

The “Other” Within: Multiple Selves Making a World of Difference

Pamela Cooper-White

“How could one tolerate a foreigner if one did not know one was a stranger to oneself?”—Julia Kristeva¹

Diversity challenges us by forcing us into encounters with the Other, the not-like-me/not-like-us. Educating leaders for effective collaboration in diverse settings means leading them through a process of de-centering from their “comfort zones” and helping them stretch to embrace difference. Such education must consider not only difference, but also inequality of power—particularly in terms of entrenched social structures that silently reinforce unearned privilege. A genuine embracing of difference that can break down social inequalities and the dominating use of power requires more than a liberal tolerance or even a sincere but naïve form of curiosity about the Other.

Growth in relation to diversity has been understood by counseling psychologists as a developmental process, with parallel stages applying, respectively, to persons targeted for oppression and persons in a privileged group.² These

Pamela Cooper-White, PhD, professor of pastoral theology, care and counseling, Columbia Theological Seminary, 701 S. Columbia Dr., Decatur, GA 30030 (E-mail: cooperwhitep@ctsnet.edu).

stages include "1. Conformity→ 2. Dissonance→ 3. Resistance/immersion→ 4. Introspection→ and 5. Integrative awareness/commitment." Persons of color in this schema take the journey from pressure to assimilate to the dominant culture, through questioning, anger and external resistance, to healthy pride, self-esteem, and a collaborative commitment to ending oppression. White persons move from denial and minimal race awareness, to defensive awareness, to shame and a desire to atone, to acceptance of responsibility for racism and an internalized commitment to ending oppression.

This developmental outline can be critiqued for not fully taking into consideration the systemic and institutionalized power dynamics of racism (or other forms of oppression), or for creating too-neat parallels between white persons and persons of color. It has, however, provided a helpful framework for understanding and teaching how individuals at different stages of growth may resist, tolerate, cooperate with, or embrace diversity. It is a far more sophisticated tool for understanding individual variations in response to the challenges of diversity than assuming that once reasonable information is shared about differences, the destructive phenomena of racism and other oppressions will be successfully resisted until they simply melt away. Nevertheless, fear, discrimination, and oppression—internalized and externalized—persist among all of us, even those of us who have participated with a good will and a relatively mature perspective in anti-racism and diversity education. What more is needed?

In this essay, I will argue that a greater appreciation of the unconscious dimensions of the human psyche is necessary for the formation of pastoral leaders in a diverse world. By coming to understand some of the unconscious dynamics at play within and among persons, we can build bridges of empathy that can more effectively combat racism, oppression, and exclusion of the Other. This process will not look the same for those who enjoy categorical privilege *vis-à-vis* those who do not. But the commitment to meet and understand unwelcome dimensions of our interior life is crucial on both sides of the power divide. Many of us, moreover, live in social locations that are not entirely privileged or entirely oppressed (for example, a white middle-class woman who enjoys race and class privilege but suffers from gender oppression; or a middle-class woman of color who experiences some class privileges but suffers from both race and gender oppression; or a gay white man who assumes both gender and race privilege, but suffers from the oppression of heterosexism). These examples, because they remain categorical, still do not be-

gin to unpack all the multi-layered dimensions of each individual's social location, with its unique confluence of both power and suffering. Nor does it address the multiple meanings given to these experiences, both in the crucible of unconscious fantasy and in the relational flux of co-constructed reality. Given such complexity, a conception of the psyche that is fluid, multiple, and relationally constituted is needed to lead us to awareness of our internal inconsistencies and complexity. This can in turn engender authentic empathy for the Other.

THE MULTIPLICITY OF THE PSYCHE

Social work theorist Carolyn Saari has argued for "identity complexity" as an indicator of mental health.⁵ This idea reaches beyond simplistic iterations of identity politics, which tend to frame both identity and culture as fixed and monolithic.⁶ Genuine identity complexity reaches beyond our conscious self-identifications (including our political identities) to the inner domains of our multiply constituted self-parts and affect states—many of which are outside our awareness for much or all of the time.

