of industry, some discourses of domesticity emphasized the importance of

---

[68] Significantly, the term "Lady" appeared in the title of another prominent source and promoter for housing patterns and the Gothic style: the influential *Godey's Lady's Book.* McDannell, *Christian Home,* 22 and 28-37.
[69] McClintock, *Imperial Leather,* 17.
[70] Douglas, *Feminization of American Culture*, 60.
[71] McDannell, *Christian Home in Victorian America*, 42-45, 67-68.

household order and drew upon "masculine" discourses of science, efficiency, and progress. Through discussions of household order, these alternative domesticities tended to focus more on the home as a site of (unwaged) household labor than those of the haven model. However, the emphasis on order and progress in households continued to reinforce hierarchies of empire. The role of promoting order as reinforcing hierarchies can be seen in the work of Harriet Beecher Stow in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. The disorder of the kitchen in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* marks not only a failure of domestic housekeeping, but the suggestion of moral disorder.[72] Also, in *The American Woman's Home*, sisters Harriet Beecher Stow and Catharine Beecher offer their own advice on proper ordering of a home—from labeled kitchen drawers to an architectural plan for a house that also functions as both church and schoolroom.[73]

The value of an ordered home also appeared in discourses of home among rural women who entered contests to design domestic spaces. However, unlike a Lady in an urban or even in one of the new suburban homes, the work of the farm and the women of the farm were not so far removed from the home. Thus, the order proposed by women in farm house designs had different emphases such as locating nurseries and dairies near the kitchen to aid in their performance of multiple roles as producer and caretaker. However, the rural house designs did continue to reflect the spreading principle of specialized rooms and separations by moving farmhands further away

---

[72] Gillian Brown, *Domestic Individualism: Imagining Self in Nineteenth-Century America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), chapter 1, "Domestic Politics in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, 13-38.

[73] Catharine E. Beecher and Harriet Beecher Stow, *The American Woman's Home: or, Principles on Domestic Science; Being a guide to the Formation and Maintenance of Economical, Helpful, Beautiful, and Christian Homes* (New York: J.B. Ford and Company, 1869). Interestingly, Beechers' plan for a church-school involves a movable screen. This notion of a multi-use room is in contrast to the specialization of rooms in much of the literature of the time. Dolores Hayden, *Grand Domestic Revolution*, 55-63. See also, Dolores Hayden, *Redesigning the American Dream: the Future of Housing, Work, and Family Life* (New York: Norton and Company, 1984,2002), 39-40. McDannell, *Christian Home*, 37.

from the "private" family than had previously been practiced.[74] In these self-identified "progressive" solutions to domestic arrangements, the notion remained the same: the need for rational order within the home to best influence the household towards greater Christian piety and civilization.

Some radical women reformers took the impetus of rational organization even further and questioned why the new technologies should not also industrialize the labor of home. As Delores Hayden recounts, these early "material feminists" fought for the use of technology to transform the drudgery of labor many women faced with housecleaning, laundry, and cooking. Hayden notes:

> What was unique about the material feminists was not their interest in these technological and architectural questions, which also attracted inventors, architects, planners, speculators, and efficiency experts, but their insistence that these economic and spatial changes should take place under women's control.[75]

By seeking to participate in redesigning the built environment of dwellings to entire urban areas, material feminists sought to engage new technologies to revolutionize the labor women performed. Rather than burdening women with isolation and "drudgery," material feminists sought to bring women together for shared labor, society, and even, as some argued, paid wages from their husbands for their labor. Towards this end, they envisioned large communal dwelling places or neighborhoods of kitchenless houses with neighborhood laundries, and collective childcare.[76]

Despite efforts of reformers to suggest and construct alternative models of home, the Cult of Domesticity and ideal of the White Lady remained powerful in designating social status and

---

[74] Sally McMurry, *Families and Farmhouses in Nineteenth-Century America: Vernacular Design and Social Change*, (Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1997), 5-6.
[75] Hayden, *Domestic Revolution*, 17.
[76] Hayden, *Domestic Revolution*. See also Wright, *Building the Dream*.

national belonging. However, as with all ideals, most women fell far short of succeeding in reaching the goal. McClintock articulates how the ideal of a "Victorian" home is implicated in the hierarchies that produce and sustain the colonial empire. Allegedly a space free of labor, the lifestyle of a lady of leisure in the 19th century required the labor of several women—maid, nanny, and cook. Yet, only the wealthiest households could afford to hire all three.[77] For this reason, many "ladies" participated in enormous efforts to hide the effects of their labor such as the "Victorian fetish of hands" which could betray signs of labor. Furthermore, McClintock describes how hidden labor affected the architecture of middle-class homes:

> The parlor marked the threshold of private and public, serving as the domestic space for the spectacular (public) metamorphosis of female work into female leisure. The morning call fulfilled the requirement of being *seen*—idle and scrubbed clean of all the telltale signs of labor. As a threshold zone, the parlor also became the domestic space for the display of commodity fetishism. The parlor served to conspicuously display the family's "best" household commodities: use value was converted to exhibition value.[78]

By attempting to hide domestic labor, the ideal of a Victorian home as a site of leisure both disavowed the labor of many "ladies" as well as the waged labor of lower-class women who were often also seen as non-white. In this way, the material space of the home was both shaped by particular socio-economic social structures of inequality while helping to reinforce this hierarchy.

By not acknowledging domestic labor as *labor*, a firm distinction between a public world of male labor and a private world of leisurely domesticity was reified. This ideological separation manifested itself materially in the architecture of houses and layout of cities that sought to preserve hierarchies of gender, race, and class. Within the marital family, a hierarchy of gender distinguished between the hard-working male able to negotiate the spaces of unsavory

[77] McClintock, *Imperial Leather,* 161.
[78] McClintock, *Imperial Leather,* 162.

waged industry (and the primitive Empire) and the leisured lady whose strength lay in her moral purity and whose weakness required a cloistering in the safe haven of home. Denial of domestic labor also created a hierarchy of class and race between women who labored and the "ladies" who (visibly) did not. Within the homes of the Ladies, servants were restricted in their movements within the house, as well as given inferior housing within or outside the homes in which they worked. Such hierarchies participated in the project of explaining the "natural" leadership of white, heterosexual men with money as the rightful head of the "Family of Man."

Despite any claims to "natural" hierarchies of difference, the historical archive also shows how the ideology of gendered separate spheres was contested. For example, the rhetoric surrounding the development of the railroad illustrates how race, class, gender and national identity not only intersected, but were actively policed and resisted. Railroad technology and the expansion of service throughout the 19th century transformed the economic and social landscape through transportation of goods and people. As the material landscape of the U.S. was changed by the presence of the rail and new possibilities of traveling in space, so also were established patterns of social interactions tested.

In the book *Home on the Rails: Women, the Railroad and the Rise of Public Domesticity*, Amy Richter illustrates how the trains pressured changes in social interactions in the nineteenth century.[79] For example, the cover of the book shows an illustration of a railroad schedule printed across the bodice and balloon sleeves of a woman. Richter argues that such imagery suggests the need to see *both* the rational male technology *and* female presence—rather than distinctly gendered spheres. By mapping a doubled vision of female presence and male technology, Richter argues that railroads gave rise to a hybridity of space that reshaped the Victorian

[79] Amy Richter, *Home on the Rails: Women, the Railroad and the Rise of Public Domesticity*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 2.

ideology of separate spheres. And yet, her analysis of the railroad also shows how hierarchies of race, class, and gender in the national space were reinforced nonetheless.

The early U.S. railroad cars celebrated a system of "open" versus "class" cars as symbolic of U.S. democracy in contrast to British trains. However, this openness seemed to promote the promiscuity of mixing race, class and gender in ways that challenged the acceptability of rail travel for Ladies. To grant an acceptably moral public space for Ladies to travel in spaces beyond the home, "ladies" cars with domestically styled furnishings were incorporated into trains. By creating a kind of home on wheels, Ladies could travel.

Although the "hybrid" space of the train may have challenged the gendered binary of public and private, the emerging order of train travel retained hierarchies of race and class. Hence, African American women discovered that their status as a "Lady" was often denied as they were refused access to the "Ladies" car. What white middle and upper class women took to be civilized politeness from the porters, African American women such as Anna Julia Cooper perceived as "a marketplace from which she and other black women were increasingly excluded."[80] Additionally, wealthy white male travelers began to resent their exclusion from the more comfortable "ladies" cars. What had begun as a domestically themed space to warrant the inclusion of ladies produced an explicit system of "class" cars. Retaining the domestically themed space for the more expensive seats demonstrates the "intricate filaments" linking gendered domesticity with commercial, class privilege as well as racial exclusion.

Furthermore, I would argue that the efforts to include an acceptable place for women on the train suggest the importance of incorporating the White Lady into the narrative of national progress. The train was not simply a technology of creating a powerful machine. The greatest

[80] Richter, *Home on the Rails*, 47.

significance of the train lay in creating a systematic order that contained the space of the frontier. That this order reflected hierarchies of gender, race, and class should not be unexpected given the patterns of connecting notions of home and nation. When the White Lady could travel across the U.S. while feeling *at home* in her lavishly-styled car, the frontier had been domesticated and white civilization had triumphed over the anarchy of frontier. Through the association of civilization with Christian piety, the presence of the White Lady on the train of national progress also links the Christian domestic home with the national, progressive homeland.

In summary, the romanticized rhetoric of home as a haven and as a "home, sweet home" reinforced an ideology in which race, class, and gender interacted through ideologies of domesticity and national identity. The rhetoric of *Home, Sweet Home* invokes a particular model of home as a white, married, heterosexual, semi-rural cottage separate from work and the cares of the world. The domestic ideology of the White Lady enshrined in the lyrics of *Home, Sweet Home* idealizes the home as a natural, apolitical place of familial and spiritual care performed by mother under the approving smile of father. Furthermore, this rhetorical link between home and family connoted not only the domestic household but also an ideal of the national family as white, married, heterosexual, patriarchal, and ordered.[81]

The performance of *Home, Sweet Home* at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition in London in May 1886 indicates that the ideological ideals of family and home promoted in the song resonated with imperial logic. Sung between the religious *Hallelujah chorus* and the nationalistic *Rule Britannia!*, the song nostalgic for home was placed within the context of a Christian

[81] For a discussion of how this ideal continues to function see, Patricia Hill Collins, "Producing the Mothers of the Nation: Race, Class, and Contemporary U.S. Population Policies," in *Women, Citizenship and Difference*, ed. Nira Yuval-Davis and Pnina Werbner (New York: Zed Books, 1999), 118-129.

imperial project that promoted the expansion of "imperial domesticity far away from home."[82] By employing the imperial notion of *manifest domesticity*, this juxtaposition of religion, nation, and home can be understood as a project of civilizing the colonies—or the frontier—in order to expand the ordered control of the imperial homeland. In this way, the lyrics of *Home, Sweet Home* draw upon the romanticized sentimentality of the domestic home to marshal support for imperial projects.

Within the U.S., the song was popular with soldiers from both sides of the Civil War as they fought for differing visions of the national family.[83] Although allegedly defending a place called the United States of America, the rhetoric of home circulating suggests powerful ideological desires of "natural" hierarchies of race, class, gender, and national identity. In other words, the war was fought not simply for a place called home, but for an idea of home that did or did not incorporate the freedom of blacks as belonging to the U.S. family. In this way, the rhetoric of home functioned to justify violence in pursuit of preserving the proper home for the rightly constituted national family.

Homeland Security: Protecting the National Family

The rhetoric of homespun, homestead, and "home, sweet home" are all historical variants of the ongoing connection between the rhetoric of home, nation, and Christianity. With the events of September 11, 2001, a new rhetoric of home has arisen to prominence with the advent of "Homeland Security." Whereas the rhetoric of home has long been part of the U.S. lexicon to describe the nation, Amy Kaplan argues that the rhetoric of *homeland* is new. For Kaplan, homeland "conveys a sense of native origins, of birthplace and birthright. It appeals to common

[82] Blunt, "Imperial Geographies."
[83] Ernest L. Abe, "'Home, Sweet Home': A Civil War Soldier's Favorite Song," *America's Civil War,* (May, 1996).

bloodlines, ancient ancestry, and notions of racial and ethnic homogeneity."[84] Whereas this notion of homeland suggest "spatial fixedness and rootedness," Kaplan argues that metaphors of spatial *fluidity* have long characterized the U.S. as a boundless and mobile nation as "a nation of immigrants" or as driven by the expanding boundaries of "manifest destiny."

The rhetoric of homeland, therefore, suggests a move towards conveying the U.S. as a national space with firmly fixed boundaries. For Kaplan, the impact of these firm national boundaries is manifold. Firstly, the border functions to establish who is allowed within the national home. In this way, immigration and the lives of immigrants have become more insecure as the right to cross the U.S. national boundary or to "belong" within the U.S. is more intensely policed. The firm border also becomes a line of defense from threats. The need to protect the homeland justifies numerous wars across the world—wherever and however the homeland may be threatened. At the same time, by rhetorically designating "home" as the space under threat, the domestic U.S. itself becomes increasingly surveilled and policed to identify any internal threats to the homeland. However, such active surveillance for threats may actually help to spread insecurity according to Kaplan.

These fears of threat are the subject of Susan Faludi's book, *The Terror Dream: Myth and Misogyny in an Insecure America*.[85] For Faludi, the events of 9/11 enveloped the U.S. in a state of anxiety. However, rather than directly engage the causes of the attacks, Faludi argues that the U.S. media and wider culture reiterated the mythic American story of a secure home protected by its strong men. Drawing upon her journalistic strengths, Faludi presents numerous ways that this myth was promulgated in contemporary media. For example, while the vast

---

[84] Amy Kaplan, "Homeland Insecurities: Reflections on Language and Space," *Radical History Review*, 85 (Winter 2003): 86.
[85] Susan Faludi, *The Terror Dream: Myth and Misogyny in an Insecure America*, (New York: Picador, 2007).

majority of those who died at the World Trade Center site were *men*, the most prominent images of rescue were fire*men* helping women. As the firemen were being compared to "the cowboys of yesterday" in the media, the dominant images and interviews of women were as grieving widows.[86]

Insofar as the myth in the media called for strong masculine protection, weak men and the role of feminism in weakening men received substantial blame for the vulnerability of the U.S. to attack. On 9/12, Reverend Jerry Falwell blamed "the pagans, and the abortionist, and the feminist, and the gays and the lesbians" for causing "God to lift the veil of protection."[87] Such rhetoric sought to make the events of 9/11 into a domestic drama of conservative Christian family values rather than directly addressing socio-economic and political issues in the attack or in the U.S. response. Indeed, the media lauded and sought out grieving widows such as evangelical Christian Lisa Beamer who had opted to be a stay-at-home mom. In contrast, the media denigrated a group of "angry" widows who pressed for concrete answers about failures in intelligence, first responders' communication, and the president's initial slow response.[88] According to Faludi, sustaining the dreamscape of American invulnerability required, "John Wayne protectors guarding little captive Debbies, a reverie in which women were needed to play the helpless and dependent foil."[89]

---

[86] Faludi, *Terror Dream*, 89. Faludi also goes into great detail regarding the development of the the most expensive ad of 2004 Bush presidential campaign. The ad features Bush hugging a 15-year-old girl, Ashley, who lost her father on 9/11. In the ad, Ashley says, "He's the most powerful man in the world, and all he wants to do is make sure I'm safe, that I'm ok." 189-191.
[87] Quoted in Faludi, *Terror Dream*, 27. "Falwell Apologizes to Gays, Feminists, Lesbians," CNN.com, September 14, 2001.
[88] Faludi, *Terror Dream*, 80-81; 124; for a discussion of the "angry widows" and the Jersey Girls campaign for answers see 137-146.
[89] Faludi, *Terror Dream*, 147.

The roots of this dreamscape and the emergence of the rhetoric of *homeland* security can be understood in relation to the rhetoric of home, nation, and Christianity that I have traced throughout this chapter. To explicate the U.S. response to the terror of national vulnerability in the attacks of 9/11, Faludi points to the terror felt by early white settlers who were unable to protect their homes and families.[90] In particular, she refers to the more than 130 years of settling the eastern frontier *before* the Revolution. As discussed above, the 1637 outbreak of King Philip's War attacked the houses, farms, and villages of the English killing hundreds of colonists. As a violent contest over the right to occupy and dwell on American soil, the substantial European losses and fear during this era suggests a deep national memory of terror and vulnerability. Although the memory of terror has abjectly lingered, the national identity arose instead around politicized national rhetoric such as homespun and homestead that celebrated rightly ordered, self-sufficient, industrious, civilized Christian households.

Indeed, Faludi points out that the era of time most often reproduced in Hollywood cowboy films is Western settlement from 1860-1890. This era is heroically represented as the "moment when we finally routed our homeland "invaders," or rather, exterminated them."[91] Or, in Kaplan's terms, the heroic defense of homesteads warranted the violence of manifest domesticity. That the contemporary rhetoric of homeland security is also deeply rooted in discourses of military violence is evident by the rise of the term through discussion in the U.S. military. In short, the term arose within discussions of how to organize the military to respond in a post-Cold War error to the rising fear of terrorist attacks within the U.S. territory.

Thus, the earliest record of the use of the rhetoric of homeland appeared after the 1993 World Trade Center bombings. In 1995, the Senate Committee on Armed Services referenced

[90] Faludi, *Terror Dream*, 266.
[91] Faludi, *Terror Dream*, 374.

the need for the U.S. to "defend both its deployed forces and the homeland."[92] The use of the rhetoric of "homeland defense" and "homeland security" expanded rapidly in military discourses from Army manuals, think tanks (the Institute of Homeland Security was formed in 1999), symposiums sponsored by the Army, and, ultimately, on March 21, 2001, the introduction of The National Homeland Security Agency Act to the House of Representatives. Although this original Act was unsuccessful, elements would reemerge and pass in the Homeland Security Act of 2002.[93]

Of course, what changed between the first attempt to create a Homeland Security Agency in March 2001 and its final creation in 2002 were the attacks of September 11, 2001. In tracing the rise of "Homeland Security as an American Ideology," Annette Beresford argues that the events of 9/11 created a sense of "group need" for security to restore a sense of itself as militarily and economically superior with "a history of relative peace within U.S. borders."[94] For the idea of a unified department of "homeland security" to become "materially manifest" within U.S. institutions, the ideology needed a champion who "believe[d] intensely in the ideology himself and is able to convince others of its "truth."[95] President George W. Bush easily filled the role of champion.

The role of President Bush's Christian faith would feature prominently in his championing of Homeland Security. Through his rhetoric of "evil" opposing "good," Bush

---

[92] Quoted in Annette D. Beresford, "Homeland Security as an American Ideology: Implications for U.S. Policy and Action," *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, (2004), Vol. 1: Issue 3, Article 301: 4. Original citation from U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Armed Services. (1995, July 12). *Senate Report 104-112: National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 Report.*

[93] Beresford, "Homeland Security," 5-7.

[94] Beresford, "Homeland Security," 10. In discussing the stages of ideology, Beresford relies upon Slovak Zizek, *Mapping Ideology*, (NY: Verso, 1994).

[95] Beresford, "Homeland Security," 10-11.

described political events in moralistic language of confidence that he understood the "truth" of the situation. Beresford quotes Bob Woodward as saying, "the president [cast] his mission and that of the country in the grand vision of God's master plan."[96] If Bush is read as Woodward suggests, then Bush can be seen as continuing a legacy of divinely ordained national purpose begun with the Puritan John Winthrop and expressed through manifest destiny. In this way, Bush's championing of Homeland Security can be seen as another weaving together of the rhetoric of home, nation, and Christianity in U.S. discourse.

When faced with the terror of an insecure home, the post 9/11 creation of the Department of Homeland Security emerged as a way to reify the U.S. state as a domestic, familial space of "home" in need of protection. This move also positions the state as patriarchal father who acts to protect the home from "terror."[97] However, as argued above, familial metaphors can function to establish a "natural" hierarchy. Thus, as a model for government, the patriarchal family model "promises security in place of democracy or equity."[98] Contesting the patriarchal family can therefore be understood as challenging the very model of a (paternalist, protectionist) government. Indeed, unsettling the very notion of a "natural" hierarchy based on differences of gender, race, class, religion, or nationality opens up the fixed boundaries of a national identity built upon an imperial logic of a civilized order.

A modern manifestation of the myth of the western cowboy, President George W. Bush and his Department of Homeland Security confidently exclaimed the need and their readiness to protect the *homeland*. No longer an anarchic country of embattled homesteads or an incipient

---

[96] Beresford, "Homeland Security," 11. Original citation from Bob Woodward, *Bush at War*, (NY: Simon and Schuster, 2002), 67.
[97] Deborah Cowen and Emily Gilbert, "Citizenship in the 'Homeland': Families at War" in *War, Citizenship, Territory* (New York: Routledge Press, 2007), 273.
[98] Cowen and Gilbert, "Citizenship in the 'Homeland'," 274.

nation peddling its homespun as worthy of a transnational economic market, in 2001 the space of the U.S. emerged with rhetorical confidence as a *homeland*. However, as with homespun, homestead, and "home, sweet home," the notion of homeland is imbricated in producing and policing hierarchies of belonging within the U.S. national space. In signifying the national space of the U.S. as a *homeland* of fixed boundaries, a new politics of space have emerged to contest who belongs within the nation as well as who should be excluded.

In this chapter, I have critically analyzed how the rhetoric of home, nation, and Christianity are woven together in U.S. discourses of homespun, homestead, "home, sweet home," and homeland security. I have sought to demonstrate how the rhetoric of home refers not only to particular kinds of material spaces, but also to ideological maps of socio-economic power that reinforce hierarchies of race, gender, economic status, religion and national identity. Having begun to map how the rhetoric of home is constituted by spatialized social relations of power, I now turn to how this rhetoric functions to reinforce and police these hierarchies of power through violence.

CHAPTER TWO

Power, Place, and Violence:
The Rhetoric of Home as a Tool of Violence

Welcome home. Make yourself at home. I can't wait to get home. Home, sweet home. Over and over again, the rhetoric of home functions to convey a sense of home as a place of both belonging and safety. The invitation to *make yourself at home* encourages someone to relax, to feel safe. Likewise, to feel *at home* with someone or something reflects a sense of familiarity linked to a low level of risk and relative safety. Within such idioms, there is a rhetorical assumption that home is understood as a place of belonging and safety. In this sense, home is a haven, the refuge of familiarity and security. Yet, for many, the experience of "home" has not been one of safety, but of violence. Throughout the 1970's and 1980's U.S. feminist movement, the notion of home as a safe haven was deeply challenged through the use of statistics that suggested home was the *most* dangerous place for women.[1] Rather than the tranquility of "home, sweet home," the feminist antiviolence movement depicted home as a space that could be fraught with violence.

Critical feminist analyses of violence against women in the home have sought to understand the multiple ways that socio-economic dynamics of power generate and perpetuate violence. Such critical analyses of power have been and continue to be vital to efforts to stop this violence. Feminist Christian discourses have sustained a critique of violence against women that

[1] The description of home "as the most dangerous place for women" continues to be widely cited. One source is the October, 1992 Congressional Report of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues on "Violence Against Women." The report states: "Many people feel safest when they are in their home, but for victims of domestic violence, the home is often the most dangerous place of all."
http://mith.umd.edu/WomensStudies/GenderIssues/Violence+Women/caucus-report

has made clear the need to address the intersection of religion with violence and home. Thus, feminist Christian discourses have critically analyzed how the ideological and structural roles played by Christian theology, institutions, and the Biblical text have contributed to violence against women.

While such feminist Christian critiques of violence against women make clear that "home" and violence are connected, a critical feminist rhetorical analysis of the rhetoric of home in such discourses can help to articulate this connection between "home" and violence. As I will show, depicting "home" only as site, stage, or background for violence fails to adequately grasp how socio-economic dynamics of power—and violence—constitute the place of home. Even more importantly, the rhetoric of home can itself function as a tool *of* violence by reifying particular constellations of socio-economic power and theo-ethical visions of social relations.

Engaging the critical analysis of home and nation within postcolonial discourses helps to articulate how the rhetoric of home can itself function as tool of violence. Postcolonial critiques of home show how the notion of "home" participates in socio-economic dynamics of power that constitute national boundaries of global space. In other words, the rhetoric of home contributes to global politics of space through which national boundaries and imperial projects are enacted through power and violence. Intersecting feminist Christian theo-ethical discourses with such postcolonial critiques of home helps to articulate how the rhetoric of home can function to perpetuate hierarchies of power that warrant and perpetuate violence against women.

I begin the chapter by reviewing trends in feminist Christian discourse of the 1980's and into the 1990's on violence against women. Although the rhetoric of home appears throughout the texts I examine, I will seek to show how the notion of home as itself a tool of violence remains under-developed. In contrast, I will argue that concurrently written postcolonial texts

emphasize the ideological work that the notion of home performs in sustaining particular constellations of power. After first surveying a range of postcolonial critiques of home, I critically engage examples of feminist discourse in the study of religion that link postcolonial critiques of home and practices of violence.

By weaving together both feminist Christian critique of violence against women in the home with postcolonial critiques of home and violence, I argue that violence in the place called home is fundamentally intertwined with the violence of imperial projects of the national homeland. Critically analyzing the rhetoric of home enables these connections between violence, home, homeland, and Christianity to become apparent. Furthermore, mapping the constellations of the dynamics of power and theo-ethical commitments that construct the rhetoric of home shows how "home" can function as a tool of violence.

Feminist Christian Rhetoric of Violence and Home

"Rape is nothing more or less than a conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear."
--Susan Brownmiller

As the feminist movement of the mid-20th century developed, violence against women became a major issue. Speaking out against sexual violence constituted a significant aspect of feminist anti-violence discourses. Discourses denouncing domestic violence, battered women, and, more recently, intimate partner violence articulated violent practices that may be understood as sexualized, though not necessarily sexual.[2] In attempting to articulate the root causes of violence against women, feminist Christian discourses engaged both wider feminist analyses of

[2] For an overview see Raquel Kennedy Bergen, Jeffrey L. Edleson, Claire M. Renzetti, eds., *Violence Against Women: Classic Papers* (Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon, 2005).

patriarchal power as well as the role of Christian texts, theologies, and institutions in sustaining particular patterns of power and submission.

Sexual Violence (1983)

The 1983 book by Mary Fortune, *Sexual Violence*, is an early and foundational text within feminist Christian discourse to address violence against women.[3] Fortune begins the book by confronting the silence that surrounded the discussion of sexual violence in churches. Having founded the Center to Prevent Sexual and Domestic Violence in 1977, Fortune had already spent a number of years attempting to open the discussion of violence against women in Christian ethical discourse. Fortune's work was a part of a larger movement throughout the 1970's that both raised issues of violence against women and worked to build lasting structures such as shelters and centers.[4] The anti-rape, anti-battering, and anti-violence activism had sought to make clear that there was a *problem* and to name it. Thus, Fortune begins the book by addressing a number of terms and confusions.

Fortune foregrounds the claim that sexual violence is an act of *violence* and not *sex*.[5] As an act of *violence*, "there is a violation of and injury to victims."[6] In her understanding of violence, Fortune suggests a relatively broad understanding that includes both physical and psychological injury—noting that sexual violence is often both. She also nuances "violation" by

[3] Marie M. Fortune, *Sexual Violence: The Unmentionable Sin: An Ethical and Pastoral Perspective*, (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1983). For a discussion of the move from rhetoric of "victim" to that of "survivor" in discourses of violence against women, see Jennifer L. Hunt, ""Victims" and "Survivors": Emerging Vocabularies of Motive for 'Battered Women Who Stay,'" *Sociological Inquiry*, 75, no.1 (Feb, 2005): 1-30. Hunt argues that the shift in vocabulary aims to reflect different conceptions of agency for women.
[4] For a contemporaneous history, see Susan Schechter, *Women and Male Violence: The Visions and Struggles of the Battered Women's Movement* (Boston: South End Press, 1982).
[5] Fortune, Sexual Violence, 5 and 15.
[6] Fortune, Sexual Violence, 5.

defining violence as "forced or coerced violation of another person."[7] The meaning of "forced or coerced" is amplified through subsequent rhetoric of the victim being "out of control" with "power taken away."[8] Having lost the "power to decide, to choose, to determine, to consent or withhold consent," the "victim" of sexual violence suffers the "ultimate experience of helplessness."[9] Fortune's rhetoric seeks to address not only definitions of physical injury, but also the dynamics of power in which violations of control and consent render a person "helpless." In this way, Fortune approaches violence in terms of power and control.

Having made clear the distinction between sexual activity and sexual violence, Fortune examines the understanding of and response to sexual violence within the Christian tradition. Within the Hebrew Scriptures, Fortune discusses a number of biblical stories and legal passages that describe rape.[10] Fortune argues that each text reveals a concern with the violation of male property rather than the pain and trauma of the women involved. Although Fortune does not find an explicit mention of rape in the Christian Testament, she broadly interprets several passages in order to suggest a Christian ethical response to sexual violence. For example, the compassion extended by the Good Samaritan can be understood as a model for responding to victims of the assault of sexual violence by lending aid.[11]

When moving from the Biblical texts to a selected number of responses to sexual violence in the Christian tradition, Fortune underscores that the tradition has focused on the

---

[7] Fortune, Sexual Violence, 6.
[8] Fortune, Sexual Violence, 6.
[9] Fortune, Sexual Violence, 7.
[10] Although Fortune's text uses the terms "Old Testament" and "New Testament," this convention that has been critiqued as anti-Semitic by biblical scholars such as Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. Following Schüssler Fiorenza, I will use the terms "Hebrew Scriptures" and "Christian Testament" instead. Also problematically, Fortune finds no examples of positive scriptural resources in the "Old Testament" whereas she works to reinterpret certain "New Testament" passages in a positive light for Christian ethics.
[11] Fortune, *Sexual Violence*, 56.

ethics of sexual acts—i.e., that sexual acts be performed at the right time with the right person, particularly in relation to the procreation of children in (heterosexual) Christian marriage. For Fortune, this model of ethical "acts" is problematic because it risks reinforcing the confusions of sexual activity and sexual violence. As an example, imagine a model wherein a sex act is defined as "good" because it occurs between married, heterosexual couples and "sin" if a couple is gay or unmarried. On this model, is consensual sex between unmarried partners "sin" whereas coercive sex between married heterosexual partners is "good"? Do the mechanics of the act—who does what with whom under what legal category—matter more than the power dynamics of consent and coercion? It is this kind of moral confusion that leads Fortune to argue for a sexual ethic that focuses not on the "who, what, when, where, and why"[12] of sexual activity, but on a "principle of consent, fully informed and freely given."[13]

Although Fortune gives central place in her ethic of sexuality to the principle of consent, "fully informed and freely given," Fortune concedes that locating relationships of equal power which enable a "free" consent is "rare." [14] However, rather than allowing this rarity to undermine the principle of consent, Fortune describes how the principle of consent can render moral critique of situations of unequal power and subsequent sexual violations—e.g. incest and marital rape. By framing her ethical considerations in terms of "consent," Fortune moves the discussion from rules governing acts towards questions of power, (in)equality, and "the potential for exploitation and abuse."[15] Consent, power, and violation form key elements of a sexual ethic that seeks to

[12] Fortune, *Sexual Violence*, 71.
[13] Fortune, *Sexual Violence*, 99.
[14] Fortune, *Sexual Violence*, 101. Feminist ethicist Lisa Sowle Cahill more robustly criticizes the limits of an ethic of consent and "autonomous" choice in her book, *Sex, Gender, and Christian Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 10, 218-219.
[15] Fortune, *Sexual Violence*, 109.

establish "right relationships" and not only the categorical form of right acts.[16] Although the ethical norm of "right relationship" addresses questions of power between persons, the text does not dwell at length on ideologies of race, class, gender, or nation as constitutive of inequalities of power.

Nor does Fortune question how the notion of "home" may itself be constructed by or participate in the construction of social inequalities of power or in patterns of violence. Rather, the rhetoric of home appears in the text primarily as a site or setting for violence. The greatest concentration of the rhetoric of home appears in examples of child sexual abuse in which home is depicted as a primary site of potential violence by family members. The examples given for *adult* victims (usually female) of sexual violence do not similarly foreground the home as a site of violence. However, the rhetoric of home does appear in a list of potential sites of violence that also includes spaces such as school, church, or office.[17]

Because I am arguing that "spaces" and the rhetoric of spaces themselves participate in the politics of power that structure socio-economic relations, I find it significant that Fortune's examples of sexual violence against adult women do *not* use the rhetoric of "home" when naming the place of violence. Rather, Fortune depicts the sites of violence as a house or an apartment rather than as a "home."[18] Similarly, in describing Biblical narratives of sexual violence, the text uses the rhetoric of "house" as the site of assault. Yet, in recounting one such Biblical narrative, Fortune moves to language of "home" when the victim is traveling *away* from the site of violence.[19] In these ways, the rhetorical construction of the sites of violence against women resists depicting *home* itself as a site of violence against women. To the contrary, by

[16] Fortune, *Sexual Violence*, 81.
[17] Fortune, *Sexual Violence*, 141.
[18] Fortune, *Sexual Violence*, 31-32.
[19] Fortune, *Sexual Violence*, 52.

using language of apartment and houses as the site of violence in lieu of the rhetoric of home, the home retains a rhetorical association of a safe place of refuge.

Fortune's text was one of the very earliest book-length treatments of violence against women in contemporary feminist Christian discourse. Widely read and still cited in feminist Christian discourse, Fortune's book helped to break the silence in Christian discourse on violence against women.[20] In a review of the book, Diana S. Richmond Garland commends Fortune for broadly defining sexual violence in terms of mutual consent. Thus, she sees Fortune's definition as helpful for describing sexual violence in a way that not only includes rape, but also the abuse of parishioners seeking help from religious professionals as well as abuse of children by adults.[21] By measuring violence in terms of consent, the social interactions that "count" as sexual violence expanded to include religious and familial relationships. Likewise, the possible locations for sexual violence widened. Richmond Garland notes that Fortune's understanding of sexual violence is significant because, "it refutes the myth that sexual violence happens in dark alleys or parking garages; a victim is most likely to experience sexual violence in the home with a family member.[22]

By redrawing the possible social interactions within the familial home to include violence, the place of home is mapped differently by Fortune's rhetoric of home. Put otherwise, "geographies of home change for women and children when they feel unsafe in their own private space."[23] And yet, as mentioned above, Fortune's text also continues to reflect a rhetorical bias to

---

[20] Lois Gehr Livezey, "Sexual and Family Violence: A Growing Issue for Churches," *Christian Century*, October 28, 1987, 938.
[21] Diana S. Richmond Garland, "Sexual Violence: The Unmentionable An Ethical and Pastoral Perspective," *Review & Expositor* 82, no. 4 (September 1, 1985): 634.
[22] Richmond Garland, "Sexual Violence," 634.
[23] Lynde Johnston and Robyn Longhurst, eds., *Space, Place, and Sex: Geographies of Sexualities* (Plymouth, UK: Rowman and Littlefield, 2010), 46.

presenting the notion of *home* as a "safe" place for adult women if not always for children. Nonetheless, by speaking out about sexual violence in a way that focused on consent, she opened up a conversation within feminist Christian discourse on the ethics of consent and the role of power in forcing or coercing consent. In this way, Fortune not only pushed Christian ethicists to reconsider their definitions of ethical sexuality, but also moved the Christian ethical discussion of sexuality to consider dynamics of power within sexual relationships.

Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse (1989)

In feminist Christian books on violence against women over the next decade, the need to look at dynamics of power remains central for challenging widely prevalent notions of women's submission within Christian heterosexual marriage. Understanding the dynamics of power led to closer examinations of how power functioned through cultural and religious contexts. This importance of context is clearly evident in the 1989 book, *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse*, edited by Joanne Carlson Brown and Carole R. Bohn.[24] As the title indicates, the essays in the volume engage the rhetoric of patriarchy to analyze the power dynamics that perpetuate violence against women. In the introduction to the volume, the editors clearly state the intention of the book is "to focus our attention on the role of Christian theology in undergirding an abusive culture."[25] When pointing to the role of Christianity in cultivating a culture of violence against women, the editors also make clear that some women have found Christianity too intertwined with violence to remain in the tradition.[26] Yet, for other feminist Christians, the role of Christian

[24] Joanne Carlson Brown and Carole R. Bohn, eds, *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse: A Feminist Critique*, (New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1989).
[25] Brown and Bohn, *Christianity and Abuse,* xiv.
[26] Of course, one of the most prominent figures to publically denounce the Christian church was Mary Daly. After writing her own critique of the role of patriarchal power in Christianity in the 1973 *Beyond God the Father*, she then chose to move beyond and became post-Christian. Mary Daly, *Beyond God the Father* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973).

text and teaching in sustaining a culture of violence has been an impetus for substantially re-thinking core Christian doctrines.[27]

Feminist Christians who understood their faith as helping to create a context of violence against women have had to both levy a strong critique of the tradition while also retaining connection to Christian texts and theologies. Throughout the text of *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse*, feminist scholars resolve this ambivalence to the tradition by attempting to disentangle the patriarchal contexts of power from the Biblical text and Christian practices. For example, in a chapter entitled, "The Western Religious Tradition and Violence against Women in the Home," Rosemary Radford Ruether examines theories of women's inferiority which she argues form the basis of women's subordination by men. She writes, "Domestic violence against women—wife battering or beating—is rooted in and is the logical conclusion of basic patriarchal assumptions about women's subordinate status."[28] In this quote, Radford Ruether clearly links *domestic* violence with a patriarchal system of gendered power.

To further explicate the sources for this patriarchal system and women's subordination, Radford Ruether examines the role that Christianity has played in structuring this gendered inequality. For example, she quotes this passage from Martin Luther's *Lectures on Genesis*:

> The wife as made subject to the man by the Law which was given after sin…The rule remains with the husband and the wife is compelled to obey him by God's command. He rules the home and the state, wages war, defends his possessions, tills the soil, plants,

[27] For example, Rita Nakashima Brock and Rebecca Ann Parker argue against the cross as substitutionary sacrifice in their book, *Proverbs not Ashes: Violence, Redemptive Suffering, and the Search for What Saves Us* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2001). They argue that the valorization of violence done to Jesus on the cross has functioned to justify violence against women and throughout culture.

[28] Radford Ruether, "The Western Religious Tradition and Violence against Women in the Home," in *Christianity and Abuse*, ed. Brown and Bohn, 31.

> builds, etc. The woman, on the other hand, is like a nail driven into the wall. She sits at home…"[29]

In this passage, Luther *spatially* designates the social dynamics of power between men and women. Whereas men are rulers who actively move to govern, wage war, til soil, etc., women are motionless subjects at home. This gendered bifurcation of the active, dominant male and the passive, subjected female echoes Simone deBeauvoir's argument in *The Second Sex* which was very likely known by Radford Ruether's audience.[30] Furthermore, in selecting this quote, Radford Ruether dramatically edits to end the passage with the short sentence "She sits at home…" This evocation of being "trapped" at home evokes another widely circulated feminist text, Betty Friedan's *The Feminist Mystique*.[31] Although quoting from a 16th century Christian text, Radford Ruether is clearly speaking to a contemporary audience familiar with feminist critiques of women's submissive role in the "home."

Writing in Latin, Luther does not in fact use the term "home" which Radford Ruether quotes in translation. In fact, the spatial rhetoric Luther deploys in Latin even more strongly reveals his sense of spatialized gendered order. According to an essay on the same *Lectures* by Catholic theologian Theo M.M.A.C. Bell, Luther understands the pre-Fall marriage as "making the woman a "mundane dwelling" (*politicum habitaculum*) or "household building" (*oeconomicum aedificium*) for the man."[32] For Luther, the Latin *oeconomicum* signifies "a household building" which could be translated as home but would miss the breadth of the original term. Describing Luther's understanding of *oeconomicum*, Bell writes,

---

[29] Radford Ruether, "The Western Religious Tradition," 33. Luther, *Lectures on Genesis*, 2:23; 3:16.
[30] Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1952).
[31] Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique*, (New York: Norton, 1963).
[32] Theo M.M.A.C. Bell, "Man is a Microcosm: Adam and Eve in Luther's *Lectures on Genesis* (1535-1545)," *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 69, no. 2 (April 2005): 172.

> "[A]s a household building it offers structure and order to living together as a family and society. Also the cultivation of the field, the care for home, cattle, and domestic animals belong to it. To put it another way: with the creation of the woman, the human species settles as a social and economical being in this world."

In Bell's Latin reading of Luther, a broader understanding of the household relations between husband and wife comes into the foreground which includes not only gendered relations of husband and wife, but a vast network of economic and material relations. And yet, like Radford Ruether, Bell agrees that the order of the household, particularly post-Fall, is of male authority over women.[33] Bell's reading of Luther helps to underscore that "home" is not a static space, but arises within historical, cultural contexts of power that structure socio-economic relations.

Following her discussion of Luther, Radford Ruether describes the Puritan view of hierarchal marriage as "the original order of creation, the order that should be restored in the Christian home."[34] Once again, she uses the rhetoric of home in connection with patriarchal marriage and family. By deploying the rhetoric of home within these examples of Christian patriarchal discourse, the notion of home is also implicated within a religious script of women's subordination to men. However, this use of the rhetoric of home speaks to her own context more than it seeks to fully convey the dynamics of power within social relations in either Luther's context or the Puritan context. Her aim in engaging the tradition is to build a critical argument against Christian traditions that emphasize natural orders of hierarchy—historically as well as in her contemporary moment.

Although the rhetoric of home may better reflect the politics of her own time rather than in the time of Luther or the Puritans, Radford Ruether's critical analysis of the tradition aims to articulate the gendered dynamics of power within the Christian tradition that reinforce

---

[33] Bell writes, "It is obvious that Luther was no proto-feminist." Bell, "Man is a Microcosm," 183.
[34] Radford Ruether, "The Western Religious Tradition," 33.

hierarchies of power. Although Christianity may teach gendered systems of inequality, Radford Ruether concludes her chapter by writing, "Christianity has in it seeds of an alternative theory, a theory of liberation, equality, and dignity for all persons."[35] Although Radford Ruether does not expound upon her "alternative theory" of equality, her framework clearly challenges patriarchal control of women by men. Whereas her use of the rhetoric of home implicates "home" as linked to these gendered dynamics of power, she uncritically uses the term without historicizing and contextualizing its shifting meaning for conveying the social and economic relations of family, home, and household. In this way, "home" appears as a static site or stage upon which dynamics of power between human agents are enacted.

As with Radford Ruether's chapter, the other chapters throughout *Christianity, Patriarchy and Abuse* do not critically depict the rhetoric of home as constitutive of gendered social relations. Rather, the rhetoric of home functions primarily as a spatial setting of violence and/or safety. For example, in a chapter on child abuse, Rita Nakashima Brock begins by noting that, until recently, how parents treated their children was "a private matter, the proper domain of the home in which women did the work."[36] In this opening line, Nakashima Brock gestures to a widely held notion of home as a private, gendered space for women and children. She suggests that the association between women and children reinforced a sense that neither was considered "serious" theology.

Within this same implicit logic, the association of home with women also renders *home* as a topic not worthy of "serious" theological consideration. Although Nakashima Brock does not critically analyze the notion of home, she does closely analyze the social interactions of

[35] Radford Ruether, "The Western Religious Tradition," 40.
[36] Rita Nakashima Brock, "And a Little Child Will Lead Us: Christology and Child Abuse," in *Christianity and Abuse*, ed. Brown and Bohn, 42.

households, specifically families with children. Through a discussion of the socialization of children in patriarchal households, Nakashima Brock underscores the historical nature of particular constellations of social practices in kinship and gender as well as the organization of space into gendered places of public/private and male/female.[37] Although in one place naming "gender, race, sexual orientation, age, culture, language, and all other aspects of life that are part of the complex nature of selves," the text primarily focuses on the reproduction of gendered patterns of behavior within the patriarchal family as well as the paternal need to control the behavior of his children.[38] In this way, power dynamics in the household continue to be understood primarily in gendered terms of patriarchy.

In the following chapter, Karen Bloomquist also develops an analysis of violence against women as rooted in a patriarchal system of male domination and female subordination. However, Bloomquist complicates the context of violence against women by depicting the patriarchal ideology as "intertwined with capitalism."[39] In this way, gender and economic status intersect to produce differing articulations of male identity. Arguing for the importance of control as a source of male identity, Bloomquist suggests that for a "poor or working class male" with limited control of economic opportunities, "home becomes the place where a married man feels he can exercise his authority."[40] Again, the implicit assumption in this statement is that home is both gendered female and, subsequently, coded as inferior. In other words, home is a site of female subordination where patriarchal males seek to enforce their dominance. Furthermore,

---

[37] Attempting to understand the role of gendered spaces across cultures in socializing people is the aim of Daphne Spain, *Gendered Spaces* (Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1992).
[38] Nakashima Brock, "And a Little Child Will Lead Us," 57.
[39] Karen L. Bloomquist, "Sexual Violence: Patriarchy's Offense and Defense," in *Christianity and Abuse*, ed. Brown and Bohn, 63.
[40] Bloomquist, "Sexual Violence," 63.

the chapter connects a sense of dominance to a sense of control. Subordination, in contrast, is a state of limited control and choice over one's actions and movements.

