

FORCED INTIMACY: THE EXPERIENCES OF SEXUALLY

VICTIMIZED PRISONERS

by

CRAIG PRINCE

submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

in the

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: PROF. F.J.A. SNYDERS

NOVEMBER 1994

DECLARATION

Conclusions arrived at are those of the researcher and not necessarily the opinion of the Department of Correctional Services.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express sincere gratitude to the following people:

- The victims who willingly participated in the research and allowed me into their traumatized worlds.

- Brigadier L. B. Bergh, Brigadier D. J. J. du Plessis, and Major P. Joans from the Department of Correctional Services for granting permission for the study to be conducted, as well as their efficiency as internal advisors.

- Staff members at the prisons who received me well and were very helpful.

- Professor Ricky Snyders for his valuable and knowledgeable input, as well as guidance.

- Lee Johnson for sub-editing the dissertation.

- My mother and sister for their eternal support and unfailing belief in me.

- Most importantly, my wife Dianne and our children, for their continued help, understanding, support, and above all, love.

DEDICATED TO MY FAMILY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
SUMMARY	viii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. THE NATURE OF TOTAL INSTITUTIONS	5
Total Institutions as Bureaucratic Organizations	7
The Process of Self-Mortification Within Total Institutions	9
3. THE CONCEPT OF FORCED INTIMACY	21
Beyond Isolation: A Control-Based Account of Privacy	23
Information, Access, or Intimate Decisions About Our Actions? The Content of Privacy	26
Intimacy: The Core of Privacy	29
The Value of Privacy	32
4. THE CONCEPT OF POWER / CONTROL	35

5. REVIEW OF "FORCED INTIMACY" IN VARIOUS CONTEXTS	42
Animal Studies	42
Studies Conducted in Open Systems	46
Studies Conducted in Closed Systems	48
Findings of Studies in Total Institutions	52
The Antarctic - Member's Experiences at South Pole Station	52
Forced Intimacy Within Prisons	54
Sexual Victimization of Male Prisoners	56
Attempted solutions	61
Sexual Victimization of Female Prisoners	68
Forced intimacy within psychiatric hospitals	68
Prison Sexual Violence: A Description and Explanation	72
Prison Gangs in South Africa	79
6. METHODOLOGY	81
The problem	81
Aims of the study	82
Method	82
Subjects	83
Measuring Instrument	84
Procedure	84
Analysis of data	89

Introduction	89
Mechanics of data analysis	90
Physical handling of data	91
Conclusion	92
7. FORCED INTIMACY: SUBJECTS' EXPERIENCES OF SEXUAL	
VICTIMIZATION	93
Experiences of Victims Prior to Victimization	93
Ignorance Within a New Context	93
Events and Experiences Leading to and Following	
Victimization	100
The Illusion of Alternatives	100
Helplessness	104
The Ineffectiveness of the Communication	
Approach	104
The Ineffectiveness of the Fight/Homicide	
Approach	106
The Ineffectiveness of the Fleeing Option	110
The Ineffectiveness of Submitting	113
A different form of submitting	114
Feeling Alone/Abandoned	115
No Help From Fellow Inmates	115
No Help From Staff (and No Law Enforcement)	118
Abandonment by Family	124
Feeling Vulnerable	125
Anxiety	126

The Effect of Being Labelled	126
Poor Self Image	128
Feelings of Degradation	129
Feeling "Unmanly"	130
Unexpressed Hatred/Blame	132
Fear	133
Painful Memories	134
Apprehension About Future	138
Frustration	139
Feeling Withdrawn and Despondent	140
Defeat	140
Conclusion	142
Forms of Empowerment Adopted	145
The Flight Option	145
The Fight Option	151
The Legal Approach	157
Suicide	160
Religion	161
"Friends"	162
Drugs/Alcohol	162
The Degree of Empowerment of the Subjects	162
Conclusion	163
8. CONCLUSION	164
REFERENCES	176

SUMMARY

Total institutions' (which include prisons) unique context prescribes "confinement" of inmates. Coping mechanisms applied "outside" (especially the ability to create distance from stressful events) is thus ineffective.

Another common feature is lack of privacy, which may result in "forced intimacy" - individuals being forced into a situation of physical and psychological "invasion" (beyond the norm) of their person/personal space. Victims lose control over intimate decisions, including who may and may not be intimate with them.

Within prisons, gangs "force intimacy" by sexually victimizing inmates, taking advantage of the context to heighten their power, and to control inmates "under" them. Four (subjects) victims' experiences and means of adaptation/empowerment were investigated phenomenologically.

Results indicated that inadequately empowered victims suffer prolonged and repeated victimization - a continued "post-traumatic stress disorder" - which is more traumatizing and draining than one circumscribed traumatic event (due to its intensity, immobilization and resulting drastic change of "personality").

KEY TERMS

Total institution; Prisoners; Forced intimacy; Privacy violation; Sexual victimization; Power / Control; Repeated and prolonged trauma; Continued "Posttraumatic Stress Disorder".

LANGUAGE OF VIOLENCE

The first day of school was always the hardest
the first day of school the hallways the darkest

Like a gauntlet
the voices haunted
walking in with his thin skin
lowered chin
he knew the names that they would taunt him with
faggot, sissy, punk, queen, queer
although he'd never had sex in his fifteen years
And when they harassed him
it was for a reason
And when they provoked him
it became open season
for the fox and the hunter
the sparks and the thunder
that pushed the boy under
then pillage and plunder
it kind of makes me wonder
how one can hurt another

But dehumanizing the victim makes things simpler
it's like breathing with a respirator

it eases the conscience of even the most conscious
and calculating violator
words can reduce a person to an object
something more easy to hate
an inanimate entity
completely disposable
no problem to obliterate

But death is the silence
in this language of violence
Death is the silence.
But death is the silence
in this cycle of violence
death is the silence.