As I have argued previously, each of us is internally constituted by a host of internal "objects" or mental representations, which are affect-laden and shaped in the crucible of relationships with significant external persons in our lives from infancy.⁷ These inner "parts" are not static or fixed in an oedipal or pre-oedipal past. Further, unlike the roles of which we may be at least dimly aware that we may play in a family or organizational system, they are entirely unconscious until some intervention (either social or therapeutic) allows us to glimpse them by the residue of their effects on our beliefs and relationships—especially as these effects are not "rational" or "ego-syntonic" and therefore demand some explanation of our self/selves to our self/selves. These inner parts of our selves operate mainly at symbolic and nonverbal levels of the psyche, where they are more analogous to forces than actual persons ("objects are not people") or even to partial aspects of our conscious selves or actual external others (such as "good mother," or "bad mother," or following some therapeutic models, "inner child," "inner critic," and so forth). They are dynamic and fluid, never simply replicas of actual people in our past or present life, shaped as they are by internal fantasies and impulses, as well as by social relationships with others.

It has been my contention that empathy for actual others in our relationships requires us to engage in the work of coming to know, accept, and even embrace the parts of our multiple selves that we have found most dif-

difficult to acknowledge. Whether through psychotherapy, clinical pastoral education, spiritual direction, or the rough-and-tumble of social conflict and everyday relationships, we inevitably find ourselves in situations where parts of ourselves that we denied or suppressed will rise up and act out in ways that surprise us, shock us, even cause pain to ourselves or others. Being willing to explore the "foreign" parts of ourselves, rather than to seal them over and pretend we are only exactly as we wish ourselves to be, is the beginning of empathic understanding of other persons.

ROADBLOCKS TO EMPATHY: DENYING VULNERABILITY AND AGGRESSION

Two aspects of our inner selves may play an especially important role in creating a bridge to empathy: our vulnerability and our aggression. As North American Christians, in particular, we may find that our societal conditioning makes it difficult for us to be fully conscious of either of these subjective states. Our North American enculturation promotes conscious awareness and adaptation to individuality, personal strength, self-sufficiency, and a can-do attitude that implies an almost sinful quality to weakness or vulnerability. Western Christianity, for its part, names overt expressions of aggression as the sin of anger and cloaks subjective aggressive impulses with a mantle of shame. The combination of these cultural myths results in a high level of ambivalence and anxiety about both vulnerability and aggression, since invulnerability moves subjectively toward aggression at least in the form of self-defense (just as Freud first described aggression in terms of self-preservation) and since, on the other hand, the suppression of aggression tends toward a subjective sense of vulnerability in the form of defenselessness. Patriarchy further infects these competing national and religious narratives of self-sufficiency and non-aggression with gender stereotypes about masculine strength and feminine dependency and weakness. Racism creates a double- and triple-bind for men and women of color, for whom aggression may be considered to be a positive attribute in some contexts, but a shameful flaw or even a crime in others.

Each of us, then, will have different unconscious motives for repressing, disavowing, or dissociating our awareness of our vulnerability and our aggression, depending on our particular social location, and our personal history, and intrapsychic makeup. Regardless of the specific ways in which this tension is played out in our individual psyches, these are the two affect states that we most avoid or unconsciously act out under threat.

The Other is always, by definition, an unknown, and as such, may initially trigger an unconscious fear response. Brain science would seem to confirm that we are hardwired to confront the unknown with suspicion for the sake of survival.¹⁰ In a fraction of a second, before any “higher” rational thought can kick in the prefrontal cortex, our “ancient brain,” is busy throwing up protective barriers. Conceptualizing this in terms of a multiplicity model of mind and the unconscious, the basic affect of fear, then, taps all our prior experiences and our inner parts that carry previous experiences of fear and the related states of both vulnerability and defensive aggression.