In the closing chapter of the volume, Carter Heyward and Beverly Harrison explore the dynamics of subordination and domination in relationship to sexuality. In their discussion, they attempt to depict a more complicated context of dynamics of power than simply gender. Rather, they argue that the "history of sexuality [is] embedded in social structures of patterned power relations such as institutional heterosexism, racism, and cultural imperialism."[41] In this way, they suggest an understanding of the social context of power that includes sexuality, race, and culture as well as gender. Although when they analyze the sexualized patterns of "pain and pleasure" in Christian eschatological anticipation, the primary rhetorical category remains gender and a concern with male domination. Thus, the analysis of the dynamics of power that shapes the context of violence against women remains limited. Although seeking to broaden the dynamics of power, Heyward and Harrison only begin to open up the complexity of social interactions and theo-ethical commitments that construct violence. Notably, they do not address the rhetoric of "home" and any role that it may play in contributing to dynamics of power.

Concilium: Violence Against Women (1994)

Following the 1989 publication of *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse*, the narrow focus on gender and patriarchal domination in feminist Christian discourses follows a trend of developing a more intersectional analysis of violence against women.[42] In a 1994 *Concilium:*

[41]Beverly W. Harrison and Carter Heyward, "Pain and Pleasure: Avoiding the Confusions of Christian Tradition in Feminist Theory," in *Christianity and Abuse*, ed. Brown and Bohn, 150.
[42] In fact, sexual violence is the key issue in a widely read article in feminist theory on intersectionality. Kimberle William Crenshaw, "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color," in *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement*, ed. Kimberle Crenshaw, et al. (New York: The New Press: 1995), 357-383.

Violence Against Women edited by M. Shawn Copeland and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, the essays not only address violence against women in varied global sites, but also incorporate discussions about the role of colonialism in perpetuating violence against women.[43] For example, in an essay about prostitution and rape in Brazil, Zilda Fernandes Ribeiro discusses the difficulty of analyzing the problem of rape in the colonial history of Brazil because of the lack of historical records due to colonial politics.[44] Beatrix Schiele addresses the legacy of colonialism in the practice of corporations allowing different work conditions for their branches in "Third World" countries versus those "at home" in Europe and the United States.[45] However, in depicting the contrast as between the "home" of Europe and Third World countries, Schiele uncritically restates a colonial rhetorical trope that mapped metropole and colonies as "home and abroad."

Domestic places and violence help to frame Delores Williams' discussion of violence against African American women. In her essay, Williams depicts "three contexts of domestic violence": slavery, the work-place of slave owners as well as white families into the 20th century, and in their own homes and communities.[46] Throughout her brief descriptions of a number of situations of violence against African-American women in history, Williams clearly emphasizes the role of racism in generating violence against black women. By situating current violence against African-American women within a longer history of racism and slavery in the U.S., Williams is following the pattern of other authors such as Angela Davis.[47]

---

[43] M. Shawn Copeland and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Concilium: Violence Against Women*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1994)
[44] Zilda Fernandes Ribeiro, "Prostitution and Rape in the Colonial Period," in *Violence Against Women*, ed. Copeland and Schüssler Fiorenza,11-21.
[45] Beatrix Schiele, "Violence and Justice," in *Violence Against Women*, ed. Copeland and Schüssler Fiorenza, 29.
[46] Delores S. Williams, "African-American Women in Three Contexts of Domestic Violence," in *Violence Against Women*, ed. Copeland and Schüssler Fiorenza, 34.
[47] Angela Davis, *Women, Race, and Class* (New York: Random House, 1981).

Telling this history is important for making clear that African-American women "have a long history of experiencing violence in white homes where they have worked as domestics from slavery to the present."[48] Significantly, Williams' use of the rhetoric of home is modified here by "white." In this way, Williams is noting that "home" is not uniform but can be marked differently by social categories of race. Furthermore, in this quote, the "white home" appears as both a site of labor for African-American women and a site of violence. Home in this account is neither a haven, nor safe as the Cult of Domesticity would suggest.

Although Williams repeatedly discusses violence against black women in the homes of slave owners or white employers, she also makes clear that African American women can face violence "in their homes and communities."[49] In denouncing this violence, Williams examines "the way in which many black men perceive black manhood and threats to it."[50] In examining "black manhood," Williams identifies racism, violence, and efforts to control but does not use the rhetoric of patriarchy. In attempting to connect violence, gender, racism, and home, the rhetoric of patriarchy does not appear to be useful or helpful for Williams. Rather, she contextualizes and historicizes ongoing socio-economic dynamics of power that shape the lives of African-American women. In naming violence against African-American women, the relatively high recurrence of the rhetoric of home as a site of violence clearly points to an understanding of home as linked to violence, racism, and sexism. However, once again, the rhetoric of home appears only a site or "domestic context" for violence without itself being named as a tool of violence.

[48] Williams, "Three Contexts of Domestic Violence," 37.
[49] Williams, "Three Contexts of Domestic Violence," 34.
[50] Williams, "Three Contexts of Domestic Violence," 38.

In the introduction to the 1994 *Violence Against Women*, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza *does* develop a critical analysis of the constitutive connections between domesticity and violence. An expanded version of her argument appears in the published papers of a conference entitled, "Spirituality of Life: Women Struggling against Violence."[51] Schüssler Fiorenza begins by citing a number of statistics that underscores that *home* is a site of violence for women. Although Schüssler Fiorenza does articulate male control of women as a cause of violence against women, she also points to "the cultural and religious construction of docile feminine bodies and subservient feminine selves" that sustains this male control.[52] In this way, her analysis further nuances Fortune's earlier description of control and consent to draw a more complicated picture of agency formed within socially disciplining contexts. In other words, the cultural and religious promotion of a particular conception of proper femininity as docile and subservient systematically shapes a woman's own perception of herself as well as how women are seen in society. Although women may not be "forced" to marry, mother, or diet, the "disciplining" practices of culture and religion reinforce social norms that shape behavior.[53]

However, Schüssler Fiorenza intentionally resists the reduction of power dynamics to the patriarchal dimensions of gender. Rather, she argues that patriarchal power should be understood in terms of kyriarchy.[54] Although kyriarchy literally means rule of the lord/master, Schüssler

---

[51] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Ties That Bind: Domestic Violence Against Women," in *Women Resisting Violence: Spirituality for Life*, Mary John Mananzan, et al. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996), 1. The conference was organized by the Women's Commission of the Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians (EATWOT). 45 women theologians from fourteen countries met in San Jose, Costa Rica, on December 7-12, 1994.
[52] Schüssler Fiorenza, "Ties That Bind," 43.
[53] Schüssler Fiorenza, "Ties That Bind," 45.
[54] "Kyriarchy means the domination of the emperor, lord, slave master, husband, the elite freeborn educated and propertied male colonizer who has power over all wo/men and subaltern men." Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *The Power of the Word: Scripture and the Power of Empire*, (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007), 158.

Fiorenza uses it to refer to a "pyramid of interstructured oppressions" that includes gender, race, class, nationality, and religion.[55] In this way, Schüssler Fiorenza points not only to gendered relations within familial household, but to how the patri-kyriarchal family functions as a school of kyriarchal relations that shape society. In this way, the home and domesticity are likewise implicated in sustaining and reproducing kyriarchal systems of power. More specifically, the patri-kyriarchal family home and domesticity understood in terms of docile female subservience are so implicated.

By focusing on how the power relations of the patri-kyriarchal family shape and are shaped by social and religious norms, Schüssler Fiorenza does not dwell at length on the place or structure of "home" in itself. Nonetheless, her analysis develops a systematic understanding of how family, "home," nation, religion, and society interact to construct one another. This framework opens up the possibility of locating "home" within a constellation of socio-economic dynamics of power. Furthermore, including "country" and nation in her understanding of kyriarchy enables her to connect dynamics of familial and national power to one another. For example, Schüssler Fiorenza writes, "personal and national power is expressed through control and violence against women, who signify all who are weak and subordinate."[56] The feminized, docile subservience that characterizes "women" (and weaker, feminized men) serves as a warrant for control by elite men. This analysis clearly dovetails with the above discussion of the "Family of Man" in the work of Ann McClintock.[57] In both examples, the patterns of dominance and subordination learned at home in the patriarchal family belong to a continuum of kyriarchal power and violence that sustains hierarchies of gender, race, class, and nation.

---

[55] Schüssler Fiorenza, "Ties That Bind," 43.
[56] Schüssler Fiorenza, "Ties That Bind," 44.
[57] Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

Notably, Schüssler Fiorenza also presents an alternative to the patri-kyriarchal family and its norms of domination. In fact, she insists:

> Liberal and liberationist theologies will not be able to overcome their own violence-producing socio-cultural and religious discourses of subordination, economic exploitation, and political objectification as long as they do not publicly condemn the institutionalized structures of heterosexist kyriarchal "Christian" family and church that jeopardize the survival of the women who struggle at the bottom of the socio-cultural pyramid of domination.[58]

Because the patri-kyriarchal family is the school of kyriarchal relations that perniciously shape the kyriarchal "pyramid," critiquing and dismantling this understanding of "Christian" family and church is a necessary and fundamental work of justice. As an alternative, Schüssler Fiorenza argues for a "just family" that is "conceptualized not only as genderless but also free from structures of race, class, and colonialist exploitation."[59] In arguing for this notion of a "just family," Schüssler Fiorenza seeks to end the socialization of men and women into structures of hierarchal power relations and into a culture of violence against women.[60] In this way, a critical feminist analysis of the structures of power within the rhetoric of family and of home can be understood as a deeply political project that shapes both personal and national patterns of dwelling together.

In the trajectory from Marie Fortune breaking the silence in 1983 to the 1994 *Concilium* and "Spirituality for Life" conference, the analysis of violence against women in the home generated more complicated understandings of the multiple dynamics of power that constitute the socio-economic patterns of power and domination. Unfortunately, there is still a need today

---

[58] Schüssler Fiorenza, "Ties That Bind," 49. Chapter four will expand upon Schüssler Fiorenza's notion of *ekklēsia* as an alternative space to kyriarchal spaces such as the patri-kyriarchal "home."

[59] Schüssler Fiorenza, "Ties That Bind," 44.

[60] The classic feminist text on the socialization of children into gender roles is Nancy Chodorow, *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978).

for feminist Christian discourses to critique of the role of religious doctrine in sustaining patterns of women's subservience. To challenge the subservience of women that justifies violent male control of women, feminist Christian discourses must critique the hierarchal dynamics of power taught in the patri-kyriarchal "Christian" family home. Feminist Christian discourses must also critically examine how theological concepts such as the valorization of suffering reinforce social norms of gendered subservience. As with Radford Ruether's reading of Luther, feminist theo-ethical discourses need to critically engage the Christian tradition, but also be mindful of critiquing the social construction of notions such as family, home, household, and nation by which we read the tradition.

Although the examples of feminist Christian discourses that I engage repeatedly challenge both the Christian tradition and elements of patri-kyriarchal power, the notion of home primarily remains as a spatial setting for violence without itself being recognized as a tool of violence. In other words, home often appears as a stage upon which the dynamics of power inflict their violence upon women and the subordinate. But the notion of home is not itself a tool of power, domination, or violence. By locating the household dynamics of power in relation to larger political systems, Schüssler Fiorenza clearly comes closest in implicating home but stops short of critically analyzing the specific term "home" in these essays.[61] To better understand how the specific rhetoric of home participates in systems of power that reinforce violence, I now turn to an overview of the rhetoric of home in postcolonial discourses.

Home, Homeland, and the Violence of Colonialism

Within the European colonial mapping of power relations, the spatial distinction between "home and abroad" marked the fundamental hierarchy of metropole and colony. Designating the

[61] Chapter three and especially chapter four will address elements of Schüssler Fiorenza's thought that explicitly critiques the rhetoric of "home."

metropolitan center as "home," the rhetoric of home has helped to sustain a colonial system of domination. As Anne McClintock argues, the "intricate filaments among imperialism, domesticity, and money" suggest "that imperialism cannot be understood without a theory of domestic space and its relation to the market."[62] Domestic ideologies of "home" have been inextricably interwoven with the global dynamics of colonial economic and political power. Furthermore, the diasporic movement of peoples through the (post)colonial currents of political and economic dynamics has unsettled the notion of "home" for many persons. Is home where one lives now? Is home the nation of origin? Is it possible to have multiple homes? To address these questions, the notion of home has been interrogated in multiple ways within (post)colonial discourses. A brief overview of the postcolonial discourses of home will help to build a more critical understanding of the relationship between the familial home, the political homeland, and the violence woven throughout both.

Varying senses of the term "postcolonial" account in part for differing articulations of the rhetoric of home within postcolonial discourses.[63] What exactly is "postcolonial" discourse? In short, there is not a singular understanding of "postcolonial." Variations abound for multiple reasons, most broadly due to different conceptions of colonialism, space, and time. For example, one way to conceive of postcolonial is in reference to the 20th-century independence movements of former European colonies. Within this type of discourse, the work of Frantz Fanon and Edward Said has been critical in establishing postcolonial studies.[64] Yet, if postcolonial signifies

---

[62] McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 17.

[63] For this discussion of differing understandings of the postcolonial, I rely in part on Ella Shohat, "Notes on the 'Postcolonial'," in *The Pre-Occupation of Postcolonial Studies*, ed. Fawzia Afzal-Khan and Kalpana Seshadri-Crooks (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000), 126-139.

[64] Frantz Fanon, *Black Skins, White Masks*, trans. Charles Lann Markman (New York: Grove Press, 1967); Edward Said, *Orientalism*, (New York: Vintage Press, 1979.)

a formally colonized nation, what distinguishes the so-called "Third World" colonies from a nation such as the U.S. that also has origins as a British colony?[65] Furthermore, in what sense is colonialism "over" as the prefix "post" suggests? Some have argued that the postcolonial era ended with the publication of Antonio Negri and Antonio Hardt's *Empire* and its massive analysis of neocolonial global relations.[66] Or, does Hardt and Negri's depiction of an "Empire" of transnational corporations and NGOs signal not the end of (post)colonialism but simply an alternative spatial depiction of colonialism not limited to European models of metropole and colony? Likewise, settler colonialism challenges the metropole-colony model of European colonialisms. In the process of settling colonized land, settler colonialism decimates and disempowers native populations such that the "post"-colonial time and space remain foreclosed.[67]

Rather than promote a singular definition of postcolonial theory or postcolonial studies over others, I understand "postcolonial" studies as a broad cluster of conversations that seek to identify and analyze the political, economic, and/or cultural dynamics operating within and as a consequence of "colonial" power. However, it is necessary to specify that colonial power has multiple modes for subjugating the economic, political, and human resources of one region (or nation) for the benefit of another. This multiplicity and specificity of varying models and experiences of colonialism has led to the development of comparative discourses that seek to

---

[65] See Michelle Kewon, David Murphy, and James Procter, "Introduction: Theorizing Postcolonial Diasporas," in Michelle Keown, David Murphy, and James Procter, eds., *Comparing Postcolonial Diasporas*, (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009).
[66] Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000).
[67] See Daiva Stasiulis and Nira Yuval-Davis, eds., *Unsettling Settler Societies*: *Articulations of Gender, Race, Ethnicity and Class* (London: Sage Press, 1995).

articulate this specificity of imperial power in differing contexts.[68] Thus, by understanding postcolonial analysis broadly, it is possible to trace the intersections between European colonialism, its continued effects in neocolonial Empire, and the impact on present day movements, connections, and communities of global diasporas. Critiques of the notion of home appear within several different strands of the broad postcolonial discussion.

One example of the rhetoric of home in postcolonial studies lies in the ubiquitous phrase *" home and abroad"* that echoed throughout 19th and 20th century British colonial rhetoric.[69] Rather than simply marking geographical locations, this spatial distinction signified a constellation of social interactions of power that distinguished between the metropole/home and colonies/abroad. Using the domestic rhetoric of home to describe the political and social relations of empire wove together the notions of domesticity and colonialism. Anne McClintock writes in *Imperial Leather* that "domesticity denotes both a *space* (a geographic and architectural alignment) and a *social relation to power.*"[70] She further states that "etymologically, domesticate is akin to the verb dominate, which derives from *dominus*, lord of the *domum*, the home."[71] Although the household of the *domus* and the 19th century *home* are not equivalent notions, the etymological connection between domestic and domination underscores the role that "social relations to power" play in constituting the spaces in which persons dwell together.

To further highlight the links between power and the rhetoric of domesticity, McClintock also points out that until 1964, "the verb [domesticate] also carried as one of its meaning the

---

[68] Michelle Keown, David Murphy, and James Procter, eds., *Comparing Postcolonial Diasporas* (New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009).
[69] See Amy Kaplan, "Homeland Insecurities: Reflections on Language and Space" in *Radical History Review*, 85 (Winter 2003): 89.
[70] McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 34.
[71] McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 35. See Karen Hansen, ed., *African Encounters with Domesticity* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992), 3.

action "to civilize.""[72] This etymological link between "domesticate" and "civilize" echoes the discussion of Amy Kaplan's notion of manifest domesticity in chapter one. In both instances, the domestication of the savage other expands the reach of "civilization" and of colonial power. When presented as a "domestic" space, the rhetoric of home participates in the civilizing power of colonial logic. In this way, the rhetoric of domesticity and home do not simply mark spatial locations or places. Rather, the rhetoric of domesticity and home participate in social relations of power that aim to "civilize" the colonized through the process of "domestication."

A second example of the rhetoric of home appears within postcolonial discourses of diaspora. Originally used primarily to describe the global dispersion of Jews, the concept of diaspora has spread to include the many peoples of the globe that have relocated for political and/or economic reasons. Again, the ambiguities of time appear within the notion of postcolonial diaspora. Within diaspora studies, attention has been paid not only to more recent movements of people from the global South to the global North, but also to the African diaspora through hundreds of years of European colonial slave trade.[73] This transnational movement of people complicates and challenges the simply binary of "at home and abroad." Where is home for the persons and communities living in diaspora? Is "home" the country of origin or the country of residence? When economic and social exchanges occur with family, neighbors, and colleagues of multiple places across the globe, where is home? Where is home when the language, skin color, religion, and cultures of the nation in which you reside do not mirror your own? Or, when a legal document proclaims you a citizen of a nation that harasses and otherwise rejects your ethnicity,

[72] McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 35. See Hansen, *African Encounters with Domesticity*, 23.
[73] Sara Ahmed, Claudia Castañeda, Anne-Marie Fortier, Mimi Sheller, ed., *Uprootings/Regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration*, (New York: Berg, 2003). Avtar Brah, "Diaspora, Border, and Transnational Identities," in *Feminist Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*, ed. Reina Lewis and Sara Mills (New York: Routledge, 2003).

culture, and/or religion as not belonging to the "true" nation?[74] If home is a place of belonging, then how do diasporic cultures articulate "home" and where they do—or do not—"belong"?

To capture this ambiguous sense of belonging, Homi Bhabha translates Freud's use of *unheimlich* as unhomely. Typically translated into English as "uncanny," Bhabha engages the notion of unhomely to describe the interstitial space between places. Challenging the binary separation of the places of home and world, the unhomely is not the same as the antonymic homelessness, but is the "location" *between* that reveals the failure of the binary to maintain a closed boundary. For example, in this passage, Bhabha points to the feminist critique of world and home binaries to explain how the binary fails:

> By making visible the forgetting of the "unhomely" moment in civil society, feminism specifies the patriarchal, gendered nature of civil society and disturbs the symmetry of private and public which is now shadowed, or uncannily doubled, but the difference of genders which does not neatly map on to the private and the public, but becomes disturbingly supplementary to them. This results in redrawing the domestic space of the normalizing, pastoralizing, and individuating techniques of modern power and police: the personal-*is*-the-political; the world-*in*-the-home.[75]

Rather than play along with the "forgetting" of the interstitial moments that reveal the failure of containing gendered spheres of home and world, feminism exposes the "unhomely" moment that recognizes the presence of one in the other.

By resisting a neat mapping upon a binary of two distinct places, the unhomely reveals the complexity of locations, of intersecting places, even intersecting times.[76] For example, Bhabha's discussion of Toni Morrison's *Beloved* examines the doubled, disrupting awareness of

---

[74] For a discussion of cultural citizenship see Aihwa Ong, "Cultural Citizenship as Subject Making," *Current Anthropology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 37, no.5 (Dec, 1996): 737-762. See also Lisa Lowe, *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics* (Chapel Hill: Duke University Press, 1996).

[75] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 15.

[76] For a discussion of postcolonial time, see Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

the familiar and the strange that marks the unhomely. He identifies the unhomely as the haunting presence of a child murdered by her mother during slavery. To allow the "unspeakable thoughts to be unspoken," the women in the novel must come to distinguish the connections between the cruelty of slavery and the impossible choices facing a mother to put her own child to death.[77] Not only does the unhomely presence of the murdered child disrupt past and present locations, so also the women must name the complex links between her choice and the context of power in which she acts.

The unhomely is a knowledge that refuses disavowal, which makes visible the complexity of social relations of power in time and space. Marked by "ambivalences and ambiguities,"[78] the unhomely defies simply binaries and definite boundaries. In this way, this interstitial space between locations becomes a means to articulate the ambivalences of postcolonial, particularly diasporic, identities that do not map neatly upon one place or another. Although the notion of the unhomely limitedly appears in Bhabha's work,[79] many others in postcolonial analyses pick up the notion of the unhomely—particularly in relation to diasporic discourses.[80]

A different example of the rhetoric of home in relation to questions of postcolonial diaspora can be found in a widely cited essay, "What's Home Got to Do with It?" by Chandra Mohanty and co-author Biddy Martin. In this essay, Mohanty and Martin state their interest in

[77] Toni Morrison, *Beloved*, quoted in Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 23.
[78] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 27.
[79] In addition to the Introduction to *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha also presented a lecture, "The World and the Home" that was published in *Social Text* no. 31 (01/01, 1992): 141-153. This became the basis of the subsequent introduction to *The Location of Culture.*
[80] Bilinda Straight, ed., *Women on the Verge of Home* (Albany: State University of New York Press), 2005.

"the configuration of home, identity, and community."[81] Although Mohanty and Martin wish to concede the appeal and importance of notions of community, they are critical of efforts to create community that fail to adequately unpack the conceptual linkages between notions of home and exclusionary practices.[82] To illustrate, Mohanty and Martin discuss an essay by Bernice Johnson Reagon in which she "makes clear that unity through incorporation has too often been the white middle-class feminist's mode of adding on difference without leaving the comfort of home."[83] For Reagon, Martin, and Mohanty, the notion of home as a safe place in which to gather into a unified (political) family fails to account for exclusions inherent in the notion of home.

To more closely explore the dynamics of exclusion in notions of home, community, and identity, Mohanty and Martin critically engage Minnie Bruce Pratt's autobiographical essay, "Identity: Skin, Blood, Heart."[84] Mohanty and Martin commend Pratt's account for refusing a stable, homogenous sense of identity. Rather, they understand Pratt's description of her "constricting eye" upon herself and her community as a shifting, non-linear, overlapping sense of

---

[81] Chandra Mohanty and Biddy Martin, "What's Home Got to do with It?" in Chandra Mohanty, *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 85. The essay first appeared in Teresa de Lauretis, ed., *Feminist Studies/Critical Studies* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986).

[82] On this point, they describe Zillah Eisenstein's critique of feminist writing in which "the pursuit of safe places and ever-narrower conceptions of community relies on unexamined notions of home, family, and nation." Mohanty and Martin, "What's Home Got to Do with It?*"* 85. See also Zillah Eisenstein, *Feminism and Sexual Equality* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1984.)

[83] Mohanty and Martin, "What's Home Got to Do with It?*"* 86-87. Bernice Johnson Reagon, "Coalition Politics: Turning the Century" in Barbara Smith, ed., *Home Girls: a Black Feminist Anthology* (New York: Kitchen Table—Women of Color Press, 1983), 343-355. Mohanty and Martin note the significance that it is an anthology of black women's writing rather than liberal white feminists that destabilize the notion of home. Mohanaty discusses Reagon's article in more detail in chapter four, "Sisterhood, Coalition, and the Politics of Experience," in *Feminism Without Borders*, 117-119.

[84] Minnie Bruce Pratt, "Identity: Skin, Blood, Heart," in Elly Bulkin, Minnie Bruce Pratt, and Barbara Smith, *Yours in Struggle: Three Feminist Perspectives on Anti-Semitism and Racism* (Itacha, New York: Firebrand Books, 1988).

worlds.[85] Furthermore, Mohanty and Martin argue that by grounding her sense of self in the materiality of the places she has called home, Pratt "politicizes the geography, demography, and architecture of the communities [by] discovering local histories of exploitation and struggle."[86] Or, in Nancy Frankenberg's term, Pratt articulates a social geography of race.[87]

In her essay, Pratt critically examines three different places that have been her "home." In discussing her childhood hometown, Pratt recounts a day when her father took her to the courthouse to climb to the top for a view of the Southern town. Although her fear of the narrow stairway prevented her from reaching the top, her adult self recounts what she would have seen and *not seen* of the town's buildings and businesses from the "center" of town. Pratt writes,

> I was shaped by my relation to those buildings and to the people in the buildings, by ideas of who should be working in the Board of Education, of who should be in the bank handling money, of who should have the guns and the keys to the jail, of who should be *in* the jail; and I was shaped by what I didn't see, or didn't notice, on those streets.[88]

Shaped by the intersections of spatialized social interactions, as a child Pratt learned not only about the socio-economic politics of her town, but also her place within the town as a white, Christian woman.

Yet, Pratt describes her *need* to look differently at her home after realizing "that what is presented to me as an accurate view of the world is frequently a lie."[89] What was known and familiar becomes strange as she resists the simply drawn social geographical map given to her as a youth. Rejecting the view of a bound world with her at the center, Pratt begins to see "the

---

[85] Mohanty and Martin, "What's Home Got to Do with It?*"* 90.
[86] Mohanty and Martin, "What's Home Got to Do with It?*"* 89.
[87] Ruth Frankenberg, "Growing up White: Feminism, Racism, and the Social Geography of Childhood," in *Space, Gender, Knowledge: Feminist Readings*, eds. Linda McDowell and Joanne P. Sharp (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc, 1997), 211-212.
[88] Bruce Pratt, *Identity: Skin, Blood, Heart*, 17.
[89] Bruce Pratt, *Identity: Skin, Blood, Heart*, 17.

world of overlapping circles" that comprises a more complex, multilayered world. [90] Although her father had aimed to teach Pratt a stable social geography centered upon white, moneyed, educated power, her own adult analysis reveals the disavowed presence of additional people, places, and activities excluded from her father's mapping of the city.[91]

Indeed, in learning to see differently, Pratt articulates her fear of confronting the existence of persons outside the safe confines of the world in which she was raised. Pratt writes:

> I have learned that my fear is kin to a terror that has been in my birth culture for years, for centuries: the terror of a people who have set themselves apart and *above*, who have wronged others, and feel they are about to be found out and punished. It is the terror that in my culture has been expressed in lies about dirty Jews who kill for blood, sly Arab hordes who murder, brutal Indians who massacre, animal Blacks who rise in rebellion in the middle of the night and slaughter. … It is the desperate terror, the knowledge that something is *wrong*, and tries to end fear by attack.[92]

In this passage, Pratt articulates a widely held sense of terror in a culture—such as the "terror dream" that enveloped the post 9/11 U.S. as Susan Faludi describes.[93] Moreover, she connects this sense of terror to the knowledge acquired through the spatialized social practices of hierarchy and exclusion in her hometown. In this way, Pratt describes not only how socio-economic dynamics construct landscapes, but how spatialized social relations in a particular place can "teach" these socio-economic dynamics through structural, material articulations of place—the presence and absence of certain buildings, people, and practices.

Although Pratt had been taught to see a social geography of "home" built by exclusions and fear, she refuses to be limited by this fear and remain "protected" in the safety of her "home"

---

[90] Bruce Pratt, *Identity: Skin, Blood, Heart*, 17.
[91] Mohanty and Martin write, "The apparently stable, centered position of the father is revealed to be profoundly unstable, based on exclusions, and characterized by terror," in "What's Home Got to Do with It?*"* 95.
[92] Bruce Pratt, *Identity:Skin, Blood, Heart*, 17-18.
[93] Susan Faludi, *The Terror Dream: Myth and Misogyny in an Insecure America*, (New York: Picador, 2007).

as a white, Christian woman. Instead, she pledges to live "on the edge at my skin, listening, asking what new thing will I hear, will I see, will I let myself fear, beyond the fear."[94] Mohanty and Martin describe Pratt's efforts to be "on the edge" as emblematic of her desire to move beyond the confining space of her childhood home without the "pretense" that she can simply leave her past behind her.[95] Thus, "home" may not be stable and unchanging, but neither can the places, communities, and "homes" of our lives be excised from our sense of self. In this sense, "home" is not left behind, but becomes constitutive of a shifting identity, a place(s) to which we return in rearticulating how we live and how we relate to others.

By grounding these insights in the materiality of places, Pratt refuses a purely psychological explanation of social relations. Mohanty and Martin describe Pratt as challenging any "self-evident" or "essential" relation between "blood, skin, heart, home, and identity [without] dismissing the power and appeal of those connections."[96] In this way, Pratt avoids what Mohanty and Martin describe as a post-structural trap of indeterminacy by locating herself within concrete, material, social, spatial relations. Recounting how she learns to "see" these places and relations of her life, Pratt weaves together the material with the psychological dimensions of (un)learning fear of what lies beyond the edge of her skin, of her "home."

Christian belief and identity are featured as a significant theme in both Pratt's essay and Mohanty and Martin's. In Pratt's essay, she is critical of the role Christianity played in teaching her to remain within the confines of a particular home as a white, heterosexual wife and mother. Coming out as a lesbian, Pratt discovered the envelope of protection that had surrounded her as a

[94] Bruce Pratt, *Identity:Skin, Blood, Heart*, 18.
[95] Mohanty and Martin, "What's Home Got to Do with It?*"* 92.
[96] Mohanty and Martin, "What's Home Got to Do with It?*"* 94.

Southern white, Christian lady came crashing down because she was "no longer pure."[97] In losing her privileged status and losing her children, Pratt comes to see the cost of "protection" offered by white, Christian men. After presenting both the Crusades and the Klan as examples of violence grounded in the "protection" of (white) Christian women, she likens these to the "threatening 'protection'" of "white Christian men" who would protect the nation from the perils of abortion, gay rights, and immorality.[98] Rather than accept this geography as "accurate," Pratt (re)educates herself by learning both the historical and ongoing role of Christianity in oppressing blacks, Jews, and "immoral" women as well as the role of white Christian women in resistance to these oppressions.

For Mohanty and Martin, such "historical grounding" of the shifting, multi-layered terrain underscores both the "terrors and pleasures" of unstable boundaries, but also the "responsibility for remapping boundaries and renegotiating connections."[99] In this sense, "home" is not a place to be "found" but to be constructed. By educating herself and questioning her knowledge of herself, her communities, and her "homes," Pratt participates in remapping her understanding of the world and her connections to the world. Imagining a more peaceful, just world, Pratt exhorts, "we should be saying, *as* white and Christian-raised women, *Not in my name*."[100] Locating herself *as* a white, Christian woman, Pratt re-maps her connections to these "homes," but does so in order to resist the boundaries erected to "protect" her privilege and the violence done in the name of that protection.

Articulating the connections between home and exclusions makes clearer the role of violence in establishing and maintain boundaries of belonging, of feeling comfortably "at home."

---

[97] Bruce Pratt, *Identity: Skin, Blood, Heart*, 26.
[98] Bruce Pratt, *Identity: Skin, Blood, Heart*, 38.
[99] Mohanty and Martin, "What's Home Got to Do with It?*"* 87.
[100] Bruce Pratt, *Identity: Skin, Blood, Heart*, 56.

In asking "what's home got to do with it?," Mohanty and Martin set out to destabilize the comfortable notions of home as a safe place of (political) unity. By engaging Pratt's critical, autobiographical readings of her own "homes," Mohanty and Martin argue that home is indeed a problematic notion built on exclusions. For this reason, they are concerned by the "challenging presence" of the rhetoric of home in the "New Right."

Unfortunately, Mohanty and Martin do not specify their concerns with the "New Right" nor make explicit a connection between the New Right and conservative Christianity. However, they note the "importance of not handing over notions of home and community to the Right."[101] I read this statement as expressing an interest not in two different topics, but in the single idea of how notions of home and community intersect to shape and construct the other. The subsequent analysis of Pratt's text makes clear how the places of "home" can function to shape the boundaries of communities around the politics of exclusion, terror, and "protection."

In summarizing Pratt's article, they make this connection between home and exclusion explicit:

> "Being home" refers to the place where one lives within familiar, safe, protected boundaries; "not being home" is a matter of realizing that home was an illusion of coherence and safety based on the exclusion of specific histories of oppression and resistance, the repression of differences even within oneself.[102]

[101] Mohanty, *Feminism Without Borders*, 85. They particularly point to the Zillah Eisenstein's critique of "revisionism" in the work of Betty Friedan, Andrea Dworkin, and Jean Bethke Elshtain. Zillah Eisentein, *Feminism and Sexual Equality* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1984).

[102] Mohanty and Martin, "What's Home Got to Do with It?*"* 90.

By identifying the illusion of coherence and the patterns of exclusions in the notion of home, Mohanty and Martin problematize the use of the rhetoric of home in feminist thought to convey unity and togetherness.[103]

After the events of September 11, 2001, Mohanty returned to the politics of home and terror. In describing her understanding of post 9/11 U.S. imperialism, she writes:

> The U.S. war state mobilizes gender and race hierarchies and nationalist xenophobia in its declaration of internal and external enemies, in its construction and consolidation of the "homeland security" regime, and in its use of the checkbook and cruise missile to protect its own economic and territorial interests. [104]

In this quote, Mohanty argues that hierarchies of race, gender, and nation function both to police the boundaries of the nation and to warrant economic and militaristic involvement and dominance over other nations in the name of "protecting" our national (read: homeland) interests. Mohanty describes the U.S. state as an "advanced capitalist state" that "owns the means of organized violence" to effect its global economic interests through "re-colonization."[105] In this way, violence is integral to the success of the U.S. imperial project of protecting the Homeland.[106] As discussed in chapter one, Susan Faludi argues that the ties between increased militaristic surveillance and violence "at home and abroad" are linked to increased masculinization.[107] There is a direct connection between the rhetoric of homeland that draws

---

[103] Bernice Johnson Reagon writes a very persuasive article of the use of "home" to convey feminist unity. See, Johnson Reagon, "Coalition Politics."
[104] Chandra Talpade Mohanty, "U.S. Empire and the Project of Women's Studies: Stories of Citizenship, Complicity, and Dissent," *Gender, Place, and Culture*, 13, no. 1 (Feb 2006): 9.
[105] Mohanty, "U.S. Empire," 10. Her discussion of the U.S. advanced capitalist state can be found in Jacquie Alexander and Chandra Talpade Mohanty, "Introduction: Genealogies, Legacies, Movements" in *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*, ed. Jacquie Alexander and Chandra Talpade Mohanty (New York: Routledge, 1997).
[106] This same connection between U.S. economic interests and military power has also been discussed at some length in Negri and Hardt, *Empire.*
[107] Susan Faludi, *Terror Dream.* In addition to Faludi and Mohanty, see Jasbir Puar and A. Rai, "Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots," *Social*

upon notions of a normative (white, heterosexual, patriarchal) family and the threats and acts of violence done in its name.

In the same way that Mohanty commended Pratt's efforts to educate herself regarding the violence done in her name as a white, Christian woman, Mohanty challenges U.S. women's studies to consider their own projects of delineating full belonging within this U.S. "in relation to racialized stories of the nation, of home and belonging, insiders and outsiders."[108] Feminists need to attend not only to race and gender, but also to the powers and ideologies of nation in projects to construct alternative conceptions of "belonging," coalition, or connection. Mohanty does not jettison rhetoric of home, but she presents it as a contested space in which dynamics of race, gender, and nation intersect to generate notions of belonging, inclusion, and exclusion. She aims for an "anti-racist, anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist, multiply gendered feminist praxis that can provide the ground for dismantling empire and re-envisioning just, human and secure *homespaces* for marginalized communities globally."[my emphasis][109]

Given Mohanty's substantial analysis of the notion of home, I understand her choice to use the rhetoric of *homespaces* rather than the rhetoric of "home" to be intentional. Thus, what may the rhetoric of homespace signify? Mohanty may be responding to the extensive discussion of her earlier essay, "What's Home Got to Do with It?." Followed first by a 1990 article by Teresa de Lauretis and then by another in 1994 by Bonnie Honig, Iris Marion Young then weighed in with a chapter entitled, "House and Home: Feminist Variations on a Theme" in

---

Text, 72 (Fall, 2002): 117-148; Zillah Eisenstein, "Sexual humiliation, gender confusion, and the horrors at Abu Ghraib," in *Sexual Decoys: Gender, Race, and War in Imperial Democracy* (New York: Zed Books, 2007).

[108] Mohanty, "U.S. Empire," 10.

[109] Mohanty, "U.S. Empire," 9.

1997.[110] Young agrees with the critiques Mohanty, de Lauretis, and Honig leverage against the notion of home and its problematic role in feminist politics of identity, coalition, and community. In fact, she acknowledges that the distrust and rejection of home in "feminism is consistently postcolonial, exposing the illusion of a coherent stable self or a unified movement of women."[111] Recognizing the illusion of coherence or unity can then promote a politics of difference that does not seek safety at the expense of the other.

Although Young agrees with the (postcolonial) feminist critique of home in this decade long discussion, her aim is not to reject home, but to "disengage a positive from an oppressive meaning of home."[112] She locates a positive meaning of home for feminist politics in the work of bell hooks. In a 1990 essay, bell hooks argues,

> Historically, the African-American people believed that the construction of a homeplace, however fragile and tenuous (the slave hut, the wooden shack), had a radical political dimension. Despite the brutal reality of racial apartheid, of domination, one's homeplace was the one site where one could freely confront the issue of humanization, where one could resist.[113]

Young picks up hooks' sense of homeplace to argue for the need to retain within feminist theory a positive and *political* sense of home. She reads this hooks' quote as identifying "home" as an important value for the oppressed as a place apart from the dehumanizing violence of a racist and

---

[110] Teresa de Lauretis, "Eccentric Subjects: Feminist Theory and Historical Consciousness," *Feminist Studies* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 115-150; Bonnie Honig, "Difference, Dilemmas, and the Politics of Home," *Social Research* 61, no. 3 (Fall 1994): 563-597; Iris Marion Young, "House and Home: Feminist Variations on a Theme," *Intersecting Voices: Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy, and Policy*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), 134-164.
[111] Young, *"House and Home,"* 158.
[112] Young, *"House and Home,"* 156.
[113] bell hooks, "Homeplace: a site of resistance," in *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1990), 42. Similarly, Traci West speaks of how the Harlem YWCA functioned as a "respite space for black women and girls as well as a wedge against the burdens of social inequality, discrimination, and economic hardship." Traci West, *Disruptive Christian Ethics: When Racism and Women's Lives* Matter (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 17.

colonizing society. Although black women may not have known the "principles of decolonization," explains hooks, "they understood intellectually and intuitively the meaning of homeplace in the midst of an oppressive and dominating social reality, of homeplace as site of resistance and liberation struggle."[114] It is in this sense that constructing a *homeplace* can be decolonizing political work of resistance.

Returning to Mohanty's post-9/11 essay on Homeland Security, her use of the rhetoric of *homespace* can be seen in a different light. Although Mohanty cites neither hooks nor this essay by Young, she does cite a later essay by Young indicating familiarity with her work. I would suggest that Mohanty was likely aware of the ongoing discussion of home in feminist theory, especially one involving a high profile scholar such as Iris Marion Young. Even if Mohanty herself is not intentionally picking up on what Young terms a "positive" use of home, Mohanty's rhetoric of homespace signals an interesting engagement with a variant of home. The rhetoric of homespace is situated in the text after a sentence naming the multiple, intersecting socio-economic dynamics of race, class, gender, sexuality, and nation to reinforce global systems of militarized imperialism. Having named these very same dynamics as problematic in the rhetoric of home in her earlier work, Mohanty clearly understands how the rhetoric of home can function to reproduce these very dynamics and hierarchies of power. But, in calling for feminists to participate in a project of decolonization and reenvisioning homespaces, she does seem to be conceding the possibility of a political variant of "home" akin to hook's homeplaces.

In summary, postcolonial discourses of home deeply problematize the very notion of home. Deployed within colonial rhetoric, the notion of home has functioned repeatedly to naturalize hierarchies of race, gender, sexuality, economic status, and national interest.

[114] hooks, "Homeplace," 45.

Furthermore, close analysis of the rhetoric of home reveals its intersections with threats and acts of violence to police the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion, belonging and not belonging, "home" and foreign.

The ongoing salience of this rhetoric was "brought home" to me recently in an advertisement in a book catalog that I received at the 2011 American Academy of Religion. Across the top of the page was a large banner, "America At Home and In the World." The book titles all spoke to some aspect of the threats to U.S. economic strength, immigration, (unprotected) freedom of speech, foreign diplomacy, and U.S. militaristic involvement overseas. America as *home* signals a constellation of socio-economic powers constructed to maintain particular hierarchies of power and oppression. Critiquing the rhetoric of home through the lens of postcolonial discourses challenges feminist thought to reconsider the violence of home as operating not only through hierarchies of race, gender, and sexuality, but also within stories of national identity. As I will now show, some feminist Christian thought has explored these connections between notions of home, nation, and violence against women.

Feminist Postcolonial Rhetoric of Home and Violence in Feminist Studies in Religion

In recent years, feminist discourse on religion has included a number of texts that engage postcolonial discourses in their discussion of women, violence, and home. However, as discussed above, "postcolonial" signifies a broad conversation of differing understandings of the postcolonial time, space, and politics. In this section, I will explore two examples of feminist scholarship engagement with the postcolonial discourses to discuss women, religion, and violence: Laura Levitt, *Jews and Feminism: the Ambivalent Search for Home* and Andrea Smith,

Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide.[115] In both texts, the rhetoric of home plays a significant role, but in very different ways. Although both texts are critical of the notion of home and its connections with violence, the differences in their postcolonial critique shape their analyses of the rhetoric of home. Attending to these differences in postcolonial critique demonstrates the range of stakes at issue in the rhetoric of home. As both texts argue, the notion of home is implicated in religious and nationalistic discourses that have sustained and promoted violence against women.

Laura Levitt: The Broken Promises of Home in a Liberal, Christian America

Through the imagery of the U.S. as a "melting pot" or as a "nation of immigrants," the U.S. national identity is touted to be one of inclusion. Yet, as historian Linda Kerber notes, "not everything melted in the melting pot."[116] Despite the imagery of One Nation, the differences among U.S. residents have not been erased. In her book, *Jews and Feminism: the Ambivalent Search for Home,* Laura Levitt questions the tensions between this promise of an inclusive "home" for Jewish immigrants and the violent exclusions of difference in seeking to claim this dream.[117] The granddaughter of Jewish immigrants, Levitt engages postcolonial discourses of home to help her make sense of the broken promise of a "home" of full belonging and safety.

In the opening pages of the book, Levitt moves from colorfully detailing her interaction with the material space of her graduate school home in Atlanta to recounting her experience of rape by a stranger in her home. The combination of her rape and the failure of the police to

---

[115] Laura Levitt, *Jews and Feminism: The Ambivalent Search for Home*, (New York: Routledge, 1997) and Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*, (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005).
[116] Linda Kerber, "The Meanings of Citizenship," *The Journal of American History*, 84, no. 3 (Dec, 1997): 387. See also, William Booth, "One Nation, Indivisible: Is it History?" *Washington Post*, Sunday, February 22, 1998, A1.
[117] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*, 3-4.

pursue her case became integral to her questioning of the meaning of home as a protected place of belonging. By weaving together the themes of Jewish identity, sexual violence against women, and U.S. nationalism, Levitt produces a critique of the notion of home to convey her ambivalent desire for home.

Throughout her text, Levitt retains language of "home" as a marker of belonging and location. However, she destabilizes the sense of home as either a permanent location or as a place of full belonging. Rather, she presents home as a shifting location and as a place of partial belonging. To argue for this understanding of home, Levitt describes her book as "about the connections between home and identity or identity as a kind of home."[118] The notion of home as an expression of self has been deeply rooted since the 19th century cult of domesticity. However, in Levitt's hands, the connection between identity and home becomes deeply problematized through an extended criticism of the promises of Liberalism to provide a space of universal belonging, or as "home" to all.

Understanding U.S. liberalism rhetorically as a construct with "material and discursive cultural configurations," Levitt describes U.S. liberalism as intertwined with the legacy of European colonialism.[119] Despite the liberal promise of equality and "inclusion" in the new U.S. state, the larger rhetorical and political context was one of established hierarchies of race, class, and gender sustained through European colonialism. Thus, the liberal state was constructed within a context of asymmetrical power.

Emphasizing this "asymmetry" of power within the "liberal/colonial project," Levitt describes how the promise of assimilation into a place in the social contract functions to also efface and exclude. In order to maintain hierarchies, full belonging within the U.S. state is

[118] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*, 1.
[119] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*, 6.

marked by the cultural location of those with greatest power. Thus, in an effort to belong, the "differences" that mark Jewish immigrants must be effaced to better "mimicry" the dominant group. Citing Homi Bhabha's discussion of mimicry, Levitt notes that the very effort to belong and assimilate creates an "excess" of desire to belong that marks Jews as "different."[120] In this way, Jewish belonging to the U.S. liberal state is always at best "partial." In subsequent chapters, Levitt explores this partiality in relation to different spaces of belonging for U.S. Jewish women in general and for Levitt herself in particular. By loosely following a semi-autobiographical narrative of her own sense of belonging, the structure of her book engages the model of Minnie Bruce Pratt's autobiographical essay to chart her own relationship to "home."