It's tough to be young
the young long to be tougher
when we pick on someone else
it might make us feel rougher
abused by their fathers
but that was at home though
So to prove to each other
that they were not "homos"
the exclamation of the phobic fury
executioner, judge and jury
the mob mentality
individuality was nowhere

dignity forgotten
at the bottom of a dumb old dare
and a numb cold stare
On the way home it was back to name calling
ten against one they had his back up against the wall and
they reveled in their laughter
as they surrounded him
But it wasn't a game
when they up jumped and grounded him
they picked up their bats
with their muscles strainin'
and they decided they were gonna
beat this fella's brain in
with an awful powerful
showerful an hour full of violence
inflict the strictest
brutality and dominance
they didn't hear him screaming
They didn't hear him pleading
they ran like cowards
and left the boy bleeding
in a pool of red
'til all tears were shed
and his eyes quietly slid
into the back of his head
DEAD....

But death is the silence
in this language of violence

Death is the silence.

But death is the silence

in this cycle of violence

death is the silence.

You won't see the face 'til the eyelids drop

You won't hear the screaming until it stops

The boy's parents were gone

and his grandmother had raised him

she was mad she had no form

of retaliation

the pack didn't have to worry about

being on a hitlist

but the thing they never thought about

was that there was a witness

to this senseless crime

right place wrong time

tried as an adult

one of them was gonna do hard time.

The first day of prison was always the hardest

The first day of prison the hallways the darkest

like a gauntlet
the voices haunted
faggot, sissy, punk, queen, queer
words he used before had a new meaning in here
as a group of men in front of him laughing came near
for the first time in his life
the young bully felt fear
He'd never been on this side of the name calling
Five against one they had his back up against the wall and
he had never questioned his own sexuality
but this group of men didn't hesitate their reality
with an awful powerful
showerful an hour full of violence
inflict the strictest
brutality and dominance
they didn't hear him screaming
they didn't hear him pleading
they took what they wanted
and then just left him bleeding in the corner
the giant reduced to jack horner

But dehumanizing the victim makes things simpler
it's like breathing with a respirator
it eases the conscience of even the most conscious
and calculating violator
the power of words
don't take it for granted

when you hear a man ranting
don't just read the lips
be more sublime than this
put everything in context
is this a tale of rough justice
in a land where there's no justice at all

Who is really the victim?
Or are we all the cause, and victim of it all

But death is the silence
in this language of violence
Death is the silence.
But death is the silence
in this cycle of violence
death is the silence.

COMPACT DISC

GROUP: The Disposable Heroes of Hiphoprisy

ALBUM: Hypocrisy is the Greatest Luxury

TRACK: Language of Violence

DATE: 1992

DISTRIBUTOR: Island records

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Prisons are notoriously violent contexts, in which large groups of inmates are forced to cohabit for sentences ranging from months to life. Gangs are prominent and they (as well as other individuals) use their position of power to control inmates "under" them. The "best" method of controlling others in this context is to create a strong sense of powerlessness amongst them. This is achieved by attacking the victim, the violation of his intimate self (especially by means of sexual victimization) heightening the desired effect. This may be accomplished with relative ease due to the context in which it occurs - that is, victims cannot (initially) escape the traumatizing situation because they are within the confines of walls and steel bars (of the prison cell).

Even if victims do manage to leave that cell (after their initial victimization), they are still within the confines of the prison, and feeling as vulnerable as they do while facing the power of their attackers, they can, and sometimes do, become the victims of further abuse.

The confinement factor of the context makes it differ from other contexts, and as a result differing experiences can be expected according to the nature of the context. The prison falls within this unique context - that of the total institution.

Goffman (1961) defined a total institution as:
a place of residence and work where a large number of
like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider
society for an appreciable period of time, together
lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life.

(p.11)

Of the five groupings of total institutions that Goffman (1961) listed (which are mentioned in the following chapter), participants from only one of these, the prison, have been used as subjects for this research. Although differences exist amongst these various groupings, the overriding factor is the similarity that they as a unique context share. The unique nature of the total institution will be discussed in detail so that behaviours specific to this context can be better understood.

The researcher has attempted to understand the experiences (events, actions, interactions, feelings) of participants who have been forced to be intimate with others within this unique context.

Very briefly, the researcher's construction of the concept of "forced intimacy" entails individuals being forced into a situation of physical and psychological "invasion" of their person/personal space usually reserved only for chosen intimate contact. With an invasion of privacy (which is not due to crowding alone, but more due to involuntary intrusions beyond the norm) the individual may lose control over intimate decisions, including who may and may not be intimate with him.

How individuals react to victimization will affect their "choice" of coping strategy which in turn will affect the nature of any (if any) therapy conducted with them.

The experiences of "victims of forced intimacy" across the groupings of the above-mentioned context will form the scope of this study. Common experiences will be categorized so as to shed light on the human phenomenon of experience within this particular context.

In order to understand their experiences, the researcher explored the meaning that subjects ascribed to their experiences. Meanings are created in "languaging", which can be broadly defined as "extending beyond the pale of spoken representation, across verbal and nonverbal, behavioral and cognitive, conscious and unconscious terrains" (Maturana, in Neimeyer & Neimeyer, 1993, pp. 4-5).