However, what psychoanalysis has taught us is that we can develop a greater awareness of our inner parts, so that we can better predict our autonomic responses in the face of unconsciously perceived threats and learn to soothe, manage, and override our animal reactivity. This will not, paradoxically, be accomplished by pretending to transcend our bodily needs and impulses, our animal sense, because this would plunge us back again into a denial of both vulnerability and aggression—since these are part of our animal inheritance. On the contrary, by embracing our embodied selves, in all our complexity, and by befriending the very particular vulnerable and aggressive self-states or parts that we find within ourselves, we are more likely to know and enlist those parts in meeting others who differ from ourselves and stretch us beyond our familiar comfort zones. That is, to the extent that we can tolerate feelings of vulnerability, we can modulate our anxiety into appropriate reality-testing about the actual level of threat that may or may not exist. To the extent that we can be aware of our own aggression, we can mobilize its energy in the service of building up new relationships, solving associated problems or conflicts, and engaging in the necessary process of learning that can enable greater mutual understanding—rather than using the aggression pre-emptively to limit or destroy the Other.¹¹

Awareness of our inner multiplicity serves a further purpose, however, beyond a classical ego-psychological framework of reality testing and self-control. As various schools of psychoanalytic thought have proposed across many decades, the more we remove intolerable affect-states, memories, impulses, or representations of self and others from conscious awareness (whether by repression, disavowal, or dissociative mental processes¹²), the more likely we are to project them onto, or even into (in the form of projective identification), the other person who triggers in us an unconscious emotional reaction, driven by one or more of our internal constituent

parts or objects. Without at least some awareness of our internal landscape—or population—we will be at a loss to prevent this from happening more or less automatically in the face of an unconsciously perceived threat. We will not only defend against knowledge of our own vulnerability and aggression, but we will project them onto the other. The other, thus, becomes “the Other,” the *xenos*—the embodiment of strangeness. Because the Other now carries our own fear and aggression, the Other becomes the enemy, in and through whom we can “innocently” fight our own evacuated impotence, rage, and destructiveness. This is the unconscious dynamic of paranoia. And once paranoia is set in motion in the unconscious, it is a short step from fear to hate.

What might this look like in an actual experience of diversity that triggers unconscious feelings of vulnerability and aggression?

PINKY HAS ROAD RAGE

Pinky, a twenty-two-year-old first-year seminarian, slouched in the back row of the mandated anti-racism workshop, arms defensively folded. Pinky had a burly build and muscular arms that offset a cherubic round face framed by blond curls. An only child growing up in a middle-class, mostly white township in upstate New York, Pinky had been her mother’s darling as a child, and the “good girl” who usually heeded her father’s loving but stringent moral expectations. She was a solid “B” student and a good athlete, raised religiously in a strict, tight-knit, Methodist Church community.

The nickname “Pinky” had come from her tendency to blush violently whenever she was teased as a child. She herself had adopted it as a way of making the slur her own, and making other kids eat their words—backed up with her fists when necessary. She had discovered the power of her own physical strength in third grade when Ricky McManus, a boy on whom she had a monstrous crush, joined in taunting her one afternoon. Fueled by fantasies of romantic rejection, she felt her humiliation convert suddenly into rage, and she efficiently decked him. She decided the day’s suspension from school was worth the newfound respect she enjoyed from shocked classmates. Memories from that afternoon built her self-confidence, which in turn allowed her safely to be her parents’ good girl most of the time—but with an emboldened demeanor.

Pinky graduated in the middle of her high school class, and attended a small liberal arts college in the area. She was pleased when the college chaplain encouraged her to consider a call to ministry. By senior year, she

had become a trusted residence hall assistant and peer counselor. Her classmates relied on her air of confidence and compassion. To save money, Pinky's parents decided that she would live with them and commute to seminary. She had high hopes for a future in pastoral care or counseling.