Levitt's reading of Pratt dwells on the connection between protection and violence. The promise of home as site of safety and protection was shattered for Levitt when she was raped in her Atlanta apartment.[121] To place her expectation of a safe home within a discursive context, Levitt explores the connections between rape and marriage within both the Jewish and Liberal traditions. As "the central life-cycle event that continues to reconstitute home," Levitt seeks to understand how marriage functions to constitute the identity of Jewish women.[122] Through a rhetorical analysis of the Jewish marriage contract (ketubbot), Levitt shows how the text both produces the vulnerability of women as dependent on men and resolves it through the protection

[120] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*, 6-7. Levitt cites Homi Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse," *October* 28 (1984): 127. The essay later became chapter 4 in Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, New York: Routledge, 2004), 121-131. For a similar analysis of the excesses created by efforts of assimilation, see Hannah Arendt, *Rahel Varnhagen, the Life of a Jewish Woman*, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Harcourt Bruce Jovanovich, 1974).
[121] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*, 17.
[122] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*, 25.

offered by heterosexual marriage. Likewise, Levitt describes Liberal marriage as a heterosexual institution of asymmetrical power.[123]

In her discussions of both Jewish marriage and Liberal marriage, Levitt also seeks to show how the dependency of women as constituted in marriage is linked to depictions of rape. Within a key Jewish text on marriage, she argues that rape appears as a matter of sexual violation of a woman as the property of a man. In this way, Levitt resonates with Fortune's reading of the Hebrew Scriptures as concerned with male property rather than with women's suffering. Indeed, Levitt reads the Hebrew texts as discounting the pain and suffering of the woman through a pedantic discussion on the relative pain a woman suffers in marital heterosexual intercourse.[124]

Likewise, Levitt presents liberal marriage as a marriage contract in which the consent a woman gives is understood as an individual woman granting sexual access to an individual man. Rape is then understood in terms of a failure of consent to a sexual contract.[125] According to Levitt, this sets up a situation of he said/she said regarding whether or not she gave consent based upon the reliability of a woman as a "good" witness. Although the courts may provide a "pretext of protection" through legal proceedings, Levitt argues that they lay the burden on women to give evidence for their lack of consent, particularly through evidence of physical restraint.[126]

---

[123] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*, 64.
[124] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*, chapter 2. The particular text she examines regarding rape and marriage is tractate Ketubbot, Chapter 3 of the Babylonian Talmud.
[125] Within feminist thought, this understanding of marriage has been widely discussed in terms of Carole Pateman, *The Sexual Contract* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988). However, her use of contract has come under critique. See Nancy Fraser, "Beyond the Master/Subject Model: Reflections on Carole Pateman's *Sexual Contract*," *Social Text* 37 (Winter, 1993): 173-181.
[126] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*, 71.

Thus, in Levitt's discussion of both Jewish and liberal marriage, the violence against women is understood through the terms of an asymmetrical, heterosexual marriage. Like Fortune and the Christian feminist critiques of sexual violence against women discussed above, Levitt also critiques gendered dynamics of power sustained by religious texts for promoting violence against women—including sacred texts on heterosexual marriage. By articulating how notions of consent in liberal marriage can also contribute not only to presumption of sexual access and rape, but also to unjust burdens upon women to "prove" their violation, Levitt likewise critiques the secular underpinnings of marriage in U.S. culture. In both cases, defining marriage in terms of asymmetrical, heterosexual power relations, the marital relationship portends the real possibility that household relations and the space of "home" can be unsafe for women.

In a search for alternatives to the convergence of asymmetrical heterosexual marriage in rabbinic and liberal traditions, Levitt turns to feminism for a different construction of "home" in which she might belong. Yet, Levitt again encounters the limits of belonging. Within the work of Judith Plaskow, Levitt finds a liberal feminism that calls for a more inclusive conception of life-long partnerships that incorporates gay and lesbian couples. Levitt is concerned that Plaskow's call for inclusion for gay and lesbian couples merely reinscribes the pattern of heterosexual marriage as a life-long couple relationship rather than fully open up space for multiple expressions of the erotic.[127]

Because liberalism seeks to harmonize difference into sameness, Levitt suggests that the alternative to liberal conceptions of marriage requires creating space for difference, for multiple modes of expressing the erotic and of constructing "home." Notably, Levitt's text is responding

[127] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*¸ch 6. Levitt addresses Judith Plaskow, *Standing Again at Sinai*: *Judaism from a Feminist Perspective* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1990) and Judith Plaskow, "Towards a New Theology of Sexuality," in *Twice Blessed: On Being Lesbian, Gay and Jewish*, ed. Christie Balka and Andy Rose (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989).

to work by Plaskow that predates the legalization of same-sex marriage in Massachusetts where Plaskow shares a home with her life partner, Martha Ackelsburg. When gay marriage became legal in 2004, Plaskow and her partner publically explained they were *not* marrying in order to resist the "norm of coupledness in our society."[128] In this way Plaskow also seeks to distance herself from the liberal notion of marriage and the promotion of a singular norm of heterosexual marriage.

As Levitt continues to interrogate possible sites of belonging for herself as a Jewish woman, she moves from the constructions of the marital home to her location within the academic study of feminism. However, Levitt identifies disturbing examples of anti-Semitism that challenge the possibility of full belonging within an academic feminist discourse marked by "competing oppressions."[129] Her experience reflects the problematic rhetoric of feminism as a unified home which Bernice Johnson Reagon rejects in her discussion of coalition politics. However, rather than reject feminist study as a "home," she embraces her Jewish difference and "partial" belonging to feminist study. In this way, rather than reject all rhetoric of home, Levitt rejects the rhetoric of home as a singular, unified, stable place of full belonging. This shift begins to build an understanding of her relationships to various "homes" as both "partial" and "shifting." Likewise, in turning to interrogate her location within the U.S. as a Jewish woman, Levitt again finds only a partial belonging as a Jewish woman. In attempting to locate herself within various "homes," Levitt discovers there is no singular location or "home" of full belonging.

---

[128] Martha Ackelsburg and Judith Plaskow, "Why We're Not Getting Married," Common Dreams, accessed March 28, 2012, http://www.commondreams.org/views04/0601-10.htm. Also, Martha Ackelsberg and Judith Plaskow, "Response," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 20, no. 2 (Fall 2004): 107-108.
[129] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*, 111.

Yet, location matters, argues Levitt, because "location shapes what we can say."[130] The locations—the "homes"—from which we speak and write shape what can and cannot be said. These locations are themselves rooted in contingencies of birth and time that belie any sense of permanence. In this way, "home" ceases to be safe in this sense of permanence. Furthermore, Levitt pushes us to consider the particular histories of violence tied to each location—whether it is the U.S. as site of violence to Native Americans and enslaved Blacks or her own rape in Atlanta. Accordingly, Levitt seeks to ground her discussion of home as identity not only in the metaphor of belonging, but also in the materiality of violence against particular people, in particular places, at particular times.

For Levitt, acknowledging and remembering the particular legacies of exclusions and violence within the space of the U.S. becomes "a graphic reminder of all that America cannot be."[131] By underscoring both the contingencies and the violence that constitute particular "homes" and locations, Levitt seeks to disrupt the rhetoric of home as singular, "safe," or "permanent." Yet, caught within the ambivalence of her "desires for home as well as my many disappointments" Levitt "come[s] to appreciate a different sense of security" than permanence.[132] She finds instead a shifting present within which remain traces of the past. Levitt repeatedly describes her relation to "home" as one of ambivalence—"the desire to hold on and the desire to let go."[133] With this notion of ambivalence, Levitt seeks to negotiate the tension of the promise of home as a space of safety, permanence and belonging with the recognition of broken promises, exclusions, and violence within home.

---

[130] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*, 136.
[131] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*, 139.
[132] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*, 164.
[133] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*, 162.

Beginning with an analysis of exclusionary practices and violence in the dominant U.S. understandings of belonging and "home," Levitt ends by expressing ambivalence to the legacies within which she is located due to the contingencies of space and time. Resigning the need for full, stable belonging resists the rhetoric of home that excludes difference by demanding a "security" of sameness and permanence. However, her conclusion fails to connect a strong analysis of the material and political consequences of colonialism with the depiction of home as a location within shifting, partial, multiple legacies of both belonging and exclusionary violence. By not directly engaging nationalism and colonialism in her conclusion, the text suggests that the "liberal/colonial project" has become a "legacy" situating the contingency of her current social location. In such a framework, the postcolonial remains tied to interpretations of a past moment of European colonialism. Alternative models of colonialism as not only legacy but as continuing patterns of hierarchy and exclusion receive no explicit attention or critique.

Andrea Smith: The Sexual Violence of White, Christian Settler Colonialism

In an influential 1991 article, legal scholar Kimberle Crenshaw argued for the need of an intersectional analysis of race and gender to understand violence against women of color.[134] Eschewing an additive approach of separately addressing race or gender, Crenshaw demonstrated how the intersection of race and gender constituted a complex social location that must be considered together to adequately address violence against women of color. In the book *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*, Andrea Smith embraces Crenshaw's intersectional approach while further complicating the analysis of sexual violence through the context of colonialism. Moving beyond the analysis of sexual violence as patriarchal control

[134] Kimberle William Crenshaw, "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color," in *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement*, ed. Kimberle Crenshaw, et al. (New York: The New Press: 1995), 357-383.

(exemplified by the Susan Brownmiller quote that opened this chapter) as well as the intersectional model of race and gender suggested by Kimberle Crenshaw, Smith argues that sexual violence is not only a tool of patriarchy and racism but also of colonialism. In other words, "*colonial relationships are themselves gendered and sexualized.*" (Italics in the text)[135] The aim of Smith's book is to critically analyze the connections between sexualized and gendered colonialism and violence against women of color. For Smith, understanding these connections changes both definitions of violence against women and strategies to end violence against women.

Although patriarchal control is a constitutive factor in violence against women for Smith, she locates patriarchal power within the system of colonialism. In this regard, her framework is akin to the patri-kyriarchal model Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza uses in her systematic analysis of the dynamics of power that reinforce violence against women. To help Smith understand how colonial power functions, she gestures to the postcolonial discourses of Homi Bhabha and Edward Said who argue that colonialism needs to maintain a hierarchy of difference through strategies of assimilation which only render partial belonging within the colonial state.[136] However, unlike Levitt's ambivalent embrace of this partial belonging, Smith is strongly critical of the hierarchies of socio-political power such strategies produce.

Within colonial strategies of assimilation and power, the first lesson of colonialism was to communicate the value of hierarchy. This lesson was conveyed through patriarchal control as a system to teach hierarchy based on a heterosexual binary of gender difference. Yet, as with the

---

[135] Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*, (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005), 100.

[136] On this point, Smith, like Levitt above, is engaging Homi Bhabha on the notion of mimicry. She cites, Homi Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Men," in *Tensions of Empire*, ed. Frederisk Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1994).

critiques of patriarchy seen above in feminist Christian and feminist postcolonial discourse, Smith also underscores that the binary of gender must be understood together with socio-political categories of race.[137] For example, Smith suggests that if one accepts Ann Stoler's depiction of white women as "bearers of more racist imperial order," then Native women should be understood as "bearers of a counter-imperial order."[138] The gendered dynamics of power that locate women within their roles of reproduction must be intersected with socio-political dynamics of race that identify the imperial order as white—and, thus, the counter-imperial order as the non-white other.

To control Native peoples as a threatening counter-order to the colonial nation-state, Native women needed to be subjugated to an intersecting hierarchy of race, gender, and sexuality that located Natives as subservient to the white colonizers. Smith explains how colonial discourse portrayed Natives as dirty, as a pollutant to further justify the control of Native women. As an example, she discusses colonial Christian discourse that likened Native people to the Cannanites—the Biblical people condemned to genocide because of their sexual immorality. In this way, Christian moral language was used to rhetorically locate Native women within narratives of violence and subjugation within the Biblical text. Warranted by religious scripture, the rhetorical constructions of Native women as threatening, dirty, and sinful designated the bodies of Native women as "rapable" or "violable."[139]

The designation of Native women's bodies as "rapable" within a colonial/patriarchal order becomes the hermeneutic key by which Smith defines sexual violence. In short, Smith

---

[137] See also Anne McClintock on the "Family of Man" in chapter one above.
[138] Smith, *Conquest*, 15. Ann Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire*, (Chapel Hill: Duke University Press, 1995).
[139] Smith, *Conquest*, 10. On biblical texts of rape and violation of women, see Phyllis Trible, *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

understands sexual violence against Native women as a tool of a colonial system seeking to subjugate not only women, but also populations of people who are a threat to the imperial order. Consequently, Smith argues that a range of colonial practices of subjugation of Native peoples should be understood as sexual violence. For example, locating hazardous and toxic materials near Native lands is a kind of sexual violence that harms the bodies and reproductive capacities of Native women.[140] So also, the violation of Native women's bodies through medical experimentation is a kind of sexual violence.[141]

Within this colonizing logic of rapability, Smith finds the appropriation of Native spiritualities to also be a kind of sexual violence.[142] To make the connection, she uses the Biblical sense of "to know." In this biblical sense, intimate knowledge of a person conveys spiritual and psychic knowledge as well as a sexual intimacy. By understanding this intimate links between spiritual, psychic, and sexual knowledge of a person, then sexual violation can be seen as the violation of these intimate boundaries of self. It is in this way that seeking to take spiritual knowledge of a person can be seen as sexual violence.

Smith implicates Christian efforts at interreligious dialogue as a form of this sexual violation of intimate spiritual knowing. As a specific example, Smith describes events surrounding the feminist theological Re-Imagining Conference in Minneapolis in which Native

[140] Smith, *Conquest*, chapter 3, "Rape of the Land."
[141] Smith, *Conquest*, chapter 5, "'Natural Laboratories': Medical Experimentation in Native Communities." Additional chapters address the legacy of sexual violence in boarding schools (chapter 2), reproductive policies (chapter 4), and the appropriation of Native spirituality (chapter 6).
[142] Smith, *Conquest*, chapter 6, "Spiritual Appropriation as Sexual Violence." The written materials from the conference can be found in Nancy J. Berneking and Pamela Carter Joern, ed., *Re-Memembering and Re-Imagining* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1995).

women were invited to dance, but not to speak. Smith writes, "[the] women were to be voiceless objects of consumption, "there for the taking.'"[143] Smith writes,

> This practice of taking without asking, and the assumption that the needs of the taker are paramount and the needs of others are irrelevant, mirrors the rape culture of the dominant society.[144]

In this way, assuming a right "to know" the other can be understood as sexual violence. The presumptive right to possession is not tempered by a sense of boundaries that must be respected. By noting this connection, Smith returns to her framework of "rapability" rooted in colonial/patriarchal ideologies of hierarchal control of not only women's bodies, but of Native people, culture, land, and religion.

Although Smith connects her analysis of sexual violence of Native women to a legacy of European colonialism, Smith clearly understands the colonial/patriarchal system to be an *ongoing* system of oppression and attack on Native sovereignty. In this way, Smith's work engages postcolonial discourses not only to articulate the past but to help analyze current situations as well as to develop strategies of resistance and change.[145] Smith's interest in analyzing violence against Native women in clearly rooted in a political project of structural changes. Thus, it should not be surprising that Smith's analysis of the rhetoric of home also reflects a concern with activism and political structures.

Smith commends the "domestic violence" movement for developing a strong critique of home as a "safe" place and correctly identifying home as the most dangerous place for women.

---

[143] Smith, *Conquest*, 125.
[144] Smith, *Conquest*, 126.
[145] Although Smith does not use the term "settler colonialism" in her 2005 book, in listening to her speak at a panel at the November, 2010 American Academy of Religion she repeatedly used the term. See also, Andrea Smith, "Queer Theory and Native Studies: The Heteronormativity of Settler Colonialism," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 16, no. 1/2 (January 2010): 41-68.

However, Smith is critical that while the analysis of the problem of violence against women correctly locates most violence at "home" rather than "out there," the strategies to stop violence against women do not. By responding to sexual violators as aberrances that must be dealt with by the state through incarceration, the problem of sexual violence is implicitly addressed as "out there" in a way that does not question the colonial/patriarchal order of the U.S. nation-state. In contrast, Smith argues that if women of color are placed at the center of the analysis of how to stop sexual violence, then "it becomes clear that we must develop approaches that address interpersonal, state (e.g., colonization, police brutality, prisons), and structural (e.g., racism, poverty) violence simultaneously."[146] In this way, understanding violence against women demands a deeply intersectional approach that recognizes social interrelations on multiple scales simultaneously.[147]

In addressing the current intersections of colonial/patriarchal violence for women of color, Smith turns her critique to the "U.S. Empire" in a post 9/11 world. In the same way that the antiviolence movement cautioned against seeing violence as "at home" and not just "out there," Smith questions the depiction of 9/11 as the *introductio*n of violence into our U.S. home. Smith writes, "Until 9/11, many people believed that terrorism was something that happened in other countries, while our "home" was a place of safety."[148] For Smith, this depiction of the U.S. as a safe home obfuscates the violent legacies of Native American genocide, slavery, and racism. As Susan Faludi argues, the U.S. national identity has disavowed the memory of being a nation built upon violent warfare against Native Americans.

---

[146] Smith, *Conquest*, 160.
[147] On the multiplicity of "scales" in the geography of place, see Michael R. Curry, "'Hereness' and the Normativity of Place," in *Geography and Ethics: Journeys in a Moral Terrain*, ed. James D. Proctor and David M. Smith (New York, NY: Routledge, 1999), 96.
[148] Smith, *Conquest*, 177.

In the same way that "home" as been shown to be the most dangerous place for women, Smith seeks to make manifest that "our 'home' in the U.S. has never been a safe place for people of color."[149] In this way, Smith argues that "home" as a national space of safety should be questioned in the same way that the domestic home has been critiqued as a site of violence. Furthermore, Smith's text connects these sites of violence through the ideology and violence of patriarchal/colonial control. Developing an intersectional analysis that locates women of color at the center of an analysis of sexual violence makes clear the need to address connections between multiple sites, types, and scales of violence simultaneously.

Conclusion

Statistically, the place designated as "home" *is* a dangerous place for women. However, as I have argued in this chapter, a critical feminist analysis of the rhetoric of home matters because the dominant rhetoric of home has functioned not only as site or setting for violence but also as a tool *of* violence. Because the rhetoric of home has itself functioned to construct and reinforce constellations of power, the rhetoric of home must be critically challenged. To resist the violent exclusions wrought by firm boundaries of "home" and "belonging," Levitt proffers an alternative understanding of home that incorporates a sense of "ambivalence." By making clear the tensions and fractures within ideals of "home," Levitt opens up the possibility of partial, shifting belonging and multiple homes. Unlike Levitt, Smith does not appear concerned with the notion of "home" itself—only with the legacies of power and violence that have been and continue to be upheld in its name, e.g. "Homeland Security." Smith generally places "home" in scare quotes when she uses the terms and otherwise avoids the term. Whereas the Jewish Levitt as an honorary white in the U.S. must address the cultural pressure to mimicry the role of the

[149] Smith, *Conquest*, 177.

White Lady, Smith must address the legacy of being the sexual other to the White Lady. Native women are the (absent) *before* that must be erased to continue the white colonial project of settler colonialism.

The different responses to a critical feminist postcolonial analysis of home in Levitt and Smith begins to raise the question of whether to critique and rework the notion of "home" *or* to leave it behind as too immersed in the U.S. colonial project. Within this colonial/patriarchal—or, as Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza says, kyriarchal—system, the notion of home has helped to define spaces of inclusion and exclusion, belonging and not belonging. The need to protect these delineations of belonging—of "home" and homeland—has repeatedly been used to justify acts of violence against those who would not accept the hierarchal boundaries of "place." Yet, Iris Marion Young, bell hooks, and, arguably, Chandra Mohanty, promote a notion of homeplace that can be tool not of violent imperialism, but a transformational resource of decolonization and resistance to imperial violence.

Laura Levitt's notion of a relationship to "home" that is partial, ambivalent, and shifting seeks to be a political and ethical statement of resistance to a singular, unchanging norm of U.S. belonging. However, Levitt does not adequately convey how this understanding might help articulate and address ongoing political and ethical questions of how to dwell together in such a space, such a nation. For example, what are the implications for those who wish to gain certain rights and privileges of belonging in the U.S.—whether it be immigration policy or gay marriage?

Andrea Smith's work does address specific political and ethical issues (e.g. toxic waste, medical experimentation, prisons). Smith pushes for the need to consider specific policy in terms of an intersectional analysis that connects notions of colonial/patriarchal belonging and violence.

In this way, Smith's work suggests an intersectional model for feminist Christian theo-ethical discussion to directly confront violence against women and the role of rhetoric of home in reinforcing structures of violence.

Both Levitt and Smith underscore the significance of location and place in the rhetoric of home. Levitt levies a challenge that locations do matter. Whereas Levitt's use of "location" could easily be read only in terms of identity politics, it is critical to point out the deeply material sense in which she references location. Her text begins with very concrete details of the living space in which she dwelled and in which she was violently assaulted. Furthermore, her use of Mohanty, Martin, and Pratt places herself into a very material conversation of place that includes city streets and court buildings as well as familial and communal memories. For Smith, her commitment to Native lands also underscores a connection to particular places. For both, location and place matter in material ways. Yet, both also make clear how the place of "home" is constituted by and constituting of socio-economic practices of social relations. By recognizing that places are constituted and constituting of simultaneous social interrelations on multiple scales, we can better interrogate the politics of space within particular constellations of socio-economic dynamics of inequality and violence. "Home" and "homeland" are certainly such spaces that must be interrogated for the particular social interrelations that they reinforce. As this chapter has aimed to show, the rhetoric of home has often functioned to construct spaces of inequality and violence.

CHAPTER THREE

A Woman's Place:
The Rhetoric of Work and Home

A woman's place is in the home. These are fighting words. They are words that have been defended as deeply held values of God-given roles for men and women. And, they are words that have been fiercely attacked as denying the full humanity and potential of women. They are also *spatial* words that try to locate particular women in places called "home." Yet, as with all places, the place of home and the location of women within the home arise from socio-economic interactions within particular times and spaces. In the context of the late 20th and early 21st century U.S., the rhetoric about the place of women in the home is inseparable from larger discourses regarding understandings of the family, feminism, and Christianity. Although recent debates over whether or not a woman's place is in the home may often revolve around questions of gender roles and Christian "family values," a feminist postcolonial analysis of the rhetoric of home shows that more is at stake in this rhetoric than simply gender. Rather, as with the rhetoric of home and violence, the rhetoric of work and home also functions to reinforce a constellation of socio-economic interactions of gender, race, sexuality, religion, and nationality.

In order to articulate the *intersecting* socio-economic dynamics that constitute "home," the rhetorical binary that sharply distinguishes "work" and "home" as *separate* must be broken down.[1] Rooted in the 19th century rhetoric of separate spheres, this binary of "work" and "home" has been both championed and challenged in the 20th century through debates over

[1] For an overview of feminist discussion of the binary of public/private that undergirds the work/home binary, see Joan B. Landes, ed., *Feminism, the Public and the Private* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

women's work and ideals of "the family."[2] In the backlash to the feminist movement of the 1960's and 1970's, numerous conservative Christian organizations rallied around an ideology of "the family."[3] By the close of the 20th century, the notion of "family values" had become nationally recognized throughout the United States. Inevitably, feminist theology confronted the conservative Christian rhetoric of "family values" as well as the underlying model of family.

The "traditional" family upheld as biblical by the conservative Christian rhetoric has generally involved a highly gendered division of roles with a male breadwinner and a female homemaker.[4] Perceived threats to this model have included women (particularly mothers) that worked outside of the home, female headed-households, and sexuality that was neither marital nor heterosexual. In other words, the conservative Christian rhetoric has assumed the model family to be a married, heterosexual couple and their children, a father who goes to work to support the family financially, and a mother who stays at home.[5] Within this formulation, a double binary emerges between men/work versus women/home. Contesting this gendered binary of work and home has been a central theme in feminist Christian challenges to the conservative Christian discourse of "the family."

In the contemporary U.S., the tensions between "work" and "home" have been an ongoing source of consternation not only for conservative Christian religious leaders who

---

[2] A leading champion of a gendered binary of roles for women has been Phylis Schlafly, *Feminist Fantasies* (Dallas, TX: Spence Publishing Company, 2003). See also, Mary Pride, *The Way Home: Beyond Feminism Back to Reality* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1985).

[3] For a discussion of the religious right organizing around the family, see Ann Bathhurst Gilson, *The Battle for America's Families: A Feminist Response to the Religious Right* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1999).

[4] As but one example, see William D. Watkins, "Family is Who You Come Home To" in *The New Absolutes* (Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1996). Watkins criticizes the idea of plural definitions of family and insists on a single definition of family as a married, heterosexual couple with children.

[5] For a discussion of the notion of "model family" in society see Gwendolyn Wright, "Prescribing the Model Home," *Social Research*, 58, no. 1 (Spring, 1991): 213-225.

advocate "family values," but also for the millions of men and women who must find a way to negotiate multiple demands and responsibilities in a late-capitalist society.[6] Can a working mom maintain a happy, healthy home? Should the government help women care for their children at home by paying maternal leave and/or stipends to care for their young children? Do children need a mom that is home and does not "work"? Should *both* fathers and mothers spend less time at work and more time at home with their children? What structural and policy changes must be enacted to protect against the exploitation of women's work? Questions such as these and many others surrounding mothers and work have become fuel for hotly contested debates not only in academic departments of economics or women's studies, but also across newspapers, magazines, websites, talk radio, and television. [7]

Debates over work and home have often used oppositional terms to distinguish between *work*ing mothers and stay-at-*home* mothers.[8] Not only do these oppositional terms frame the debate in terms of the location of the mother, they also reinforce work and home as distinctly separate spaces. As mothers who work outside the home have become increasingly accepted, rhetorical shifts reflect changing understandings of the spatial relationship of work and home.

---

[6] The wide-spread anxiety of families can be seen in the rise of "work-life" programs in corporations that are presented as a "perk" for employees, but are also measured for their effectiveness in promoting productivity. Alison M. Konrad and Robert Mangel, "The Impact of Work-Life Programs on Firm Productivity," *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, no. 12 (December 2000): 1225-1237.

[7] For a popular fictionalized representation of the "juggling" mother, see the bestselling book (now movie), Allison Pearson, *I Don't Know How She Does It* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002).

[8] In more recent years, the tension between working mothers and stay-at-home moms has become known in the media as "mommy wars." A catalyzing essay in the recent mommy wars was Lisa Belkin, "The Opt-Out Revolution," *New York Times*, October 26, 2003, accessed April 1, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2003/10/26/magazine/26WOMEN.html?pagewanted=all. See also, Leslie Morgan Steiner, *Mommy Wars: Stay-at-Home and Career Moms Face Off on Their Choices, Their Lives, Their Families* (New York: Random House Press, 2006). See also, Susan Douglas and Meredith Michaels, "The Mommy Wars," *Ms. Magazine*, Feb-Mar 2000, accessed online March 28, 2012, http://www.msmagazine.com/feb00/mommywars1.asp

For example, the rhetoric describing the need for women to "balance" work and home has become prevalent. However, this rhetoric of balancing work and home suggests efforts to negotiate demands from two loci—"work" and "home." In this sense, "balance" evokes a sense of two distinctly weighted objects that exert different forces. Mapping this notion of "balance" onto a rhetorical context of "separate spheres" thereby continues to reinforce a binary of work and home as separate from one another.

As debates raged over the gendered binary of work and home in the closing decades of the 20th century, there was also rising consciousness that the global context impacted employment patterns and income in the United States. Terms such as "globalization" entered common parlance in the academy to describe global networks of capital, production, and trade.[9] In various ways and to differing degrees, the feminist theological rhetoric of work and home has attempted to incorporate this global perspective into their analyses.[10] However, some critiques of the global economy eschewed the neo-liberal focus of "globalization" and instead took on the rhetoric of anti-imperialism.[11] Thus, within more progressive Christian theology—including

[9] For example, see the series edited by Max L. Stackhouse, ed., *God and Globalization*, 4 vols. (New York: T&T Clark International, 2000-2007). For an example of the rhetoric of globalization in Christian ethics of family, see Don S. Browning, *Marriage and Modernization: How Globalization Threatens Marriage and What to Do About It* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Press, 2003).

[10] Gloria Albrecht uses "globalization" when setting up the economic context for her discussion of family. Gloria Albrecht, *Hitting Home: Feminist Ethics, Women's Work, and "Family Values"* (New York: Continuum Publishing Group, 2002).

[11] Anecdotally, at a conference paper the discussion turned to the difference between postcolonial and globalization. An audience member described globalization as the view of the global political economy from the "top" and postcolonial as the view from "bottom." As a rough distinction, this highlights the emergence of the rhetoric of *globalization* to applaud the "successful" spread of neo-liberal power across the globe in contrast to the postcolonial emphasis on resisting, challenging, or subverting this global spread of power.

feminist theology—the language of "empire" and "imperialism" appeared to address the global imbalances of economic wealth.[12]

Most recently, the global financial crisis has reiterated the global connections of capital, production, and trade.[13] As critiques of global systems of imperialism, postcolonial theories have helped to draw connections between the global economy and the role of U.S. imperialism within it.[14] What has remained less clear—particularly in (feminist) theological discourse—is the connection between the global political economy and the domestic economy of the household. [15] In other words, what does "family values" or "gay marriage" have to do with Wal-Mart or the failed mortgage backed securities that upended the global financial market?[16] Addressing such connections between the global economy, the household economy, and theo-ethical commitments regarding "family" helps to articulate the connections between notions of home, homeland, and Christianity.

Tracing the connections between work, home, homeland, and Christianity makes more evident the role of the rhetoric of home in developing *spatialized* social relations. The rhetoric of work and home functions not only to construct different spatial locations of power—work/home,

---

[12] For example, Mark Lewis Taylor, *Religion, Politics, and the Christian Right: Post 9-11 Powers and American Empire* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005). To understand "empire" in the contemporary moment, Taylor and many others rely on the work by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000).

[13] Gretchen Morgenson and Joshua Rosner, *Reckless Endangerment: How Outsized Ambition, Greed, and Corruption Let to Economic Armageddon* (New York: Times Books, 2011).

[14] See Zillah Eisenstein, *Against Empire: Feminisms, Racisms, and the West* (New York: Zed Books, 2004); Inderpal Grewal, *Transnational America*: *Feminisms, Diasporas, Neoliberalisms* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005).

[15] For an example of a book in Christian ethics that seeks to make such connections, see Pamela K. Brubaker, Rebecca Todd Peters, and Laura A. Stivers, *Justice in a Global Economy: Strategies for Home, Community, and World* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2006). However, the structure of the book deliberately sets up three separate sections: Home, Community, and World which undermines the connections *between* them.

[16] See Bethany Moreton, *To Serve God and Wal-Mart: The Making of Christian Free Enterprise* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).

home/abroad—but also reflects how spatial landscapes can reinforce socio-economic dynamics of power. Or, in Massey's words, "this gendering of space and place both reflects and has effects back on the ways in which gender is constructed and understood in the societies in which we live."[17] As such, critically analyzing the spatialized rhetoric of the place of "home" can help identify the socio-economic elements of power that construct "home," but it can also help identify the policing effects of this construction of "home." In other words, the space of "home" may be a social construct, but the rhetoric of home—especially as a "place for women"—has real effects upon the lives of women.

To describe the effects of spatialized social relations of contemporary U.S. mothers, political scientist Marsha Marotta writes,

> [M]any mothers spend their days or evenings (or both) at home, but it is not the house itself that keeps them there. Rather, it is what the discourses say they should be doing and the practices they should be engaged in—laundry, housework, cooking, taking care of kids, and so on—that keeps them there. … As mothers fulfill their presence and practices at home, they are absent for other practices that sustain and promote other aspects of their lives such as networking in business and academia, or long hours at work.[18]

In Marotta's example, a mother may not be physically forced to remain in the house, but the social discourses that convey her "place" to be in the "home" taking care of her "family" shapes both where she is located and the activities she performs within that space. Moreover, as Marotta notes, spending time in the space of home has the effect of not spending time in other locations or different practices. In this way, the rhetoric of home constructs the gendered location and actions of "mothers" while also effecting their interactions with spaces other than home. The

[17] Doreen Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 186.
[18] Marsha Marotta, "Motherspace: Disciplining through the Material and Discursive," in *Motherhood and Space: Configurations of the Maternal through Politics, Home, and the Body*, ed. Sarah Hardy and Caroline Wiedmer (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 23.

gendered discourses of home function to locate her within particular spaces and socio-economic practices of household and familial care.

The role of *gender* in constructing the spatialized social relations of work and home has been widely analyzed in feminist discourses.[19] For example, many critical narratives of the Cult of Domesticity have often focused upon the *gendering* of separate spheres.[20] However, as previous chapters have argued, the rhetoric of home is intertwined not only with gendered dynamics of the heterosexual family but also with notions of race, class, nation, and religion.[21] Accordingly, as I critically examine examples of feminist Christian critiques of the binary of work and home in this chapter, I will seek to identify in what ways each text addresses the multiple socio-economic dynamics that constitute the relationship of work and home. When identifying which socio-economic dynamics are named, I will particularly attend to the presence or absence of critiques of colonialism and nationalism in the texts.

By seeking to articulate the socio-economic dynamics of power that construct home, I am once again approaching space and place as constructed by social interrelations. As such, space is not a static setting, stage, or "empty background against which we perform our quotidian activities, our power differentials, and our social maneuverings."[22] Within much of the recent history in the U.S., the dominant rhetoric of home has characterized the "model home" as stable, unchanging haven for the heterosexual, Christian nuclear family set apart from the politics and

[19] Within feminist geography see Daphne Spain, *Gendered Spaces* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992).
[20] For example, the widely cited, Barbara Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860," *American Quarterly*, 18, no. 2, part 1 (Summer, 1966): 151-174.
[21] See especially above discussions of Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995).
[22] Sarah Hardy and Caroline Wiedmer, eds., introduction to *Motherhood and Space*, 2.

economics.[23] To challenge this rhetoric of home, "home" must be clearly imbricated within a changing history of socio-economic dynamics of power. In other words, the space or place of home is not a *background* for the dynamics of power, but is itself constitutive of and constructed by socio-economic dynamics of power. For this reason, as I critically analyze the rhetoric of work and home in the three examples of feminist Christian discourse, I will examine in what ways the spatiality of "home" contributes to an understanding of the space of home as changing, multiple, and porous in its boundaries.

The spatiality of the rhetoric of work and home is particularly problematic because the dominant rhetorical construction of home as an unchanging haven belies the dynamics of power within this rhetoric that reinforce patterns and structures of socio-economic inequality. Insofar as space is understood as a construction of social relations of power, then contesting a particular understanding of space can then be understood as a challenge to the social relations which have constructed that space. Indeed, I understand each of the following examples of feminist Christian discourses to be contesting the social relations of inequality by challenging the spatial binary of work and home.

The three feminist Christian texts on work and home that I have chosen to examine in this chapter reflect different approaches to challenging the rhetorical binary of work and home. Although the rhetoric of work and home appears in many other feminist Christian theo-ethical books on "family" or the role of "women," the texts that I have chosen explicitly focus on women and *work*. I chose to address the texts chronologically because doing so helps to reflect the impact of changing socio-economic context on evolving notions of work, home, and nation/homeland. However, as we shall see, differences in the rhetoric of work and home cannot

[23] Wright, "The Model Home."

be reduced to a historical narrative. Rather, the rhetoric of work and home remains multiple, changing, and porous.

The Patterns of Exploitation: Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, 1987

As discussed in chapter one, the rhetoric of the Christian home as a haven played a significant role in the changing socio-economic patterns of the 19th century separate spheres ideology. With the rise of the women's movement of the 1960's and 1970's and the slogan "the personal is political," the dynamics between "private" and "public" became politicized and heavily questioned. Feminists critically queried the tension between the place of the "private" *home* and the "public" places of *work* using tools of social analysis and political theory.[24]

To challenge socio-economic structures of power, feminist scholars of religion also began to bring feminist methodologies of social analysis to bear upon traditional Christian theological issues and institutions.[25] Feminist theology was not alone in challenging traditional theology. Liberation theology as well as black theology also brought social issues and the tools of social analysis into theological methodology.[26] Although the use of social analysis in theology has not always been welcomed by mainstream theologians, feminist theology has developed an expansive theological analysis of the rhetoric of work and home by engaging tools such as critical theory, economics, and sociology.

---

[24] Jean Bethke Elshtain, *Public Man, Private Woman: Women in Social and Political Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981); Christine Delphy, *Close to Home: A Materialist Analysis of Women's Oppression* (Amehurst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1984); Susan Moller Okin, *Justice, Gender, and the Family* (New York: Basic Books, 1989).

[25] The first two roundtables in the *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* addressed issues of feminist methodology. Carol P. Christ, Ellen M. Umansky, Anne E. Carr, "Roundtable Discussion: What Are the Sources of My Theology?" *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, 1, no. 1 (Spring, 1985): 119-131; Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza et al. "Roundtable Discussion: On Feminist Methodology," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, 1, no. 2 (Fall, 1985): 73-88.

[26] Gustavo Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1973); James H. Cone, *God of the Oppressed* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1975).

However, the introduction of tools of social analysis also brought methodological tension within biblical and religious studies. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza's introduction to a 1987 *Concilium* volume entitled *Women, Work, and Poverty* demonstrates the need for a defense of the emerging feminist methodology.[27] Of course, Schüssler Fiorenza's work and thought has continued to develop over the intervening years from the 1987 *Women, Work, and Poverty* until today. For this reason, I will place her earlier work into the larger corpus of her work to help elucidate the complexity of her argument. Contextualizing her work also helps to suggest how elements of her earlier work reflects a particular moment in the emerging field of feminist studies of religion.[28]

For feminist Christian discourse to challenge the rhetoric of women's place in the home, methodological tools were needed to connect socio-economic analyses of power with Christian teaching and practice. In the *Women, Work, and Poverty* introduction, Schüssler Fiorenza's rhetoric clearly indicates that she is responding to criticisms that a volume on women and work is not "theological." As she addresses this objection, Schüssler Fiorenza carefully frames her own methodological approach to the issue of women, work, and poverty. Schüssler Fiorenza's rhetoric rejects theological approaches that reinforce a "patriarchal" system of exploitation of

---

[27] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day: Introduction," in *Concilium: Women, Work, and Poverty*, ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and Anne Carr (Edinburgh: T&T Clark LTD. 1987), xvii-xxiii.

[28] The "newness" of the field in 1987 is evident by the newly formed *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* which Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza co-founded with Judith Plaskow. See Judith Plaskow, "A Short History of *JFSR*," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, 21, no. 2 (Fall, 2005): 103-106. However, Schüssler Fiorenza also has made clear the need for more recent feminist scholarship in religion to remain aware and connected to earlier feminist scholarship as well. For example, Elizabeth Castelli has heeded this call by locating Schüssler Fiorenza within a trajectory of feminist utopian thought, see Elizabeth A. Castelli, "The Ekklēsia of Women and/as Utopian Space: Locating the Work of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza in Feminist Utopian Thought," in *On the Cutting Edge: The Study of Women in Biblical Worlds: Essays in Honor of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza*, ed. Jane Schaberg, Alice Bach, and Esther Fuchs (New York: Continuum, 2004), 36-52.

women.[29] Rather, she embraces a critical feminist liberation theology that pursues the "Christian recognition of women's dignity."[30] In her rhetorical framework, the undermining of women's dignity makes the analysis of women's work experiences within a patriarchal system of exploitation a task for feminist liberation theology.

The need for feminist Christian discourses to resist theological language that sustains rather than challenges the patriarchal system is central to Schüssler Fiorenza's argument throughout the introduction. For example, the text states that the editors' "were not interested in formulating another 'genitive-theology', either a 'woman's theology of work' or a 'woman's theology of poverty'."[31] By using the rhetoric of "another," the text indicates that she expects the audience would be well-aware of the presence of examples of such "genitive theology." Schüssler Fiorenza's rhetoric attempts to not only differentiate the methodological approach of the *Women, Work, and Poverty* volume, but to critique the "theology of woman" approach as something to *not* engage.

Describing the approach of "theology of woman" as reducing the "pluriform" experiences of women, the introduction explains that the bulk of the volume attends to a "prismatic case-study approach to shed light on women's experience of work and poverty in very different contexts."[32] Following the emphasis on "pluriform," the use of the term "prismatic" conveys a sense of multiple points of refraction to underscore the plurality of women. This emphasis on the plurality of women in notable considering that earlier notions of a global

[29] In this earliest work, Schüssler Fiorenza does not use her neologism "kyriarchy."
[30] Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xi.
[31] Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xix.
[32] Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xix.

sisterhood of women had been challenged, particularly by African American feminists.[33] Rather than put forth a singular category of "woman," Schussler Fiorenza's describes the bulk of the volume as "case-studies" thereby reinforcing the importance of concrete women's experiences as a source of information for critical analysis and theological reflection.[34] Thus, for Schussler Fiorenza, the critical feminist theological method seeks to analyze the plurality of women's experiences with work and poverty.

Indeed, Schüssler Fiorenza's rhetoric describes feminist theology as beginning with the "personally and systematically reflected experience of women in our struggle for survival under patriarchal conditions."[35] With this rhetoric, Schüssler Fiorenza reflects notions of feminism as woman struggling against the patriarchal system. Although "patriarchal" is usually read within feminist discourses only in terms of a gender, Schüssler Fiorenza's rhetoric cannot be simply reduced to arguing for a binary of two classes of people: women against men. Not only is this evident in light of her subsequent development of the term kyriarchy,[36] but in her 1987 introduction she is more broadly concerned with how gendered divisions "reinforce the androcentric dualistic split between masculine and feminine, soul and body, public and private,

---

[33] Bernice Johnson Reagon, "Coalition Politics: Turning the Century," in Barbara Smith, *Home Girls: a Black Feminist Anthology* (New York: Kitchen Table—Women of Color Press, 1983) 343-355.

[34] Throughout her work, Schüssler Fiorenza often cites the work of Paolo Friere on the methodology of conscientization. For example, see Schüssler Fiorenza, *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992), 53. Paola Friere, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Seabury Press, 1970).

[35] Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xx.

[36] In 1992, Schüssler Fiorenza explains, "Such an articulation [of critical feminist interpretation] requires a different understanding of patriarchy, one which does not limit itself to the sex/gender system but conceptualizes it in terms of interlocking structures of domination [i.e., *kyriarchal*, elite male, relations of ruling (*Herr-schaft*)]." Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *But She Said,* 7-8. Even more recently, she defines kyriarchy as "the domination of the emperor, lord, slave master, husband, the elite freeborn educated and propertied male colonizer who has power over all wo/men and subaltern men." Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *The Power of the Word: Scripture and the Power of Empire* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007), 158.

religious and secular."[37] The rhetoric of a gendered binary reflects a systematic attempt to "split" society into dualistic categories that extends far beyond just "male" and "female."

Thus, retaining a rhetoric that reinforces distinctions between gendered categories serves to sustain the system of gendered divisions. In this way, the genitive theology of woman reinforces not only a gendered division between (male) theology and "woman's theology," but an entire socio-economic system of binary categories. Schüssler Fiorenza writes, "a feminist theology understood as a 'theology of woman' theologically legitimates the existing economic structures of patriarchal exploitation as well as the cultural gender role division and socialization for 'feminine' behavior which internalize and sustain such exploitation."[38] In this way, Schüssler Fiorenza argues that theological rhetoric can reinforce socio-economic dynamics of power. Accordingly, challenging theological and biblical readings participates in praxis of liberation. Because kyriarchal power is taught and sustained through culture and socialization, the role of Christian theology, text, and practice must be examined for how it participates in shaping culture and socialization.[39] Thus, Schüssler Fiorenza underscores how theology cannot be separate from questions and analyses of such power dynamics.

In her analysis, Schüssler Fiorenza attempts to draw connections and map the dynamics of power that sustain a kyriarchal system. She writes, "the interface of race, class, gender, and colonialism structures women's work outside the home but also that in the home."[40] In this

---

[37] Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xx-xix.
[38] Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xix.
[39] Within feminist discourses of the time, the role of socialization in teaching gender roles often relied upon the work of Nancy Chodorow, *The Reproduction of Mothering Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978). Chodorow appears as an important source for a number of authors in the Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and Anne Carr, ed., *Concilium: Motherhood: Experience, Institution, Theology* (Edinburg, Scotland: T&T Clark, 1989).
[40] Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xxi.

quote, Schüssler Fiorenza seeks to map the "interface" between the dynamics of power "outside" the home with those "inside" the home. Most significantly, by highlighting how power structures *both* the "inside" and the "outside" of the home, Schüssler Fiorenza is clearly arguing against the separate spheres ideology of two distinct spaces. Rather, as seen in the discussion in chapter two of the patri-kyriarchal family as a school of kyriarchal relations, throughout her scholarship Schüssler Fiorenza intends to convey how the dynamics of power function to shape interlocking structures of oppression. Thus, in her *Women, Work, and Poverty* introduction, she highlights the "interface" of power dynamics that *connects* the spatially designated boundaries of home. By identifying this connection, her rhetoric of home challenges the notion of home as a haven distinct from systems of socio-economic power.

Whereas the rhetoric of "interface" emphasizes how power connects the work of women in multiple places, the particular rhetoric of "inside" and "outside" is somewhat problematic. Namely, the designation of an "inside" and "outside" to home suggests that the place of home is a bounded space with an "in" and an "out." This is problematic insofar as it could be read as reinscribing home as a distinct place separate from the "outside" places. In this reading, home once again emerges as a distinct "haven" and separate space. However, given Schüssler Fiorenza's larger argument about power in this work and elsewhere, it is more important to underscore how her rhetoric is responding to the common depiction of work and home as distinct by connecting them through dynamics of power. Thus, another way to read the above quote might be with "in" and "outside" in scare quotes as terms that her argument is clearly destabilizing.