Being human entails active efforts to interpret experience, seeking purpose and significance in the events that surround us.... It is this drive toward meaning, this effort to forge significance and purpose from elements of experience, that typifies the human enterprise and that serves as the cornerstone of constructivist thinking. (Neimeyer & Neimeyer, 1993, p. 4)

It is from within this framework that the researcher wishes to explore the concept of "forced intimacy", which is in itself a construction. This languaging is purely subjective and the researcher's constructs will appear in the dissertation through

writing (which is a form of languaging). It is left to the reader to construct his/her own meaning regarding that to which the participants and researcher gave meaning to. Yet, by discussing all aspects of the study as well as providing verbatim segments of subjects' "languaging", the information provided will help readers to understand the interpretations and applications generated, and thus enhance the trustworthiness of findings (Moon, Dillon & Sprenkle, 1991).

In order to understand the meaning ascribed to subjects' experiences, it is necessary to have an adequate knowledge of the context within which they experience. In this case the total institution applies.

CHAPTER 2

THE NATURE OF TOTAL INSTITUTIONS

All total institutions have encompassing characteristics which are symbolized by the barrier to regular contact with those on the "outside", as well as the barrier to physical departure from the institution. This is ensured through the physical nature of the institution, which has characteristics which include any of the following: locked security doors, bars over windows, high walls or fences, barbed wire, and being situated in remote environments.

While this may be considered the main encompassing feature of these "total" institutions, they share other common characteristics (as well as a few differences) which will be highlighted in this section.

Examples are highlighted in Goffmann's (1961) five groupings of total institutions:

1. Institutions which care for the incapable and harmless (e.g. homes for the blind, orphaned or aged).
2. Institutions for those who are incapable but may be a threat to society or themselves (e.g. psychiatric hospitals).
3. Institutions which protect society against intentional dangers to it (e.g. prisons, prisoner of war camps/concentration camps).

4. Those justified on instrumental grounds, in which a worklike task may be pursued (e.g. army barracks, boarding schools, work camps, ships).

5. Retreats from the world in which religious training takes place (e.g. monasteries, abbeys, convents).

With these examples in hand, one may better understand the definition of a total institution, which is

a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life.

(Goffman, 1961, p. 11)

It is clear from the above that total institutions differ from the social arrangements of (western) society in that within the latter, "the individual tends to sleep, play and work in different places with different co-participants, under different authorities and without an overall rational plan" (Goffman, 1961, p. 17).

Within total institutions, these spheres of life become one, with the breaking down of the barriers separating them.

First, all aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the same single authority. Second, each phase of the member's daily activity is carried on in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and required to do the same thing together. Third, all phases of the day's activities are tightly scheduled, with one

activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole sequence of activities being imposed from above by a system of explicit formal rulings and a body of officials. Finally, the various enforced activities are brought together into a single rational plan purportedly designed to fulfil the official aims of the institution. (Goffman, 1961, p. 17)

To make these features even more unique, human needs are handled "by the bureaucratic organization of whole blocks of people;" as an "undifferentiated batch" (Goffman, 1961, p. 18).

Total Institutions as Bureaucratic Organizations

The bureaucratic organization's structure consists of a hierarchical chain with a pyramidal form. The blueprint of the organization is typified by rules and regulations which delimit the behaviour of all members in their official functions within the organization. Division of labour is clearly defined, more so as one moves closer to the top of the hierarchy.

Within these bureaucratic organizations, guidelines, rules, and regulations are passed down from those at the top of the pyramid - by people who have the least information concerning inmates and lower staff situations (about the fate of the inmate). Likewise, information from the lowest levels does not often reach the top levels, and if it does, is usually inaccurate. This can either be due to information not being passed on to the next highest level, or being distorted along

the way (as has been demonstrated time and time again in the game "broken telephone").

With decisions being made at the higher levels of the organization, in most total institutions the inmate is excluded from any decision making.

There are further "splits" between these large managed groups (blocks), and the small group of supervisory staff (who live outside the confines of the institution). While staff often have families on the "outside" with whom they associate or live, inmates "can hardly sustain a meaningful domestic existence" (Goffman, 1961, p. 22). Inmates are kept under surveillance (rather than supervision) to ensure compliance with the set of rules of the institution. Work usually does not have the same structural significance to that on the "outside", often being employed to keep inmates busy. Work (if provided) may be either slow or boring, or strenuous and a lot, depending on the institution. Inmates may often feel demoralized by this, yet there are exceptions (such as when an inmate manages to learn a trade which he will be able to use upon release from the institution).

This split also has implications for how each group sees the other, in a stereotypical fashion...

Staff often seeing inmates as bitter, secretive, and untrustworthy, while inmates often see staff as condescending, highhanded, and mean. Staff tends to feel superior and righteous; inmates tend, in some

ways at least, to feel inferior, weak, blameworthy, and guilty. (Goffman, 1961, p. 18)

The lowest levels of staff have the most contact with inmates and are given great responsibility without too much "real" authority. With this, added to treating inmates in a stereotypical fashion, "their activity degenerates into an anxious fending off of any form of responsibility, initiative and creativeness" (Foudraine, 1974, p. 228). If this "treatment" continues year after year, the inmate's feeling of self-respect may erode, by feeling treated as a thing, rather than a person.

The above emphasises the latter part of Goffman's (1961) definition, in which inmates lead "an enclosed formally administered round of life" (p. 11); that is, they are subject to bureaucratic authority. Yet, as may be derived from the five groupings stated above, the "totality" of various institutions will differ, depending upon the "degree of bureaucratization" and the "openness versus closedness" of each institution (Davies, 1989, p. 94).