Pinky had not been prepared, however, for the culture shock she experienced upon entering seminary. The academic demands were much tougher than anything she had known before, the approach to theology was very different from the simple affirmations of faith she was used to at her home church, and the social expectations were even more foreign. The men either shied away from her assertiveness or treated her as one of the boys. The women sometimes found her abrasive and did not seek her out to share confidences as she had experienced in college. She felt like a fish out of water with the assumptions her professors made about "historicalcritical exegesis" of the Bible or "postcolonial and postmodern approaches" in church history and pastoral care. She had never heard of most of what the professors seemed to take for granted, and she wasn't sure she wanted to. Living at home provided a welcome respite at the end of each day, but she knew she was missing out on some of the casual social interactions with other students who lived in the dorm. She felt cut off from a network of potential support. She felt anxious about what her professors and candidacy committees called "formation for ministry." "Yeah, like being shot through a mold," she thought to herself. "Will I even recognize myself when I come out the other end?"

Pinky sat through the diversity training, longing to be outside tossing a ball or even just sitting in the library trying to get a difficult paper over and done with. At times she felt momentary twinges of insecurity, not unlike the way she had felt as a child when she was made fun of, before she had realized she could defend herself physically. But fists could not help her in this situation. Nor could her parents' assurances of how wonderful she would be as a minister. She honestly didn't know how to "be good" in this situation. She felt unequipped to cope with the strangeness of all the new information being shared in the diversity training. She didn't know how to fend off the feelings of inadequacy, guilt, and shame that threatened to wash over her. In automatic response, she assumed her old familiar stance of bravado and slumped in her seat, looking belligerent and annoyed. She used the evaluation form at the end of the day to vent feelings that the training felt like a waste of her time. Stepping gratefully out into

the cold December air, she tried to shake off the day's discomfort and just get home to a hot meal and a comfortable evening on the couch.

Driving west with the last streaks of sunset in front of her, Pinky turned on some good, loud music. She found herself driving five, ten, and then twenty miles over the speed limit. Other cars seemed to clog the turnpike, trundling along at an unnecessarily law-abiding pace that started aggravating her until she began weaving among other cars, shifting lanes and muttering under her breath. She felt like cursing. She was just about to give one especially slow driver the finger, but, remembering her father's disapproval of "gutter talk," she held back at the last minute. Instead, she accelerated and cut the guy off. She went hurtling down the left lane, not noticing the road slicking up in the dark. Suddenly another car shifted in front of her. Slamming on the brakes, she hit a newly forming patch of black ice and found herself spinning toward the median. The car revolved 180 degrees, and as she regained control of the steering wheel, she was startled to find herself in the left lane on the opposite side of the turnpike. Thinking fast, with traffic bearing down on her from behind, she accelerated and began to shift lanes to take the next exit and turn around. Just as her breathing began to return to normal, she saw red and blue lights flashing in her rearview mirror. She slammed her fist into the steering wheel, finally letting loose a stream of invectives, and pulled over. She prayed for the self-control not to scream directly at the cop who was now fast approaching the driver's side window with a blinding flashlight pointed at her face.

FROM EMPATHY TO JUSTICE

Pinky can be understood as a multiple self. Any single characterization or clinical diagnosis of Pinky's rage would be simplistic, failing to capture the complexity of her internal conflicting feelings and motivations. A complicated interplay of vulnerability and aggression are at work in this scenario, as Pinky moved through a series of affect states, both familiar and unfamiliar, involving fear of difference, fear of her own complicity in racism, guilt, shame, and in turn, defensive aggression, and rage. Pinky's resistance to the training was more than a truculent denial of privilege and an inability to be open to diversity—although it may well have looked like an arrogant refusal to enter into the process of learning. Pinky had already been feeling both vulnerable and angry for several months, but the good girl who delighted her mother and kept her father's criticisms at bay had been at the helm of her consciousness most of the time. Many other parts of Pinky—the toddler who perhaps felt ex-