By focusing primarily on the socio-economic activities of women "in" and "outside" of the home, her rhetoric certainly implicates "home" *within* dynamics of power, but does not

critically engage the space or place of "home" in itself. Rather, each use of the term home in this essay is accompanied by the preposition "in" or "outside" which functions to designate the space of home as a boundaried place. The binary of these prepositions reflects the larger rhetorical context in which responding critically to the public/private distinction of work/home shapes her rhetoric. Insofar as her use of the specific term "home" continues to reflect "home" itself as a boundaried place, the larger analysis of the dynamics of power shaping social interrelations makes clear that the social relations within the place of home interact with social relations that construct spaces other than home as well. In this way, Schüssler Fiorenza's rhetoric resonates with an understanding of space as constructed by social relations of power.

Although Schüssler Fiorenza may not emphasize the material or physical *spatiality* of the place called home, through her treatment of domesticity, she analyzes how the socio-economic dynamics of power that construct the rhetoric of "home" have material and physical effects upon the lives of women.[41] Schüssler Fiorenza writes, "Global exploitation of women is maintained through violence against women in and outside of the home as well as through systemic socialization and education of women into freely accepting feminine roles and behavior."[42] As discussed in chapter two, Schüssler Fiorenza identifies important connections between the exploitation of women, violence, and femininity.[43] Namely, the socialization of women through

[41] In contrast, I am thinking of feminist analyses of the spatiality of the structure of "home" in such work as Dolores Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution*, Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1981); Hayden, *Redesigning the American Dream: Gender, Housing, and Family Life*, (New York: Norton and Company, 2002); Sally McMurry, *Families and Farmhouses in Nineteenth-Century America: Vernacular Design and Social Change*, (Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1997).
[42] Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xx.
[43] This brief comment echoes the fuller discussion of Schüssler Fiorenza on violence and the home discussed in the earlier chapter on violence and the home.

"domesticity" into roles of subservience functions to reinforce a patri-kyriarchal system of hierarchal relations of power.

By immediately following this quote regarding socialization into "feminine" behavior with a statement about "socialization to domesticity," Schüssler Fiorenza's rhetoric suggests interchangeability between the terms feminine and domestic.[44] To be socialized to be feminine is to be socialized to be domestic. How this connects to exploitation becomes evident in the statement, "all women are educated to 'domesticity', i.e. unpaid labor for love's sake."[45] In short, women are socialized to perform labor at home without wages.[46] The inclusion of violence in this constellation may suggest the means of controlling women who fail to be adequately socialized into their roles—or as a part of this socialization into feminine demure behavior.

Reading Schüssler Fiorenza's critique of domesticity in concert with a Marxist Feminist analysis of work and home provides further insight into her critique of domesticity and home. In the cleverly titled essay, "For Every Knight in Shining Armor, There's a Castle Waiting to be Cleaned: A Marxist-Feminist Analysis of the Household," co-authors Harriet Fraad, Stephen Resnick, and Richard Wolff address the difference between labor relations *within* the household and without.[47] Whereas most Marxist analysis has addressed the extraction of surplus labor from waged laborers in capitalist industry, the labor relations within the household have been given less attention.

---

[44] Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xx.
[45] Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xxi.
[46] Although not specifying the particular cultural context for this understanding of domesticity in the "The Endless Day," Schüssler Fiorenza elsewhere makes the connection to the legacy of 19th century legacies of what she terms the White Lady more explicit. Schüssler Fiorenza, *The Power of the Word*, 224.
[47] Harriet Fraad, Stephen Resnick, and Richard Wolff, "For Every Knight in Shining Armor, There's a Castle Waiting to be Cleaned: A Marxist-Feminist Analysis of the Household," in *Class Struggle on the Home Front: Work, Conflict, and Exploitation in the Household*, ed. Graham Cassano (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 19-70.

Fraad, Resnick, and Wolff describe the labor relations within a patriarchal household as non-capitalist because the labor of the wife is not purchased with cash wages by the husband, nor does he seek to sell the products of her surplus labor—for example, her preparation of meals for others besides herself. Rather, the co-authors depict the patriarchal household as a feudal relationship:

> The producer of surplus on the medieval European manor often delivered his/her surplus labor (or its products) directly to the lord of the manor, much as the wife delivers her surplus to her husband. Ties of religion, fealty, personal loyalty and obligation , tradition, and force bound serf and lord as much as parallel marital bonds, ideology, tradition, religion, and power binds a husband and wife in the sort of household we are analyzing here.[48]

The description of this feudal model of household resonates with Schüssler Fiorenza's understanding of the kyriarchal household rule by a "lord." Within this feudal-kyriarchal model of household labor, the labor performed by the wife exceeds her own use-value.

Rather than involve an exchange of wages or sale of the products she produces, the delivery of a woman's labor to her husband is like the non-capitalist relations between a serf and her lord. Furthermore, this economic relationship between husband and wife is secured through the bonds of marriage, religion, and tradition. If she does not perform the household labor that the husband expects, the co-authors suggest that the husband may need to take on a role of supervisor to enforce her labor, or, "gender processes may push her to discipline—control and direct—herself."[49] This quotes echoes Schüssler Fiorenza's analysis that violence threatens women who fail to perform their gendered, domestic roles. Furthermore, the notion that a woman may self-discipline can be read as akin to Schüssler Fiorenza's emphasis on the role of socialization such that "all women are educated to 'domesticity'"

[48] Fraad, Resnick, and Wolff, "For Every Knight," 25.
[49] Fraad, Resnick, and Wolff, "For Every Knight," 29.

Although Schüssler Fiorenza uses the rhetoric of "all women," her larger discussion retains the emphasis on "pluriform" experiences. As an example, Schüssler Fiorenza cites a lengthy description by womanist theologian Katie Cannon of learning domestic work as a teen by working at a white family's house. As a female, black child, Cannon was expected to perform domesticity for pay in a white person's house. The materiality of Cannon's experience as a "domestic" comes through in her descriptions of washing windows, earning two dollars a day, and the white kids who would "sit around and watch TV and play games, and they didn't think nothing of the fact [she] was cleaning."[50] For Schüssler Fiorenza, this description serves as an important example of how the "interface of race, class, gender, and colonialism structures women's work."[51] In other words, the work of women is shaped not only by gender, but also by class, race, and colonialism such that women's socialization into domesticity is also not uniform—even as Cannon's experience and the white children had different relations to domestic labor within the space of the white family's house.

In this way, the space of "home" teaches socio-economic dynamics of gender, race, and class regarding who is and is not responsible for the labor in the home and at what cost. Recalling the rhetorical distinction between "a theology of woman" and the "pluriform" approach of "prismatic case-studies," Schüssler Fiorenza's rhetorical strategy is to continue to call attention to the variations in concrete experiences due to structures of race, class, gender and colonialism. In line with this strategy, the text adds a challenge to feminist theology to "highlight such difference in experience among women before claiming what is common in our

[50] Quoted in Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xx. Taken from Victoria Byerly, *Hard Times Cotton Mill Girls. Personal Histories of Womanhood in the South* (Cornell University, 1986), 38f.
[51] Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xxi.

diverse experience of socialization to domesticity."[52] Again Schüssler Fiorenza's rhetoric seeks to navigate the tension between the connections and differences among the experiences of women's work and domesticity.

Within a critical framework of the place of home as constituted by social relations, Schüssler Fiorenza's emphasis on the pluriform experiences of domesticity can be read as also an argument for multiple spaces of "home." Due to the intersecting socio-economic relations of power that constitute the places called "home," the "home" of differently located persons will also vary. For example, Schüssler Fiorenza notes that whereas "middle- and upper-class women" may have had the "'luxury' of staying at home" they did not have the "choice of working outside the home."[53] In contrast, "poor, working-class, and Third World women, however, have never had the possibility and privilege 'not to work' but to 'stay home'."[54] The differences in the place of home for each group of women are structured by the interface of race, class, gender, and colonialism. Or, in Marotta's rhetoric, "what the discourses say they should be doing and the practices they should be engaged in" differ according to the intersections of socio-economic dynamics of power.[55]

Although Schussler Fiorenza's rhetoric of work "in" and "outside" of home is problematic for a feminist postcolonial view of space as changing, fluid, and porous, her larger analysis of how power functions clearly seeks to break down the rhetoric of home as a haven separate from larger socio-economic dynamics of power. Schüssler Fiorenza writes, "if women's work outside the home is patterned after that inside, a feminist theological reflection must begin with an analysis of the social structures of domesticity that structure women's work and

[52] Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xxi.
[53] Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xxii.
[54] Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day," xxii.
[55] Marotta, "Motherspace: Disciplining through the Material and the Discursive," 23.

economic exploitation."[56] This statement makes clear the import of Schüssler Fiorenza's argument as a call for a feminist theological analysis of domesticity as a critical project for challenging socio-economic dynamics of oppression and inequality. In this way, I understand my project of critically analyzing the rhetoric of home as a response to this call to analyze how the related notions of domesticity and home function to reinforce patterns of inequality and injustice.

By naming "colonization" within the constellation of socio-economic dynamics of power that structure the patterns of domesticity, Schüssler Fiorenza's analysis can be understood as a project of decolonization. Indeed, in her more recent work, *The Power of the Word*, she presents a similar analysis of how the heterosexual family functions to "sustain such kyriarchal structures of domination" which she then follows with a "decolonizing/detoxifying" reading of 1 Peter. [57] Challenging the "tendency of texts to 'naturalize' structures of domination by eliminating their socio-historical genealogy from consciousness," the decolonizing/detoxifying method of interpretation which she presents seeks to bring out the elements of kyriarchal elements of domination in a text or ideology.[58] Insofar as religious texts and institutions participate in the socializing people into kyriarchal relations of domination, decolonizing interpretations challenge not only scriptural interpretations but also relations of power.

In similar fashion, Schüssler Fiorenza's call to analyze the intersecting structures of domination in the structures of domesticity can be understood as a call for a decolonizing interpretation of the naturalized patterns of kyriarchal power in the rhetoric of home. To change women's work situations is not as simple as arguing for policy changes regarding women's pay

[56] Marotta, "Motherspace: Disciplining through the Material and the Discursive," 23.
[57] Schüssler Fiorenza, *Power of the Word*, 160.
[58] Schüssler Fiorenza, *Power of the Word*, 165.

for work in or outside of the home. Rather, the underlying socialization of women into "domesticity, i.e. unpaid labor for love's sake" must be analyzed and changed. Yet, changing the exploitation of women requires changing a kyriarchal system that would teach all women to be "feminine" and accept their "domestic" role to house-keep and care for children.

As noted above, Schüssler Fiorenza's rhetoric moves away from the language of "patriarchy" used in *Women, Work, and Poverty* to the language of kyriarchy. Kyriarchy functions to better convey the intersecting structures of race, gender, class, and colonialism that her even her earlier analyses of kyriarchy clearly intend to convey.[59] Schüssler Fiorenza also coins the rhetoric of "wo/men" to disrupt the singularity in the term women and underscore the "pluriform" of social locations that this 1987 essay clearly seeks to underscore.[60] For this reason, the analysis of Schüssler Fiorenza's rhetoric of work and home in this essay is not intended to represent her "position" on work and home. Rather, the fact that her rhetoric changes reinforces the point that rhetoric of work and home is dynamic in relation to socio-economic processes.

The rhetoric of the 1987 *Women, Work, and Poverty* essay reflects its location within a context of liberation theology, the "second-wave women's movement," and the contested creation of a critical feminist theology of work and home. A gendered rhetoric of work and home that reinforced a system of exploiting women's work could no longer be tolerated. Because the patterns of exploitation in women's work functioned both "in" and "outside" the

[59] Even in Schüssler Fiorenza's landmark early book, *In Memory of Her*, the discussion of the patriarchal order extends beyond patriarchal marriage to also address the wider household including slaves. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 265.

[60] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "G*d-the Many Named: Without Place and Proper Name," in *Transcendence and Beyond*, ed. John D. Caputo and Michael Scanlon (Indianapolis: University of Indiana Press, 2007), 109-126.

home, a thorough analysis of the structures of society is needed. In particular, the socialization of women into subservience through an ideology of domesticity must be challenged. As a part of this socialization, the ideological and institutional supports in Christian text, theologies, and practices that teach women to "labor for love's sake" need to be challenged and changed. In this way, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza helped to open the door for further critical analyses of the intersections between socio-economic power and Christian belief and practice.

The Moral Tension of Work and Home: Bonnie Miller-McLemore, 1994

Throughout the 1960's and 1970's, the feminist movement had a number of successes from narrowing the pay gap, abortion rights, no-fault divorce, stronger laws against violence against women, Title IX, and rising numbers of women in colleges and in careers traditionally dominated by men. However, with these successes came both new questions as well opposition. To describe the shifting demands of labor on women's lives, sociologist Arlie Hochschild popularized the notion of "the second shift" in her 1989 book of the same title.[61] Arguing that the gains in women's employment were not coupled with a significant increase in men's domestic work, Hochschild depicts a grim picture for women stressed with a second shift of domestic labor. Subsequently, Susan Faludi described a "backlash" against women which had developed throughout the 1980's.[62] Mobilized around resistance to the social changes wrought by the feminist movement, through the later 1970's and throughout the 1980's (and beyond) conservative Christian organizations developed and politicized the rhetoric of "family values."

As Christian conservatives rallied to support "family values" political platforms, the rhetoric surrounding Christian families exploded in books, institutes, sermons, and conferences.

[61] Arlie Russell Hochschild, *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home* (New York: Viking, 1989).
[62] Susan Faludi, *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women* (New York: Crown Publishing Group, 1991).

More progressive and liberal Christian scholars and groups also entered the fray to proffer definitions of the "Christian" family. For example, in 1991 Don Browning organized the Religion, Culture, and Family (RCF) project at the University of Chicago that generated twenty books, numerous articles, and several major conferences.[63] Feminist Christian work on the family also appeared in the academic journals of religion and edited volumes.[64] Among those writing about feminism and the family, the work Bonnie Miller-McLemore was one bridge between the RCF project and feminism.[65] Her 1994 book, *Also a Mother: Work and Family as Theological Dilemma* merits close, critical attention for its rhetoric on work and home during this volatile time of backlash to feminism. Like Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Miller-McLemore also tries to analyze the impact of dividing "work" and "home" has upon the lives of women. However, Miller-McLemore emphasizes the individual experience of (white, middle-class) women trying to "have it all" rather than adequately addressing the socio-economic dynamics of power structuring "family" and "home."

A practical theologian, Bonnie Miller-McLemore engages the topic of work, family, and home with a rhetoric reflective of psychological as well as theological discourses. Although she

---

[63] See the archived Religion, Culture, and Family Project website at http://divinity.uchicago.edu/martycenter/research/rcfp/index.html. Accessed March 28, 2012.

[64] Anne Bathurst Gilson, Marcia Y. Riggs, Elizabeth Bounds, Rita Nakashima Brock, Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, Susan Brooks Thistlethwaite, "Special Section: Feminism and Family Values," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, 12.1 (Spring, 1996): 99-157; Gloria Albrecht, "Re-Forming Families: Producing the New Ideal," in *JFSR*, vol.18.2 (Fall 2002): 33-52; Christine Firer Hinze, " Bridge Discourse on Wage Justice: Roman Catholic and Feminist Perspectives on the Family Living Wage," *Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics*, (1991): 109-132; Gloria H. Albrecht, "Ideals and Injuries: the Denial of Difference in the Construction of Christian Family Ideals," *Journal of the Society* of *Christian Ethics* 25 (2005): 169; Lisa Sowle Cahill and Dietmar Mieth, eds., *Concilium: The Family*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995).

[65] For other self-identified feminists working with the RCF project, see Anne Carr and Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen, ed., *Religion, Feminism, and the Family*, (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.) Some contributors to this volume are Rosemary Radford Ruether, Pamela Couture, Christine Gudorf, and Bonnie Miller-McLemore. McLemore's chapter was entitled, "Family and Work: Can Anyone 'Have it All'?."

gestures to the possibility of a "social, political, and economic" analysis, she simply states that this is not her approach or area of expertise.[66] Rather, she deploys developmental psychologist Erik Erikson's concept of "generative" to address the "dilemma" of work and family.[67] Miller-McLemore describes Erikson's choice of the term generativity as "a metaphor to encompass several facets of adult work and love: *procreativity, productivity, and creativity*."[68] [my emphasis] The notion of multiple facets of actions is fundamental to Miller-McLemore's effort to describe adult life. Rather than seeing adult life as *roles* performed at the particular places such as work or home, she uses the rhetoric of generativity to emphasize *processes* of "procreativity, productivity, and creativity."

For Miller-McLemore, the good adult life of "generativity" integrates the processes of "procreativity, productivity, and creativity." She uses this framework of generativity to analyze the tension felt in contemporary women's lives between the different facets of women's adult lives as waged workers as well as mothers. In short, her analysis implicates both socio-economic changes and feminist responses to these changes. To begin, she describes a time "prior to the Industrial Revolution" when women's lives were productive with "vital contributions" until "the market economy that created a new world of work for men shattered the previous unity of work and home, public and private, and forged a line between them taut with *moral tension*."[69] [my

---

[66] Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother: Work and Family as Theological Dilemma* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), 24.
[67] Fellow practical theologian, Don Browning had likewise engaged Erikson's term in his 1975 work *Generative Man: Psychoanalytic Perspectives* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973).
[68] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 43.
[69] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 44. In a recent blog post, conservative Christian author Carolyn McCulley wrote of her surprise to learn the history of home and the shift from a place of production to one of consumption in the 19th century. Like Miller-McLemore, she resolves the split of "spheres" by counseling women not to seek "careers" but to become productive "investors"—however that labor may manifest itself at different points in life. Thus, her

emphasis] Thus, for Miller-McLemore, work and home became separate from one another connected by a line of "moral tension."

With this shattering of work and home, Miller-Mclintock explains, women lost options for productive and creative work. Public work was closed off to them and industrialization reduced home production of many goods. Although acknowledging that prior to the Industrial Revolution women were "directed by the edicts of men," she also positively describes female generativity in this time as including a range of domestic and family productive labors from healing to planting, pickling, and preserving food.[70] According to Miller-McLemore's account of the "first wave" of the women's movement in the U.S., women at this time wrestled with whether or not to continue to positively value domestic and maternal labor.[71] As examples of efforts to reform both home and work, she cites Elisabeth Cady Stanton's arguments for social policies that promoted "equal responsibility of men and women" as well as Frances Willard's arguments for social changes to enable an "active, devoted fatherhood and gender-equal partnerships in the home."[72]

However, Miller-McLemore argues that these late 19th and early 20th century feminist efforts to reform the domestic household in relation to larger social policies were forgotten by mid-20th century. Rather than retaining and developing strategies for gender reform in *both* the society *and* the home, Miller-McLemore describes U.S. culture as becoming "enamored" with

---

resolution does not question the inequalities generated and sustained through separate spheres ideologies. http://solofemininity.blogs.com/posts/2012/03/loves-labor.html

[70] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 43.

[71] She portrays the early 20th century women's as divided over "the import of motherhood and domesticity, some claiming its centrality, others impatient with domestic distractions." Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 67. See also, Nancy F. Cott, *The Grounding of Modern Feminism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987).

[72] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 67.

"the lore of idealized motherhood and femininity."[73] In other words, rather than reforming the domestic household as some early feminists suggested, the domestic, feminine mother became the cultural ideal.

Continuing her historical contextualization of the feminist movement on work and home, Miller-McLemore describes "second wave" feminism as calling for "a repudiation of autocratic ideologies of domesticity and the pursuit of unqualified entrance into male-dominated institutions."[74] Miller-McLemor presents "second wave" feminism as a "repudiation" of domesticity and the home rather than as a call to *reform* the home. Thus, within her framework of generativity, she identifies 1960's feminism as underscoring the importance of "productivity" through waged work, but as failing to also integrate "procreativity" and domestic labors as well. Although she depicts her rhetoric as a historical narrative about tensions within feminism, I read the rhetorical purpose of her historical narrative as an argument for the importance of developing a feminism that explicitly attends to domesticity, family, home, and motherhood—an approach akin to maternal feminism.[75]

Miller-McLemore's rhetoric repeatedly makes a case for the importance of addressing domesticity, family, home, and motherhood in feminist thought and theology. For example, after sketching out the critiques laid against feminism for "destroying the family" or "abandoning mothers to the double burden of family and work," she writes:

> In its efforts to liberate women from domestic oppressions, neither the first nor the second wave foresaw some of the indirect negative effects on many future mothers and children, including the counter-effects of the failure to obtain genuine equality. Nor could

[73] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 67.
[74] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 68.
[75] On maternal feminism, see Sara Ruddick, *Maternal Thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989, 1995); Nel Noddings, *Caring: An Ethical Approach to Caring and Morality* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984, 2003) or more recently, Nel Noddings, *The Maternal Factor* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2010).

> these movements anticipate the larger social, economic, and cultural roadblocks that would further complicate the life of home and family.[76]

In this passage, Miller-McLemore's rhetoric strikes an almost apologetic tone—depicting current tensions of work and home as a consequence of the limitations of feminist thought to envision the full implications of challenging the established boundaries of the domestic space. For her, the "failure to obtain genuine equality" meant women could go to work, but women—specifically mothers—continued to be disproportionately responsible for the domestic care of the home and children. Thus, the crux of the passage again points to her argument for a feminism that more fully addresses domestic reform of home and family in tandem with fighting for equality at work.

Notably, in the above passage, the rhetoric of "mothers and children" signifies a general group without foregrounding the differences between mothers—or women who are not mothers—in relation to their location within socio-economic structures of race, class, sexuality, marital status, or national origin. However, the passage does gesture towards a structural explanation when pointing towards the "larger social, economic, and cultural roadblocks" that "complicate the life of home and family." And yet, the rhetoric of "roadblock" suggests a rather simplistic understanding of power dynamics as atomized "issues" (roadblocks) rather than an intersecting matrix of power. Although Miller-McLemore does sporadically cite the relevance of distinctions of race, class, and marital status, she also suggests that these dynamics "raise concerns beyond the scope of this book."[77] By giving only cursory attention to intersecting dynamics of power in her analysis of family, work, and home, Miller-McLemore seems to be suggesting the possibility of setting these concerns aside as not fundamental to her analysis.

---

[76] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 70.
[77] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 88.

The ability to set aside the discussion of race, class, and marital status reflects Miller-McLemore's own social location as a white, middle-class, married, heterosexual mother which she intentionally and openly draws upon throughout the text.[78] Although she may present a larger structural analysis and greater attention to race, class, and marital status as a matter of "expertise" or "scope," a critical feminist perspective can identify how the absence of this intersectional structural analysis does not simply disregard these issues but functions to reinforce patterns of kyriarchal power. For example, Miller-McLemore writes,

> The real locus of the conflict lies in the structures of the work site, the structures of the family, the structures of social policy, and the ideologies related to all three. In American society, few people, men or women, attain an integrated work and home life.[79]

Although this quote states the importance of attending to the structures of society, it does so in order to further articulate the problem "women" face in attempting the "very complicated coordination" of work and family.[80] The rhetoric of "coordination" reflects the language of striving for a "work-life balance" which reflects Miller-McLemore's own social location as a white, educated, elite woman for whom the desire for "having it all" is a problem.[81]

Miller-McLemore's emphasis on the moral tension of trying to fulfill the multiple aspects of generativity focuses her analysis on white, middle-class, educated women for whom the ideology of gendered separate spheres shaped their social locations. Yet, as Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza makes clear, this ideology of the White Lady not only structured the lives of the white, educated, heterosexual women, but it reinforces intersecting hierarchies of power through

---

[78] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 24.
[79] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 113.
[80] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 113.
[81] Bonnie Miller-McLemore, "Family and Work: Can Anyone 'Have it All?'," in *Religion, Feminism, and the Family*, ed. Anne Carr and Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 277.

structures of race, class, gender, sexuality, and nationality.[82] Within discourses of mothering, for example, the desirability for white mothers that made birth control a white feminist issue also functioned to restrict and limit black mother's right *to* reproduce.[83] Thus, when Miller-McLemore calls for feminist theology to pay more attention to models of mothering, the model that she proposes must be read critically.

To contextualize the need for a specific model for mothering, Miller-McLemore first surveys the extant literature on mothering in feminist theological discourse. To explain her own book title, she cites the first line of Valerie Saiving's 1960 article—"I am a student of theology; I am also a woman." To this, Miller-McLemore adds her reading of the "implicit" sentence, "I am also a mother."[84] For Miller-McLemore, this silence surrounding Saiving's mothering signals a wider silence in the feminist theological treatment of the experience of mothering.[85] Rather than

---

[82] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *The Power of the Word: Scripture and the Rhetoric of Empire* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press), 224; Schüssler Fiorenza, *Sharing Her Word*: *Feminist Biblical Interpretation in Context* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1998), 36, 45,144-147. See also Kwok Pui Lan, "The Image of the White Lady: Gender and Race in Christian Mission," in *The Special Nature of Women?*, ed. Anne Carr and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991), 19-27.

[83] Dorothy Roberts, *Killing the Black Body*: *Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty* (New York: Pantheon, 1997). For a recent take on the right to reproduce see, Stephanie May, "A New Normal and the Right to Reproduce," Feminism in Religion Forum, posted February 20, 2012, http://www.fsrinc.org/blog/new-normal-and-right-reproduce.

[84] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 84.

[85] Miller-McLemore notes that *Womanspirit Rising* (1979) edited by Carol Christ and Judith Plaskow did not have "an article on the maternal per se, or on work and family." Although Miller-McLemore notes that "no one speaks out of her own maternal experience" in Christ and Plaskow's second volume, *Weaving the Visions* (1989), the volume does include essays by Sallie McFague, Paula Gunn Allen, and Delores Williams that discuss various values and virtues of the maternal. Miller-McLemore also lauds the volume *Inheriting Our Mother's Gardens* (1988) for putting mother right in the title, but notes that the introduction to the volume also reflected ambivalence with the term. However, Miller-McLemore does "hail one groundbreaking exception to the dearth of material in motherhood in theology"—the *Concilium*: *Motherhood: Experience, Institution, Theology* (1989) edited by Anne Carr and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. Despite this positive rhetoric to initially describe the volume, Miller-McLemore suggests the text "reflects a novice state of affairs" and that "many of the essays remain at the level of the critique

isolating feminists and working mothers in their struggle to negotiate a fulfilling adult life, Miller-McLemore implicates the "general populace" for the "failure to envision adequate models of loving and working—that is, of caring for those *whom* we produce while we are so busy worrying about *what* we produce and consume."[86] Thus, she identifies the root of the "dilemma" women face in work and family lie in the inadequate *model of loving and working*.

By locating the problem of the "dilemma" women face in an inadequate *model of loving and working*, Miller-McLemore's rhetoric invokes a sense of spatiality. Using the language of a "model," her rhetoric suggests an ideal set of connections, a blueprint to direct the construction of a society. However, in her rhetoric of "model," she puts forth a spatial model of the activities of "loving and working" rather than a spatial model of the locations of "work" and "home." In this way, her rhetoric emphasizes the *activities* of fulfilled, generative adults rather than spatial *locations* where these actions occur. In other words, a "model of loving and working" could be read as describing a social space constructed through these practices. However, a critical analysis of the particular model she suggests once again reveals her analysis of socio-economic dynamics of power to be problematic.

Feminist theology has critiqued the patriarchal model of home, explains Miller-McLemore, but "few feminist theologians have actually identified alternative family models."[87] She first discusses how biblical passages about Hagar have been useful for womanist theologian,

---

of the institution and its ideologies." Similar to the *Concilium: Women, Work, and Poverty* discussed above, the motherhood volume also focuses on the structural, ideological issues surrounding the notion of motherhood. Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 99. Carol P. Christ and Judith Plaskow, ed., *Womanspirit Rising: A Feminist Reader in Religion* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1979); Christ and Plaskow, ed., *Weaving the Visions: New Patterns in Feminist Spirituality* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989); Letty M. Russel, et al, ed., *Inheriting Our Mother's Gardens: Feminist Theology in Third World Perspective* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988).

[86] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 82.

[87] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 85.

Delores S. Williams.[88] Then, in search of "a comparable biblical story for white women as mothers," she describes how the little-known biblical character of Orpah, "silenced and lost, rose up as a soul-mate."[89] Unlike the choice of Ruth to remain with her husband's mother, Naomi, the widowed Orpah elects to return to her "mother's house." (Ruth 1:8, NRSV)

In discussing her resonance with Orpah, Miller-McLemore writes, "in the silence that surrounds Orpah, I recognize the silence that surrounds many women today who follow different paths, choose a different god/dess, and otherwise fail to meet certain expectations."[90] In her reading, Orpah seems to function as a generic placeholder for the silent "different paths" that have not received the attention and praise of the well-known path. Emphasizing the different choices "women" make, she reads the story as conveying a moral insight for women struggling with the dilemma of negotiating which "path" to take in life. This reading both decontextualizes the story and focuses on a psychological-spiritual meaning for individual women—particularly for white women. She writes: "white feminist women who choose the path of motherhood can, in one sense, be understood as Orpahs who choose not to renounce the 'mother's house.'"[91] By reading the text for a meaning for white feminist women, Orpah is problematically encoded as "white." Miller-McLemore is able to make this interpretative move only by decontextualizing Orpah from the socio-economic-political dynamics of power that shape not only her choice but also of what constitutes her "mother's house."

---

[88] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 86. See also Delores S. William, *Sisters in the Wilderness: The Challenge of God-talk* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993). William's work influenced the later edited volume, Phyllis Trible and Letty M. Russell, ed., *Hagar, Sarah, and their Children: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Perspectives* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006).
[89] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 86.
[90] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 87.
[91] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 87.

Laura Donaldson offers an alternative feminist postcolonial reading of Orpah that does attend both to Orpah's context as well as to her own location as a Cherokee woman in the United States.[92] According to Donaldson, both the Moabite women (like Ruth and Orpah) and Native women within the U.S. have been represented as oversexualized and threatening. In fact, in Thomas Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia*, he describes the sexuality of Native American women in terms of the Moabite women.[93] Although Ruth has often been read as an exemplar of forsaking her pagan gods and godless country of Moab, Donaldson reads her conversion against the assimiliation strategies of the U.S. project of colonization via assimilation into white Christian culture.[94] Within the matrilinear Cherokee society, the intermarriage and assimilation of Native women into their white husband's households "wreaked havoc upon tribal organization and development."[95]

In contrast to the assimilationist story of Ruth's choice to live with her husband's people in a different culture, Donaldson finds hope for Cherokee women in the "sign of Orpah...who returned to her mother's house."[96] Unlike Miller-McLemore, Donaldson places Orpah's choice to return to her mother's house into two cultural contexts. She first explains Orpah's context as a Moab woman whose sexuality and religion is suspect to the Israelites. As such, she can agree with William Phipps reading that Orpah takes "Naomi's common-sense advice and…returns 'to

[92] Laura E. Donaldson, "The Sign of Orpah: Reading Ruth through Native Eyes," in *The Postcolonial Biblical Reader*, R.S. Sugirtharajah, ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 159-170.
[93] Donaldson, "The Sign of Orpah," 162. See Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, ed. William Peden, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1954).
[94] Her analysis here parallels that of Andrea Smith on colonizing strategies of assimilation. See chapter two above.
[95] Donaldson, "The Sign of Orpah," 164.
[96] Donaldson, "The Sign of Orpah," 166.

her people and to her gods.'"[97] However, Donaldson finds Orpah's choice to return to her *mother's* house to be the most significant aspect of her decision. For Cherokee women, explains Donaldson, "Orpah connotes hope rather than perversity, because she is the one who does not reject her traditions or her sacred ancestors….In fact, Cherokee women not only chose the mother's house, they also owned it (along with the property upon which it stood as well as the gardens surrounding it.)"[98] With this description, Donaldson conveys key elements of the material specificity, the religious commitments and the socio-economic dynamics that construct the *Cherokee's* mother's house.

In another feminist postcolonial essay on Ruth and Orpah, Kwok Pui Lan surveys several different strategies feminist have used to read the book of Ruth. More particularly, she is interested in different readings of finding Ruth a "home" as her mother-in-law promises her in 3:1. Kwok notes that the Hebrew word often translated in English as "home" (*mānôach*) "can also mean a place where one can find rest and a sense of security."[99] Because for many readers "home" carries a sense of the "private sphere of domesticity," Kwok does not find it surprising that Ruth is read "as a romantic story with a happy ending."[100] Yet, she resists this reading within her contemporary U.S. context with its particular legacy of immigration, ideology of the inclusive American Dream, and role in the global displacement of persons. Within this context,

> "[H]ome" cannot be read through the myopic lens of the warmth and comfort of the private sphere without taking in to consideration how the private intersects with national identity, ethnicity, citizenship, law, and women's rights." In the global scene…home is not a fixed and stable location but a traveling adventure, which entails seeking refuge in strange lands, bargaining for survival, and negotiating for existence. Such a destabilizing and contingent construction of home dislodges it from its familiar domestic territory and

[97] Quoted in Donaldson, "The Sign of Orpah," 167.
[98] Donaldson, "The Sign of Orpah," 167.
[99] Kwok Pui Lan, *Postcolonial Imagination and Feminist Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 101.
[100] Kwok, *Postcolonial Imagination*, 101.

> questions the conditions though which the cozy connotations of home have been made possible and sustained.[101]

Within a critical feminist postcolonial reading, "home" is neither fixed nor stable but contingent. "Home" is neither a cozy haven nor separate from the "global scene" of socio-economic politics.

Using this critical feminist postcolonial framework, Kwok challenges several readings of a "home" for Ruth. In responding to readings of "home as kinship," Kwok challenges notions of kinship that address only questions of lineage that do not account for how women's sexuality is not "private" but interwoven with an "omnipresent heterosexual system operating in the story through different economic and political arrangements, and supported by theological discourse."[102] To craft a response to "home as patriarchal household," feminist have had to look beyond the substantial role that the patriarchal family plays in the storyline to "retrieve liberating moments."[103] Kwok finds white feminist readings that focus on the "virtue and character" of Ruth or Naomi to be focused on the "recovery of the authoritative self associated with the modern female subject."[104] Similarly, Kwok finds efforts to retrieve a model of female friendship or lesbian love between Ruth and Naomi to problematically decontextualize their relationship as interethnic and as a specific kinship relationship within a particular cultural context. As noted above, I find Miller-McLemore's reading of Orpah to also problematically decontextualize Orpah in favor of a moral, inspirational model. Orpah as the model white mother belies the

---

[101] Kwok, *Postcolonial Imagination*, 101-102.
[102] Kwok, *Postcolonial Imagination*, 106. See Marcella María Althaus Reid, "On Wearing Skirts without Underwear: 'Indecent Theology Challenging the Liberation Theology of the Pueblo': Poor Women Contesting Christ," *Feminist Theology* 20 (1999): 40. See also, Gayle Rubin, "The traffic in women: notes on the "Political economy" of sex" (1975), in Gayle S. Rubin, *Deviations: a Gayle Rubin Reader* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011), 33-65.
[103] Kwok, *Postcolonial Imagination*, 108.
[104] Kwok, *Postcolonial Imagination*, 108.

complexity of intersecting dynamics of socio-economic power both in Orpah's context as well as in Miller-McLemore's contemporary U.S. context.

In turning to critique "home as hospitality for strangers," Kwok addresses Orpah's story through a discussion of Cynthia Ozick's reading of Ruth. For Ozick, Ruth emerges as a visionary heroine who moves towards a new understanding of God whereas Orpah leads the usual life of remaining on "home ground."[105] However, Bonnie Honig critiques Ozick's reading for depicting Ruth as the "model émigré."[106] Specifying some immigrants as more desirable than others reveals how the boundary of a nation is not simply "open" to strangers. Rather, the border is controlled to privilege access to the *desirable* immigrants.[107] As with Amy Kaplan's later critique of the rhetoric of Homeland Security, Kwok insists that "myths of home, nation, people, and bloodline on which a common 'origin' of belonging is generated" must be questioned for their role in justifying violence and exclusion.[108] As Laura Donaldson makes clear in her reading of Orpah, vilifying Orpah for not assimilating reinforces legacies of sexual violence against Native women, the "Moabites" who are marked as other to the nation. Or, in Andrea Smith's words, Native women are the "bearers of a counter-imperial order."[109]

---

[105] Kwok, *Postcolonial Imagination*, 112.
[106] Discussed in Kwok, *Postcolonial Imagination*, 112. Bonnie Honig, "Ruth, the Model Emigrée: Mourning and the Symbolic Politics of Immigration, in *Ruth and Esther: A Feminist Companion to the Bible*, 2nd ser., ed. Athalya Brenner (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).
[107] Martha Gardner, *The Qualities of a Citizen: Women, Immigration and Citizenship, 1870-1965* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2005); Mai Ngai, "The Architecture of Race in American Immigration Law: a Re-examination of the Immigration Act of 1924," *Journal of American History*, (June 1999): 67-92; Anne Marie Nicolosi, "'We do Not Want Our Girls to Marry Foreigners': Gender, Race, and American Citizenship," *NWSA* 13, no.3: 1-21.
[108] Kwok, Postcolonial Imagination, 113. See also chapter one "Homeland Security" above and Amy Kaplan, "Homeland Insecurities: Reflections on Language and Space" *Radical History Review*, 85 (Winter 2003): 86.
[109] See chapter two above on Andrea Smith, *Conquest*.

In her search for a better model of loving and working, Miller-McLemore does examine elements of the national identity and context that shape our understanding of work and home. For example, Miller-McLemore identifies the ideology of the American Dream as reinforcing a work ethic that values individual achievement rather than communal values.[110] Likewise, she discusses the religious roots of the myth of the "Promised Land" that helped to sustain the values of a hard-working individual. [111] She also implicates "American myths (Daniel Boone, the Lone Ranger)" as contributing to a notion of a "separate, independent selfhood."[112] Although these two examples of American myths emerge from the idealization of the frontier and homesteading, she does not locate these myths in relation to their role in manifest domesticity or the growing imperialism of the U.S. as discussed in chapter one. Rather than pursue a structural or ideological analysis of the connections between domesticity, "family," "home," and national identity, the text focuses on the psychological notion of generative selfhood.

Although discussing elements of *national* identity, she does so to reject "separative" selfhood in service of her argument for a "generative" selfhood. In this way, the rhetorical aim of the book is to improve the individual lives of particular selves—namely, white, middle-class, heterosexual, married mothers—by arguing for socio-economic and political changes that support the ability of these selves to develop more fully as generative adults. As a white, educated mother myself, I certainly do not mean to suggest that the experiences of these mothers or the moral and religious tensions they may feel should be silenced. Furthermore, I find Miller-McLemore's emphasis on the need to integrate the range of activities that constitute a life to be persuasive—in her words, "procreativity, productivity, and creativity." Drawing stable, fixed

[110] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 56-57.
[111] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 73. Sylvia Hewlett, *The Lesser Life:The Myth of Women's Liberation in America* (New York: William Morrow, 1986), 179-180.
[112] Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother*, 183.

boundaries of space or time around a person's relationship to the activities of life strikes me as both unreasonable and, as Miller-McLemore insists, contributive to enormous tensions in individual lives. However, the constellation of socio-economic relations that constitute an individual's experience of home simply must be adequately articulated within a larger context of power than addressed in her text.

Also a Mother does not adequately address these important issues of socio-economic analyses of power relations that Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza had earlier argued were necessary for understanding women and work. In so far as Miller-McLemore's text aims to create new models of loving and working, these models must also include a critical analysis of the power dynamics of gender, race, class, sexuality, and nationality. Work and home do have shifting boundaries constructed by socio-economic dynamics as well as by Christian belief and practice.[113] However, the analysis of these socio-economic dynamics and the power distributed throughout them needs to be more fully articulated than that developed in *Also a Mother*. Without such an analysis, the promotion of alternative models of work and home risk reproducing dynamics of power that retain hierarchies of race, class, gender, sexuality, and nationality.

The Political Economic Context of Work and Home: Gloria Albrecht, 2002

Published in a different decade and in a new century, Gloria Albrecht's *Hitting Home: Feminist Ethics, Women's Work, and the Betrayal of "Family Values"* reflects a different context than *Also a Mother: the Work and Family as Theological Dilemma*. As the 1990's

[113] Kimberly Morgan argues that differences among countries in work-family policies arise from long legacies of degrees of church involvement in state policies. Insofar as families were accustomed to regulation by the state-church, stronger work-family policies have been enacted. Kimberly J. Morgan, *Working Mothers and the Welfare State: Religion and the Politics of Work-Family Policies in Western Europe and the United States* (Stanford: Standford University Press, 2006).

headed towards the end of the century, the U.S. economy appeared to be strong and growing according to conventional economic markers. "Globalization" had become a common word in academic and media parlance. At the same time, anti-globalization critiques grew and attempted to show the uneven global impact of the policies and practices of transnational corporations as well as governmental organizations such as the IMF and the World Bank.[114]

Within the U.S., the political landscape exhibited deep fractures from eight years of tension between a Democratic Clinton administration and a politically active Religious Right which exerted considerable influence on the platform and the rhetoric of the Republican Party. The Clinton administration passed major pieces of legislation significant for the relationship of work and home—the 1993 Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) gave unpaid leave to (some) parents and the 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act reformed welfare to emphasize the responsibility of recipients to participate in waged work or to prepare for such work. Feminists continued to criticize the "family values" rhetoric and the call to recognize diverse family forms—from single moms to gay couples—became increasingly politicized. Traces of this context are evident in *Hitting Home.* However, Albrecht's 2002 text is silent on the events of Sept 11, 2001 and subsequent shift in the U.S. political rhetoric to "terror."

The need for a feminist Christian understanding of the socio-economic and political context of women's work is fundamental to the argument in *Hitting Home*. The book begins by laying out several different kinds of contexts: economic, women, and families. Under "contemporary economic contexts," the text first discusses "globalization." Although Albrecht's text notes that the exchange of goods and services marks continuity with "centuries-old phenomenon," she also makes the distinction that the exchanges now move at greater speeds and

[114] A widely regarded text in critiquing "globalization" as a new form of imperialism was Hardt and Negri¸ *Empire*.

include financial and labor markets as well.[115] The text then underscores the contemporary context of globalization:

> Lying behind these changes in a world of very uneven economic conditions among countries, and among groups within countries, is a singular, Western, and North Atlantic economic theory and practice that has come to dominate the promotion of this highly interconnected system of world trade.[116]

In her work, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza similarly describes globalization as the effort to "amalgamate and merge all economic activities around the world within a single model of a global monoculture."[117] In both descriptions, the "globalization" model strives towards a singular, universal socio-economic system.

Despite the aims of globalization towards universality, the above quote also suggests that the particular configuration of world trade originates from a particular location within the globe, namely the "West" and the "North Atlantic." Albrecht's use of the terms "West" and "North Atlantic" signals both an attempt to locate a Euro-North American bias and awareness of the shift towards a rhetoric of a global North-South axis rather than First/Third World to distinguish between global regions. In this way, the rhetoric used in the text to map the globe intentionally reflects theoretical and political commitments.

By carefully deploying terms to map global relations, Albrecht's text reflects a degree of critical awareness that space is constructed out of social processes. Indeed, throughout the text, the importance of critically mapping socio-economic dynamics functions as a core notion that weaves together the elements of the argument. In the case of globalization, the text presents a

---

[115] Albrecht, *Hitting Home: Feminist Ethics, Women's Work, and the Betrayal of "Family Values"* (New York: Continuum, 2002), 13.
[116] Albrecht, *Hitting Home*, 13.
[117] Schüssler Fiorenza, *Power of the Word*, 38.

map of inequality that divides not only nations from each other, but also within themselves.[118] Promoting a global system of interconnected markets is an economic theory and practice of the region of the globe which the reader presumptively understands as on the higher side of the "uneven" economic contexts.

Albrecht identifies the singular economic theory and practice at work in globalization as "neoliberalism."[119] According to the text, neoliberalism is a "political economic theory within capitalism that places great faith in the ability of unregulated markets to find the best economic balance among multiple players and the best solutions to an increasing number of social problems."[120] In other words, the text understands the theory and practice of neoliberalism to promote unregulated global markets as a means towards creating economic balance among the inter- and intra-national inequalities. Significantly, the text refers to a "political economic theory." By pairing politics with economics, Albrecht's rhetoric seeks to reinforce that neoliberalism is not "natural," but a system of power sustained by governmental policies that enable and promote particular kinds of national and fiscal relations.