The Process of Self-Mortification Within Total Institutions

Inmates enter the institution with a "presenting culture" (Goffman, 1961, p. 23) - "a way of life and a round of activities taken for granted until the point of admission to the institution." Whatever the level of stability of the individual, his personal organization and conception of self has developed over time within this "home world" (p. 23) and the individual

should feel fairly confident in tackling most situations and exercising coping manoeuvres, at his own discretion, to cope with conflicts and failures.

Yet, within the total institution the inmate must learn a new culture, and with long stays in the institution, this may lead to "disculturation" (Sommer, in Goffman, 1961). This implies that the individual is "untrained" from his original culture, which temporarily provides difficulties for the individual in coping again in the "outside" culture, when, and if, he returns to it.

When an individual enters a total institution, a process of change occurs - that of "self-mortification" (Goffman, 1961; Homer, 1981), or more specifically, a loss/change of self-concept.

Individuals enter the institution with relatively stable constructions of themselves, developed upon a "stable" social arrangement in the outside world. Upon entrance, this "stable" environment changes drastically, which results in a change in self-concept.

This process of change begins with the "shock period" (Goffman, 1961), in which all aspects of the identifiable self are bombarded by the institutional processes; such as one's name, clothes, belongings, and body. During the reception procedures the inmate goes through a series of degrading ceremonies in which many of the following may be encountered: being assigned a number, photographed, fingerprinted, the taking of personal history, physical and psychiatric examination, being

searched, undressed with possessions documented for storage, bathed/showered, haircutting, being supplied with institutional clothing and "kit," rule informing, and assignment to quarters. Everyone is supplied with the same clothing, food, accommodation, routine, and restrictions, which are determined by the circumstances of and those related to the inmates' context. In so doing, most of the individuals' previous bases of self-identification and autonomy are ignored and they become one of many "identical" members - an "element" of a homogeneous group.

This lack of autonomy can lead to feelings of helplessness. As stated by Smith (in Nesper, 1993, p. 409):

It was the nature of these impositions - the enforced respect and deference, the finality of authoritarian decisions, and the demands for conduct deemed by others to be in one's best interest - that threatened the inmate most, for in this absence of control [emphasis mine] a sense of helplessness arose.

This feeling of helplessness may be enhanced by the knowledge that society has proclaimed him "not wanted" (in the case of prisoners) and that he is good for nothing. The prisoner wants to know that his life still has meaning, that others are still willing to listen to him, and that his dignity has not been violated. This is not easy to feel when faced with the realisation that one is being separated from the outside world for a period of time in a context in which one begins by feeling very uncertain, insecure, and even impotent (Nesper, 1993).

Once within the institutional "community", inmates feel their way around trying to find a place for themselves. The other inmates, at the same time, "seek ways to test the newcomer's acceptability into the community" (Homer, 1981, p. 332).

This process continues with the inmates feeling a change within themselves, as compared to how they experienced themselves in the world outside. Role dispossession occurs (the inmate losing many roles which he had "outside") and the privileges associated with these roles. The role of "inmate" must now supersede all other roles which the individual was accustomed to, to ensure that all inmates at least begin by having the same role.

The new inmates may find themselves at an even lower status in this already low-status group. They may be called names such as "fish", "swab" or "troop"; and obedience tests may be undergone so as to get the inmate to openly declare his humility within the institution.

This sudden shift to a lower status is enforced through the hierarchy of the institution, with the inmates often addressing staff as "sir" (within prisons and the military), while they may often have to literally beg for permission for small things, such as a light for a cigarette or for permission to use the phone. Staff and fellow inmates may also swear at the new inmates, tease them, or gossip in their presence.

In order to fit in to their new role, inmates act strictly according to the rules of the institution - a result of the

anxiety of breaking rules and the consequences thereof (Goffman, 1961).

Another form of mortification is that of "contaminative exposure" (Goffman, 1961), or "forced intimacy", which is the scope of this study.

On the outside, the individual can hold objects of self-feeling - such as his body, his immediate actions, his thoughts, and some of his possessions - clear of contact with alien and contaminating things. But in total institutions these territories of the self are violated; the boundary that the individual places between his being and the environment is invaded and the embodiments of self profaned. (Goffman, 1961, pp. 31-32)

Firstly, there may be a violation of personal information in some circumstances (such as a psychiatric patient's file information being available to most staff members). Even when "unauthorized" persons do not have access to files (such as prescribed by Correctional Services Order B 1 [2] [h] [vi]), the inmate may believe that they do, or he may not even want "authorized" persons to have certain knowledge about him.

While most institutions do not read and censor inmates' mail (as was common in the past), mail may be opened (and must be opened in prisons, as prescribed by Correctional Services Order B v [f]) to ensure that no unpermitted items are being passed to the inmate. With this practice, there is always a chance of one's mail being read, and once again, even if it does

not occur, inmates may have the perception that it does occur. They may thus feel "invaded", merely as a result of their beliefs.

Most institutions (save prisons), do not permit "adequate" contact with relatives or friends, either due to short and infrequent visiting hours or due to the remote areas in which they are situated. Inmates may feel exposed to the system, without the possibility of discussing this issue with their loved-ones.

The inmate may feel "exposed" - by being forced to undergo medical, psychiatric, or security examinations - while a similar exposure follows from living in close contact with others; which often includes sharing open showers or using toilets without doors. This exposure may be worse for certain individuals, especially if they strongly disagree to mixing with various age, ethnic or racial groups.