cited by her parents' hugs and kisses but thwarted by their rules and requirements; the little girl who felt shame and rage while being taunted; the third-grader who had learned to use her anger to defend herself; the girl who thrived under the occasional approving nods of her father, her teachers, and her pastor; the young woman who had made pretty good grades but was flummoxed by new academic demands for a level of critical thinking she had never been asked for before in relation to her faith; the young woman who was used to being everyone's confidante and now felt like a social outsider; the young woman who had never thought anything about race or racism in a town that had no people of color that she could recall and who thought of herself as a good person but now was being confronted with the possibility that she had enjoyed a race privilege she had never asked for or subjectively experienced; the frugal commuter student who realized that she had not enjoyed many things that some of her wealthier classmates seemed to take for granted—all these parts were roiling in her unconscious. They threw her into a variety of unwelcome affect states from time to time. However, she had never been given the cognitive tools, nor was she in a supportive safe context, to be able to understand her more negative feelings or to put them in perspective. So Pinky shoved back the feelings of vulnerability, shame, and incapacity that all these parts of herself threatened to bring to the surface and, without conscious intention, gave in to the seductions of adrenaline that came with pounding music, dangerous speed, and caution-defying expressions of rage.

We can imagine many different scenarios in which vulnerability, aggression, or a combination of the two would be implicated in a failure to meet the challenges of diversity and empathic understanding of the Other. In Pinky's case, it was aggression that was let loose in the form of rage, like steam escaping a valve. (It should be noted that rage in itself does not lead to insight because it is an autonomic response that boils over and, in fact, defends against deeper and more complex self-understanding.) But we can also imagine a scenario in which the affective balance could swing toward an unmetabolized expression of vulnerability: A different person, who had never learned or been allowed to use her anger at all, might have unconsciously sealed over her aggression. Anger turned inward, she might have sunk into depression where feelings of vulnerability surface more readily but, without conscious acceptance, turn into rancid despair.

It would take courage for Pinky to come to know and accept the more threatening parts of herself and, importantly, a relational context that

would help her to feel safe enough to risk feeling the feelings that each suppressed part of herself was bearing in the secret recesses of her psyche. But Pinky is not an extreme example. We all contain parts of ourselves who know things we would rather not know, remember things we would prefer to forget, and represent aspects of personality we would rather disavow. These parts carry the emotional freight of such knowledge, memories, and identities or self-states. These are the strangers that live within us every hour of every day. We want to keep them strange. Yet, as Freud understood, the stranger, the uncanny, is always felt simultaneously as that which we can never know and that which we have always known from our earliest days.¹³ The "return of the repressed" is the uncanny familiar. The stranger outside ourselves who most triggers a fight-or-flight response is usually the one who taps the most familiar but hidden parts of our internal nature.

To quote Julia Kristeva:

My discontent in living with the other—my strangeness—rests on the perturbed logic that governs this strange bundle of drive and language, of nature and symbol, constituted by the unconscious, always already shaped by the other. It is through unraveling transference—the major dynamics of otherness, of love/hatred for the other, of the foreign component of our psyche—that, on the basis of the other, I become reconciled with my own otherness-foreignness, that I play on it and live by it. Psychoanalysis is then experienced as a journey into the strangeness of the other and of oneself, toward an ethics of respect for the irreconcilable. How could one tolerate a foreigner if one did not know one was a stranger to oneself?¹⁴

By coming to know and to love the stranger(s) within, especially the most vulnerable and aggressive parts of ourselves, we can begin to engage in a kind of internal justice-making, whereby the voices we have silenced within ourselves can come to expression. By learning what they bear for us and how they may have helped us to survive across a lifetime of emotional challenges, we can give them new respect and appreciation—even as we may need to parley conflicting affects and impulses toward a negotiated peace. This kind of inner peacemaking, which recognizes our unconscious complexity and multiplicity, is what makes us most able to meet the demands of external diversity. No longer continually threatened by the otherness within ourselves, we can meet and enter into genuine encounters with the others in the outer world. Such genuine openness to encounter can, in turn, lead to an engagement in the kinds of negotiations that true relationship engenders and a commitment to

justice in which the sacrifice of certain assumptions and privileges can be understood as a larger mutual benefit to both others and ourselves.