Albrecht notes the use of the notion of "freedom" to justify the neoliberal governmental policies of an unregulated market. She writes, "A free—that is, a privatized—market is expected to extend individual liberties and to promote democratic forms of government."[121] According to Albrecht, the notion of "free" is understand within neoliberalism to be associated with both the "private" and the "individual." In so far as neoliberal policies promote an unregulated market,

---

[118] Boaventure de Sousa Santo and César A. Rodríguez-Garavita, "Law, Politics, and the Subaltern in Counter-hegemonic Globalization," in *Law and Globalization From Below: Towards a Cosmopolitan Legality*, ed. Boaventure de Sousa Santo and César A. Rodríguez-Garavita (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 14.
[119] For an excellent discussion of neoliberalism and U.S. culture see chapter one of Brenda Weber, *Makeover Nation: Selfhood, Citizenship, and Celebrity* (Duke University Press, 2009).
[120] Albrecht, *Hitting Home*, 13.
[121] Albrecht, *Hitting Home*, 13.

then a privatized market can be understood in Albrecht's rhetoric as deploying a notion of "private" that exists in contrast to the state—or "public"—ownership or control of the market. Although not specified in the text, a counter to the "privatized," unregulated markets of neoliberalism might be a political economy that sets limits upon market practices with an eye to the common good rather than to the individual.[122]

Not only does the notion of "political economy" suggest the role of the political state in determining the economic practices of the state, the "political economy" is also understood as interwoven with the form of government. Neoliberalism, according to Albrecht's text, understands itself as promoting a "democratic form of government" through its emphasis on the (free) individual. However, the text questions this "democratic" impulse in neoliberalism by stating that the "global dominance" of neoliberalism was itself not created by "democratic processes."[123] Rather than democratic processes by which individuals or even nations "freely" elect to participate in the global, neoliberal market, "differing nations and communities must somehow fit" into the economic systems "supported by the power of (north-) Western governments."[124]

The global map reflects an unequal distribution of power between those who design and sustain the global political economy and those who are dominated by it. The neoliberal policies interact with local sites to produce different shapes of social relations, writes Albrecht. By disrupting existing local practices of "distribution of benefits and burdens within a society," neoliberalism "reaches into local neighborhoods and places new demands on people and their

[122] Herman E. Daly and John B. Cobb, Jr., *For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Toward Community, the Environment, and a Sustainable Future* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1994).
[123] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,*13.
[124] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,*13.

families *in the privacy of their homes*."[125] In these selected phrases, Albrecht's rhetoric again spatially maps neoliberalism as a global system with multiple sites of interaction that differently constitute particular localities. Notably, in describing the postcolonial space, Sara Mills similarly insists upon a localized analysis of how the socio-economic dynamics of colonial power differently shape a place.[126] The spatial image of a growing reach from the global to the most local rhetorically reaches its most local site when reaching into "the privacy of their homes." Although linking the home with global networks of power, the rhetoric of home in this phrasing maps "home" as private space of dwelling for families.

In addition to the political economic context of globalization and neoliberalism, Albrecht also describes the "contexts for women."[127] In this section, her rhetoric again foregrounds the uneven distribution of power through a *gendered* political economic system in which women and their children are disproportionately poor.[128] Yet, the text also specifies that in the U.S. "people of color" are also disproportionately poor.[129] In this way, the text nuances the analysis to weave together gender, race, and economic conditions. While the text somewhat specifically referred to the "United States," the description of women in the "global market for low-wage workers" remains problematically vague and functions to create a generic non-U.S. low-wage female worker.[130] In addressing a "global trend for women to be the sole head of the household," the

[125] Albrecht, *Hitting Home*,14. [My emphasis]
[126] Sara Mills, *Gender and Colonial Space* (NY: Manchester University Press, 2005), 26.
[127] Albrecht, *Hitting Home*, 16-20.
[128] Feminist critique of welfare reform in the 1990's repeatedly made this argument regarding women and poverty. Elizabeth Bounds, Pamela K. Brubaker, Mary E. Hobgood, ed., *Welfare Policy: Feminist Critiques* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1999).
[129] Albrecht, *Hitting Home*, 17.
[130] Albrecht, *Hitting Home*, 17.

text follows this global statement with statistics for specific European countries before then giving a single statistic for the region of Latin America.[131]

The need for feminist Christian analyses to convey a global picture is apparent in Albrecht's text. Although the "global" emerges in a way that unevenly differentiates between European and Latin American nations, Albrecht's rhetoric suggests the need for global trends to be analyzed for differing impacts at particular social sites. Not only is analyzing differences among social locations important, but the need to attend "to the relationships that exist between women in differing social locations" is also necessary.[132] In other words, feminist Christian discourses need to attend to both differences among social locations of race, gender, and economic conditions as well as how these differences relate to one another. Thus, a global map of interrelated social locations constructed through social structures emerges in Albrecht's rhetoric.

In beginning the text of *Hitting Home* with a discussion of contexts, Albrecht's rhetoric both conveys certain information but also develops a particular view of the relationship of work, home, and family as interrelated and socially constructed. In addressing the "contexts for families," Albrecht writes:

> When mindful of economic forces, as well as race and class differences, the term "family crisis" should function as a critique of social systems that provide unmerited benefits for some at the unmerited expense of others.[133]

In this sentence, Albrecht's rhetoric again describes a social system of race, class, and economic dynamics that creates different social locations *in relationship with one another*. Furthermore, Albrecht's rhetoric deploys the term "family crisis" as a critique of these uneven relationships.

---

[131] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 18.
[132] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 20.
[133] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 21.

In Albrecht's rhetoric, both race and poverty have created "family crisis" in the U.S. through structures of racial discrimination and economic strain. In contrast, Albrecht's rhetoric challenges the use of "family crisis" as one of "individual moral behavior."[134] In Albrecht's depiction of the problem of work, family, and home, the "family crisis" lay not with individual morality of the work ethic of an unemployed worker or sexual choices of a single mother. Rather, she describes the term "family crisis" as "a trope for the conflicts that arise when gender relations and family forms become sites of struggle in response to the corrosive influence of economic transitions."[135] In this way, "family crisis" signals tension in the relationships between the social structures of gender, family, and the economy.

Albrecht's depiction of the problem of work, family, and home assumes interrelated social structures of race, class, gender, and economic conditions. For this reason, the text is critical of liberal Christian approaches to work and family that do not adequately attend to a socio-economic analysis. *Hitting Home* specifically addresses "Don Browning and his co-authors."[136] The footnote refers to the 1997 RCF Project book, *From Culture Wars to Common Ground*, which was co-written by Browning and four others—including Bonnie Miller-McLemore.[137] As indicated in the section above, the RCF Project produced a number of articles, books, and conferences about the family from 1991-2003. Although Albrecht's rhetoric refers simply to "one example of a recent liberal ideal of Christian families," the particular example of a Browning book represented a widely read and influential perspective.[138] Albrecht quotes (with italics from the original text) the Browning/RCF family ideal of "*the committed, intact, equal-*

[134] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 21.
[135] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 22.
[136] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,*145.
[137] Don S. Browning, et al., *From Culture Wars to Common Ground: Religion and the American Family Debate* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997).
[138] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,*145.

regard, public-private family."[139] Albrecht describes this "post-modern Christian" ideal of equal sharing of work and family between parents as essentially the family form Betty Friedan presented in the 1960s.[140]

In invoking Betty Friedan, Albrecht's rhetoric is not simply commenting about chronology, but also critiquing a problematic continuity of assumptions and perspectives. Specifically, this passage about Browning appears near the end of the *Hitting Home*. The three chapters that comprise the bulk of the book presented detailed socio-economic analyses of the history of women's work, the impact of care-giving on women's work, and differing patterns of organizing limited time to invest in work and home. The chapter on women's work begins with a discussion of Betty Friedan to whom Albrecht's rhetoric shows respect for articulating that women wanted "more than my husband and my children and my home."[141] However, Albrecht's text carefully present's Friedan's perspective as representing the "privileged group" of "domestic, suburban, educated, white housewives in the '50s."[142] Thus, Albrecht understands Friedan's perspective on work, family, and home as representing a privileged position for white, suburban, families.

In critiquing the ideal of the Christian family in *Culture Wars*, Albrecht's rhetoric similarly suggests that the book's ideal also reflects a particular social location of privilege of the co-authors. For example, Albrecht challenges the economic solution presented in *Culture Wars* that both parents work part-time, 30 hours per week. Albrecht briefly restates an earlier socioeconomic analysis from chapter four that part-time work is not only economically not

---

[139] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 145. Original quote Browning, *From Culture Wars,* 2.
[140] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 145.
[141] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 35. Original quote in Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (New York: Laurel, 1963; reprint 1983), 32.
[142] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 34.

viable for most families, but that the "good" part-time jobs are "only for a very few privileged professionals."[143] In this way, Albrecht's rhetoric presents the co-authors' solution as both unlikely and indicative of a white, heterosexual, middle-class point of view.

Hitting Home moves from critiquing the particular ideal Christian family presented in *Culture Wars* to a critique of the notion of an "ideal." For Albrecht, "history" shows the danger of promoting a family ideal that is only accessible to "economically elite families."[144] Albrecht's overview in chapter two on the history of women's work gives a sense of which history that she has in mind. As noted above, the chapter begins by placing Betty Friedan in a particular social location. The chapter then begins a section entitled "A Brief History" that is broken into three subsections entitled, "The Disappearance of White Women's Work"; "The Work of African American Women"; and "Organic Connections."

In the first subsection regarding "white women's work," Albrecht rejects the notion that industrialization removed productive work from the home. Rather, the movement towards a capitalist cash economy in conjunction with an existing gendered system of male privilege functioned to render waged labor as "work" and unwaged labor as not-work—as invisible. Furthermore, Albrecht depicts a notion of an "ideal image of an insular, nuclear family that focused all its energy on preparing its children to succeed" that was only achievable by "urban, white, middle-and upper-income families."[145] The intersection of a particular family ideal with the masculinization of work functioned to create not only gendered notions of work, but also to associate certain patterns of families' lives with "lack of economic success: having non relative

[143] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,*146.
[144] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,*146.
[145] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,*45.

living in the household such as boarders, having other relatives living in the household, being headed by a female, and having mothers leave home to do work for wages."[146]

In this way, Albrecht depicts how differences in the organization of "family," work, and home are organized are reflective of varying socio-economic locations rather than the moral failings or preferences of individuals.[147] In other words, the ideal image of separate spaces of work and home arose from socio-economic processes that privileged particular persons and groups of persons. Or, in the words of Gwendolyn Wright, a conception of the "model home" functions to reinforce not only normative housing, but also particular ideals of "family."[148]

In Albrecht's rhetoric, gender was not the only socio-economic dynamic constituting the 19th century ideal of "home." In discussing "the work of African American Women," Albrecht briefly discusses the context of African American women's work. Beginning with an economic assessment of the 19th century, the text states that "the entire U.S. society was enmeshed in the economics of slavery."[149] By choosing to describe the racial and economic dynamics of slavery in the U.S. as "enmeshed," Albrecht not only emphasizes the interrelatedness of social constructions of race with economic conditions, but also chooses a term with a negative sense of a terrible, tangled mess to convey a sense of moral disapproval. Thus, the text suggests that not all configurations of the interrelated dynamics of the political economy and social systems are morally acceptable. Indeed, the text continues by specifying some of the differences for African

---

[146] Albrecht, *Hitting Home*, 45.

[147] Recently, the tension between moral failings and socio-economic context re-emerged in the controversy surrounding the publication of Charles Murray, *Coming Apart: The State of White America, 1960-2010* (New York: Crown Publishing, 2012). For a sense of some of the response, see W. Bradford Wilcox, "Values Inequality," *Wall Street Journal*, January 31, 2012, accessed February 19, 2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203806504577181750916067234.html

[148] Gwendolyn Wright, "Prescribing the Model Home," *Social Research*, Vol. 58, No. 1 (Spring, 1991): 213-225.

[149] Albrecht, *Hitting Home*, 47.

American women's work. In contrast to a white work ethic in which all work was good and contributed to the well-being of the worker, the labor of slaves, "including the childbearing of African American women, contributed to their owner's economic well-being."[150]

Turning to a short discussion of womanist Joan Martin's book, *More Than Chains and Toil*, Albrecht presents Martin's book as challenging the white work ethic for failing to account for "power relations within society, relations of domination and subordination."[151] Agreeing with Martin, Albrecht's rhetoric returns to the importance of analyzing the uneven social relations constructed by social processes. Although her depiction of African American women's work both in and after slavery is brief, the text attempts to underscore the differences in economic opportunities to black families.

The final subsection on the brief history of women's work is entitled, "Organic Connections." Although the term "organic" does not appear in the section, the first paragraph begins:

> Renditions of history that do not pay attention to differences of gender, race, and class often begin with the assumption that current beliefs and practices are "natural." That is, these historical accounts assume that things were always the way they are, or that they inevitably developed this way. . . . White Americans, especially, seem to assume that history is, after all, progress.[152]

In these sentences, Albrecht's rhetoric seeks to de-naturalize history as either a stable set of social relations or as an inevitable progression to be the way they are. Within the politics of socially constructed notions of space-time, that "White Americans" particularly seem to perceive

[150] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 47.
[151] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 48. Joan Martin, *More Than Chains and Toil: A Christian Work Ethic of Enslaved Women* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000), 105-9.
[152] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 50.

history as stable can be understood as an effort to "freeze" time, or, at least, their position of power in the march of time.[153]

Albrecht's criticism of "natural" social relations suggests that her use of the phrase "organic connections" does not mean to suggest a "natural" social landscape. Rather, the section revisits "industrialization" as a gendered shift in political economy that "maintained male domination over women and children, white male domination over people of color; and it established the domination of white male owners of capital over everyone."[154] In this way, Albrecht once again underscores the interrelated social processes of gender, race, and class in creating different social locations.

Emphasizing the interrelations between social locations is clearly an aim of her rhetoric. For example, Albrecht describes a capitalist process of repeated extraction of wealth through the production of goods and services. Whether through the unwaged labor of a wife or the under-waged industrial or domestic worker, Albrecht depicts the capitalist system as channeling money to the dominant class—namely, white male capitalists. In this way, not only is the ideal model of a male breadwinner and female homemaker limited to "urban, white, middle-and upper-income families," but the model must be understood as relying on the inability of different families to reach this ideal. Dominant white, capitalist families require the labor of the working classes—male and female—to sustain their model of family and their "model home." Albrecht writes, "The cost of "ideal" families rests on the survival strategies that make other families deviant. In this way, ideals function to legitimate benefits derived from exploitative race and class relationships."[155]

---

[153] Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*, 122-123.
[154] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 51.
[155] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 53.

When Albrecht refers to the lessons "history" teaches regarding "ideals" in her final chapter, a rhetorical analysis of the second chapter thus enables a clearer sense of the concerns she brings to bear on her criticism of Browning and co-authors proposal of a new "ideal" Christian family. The problem with an "ideal" is it fails to account for the interrelated social relations and the dynamics of power. The discussion of "contexts" that Albrecht begins her book is thus pivotal to her overarching rhetorical strategy to underscore a constellation of social relations. However, in depicting this constellation of relations, Albrecht's rhetoric also suggests a tension between a depiction of an interconnected web and the retention of a line between the political economy and civic society. Most broadly, this line appears early in the text through the rhetoric of a "political economy" that intersects with the configurations of family. Underlying this particular distinction is the depiction of the dual processes of material production and social reproduction.

Although seemingly calling for an understanding of life that encompasses both material production and social reproduction, I find the depiction of life into two distinct categories to problematically echo the split between work and home. The rhetorical suggestion of retaining a line between work and home appears most strongly in a section on corporate child care. As already established early in the text, Albrecht is suspicious of the neoliberal emphasis on time and efficiency that focuses on the continued expansion of capital. In describing the appearance of corporate day care centers, Albrecht questions the "kinder, gentler capitalism" that seeks to support the care of dependents as just another "line item in an activity focused on producing capital."[156]

[156] Albrecht, *Hitting Home*, 85, 87.

To bolster her concern with "kinder, gentler capitalism," she refers to the concern of "many public intellectuals and Christian ethicists" who argue for the "strengthening civil society: that arena of institutions in which nonmarket values are learned in the intimacy of family, neighborhood, and voluntary associations."[157] With this rhetoric, Albrecht deploys the spatial language of an "arena" that problematically echoes spatial language of "spheres." Furthermore, her rhetoric draws a line between the "market" and an "arena" that includes the "family, neighborhood, and voluntary associations"—which undoubtedly she understands to include religious organizations. This line thus seems to reproduce a split between a space of work with its dangerous market values and the separate spaces of family, home, and church in which the morality of life is taught.

To better understand her concern with a line between the market and the family and home, it is helpful to revisit her opening pages. At the beginning of *Hitting Home,* Albrecht writes:

> A primary source of the "family crisis"—so prevalent in public discourse—is the instability and conflict created as people and families respond to new economic and social conditions. Families *are* being battered by the constant expansion of economic rationality into their lives and by the need to radically reorganize family life in response to the demands of the workplace.[158]

In this passage, both people and families appear to be interacting *with* changing social processes rather than to be fundamentally constituted by these same processes. The spatial image is of a person who must navigate a complicated web of social expectations and opportunities—including those imposed upon her by the "workplace."

The combination of such rhetoric suggests an implicit sense of home and work as distinct spaces or "arena" of life that are connected through an intersecting web of multiple connections.

---

[157] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 87.
[158] Albrecht, *Hitting Home,* 8-9.

However, these interactions may reshape family and home, but the underlying sense of distinctive arenas remains. Furthermore, it is important to retain this distinction and even strengthen it so that a greater balance might be achieved in both individual lives and among the uneven distributions of material goods in the U.S. and among nations.

Writing as she does in an era dominated by the rhetoric of "globalization," the text reflects a concern with the global that attempts to conscientiously highlight inequalities. However, the rhetoric of the text also has moments where the spatial depictions unevenly distinguish among nations, as mentioned above. The text also has remains largely silent on issues of colonialism. In the discussion of slavery, the discussion on capitalism shapes the entire narrative without discussion of the Trans-Atlantic political dynamics of colonialism. Or, when discussing "wars that slowed the movement west" in the U.S., the text focuses only on the impact on economic opportunities without addressing the imperialism of manifest domesticy.[159]

Like Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza's early defense of the use of social research tools in theological discussion, Albrecht also understands her work as a Christian feminist liberative ethic. Both share an emphasis on the importance of structural analysis in the service of creating a more just world. Writing after Schüssler Fiorenza, Albrecht's text indicates her indebtedness to Schüssler Fiorenza by opening two chapters with quotes of her work highlighting the importance of understanding the impact of socio-economic systems on the economic wellbeing of women. Writing after Miller-McLemore, Albrecht's text does not name her, but clearly intends to respond to her work through the attention given to her colleague Don Browning. The liberal Christian approach fails to give an adequate socio-economic analysis and consequently

[159] Albrecht, *Hitting Home*, 37.

dangerously risks reproducing systems of oppression through promotion of a (white) family ideal that relies on the inability of many to obtain it.

In short, Albrecht's depiction of work and home is a detailed analysis of the socio-economic dynamics of power that shape work and home. Despite heavily emphasizing the importance of contexts and the role of the political economy in shifting configurations of home, Albrecht's rhetoric retains a problematic sense of work and home as distinct arenas. Furthermore, the rhetoric of global connections fails to adequately address the political dynamics of postcolonialism. She begins with the claim that the fundamental question is one of how to construct a good society and attends to issue of equality as both a moral issue of justice and a political issue of citizenship. However, she does not tie either of these to questions of national identity or homeland. Home remains a concept associated with family and social reproduction. Home and the economy intersect through complex social relations and the economy is global, but home itself remains fixed as a space.

Connecting the Spaces of Home, Work, and Homeland

Where is the "place" of women? How does a woman "balance" her responsibilities to "work" and "home"? Addressing these questions in light of a critical feminist analysis of space and place helps to better identify the socio-economic dynamics at work in answering such questions. Which kinds of spaces that women are expected to be physically located within—where women "belong"—reflects not simply gender roles, but the "rules" established by dynamics of social, economic, political, and religious power for structuring complex systems of human material interaction. It is important to keep in mind the *spatiality* and subsequent materiality of human interactions occurring simultaneously at multiple scales. By not forgetting that identification and articulations of space and place are themselves a part of socio-economic

dynamics, we can better identify the dynamics of power operating in spatial discourses of places such as "home" and "work."

In critically analyzing the rhetoric of "work" and "home" in these three examples of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Bonnie Miller-McLemore, and Gloria Albrecht, I have sought to articulate how the rhetoric of "work" and "home" convey spatial conceptions of the socio-economic systems. In attempting to resolve the "problem" of work and home, these examples of feminist rhetoric convey different conceptions of the spatial relations between work and home. Schüssler Fiorenza's introduction argued that a kyriarchal systems of power structures gendered behavior and expectations both "outside" and "in" the home. This systematic approach to the "patterns" structuring women's lives clearly addresses a range of interconnected socio-economic dynamics of power on domestic, national, even global scales. However, the rhetoric of "in" and "outside" the home problematically suggests that home is a bounded space rather than multiple, fluid, and porous.

Miller-McLemore takes a psychological, historical approach to argue for feminists to develop an integrated understanding of women's work that values both reproductive labor of mothering as well as productive labors in commercial endeavors. Focusing on resolving a moral tension of a self divided between different aspects of a whole life, Miller-McLemore primarily focuses on individuals and a tension modeled from her own life as white, professional woman. Thus, the model of Orpah that she proposes does not adequately account of the complexity of socio-economic dynamics of power in structuring the "mother's house." In this way, she fails to understand how the system of separate spheres—"home" and "work"—not only functions to reinforce a gendered split in women's reproductive and productive lives, but also reinforces hierarchies of race, class, sexuality, and nationality as well. In other words, by not engaging a

political and economic structural analysis, she misses the connections between the domestic familial home, the national political homeland, and the violence beget by politics of exclusion.

Like Schüssler Fiorenza, Gloria Albrecht also articulates a complex structural analysis of the relationships between work and home. Writing within a context of "globalization" narratives, Albrecht argues for a political economic context in which to understand women's labor at the beginning of the 21st century. However, the place of "home" is not clearly implicated within this complex context. Rather, it remains generally associated with family and the domestic. Despite the events of 2001 and the creation of Homeland Security, the links between the politicized rhetoric of home and homeland remain unaddressed.

However, the names given to spaces shape the "rules" for that place. Naming a place "homeland" in 2001, after more than a decade of debates over "family values" about the ideal home, clearly suggests a rhetorical association between home and homeland. More specifically, it suggests that the hierarchal rules of socio-economic dynamics that construct the domestic home also function to reinforce white, heterosexual, married, Christian power at the national level. In this regard, articulating the political economies that comprise the interrelations between "home" and "work" must also clearly incorporate national and transnational dynamics of power to fully account for the context of our lives.

The rhetoric of "work" and "home" as distinct spaces reflects an ongoing legacy that seeks to separate "private" individual economic choices in the home as disconnected from the "public" (political) economy. This division reinforces not only hierarchies between individuals and families with differing abilities to successfully "balance" demands of work and home. For those with resources to pay for domestic labor of cleaning, childcare, and/or cooking, the ability to live a "balanced" life is much different than the global nannies that leave their own children as

they cross oceans to work as caretakers and cleaners.[160] Within families, gendered assumptions of labor often remain with women continuing to perform more household and childcare labor.[161]

To articulate the complexity of socio-economic systems shaping our daily lives on multiple scales, we need to move beyond the spatial rhetoric of "balance" or "intersection" of work and home to proffer alternative articulations of the full range of necessary labors to sustain human and planetary life. However, rather than simply remain at the level of the individual seeking strategies and choices to construct an integrated life, an account must also be given of the structural dynamics of power operating at multiple scales—from households to cities and states to national and global relations.

A feminist postcolonial rhetoric of home is needed that articulates a new spatial "map" that gives a better account of the complex, interrelated lives we lead and the connections between "local" and "global." Such a "map" would aid in analyzing the relations that exist in the political economic contexts. Critical discourses have long aimed to present just such critical analyses of how power functions. Within critical analyses of the rhetoric of work and home, the "map" of power relations would be furthered if the notion that "home" was neither singular nor stable in order to refuse the notion of a "natural" ideal. Understanding the place of "home" as fluid and multiple helps to legitimate the "non-normal" configurations of "home" and dwelling together—from married lesbian homes with children or unmarried childless homes or communal farming homes or urban month-to-month rented homes shared with strangers met through Craigslist.

How people dwell together and where they call "home" is multiple and fluid. At the same time, how people manage their economic activity in relation to their needs for shelter, food,

[160] Barbara Ehrenreich and Arlie Hochschild, *Global Women: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2003).
[161] Arlie Hochschild, *The Second Shift and the Revolution at Home* (New York: Viking, 1989).

clothing, sex, and other "domestic" activities varies widely within the U.S. and around the globe. People always are negotiating multiple socio-economic relations shaped by social practices, dynamics of power, and—as possible—individual choice.

Mapping the socio-economic relations of our lives not only allows a critical analysis of how power functions to oppress and privilege particular persons, it also enables the possibility of envisioning how to build more just socio-economic relations. In this regard, a critical feminist rhetoric analysis of home can be understood as a project of social ethics and articulating ethical visions for a just society. Whether in the rhetoric of violence and home or in the rhetoric of work and home, the rhetoric of home reinforces socio-economic systems that function to shape lives—reinforcing constellations of privilege and oppression—based on race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, nationality and religion. Ethical commitments to justice demand a critical understanding of how power functions in society. A critical rhetorical analysis of home that articulates how the notion of home participates in these dynamics of power and oppression can be a tool in subverting this power. Whether or not the rhetoric of home can also be leveraged to be a part of ethical vision of just social relations will be the topic of the next chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Normative Orientation of Home:
The Theo-ethical Rhetoric of Heaven, Paradise, and Planetarity

Dorothy closes her eyes, imagines Kansas, clicks her ruby red heels, and chants, "There's no place like home, there's no place like home." A parent comforts a child, "its okay . . . Grandma has gone home to live with Jesus in heaven." An environmental activist circulates buttons with "Home" emblazoned across an image of the planet earth. These examples point to how a notion of "home" can motivate a person to journey through a strange land, to find comfort in death, or to fight to change the world. Although home in these examples signifies three different places—a Kansas farm, a transcendent heaven, a mundane earth, each example deploys rhetoric of home in a way that intends to provide theo-ethical orientation for human action and response.

"Home" is not simply one place among many; nor is "home" simply a unique place. Rather, these examples show how "home" is deployed in a way that presumes not only attachment and desire, but also a sense of ultimate desire. As such, home functions as a rhetorical short cut that stands in for a cluster of ideals that provide theological and ethical structure and guidance. Presumed to be *good*, "home" emerges as a place value worth seeking, caring for, and defending with great conviction and energy. However, a critical feminist analysis of the rhetoric of home must ask the theo-ethical question "good *for whom?*" What is represented as "good" or "model" or "normative"? Who benefits from these representations? Who is excluded from a particular conception of the "good"?

A critical feminist analysis of the rhetoric of home can show the interaction between the theo-ethical visions of the "good" home and the material environment. As the preceding

chapters have argued, the rhetoric of home is constructed through a constellation of socio-economic dynamics of power that delineate and materially shape the places designated as "home." For example, architectural historian Gwendolyn Wright describes the "model home" as a powerful ideology within a culture that fuses together ideals of family and home.[1] By fusing the familial and the architectural, Wright's notion of the "model home" gestures towards the ways in which social ideals both shape and are shaped by the materiality of spatial structures.

The "model home" not only reflects social ideals of family, sex, and social reproduction but also the material, economic values of what constitutes the best housing and furnishings within a house. In this way, the rhetoric of "home" can function to convey an intersecting vision of the good life that encompasses familial relations, economic activity, and material well-being. According to Wright, the ideology of the "model home" is so powerful because "it seems so familiar and obvious, so accessible and desirable. An object and ideal, seemingly without controversy, this notion of home contains and obscures innumerable conflicts."[2] The sense of "home" as an uncontestable good functions to mask the dynamics of power that construct a *particular* notion of home as "good."[3]

Within Christian theo-ethical discourses, heaven has often been deployed rhetorically as (the true) home for Christians.[4] Rhetorically linking heaven and home has reinforced the

---

[1] Gwendolyn Wright, "Prescribing the Model Home," *Social Research* 58, no.1 (Spring 1991): 213-225.
[2] Wright, "The Model Home," 213.
[3] A critical discussion of how this presumption of the goodness of the "model home" contributed to the policies and politics of the mortgage bubble and subsequent 2008 economic crisis needs to be written. However, it is beyond the scope of this project.
[4] Most recently, famed evangelist Billy Graham has entitled what may be his final book *Nearing Home.* William F. Graham, Jr., *Nearing Home: Life, Faith, and Finishing Well* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2011). Notably, the same title was used for a similar themed text in 1868. William Edward Schenck and Caroline (Unspecified), *Nearing Home: Comforts and Counsels for the Aged* (Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1868).

theological and ethical sense of home as good. This chapter explores the rhetorical linkages between heaven and home to develop a sense of how the rhetoric of home functions to convey ethical normativity to particular constellations of socio-economic dynamics of power and practice. Beginning with a brief rehearsal of the historical roots of the Christian rhetoric of heaven and home in the 19th century U.S., I critically examine the particular constellations of theo-ethical values and practices upheld in the rhetoric of heaven as home. In short, I will argue that what I call "heavenly home" ethics conflate ideals of the white, heterosexual, patriarchal familial home with Christian images of heaven. This conflation seeks to render a particular "model home" as divinely sanctioned and beyond the politics of space.

Responses to the rhetorical legacy of the "heavenly home" vary within feminist and womanist Christian discourses. Some eco-feminist discourses directly challenge the rhetoric that *heaven* is home by relocating "home" from heaven to earth. This strategy seeks to reorient our ethical sense of connection to the ecological universe as well as to each other. Other feminist and womanist discourses retain visions of a "heavenly home" but re-imagine the social relations that constitute "home." In this way, alternative visions of normative social relations are imagined. A third strategy is to relocate "heaven" itself to earth. As with moving "home" to earth, moving "heaven" to earth shifts theo-ethical discussions to our earthly, planetary connections to one another. Not only does this shift undermine the possibility of a transcendent foundation to ethics, it also locates ethics within the messy multiplicity of changing constellations of spatio-socio-economic relations of power. Rather than following a heavenly blueprint for a singular eternal ideal of how we should dwell together, a feminist postcolonial analysis of the rhetoric of the heavenly home seeks to locate ethics within the spatio-socio-economic dynamics of power that construct how we dwell together in planetary life.

By exploring the rhetoric of home in relation to notions of heaven and home, the chapter argues that "home" operates as a powerful marker to orient and shape ethical commitments. In *Geography and Ethics,* the editors' write,

> Because places are basic sites of human activity, a central function which they perform is to define what is possible and allowable within their boundaries. Places are thus fundamentally normative, concerned with what is right and good conduct and where.[5]

The places of "home" and "homeland" have indeed functioned to convey a wide range of acceptable behaviors including sexual relations, care for dependents, use of animal and material resources (land use, house construction, food, energy policy), as well as "legal" immigration and violent military action to "secure" the nation.

However, "places" alone do not establish normative behavior. As political scientist Marsha Marotta explains,

> Discourses produced by institutions or "experts" communicate to the occupants of a space what should or should not be done there, what practices are acceptable there, setting normative expectations for that historical moment. But because ideologies change over time, and because interpretations may vary and normative expectation may be defied, renegotiation of space and its role in creating power relations is always possible.[6]

Many theo-ethical discourses on the places of heaven and home produced by Christian institutions and "experts" have presented the white, patriarchal Christian family as normative. However, feminist Christian interpretations of "heaven" and "home" have sought to renegotiate these spaces and their role in creating unjust and exploitative power relations. A critical feminist postcolonial analysis of the rhetoric of heaven and home rehearses these critical interventions into the discourses of normative behavior and ideals for dwelling together in planetary life.

---

[5] James D. Proctor and David M. Smith, ed., *Geography and Ethics: Journeys in a Moral Terrain*, (New York, NY: Routledge, 1999), 93.
[6] Marsha Marotta, "Motherspace: Disciplining through the Material and Discursive," in *Motherhood and Space: Configurations of the Maternal through Politics, Home, and the Body*, ed. Sarah Hardy and Caroline Wiedmer (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 15.

Heaven as the Ideal Domestic Space

Through many dangers, toils and snares
We have already come.
T'was grace that brought us safe thus far
And grace will lead us home.
--Amazing Grace

An expansive analysis of translating and interpreting the language of houses, homes, cities, and dwellings in the Christian tradition would undoubtedly be immense and beyond the scope of this project.[7] A quick glance at an English concordance for the word "house" makes it evident that the size of scriptural analysis alone would be enormous. However, for the purposes of this project, it is important to take a moment to critically reflect on the biblical rhetoric of house, home, and heaven to underscore anew the indeterminacies of biblical translation and interpretation. For feminist and postcolonial hermeneutics, this is simply a reminder that texts are written within particular socio-historical-cultural context whose social relations and practices construct spaces such as "home," "household," or "nation" differently.[8] However, as Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza has made abundantly clear throughout her work, the politics of biblical interpretation are such that one does not merely "forget" to contextualize biblical readings.[9] Rather, the ("unintentional") conflation of the biblical text with contemporary context is itself a political reading.

[7] One example of a recent work that addresses an aspects of house and home in Christianity is Carolyn Osiek and Margaret Y. MacDonald with Janet H. Tulloch, *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2006).
[8] For a general discussion of cultural hermeneutics and biblical interpretation, see Brian K. Blount, *Cultural Interpretation: Reorienting New Testament Criticism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995).
[9] Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999).

An excellent example of the challenges in interpreting Biblical language of "home" is the opening phrase of John 14:2. In the King James Version, this verse famously reads, "In my Father's house, there are many mansions," whereas the NIV reads "in my Father's house are many rooms" and the NRSV translates "in my Father's house there are many dwelling places."[10] Additional translations of the space include: lodgings, abodes, resting-places, and homes.[11] Within a contemporary U.S. context, these different translations signify very different kinds of spaces. From a "mansion" with connotations of a enormous, wealthy space to the sense of temporary, shared space of "lodgings," the rhetoric of these translations suggest very different goods are promised to those that arrive at the "Father's house."

The phrase, "my father's house" has been more consistently translated and interpreted to signify a *heavenly* dwelling place for God. Of course, this language of "father" within this phrase is itself problematic within feminist Biblical interpretation. The patriarchal language of "my father" can be understood as reifying the maleness of God as well as a gendered hierarchy of human society.[12] Also, if the place of "house" is understood within a context of first century household, or *oikos,* then, as the work of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza suggests, should feminists not question the kyriarchal relations of the household estate?[13] Furthermore, is the verse clear

[10] *The Interlinear NRSV-NIV Parallel New Testament in Greek and English*, Alfred Marshall, ed., (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993).
[11] In order: *Aramaic Bible in Plain English* (2010), *Darby Bible Translation, Weymouth New Testament*, and the *World English Bible*. Accessed online March 28, 2012, www.biblos.com.
[12] For example, Mary Daly's infamous line, "if God is male, then the male is God." *Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1985), 19.
[13] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *The Power of the Word: Scripture and the Rhetoric of Empire* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007),152-153. See especially FN 12 for additional sources on the Roman Family ideal.

where God's house is? Jesus speaks of "going to" the house of God and then cryptically explains that the disciples also "know the way."[14]

What are we to make of this spatial rhetoric describing the architecture of God's house and the directions on how to arrive there? Clearly this passage is neither an architectural blueprint nor a Google map. However, the text does draw from common language for the place of human dwelling to articulate a theo-ethical relationship between God and Christian believers.[15] Thus, as the socio-economic context of what constitutes the place of human dwelling shifts so will interpretations of John 14:2. Within the contemporary U.S. context, John 14:2 has often been interpreted to describe an otherworldly dwelling place for God to which believers would travel after death for eternity. God, heaven, and the dwelling place of God were presented as another space-time to which believers would be taken after death for eternal life with God.[16] In sum, the use of the rhetoric of house, home, and heaven in the Christian tradition must be approached critically with an understanding that the meaning of such terms arises from particular socio-economic contexts.

---

[14] "And you know the way to the place where I am going." Thomas said to him, "Lord, we do not know where you are going. How can we know the way?" Jesus said to him, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me." John 14:4-6, *NRSV*

[15] The first meaning given to the Greek term "oikos" is "house, as a building" in Walter Bauer, et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature : A Translation and Adaptation of the Fourth Revised and Augmented Edition of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch Zu Den Schriften Des Neuen Testaments Und Der Übrigen Urchristlichen Literatur*, 2nd, rev. and augmented by F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker from Walter Bauer's 5th, 1958. ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979). Likewise, the first Greek term given for "house" is "oikos" in W.E. Vine, Merrill F. Unger, William White, ed., *Vine's Expository Dictionary of Biblical Words* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1985).

[16] Because the text depicts the dwelling place of God, John 14:2 has also been read as describing the efforts of the Jewish messiah to restore the Temple. James McCaffrey, *The House with Many Rooms: the Temple Theme of John 14:2-3* (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto biblico, 1988, c1987); Bryan, Steven M. "The eschatological temple in John 14." *Bulletin For Biblical Research* 15, no. 2 (January 1, 2005): 187-198.

A particularly relevant trajectory of the rhetoric of house, home, and heaven in U.S. Christian discourse is what Ann Douglas has described as the 19th century *"feminization of American culture*."[17] According to Douglas, the 19th century saw a strengthened alliance between women and clergy. She argues this alliance was wrought by shared experiences of cultural disestablishment—clergy through the removal of state support and women by the removal of productive labor from the household with the rise of industrialism. Douglas tracks the theological and cultural paths clergy and women took to assert the value of both religion and the domestic space of home and family.

In discussing the role of consolation literature such as Elizabeth Stuart Phelps' *The Gates Ajar* (1868), Douglas argues that the exquisitely painted details of heavenly homes can be seen as a "bid for power." Namely, the logic of the genre suggests, "you are going to end up, if you are well-behaved and lucky, in a domestic realm of children, women, and ministers (i.e. angels), so why not begin to believe in them now?"[18] In other words, depicting the transcendent *heaven* as a domestic home seeks to up the ante on the value of domesticity and home in this earthly realm.[19] Furthermore, Douglas argues that detailed visions of a heavenly home reinforced not only the value of domesticity generally, but specifically a suburban, privately owned home that prized consumption and leisure. In this way, depictions of the heavenly home signaled a

[17] Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture* (New York: Noonday Press/Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1998).
[18] Douglas, *Feminization of American Culture*, 224.
[19] As Colleen McDannell writes, "The 'true' home imitated the perfect harmony experienced in Eden and heaven. Home was a foretaste of 'the joys of Heaven'; a 'sweet image of God's home on high.'" Colleen McDannell, *The Christian Home in Victorian America, 1840-1900* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 56.

"mysterious glorification inherent in the process by which an impermanent object becomes permanent."[20]

With Douglas, I would agree that representing heaven as a home modeled after the ideals of a white, suburban, heterosexual, consuming, Christian household functions to make this particular "model home" as both eternally "permanent" as well as theo-ethically normative. Douglas depicts this literature as a "bid for power."[21] While agreeing, I would argue that describing heaven in such terms not only reinforced the power of the white, educated authors, but also of the entire socio-economic system that produced this particular "model home." These theo-ethical discourses of consolation literature interacted with mid-19th century social relations of power in the U.S. to construct spaces of "work," "home," "church," and "nation." By depicting the eternal, transcendent "heavenly home" upon a model of an earthly "home," the social relations based upon hierarchies of race, class, and gender not only remain fundamentally unchallenged, but are also made eternally normative by identifying them as the model for God's "home" in heaven.

The continued rhetorical connections between heaven, family, home, and nation are evident within conservative U.S. Christian culture today. By fusing together family and home, the rhetoric of heaven and home can be understood as depicting a particular "model home" that reinforces particular constellations of social relations of power. For example, in the best-selling book *The Purpose Driven Life,* evangelical pastor Rick Warren grounds the purpose and actions of life in preparing for an eternity in heaven.[22]

---

[20] Douglas, *Feminization of American Culture*, 226.
[21] Douglas, *Feminization of American Culture*, 224.
[22] Rick Warren, *The Purpose Driven Life: what on Earth Am I Here For?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Press, 2002), 34.

Describing heaven, Warren writes, "God is preparing an eternal home for us. In heaven we will be reunited with loved ones who are believers, released from all pain and suffering, rewarded for our faithfulness on earth, and reassigned to do work that we will enjoy doing."[23] Warren's rhetoric suggests a normative *eternal* heaven is comprised of "loved ones," Christian "believers," no pain or suffering, "rewards" for the "faithful" (suggestive of both Christian belief as well as marital fidelity), and enjoyable work. Within this framework, strangers, non-"believers," pain, suffering, infidelity, and boring jobs are deviant. If this framework is read through the contemporary U.S. context from which Warren speaks, deviance includes immigrant (non-white) strangers, Muslims (non-Christian), unmarried sex (especially non-heterosexual), and mundane work whose undesirability often makes it poorly paid and filled with non-white and/or non-male employees. In other words, white, well-employed, married, heterosexual, Christian men who are citizens of the U.S. represent the normative ideals depicted in Warren's heaven. When Warren portrays a particular understanding of the place of "heaven," he articulates a constellation of normative socio-economic relations that are rendered normative through their location in the "eternal home" of heaven.

Amidst the constellation of theo-ethical practices in the rhetoric of heaven and home in conservative Christian discourse, the gendered, familial space of home is evident. For example, in the chorus of a song by award winning contemporary Christian singer Mark Schultz entitled, "When You Come Home," a mother comforts a small boy who has scraped his knee:

When you come home,
No matter how far,
Run through the door
And into my arms
It's where you are loved,
It's where you belong

[23] Warren, *Purpose Driven Life*, 39.

And I will be here
When you come home[24]

As the narrative of the song's verses progresses, the boy grows to a man beside his mother's deathbed. After asking her son "to promise me before I go," the song transitions to the chorus "When you come home." Thus, the son is asked to promise his dying mother that he will "come home" to heaven and be reunited with her there. In this way, the gendered comfort of the domestic space lauded within conservative "family values" becomes rhetorically linked to a gendered comfort of a family reunion in heaven after death. Clearly, this echoes the 19th century connections between family and heaven that Douglas discusses.

Similarly, in *Simple Hospitality,* Jane Jarrell connects Martha Stewart style chapters on creating practices of hospitality in an earthly home to discuss our relationship with our heavenly home.[25] Within Jarrell's trope of gendered hospitality, the most "hospitable" act a woman can do is to share a message of salvation thereby insuring others have the opportunity to make a reservation for a heavenly home. Conversely, Jarrell presents the heavenly home God offers as an extension of hospitality to us. Hospitality becomes a trope to uphold practices of care and domestic comfort. [26] By identifying these same practices with divine care and heavenly homes, the mundane practices of reproducing a gendered, domestic space of care take on larger ethical and spiritual purposes. However, she does not analyze the socio-economic relations of race, gender, or class that underline the married, heterosexual, middle-class, single family home that her text presumes. In this way, she conflates a particular constellation of socio-economic

[24] Mark Schultz, "When You Come Home," *Mark Schultz*, 2000 (Word Entertainment)
[25] Jane Jarrell, *Simple Hospitality* (Nashville: W Publishing Group, 2005), 25.
[26] A more critical feminist postcolonial engagement with the theme of hospitality can be found in Letty M. Russell, *Just Hospitality: God's Welcome in a World of Difference*, ed. J. Shannon Clarkson and Kate M. Ott (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009).

relations of power that construct her notion of "home" with heavenly ideals of behavior that God extends to us and expects from us.

Within a critical feminist postcolonial analysis, these examples of the conservative Christian rhetoric of home and heaven problematically portray socio-economic relations that reinforce hierarchies of race, class, gender, and nation as reflective of the space of the "heavenly home." In this way, a particular constellation of socio-economic relations of power that construct the earthly spaces of home also function to construct the "heavenly home." Because spaces and the discourses about spaces convey expectations for normative behavior within a space, the interwoven spaces of heaven and home likewise reinforce ethical images of normativity for both spaces. However, because these examples presume a theology of heaven as both *transcendent* and *eternal*, the space of heaven is understood to be an unchanging, fixed space separate from any socio-economic relations of mundane power. Consequently, the rhetoric of a heavenly home functions to reinforce a particular constellation of socio-economic relations of power as apolitical, eternal truths to be upheld as *God's* model for human dwelling together.

This logic of an eternal, apolitical design for human relationships is clearly evident is contemporary conservative rhetoric against same-sex marriage. For example, in an online Family Research Council pamphlet entitled "The Bible's Teaching on Marriage and the Family," Andreas J. Kostenberger ties the "current cultural crisis" of marriage and family to the failure to uphold a narrow Biblical definition of family as "the union of one man and one woman in matrimony which is normally blessed with one or several natural or adopted children."[27] Any deviations from this family pattern through socio-historical context are interpreted by

[27] Andreas J. Kostenberger, "The Bible's Teaching on Marriage and the Family," (Family Research Council, 2011), accessed March 28, 2012, http://www.frc.org/brochure/the-bibles-teaching-on-marriage-and-family

Kostenberger as the effects of sin—including "homosexuality." According to Kostenberger, "The New Testament teaches that the restoration of God's original design for marriage in Christ is part of God's realignment of all things under Christ's authority and lordship."[28] In other words, a singular, unchanging model based on God's transcendent design of "family" constructs the normative ethic for human sexuality, reproduction, and dwelling together.

Relocating Home from Heaven to Earth

One critical response to the rhetoric of heaven as home can be found in the work of Sallie McFague and other ecofeminist Christians. Namely, there is an effort to move away from the rhetoric of a transcendent heaven as a home toward an understanding of *earth* as our home. While Rosemary Radford Ruether used the rhetoric of "earth as home," the most extensive use of the rhetoric of "earth as home" appears in *The Body of God* by Sallie McFague. In this section, I will begin by discussing Radford Ruether's rhetoric of home before moving to McFague's use of "home" in *The Body of God.* Critically analyzing the deployment of the rhetoric of home in *The Body of God* demonstrates how feminist interventions in the rhetoric of the heavenly home re-imagine theo-ethical models that connect humans to one another, to the earth, and to God.