As will be described in chapter 7, some inmates (especially whites) felt very alone and vulnerable after being placed in a cell with others of a different race to them. It is important to note that this occurrence is not wilfully chosen by staff members, but the United Nations (1984) "Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners and Procedures for the Effective Implementation of the Rules", which the South African Department of Correctional Services adheres to, does not allow for any discrimination between inmates.

When one looks at the race composition of the country and generalizes it to the prison community, the ratio of blacks and

coloureds to whites is one of 25:1 (according to figures from the Department of Correctional Services, [1993]). It is thus expected that many whites will be placed in cells amongst blacks, coloureds and Asians.

In a similar vein, inmates may object to being dealt with by staff members of a different race to them. In the South African context, the same argument as above applies - inmates feeling prejudiced because they are in the minority.

Feelings of physical contamination may also be reflected in complaints about unclean food, quarters and clothing (which may be second or third hand - if not worse). In one or two total institutions forcible "contamination" of one's physical inner self may take place through forced feeding or medication, no matter how much the individual objects to this.

Apart from the direct physical examination stated above, inmates may have to undergo searchings of their person, quarters and "belongings", either on a routine basis, or upon troubled situations (such as riots) developing. While these searchings should be conducted in a dignified manner (as prescribed by Correctional Services Order B 1 [2] [d], for example), this may not always be adhered to (based on first person observations), and individuals may feel exposed/"contaminated" anyway.

Threats of assault or death, or the actual occurrence of assault, which varies in form and degree, can be expected to have severe mortifying effects upon the inmate, especially if it occurs on a regular basis. One severe, yet common form of assault, especially within prisons, and to a lesser extent

psychiatric hospitals, is that of sexual victimization of inmates.

Related to this, exposure of one's relationships can occur in... drastic forms, for there may be occasions when an individual witnesses a physical assault upon someone to whom he has ties and suffers the permanent mortification of having (and being known to have) taken no action. (Goffman, 1961, p. 39)

The structure of the institution enforces forced intimacy, and thus mortification, from the point of view that the inmate cannot defend himself in at least one "typical" way - by creating distance between himself and the mortifying situation.

"Whatever the form or source of these various indignities, the individual has to engage in activity whose symbolic implications are incompatible with his conception of self" (Goffman, 1961, p. 31).

While this mortification process continues, the inmate begins to receive instruction about the privilege system. This system is largely responsible for helping the inmate construct a framework for personal reorganization.

The inmate must first learn the "house rules", which are prescribed to enforce inmate conduct. Against this background, there are a number of defined rewards, for good, obedient behaviour. These rewards are usually small things that the inmate would previously have possibly taken for granted. They may be seen as such a luxury (a reminiscence of the outside

world), that inmates may become quite fanatical in devoting their thoughts and actions to these rewards (Goffman, 1961).

On the other side of the coin, order may be maintained by punishing negative behaviour - for disobeying "house rules". This may entail removing privileges or the right to earn them.

On the whole, the disciplinary system must be applied consistently and firmly (for example, according to Correctional Services Order B v [4] [a]), so that healthy discipline and an orderly community life may prevail in the institution. It has, however, been noted that these punishments and privileges may be used by "management" to threaten longer stays "inside", while most inmates desire to be "outside".

Inmates do form groups, gangs, cliques and smaller friendships within total institutions, yet these are often not very close, since friends may "drop" a person in times of need. So, although there is little group loyalty, all inmates are expected not to break inmate solidarity. If this does occur, inmates may be tried, judged and sentenced, by "kangaroo courts", (made up of inmates).

In order to gain personal things/things which make life easier, or more pleasant, there is an underlife in total institutions. In order to gain that which is taken for granted in the outside world ("primary adjustments"), the inmate has to use wit, force, bargaining and cunning to "organize" stashes, special means of transportation, territories and supplies for economic and social exchange (and they thus become "secondary adjustments") (Goffman, 1961).

In order to remind themselves of the outside world or to temporarily lose themselves in their "own world", inmates may take part in any of the following activities: church services, movies, stage productions, reading, art, educational courses, jigsaw puzzles, games, and the occasional monthly ceremony, especially the Christmas party.

If the inmates do not find satisfactory meaning within their new context they may be left with little meaning in their lives and there can be no talk of self-assertion and self-realisation. The way that they adapt to their context will depend on the meaning that they have given to their circumstances within that context, and with changing meanings may come changing adaptations.

In attempting to adapt to the structure of the total institution, Goffman (1961) categorised adaptation "techniques" which the inmate may employ (singularly, or a combination of two or more):

1. In "situational withdrawal", the inmate withdraws apparent attention from everything, except events immediately around his body, and sees these in a perspective not employed by others present. Examples are "regression", "prison psychosis" or "acute depersonalization" (p. 61).

2. Within the "intransigent line", the inmate refuses to cooperate with staff, and in so doing intentionally challenges the institution. This is usually (although not always) short lived and the inmate may shift to situational withdrawal or another kind of adaptation.

3. In "colonization", "the sampling of the outside world provided by the establishment is taken by the inmate as the whole, and a stable, relatively contented existence is built up out of the maximum satisfactions procurable within the institution" (p. 62).

4. In "conversion", the inmate plays the role of perfect inmate, being just as the staff would like all inmates to be.

These adaptation "techniques" may be employed, but few inmates pursue any of them very far. Usually, most inmates use the "technique" of "playing it cool" (Goffman, 1961, p. 64):

This involves a somewhat opportunistic combination of secondary adjustments, conversion, colonization, and the loyalty to the inmate group, so that the inmate will have a maximum chance, in the particular circumstances, of eventually getting out physically and psychologically undamaged.

While these are broad categories of adaptation according to Goffman (1961), inmates' coping mechanisms can be more specifically observed as is seen during the latter part of the study (as related to sexual victimization).