We cannot avoid the reality of our vulnerability. As Judith Butler has written in the aftermath of September 11, we are vulnerable. Our lives are always “precarious”: “This is a condition, a condition of being laid bare from the start and with which we cannot argue.”¹⁵ It is through mutual mourning and recognition of our human vulnerability and contingency, rather than through denial, that Butler sees the possibility for nonviolence and ethical relating.

MULTIPLICITY IN COMMUNITY

Such appreciation of multiplicity in our inner lives has potential impact for entire communities—even nations. Freud and his daughter Anna and others in their inner circle lived through the devastations of war upon war, culminating with the horrors of World War II and the Holocaust. They were, therefore, no romantics when it came to their view of human nature. In *Civilization and Its Discontents* Freud cited numerous savage human atrocities, concluding with Plautus: “*Homo homini lupus*” (“Man is wolf to man.”)¹⁶ Yet, they believed that their movement was not merely therapeutic for individuals but had political implications. The Freuds and Jung envisioned a rising tide of consciousness, which augured hope for a less brutal world. As Christopher Lane puts it, “What, Freud effectively asks, could be more political than fantasy when it determines the fate of entire communities, nations, and even continents?”¹⁷ To quote Kristeva again, “The ethics of psychoanalysis implies a politics: it would involve a cosmopolitanism of a new sort that, cutting across governments, economies, and markets, might work for a mankind[i] whose solidarity is founded on the consciousness of its unconscious—desiring, destructive, fearful, empty, impossible.”²⁰

Freud’s conception of the unconscious as a product of inner conflict and repression perhaps unconsciously reflects the war-torn and ultimately genocidal milieu of his life and times. A turn to multiplicity may bear the marks of the fragmentation and alienation of our own era. It may, in fact, be most intuitive for us to first appreciate multiplicity as it operates at the social and political level. Mark Lewis Taylor, for example, advocates a postmodern shift from dependency on certain singular truth claims or dominant voices to “the nurturing of breadth in conversation:”

Reasoning in a conversational setting attains its truths not by opting out of the heightening of difference by fixing on some fulcrum outside

differences or on some foundation below them. Rather, those truths are attained by maximizing "the breadth" of the conversation, so that truths are disclosed in the conversation playing between different perspectives emerging within the widest possible fields. The conversation in which difference is really valued, then, will feature not only the vulnerability that goes with openness generally but also those experiences of difference and negativity that may be had in encounters with the most multifarious, widely arrayed "others." This nurturing of breadth is a feature of the conversational valuation of difference.²¹

He draws on philosopher Charles S. Peirce's image of a cable of intertwined threads, in which strength is derived from the connectedness of the whole rather than the dominance of a few:

This requires, in Charles S. Peirce's words, a trusting to "the multitude and variety of arguments rather than to the conclusiveness of any one. Its reasoning should not form a chain which is no stronger than its weakest link, but a cable whose fiber may be ever so slender, provided they are sufficiently numerous and intimately connected."²²

This argument re-privileges those who have been on the margins and places the individual within a larger context of interdependency. The "acknowledgement of a privilege for those excluded or absent from the conversation...often voiceless because of death, persistent hunger, or systematic distortion of their social and political life—is the crucial way by which the fullest breadth of conversation can occur, a breadth needed for the truth of reasoning to occur and be sustained."²³

Taylor refers to our moments of alienation, disempowerment, and vulnerability at the conscious level of political relations when he writes, "exploration of our own otherness is also crucial to the whole breadth of conversation."²⁴ Without taking anything away from the call for a preferential option for the voices of the poor and disenfranchised on the conscious level of political discourse, I would argue that Taylor's recognition of our own otherness must also be applied to our internal otherness as well—that all political discourse is carried on waves of unconscious as well as conscious communication.