To reject notions of an eternal, transcendent heavenly home, Rosemary Radford Ruether begins *Gaia and God* by critiquing creation stories. She addresses creation stories because they "not only reflect current science . . . but they are also blueprints for society."[29] By describing creation stories as blueprints, Radford Ruether connects theo-ethical social practices with metaphors and tools of constructing buildings and a material landscape. In this way, creation stories can be understood as literally shaping and constructing a particular social and material

[28] Kostenberger, "The Bible's Teaching on Marriage and the Family."
[29] Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Gaia and God: An Ecofeminst Theology of Earth Healing* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992), 15.

topography. Radford Ruether describes the "classical" creation story from Plato to develop her case against the heavenly home:

> Like the body, "prisonhouse" of the soul, earth is the collective prison of incarnated souls, which must work their way out of this fallen state to return to their "true home" in the starry heavens. Earth and body, once dominated and made inferior, are now fled altogether in the quest of the male mind to free itself from the "contamination" of mortality and to secure immortal life.[30]

Radford Ruether suggests that this Platonic view of creation became synthesized with Christian cosmology.

Through this synthesis with the Platonic creation story, argues Ruether, Christian theology inherited an earth-centered, hierarchal view of the universe with earth at the lowest point and God dwelling in the "eternal space" beyond the stars.[31] The heliocentric view of the universe presented by Copernicus and Galileo challenged this earth-centered understanding—upsetting the imagined hierarchy of the cosmos. With the loss of this spatial hierarchy of heaven and earth, the "world picture of where God dwells and the soul, with its transfigured body, 'goes' at death disappears."[32] The shift in scientific understanding revised the spatial blueprint that mapped theological claims onto a particular description of the relationship between heaven and earth. The location of God and heaven "beyond" the stars became more problematic.

Another shift in scientific metaphors occurs, according to Radford Ruether, with the advent of the "Big Bang Theory." With this theory, a "new" creation story emerges in which humans become kin with distant stars as well as with all living things by sharing a common origin of "stardust."[33] This "*kinship"* between humanity and the material cosmos becomes the basis upon which Radford Ruether develops her ecological ethic. Within this creation story, the

---

[30] Radford Ruether, *Gaia and God,* 26.
[31] Radford Ruether, *Gaia and God,* 28.
[32] Radford Ruether, *Gaia and God,* 34.
[33] Radford Ruether, *Gaia and God,* 41 and 48.

blueprint inextricably locates humans within the cosmos while further obscuring the possibility of a God located "beyond" the stars. Consequently, Radford Ruether is similarly critical of apocalyptic theologies that pursue escapist fantasies that, like Platonic eschatology, seek to flee the mundane material world.[34] In contrast to this otherworldly out, Radford Ruether notes that scientific culture does not appeal to an external deity or world for escape. Rather, "we have no home outside the earth."[35] In this way, Radford Ruether denounces the possibility of a home in the heavens even as she re-locates "home" on earth.

Although Radford Ruether does not frequently deploy the rhetoric of home in her eco-feminist theology, she consistently does so in relation to Plato and discussions of an otherworldly heaven. She does so as direct confrontation to the hierarchal norm that she identifies with the rhetoric of heaven as home. In rejecting this norm in the rhetoric of "heavenly home," her principal concern appears to be developing an ecological ethic that emphasizes the kinship of humanity and creation. While challenging the hierarchal norms in the rhetoric of the "heavenly home," Radford Ruether does not challenge the gendered imagery and in fact retains the language of "home" to develop a new vision of kinship.

Radford Ruether is clearly concerned with the ways patriarchal power has used the rhetoric of an "earth fleeing ethic." She denounces the "despising of finite but renewable life"

---

[34] However, Radford Ruether does give a place for apocalyptic thought as an "offspring" of prophetic challenges to the systems of political and religious power that intend to shift earthly behavior. This possibility will be discussed at more length in the next section. Radford Ruether, *Gaia and God*, 83. For examples of escapist apocalyptic thought see, Hal Lindsey, *The Late Great Planet Earth* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Press, 1970) and Tim F. LaHaye, *Left Behind: a Novel of Earth's Last Days* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 1995). For a feminist critique of this genre, see Barbara R. Rossing, *The Rapture Exposed: the Message of Hope in the Book of Revelation* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2004).

[35] Radford Ruether, *Gaia and God*, 86.

and suggests that it is linked to "despising women as birth givers."[36] On the one hand, her language of women as birth givers clearly suggests a problematic norm for women as mothers. On the other hand, her intended point is to resist a patriarchal rejection of women or activities associated with women as being sinful or deviant.[37] Radford Ruether is also strongly critical of the hierarchal dualist lens that rejects "religious, social, sexual, and racial-ethnic 'aliens'." [38] Her rhetoric clearly seeks to resist the use of patriarchal hierarchies to exclude some as "aliens" or "strangers" who do not belong. By using scare quotes when invoking the language of "aliens," Radford Ruether's text challenges this boundary of exclusion as she promotes her own cosmology of kinship within an ecofeminist ethic of an earthly home.

Unlike Radford Ruether's limited use of the rhetoric of home, the rhetoric of home is central in *The Body of God* by Sallie McFague. Like Radford Ruether's discussion of creation stories, McFague also develops a cosmological model to establish an understanding of connections between God, humanity, and earth. To secure these connections, McFague heavily deploys the rhetoric of home. In short, for McFague, the earth is our one, shared home and ecology is the study of "house rules." In this way, the notion of "home" provides a normative grounding for theo-ethical practices. Although "home" is located as earth not heaven, the rhetorical association of "home" as an ethical model to articulate and shape ethical ideals remains. Significantly, McFague makes an explicitly ethical argument against viewing heaven as home. Namely, she credits the Christian belief that we can exist apart from our bodies "here

---

[36] Radford Ruether, *Gaia and God*, 140.
[37] The rejection that motherhood is normative for women can be found in early white feminist critiques such as Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*. Indeed, de Beauvoir's analysis of a patriarchal dualism of mind/body; male/female is echoed in Radford Ruether's depiction. For a cultural analysis of differing views of "women as birth givers," see Emily Martin, *The Woman in the Body: A Cultural Analysis of Reproduction* (Boston:: Beacon Press, 1987).
[38] Radford Ruether, *Gain and God*, 139.

or 'in heaven'" as contributing to an inability to love the "body" of earth. A cosmological blueprint that locates a heavenly beyond as home contributes to an ethical disregard of the earth. Thus, her ethical concern lies not only with human social relations but also with an ecological care of the earth.

In contrast to a heavenly home, McFague proposes not only an understanding of the earth as our home, but of the earth as the body of God. McFague writes: "the body is the home of everything we value, both in ourselves and others."[39] McFague's rhetoric of home in this key sentence again imports rhetorical associations of home as a location of special ethical import. Rhetorically, the sentence could simply read, "the body is the location/container/space." But, by choosing to deploy the rhetoric of "home"—especially in deliberate contrast to the rhetoric of a heavenly home—the body as an ethical topography of values is reinforced. Because she grants such high status to the body as "home" of theo-ethical values, McFague accordingly argues for a cosmological model of an organic body that is home to all living things—including us, including God. She writes:

> There is no more convincing form of persuasion than to be welcomed home and to feel at home, and for Christians who have been made to feel that we do not, in a fundamental sense, belong on the earth (for our home is in another world), the organic model invites us to be at home here on the earth. [40]

Although the organic model of earth as our home echoes Radford Ruether's emphasis of a shared kinship, McFague carefully argues that a common story of scientific origin promotes both unity *and* diversity. On the one hand, the common story is one of shared origins and interdependency. On the other hand, attention to creation reveals a vast multiplicity of creatures and habitats, species and kind. The tension to maintain both interdependency and diversity

[39] Sallie McFague, *The Body of God: An Ecological Theology*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 23.
[40] McFague, *Body of God*, 31.

wends through McFague's ethical and theological project. For example, the recognition that resources of our shared planetary "home" are finite must be held in tension with the awareness that different living things have particular needs.[41]

McFague's ethical aim is not a single, static blueprint for a shared "home." Rather, she promotes principles of "sustainability and livability: not the kingdom of God, but a decent life in community for all life-forms and the eco-system on which they rely."[42] In this way, a description of home as finite and interdependently shared by diverse creatures produces particular ethical norms of sustainability and livability. Conversely, McFague defines sin as the "unwillingness to stay in our place, to accept our proper limits." [43] "Limits," "sustainability" and "livability" are not narrowly defined, but are intended to function as broad ethical ideals to shape socio-economic dynamics of power as they function to construct particular social relations and structures.

Although McFague's choice of title, *The Body of God*, clearly reflects how the text foregrounds notions of *body*, she returns again and again to the point that earth is our *home*. As noted above, McFague, in fact, describes the body as a home. On one level, such rhetoric appears to make earth, home, and body interchangeable. However, to understand the rhetorical work that "home" does in McFague's argument, it is helpful to place her within the larger context of conservative Christian theo-ethical discourses of heaven.

Specifically, it is rhetorically significant that McFague retains the rhetoric of "home" but relocates "home" from an eternal, transcendent heavenly home to a home on *earth*. By

[41] For an interesting case-study in the ethical tensions between human and plant needs, see "Must Java Have No Forests? Nature Preserves and Human Population Pressures," in Christine E. Gudorf and James E. Huchingson, *Boundaries: a Casebook in Environmental Ethic*s (Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2003), 73-89.
[42] McFague, *Body of God*, 68.
[43] McFague, *Body of God*, 113.

deploying such rhetoric as "house rules," McFague points to an ethical connection by which the space of "home" is understood to carry with it particular expectations of normative behavior.[44] Furthermore, the linkage between earth, home, and the "body of God" functions to retain the rhetoric of "home" as a site of ultimate belonging and connection to God, to humanity, and to the earth. Thus, "earth as home" emerges as a space that, like the heavenly home, conveys theo-ethical expectations for the normative behavior of dwelling together in a shared space. In other words, the rhetoric of "home" functions as a short cut for conveying a deep sense of normativity, ethical ideals, and ultimate belonging to an audience steeped in the rhetorical language of heaven as the beloved, true home. Heaven may be ethically dethroned within McFague's ecofeminist theology, but "home" as the space of ethical normativity remains.

As with Radford Ruether's critique of patriarchal hierarchies, McFague's particular theo-ethical aim clearly seeks to enact feminist goals of greater justice—expanded to not only include human communities, but also animals, plants, and the material cosmos. However, the continued use of the rhetoric of home problematically risks importing notions of "home" as a hierarchal, gendered space of "belonging." Women have too long been told that they "belong" in a place called home. Kyriarchal models have too long deployed domestic ideologies to reinforce hierarchies of race, class, gender, sexuality, and nation to uncritically foreground the rhetoric of home—especially in discourses that seek to describe theo-ethical visions for the Christian life.[45]

Significantly, not all ecofeminist Christian discourses have relied on the rhetoric of home to underscore human location within the material cosmos. For example, Latin American feminist

[44] James D. Proctor and David M. Smith, *Geography and Ethics*, 93.
[45] Another key example in feminist Christian discourses of an effort to recuperate the rhetoric of home and household can be found in Letty M Russell, *Authority in the Household of Freedom* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987). In trying to reconfigure the ethical relations in the home, Russell seeks to reclaim domestic imagery within the biblical text to craft a more just household.

Ivone Gebara rarely uses the rhetoric of home in her book, *Longing for Running Water.* Despite the virtual absence of the rhetoric of home, Gebara echoes many of the ecofeminist principles in Radford Ruether and McFague.[46] First, the importance of developing a consciousness of the connections between humanity, God, and all of creation is fundamental for her as well. For Gebara, this emphasis appears through a rhetoric of "relatedness" which she explores throughout her book.

Notably, unlike the rhetoric of kinship or home, Gebara's notion of "relatedness" conveys a sense of interconnection without also importing problematic domestic ideologies of "home" or "kin." Nor does she juxtapose her conceptions of relatedness to notions of a "heavenly home." However, Gebara does reject theology that emphasizes "godly matters over worldly and human ones" and calls for a refusal of such divisions as neither real, nor willed by God.[47] In these ways, Gebara demonstrates a critique of the ideologies constituting the heavenly home without directly engaging the rhetoric of home. This also highlights the question of whether or not the rhetoric of home or kinship is even necessary to convey social and material connectedness.

Like McFague, Gebara emphasizes not only the interconnected unity of a shared cosmic origin, but also the vast multiplicity: "we are all one and the same Sacred Body in multiple and diverse expressions."[48] Also like McFague, Gebara uses language of body to emphasize the importance of everyday materiality and space in ethical considerations. Within the context of Latin American Liberation Theologies, Gebara foregrounds a preference for the poor even as she

[46] Gebara makes minimal reference to "home" as a place of eating and in the phrase "ancestral homes." Although these uses could be critically analyzed, they play no significant role in her framing of ecofeminst theology nor ethical visions.
[47] Ivone Gebara, *Longing for Running Water: Ecofeminism and Liberation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 56-57.
[48] Gebara, *Longing*, 82.

expands the notion of "poor" to include animals, plants, and eco-systems in poor health. However, Gebara also engages the rhetoric of body through Trinitarian discourse that traces relatedness not only among God, but also examines Trinitarian relatedness on earth, among human persons and cultures, in every person, as well as with good and evil.

Through these discourses of relatedness, Gebara depicts a "process of construction and deconstruction, of creation and elimination" that is "integral to the fabric of our lives, to our everyday lived reality."[49] By depicting shifting processes as the "fabric" of our lives, Gebara suggests a normative vision of spatio-socio-economic relations that is radically unstable and shifting. Such a vision produces an understanding of "body" that does not seek to draw firm, static boundaries. Rather, Gebara proclaims, "everything is our body" in a Trinitarian relatedness of "continual tension and communion of multiplicity and unity."[50] In this way, Gebara deploys the mystery of the complex interrelatedness of the Trinity to be a model and metaphor for the complex array of shifting social and material relations that form the "fabric" of our lives together with the animals, plants, and planet.

Within the feminist geographical language of Gillian Rose, Gebara's vision is one of "plurilocality" which recognizes "two-dimensional social maps are inadequate" and calls for "spaces structured over many dimensions."[51] How is a multiplicity of shifting, changing relations to be mapped? As another example of "plurilocality," geographer Edward Soja identifies Gloria

[49] Gebara, *Longing*, 170.
[50] Gebara, *Longing*, 170.
[51] Gillian Rose, *Feminism and Geography* (Cambridge, Polity Press, 1993), 124. Quoted in Edward W. Soja, "Thirdspace: Expanding the Scope of the Geographical Imagination," in *Human Geography Today*, ed. Doreen Massey, John Allen, and Philip Sarre (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1999), 273.

Anzaldúa's notion of "*mestiza,* or *mestizaje,* another way of being outside and inside at the same time."[52] He quotes:

> As a *mestiza,* I have no country, my homeland casts me out; yet all countries are mine because I am every woman's sister or potential lover. (As a lesbian I have no race, my own people disclaim me: but I am all races because there is the queer of me in all races.)[53]

In this quote, Anzaldúa blurs boundaries not only of her own identity, but of also of the meaning of national citizenship as well as the "citizenship" of sexual "races." Crossing borders, she cannot be mapped in two-dimensions of where and how she "belongs." She is "plurilocal" within a complex constellation of spatio-socio-economic relations of power.

Likewise, Gebara's notion of a "Trinitarian interrelatedness" resists a two-dimensional mapping of connections between humanity, earth, God, and ethics. Focusing on both relatedness and an ongoing "process of construction and deconstruction, of creation and elimination," it is not surprising when Gebara advocates the following ethic:

> [E]ach generation must rediscover, through mutual aid and surely also by learning from its past, new forms of shared living that will permit, to the greatest possible extent, the flourishing of the life of all beings and the development of each individual.[54]

In the plurilocal process of "relatedness," dwelling together requires a process of construction and deconstruction that is ongoing and deeply relational with all of planetary life.

Although Gebara does not deploy the rhetoric of home in these passages, she makes it clear in her citations and discussions that she is in dialogue with both Ruether and McFague. Thus, her decision to not use any rhetoric of home strikes me as a significant and intentional elision that refocuses her concerns away from the legacy of the "heavenly home." Gebara does

---

[52] Edward W. Soja, "Thirdspace," 274.
[53] Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Press, 1987), 128-9. Quoted in Edward W. Soja, "Thirdspace," 274.
[54] Gebara, *Longing,* 98.

write, "Some readers may be a bit disappointed that I have not spoken more of heaven, of the angels, of the embrace of the Father who awaits us at the gates of paradise, of the joyful reunion with those we have loved or would like to have known."[55] Clearly a reference to the 19th century legacy of the "heavenly home," Gebara goes on to grant a role to such visions as "dreams" of consolation, but adds that as a mystery, the after-life "will be what it will be."[56] Again and again throughout *Longing for Running Water*, Gebara's focus is on the material here and now of sustaining planetary life.

In the opening pages of her book, Gebara briefly mentions Marcel Gauchet's prediction of a crisis in religions of transcendence and in "the model that leads us to look for the grounding of this world somewhere outside of it."[57] Referencing Gauchet's belief in a similar crisis for nation-states, Gebara describes her own work as a presentation of the crisis in transcendent religion "in the light of the environmental crisis and of the current crisis in relations within the human community."[58] In other words, Christian notions of the transcendent are interwoven with social, political, and environmental interrelations.[59] By moving away from discourses of the heavenly home as well as its derivative earthly "home," Gebara presents a different vision of social and earthly relations whose ethics are not grounded upon visions of a transcendent heaven or even a "model home," but by a mundane socio-historical process of continuing relatedness in the promotion of the flourishing of life.

---

[55] Gebara, *Longing*, 161.
[56] Gebara, *Longing*, 161.
[57] Gebara, *Longing*, 7. Marcel Gauchet, *Le désenchantement du monde: Une histoire politique de la religion*, (Paris: Gallimard, 1985).
[58] Gebara, *Longing*, 7.
[59] For a critique of the role of notions of transcendence in civil religion in the U.S., see Richard K Fenn, *Beyond Idols: The Shape of a Secular Society* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Apocalyptic Hope and Re-Imagining the Heavenly Home

The rhetoric of home and heaven not only functions to convey another *space* than the planet earth, but also another *time*. Of course, within an Einsteinian framework, space and time are not separate but form a continuum. For feminist geographer Doreen Massey, this space-time continuum means that places are not static, nor can time be understood independently of the spatial dimension. In this way, places are the spatial manifestation of time rather than a setting upon which time happens.[60] Keeping this space-time continuum in mind is helpful in discussing apocalyptic visions of heaven as home. By articulating an understanding of a heavenly home as an alternative *space-time,* the apocalyptic rhetoric of home can function to inspire hope in another possible world.

While such apocalyptic rhetoric of a heavenly home may function to undergird the kind of escapist theologies Radford Ruether and McFague critique, Radford Ruether also makes room for the possibility of apocalyptic thought as an "offspring" of prophetic challenges to the systems of political and religious power that intend to shift earthly behavior.[61] In other words, sometimes images of heaven as home can function to re-imagine the space of heaven and, subsequently, the normative behaviors and ideals for earthly as well as heavenly spaces. In the same way that the conservative Christian rhetoric of heaven as home can function to undergird a particular ethical vision for structuring social relations in this world, so can re-imagining the heavenly home articulate prophetic challenges to the world as it is structured today in space-time.

A powerful illustration of the prophetic re-imagining of a different space-time can be found in Martin Luther King's speech during the March on Washington in 1963. In a 1973 essay, entitled "Choosing to Stay at Home: Ten Years After the March on Washington," Alice Walker

[60] Doreen Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*, 260-1.
[61] Radford Ruether, *Gaia and God*, 83.

remembers her trip from Boston to Washington. Born in Georgia, Walker was spending the summer in Boston to work for money for college in the fall. Walker recounts portions of King's speech:

> And when he spoke of "letting freedom ring" across "the green hills of Alabama and the red hills of Georgia" I saw again what he was uniquely able to make me see: that I, in fact, had claim to the land of my birth. Those red hills of Georgia were mine, and nobody was going to force me away from them until I myself was good and ready to go.[62]

King's prophetic dream of a reconfigured social-material landscape allows Walker to reorient her connection to the "land of my birth." Recognizing her claim to this land enables Walker to question the (in)ability of Walker and her Southern sisters and brothers to *stay home*.

Walker laments the "lack of jobs, money, power, and respect" that had driven so many North—including her own summer job in Boston.[63] Walker longs for a world in which she is not forced to leave her "home" with the "countryside" that includes the house where her mother was born, the old pine tree where her father rested on his way to school, or the land that generations of her ancestors worked—"and briefly owned."[64] Despite these social-material relations connecting her to the landscape, Walker also writes that racist boundaries of "*place*" [her emphasis] left her as "an exile in my own town."[65] In considering the passing of time, Walker can point to changes in the social and material landscape that had granted increased accessibility to public spaces for blacks—the black teen swimming in the motel pool, the absence of "Whites Only" signs. And yet, Walker describes how brutal and soul-draining memories of exclusion and violence haunt her enjoyment of this landscape.

---

[62] Alice Walker, "Choosing to Stay at Home: Ten Years After the March on Washington," *In Search of our Mother's Gardens* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1983), 160.
[63] Alice Walker, "Choosing to Stay at Home," 160.
[64] Alice Walker, "Choosing to Stay at Home," 162.
[65] Alice Walker, "Choosing to Stay at Home," 162.

Walker's essay demonstrates the notion that places are not static, but change with time. Furthermore, the essay describes how socio-economic structures function to construct "*place*"—understood both as social location and the material landscape. A "place" is neither fixed in space, nor in time. Just as maps that trace the roads must always be redrawn, so are the socio-economic structures that shape social location always changing. By locating social change within a spatial landscape, King's speech envisions a reconfigured space-time in a way that also shifted how Walker understood her own location within a constellation of socio-economic relations and practices.

Moreover, the changing contours of the socio-economic relations constituting Walker's space reshaped the possibilities for her movement within the United States. In 1973, Walker still lived in the South. She insists that it will not be fear that makes her leave. Rather, "it will be because I have freed myself to go; and it will be My Choice."[66] Her rhetoric clearly echoes King's dream of a space of freedom for blacks to move without force or exclusion in the South. In this way, King's rhetoric of a dream of a reconfigured social-material landscape helped to create just such a space in a future time. In other words, articulating a vision of a "new" space in a "future" time reshaped the space-time of the initial rhetorical moment by helping to change the social relations that constituted the space of the "South." It is in this sense that I suggest apocalyptic thought of a heavenly home can function as a challenge to remake the social-material landscape without falling into escapist or anti-Earth sentiments.

Theo-ethical visions of a better—even a perfect—world function to shape the constellation of spatio-socio-economic relations that constitute "dwelling together." In her inaugural address as the first woman president of the *Society of Christian Ethics,* feminist

[66] Alice Walker, "Choosing to Stay at Home," 170.

Christian ethicist Beverly Harrison argued for a vision of justice to animate Christian ethics. Harrison engages a kind of teleology that focuses not on "consequences or the identification of concrete ends," but on teleology as "a purposive sense of vocation or lifestyle."[67] Furthermore, Harrison contends that "theological images and metaphors of justice" comprise the "axiological and aesthetic" aspects of ethical theory:

> They shape our sense of *what sort of community would be beautiful to behold.* Our images of justice provide intimations, imaginative envisagements, of what constitutes the good of the whole society. So while theological notions of justice specify neither the range of concrete goods and values for which we ought to strive in the immediate future, nor principles of sufficient specificity to adjudicate conflicts of interest, they do ground our sense of purpose and order our direction as moral agents and communities. They give some clues for prioritizing our principles and identifying our concrete goals. [my emphasis][68]

By depicting "what sort of community would be beautiful to behold," theological images and metaphors of justice have a key role in Christian ethics.

Namely, theo-ethical images of the beautiful community provide a vision not only for a particular space, but for the kind of socio-economic relations that would be considered normative for that space. As Harrison notes, such teleological images may not provide concrete rules and principles, yet they do function to provide "intimations" and "clues" of what a "beautiful" community might look like. Joining with liberation theologies, Harrison contents that there are no "blueprints for a just world."[69] Rather, it is only by "engaging in the struggle for justice" that "we gain intimations of what rightly ordered community" means.[70] In this way, visions of

---

[67] Beverly Wildung Harrison, "The Dream of a Common Language: Toward a Normative Theory of Justice in Christian Ethics," in *Justice in the Making: Feminist Social Ethics*, ed. Elizabeth Bounds, et al. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 17. In distinguishing between two types of teleology, Harrison cites the work of Dorothy Emmet, *The Moral Prism* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979), esp. 5-17, 42-61.
[68] Harrison, *Justice in the Making*, 17.
[69] Harrison, *Justice in the Making*, 21.
[70] Harrison, *Justice in the Making*, 21.

justice and the "rightly ordered" community that is "beautiful to behold" help to re-imagine socio-economic relations toward spaces of peace and justice.

The rhetoric of the heavenly home can function in this way to depict an "imaginative envisagement" of a beautiful and rightly ordered community. I understand the impact of King's "I Have a Dream" speech on Alice Walker and so many others as this kind of "imaginative envisagement" that mapped an alternative constellation of socio-economic space and reshaped theo-ethical ideals of moral action. Within feminist Christian ethical discourse, I find that the work of womanist Emilie Townes likewise provides a number of powerful examples of "imaginative envisagements." By incorporating poetry as well as finely crafted prose into her ethical texts, Townes' work reflects both the "axiological and aesthetic" aspects of moral discourse. The aesthetic vision of justice plays a key role in Townes' work. Within this vision, the rhetoric of home has played a role in depicting re-imagined notions of "heaven."

In Emilie Townes' 1995 book, *In a Blaze of Glory*, she articulates her understanding of "womanist spirituality as social witness."[71] For Townes, womanist spirituality is foremost a *lived* spirituality that does not separate Christian faith from earthly life. Townes situates *lived* spirituality within the religious life of African American slaves who blended Christianity with African cosmology. Within African cosmology, explains Townes, the secular and sacred were not separate. Rather, forces of good and evil were understood to permeate the material, earthly realm. In this way, earthly life was imbued with spiritual meaning. Within the Judeo-Christian religious legacy, Townes identifies the importance of the story of the Exodus of slaves out of

[71] Emilie M. Townes, *In a Blaze of Glory: Womanist Spirituality as Social Witness* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995).

Egypt upon African American lived spirituality. The Exodus story produced a sense of a "God who was not wholly transcendent, but immanent as well."[72]

Townes constructs a notion of God who is concerned not only with spirituality in terms of otherworldly faith, but with the social, material, and bodily well being of people struggling with oppression.[73] However, the framework of lived spirituality in which religious belief informed socio-economic relations of power could either reinforce the status quo or inspire its transformation. On the one hand, the combination of "social status, race, and illiteracy" among some pious slaves functioned to create a socio-religious framework of right and wrong that reinforced the "place" of slaves as inferior.[74] On the other hand, interpretations of Christianity among slaves that highlighted divine action towards justice in this world could be hidden in plain view through the lyrics of spiritualism that not only communicated a spiritual message but also news of the Underground Railroad.[75]

Throughout *Blaze of Glory*, Townes builds her case for understanding womanist spirituality as a social witness of lived faith. In contrast to this understanding of faith engaged in promoting the social and spiritual well being of the African-American community, Townes criticizes white, Western Christian theology that emphasizes individual salvation linked to an otherworldly, male God. Through a critical engagement with the novel *The Color Purple* by

---

[72] Townes, *Blaze of Glory*, 21.
[73] For a discussion of Townes and womanist ethics, see Stacey M. Floyd-Thomas, *Mining the Motherlode: Methods in Womanist Ethics* (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 2006). One trajectory of method Floyd-Thomas traces is a link to liberation theology. For more on the link between liberation theology and liberation ethics, see Thomas L. Schubeck, *Liberation Ethics: Sources, Models, and Norms* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).
[74] Townes, *Blaze of Glory*, 24. The depiction of Uncle Tom of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is perhaps the best known example of Christian belief reinforcing the place of slaves as inferior through a piety that insisted on obedience rather than rebellion.
[75] Townes, *Blaze of Glory*, 24. However, on page 70 Townes also refers to Delores William criticism of spirituals that only see relief from slavery's oppression in the next life.

Alice Walker, Townes distinguished between the otherworldly, male God of Celie who does not intervene in her suffering of domestic violence and Shug's God who is "beyond Gender, a God who is Spirit and intimately connected to the fabric of the universe."[76] God is not simply otherworldly, but a Spirit within the relations that constitute the world who works to shape the world towards healing and justice.

Townes reading of Shug's God underscores an understanding of womanist spirituality that encounters God in the transformation of life in this world and not simply accepting suffering as one waits for the next life in a transcendent heavenly home. Rather, Townes explains: "The home that Celie and Albert create for themselves is rooted in Celie's conversion to the God who is in creation, listening intently and passionately to the injustice and justices we do."[77] Townes cites this change from a home racked by domestic violence to a relationship of compassionate care as an example of how "Shug's God in and of creation calls us to recreate our material and spiritual homes."[78] Although Townes uses the rhetoric of home in both of these excerpts, she does so in a way that underscores that "home" itself is not a singular ideal, but a malleable place transformable to approximate social relations of justice and love in better or worse ways. Furthermore, Townes links the "home" to a larger project of divine engagement in the material and spiritual lives of humanity on an earthly plane.

The concluding chapter of *Blaze of Glory* is entitled "Living into an Apocalyptic Vision: Bringing Ourselves Home." Despite the prominence the rhetoric of home is given in this subtitle, Townes does not again mention home in this final chapter. However, in the preceding chapter, Townes addresses African American identity in relationship to the "journey home" of

[76] Townes, *Blaze of Glory*, 70. Alice Walker, *The Color Purple* (New York: Harcourt Bruce Jovanovich, 1982).
[77] Townes, *Blaze of Glory*, 88.
[78] Townes, *Blaze of Glory*, 87.

the protagonist, Avey Johnson, in the novel *Praisesong for the Widow*.[79] In this chapter, the rhetoric of "home" signals a reconnection with Avey's African heritage and ancestors that helps to heal her of broken social relations and restore her to a sense of wholeness. By becoming aware of those "who have gone before and those who are yet to come," Avey is able to locate herself within a community of accountability and care.[80]

Within Townes' theo-ethical framework, this location of self within community is fundamental for a *lived spirituality*.[81] For Townes, lived spirituality is inextricably *social* as our material and spiritual lives are bound up in social relations and structures that hold within them legacies of injustice and hate. Thus, womanist spirituality as social witness is a call to be human agents in God's work of "accomplishing divine plans within the context of human history."[82] Given these connections between lived spirituality and African American identity, I understand Townes' subtitle rhetoric of "bringing ourselves home" signals a return to this understanding of spirituality linked with material history. It is a return to the African cosmology blended with Christianity that does not see the sacred and secular as separate, but a God both immanent and transcendent.

For Townes, the apocalyptic vision of bringing ourselves home is a call for a womanist spirituality that seeks to prophetically announce a vision of justice and love. Apocalyptic vision and eschatological hope are twins for Townes. Whereas apocalyptic vision responds to a moment of crisis—as Townes identifies the situation of African Americans in the U.S. to be in,

---

[79] Townes, *Blaze of Glory*, 89. Paule Marshall, *Praisesong for the Widow* (New York: Penguin Group, 1983).
[80] The importance of ancestors as a source of spiritual connection was evident in the above reading of Orpah by Laura Donaldson. On the importance of ancestors for African American spirituality, see also Monica A. Coleman, *Making a Way Out of No Way: a Womanist Theology* (Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2008).
[81] Townes, *Blaze of Glory*, 119.
[82] Townes, *Blaze of Glory*, 122.

eschatological hope signals the prophetic call for a new heaven and a new earth. The trope of a "new heaven and a new earth" reappears throughout *Blaze of Glory* to underscore the need for *both*…a new heaven and *a new earth*. In this way, the eschatological vision of womanist spirituality is not to wait and prepare for another world, but to engage in God's work of remaking this world as one of greater justice and love.

The role of eschatological hope reappears in Townes' 2001 book, *Breaking the Fine Rain of Death* which addresses "African American health issues and a Womanist ethic of care."[83] As with *Blaze of Glory*, this text argues for a lived Christian ethic that seeks a communal ethic that promotes love and justice. After examining the historical legacies of injustice and abuse of African Americans' health, Townes again concludes her book with a chapter whose rhetoric echoes notions of heaven and eschatology. Entitled "Searching for Paradise in a World of Theme Parks," the chapter begins and ends with poetry.

In the opening poem, Townes discusses her efforts as a girl to "conjure up heaven" which she describes primarily in terms of domestic images of her favorite foods—"(i realize now that i was associating heaven with the way my grandmama's house smelled on Saturday night and Sunday)."[84] Completing her poem with a lament of the search for paradise among (the empty promises of) the world of theme parks, Townes states, "i, frankly, have renewed my search for paradise."[85] I quote at length:

> This paradise is not collapsed solely into a terrifying apocalypse howling in the end of human history. It is connected to an understanding of humanity, our value systems, and our world. Therefore, this paradise I seek is largely focused on this life, for it is intimately linked to a Hebraic focus on a good and long life as the goal of each person. …. [T]he salvific dimension of this paradise in not otherworldly. Salvation, here,

[83] Emile M. Townes, *Breaking the Fine Rain of Death: African American Health Issues and a Womanist Ethic of Care* (New York: Continuum Publishing, 1998).
[84] Townes, *Fine Rain of Death*, 169.
[85] Townes, *Fine Rain of Death*, 172.

> embraces all of humanity, for it is our kinship and relationship with God and one another.[86]

In this quote, Townes expresses an understanding of "paradise" in clear contrast to a sense of individual salvation as gaining assurance of access to a heavenly home. Rather, Townes shifts her eschatological vision from an otherworldly heaven to an eschatological hope for a better life in this world for all persons, communally.

As we will see in the next section, the notion of paradise is not a new one in the Christian theo-ethical imagination. However, what is less clear is the role of the rhetoric of home within notions of paradise. Although Townes upholds domestic imagery of food and kin in her poetic visions of paradise, she does not use the rhetoric of "home" directly. Yet, the ethics of connection with God, humanity, and the earth are retained. This begins to raise the question as to what role, if any, the rhetoric of home could or should play in developing a feminist postcolonial Christian rhetoric of home.

Returning to an Earthly Paradise: Feminist Utopian Visions

The rhetoric of paradise as an alternative vision to the "heavenly home" is the subject of the 2008 book *Saving Paradise*, Rita Nakashima Brock and Rebecca Ann Parker.[87] Brock and Parker's ambitious text follows the trajectory of the whole of Christian history to develop their view of paradise as a central vision of Christian life. Although Brock and Parker engage elements of Church history, theology, and liturgical practices to make their argument about the role visions of paradise—and their expulsion—have played in Christianity, they also make a critically important argument about the relationship between theology, politics, and ethics in visions of heaven and paradise. In recounting the narratives of paradise preceding and

[86] Townes, *Fine Rain of Death*, 172.
[87] Rita Nakashima Brock and Rebecca Ann Parker, *Saving Paradise: How Christianity Traded Loved of This World for Crucifixion and Empire* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2008).

throughout the Christian tradition, Brock and Parker seek to show "how stories of paradise place it on the earth and how they raise ethical implications about how humanity should live."[88] In other words, they construct their narrative of paradise not simply as a project of church history or even of theology, but in order to make an ethical argument about the connections between understandings of paradise and human actions.

Brock and Parker begin *Saving Paradise* by describing their own surprise at discovering the centrality of the notion of paradise to the early Christian church. Although their earlier jointly authored text, *Proverbs not Ashes*,[89] argued against Christian notions of salvation grounded in redemptive violence, they were startled to learn that large-scale public images of the crucified Christ do not appear in extinct Christian art until the Gero Cross from around 960-970 AD.[90]

This absence of the crucifix led Brock and Parker to ask what *was* there instead? What they found were images of paradise—visual depictions of rivers, gardens, trees, and a *living* Christ. Rather than suggesting early Christians were "obsessed" with an afterlife in heaven, Brock and Parker argue that, "paradise—first and foremost—was this world, permeated and blessed by the Spirit of God."[91] To argue for this view, they begin with a discussion of paradise in the Hebrew Scriptures. Echoing elements of Sumerian paradise narratives, Brock and Parker examine not only the Genesis image of Eden but also images of the delights of paradise in the Psalms, Song of Songs, and prophetic literature. These images of paradise depicted a flourishing of life—earthly life at its best standing in contrast to periods of crisis and war. By illustrating

[88] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, 4.
[89] Rita Nakashima Brock and Rebecca Ann Parker, *Proverbs not Ashes: Violence, Redemptive Suffering, and the Search for What Saves Us* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2001).
[90] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, 223. In a footnote, they indicate that small images of the crucified Christ appeared in illuminated manuscripts, book covers, and tiny amulets. However, these would have been seen only by an elite few.
[91] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, xv.

earthly life at its best, the stories of paradise raised ethical implications about how to live here and now. For example, they describe Genesis 1 as an entreaty for humanity, like God, to be "responsible for making life flourish, so that joy and beauty might bless the world."[92]

The importance of beauty is paramount throughout *Saving Paradise*. Brock and Parker reject a split between ethics and aesthetics to argue for the ethical importance of love and beauty. In a chapter entitled, "The Beautiful Feast of Life," Brock and Parker describe the early Christian Eucharist as a shared feast that began by a ritual prayer of thanksgiving before calling down the presence of God to sanctify the food. In this way, Brock and Parker argue, "The Eucharist enacted a way of perceiving the whole created world that recognized it as filled with the Spirit of God."[93] As with Townes' understanding of God as Spirit in the fabric of the universe, Brock and Parker likewise underscore God's immanence. They understand the Eucharist as a means to teach Christians to develop a finely tuned perception both to the sensory delights of this world as well as to the presence of God in the world.[94]

Perceiving both the presence of God in this world as well as the delights of this world has an *ethical* function.[95] Through a discussion on the power of beauty, Brock and Parker further explain the connection between perception and ethical action. They write, "The ancients called the power of beauty *eros*, or love."[96] Not only does love "capture the experience of wholeness that was beauty," such love elicits a *response*. In this case, they are particularly concerned with how love of this world can elicit a response in terms of ethical behavior. Specifically, "Beauty's

[92] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, 15.
[93] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, 145.
[94] See Alexander Schmenmann, *For the Life of the World* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2000) for an Orthodox discussion of food, God, and the Eucharist along similar lines.
[95] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, 148.
[96] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, 149.

ethical power was its ability to educe a loving orientation toward the world."[97] In using language of orientation, their rhetoric suggests a framework of teleological ethics structured by a focus on the Good—which, in this case, is the world.

Brock and Parker's discussion of teleological ethics resonates with the above discussion of teleological visions of the beautiful community in the work of Beverly Harrison. For Harrison, theological metaphors and images of justice shape our understanding of the community that is beautiful to behold. In this view, "beauty" is shaped *by* images of justice. Yet, for Brock and Parker beauty itself has the ethical effect of calling us to love. In this way, the beauty of earthly delights function to elicit love for *this* world. Loving *this* world has the effect of shifting the teleological vision from an otherworldly heaven to a paradise on the earthly plane. Rather than move "home" from heaven to earth as did the ecofeminists discourses of Radford Ruther and McFague, Brock and Parker move heaven itself to earth in the form of paradise.

Throughout *Saving Paradise*, the central organizing metaphor for the ethical life of paradise is the notion of "ethical grace." First appearing within a description of the life and work of Jesus, Brock and Parker link "ethical grace" with Jesus' use of images of paradise from the Hebrew Scriptures. They write:

> In echoing the vision of Isaiah, Jesus says the Spirit of God in the world assures a flowering of righteousness, a concept we call "ethical grace." By using the terms "ethical" and "grace" together, we want to suggest that the idea of paradise carries both the grace of the core goodness of life on earth, and humanity's responsibility for sustaining it.[98]

The ethical vision for paradise thus centers on sustaining the "core goodness of life on earth." Thus, the ability to perceive goodness within earthly life is likewise fundamental to their understanding of the Christian life—as in their understanding of the Eucharist as a means to

[97] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, 150.
[98] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, 29.

cultivate an awareness of the delightful goodness of this world and of the presence of God in this world.

For Brock and Parker, however, paradise is no utopia.[99] "Ethical grace" is an ethics of learning to dwell in the here and now of this world with its joy *and* its struggle. The model for ethical grace is not of an eternal unchanging model of socio-economic relations, but rather an argument for ethical practices that promote the flourishing of life. Jesus, say Brock and Parker, embodied ethical grace in his mission by healing, feeding, and loving people in their spiritual and material needs. By grounding itself in love of this world, ethical grace does not bifurcate the spiritual and the material. Rather they argue,

> Jesus, like the Hebrew prophets, connected paradise—abundant life—to the practical needs of human beings, who require a sustainable and sustaining life free from exploitation and political oppression. The spiritual and material are inseparable, as are grace and ethics.[100]

By promoting a vision of "abundant life," the notion of "ethical grace" also functions to critique those socio-economic dynamics of power that exploit and oppress. This ethical vision makes promoting abundant life an ethical matter for how we dwell together in the material here and now of this world, rather than awaiting the beginning of "abundant life" and "heaven" in another.

After arguing for the view that paradise locates ethical responsibility within the here and now, Brock and Parker present trajectories within Christianity which contrast with their notion of an earthly paradise. In tracing what they term the "fall from paradise," Brock and Parker rehearse a legacy of colonialism that spread the power of Christian peoples by war and violence. From

---

[99] I will discuss feminist utopias more below. For a broad discussion of feminist utopian thought in feminist Christian discourses, see Elizabeth A. Castelli, "The Ekklēsia of Women and/as Utopian Space: Locating the Work of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza in Feminist Utopian Thought," in *On the Cutting Edge: The Study of Women in Biblical Worlds: Essays in Honor of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza*, ed. Jane Schaberg, Alice Bach, and Esther Fuchs (New York: Continuum, 2004), 36-52.

[100] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, 34.

Charlemagne's conquests of the Saxon North, to European Crusades to Palestine, to Puritan settlement of New England, an "apocalyptically inspired pattern of Christian pilgrimage, conquest and colonization" played out repeatedly across centuries and continents.[101] Within a context of fracturing political and economic systems, paradise ceased to be understood as a dimension of life here and now, shifting instead to either another time and/or another place. Furthermore, within a critical understanding of the politics of space, re-imagining the place of "paradise" also meant changes both in the spatio-socio-economic relations of power constituting "paradise" and the normative expectations for behavior within "paradise."

Indeed, Brock and Parker trace a number of "escape routes"—the search for portals to take people away from the travail of earthly life to a paradise conceived of as *another* time and place. Paradise conceived of as "escape routes" can be understood as alternative theo-ethical visions to a theo-ethical vision of sustaining the flourishing of just life here and now. For example, they describe colonial expansion across the "New World" as an example of searching for an "escape route" of paradise.[102] Envisioning that the U.S. provided access to both a pristine past unsullied by European Wars as well as the promise of a better future, the Puritan settlers left a lingering legacy according to Brock and Parker.

> Pursued as an escape route, paradise was not a sacred place where Christian received with gratitude the wonders they discovered. Those seeking to escape to paradise moved too fast and too far into the future to find rest in this life and this world, or redemption among its peoples and places.[103]

As an "escape route" from legacies and/or present situations of injustice and violence, the search for "paradise" can function either to reinforce nostalgic longings that "forget" the violence and

---

[101] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, 275.
[102] See above chapter, "From Homespun to Homeland Security" for a discussion of the role of Christian civilization in U.S. colonial settlement and "manifest domesticity."
[103] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, 341.

inequality *and/or* to disregard present oppression as one waits for the paradise of another space-time.

Brock and Parker depict these "escape routes" as a "fall from paradise" within the larger structure of their argument about the images of an earthly "paradise" in early Christianity. As reviews of *Saving Paradise* have noted, even a book as long as *Saving Paradise* will struggle to organize all of Christian history, theology, and practice beneath a single organizing metaphor.[104] As neither a church historian nor scholar of early Christianity, my interest in *Saving Paradise* lies in their rendition of the space of "paradise" as an ethical vision for the contemporary U.S. Christian church. I am locating *Saving Paradise* in conversation with both the earlier eco-feminist Christian arguments that *earth* is our home and with the work of Emilie Townes to "search for paradise." In this way, I am tracing how feminist Christianity has responded to the rhetorical legacy of a "heavenly home" as a space of ideal belonging and normative behavior.

I understand Brock and Parker as moving paradise to earth—thereby challenging notions of a "heavenly home" as an "escape route" from the socio-economic legacies and material demands (and delights) of earthly life. The rhetoric of "paradise" clearly forms the metaphorical core of their ethical vision. Nonetheless, the rhetoric of home does surface in the text in significant ways. For example, in the prologue, the authors write of how Jesus "reopened the paradise garden on this earth, created by God as the home of humanity."[105] Several pages later, they write,

> As inheritors of Western Christianity and citizens of a New World stolen from those who still live upon this land, we believe we must stand again at the open doors of paradise and

[104] David A. Brondos, "Saving Paradise: How Christianity Traded Love of This World for Crucifixion and Empire," *Dialog* 49, no. 3 (September 1, 2010): 249-252; Margaret R. Miles, "Saving Paradise: How Christianity Traded Love Of This World For Crucifixion And Empire," *Christian Century* 125, no. 21 (October 21, 2008): 52-53.
[105] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, xviii.

> bless this world as sacred soil, as holy ground, and as a home which we all must learn to inhabit together.[106]

In both of these excerpts, "home" is linked both to paradise and to this world. Furthermore, "home" and "paradise" are situated in the here and now that is constructed by spatio-socio-economic dynamics of colonizing power for which U.S. Christians bear responsibility to address today.