Once the individuals find their place in the community, their self-conception has also undergone a process of change, derived from the constructions which they developed through this process.

Upon release/graduation from the total institution, the mortifying process may not end. The inmates may experience anxiety as to how well they will cope on the outside again. If

the person developed a proactive status, such as graduating from officers' training school, then pride and much certainty in themselves may be expected. When this status is unfavourable though, such as for many prisoners and psychiatric patients, the inmate may move from the top of a small world, to the bottom of a large one. They may also have to live with the stigma associated with their stay in the institution.

Even upon discharge (in some institutions, such as psychiatric hospitals), the inmate may be released into a context where he is still "controlled" by others. When an inmate is placed in the custody of family or an acquaintance, these people may have a strong sense of control over the ex-inmate, since they can establish readmission of the inmate (for example, a family member saying that the "patient" has relapsed, and is a known patient; i.e. "sickness" is expected, even if the individual is not ill). What makes this worse for the inmate is if this person was previously never in a superior position to the inmate or if the inmate does not get along well with this person.

How individuals cope/readapt to their previous way of living varies for each individual depending on the length of stay, support systems, experiences, coping mechanisms, the above named issues, what is waiting for them outside and, obviously, the uniqueness of each individual.

From the above, it is clear that individuals face varying degrees of forced intimacy. To avoid misinterpretation of this concept, it is necessary to clarify what is meant thereby.

CHAPTER 3

THE CONCEPT OF FORCED INTIMACY

All human beings interact with others in one way or another. Even choosing "not to interact" is a form of interacting. People interact with others in varying degrees of intimacy and spatial distance from each other. While interacting in an intimate relationship may be pleasant, as when with a loved one, it may also be unpleasant, when intimacy has been forced upon an individual.

In discussing personal space, Hall (in Popenoe, 1986) names the following categories:

1. Public distance

This is a distance beyond 12 feet (3.7 m), and is the distance at which public figures address others.

2. Social distance

The distance at which impersonal business is carried out, is between 4 feet (1.2 m) and 12 feet (1.2 m and 3.7 m).

3. Personal distance

This is a distance of 18 inches (45.7 cm) to 4 feet (1.2 m), and is the range in which lovers and close friends normally interact.

4. Intimate distance

This ranges from contact to 18 inches (45.7 cm) from one another. This is usually appropriate in intimate relationships (intimates, lovers, and spouses), mostly in private situations;

permitting extensive communication, involving touch, heat, sound, and smell.

Within the last two categories, intimacy occurs in varying degrees. "Intimate pertains to close personal relations characterized by warm friendship; private or closely personal" [italics added] (Carr, 1988, p. 6).

Yet, this is a very simplistic definition of intimacy. The one word that does stand out though, is "private". In order to discuss the concept of forced intimacy it is necessary to discuss privacy because it is privacy which enables an individual to control who may or may not be intimate with that person (Inness, 1992).

As mentioned by Inness (1992, p. viii):

Privacy provides the agent with control over intimate decisions, including decisions about intimate access, the dissemination of intimate information, and intimate actions. I understand intimacy to be a product of the agent's motivation. To claim that something is intimate is to claim that it draws its meaning and value for the agent from the emotions of love, liking, or care. Hence, I conclude that privacy is the state of possessing control over decisions concerning matters that draw their meaning and value from an agent's love, liking, or care. We value the control privacy provides because it embodies our respect for persons as emotional choosers. To respect others in this fashion, we must acknowledge their

autonomous capacity for love, liking, and care: we must accord them privacy. Understanding the ties between privacy and intimacy allows us to understand the paramount importance of protecting privacy: a person without privacy is a person who cannot live by her own plans with respect to intimacy, a person who has been denied control over her emotional destiny.

This is a complex definition with many areas that need clarification; many of which have been derived through complex debates. In order to shed light on the above definition of privacy, as it relates to intimacy, a discussion of the key issues will follow.

The first part of the definition states that "privacy provides the agent with control...."

Beyond Isolation: A Control-Based Account of Privacy

The separation-based account of the function of privacy is that it enables separation from others - thus, access to particular areas of one's life is restricted to others. While this is one outlook, there remains what will be shown to be a "superior" outlook - that of individuals having control over certain aspects of their life.

The separation-based account firstly places emphasis on withdrawal from others; a separation from the public realm. In this statement, privacy is opposed to publicity, and we may feel

tempted to feel that privacy and limited access (or seclusion) are synonymous.

The conclusions from this outlook are the following: (a) privacy is inherently a morally neutral concept, in that the context is essential before a normative value may be gained. (b) Privacy is individualistic - no matter what the nature of an encounter, as soon as another is present, privacy is lost. (c) As long as individuals are separated from others, the strongest claim that they could make is that privacy has been threatened (with violation).

These separation-based conclusions are problematic for the following reasons: (a) Our language reflects treating privacy as a condition which is positively valued. The value of privacy is suggested in phrases such as "enjoying privacy" and "invasion of privacy". While "we can imagine a shipwrecked person running to her rescuer and offering thanks for the relief of her isolation, ...it is awkward at least to imagine this person praising her rescuer for relieving her privacy" (Inness, 1992, p. 44). (b) If privacy is individualistic, then all people will lose privacy as soon as they are in contact with others. This does not consider the fact that shared privacy is possible, as when one allows a friend to read one's personal letters, or when sexual activity is mutually initiated. In other words, publicity is not necessarily opposed to privacy. (c) Threatened privacy violations can be more accurately described as true privacy violations; for example, if one has to take steps to avoid being "accessed" in some way, it can still be said that one's privacy

has been violated. The violation occurs since the individual feels a need to conceal something which is intended to be under his control.