This is explicitly theological, as we understand the divine as the power of love in relationship. I have previously discussed in detail how the Christian doctrine of the Trinity provides a generous metaphor for an inherent multiplicity and relationality of God.²⁵ In Kristeva's words once more:

Henceforth the foreigner is neither a race or a nation. The foreigner is neither glorified as a secret *Volkgeist* nor banished as disruptive of rationalist urbanity. Uncanny, foreignness is within us: we are our own for-

eigners, we are divided. Even though it shows a Romanticist filiation, such as intimist restoring of the foreigner's good name undoubtedly bears the biblical tones of a foreign God or of a Foreigner apt to reveal God.²⁶

Filipina theologian Elizabeth Dominguez draws on Gen. 1:26 to propose that "to be in the image of God is to be in community. It is not simply a man or a woman who can reflect God, but it is the community in relationship."²⁷ This has implications, as well, for righting imbalances of power. Quoting Chung Hyun Khung:

Interdependence, harmony, and mutual growth are impossible when there is no balance of power. Monopolized power destroys community by destroying mutuality. Therefore, in this image of God as the community in relationship, there is no place for only one, solitary, all-powerful God who sits on the top of the hierarchical power pyramid and dominates other living beings. Where there is no mutual relationship, there is no human experience of God.²⁸

The extent to which we can be aware of our inner multiplicity and take seriously the hosts of voices crying from the margins of our own unconscious life may well be the extent to which we are able to recognize and withdraw projections that demonize, dominate, and exclude actual other persons in the context of political life. In so doing, we participate in the eternal conversation that most brightly reveals our creation in the image and likeness of God. How else can we ever truly make a world of difference?

NOTES

1. Julia Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*, trans. Leon Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), cited in Donald Capps, *Freud and the Freudians on Religion* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2001), 328.

2. "Minority Identity Development Model" from Donald R. Atkinson, George Morten, and Derald W. Sue, *Counseling American Minorities* 6th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2004), 39–46; William E. Cross Jr., "The Negro-to-Black Conversion Experience: Toward a Psychology of Black Liberation," *Black World* 20 (1971): 13–27, and "The Psychology of Nigrescence: Revising the Cross Model," in J. G. Ponterotto and others, *Handbook of Multicultural Counseling* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1995); H. Sabnani, J. Ponterotto, and L. Borodovsky, "White Racial Identity Development and Cross-cultural Counselor Training: A Stage Model," *Counseling Psychologist* 19 (1991): 76–102. See also Janet E. Helms, *Black and White Racial Identity Theory, Research, and Practice* (New York: Greenwood, 1990); and William E. Cross Jr., *Shades of Black: Diversity in African-American Identity* (Philadelphia, Penn.: Temple University Press, 1991); Paul B. Pedersen and others, *Counseling Across Cultures* 4th ed. (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1996); Emmanuel Lartey, *A Living Color: An Intercultural Approach to Pastoral Care and Counseling*, rev. ed. (London: Jessica Kingsley, 2003); and Emmanuel Lartey, *Pastoral Theology in an Multi-Cultural World* (London: Epworth, 2007).

3. For more psychoanalytic reflections on whiteness, see, recently, Lisa Cataldo, "Whiteness Real and Unreal: Destruction, Survival and Racial Melancholia," and Lallene Rector, "Narcissistic Dimensions of Racial Identity: The Role of Selfobject Experiences in the Development and Maintenance of 'Whiteness,'" (papers presented at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion to the Psychology, Culture, and Religion Group, Chicago, November 3, 2008). See also Thandeka, *Learning to Be White: Money, Race, and God in America* (New York: Continuum, 2000).

4. Pamela Cooper-White, *Shared Wisdom: Use of the Self in Pastoral Care and Counseling* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2004), 35–54.

5. Carolyn Saari, "Identity Complexity as an Indicator of Mental Health," *Clinical Social Work Journal* 21, no. 1 (1993): 11–23.