In Brock and Parker's account, both "paradise" and "home" emerge as spaces born from socio-economic relations of power that shape the ethical questions for inhabiting shared space. However, recognizing that socio-economic relations of power construct notions of "paradise" also raises the question whether or not to deploy the rhetoric of "paradise" within a feminist postcolonial Christian ethic of inhabiting shared space. In his review of *Saving Paradise,* theologian David Brondos asks, "cannot the notion of paradise also be used in oppressive ways?"[107] As an example, he notes that their "uncritical" depiction of the church as "paradise on earth" fails to address how:

> [T]he Roman Catholic dictum *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* frequently has been employed to exclude, silence, and demand submission from people both inside and outside of the church, often through the use of force and violence.[108]

As Brondos points out, the church has not been a "paradise" of belonging for many. As Brock and Parker themselves acknowledge, "paradise" has not only meant a Christian community of shared feast to sustain life, but also escape from this world. Yet, as their title makes clear, Brock and Parker seek to "save" paradise—presumably restoring "paradise" to its proper understanding. However, Brondos questions whether or not this strategy is itself an attempt to return to a "pristine" Christian origin? He asks, "Must we not recognize that all forms of

---

[106] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, xxii.
[107] Brondos, "Saving Paradise," 251.
[108] Brondos, "Saving Paradise," 251.

Christianity are at times oppressive, unjust, and violent, just as at times they can all promote what is good and life-affirming?"[109]

From a critical feminist rhetorical perspective, the paramount question is not the most "accurate" depiction of "paradise," but how the rhetoric of "paradise" is shaped and shapes socio-economic dynamics of power. As Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza has pointed out in her work, "paradise" and "Eden" have indeed been problematically deployed to convey a problematic utopic alternative in contrast to "patriarchy."[110] Furthermore, Schüssler Fiorenza refers specifically to imagery of "Eden-home" and "Paradise-home" thereby linking the rhetoric of home to these notions. However, in using this rhetoric, Schüssler Fiorenza refers not to an otherworldly ideal but to how these notions operate to structure earthly familial and feminine ideals. In the early work *In Memory of Her*, she writes,

> The "cult of true womanhood" proclaims that the vocation of women is "homemaker." The fulfillment of her true nature and happiness consists in creating the home as a peaceful island in the sea of alienated society, as Eden-Paradise to which men can retreat from the exploitations and temptations of the work-world.[111]

In this passage, Schüssler Fiorenza locates the image of "Eden-Paradise" within the rhetoric of home as a "haven" or as a "home, sweet home." As already discussed above, Schüssler Fiorenza connects this rhetoric of home to an ideology of the "White Lady" that reinforces not only (white) feminine ideals, but intersecting constellations of kyriarchal power.

However, "Eden-Paradise" is not the only space Schüssler Fiorenza critiques. She also challenges the counter-image of "Exodus" within radical feminism that "call[s] us to abandon the

---

[109] Brondos, "Saving Paradise," 252.
[110] Schüssler Fiorenza refers both to "Eden" and "Eden-Paradise" in the early work *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 346. However, Schüssler Fiorenza shifts to language of "paradise" in later works including the most recent *Transforming Vision: Explorations in Feminist The*logy* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011), 152.
[111] Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 347.

oppressive confines of home and church."[112] Schüssler Fiorenza rejects both options. In *But She Said,* she presents an extended critique of the rhetoric of home *and* exodus in feminist Christian discourses to date:

> Since the last century, the women's movement in biblical religion has theologically symbolized these discursive strategies [of identity] by using the biblical images of the church either as "*household of God*," home/at homeness/ownership/*Heimat*, or as *exodus* out of Egypt, away from the cigar-smoking moloch of patriarchy into the prophetic community of the liberated, which in turn constitutes a new home.[113]

Although not using language of "paradise" or "eden," the parallel between home and exodus clearly echoes the earlier passage from *In Memory of Her*. Where this passage differs somewhat is the emphasis on the rhetoric of "home"—even exodus as a "new home"—as a discursive strategy of identity.

Why this connection between "identity" and "home" matters becomes clearer as she explains,

> In my own work I have searched for a different biblical metaphor and rhetorical image that could mediate between the dualistic feminist alternatives of "church as home" and "exodus into a new, liberated home-space" while allowing for an open discussion of different feminist theories and practical strategies.[114]

As Bernice Johnson Reagon argued, the singularity of belonging encapsulated in the rhetoric of "home" is a not a good political metaphor for capturing the politics of difference or for organizing political action.[115] Schüssler Fiorenza is likewise critical of "home" as a metaphor to organize radical democratic spaces—especially with its legacy of kyriarchal relations from

---

[112] Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 347.
[113] Schüssler Fiorenza, *But She Said*, 126.
[114] Schüssler Fiorenza, *But She Said*, 127.
[115] Bernice Johnson Reagon, "Coalition Politics: Turning the Century," in Barbara Smith, *Home Girls: a Black Feminist Anthology* (New York: Kitchen Table—Women of Color Press, 1983), 343-355.

Roman households to the 19th century "White Lady" to the 20th century "Moral Majority." Thus, she seeks a biblical image to convey "a public site of feminist political struggles."[116]

The alternative feminist space Schüssler Fiorenza envisions is *ekklēsia*. In short, Schüssler Fiorenza describes the *ekklēsia* of wo/men as "the congress of full decision-making citizens."[117] So, first of all, *ekklēsia* is a space constituted by radical democratic relations of power rather than kyriarchal relations of power. Whereas notions of "church"—and certainly "church" as "paradise-home"—have functioned to reinforce kyriarchal patterns of power, the space of *ekklēsia* seeks to promote a "discipleship of equals." However, Schüssler Fiorenza carefully distinguishes the democratic vision of *ekklēsia* not as a "given fact" but as "an active process moving toward greater equality, freedom, and responsibility as well as toward communal relations free from domination."[118] As a process of moving towards greater equality, *ekklēsia* is a shifting, changing space constituted not by firm boundaries of "identity" but by radical democratic politics of equality. In this way, *ekklēsia* can clearly be understood as a feminist postcolonial space.

Elisabeth Castelli understands Schüssler Fiorenza's notion of *ekklēsia* as utopian space.[119] More specifically, Castelli locates the notion of *ekklēsia* within a trajectory of *feminist* utopian thought. Castelli argues that feminist utopian thought is characterized in part by rejecting the male utopian desire to "produce a particular utopia as a perfect, closed, and static system

---

[116] Schüssler Fiorenza, *But She Said*, 127.
[117] Schüssler Fiorenza, *Sharing Her Word*, 112.
[118] Schüssler Fiorenza, *Sharing Her Word*, 119. The accompanying term to *ekklēsia* in Schüssler Fiorenza's thought is *basileia*--her alternative to the rhetoric of the "kingdom" of God. Whereas *ekklēsia* modeled the life of the "church," the vision of *basileia* was of "G*d's alternative society," 115. I focus on *ekklēsia* here because of the connections to her critiques of "home" as well as the below discussion in Castelli.
[119] Castelli, "The *Ekklēsia* of Women and/as Utopian Space," 36.

characterize by the end of both politics and history."[120] Rather than blueprints for a new world, feminist utopian though provide political critique of the relations of power that structure worlds. Along this line, Castelli describes *ekklēsia* not as "blueprint for a concrete future but as an alternative space within which the future might be reimagined and renegotiated in light of a critical vision of the past and present."[121] In this description, *ekklēsia* emerges not only as a process of radical democratic politics, but also as a space in which the boundaries of time become porous as critical linkages to the past and the future shape the present.

The notion of feminist utopian space which Castelli presents is helpful to understand not only Schüssler Fiorenza's notion of *ekklēsia*, but the broader trajectories of the rhetoric of heaven and home. Insofar as notions of the *heavenly home* have functioned as a utopian vision to portray an eternal blueprint constructed through constellations of kyriarchal spatio-socio-economic relations of power, the rhetoric of heaven as home has reinforced both this blueprint and the underlying dynamics of power. Through different strategies, feminist Christian discourses have sought to reimagine the heavenly home and proffer alternative visions for dwelling together in more ethical and just ways. The rhetoric of "home," "heaven," and "paradise" have all been used to convey visions for a better world and have all been critiqued for reproducing patterns of injustice.

Heaven, Paradise, and Planetarity: The Ethics of Locating "Home"

In this chapter, I have explored the dynamics between the rhetoric of home and notions of heaven and paradise. In tracing the rhetoric of home and heaven, I have argued that theological conceptions of heaven and paradise function to shape theo-ethical visions of normative and/or utopic space for earthly life. In trying to articulate both a connection to earthly life as well as

[120] Castelli, "The *Ekklēsia* of Women and/as Utopian Space," 38.
[121] Castelli, "The *Ekklēsia* of Women and/as Utopian Space," 45.

visions for a better world, feminist discourses have wrestled with theological language of transcendence and immanence. What role do transcendent visions of God, of the Good, or of heaven play in crafting the mundane ethical choices encountered in a material, bodily world?

Radford Ruether critiques how the rhetoric of a heavenly home suggests that a transcendent heaven serves as a perfect, unchanging model for earthly endeavors—an eternal "blueprint." Critical of the hierarchies of spiritual/material in this model, Radford Ruether proposes a "kinship" model of shared stardust grounded in the Big Bang. In this way, Radford Ruether seeks to bridge the hierarchal gap between heaven and earth, spiritual and material, transcendent and immanent. Likewise, McFague suggests a cosmological model of the earth as the organic body—or *home*—of God. Again, McFague is clearly wrestling with connecting the transcendent God with the multiplicity of life that constitutes the mundane earth. Gebara continues in this vein by deploying Trinitarian language to convey a web of interconnectedness that links together the multiplicity of social and material earthly life with God. Indeed, she locates her work as a response to the crisis of religions of transcendence that seek foundations beyond this world.

By locating paradise in this world, Brock and Parker also attempt to negotiate an understanding of heaven and home that integrates the transcendent and immanent. Entering paradise is understood as developing a capacity for perception of the presence of God in this world—the transcendent immanently present. Developed and nurtured through community, this ability to see the presence of God and the beauty of this world enables a capacity for love and ethical grace. Brock and Parker not only argue against God's distance from the earth, but also critique human disassociation from the material present as a major factor in human acceptance of violence, greed, and all forms of harm to the flourishing of abundant life on earth. Thus, living in

paradise is a "full-bodied life in the present—attuned to what is beautiful and good and responsive to legacies of injustice and currents of harm."[122] For Brock and Parker, neither God nor humanity escapes from the messy immanence that constitutes earthly life.

Another way to engage the tensions between transcendence and immanence in feminist theology is through Susan Abraham's articulation of Gayatri Spivak's notions of planetarity and the detranscendentalizing the sacred.[123] Detranscendentalizing, explains Abraham, is "an attempt to rethink transcendence and immanence on the cultural plane."[124] Thinking transcendence on a cultural plane, Abraham argues, does not signal a closure of possible engagements with theological reflection. Rather, Abraham revisits feminist theological arguments regarding classical theism, panentheism, and pantheism to show how Spivak's notions connect with these debates.

Specifically, Abraham attends to how feminist theologians wrestle with the relationship between transcendence and the immanence in God's relationship with the world to develop frameworks that connect the two. Abraham identifies examples of each conception of God that underscores the connections between God's immanence and transcendence. In concluding this survey, Abraham writes,

> Creation, nature, space, place, planet—all the names we give to the ground of our becoming are also the instance of the becoming of the divine. It is a leaky, porous boundary that reveals (re-veils?) the divine imprint in the mundane living processes of the biosphere even as this leaky, porous boundary allows the mundane to well up from its mundane occupations to encompass that which is more than itself.[125]

---

[122] Brock and Parker, *Saving Paradise*, 418.
[123] Susan Abraham, "The Pterodactyl in the Margins: Detranscendentalizing Postcolonial Theology," in *Planetary Loves: Spivak, Postcoloniality, and Theology*, ed. Stephen D. Moore and Mayra Rivera (New York: Fordham University Press, 2011), 79-101.
[124] Abraham, "Pterodactyl in the Margins," 80.
[125] Abraham, "Pterodactyl in the Margins," 93.

In articulating the "porous, leaky boundary" between the mundane and the transcendent, Abraham finds common ground between feminist theologians and Spivak in what Abraham calls a "mundane transcendence." The transcendent is not jettisoned from the mundane as wholly other, nor is the mundane without reach to the transcendent. The transcendent and the mundane—the immanent, material world of culture—must be thought together in what Spivak describes as a "peculiar mindset" of detranscendentalized thinking.

The "peculiar mindset" of planetarity is a detranscendentalized thinking that does not seek foundations for ethical behavior in other-worldly planes—such as blueprints of a "heavenly home" or "eternal paradise." Abraham clarifies that Spivak's apparent target in her argument to detranscendentalize the sacred is not theological discourses, but ethical frameworks rooted in essentialized identity politics. Abraham presents Spivak's notion of planetarity as an effort to move away from "arbitrary cultural and imaginary maps for identity-based ethical models" in favor of a new topography for ethics.[126] Whereas an identity model appeals to various notions of the ethical *agent* or *entity*, Spivak's ethical topography seeks to speak of "planetary subjects" and "planetary creatures." In this way, she seeks to locate our alterity—our human intention to be for the other—within a space-time continuum that is both immanently, materially "us" as well as more than us.

In reaching beyond "identity-based ethical models," the move towards planetarity is a key element in working towards a feminist postcolonial ethic of dwelling together by addressing several key issues within feminist social ethics. As discussed throughout the chapter, the connections between God, the earth, and human community must be articulated within a feminist postcolonial social ethic. The rhetoric of "home" understood as a term of "belonging" or

[126] Abraham, "Pterodactyl in the Margins," 79.

"identity" has been used to marshal ethical responsibility—"heaven is our true home" or "earth is our home." Planetarity enables a way to speak of the "cultural plane" of spatio-socio-economic connection without establishing boundaries of "home" to function as firm boundaries of violent exclusion.

In this way, a "planetary subject" inescapably lives within Abraham's "leaky, porous boundary" of the divine presence in the mundane world. Thus, planetarity should be understood as a call for locating theo-ethical frameworks within the politics of space that constitute *this* space-time rather than another. Ethical frameworks of paradise as well as of planetarity attempt to wrestle with a complex topography of space-time. Not only space, but time also has a "porous, leaky boundary" with the past, present, and future interwoven in a non-linear ways.[127] Recognizing this is critical in order to locate ourselves ethically in relationship to the legacies of the past—including the pre-historical "before" that exists at the margins of the historical narratives that undergird nationalistic narratives of progress. Recognizing that the "past"—even the pre-historical *before*—is part of the here and now that constitutes the complexity of planetary paradise is critical. So also, visions for the future shape the socio-economic relations of power that construct how we dwell together in planetary life.

[127] A large portion of Abraham's article addresses the relationship between time and space in Spivak's reading of Mahasweta Devi, "Pterodactyl, Puran Sahay and Pirtha" in *Death of a Discipline* and again later in *Moving Devi.* Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *Death of a Discipline* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003); Spivak, "Moving Devi (1997): The Non-Resident and the Expatriate," in *Other Asias*, (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2008).

CONCLUSION

Toward a Feminist Christian De-Colonizing Ethic of Dwelling Together

The rhetoric of home is everywhere. And often the rhetoric of home does seem to be banal—a simple term of location to indicate the space in which persons dwell together. However, as I have argued, places designated as home should be understood within the framework of a politics of space. Understood as the "product of interrelations,"[1] spaces are socially constructed and imbricated in the dynamics of power that shape socio-economic dynamics and structures. As such, dynamics of socio-economic (in)equality function to construct spaces and spaces in ways that reinforce patterns and structures of socio-economic (in)equality. Conversely, the spatiality of social relations and social structures—the walls between nations, the layout of housing—reinforces particular patterns of social interrelations. A critical feminist rhetorical analysis of home reveals the functioning of these politics of power at work in differing articulations of home.

Within the U.S. politics of space, representing "home" as a singular, unchanging notion reflective of heavenly ideals and divine will has functioned to reinforce hierarchies of power that privilege a white, heterosexual, Christian, self-sufficient "family" as the "model home." This "model home" has not only shaped the politics of the domestic household "family," but also the policies and politics that construct the national "family" and U.S. "homeland." In contrast to the view of home as singular and static, a view of space as multiple, dynamic, and contestable opens up the possibilities of contesting and transforming spaces and places. As Sarah Hardy and Caroline Wiedmer write, "allowing for the possibility that space can emerge and change over

[1] Massey,"Spaces of Politics," in *Human Geography Today*, eds. Doreen Massey, John Allen, and Philip Sarre (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1999), 279.

time …enact[s] one of the more liberating moves of space theory, the idea that conceptions of space as fluid and multiple and emerging result in the possibility of alternative political trajectories."[2] In other words, thinking of space as a "product of interrelations" enables the politics of space to emerge—including the possibility of liberation from oppressive and violent conceptions of space.

As I have argued, the dominant rhetoric of home, homeland, and Christianity in the U.S. has indeed functioned as a tool of violence and exclusion. As such, a feminist postcolonial critical analysis of the rhetoric of home is an important project for decolonizing the spatial politics of "home" and "homeland." After revisiting the critical analysis of the rhetoric home in the preceding chapters, I will consider a range of different critical responses to the dominant U.S. rhetoric of home. These different responses reflect various approaches to the politics of space in the rhetoric of "home." Finally, I will propose my own response to the politics of the rhetoric of home by laying out a feminist postcolonial Christian ethic of dwelling together that promotes the flourishing of planetary life.

Revisiting the Analyses

The need for a critical feminist postcolonial rhetorical analysis of "home" in the contemporary U.S. arises from a politicized context of the Christian "home" and "homeland." During the latter decades of the 20th century, the conservative Christian rhetoric of "family values" portrayed the heterosexual, married, patriarchal Christian family as the sole "true" representation of God's design for "home" and the normative model of human dwelling together on earth as in heaven. Both feminist Christian and postcolonial critiques have challenged this

[2] Sarah Hardy and Caroline Wiedmer, ed., introduction to *Motherhood and Space: Configurations of the Maternal through Politics, Home, and the Body* (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 9.

singular, static notion of home for its role in constructing social systems that reproduce hierarchies that privilege white, male, heterosexual, patriarchal Christian power—or, as Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza writes, *kyriarchal* power.

By challenging this dominant rhetoric of home, both feminist and postcolonial discourses have participated in a politics of space that shape the rhetoric of "home." Earlier feminist Christian critiques of home showed how power functioned to reinforce gendered hierarchies that shaped the social interrelations structuring the domestic space of the familial home. Over time, more intersectional analyses of race, class, gender, sexuality, and nationalism also emerged to broaden the analysis of the dynamics of power shaping "home." Even early on some scholars engaged in intersectional analyses that incorporated more than gender—such as Carter Heyward and Beverly Harrison's attention to sexuality, Delores Williams' emphasis on race, or Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza's inclusion of colonialism as she developed the notion of kyriarchy.[3] Postcolonial critiques of home have added further complexity to the politics of space in the rhetoric of home by connecting both the national and the familial rhetoric of "home" to patterns of national belonging, exclusion, and colonialism.[4] Thus, a robust feminist postcolonial Christian critical analysis of the rhetoric of home draws upon both sets of analyses to articulate a complex

[3] Beverly W. Harrison and Carter Heyward, "Pain and Pleasure: Avoiding the Confusions of Christian Tradition in Feminist Theory," in *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse: A Feminist Critique*, ed. Joanne Carlson Brown and Carole R. Bohn (New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1989), 150; Delores S. Williams, "African-American Women in Three Contexts of Domestic Violence," in *Violence Against Women*, ed. Copeland and Schüssler Fiorenza (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1994); Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Ties That Bind: Domestic Violence Against Women," in *Women Resisting Violence: Spirituality for Life*, Mary John Mananzan, et al. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996).

[4] Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Amy Kaplan, "Homeland Insecurities: Reflections on Language and Space," Radical History Review, 85 (Winter 2003): 82; Deborah Cowen and Emily Gilbert, "Citizenship in the 'Homeland': Families at War" in *War, Citizenship, Territory* (New York: Routledge Press, 2007), 261-280.

portrait of the constellation of spatio-socio-economic dynamics of power functioning in the notion of "home."[5]

A critical feminist postcolonial rhetorical analysis shows that home, homeland, and Christianity are rhetorically linked in the U.S. to promote a set of socio-economic dynamics of power that privilege white, heterosexual, married, "native"-born Christian *Americans*. The material construction and transformation of the landscape of the place designated as the "wilderness," the "New World," and the "Promised Land" reflected both European models of home as well as the manifestation of theological belief in God's providence directing a trans-Atlantic and trans-continental pilgrimage. Through an ideology of "manifest domesticity" and a celebratory rhetoric of "home, sweet home," a gendered, racialized hierarchy of white, European Christian civilization transformed the "empty" spaces of the frontier into a national network of home(stead)s built upon land violently taken from Native peoples.[6]

Faced with a threat to its own national space, the post-9/11 introduction of the rhetoric of "homeland" conveyed a singularity of national family that functioned to warrant violence against the outsider and to justify hierarchal control of the citizen family by the benevolent patriarch of federal government.[7] This rhetorical linkage between home, homeland, and Christianity underscores the political, economic, and religious power that construct the notion of home in

---

[5] Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*, (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005), Laura Levitt, *Jews and Feminism: The Ambivalent Search for Home*, (New York: Routledge, 1997); Laura E. Donaldson, "The Sign of Orpah: Reading Ruth through Native Eyes," in *The Postcolonial Biblical Reader*, R.S. Sugirtharajah, ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 159-170; Kwok Pui Lan, *Postcolonial Imagination and Feminist Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 101; Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Ties That Bind."

[6] Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 17-19.

[7] Amy Kaplan, "Homeland Insecurities"; Susan Faludi, *The Terror Dream: Myth and Misogyny in an Insecure America*, (New York: Picador, 2007).

order to structure the practices and places of human dwelling in ways that reinforce particular violent, unjust constellations of power.

Because the rhetoric of home functions to preserve particular constellations of unjust power, "home" itself becomes a tool of violence to reinforce patterns of socio-economic practices that sustain these structures of power. By relying on the supposed naturalness of home and familial relations, the rhetoric of home is used to justify who does and does not belong in a given place as well as the terms of that belonging. This violence engages multiple modalities. One modality uses an ideology of the patriarchal family to justify the use of violence to police the behavior of women as subservient and docile; another mode is the colonial rhetoric of home that reinforces intersecting hierarchies of race, class, gender, and sexuality through "natural" differences in the domestic (and dominated) civilizations of the "Family of Man" to justify colonizing power of domination, slavery, and conquest.[8]

Feminist scholars in religion have used postcolonial critiques to challenge the violence that arises within the colonizing rhetoric of home and homeland. Using the notion of the *unhomely* to critically examine her own relationship to home, violence, and U.S. belonging, Laura Levitt argues for an understanding of "home" that is ambivalent, partial, and shifting—with no one "home" promising full belonging or security.[9] By refusing a fixed boundary, Levitt's rhetoric of home undercuts the use of violence to defend such boundaries. Tracing the connections between the U.S. national project of settler colonialism and Christian civilization, Andrea Smith uncovers a particular legacy and patterns of violence against Native American

[8] On home reinforcing the subservience of women, see Schüssler Fiorenza, "Ties That Bind." On the "Family of Man," see McClintock, *Imperial Leather.*
[9] Laura Levitt, *Jews and Feminism: The Ambivalent Search for Home,* (New York: Routledge, 1997).

women.[10] While Smith commends the feminist "domestic violence" movement for critiquing "home" as "safe" place, Smith also argues for a broader intersectional analysis that connects gendered violence in the home to the hierarchies of race, gender, and sexuality that operate in projects of U.S. nationalism. Playing with the spatial rhetoric of "home" as a "safe" space, Smith argues that in a post-9/11 world, we must see violence as not just "out there" but also at "home" in the U.S. levied against Native Americans and others oppressed by the intersecting constellations of unjust power.

How the spatiality of the rhetoric of home reinforces unjust patterns of power is particularly evident in the rhetoric of work and home. Feminist challenges to the rhetoric of work and home as *separate* spaces emphasize how this spatio-social division reproduces inequalities in socio-economic opportunity and well-being. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Bonnie Miller-McLemore, and Gloria Albrecht all make the case for approaching issues of work and home as interrelated rather than as distinct spheres.[11] Whereas Schüssler Fiorenza and Albrecht seek to link work and home through analyzing the socio-economic dynamics that police and limit women's economic lives, Miller-McLemore primarily engages a psychological framework to argue that women need to be able to lead lives that integrate productive and reproductive practices. The structural approach taken by Schüssler Fiorenza and Albrecht more clearly underscores the hierarchies of race, class, gender, sexuality and nation that operate in the normative U.S. model of home, whereas Miller-McLemore's challenge to not dismiss the value

[10] Smith, *Conquest.*
[11] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Endless Day: Introduction," in *Concilium: Women, Work, and Poverty*, ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and Anne Carr (Edinburgh: T&T Clark LTD. 1987), xvii-xxiii; Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother: Work and Family as Theological Dilemma* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994); Gloria H. Albrecht, *Hitting Home: Feminist Ethics, Women's Work, and the Betrayal of "Family Values"* (New York: Continuum, 2002, 2004).

and importance of labor in the household cautions against a potential blind spot for some feminists.

However, in each of these texts, the rhetoric of work and home retains elements of spatial distinction between the two places of "work" and "home." This spatial distinction undermines the critical, intersectional analysis each text seeks to impart. Thus, I argue that feminist Christian theo-ethical discourses need to refine the spatial "map" of our socio-economic lives to give a better account of the complex, interrelated lives we lead. Rather than a rhetoric that discusses efforts to "balance" two distinct places of "work" and "home," theo-ethical discourses should emphasize the multiple patterns of dwelling together that emerge from the intersecting needs of shelter, food, clothing, sex, and other "domestic" activities.

In other words, lives are not an additive equation of separate spaces and responsibilities (work + home + church="life"), but a complex constellation of spatio-socio-economic practices (the interrelations of eating, sheltering, making love, caring for dependents, paying for goods, raising capital to pay for goods, creating, sharing, worshipping, and so on as "life").[12] Shifting from mapping the intersections of separate spaces to tracing the constellations of practices emphasizes the ongoing processes of interrelations among socio-economic dynamics of power

[12] With this statement, I seek to follow Sara Mills description of space as "a series of spatial frameworks operating at the same time in hierarchical relations with, and often conflicting with, one another, as many social spaces negotiated within one geographical place and time. Sara Mills, *Gender and Colonial Space* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2005), 26. In future work, one way to situate my argument of "dwelling together" would be to develop a fuller discussion of feminist mappings of power and subjectivity as found in such texts as: Susan Stanford Friedman, *Mappings: Feminism and the Cultural Geographies of Encounter*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998); Amy Allen, *The Power of Feminist Theory: Domination, Resistance, Solidarity*, (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1999); Chandra Talpade Mohanty, *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003); Saba Mahmood, *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); Lara Deeb, *An Enchanted Modern: Gender and Public Piety in Shi'I Lebanan*, (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2006).

that structure how we dwell together. Such a mapping enables both a critical analysis of how power functions to oppress and privilege particular persons as well as the possibility of envisioning how to build more just socio-economic relations and patterns of dwelling together.

Insofar as the rhetoric of home conveys patterns of dwelling together, a critical feminist analysis of the rhetoric of home can reveal the socio-economic dynamics of power that construct these patterns. As such, a critical feminist rhetorical analysis of "home" can function to critique certain patterns as reproducing socio-economic dynamics of injustice or to imagine alternative patterns of dwelling together that would promote the well-being of all. The rhetoric linking heaven and home, in particular, has functioned to reinforce particular patterns of dwelling together as ethically normative. Operating as a kind of short cut to convey ethical importance, the rhetoric of home often contains theo-ethical visions for how to structure the socio-economic dynamics of power that shape the patterns of dwelling together.

Feminist Christian critiques of the dominant conservative Christian rhetoric of heaven as "home" have both challenged this rhetoric and proffered alternative discourses linking "home" with heaven, earth, or a planetary "paradise."[13] Whether arguing that earth is "home" rather than heaven or seeking to "detranscendentalize" ethics, feminist and postcolonial critiques of the heavenly home seek to move ethics away from an ahistorical foundation of immaterial, eternal

[13] Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Gaia and God: An Ecofeminst Theology of Earth Healing* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992); Sallie McFague, *The Body of God: An Ecological Theology*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993); Emilie M. Townes, *In a Blaze of Glory: Womanist Spirituality as Social Witness* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995); Rita Nakashima Brock and Rebecca Ann Parker, *Saving Paradise: How Christianity Traded Loved of This World for Crucifixion and Empire* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2008); Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 346; Schüssler Fiorenza, *Transforming Vision: Explorations in Feminist The*logy* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011), 152; Susan Abraham, "The Pterodactyl in the Margins: Detranscendentalizing Postcolonial Theology," in *Planetary Loves: Spivak, Postcoloniality, and Theology*, ed. Stephen D. Moore and Mayra Rivera (New York: Fordham University Press, 2011), 79-101.

principles. Rather, by locating *earth* as "home," a feminist postcolonial critique explores ethics within the planetary frame of social relations in the here and now of material life upon this planet. Likewise, dreaming of an alternative "heaven" or "paradise" to nostalgic images of (white, heterosexual, patriarchal) family reunions, is a means to challenge the pattern of socio-economic dynamics of power that constructs (rather than "finds") this heavenly home.[14] Theo-ethical ideals of "home"—whether on earth or in heaven—can function to promote and/or challenge particular patterns of dwelling that emerge from spatio-socio-economic dynamics of power.

Retaining, Revising, or Refusing the Rhetoric of Home?

When people learned that I was writing about "home," they have often spontaneously responded with their own thoughts and musings about what home means to them. The social locations of these persons have been multiple: from married, heterosexual couples to married same-sex couples; from U.S. citizens who have lived extensively abroad to U.S. resident "aliens" who have spent decades living in the U.S.; from my grandparents who have lived more than 60 years on the same acre of Midwest farmland to my sometimes homeless friend. Home is not a singular notion that is experienced in the same way by all people at all times. "Home" is multiple

[14] Nostalgia has been widely theorized and discussed in feminism and cultural studies. For example, Lynne Huffer, *Maternal Pasts, Feminist Futures: Nostalgia, Ethics, and the Question of Difference*,(Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998); Svetlana Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia*, (NY: Basic Books, 2001). While I have not expounded upon the role of nostalgia in feminist re-imaginings of "home," I have sought to disrupt impulses towards nostalgia by emphasizing the politics of space and the shifting, multiple processes that construct "home." In this way, I seek to show that a singular, static nostalgic vision of "home" belies the politics of spatio-socio-economic dynamics of power that construct "home." For a similar strategy of disrupting nostalgia in the notions of "family," see Stephanie Coontz, *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap*, (NY: Basic Books, 1992). For a discussion of nostalgia, Christianity, and the U.S. post 9-11 rhetoric of "homeland," see Christopher Collins, *Homeland Mythology: Biblical Narratives in American Culture*, (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007).

and shifting. Most importantly, these different experiences of "home" do not simply signify a "natural" plurality of experiences, but reflect the politics of space in which socio-economic interrelations construct the space of "home" in different ways for different people.

Constructed by socio-economic dynamics of power, the space of "home" is not static, singular, or banal. A rhetoric of home in which home appears as if it *is* a singular, static norm seeks to "freeze" in time a particular constellation of socio-economic dynamics of power. Questioning such efforts to "freeze" a place, Doreen Massey writes,

> Who is it really that is hankering after a notion of place as settled, a resting place? Who is it that is worrying about the breakdown of barriers supposedly containing an identity? It is at least by no means a coincidence that the exultation in the uncontrollable complexity of the city (Virginia Woolf), the questioning of the very notion that a settled place to call one's own was ever a reality (Toni Morrison, bell hooks), the insistence that memory and recovery does not have to take the form of nostalgia (bell hooks) and the celebration of a multiplicity of home-places (Michele le Doeuff)...that all this has so often come for those who were "on the margins" of that old, settled (and anyway mythologized?) coherence.[15]

For those persons excluded by static, coherent definitions of a place, Massey suggests, there is an appeal to places that are complex, unsettled, without nostalgia, and multiple. Within the rhetoric of home, efforts to "freeze" the place of "home" as a domestic "haven," a "safe" place, a familial reunion in a heavenly home, or as a white, heterosexual, Christian nation of self-sufficient households are all attempts to reinforce a particular constellation of socio-economic dynamics of power.

By contesting the rhetoric of home as a "haven," as "heaven," as "safe," or as "secure," feminist and postcolonial critiques of home have been engaging in a politics of space. Both "home" and "homeland" are constructed by particular constellations of social relations of power. However, it is not enough to simply understand space as constructed by social relations of

[15] Doreen Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 122-123.

power. Rather, as Massey explains, "recognizing our interrelatedness means recognizing that these relations are power relations of a variety of sorts and that they may well be in some sense unequal or oppressive."[16] As repeatedly articulated in feminist and postcolonial critiques of home, the power relations that construct the spaces of "home" and "homeland" have indeed been unequal and oppressive.

Given that "home" and "homeland" are imbricated in social relations of power, what possible interventions can feminist postcolonial Christian discourses make in the politics of space that constitute the rhetoric of home? The foremost strategy must be for an ongoing critique of the rhetoric of "home" and "homeland" to reveal the dynamics of power at work in reinforcing unjust constellations of social relations. In other words, "home" and "homeland" must be deconstructed to challenge the ongoing power of the socio-economic dynamics that constitute the "model home" in the U.S. today.[17]

A critical feminist analysis of the rhetoric of home has made clear how "home" is a notion constituted by practices and structures of inequality, particularly in matters of the domestic household or "family." Critical postcolonial discourses have underscored the nationalistic structures of inequality that are sustained and policed by the rhetoric of home. Weaving together feminist and postcolonial critiques of home develops a critical analysis that draws the linkages between the spatio-socio-economic dynamics of power that construct both the domestic household "family" and the national "family." Thus, I would argue that it is important

[16] Massey, "Spaces of Politics," 289.
[17] A critical feminist rhetorical analytic method functions particularly well for revealing the dynamics of power operating in the rhetoric of home and homeland. Insofar as any critical feminist postcolonial response must first identify the politics of space operating in the rhetoric of home in order to form a critical response, revealing these dynamics of power through deconstruction is the foremost strategy.

for feminist studies in religion to continue the deconstructive work of destabilizing the place of "home" to make evident the constructed, contested nature of "home" and "homeland."

Given the legacies of injustice and inequality that the rhetoric of home reproduces, another evident intervention in the politics of space in the rhetoric of home is to refuse to use any rhetoric of "home" or "homeland." For example, Ivone Gebara articulated her social, ecological vision through language of "relatedness" rather than retain the rhetoric of home as used in the earlier ecofeminist work of Rosemary Radford Ruether and Sallie McFague.[18] So also, Andrea Smith deployed scare quotes around "home" to destabilize it's meaning when she does use the term. Refusing to use the rhetoric of home—or to use it only by clearly signifying "home" as problematic—helps to resist the ongoing reification of the socio-economic dynamics of power that construct "home" and "homeland."

Yet, the rhetoric of home *is* everywhere in U.S. spoken and written English. As such, it continues to be used throughout Christian discourses—including feminist Christian discourses. The rhetoric of home continues to be used uncritically to designate everything from a place of domestic dwelling (I'm going *home* now), to an academic field (religion is my departmental *home*), to emphasizing a point of argument (drive the point *home*). Even these seemingly banal uses of the rhetoric of home can be questioned for their role in reinforcing particular rhetorical understanding of "home." For example, the phrase "to drive a point home" reifies the sense of "home" as place of safety and security—a certain place beyond question. Scholars also need to question whether or not "home" is a necessary and appropriate term to use when describing the (household/domestic) location of a person either in a contemporary context or in a biblical text.[19]

[18] Ivone Gebara, *Longing for Running Water: Ecofeminism and Liberation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 56-57.
[19] See discussion in chapter four of interpretations of John 14:2.

Most importantly, as Bernice Johnson Reagon challenged, feminist scholars should continue to challenge the use of "home" to convey networks of "belonging" for coalition or political purposes.[20] Likewise, identifying an academic discipline as "home" may convey belonging, but may do so in a way that risks reinscribing "home" as a notion of exclusivity and/or hierarchy. For the same reasons, describing a church (or The Church) as "home" also problematically incorporates patterns of unequal social relations based upon the patriarchal family.[21]

Despite, or even because of, the dynamics of power in the dominant rhetoric of home, some feminist scholars have suggested re-imagining what "home" signifies—trying to revise the discourse to visions of a "home" that is more just, more inclusive. For example, Emilie Townes argues that "Shug's God in and of creation calls us to recreate our material and spiritual homes."[22] She then offers her own re-imagined "Apocalyptic Vision" for "bringing ourselves home."[23] Although using the rhetoric of home, Townes does so to subvert social relations of inequality and violence as she calls for an alternative eschatological hope built upon a lived spirituality of justice and love that attends to our social, material, and spiritual lives. The pull to re-imagine an earthly home of ecological and social justice is evident throughout both eco-feminist Christian discourses as well as the postcolonial influenced work of Rita Nakashima Brock and Rebecca Parker.[24]

---

[20] Bernice Johnson Reagon, "Coalition Politics: Turning the Century" in Barbara Smith, ed., *Home Girls: a Black Feminist Anthology* (New York: Kitchen Table—Women of Color Press, 1983), 343-355.
[21] Mary Daly, *The Church and the Second Sex*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1968).
[22] Emilie M. Townes, *In a Blaze of Glory: Womanist Spirituality as Social Witness* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995), 87.
[23] Townes, *Blaze of Glory*, 120.
[24] Rita Nakashima Brock and Rebecca Ann Parker, *Saving Paradise: How Christianity Traded Loved of This World for Crucifixion and Empire* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2008).

Similarly to re-imagining "home," using an alternative rhetoric of home to challenge the dominant rhetoric of home seeks to intervene in the politics of space. For example, by using the notion of the "unhomely" to play with a partial, shifting sense of belonging, postcolonial discourses have sought to undermine the violence perpetuated against the "other."[25] The notion of the "unhomely" and "the-home-in-the-world" refuses to accept a global binary of "home" and "abroad/other." Insisting upon a "leaky, porous boundary" between "home and abroad" challenges the rigid structures of colonial power sustained by the binary mapping of home/abroad.[26] An imperial binary logic of "in/out" or "home/abroad" rests upon the spatio-socio-economic mapping of social relations in terms of a singular standard of belonging—namely, white, Euro-American, heterosexual, moneyed, married, Christian men. In contrast, the postcolonial logic of the unhomely re-imagines the spatio-socio-economic landscape in terms of interwoven social relations with shifting, porous boundaries. Resisting the singular, firm boundary of the imperial "home" is a step towards decolonizing social relations of inequality and exploitation that rests upon this socio-spatial mapping of power.

Throughout this dissertation, I have repeatedly argued that the space of home is constructed by social relations. A critical rhetorical analysis of "home" helps to articulate how these social relations reinforce particular constellations of power. Both feminist and postcolonial critiques of the rhetoric of home have challenged the dominant rhetoric of home and homeland for reinforcing constellations of *unjust* power and warranting violence against people and the material planet upon which we dwell. Given the dynamics of power operating within the rhetoric of home, feminist and postcolonial critiques of "home" have intervened to reveal these

[25] Levitt, *Jews and Feminism*.
[26] Abraham, "Pterodactyl in the Margins"; Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, (New York: Routledge Classics, 2004), 14-15.

dynamics of power, to refuse to speak of "home," and to re-imagine how to speak of "home." In so far as the rhetoric of home participates in a politics of space that construct the spatio-socio-economic landscape in which we dwell, these interventions into the rhetoric of home should be understood as *political* speech.

Too often the rhetoric of home has been deemed as banal, apolitical speech by understanding "home" to refer *only* to a kind of space. However, a critical understanding of space as constructed by social relations makes clear that spaces are not merely settings or backdrops for action. Rather, spaces and places are in themselves "participants" in spatio-socio-economic dynamics of power. For this reason, seeking to construct an alternative space of "home" is a political intervention in the dynamics of power that have constructed "home" and "homeland." The strategies of deconstructing, revealing, refusing, and re-imaging "home" all offer ways to intervene in the politics of space functioning within the rhetoric of home. However, I would like to offer a final way to intervene in the politics of space: re-framing how we understand the social relations that construct "home" and "homeland."

In suggesting the need to change how we understand the social relations of power that construct both "home" and "homeland," I am arguing not merely for a change in speech, but for the need to construct alternative spaces to those constructed by the dominant rhetoric of home, homeland, and conservative Christianity.[27] In order to work towards constructing these alternative spaces to the patri-kyriachal "home," however, we need a better way of articulating

[27] I understand this move from a deconstruction of the rhetoric of home to a constructive vision to be akin to Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza's statement: "A critical feminist interpretation must be both deconstructive and reconstructive at the same time. It must unmask both the kyriarchal discourses of contemporary culture and those of the biblical text itself; it must also rewrite them by asserting the presence and agency of wo/men in kyriarchal texts, cultures, and religions." *Sharing Her Word*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1998), 105. By tracing feminist alternatives to the dominant rhetoric of home, I have sought to show how the singular, static notion of the white, patriarchal "home" has been actively resisted and challenged.

the constellations of power that structure dwelling together in planetary life. For many feminists and postcolonial scholars, the rhetoric of "home"—re-imagined or not—is either too problematic or simply fails to capture the complex interactions of social relations that construct our dwelling together. Here is where I take seriously Bonnie Miller-McLemore's contention that feminist discourses have failed to adequately reform the social practices of domestic labor, social reproduction, and material care for bodies which constitute "home."[28] What *constructive* vision of the interwoven social relations of dwelling together in planetary life might feminist Christian discourses offer? How can this vision not only promote socio-economic justice within the social relations that construct household dwelling but also function to de-colonize national spaces of dwelling together?

In seeking to proffer a constructive feminist, postcolonial vision of dwelling together, my aim is decidedly *not* to pave the way for a post-feminist recuperation of a gendered domesticity that celebrates the "place" of women in the home.[29] Nor do I wish to simply offer my own utopian "blueprint" for a particular set of laws—legal, political, or ethical—or for a massive redevelopment project on a global scale. Rather, I seek a way to convey the full complexity of the constellation of social relations that construct the spatio-socio-economic structures in which we dwell together. Mapping these connections not only allows for a critical analysis of those spatio-socio-economic structures, but also for constructively imagining the possibilities for

[28] Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, *Also a Mother: Work and Family as Theological Dilemma* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), 70.

[29] Recent years have seen a resurgence in domesticity among young women in the media, blogs, and books. Analyzing this trend in terms of feminist utopias is beyond the scope of this dissertation; however, it suggests a number of provocative directions for considering the im/possibility of a "feminist" domesticity. See Shannon Hayes, *Radical Homemakers: Reclaiming Domesticity from a Consumer Culture*, (Richmondville, NY: Left to Write Press, 2010); Peggy Orenstein, "The Femivore's Dilemma," *New York Times*, March 11, 2010, accessed March 31, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/14/magazine/14fob-wwln-t.html

constructing shared spaces of dwelling that promote the flourishing of all.[30] In this way, I seek to re-frame the rhetoric of home from discourses emphasizing social relations of power operating *in* spaces such as "home" to a critical-constructive discussion of spatio-socio-economic dynamics of power. Rather than attempt to recuperate "home," I propose a feminist Christian theo-ethical rhetoric of dwelling together to convey the complex, shifting constellation of theo-ethical commitments and practices that shape the spatio-socio-economic dynamics that constitute our planetary lives.

Toward a Feminist Christian De-Colonizing Ethic of Dwelling Together

In this final section, I will identify three necessary components for constructing a feminist Christian de-colonizing ethic of dwelling together. First of all, I will articulate my choice of the phrase "dwelling together" and its role in underscoring the interconnected elements that constitute our social, material, spiritual, and ethical lives. Secondly, I will discuss how this interconnected mapping of spatio-socio-economic relations informs how I understand the constellations of power in which we dwell together. Thirdly, I will name my own theo-ethical vision of the "good life" for shaping how we might dwell together to promote the flourishing of all planetary life.

Dwelling Together in Spatio-Socio-Economic Space

By selecting the phrase "dwelling together," I want to emphasize a number of interrelated spatio-socio-economic dynamics that shape and structure planetary life. Choosing to deploy the rhetoric of "dwelling" is an effort to reflect the dual meaning of "dwelling" as a material place

[30] I understand my ethical framework of "mapping" the connections to be genealogically related to the feminist Christian ethical framework of Beverly Harrison who argues for "making" the connections. However, to convey the spatiality of a constellation of connections, I rely on language of "mapping" rather "making." Beverly W. Harrison, *Making the Connections: Essays in Feminist Social Ethics*, ed. Carol S. Robb (Boston: Beacon Press, 1985).

(i.e. *a* dwelling as in a kind of shelter) *and* "dwelling" as an action (i.e. to dwell as a type of movement). Thus, an ethics of dwelling together seeks to articulate the interrelations between socio-economic practices and the structures, institutions, and the ecological environment of planetary life. By mapping the constellations of the socio-economic dynamics of power that *spatially* constitute planetary life, a feminist Christian de-colonizing ethic of dwelling together seeks to address both the social and material environments of planetary life.

In speaking of dwelling *together*, I seek to highlight the *social* dynamics of dwelling. Humanity does not dwell alone but is in social relationship with both other humans and animals with which we share planetary space. Thus, a feminist postcolonial ethic of dwelling together must address in what ways these social relationships are constituted to sustain particular patterns and structures of shared space—i.e. patterns of inequality or of justice. However, a feminist postcolonial understanding of space resists a model by which a single set of "house rules" from the small scale are used to pattern large scale social interactions—e.g. patterning the national "family" on the patriarchal "family" of white, heterosexual, Christian marriage—or whereby an singular universal model patterns all smaller scales of interactions.[31]

Rather, a feminist postcolonial understanding of the spatio-socio-economic space insists upon an understanding of space as both complex and multiple. According to geographer Michael Curry, we live in a "mangle of practices":

> through which we construct and maintain places is always constructing and maintaining multiple places, at what some would term different "scales," we are always in more than one place at once. We are home at home and in the bedroom and in New Jersey, or at work and in an office and in California, or in an airplane seat and in the U.S.s and in first class. And it is because different activities and objects and ideas "fit" within different

[31] For example, the metaphor of a heavenly household to convey social ethical relations in this world. Letty Russell, *Household of Freedom: Authority in Feminist Theology* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987).