The above factors are supportive of the fact that separation-based definitions of privacy fail, while support for control-based definitions of privacy is provided: (a)

Control-based definitions of privacy function by giving the individual [italics added] control over a certain area of her own [italics added] life, in other words, they give the individual a specified realm of autonomy. Given the modern liberal assumption that autonomy is a positively valued condition, we are led to the conclusion that control-based definitions of privacy do incorporate an underlying assumption that privacy is positively valued. (Inness, 1992, p. 47)

b) Assuming the definition of privacy as having control over a certain area of one's life, then shared privacy need not involve a loss of privacy. If one has control over access to oneself, then inviting another in, is merely exercising control over this situation. Yet, one does not necessarily control a situation, simply due to the fact that you initiated it.

Exercising control is an ongoing process; as such, it consists of not only the voluntary initiation of a situation, but also the ability to regulate the situation as it develops (which includes the ability to either continue or halt it) and a reasonable

expectation of continued control. (Inness, 1992, pp. 48-49)

c) Control over a situation will be threatened, not violated, when there is a high probability that the situation we are faced with involves factors not personally determined. Yet, these factors must be such "that they could reasonably be expected to exert sufficient causal influence over our particular ends in the given situation as to require protective action to gain that end" (Inness, 1992, p. 51). When there is a reasonable probability that we can regulate the outcome of a situation without resorting to emergency maneuvers it can be said that we have control over that particular situation (even without the ability to predict future events).

When protective measures are taken to restrict access to an individual's private domain, privacy is threatened; while if the measures required are emergency measures, or if access is actually gained, then privacy has been violated.

Having shown that privacy provides the agent with control over X, the X needs to be defined - thus, what is the content of privacy?

Information, Access, or Intimate Decisions About Our Actions?

The Content of Privacy

The content of privacy has three potential types: Firstly, privacy may regulate information about ourselves; secondly, it may concern access to ourselves; and thirdly, it may focus on

intimate decisions about our actions. Inness (1992, p. 56) names these terms "information based", "access based" and "decision based" accounts of privacy's content.

It will be shown that none of the above alone captures the content of privacy, but rather all three. It is also important to note that privacy's content covers intimate information, access, and decisions (i.e. some, but not all information will be included in the scope of privacy).

In "information based" accounts of privacy, individuals determine when, how and to what extent information about themselves is communicated to others. As stated above though, we must look at the type of information provided; a loss of privacy is identified through the intimacy of this information. This differs from the term "secrecy," since privacy concerns control over information, not simply concealment of it.

However, this definition presents a problem. There are two ways in which privacy may be lost without another gaining information. Firstly, loss of information may only be threatened. Secondly, access is breached without an informational gain (for example, if a voyeur observes his victim for the second time, absolutely no new information about the victim may be acquired).

In "access based" accounts of privacy, the individual has control over access (intrusions and observations) to self - this may also include access to information (thus incorporating the "information based" account). This definition explains how privacy can be lost both with and without actual information

loss. Firstly, if privacy regulates access to an individual, then privacy loss is not required to lose privacy, since the individual's access control may be damaged without another learning information about the individual (as shown in the voyeur example above). On the other hand, if control over intimate information is lost, privacy may be lost, since someone may access another when information about that individual is learnt. Learning information about another may therefore be understood as informational access, "a subset of access" (Inness, 1992, p. 63).

The above definitions do not exhaust the field of privacy. Intimate decisions are also relevant - it is because these decisions are intimate that they belong to the scope of privacy. As soon as decisions are forced upon us, our decisions are lost, and so is our privacy.

When the content of privacy is explained only in terms of intimate decisions about actions, it falls short, because informational and intimate access also fall within the domain of privacy; but including intimate access and intimate decisions about an agent's actions within the content of privacy is satisfactory. These seemingly disparate areas of privacy are tied together by their intimacy.

This can be highlighted as follows: During intimate access control, "we do not seek to avoid all access by others; we seek control over decisions [*italics added*] about intimate access to ourselves. We wish to be free to decide who may access us" (Inness, 1992, p. 69). Within "decisional privacy," we claim "to

have control over decisions [italics added] concerning our intimate actions. We wish to be free to decide how to act with respect to intimate situations" (Inness, 1992, p. 69).

In short, both "access" and "decisional" privacy claims are claims to have control over decisions [italics added]; hence, the distinction between decision-based and access-based privacy collapses. Rather than understanding privacy's content in terms of intimate access and [italics added] intimate decisions, we should draw together these seemingly disparate areas; privacy's content covers intimate decisions, including the agent's decisions concerning intimate access to herself (including informational access) and her decisions about her own intimate actions. (Inness, 1992, p. 69)

What needs to be explained now is what constitutes "intimacy."

Intimacy: The Core of Privacy

It has been assumed that intimacy is a feature of behaviour qua behaviour. This behaviourist characterization of intimacy presumes that, simply by the virtue of the instance or type of behaviour involved, certain acts and activities appear to be intimate. This definition has problems, as can be seen in an example of say kissing. Although kissing another may be seen (in many instances) as clearly intimate, in our society, it is

obvious that this need not always be the case. Culture and historical period also have an influence here. "The fact that intimacy claims can be made without a description of behavior leads to the conclusion that the behaviorist has mistakenly focused on behavior; intimacy stems from something prior to behavior" (Inness, 1992, p. 77).