6. Seyla Benhabib, "Complexity, Interdependence, Community," in Martha Nussbaum and Jonathan Glover, eds., *Women, Culture, and Development* (Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon, 2005), 235–255.

7. Cooper-White, *Many Voices: Pastoral Psychotherapy in Relational and Theological Perspective* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2006).

8. Gregorio Kohon, "Objects Are Not People," *Free Associations* 2 (1985), 19–30.

9. Sigmund Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud: Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, vol. 18, ed. and trans. James Strachey (London: Hogarth, 1953–74), 13 et passim.

10. David Hogue, *Remembering the Future, Imagining the Past: Story, Ritual, and the Human Brain* (Cleveland, Ohio: Pilgrim, 2003).

11. See also Kathleen Greider, *Reckoning with Aggression: Theology, Violence, and Vitality* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1997).

12. Cooper-White, *Shared Wisdom*, 47–52.

13. Sigmund Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud: The Uncanny* vol. 17, ed. and trans. James Strachey (London: Hogarth, 1953–74), 217–256.

14. Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*, 137–138 (my italics).

15. Judith Butler, *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence* (New York: Verso, 2004), 31.

16. See also Jill Petersen Adams, "The Just Politics of Mourning and Judith Butler's Precarious Life" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion to the Psychology, Culture, and Religion Group, Chicago, November 1, 2008), http://pcr.revdk.com/2008/adams.judith_butler.htm.

17. Sigmund Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud: Civilization and Its Discontents*, vol. 21, ed. and trans. James Strachey (London: Hogarth, 1953–74), 111.

18. Elizabeth Ann Danto, *Freud's Free Clinics: Psychoanalysis and Social Justice, 1918–1938* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005); Robert Coles, *Sanna Freud and the Dream of Psychoanalysis* (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1993); C. G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams and Reflections*, rev. ed., ed. A. Jaffe, trans. R. Winston and C. Winston (New York: Vintage, 1989).

19. Christopher Lane, "The Psychoanalysis of Race: An Introduction," in Lane, ed., *The Psychoanalysis of Race* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 7. It should be

noted that both Lane and Celia Brickman in *Aboriginal Populations in the Mind: Race and Primitivity in Psychoanalysis* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003) advance important critiques of the oscillating romanticization and denigration of the racialized Other as “savage” or “primitive,” embedded within psychoanalysis from its beginnings with the notion of “primitivity” of infantile memories and forces in the psyche.

20. Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*, 333.

21. Mark Lewis Taylor, *Remembering Esperanza: A Cultural-Political Theology for North American Praxis* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2005; orig. publ. Mark Kline Taylor, 1990), 63.

22. *Ibid.*, citing Richard Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1979), 224.

23. *Ibid.*, 64.

24. *Ibid.*

25. Pamela Cooper-White, *Many Voices*, 67–94; see also *Shared Wisdom*, 181–193.

26. Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*, 138.

27. Elizabeth Dominguez, “A Continuing Challenge for Women’s Ministry,” *In God’s Image* (Aug. 1983), 8, cited in Chung Hyun Kyung, *Struggle To Be the Sun Again: Introducing Asian Women’s Theology* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 2002), 48.

28. *Ibid.*

Finally, it is clear that the education of interfaith spiritual care-givers in professional wisdom requires that theological education and ministerial formation be holistic and comprehensive. Indeed it must include three equally important and interrelated dimensions, namely, academic, personal-spiritual, and professional. The academic formation is obviously indispensable because, among other contents, it includes learning about one’s own (religious or nonreligious) faith tradition and heritage and as much as possible about other traditions; it also includes learning about the social and cultural contexts of our work. The personal-spiritual formation focuses on our identity and integrity as spiritual caregivers who represent a given tradition; it involves nurturing our moral character. And the vocational-professional formation centers on the development of those clinical and other competencies necessary for caring effectively and faithfully wherever we serve as spiritual caregivers.

Interfaith Spiritual Care: Understandings and Practices
Daniel S. Schipani and Leah Dawn Bueckert, editors