> places that we are inexorably faced with moral dilemmas. Those moral dilemmas are geographical dilemmas.[32]

Insisting upon the recognition of such multiple "scales" or "places" of the spatio-socio-economic landscape is an effort to think through complex constellations of interrelated social relationships and responsibilities. In *Disruptive Christian Ethics,* Traci West writes, "Interrogating the connection between particular and universal moral concerns is my major conceptual focus."[33] Rather than thinking only in terms of the "universal" and the "particular," I am proposing that a spatio-socio-economic model insists upon thinking of a constellation of multiple scales of interrelations.

In order to adequately and productively respond to ethical issues facing contemporary life, critical feminist postcolonial Christian ethical discourses need to articulate a vision of the complex, changing patterns of spatio-socio-economic relations that constitute planetary life. Ethical discussions on most if not all issues are inevitably complex. However, as with many areas of study in the academy, specialization within the study of Christian ethics as well as specialization as an ethicist within the study of religion had increasingly produced ethical specialties that can miss critical connections that might become more apparent in a larger frame. By critically analyzing the notion of "home" in feminist Christian theo-ethical discourses, I have attempted to argue for a way to re-frame family, social, and environmental ethical issues in terms of an ethics of dwelling together.

---

[32] Michael R. Curry, "'Hereness' and the Normativity of Place," in *Geography and Ethics: Journeys in a Moral Terrain*, ed. James D. Proctor and David M. Smith (New York, NY: Routledge, 1999), 96.

[33] Traci West, *Disruptive Christian Ethics: When Racism and Women's Lives* Matter (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 37.

My approach to a feminist postcolonial Christian ethic of dwelling together is most akin to social ethics.[34] Like social ethics, a feminist postcolonial Christian ethic of dwelling together seeks to attend to the ethical questions of living together in society. But even social ethics have often referenced social "structures" in ways that seem to miss the impact of the *built* environment of material structures and of environmental location upon social movements and relations.[35] In other words, how does a society actually get built? What role does the built environment have in shaping social relations?

By highlighting the connection between social relations, space, and the built environment, I hope to offer another way to produce ethical critiques of the intersections between socio-economic dynamics of power and the material environment in which we dwell. For example, as discussed in chapter one, social and religious ideals of the self-sufficient, married, heterosexual "family" have affected housing design, the layout of cities, and the national space of a rationally ordered grid of land surveyance. So also, social ideals of a white, heterosexual, married, Christian "family" *build* the homeland through the erection of fences along the Rio Grande to keep out brown people, a War on Terror that renders Muslims

[34] Sources on Christian social ethics in addition to Beverly Harrison, *Making the Connections* include: John B. Cobb, Jr. and Herman E. Daly, eds., *For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy toward Community, the Environment, and a Sustainable Future*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989, 1994); Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches* (Louisville, Ky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992); Gary J. Dorrien, *Economy, Difference, Empire: Social Ethics for Social Justice* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010).

[35] The phrase "built environment" is common to architectural discourses of sustainable building which seek to consider the ethical and environmental impact of constructing buildings and infrastructure upon the material environment. It has also begun to make its appearance in Christian theology and ethics. Timothy Gorringe, *The Common Good and the Global Emergency: God and the Built Environment* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Gorringe, *A Theology of the Built Environment: Justice, Empowerment, Redemption* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

perpetually suspect, and the withholding of the legal privileges of marriage from same-sex couples—including the right to share access to citizenship with their partners.

Dwelling together encompasses multiple social practices from caring for dependents, providing shelter, preparing food, exchanging goods, producing goods for exchange, providing services, securing resources, healing bodies, remembering, learning, legislating, voting, protesting, and much more. As such, a feminist postcolonial ethic of dwelling together is a broad framework to help articulate and critical analyze the interconnections among social practices. Within Christian ethics, the call for an ethical analysis of dwelling together is a challenge to weave together ethical discourses of marriage and family ethics, environmental ethics, as well as ethical critiques of the political economy of globalization and neo-imperialism. Rather than envision the social landscape as a series of distinct spaces of different issues, a feminist postcolonial Christian ethic of dwelling seeks to map connections. In her analysis of sexual violence and Native American women, for example, Andrea Smith made clear the need to analyze ethical ideals of white, heterosexual Christian marriage in conjunction with the ethics of building a national "homeland" upon a legacy of sexual violence against Native women.[36]

Constellations of Spatio-Socio-Economic Power

A feminist postcolonial Christian ethic of dwelling together does not seek simply to articulate the interconnected patterns of spatio-socio-economic dwelling. Rather, a feminist Christian de-colonizing ethic of dwelling together seeks to intervene in the politics of space in order to work towards creating more just social relations that restructure how we dwell together in planetary life. As shown in chapters two and three, feminist theo-ethical discourses have sought to convey dynamics of power in increasingly more complex ways. Moving away from a

[36] Smith, *Conquest.*

binary of power to more intersectional models, feminist theory has sought to convey the multiplicity of socio-economic dynamics of power that constitute social-political structures as well as human subjectivity. For example, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza has coined the term *kyriarchy* to convey her understanding of the interrelated dynamics of power.

In my argument, I have sought to incorporate the spatial into these dynamics of space as well—thus speaking of spatio-socio-economic dynamics of power. Whereas language of "intersectionality" *can* function to convey the complexity of socio-economic dynamics of power, I find the language of "constellations" to be more compelling. Like the "constellations" in the sky, I envision "constellations" of power to be multi-dimensional in a way that incorporates the depth of space-time.[37] In other words, "constellation" can better convey the *spatiality* of socio-economic dynamics of power.[38]

Thus, I understand our ethical landscapes to be constituted by complex, shifting constellations of socio-economic dynamics of power occurring simultaneously at multiple scales "from the most local level to the most global."[39] Within such a view of power, ethical actions and interventions can also occur simultaneously at multiple scales in interrelated ways. For example, recent studies have shown that the majority of children born to women under the age of

---

[37] For a discussion of queering space-time so as to open "the field of utopian possibility" of "multiple forms of belonging-in-difference," see José Esteban Muñoz, "Queerness as Horizon: Utopian Hermeneutics in the Face of Gay Pragmatism," in *A Companion to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Studies*, ed. George E. Haggerty and Molly McGarry (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 452-463.

[38] Another way to consider the notion of "constellation" is through the vast, global networks of digital communications such as the internet. Where is the internet? The "space" of the internet is both material in the places of particular computers, servers, smart phones, etcetera, *and* in the relations between the computers, servers, smart phones, etcetera. Thus, I find it significant that "home" in this internet model is the point of "entry" and connection into this constellation of interrelated spatio-socio-economic engagements with the "internet." While this metaphor is helpful to support my understanding of "constellation," I have not researched philosophies of virtual reality or technology to be able to comment more substantially.

[39] Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*, 264.

30 are now born to unwed parents.[40] On one scale, the ethics of unwed mothers can be read only in terms of individual choices regarding sexuality and childbirth outside of marriage. On another scale, this statistic can be analyzed in terms of changing U.S. socio-economic patterns of income inequality that shape the desire for and likelihood of marriage for lower-income households. On yet another scale, the changing demographics of social reproduction within the U.S. can be located within discussions linking global economics and U.S. political policies of privatization.

These "scales" of analysis may be separate in terms of rhetoric; however, a feminist postcolonial analysis insists that social relations are interrelated through complex, shifting constellations of power. Thus a feminist postcolonial ethic of dwelling together seeks not only to analyze the interrelations in these constellations, but also to intervene in the politics of spatio-socio-economic relations of power on multiple scales of action. For example, feminists can intervene in sexual violence by helping an individual woman to realize she does *not* deserve sexual abuse, by lobbying for the Congressional reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, and by challenging the spread of neo-liberal capitalism through organizations such as the IMF that wreak havoc upon local economies and contribute to the global rise of women in sex work.[41] Although emphasizing the multiplicity of scales, it is critical for a feminist postcolonial ethic of dwelling together to maintain a sense that these are simultaneous and interwoven social relations that structure planetary life.

Feminist Christian ethicists such as Gloria Albrecht, Emilie Townes, Traci West and many others have been offering complex articulations of the interwoven social relations that

---

[40] Stephanie May, "A New Normal and the Right to Reproduce," Feminist Studies in Religion blog, posted February 20, 2012, http://www.fsrinc.org/blog/new-normal-and-right-reproduce.
[41] On the 2012 politics of reauthorizing the VAWA act see, Nancy K. Kaufman, "The Struggle to End Violence Against Women Encounters a Road Block," *Huffington Post,* posted March 15, 2012, accessed March 31, 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nancy-kaufman/violence-against-women-act-2012_b_1339525.html.

structure human dwelling. However, to more adequately account for the dynamics of power shaping the ethical landscapes of contemporary U.S. society, postcolonial critiques of practices of U.S. imperialism and exceptionalism need to be incorporated into our ethical maps. As Andrea Smith writes, what happens "out there" is connected to what happens in the "homeland" as well as in the "home." As a *feminist* ethic, my approach to ethics engages a critical conversation about the gendered inequalities of power—a conversation that has expanded to recognize that gender, race, class, sexuality, ability, ethnicity, and nationality are complex, interrelated socio-political dynamics that distribute power unequally and unjustly. So also, as a *de-colonizing* ethic, the aim is to produce an ethical understanding of the socio-economic distribution of power that seeks to shift the distribution of power to be just, to promote human flourishing more equitably to the dignity of all.

Constructing Spaces for the Flourishing of Planetary Life

Dwelling together is in itself devoid of specific ethical content and on its own does not provide a particular ethical orientation within the constellation of socio-economic dynamics that constitute planetary life. As Massey explains, recognizing interrelatedness is not enough for a politics of space—and, I would add, for an ethics of space. Rather, a feminist Christian de-colonizing ethic of dwelling together seeks to intervene in the politics of space in ways that promotes the flourishing of planetary life. On the one hand, this means challenging and disrupting patterns of spatio-socio-economic constellations of power that function to reinforce violence and social inequality. On the other hand, this means envisioning and enacting alternative constellations of spatio-socio-economic power to construct a more just planetary life for all.

Within a feminist Christian de-colonizing ethic of dwelling together, the dominant U.S. and Christian rhetorics of "home," "family," and "marriage" must be contested for promoting a singular, static model of white, heterosexual, patriarchal marriage and self-sufficient households. Rather, a feminist de-colonizing ethic seeks to re-imagine how we might dwell together in ways that promotes the flourishing of planetary life in its multiplicity. For example, advocating for same-sex marriage is certainly one means of politically intervening to challenge the singular norm of "home." However, another strategy might be to follow the work of feminist legal scholar Martha Fineman and focus not on particular forms of dwelling together—such as "marriage"—but on how the state might support the ethical activities of caring for dependents.[42] Both seek to intervene in the politics of space to promote the flourishing of life through relationships of care in ways that challenge the singular dominant rhetoric of "home" or "family." So also, the U.S. rhetoric of "homeland" as a white, Christian nation of self-sufficient home(steads) must be challenged in its multiple forms—from racism and heterosexism in immigration policies to the political gutting of the social safety net.

A feminist Christian de-colonizing ethic of dwelling together also seeks to envision alternative patterns of spatio-socio-economic interrelations that promote the flourishing of life for all. To develop the notion of "flourishing," I incorporate several different strains of feminist utopian thought. With Elizabeth Castelli, I agree that feminist utopian thought cannot be a "blueprint."[43] Rather than attempt to build the perfect, closed system, I choose the term

---

[42] Martha Fineman, *The Autonomy Myth: A Theory of Dependency* (New York: New Press, 2004). See also, Fineman, *The Neutered Mother, the Sexual Family, and Other Twentieth Century Tragedies* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

[43] Elizabeth A. Castelli, "The Ekklēsia of Women and/as Utopian Space: Locating the Work of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza in Feminist Utopian Thought," in *On the Cutting Edge: The Study of Women in Biblical Worlds: Essays in Honor of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza*, ed. Jane Schaberg, Alice Bach, and Esther Fuchs (New York: Continuum, 2004), 36-52.

"flourishing" to convey as sense of "abundant life" in the sense of "ethical grace" that Rita Nakashima Brock and Rebecca Parker develop in *Saving Paradise*. Within the "detranscendentalized" frame of planetarity, ethical action must be oriented to building and sustaining abundant life here and now. For example, an alternative to the inequalities spread and sustained through neo-liberal capitalism can be found in feminist economist Juliet Schor's notion of "plentitude"—"a vision for a way to live that respects the awesome place we call earth and all who live upon it."[44]

While economic, material, and ecological well-being are foundational for "flourishing," a feminist de-colonizing Christian ethic of dwelling together also demands democratic processes of shared power as fundamental. In this regard, I find both Bernice Johnson Reagon's critique of home and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza's critique of "Eden-Paradise-home" to be important correctives to resist romanticized notions of dwelling together as simply "sisterhood," "home," or even "love."[45] Insofar as the spaces in which we dwell together are themselves constituted by socio-economic dynamics of *power*, then political structures that promote the equitable sharing of power in decision-making that shapes how we dwell together are critical.

Final Thoughts and Future Possibilities

The U.S. rhetoric of home, homeland, and Christianity has functioned to reinforce hierarchies of power, policies of exclusion, and practices of violence. As such, feminist Christian theo-ethical discourses have intervened in the spatio-socio-economic dynamics of power that construct notions of home, homeland, *and* Christianity. Whereas I acknowledge the important

[44] Juliet B. Schor, *Plentitude: The New Economics of True Wealth* (New York: Penguin Press, 2010). Another alternative economic model is that the "community economy" put forth by J.K. Gibson-Graham, *A Postcapitalist Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006).
[45] Reagon, "Coalition Politics"; Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 346; Schüssler Fiorenza *Transforming Vision*, 152.

work of resistance and re-imagining performed by alternative feminist and postcolonial discourses of "home," I contend that developing a feminist Christian de-colonizing ethic of dwelling together better shifts the analysis to the politics and processes that construct our planetary life.

As a broad ethical framework, I understand a feminist Christian de-colonizing ethic of dwelling together to be a way of approaching the interrelations of planetary life. In future work, I would like to explore how a feminist Christian de-colonizing ethic of dwelling could be used to provide ethical analysis of a particular issue. For example, the issue of food politics requires an analysis of a multiplicity of interrelated spatio-socio-economic dynamics including: gendered labor within the domestic household; transnational exchanges of agricultural commodities; environmental critiques of factory farming; social inequality in access to healthy food as well as adequate food within the U.S. and globally; immigration issues of agricultural labor; as well as nostalgic notions of a pastoral U.S. identity of self-sustaining households. A feminist Christian de-colonizing ethic of dwelling would seek to attend to the complex constellation of interrelations on multiple scales to articulate a critique as well as a vision of particular practices and policies that materially structure the dynamics of food politics.

A Christian notion of flourishing and "ethical grace" would help to shape both the critique and the vision of food politics towards ethical responsibility of socio-environmental justice as well as delight and love for this world. In other words, a feminist Christian de-colonizing ethic of dwelling together seeks to articulate an alternative vision to "home" that does not escape this world for paradise in another. Rather, a feminist Christian de-colonizing ethic of dwelling together promotes the flourishing of the multiple interrelated dynamics of planetary life here and now—social, economic, political, environmental, and spatial.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Nearing Home: Comforts and Counsels for the Aged. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1868.

Abe, Ernest L. "'Home, Sweet Home': A Civil War Soldier's Favorite Song." *America's Civil War* (May, 1996).

Abraham, Susan. "Pterodactyl in the Margins." In *Planetary Loves: Spivak, Postcoloniality, and Theology*, edited by Stephen D. Moore and Mayra Rivera. 1st ed., 79-101. New York: Fordham University Press, 2011.

Afzal-Khan, Fawzia and Kalpana Seshadri-Crooks, eds. *The Pre-Occupation of Postcolonial Studies*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2000.

Ahmed, Sara, ed. *Uprootings/regroundings:Questions of Home and Migration*. 1st ed. New York: Berg, 2003.

Albrecht, Gloria H. "Ideals and Injuries: The Denial of Difference in the Construction of Christian Family Ideals." *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 25, no. 1 (March, 2005): 169-195.

———.*Hitting Home: Feminist Ethics, Women's Work, and the Betrayal of "Family Values"*. New York: Continuum, 2002.

———. "Re-Forming Families: Producing the New Ideal." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 18, no. 2 (Sept, 2002): 33-52.

Allen, Amy. *The Power of Feminist Theory: Domination, Resistance, Solidarity*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1999.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands : The New Mestiza = La Frontera*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute, 1987.

Arendt, Hannah. *Rahel Varnhagen, the Life of a Jewish Woman*. Rev. ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974.

Auslander, Leora. *Cultural Revolutions: The Politics of Everyday Life in Britain, North America and France*. English ed. New York: Berg, 2009.

Balka, Christie and Andy Rose, eds. *Twice Blessed: On being Lesbian, Gay, and Jewish*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1989.

Bathurst Gilson, Anne, Marcia Y. Riggs, Elizabeth Bounds, Rita Nakashima Brock, Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, and Susan Brooks Thistlethwaite. "Special Section: Feminism and Family Values." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 12, no. 1 (Spring, 1996): 99-157.

Bauer, Walter, William Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature : A Translation and Adaptation of the Fourth Revised and Augmented Edition of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch Zu Den Schriften Des Neuen Testaments Und Der Übrigen Urchristlichen Literatur*. 2nd, rev. and augmented / by F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker from Walter Bauer's 5th, 1958. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Beasley, Nicholas M. *Christian Ritual and the Creation of British Slave Societies, 1650-1780*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2009.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. New York: Vintage Books, 1952.

Bederman, Gail. *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Beecher, Catharine Esther, 1800-1878. *A Treatise on Domestic Economy, for the use of Young Ladies at Home, and at School*. Rev. ed. Boston: T.H. Webb & Co, 1842.

Beecher, Catharine Esther, 1800-1878. and Harriet Beecher Stowe 1811-1896. *The American Woman's Home: Or, Principles of Domestic Science : Being a Guide to the Formation and Maintenance of Economical, Healthful, Beautiful, and Christian Homes*. Hartford, Conn.: Stowe-Day Foundation, 1987.

Belkin, Lisa. "The Opt-Out Revolution." *New York Times*, October 26, 2003.

Beresford, Annette D. "Homeland Security as an American Ideology: Implications for U.S. Policy and Action." *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management* 1, no. 3, (2004): Article 301.

Bergen, Raquel Kennedy, Jeffrey L. Edleson, and Claire M. Renzetti, eds. *Violence Against Women: Classic Papers*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon, 2005.

Bhabha, Homi. "The World and the Home." *Social Text* no. 31 (1992): 141-153.

———. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge Classics. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Blount, Brian K. *Cultural Interpretation: Reorienting New Testament Criticism*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Blunt, Alison. "Imperial Geographies of Home: British Domesticity in India, 1886-1925." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 24, no. 4 (1999): 421-440.

Boles, John B. "Turner, the Frontier, and the Study of Religion in America." *Journal of the Early Republic* 13, no. 2 (July, 1993): 205-216.

Bounds, Elizabeth M., Pamela Brubaker, and Mary E. Hobgood, eds. *Welfare Policy: Feminist Critiques*. The Pilgrim Library of Ethics. Cleveland, Ohio: Pilgrim Press, 1999.

———. *Welfare Policy: Feminist Critiques*. Cleveland, Ohio: Pilgrim Press, 1999.

Boym, Svetlana. *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York: Basic Books, 2001.

Bradford Wilcox, W. "Values Inequality; "Coming Apart" Argues that a Large Swath of America--Poor and Working-Class Whites--is Turning Away from Traditional Values and Losing Ground." *Wall Street Journal (Online)*, Jan 31, 2012.

Brenner, Athalya, ed. *Ruth and Esther*. Feminist Companion to the Bible; 2nd Ser., 3. Vol. 2nd ser., 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Brock, Rita Nakashima and Rebecca Ann Parker. *Proverbs of Ashes: Violence, Redemptive Suffering, and the Search for what Saves Us*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2001.

———. *Saving Paradise: How Christianity Traded Love of this World for Crucifixion and Empire*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2008.

Brondos, David A. "Saving Paradise: How Christianity Traded Love of this World for Crucifixion and Empire." *Dialog* 49, no. 3 (Sept, 2010): 249-252.

Brown, Gillian. *Domestic Individualism: Imagining Self in Nineteenth-Century America*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Brown, Joanne Carlson and Carole R. Bohn, ed. *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse: A Feminist Critique*. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1989.

Browning, Don. "Religion, Culture, and Family Project." University of Chicago, accessed March 28, 2012, http://divinity.uchicago.edu/martycenter/research/rcfp/index.html.

Browning, Don S., Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, Pamela D. Couture, K. Brynolf Lyon, Robert M. Franklin. *From Culture Wars to Common Ground: Religion and the American Family Debate*. The Family, Religion, and Culture. 1st ed. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.

———. *Generative Man: Psychoanalytic Perspectives*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973.

———. *Marriage and Modernization: How Globalization Threatens Marriage and What to Do About It*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub, 2003.

Brubaker, Pamela, Rebecca Todd Peters, and Laura A. Stivers, eds. *Justice in a Global Economy: Strategies for Home, Community, and World*. 1st ed. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.

Bryan, Steven M. "The Eschatological Temple in John 14." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 15, no. 2 (2005): 187-198.

Bulkin, Elly, Minnie Bruce Pratt, and Barbara Smith. *Yours in Struggle: Three Feminist Perspectives on Anti-Semitism and Racism*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Firebrand Books, 1984.

Byerly, Victoria Morris. *Hard Times Cotton Mill Girls: Personal Histories of Womanhood and Poverty in the South*. Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR Press, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1986.

Cahill, Lisa Sowle. *Sex, Gender, and Christian Ethics*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Cahill, Lisa Sowle and Dietmar Mieth. *Concilium: The Family*. Vol. 1995/4. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995.

Cannon, Brian Q. *Reopening the Frontier: Homesteading in the Modern West*. Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas, 2009.

Cannon, Katie G. *Katie's Canon: Womanism and the Soul of the Black Community*. New York: Continuum, 1995.

Carr, Anne E. and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, eds. *Concilium: The Special Nature of Women?*. Vol. 1991/6. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991.

Carr, Anne E., Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, and Philip Hillyer, eds. *Conciliuim: Motherhood: Experience, Institution, Theology*. Vol. 206. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989.

Cassano, Graham. *Class Struggle on the Homefront : Work, Conflict, and Exploitation in the Household*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Castelli, Elizabeth A. "The Ekklēsia of Women and/as Utopian Space: Locating the Work of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza in Feminist Utopian Thought." In *On the Cutting Edge: The Study of Women in Biblical Worlds : Essays in Honor of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza*, edited by Jane Schaberg, Alice Bach and Esther Fuchs, 36-52. New York: Continuum, 2004.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe : Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton Studies in culture/power/history. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Chodorow, Nancy. *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Chopp, Rebecca S. "Feminist Queries and Metaphysical Musings." *Modern Theology* 11, no. 1 (1995): 47-63.

———. *The Power to Speak: Feminism, Language, God*. New York: Crossroad, 1989.

Christ, Carol P., Ellen M. Umansky, and Anne E. Carr. "Roundtable Discussion: What are the Sources of My Theology?" *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 1, no. 1 (Spring, 1985): 119-131.

Coleman, Monica A. *Making a Way Out of no Way: A Womanist Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.

Collins, Christopher. *Homeland Mythology: Biblical Narratives in American Culture*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007.

Cone, James H. *God of the Oppressed*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1975.

Coontz, Stephanie. *The Way we Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap*. New York: BasicBooks, 1992.

Cott, Nancy F. *The Grounding of Modern Feminism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.

———. *Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Cowen, Deborah and Emily Gilbert 1969-. *War, Citizenship, Territory*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement*. New York: New Press: Distributed by W.W. Norton & Co, 1995.

Daly, Mary. *Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1973.

———. *The Church and the Second Sex*. [1st] ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Davis, Angela Y. *Women, Race, & Class*. 1st ed. New York: Random House, 1981.

De Lauretis, Teresa. *Feminist Studies, Critical Studies*. Theories of Contemporary Culture; v. 8. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Deeb, Lara. *An Enchanted Modern: Gender and Public Piety in Shi'i Lebanon*. Princeton Studies in Muslim Politics. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Delphy, Christine and Diana Leonard. *Close to Home: A Materialist Analysis of Women's Oppression*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1984.

Donaldson, Laura E. "The Sign of Orpah: Reading Ruth through Native Eyes." In *The Postcolonial Biblical Reader*, edited by R. S. Sugirtharajah, 159-170. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Pub, 2006.

Dorrien, Gary J. *Economy, Difference, Empire: Social Ethics for Social Justice*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

Douglas, Ann. *The Feminization of American Culture*. New York: Noonday Press/Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1998.

Douglas, Susan and Meredith Michaels. "The Mommy Wars." *Ms* 10, no. 2 (2000): 62-69.

Eisenstein, Zillah R. *Against Empire: Feminisms, Racism, and the West*. New York: Zed Books, 2004.

———. *Feminism and Sexual Equality: Crisis in Liberal America*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1984.

———. *Sexual Decoys: Gender, Race and War in Imperial Democracy*. New York: Zed Press; Distributed in the USA by Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. *Public Man, Private Woman: Women in Social and Political Thought*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Emmet, Dorothy Mary. *The Moral Prism*. London: Macmillan, 1979.

Faludi, Susan. *The Terror Dream: Myth and Misogyny in an Insecure America*. Reprint ed. New York: Picador, 2008.

———. *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women*. 1st ed. New York: Crown, 1991.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press, 1967.

Feldstein, Ruth. *Motherhood in Black and White: Race and Sex in American Liberalism, 1930-1965*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Fenn, Richard K. *Beyond Idols: The Shape of a Secular Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Fineman, Martha. *The Autonomy Myth: A Theory of Dependency*. New York: New Press: Distributed by W.W. Norton, 2004.

———. *The Neutered Mother, the Sexual Family, and Other Twentieth Century Tragedies*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Finkelman, Paul. "Slavery and the Northwest Ordinance: A Study in Ambiguity." *Journal of the Early Republic* 6, no. 4 (December, 1986): 343-370.

Floyd-Thomas, Stacey, ed. *Mining the Motherlode: Methods in Womanist Ethics*. Cleveland, Ohio: Pilgrim Press, 2006.

Fortune, Marie M. *Sexual Violence: The Unmentionable Sin*. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1983.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 2nd Vintage Books ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

Frankenberg, Ruth. "Growing Up White: Feminism, Racism and Social Geography of Childhood." *Feminist Review* no. 45 (Sept, 1993): 51.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. New York: Seabury Press, 1970.

Freud, Sigmund. *The Uncanny*. Translated by David McLintock. Penguin Classics. New York: Penguin Books, 2003.

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Norton, 1963.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. *Mappings: Feminism and the Cultural Geographies of Encounter*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Fulkerson, Mary McClintock. *Places of Redemption: Theology for a Worldly Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Gardner, Martha Mabie. *The Qualities of a Citizen: Women, Immigration, and Citizenship, 1870-1965*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Gates, Paul Wallace. *Jeffersonian Dream: Studies in the History of American Land Policy and Development*. Edited by Allan G. Bogue and Margaret Beattie Bogue. The Historians of the Frontier and American West. 1st ed. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996.

Gauchet, Marcel. *Le Désenchantement Du Monde: Une Histoire Politique De La Religion*. Bibliothèque Des Sciences Humaines. Paris: Gallimard, 1985.

Gebara, Ivone. *Longing for Running Water: Ecofeminism and Liberation*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1999.

Gibson-Graham, J. *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006.

Gilson, Anne Bathurst. *The Battle for America's Families: A Feminist Response to the Religious Right*. Cleveland, Ohio: Pilgrim Press, 1999.

Gorringe, Timothy. *The Common Good and the Global Emergency: God and the Built Environment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

———. *A Theology of the Built Environment: Justice, Empowerment, Redemption*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Gould, Rebecca Kneale. *At Home in Nature: Modern Homesteading and Spiritual Practice in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Graham, William F. *Nearing Home: Life, Faith, and Finishing Well*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2011.

Greene, Jack P., ed. *Colonies to Nation, 1763-1789*: *A Documentary History of American Life* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Grewal, Inderpal. *Transnational America: Feminisms, Diasporas, Neoliberalisms*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2005.

Griffin, Patrick. *American Leviathan: Empire, Nation, and Revolutionary Frontier*. 1st ed. New York: Hill and Wang, 2007.

Gudorf, Christine E. and James Edward Huchingson. *Boundaries: A Casebook in Environmental Ethics*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2003.

Gutiérrez, Gustavo. *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1973.

Hansen, Karen Tranberg. *African Encounters with Domesticity*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1992.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Hardy, Sarah Boykin, and Caroline Alice Wiedmer. *Motherhood and Space: Configurations of the Maternal through Politics, Home, and the Body*. 1st ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Harrison, Beverly Wildung. *Justice in the Making: Feminist Social Ethics*. Edited by Elizabeth M. Bounds, Pamela K. Brubaker, Jane E. Hicks, Marilyn J. Legge, Rebecca Todd Peters, and Traci C. West. 1st ed. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.

———.*Making the Connections: Essays in Feminist Social Ethics*. Edited by Carol S. Robb. Boston: Beacon Press, 1985.

Haulman, Kate. "Fashion and the Culture Wars of Revolutionary Philadelphia." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 62, no. 4 (October, 2005): 625-662.

Hayden, Dolores. *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1981.

———. *Redesigning the American Dream: The Future of Housing, Work, and Family Life*. Rev. and expanded. ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 2002.

Hayes, Shannon. *Radical Homemakers: Reclaiming Domesticity from a Consumer Culture*. Richmondville, N.Y.: Left to Write Press, 2010.

Hennessy, Rosemary. *Materialist Feminism and the Politics of Discourse*. Thinking Gender. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Higginbotham, Evelyn Brooks. *Righteous Discontent: The Women's Movement in the Black Baptist Church, 1880-1920*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Hinze, Christine Firer. "Bridge Discourse on Wage Justice: Roman Catholic and Feminist Perspectives on the Family Living Wage." *Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics* (01/01, 1991): 109-132.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*. New York, N.Y.: Viking, 1989.

Hooks, Bell. *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1990.

Huffer, Lynne. *Maternal Pasts, Feminist Futures: Nostalgia, Ethics, and the Question of Difference*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Hyman, Harold Melvin. *American Singularity: The 1787 Northwest Ordinance, the 1862 Homestead and Morrill Acts, and the 1944 G.I. Bill*. The Richard B. Russell Lectures; no. 5. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986.

Jackson, Michael. *At Home in the World*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995.

Jarrell, Jane Cabaniss. *Simple Hospitality*. Nashville, Tenn: W. Publishing Group, 2005.

Jefferson, Thomas. *Notes on the State of Virginia*. Edited by William Peden. New York: Norton, 1954.

Johnston, Lynda and Robyn Longhurst. *Space, Place, and Sex: Geographies of Sexualities*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2010.

Johnston, R. J., Derek Gregory, Geraldine Pratt, and Michael Watts, eds. *The Dictionary of Human Geography*. 4th ed. Oxford, UK;Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

Josephson, Matthew. *The Robber Barons; the Great American Capitalists, 1861-1901*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and company, 1934.

Kang, Nam-sun. "A "Transit Home" Away from Home." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 21, no. 2 (Fall, 2005): 123-126.

Kaplan, Amy. "Homeland Insecurities: Reflections on Language and Space." *Radical History Review* no. 85 (Winter, 2003): 82-93.

———. *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Keown, Michelle, David Murphy, and James Procter, eds. *Comparing Postcolonial Diasporas*. Basingstoke England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Konrad, Alison M. and Rober Mangel. "The Impact of Work-Life Programs on Firm Productivity." *Strategic Management Journal* 21, no. 12 (2000): 1225-1237.

Kostenberger, Andreas J. "The Bible's Teaching on Marriage and the Family." Family Research Council, accessed March 28, 2012, http://www.frc.org/brochure/the-bibles-teaching-on-marriage-and-family.

Kwok, Pui-lan. *Postcolonial Imagination and Feminist Theology*. 1st ed. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.

LaHaye, Tim F. and Jerry B. Jenkins. *Left Behind: A Novel of the Earth's Last Days*. Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House Publishers, 1995.

Landes, Joan B. *Feminism, the Public and the Private*. Oxford Readings in Feminism. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Levitt, Laura. *Jews and Feminism: The Ambivalent Search for Home*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Lewis, Reina and Sara Mills. *Feminist Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Lindsey, Hal and Carole C. Carlson joint author. *The Late Great Planet Earth*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1970.

Lowe, Lisa. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1996.

Mahmood, Saba. *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Mananzan, Mary John. *Women Resisting Violence: Spirituality for Life*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1996.

Marshall, Alfred. *The Interlinear NRSV-NIV Parallel New Testament in Greek and English*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1993.

Marshall, Paule. *Praisesong for the Widow*. New York: Putnam's, 1983.

Martin, Emily. *The Woman in the Body: A Cultural Analysis of Reproduction*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1987.

Martin, Joan Marie. *More than Chains and Toil: A Christian Work Ethic of Enslaved Women*. 1st ed. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000.

Massey, Doreen B. *Space, Place and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity, 1994.

Massey, Doreen B., John Allen, and Philip Sarre, eds. *Human Geography Today*. Cambridge; Malden, Mass.: Polity Press, 1999.

May, Stephanie. *A New Normal and the Right to Reproduce*. Feminism in Religion Forum. Feminist Studies in Religion, Inc., February 20, 2012, http://www.fsrinc.org/blog/new-normal-and-right-reproduce

McCaffrey, James. *The House with Many Rooms: The Temple Theme of Jn. 14:2-3*. Vol. 114. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987.

McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

McClintock, Anne, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat, eds. *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

McDannell, Colleen. *The Christian Home in Victorian America, 1840-1900*. Religion in North America. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

McDowell, Linda and Joanne P. Sharp. *Space, Gender, Knowledge: Feminist Readings*. London: Arnold, 1997.

McFague, Sallie. *The Body of God: An Ecological Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

McMurry, Sally Ann. *Families and Farmhouses in Nineteenth-Century America: Vernacular Design and Social Change*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997.

Miles, Margaret R. "Saving Paradise: How Christianity Traded Love of this World for Crucifixion and Empire." *Christian Century* 125, no. 21 (October 21, 2008): 52-53.

Miller-McLemore, Bonnie. *Also a Mother: Work and Family as Theological Dilemma*. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1994.

———. "Family and Work: Can Anyone 'Have it all?'." In *Religion, Feminism, and the Family*, edited by Anne E. Carr and Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

Mills, Sara. *Gender and Colonial Space*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press; Distributed exclusively in the USA by Palgrave, 2005.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "U.S. Empire and the Project of Women's Studies: Stories of Citizenship, Complicity, and Dissent." *Gender, Place, and Culture*. 13, no. 1 (Feb 2006): 9.

———. *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

Moore, Henrietta L. *Space, Text, and Gender: An Anthropological Study of the Marakwet of Kenya*. New York: Guilford Press, 1996.

Moreton, Bethany. *To Serve God and Wal-Mart: The Making of Christian Free Enterprise*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Morgenson, Gretchen and Joshua Rosner. *Reckless Endangerment: How Outsized Ambition, Greed, and Corruption Led to Economic Armageddon*. 1st ed. New York: Times Books, 2011.

Muñoz, José Esteban. "Queerness as Horizon: Utopian Hermeneutics in the Face of Gay Pragmatism." In *A Companion to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Studies*, edited by George E. Haggerty and Molly McGarry, 452-463. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007.

Murray, Charles A. *Coming Apart : The State of White America, 1960-2010*. 1st ed. New York N.Y.: Crown Forum, 2012.

Nagi, Mae M. "The Architecture of Race in American Immigration Law: A Reexamination of the Immigration Act of 1924" *Journal of American History* 86, no. 1 (1999): 67-92.

Nelson, Louis P. *The Beauty of Holiness: Anglicanism & Architecture in Colonial South Carolina*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

Nicolosi, Ann Marie. "'We do Not Want our Girls to Marry Foreigners': Gender, Race, and American Citizenship." *NWSA Journal* 13, no. 3 (Fall, 2001): 1.

Noddings, Nel. *The Maternal Factor: Two Paths to Morality*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.

———. *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics & Moral Education*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Okin, Susan Moller. *Justice, Gender, and the Family*. New York: Basic Books, 1989.

Onuf, Peter S. *Statehood and Union: A History of the Northwest Ordinance*. Midwestern History and Culture. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Orenstein, Peggy. "The Femivore's Dilemma." *New York Times,* March 11, 2010, 2010.

Osiek, Carolyn and Margaret Y. MacDonald with Janet H. Tulloch. *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006.

Pateman, Carole. *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1988.

Payne, John Howard, 1791-1852. *Home Sweet Home*. Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1880.

Pearson, Allison. *I Don't Know how She does It: The Life of Kate Reddy, Working Mother*. 1st American ed. New York: Knopf, 2002.

Peavy, Linda S. and Ursula Smith. *Women in Waiting in the Westward Movement: Life on the Home Frontier*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994.

Phillips, Kevin. *Wealth and Democracy: A Political History of the American Rich*. 1st ed. New York: Broadway Books, 2002.

Plaskow, Judith. "A Short History of JFSR." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 21, no. 2 (Fall, 2005): 103-106.

Plaskow, Judith and Carol P. Christ, eds. *Weaving the Visions: New Patterns in Feminist Spirituality*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989.

———. *Womanspirit Rising: A Feminist Reader in Religion*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979.

Pride, Mary. *The Way Home: Beyond Feminism, Back to Reality*. Westchester, Ill.: Crossway Books, 1985.

Proctor, James D. and David Marshall Smith. *Geography and Ethics: Journeys in a Moral Terrain*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Puar, Jasbir K. and Amit S. Rai. "Monster, Terrorist Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots." *Social Text* no. 72 (October, 2002): 117-148.

Reagon, Bernice Johnson. "Coalition Politics: Turning the Century." In *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology*, edited by Barbara Smith 1946-. 1st ed., 343-355. New York: Kitchen Table--Women of Color Press, 1983.

Rich, Adrienne. *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution*. 1st ed. New York: Norton, 1976.

Richter, Amy G. *Home on the Rails: Women, the Railroad, and the Rise of Public Domesticity*. Gender & American Culture. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.

Roberts, Dorothy E. *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty*. 1st ed. New York: Pantheon Books, 1997.

Rodríguez Garavito, César A. and Boaventura de Sousa Santos, eds. *Law and Globalization from Below: Towards a Cosmopolitan Legality*. Cambridge Studies in Law and Society. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Rose, Gillian. *Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Rossing, Barbara R. *The Rapture Exposed: The Message of Hope in the Book of Revelation*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 2004.

Rubin, Gayle. *Deviations: A Gayle Rubin Reader*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011.

Ruddick, Sara. *Maternal Thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1995.

Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Gaia & God: An Ecofeminist Theology of Earth Healing*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1992.

Russell, Letty M. *Just Hospitality: God's Welcome in a World of Difference*. Edited by J. S. Clarkson and Kate M. Ott. 1st ed. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.

———. *Household of Freedom: Authority in Feminist Theology*. 1st ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987.

Russell, Letty M., Katie Geneva Cannon, Ada María Isasi-Díaz, Kwok Pui-lan, eds. *Inheriting our Mothers' Gardens: Feminist Theology in Third World Perspective*. 1st ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. 1st Vintage Books ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.

Schechter, Susan. *Women and Male Violence: The Visions and Struggles of the Battered Women's Movement*. Boston: South End Press, 1982.

Schlafly, Phyllis. *Feminist Fantasies*. Dallas: Spence Pub. Co, 2003.

Schmemann, Alexander. *For the Life of the World : Sacraments and Orthodoxy*. 2nd rev. and expanded ed. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1973.

Schor, Juliet. *Plenitude: The New Economics of True Wealth*. New York: Penguin Press, 2010.

Schubeck, Thomas Louis. *Liberation Ethics : Sources, Models, and Norms*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Schultz, Mark. *When You Come Home*. Word Entertainment, 2000.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. "G*d-the Many Named: Without Place and Proper Name." In *Transcendence and Beyond: A Postmodern Inquiry*, edited by John D. Caputo and Michael J. Scanlon, 109-126. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2007.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *Transforming Vision: Explorations in Feminist the*logy*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011.

———. *The Power of the Word: Scripture and the Rhetoric of Empire*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

———. *Rhetoric and Ethic: The Politics of Biblical Studies*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.

———. *Sharing Her Word: Feminist Biblical Interpretation in Context*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1998.

———. *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1992.

———. "The Endless Day: Introduction" In *Concilium: Women, Work, and Poverty*, edited by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Anne E. Carr and Marcus Lefébure. Vol. 194, 137. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1987.

———. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. New York: Crossroad, 1983.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth and M. S. Copeland. *Concilium: Violence Against Women*. Vol. 1994/1. London :Maryknoll, N.Y.: SCM Press ;Orbis Books, 1994.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth, Karen McCarthy Brown, Cheryl Townsend Gilkes, Mary E. Hunt, and Anne Llewellyn Barstow. "Roundtable Discussion: On Feminist Methodology." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 1, no. 2 (Fall, 1985): 73-88.

Shorto, Russell. *The Island at the Center of the World: The Epic Story of Dutch Manhattan and the Forgotten Colony that Shaped America*. 1st ed. New York: Doubleday, 2004.

Smith, Andrea. *"Queer Theory and Native Studies: The Heteronormativity of Settler Colonialism"*. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*. Vol. 16, no.1/2 (January, 2010): 41-68.

———. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005.

Spain, Daphne. *Gendered Spaces*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Other Asias*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub, 2008.

———.*Death of a Discipline*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Stackhouse, Max L. and Peter J. Paris, eds. *God and Globalization*. Theology for the Twenty-First Century. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000.

Stasiulis, Daiva and Nira Yuval-Davis, eds. *Unsettling Settler Societies : Articulations of Gender, Race, Ethnicity and Class*. Sage Series on Race and Ethnic Relations; v. 11. London: Sage, 1995.

Steiner, Leslie Morgan. *Mommy Wars: Stay-at-Home and Career Moms Face Off on their Choices, their Lives, their Families.* 1st ed. New York: Random House, 2006.

Stoler, Ann Laura. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995.

Straight, Bilinda, ed. *Women on the Verge of Home*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.

Sugars, Cynthia, eds. *Unhomely States: Theorizing English-Canadian Postcolonialism*. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2004.

Taylor, Mark Lewis. *Religion, Politics, and the Christian Right: Post-9/11 Powers and American Empire*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2005.

Thurman, Judith. "Wilder Women." *New Yorker* 85, no. 24 (August 10, 2009): 74-80.

Tinsley, Jim Bob. *He was Singin' this Song : A Collection of Forty-Eight Traditional Songs of the American Cowboy, with Words, Music, Pictures, and Stories*. Orlando, Fla.: University Presses of Florida, 1981.

Townes, Emilie Maureen. *Breaking the Fine Rain of Death: African American Health Issues and a Womanist Ethic of Care*. New York: Continuum, 1998.

———. *In a Blaze of Glory: Womanist Spirituality as Social Witness*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995.

Trible, Phyllis. *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*. Overtures to Biblical Theology ; 13. Vol. 13. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Trible, Phyllis and Letty M. Russell, eds. *Hagar, Sarah, and their Children: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Perspectives*. 1st ed. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.

Troeltsch, Ernst. *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*. Library of Theological Ethics. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

Turner, Frederick Jackson. *The Frontier in American History*. New York: H. Holt and company, 1920.

Ulrich, Laurel. *The Age of Homespun: Objects and Stories in the Creation of an American Myth*. 1st ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2001.

Vine, W. E. Vine, Merrill F. Unger, and William White, eds. *Vine's Expository Dictionary of Biblical Words*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1985.

Walker, Alice. *In Search of our Mothers' Gardens: Womanist Prose*. 1st ed. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1983.

Warren, Richard. *The Purpose-Driven Life: What on Earth Am I here for?*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2002.

Watkins, William D. *The New Absolutes*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bethany House Publishers, 1996.

Weber, Brenda R. *Makeover TV: Selfhood, Citizenship, and Celebrity*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2009.

Welter, Barbara. "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860." *American Quarterly* 18, no. 2, Part 1 (Summer, 1966): pp. 151-174.

Werbner, Pnina and Nira Yuval-Davis, eds. *Women, Citizenship and Difference*. Postcolonial Encounters. New York: Zed Books, 1999.

West, Traci C. *Disruptive Christian Ethics: When Racism and Women's Lives Matter*. 1st ed. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.

Wheeler, Barbara G. and Edward Farley. *Shifting Boundaries: Contextual Approaches to the Structure of Theological Education*. 1st ed. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.

Williams, Delores S. *Sisters in the Wilderness: The Challenge of Womanist God-Talk*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1993.

Woodward, Bob. *Bush at War*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2002.

Wright, Gwendolyn. "Prescribing the Model Home." *Social Research* 58, no. 1 (Spring, 1991): 213-225.

———.*Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America*. 1st ed. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.

Young, Iris Marion, 1949-. *Intersecting Voices: Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy, and Policy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Zakim, Michael. *Ready-made Democracy: A History of Men's Dress in the American Republic, 1760-1860*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Zonana, Joyce. *Dream Homes: From Cairo to Katrina: An Exile's Journey*. New York: The Feminist Press at the City University of New York, 2008.