Rather, the motivations demanded by acts and activities identify them as intimate (Inness, 1992). This author also suggests, that to see these matters as intimate, "involves understanding them as drawing their value and meaning from the agent's love, care, or liking" (p. 78). These terms refer to emotions that exist between people.

An example can be allowing oneself to be kissed. As stated earlier, intimacy cannot be explained by the behaviour per se. Rather, we must look at the role which kissing plays in our society. Kissing another can be clearly differentiated from tapping another on his shoulder, the difference being the meaning and value accorded to the gesture. The meaning attached to allowing a kiss can be coupled with the agent's motivation (in most cases) and is drawn from its role in experiencing the agent's love, liking, or care for another. In a similar manner, the value accorded to kissing is drawn from the expression of our feeling and not the act as merely a physical action. "The meaning and value accorded to such an act depends on the agent's emotional motivation; the act of allowing a kiss draws its intimacy from this dependency" (Inness, 1992, p. 79).

Yet, the argument against this is that these matters could be understood in terms of other considerations. If a person allowed himself to be kissed, merely for financial gain, then the value accorded may be in proportion to the monetary gain he hoped to make. If an action is seen in this way, then it may be argued that it is not necessarily intimate. "If we fail to link both the meaning and value of our actions to love, liking, or care, we have divorced our actions from intimacy" (Inness, 1992, p. 80). This may be generalized to intimate access and intimate informational access.

When a person allows access to himself, the gesture indicates something about the relationship.

The fact that we are allowing access that we understand [italics added] as significant and personal suggests that we share, or wish to share, a close relationship with the other.... When we provide intimate access to another, the meaning of our act follows from our emotions [of liking, caring, or loving]. (Inness, 1992, p. 83)

If the underlying act lacks these related emotions, it lacks meaning as an intimate act. In the same manner, if access is considered intimate, its value must also be seen as dependent on the agent's love, liking, or care.

We value allowing intimate access to someone because we value expressing our care, liking, or love to that person. If we valued conveying this meaning only

because it produced some extrinsic end, we would not be valuing it as intimate. (Inness, 1992, p. 84)

Since intimacy cannot be identified from an external point of view, determinations of intimacy are derived from personal constructions of an individual. In seeing intimacy as a personal construction, it has been argued that any act can be seen as intimate; but this carries little weight (as described by Inness, 1992).

To conclude,
privacy claims are claims to possess autonomy with respect to our expression of love, liking, and care. For example, consider my claim to privacy with respect to my decisions about whether or not to kiss others. I want this control because I understand kissing as an action that derives its meaning and value from my love. Hence, I want control over the expression of my love; my privacy claim amounts to a claim to possess such control. (Inness, 1992, p. 91)

This leads us to the question of why privacy is valued.

The Value of Privacy

For a person to be respected for his capacity for love, liking, and care, a zone with two characteristics is needed by the agent (Inness, 1992): one in which the agent possesses autonomy of action; and the other which prevents interference from external parties. For the first requirement to be

satisfied, autonomy with respect to the actions the agent takes to embody his love, liking and care, is required; the agent must not be used by society in such a way that the individual lacks the autonomy of action to express these emotions. For the second requirement to be satisfied, a zone is required by the agent in which he can regulate the access of others (informational access included); the agent must not be used by society in such a way that he is rendered incapable of understanding self as a source of intimacy. The provision of this zone enables development and the ability to sustain a self-concept as an originator of love, liking and care.

However, these two arguments are only sufficient to create a contingent sphere of autonomy with respect to intimacy, that is, privacy, for the agent. These arguments only establish that respecting an agent as a person with the capacity for love, liking, and care entails not blocking her route to intimacy; they say nothing about why we should necessarily respect the agent's own choices [emphasis mine] with respect to intimacy. (Inness, 1992, pp. 110-111)

This entails that we not only see people as emotional beings but as "emotional choosers [italics added]" (Inness, 1992, p. 111). This entails not merely leading lives in which one is capable of expressing love, liking and care; they must be entitled to choice with respect to such lives. This choice grants various forms of freedom: "the freedom of action necessary to express intimacy, freedom to create themselves as

an originator of intimacy, and freedom of choice with respect to intimacy" (Inness, 1992, p. 112). When these requirements are combined, it is made clear that respecting another as an emotional chooser with respect for love, liking and care, demands that privacy be accorded them.

Privacy's positive value stems from a principle of respect for persons as autonomous beings with the capacity for love, care, and liking, beings with an invaluable capacity for freely chosen [emphasis mine] close relationships; this principle dictates the positive value we accord to the agent's control over intimate decisions about her own actions and her decisions [emphasis mine] about intimate access to herself [or himself]. Without this underlying notion of persons as emotional choosers, we would not recognize that the agent's sphere of autonomy with respect to her care, liking, and love is a sphere over which she has evident moral rulership, a rulership that deserves the respect and protection of society.

(Inness, 1992, p. 112)

Because we value intimacy, we seek to protect privacy; the violation of privacy is condemned because it violates intimacy. However, violation of privacy does occur; the rulership stated above is not always respected; and therefore violation of intimacy can occur. Relating back to the original definition of privacy stated above: "a person without privacy is a person who cannot live by her own plans with respect to intimacy, a person

who has been denied control [emphasis mine] over her emotional destiny" (Inness, 1992, p. viii).

The effect of being denied control over one's emotional destiny/the effects of violation of intimacy within a certain context, forms the scope of this dissertation.

CHAPTER 4

THE CONCEPT OF POWER / CONTROL

It has been argued above that privacy is a state of possessing control over intimate decisions and that when one loses control over one's privacy, intimacy may be forced upon you. The term "forced intimacy" smacks with the word "power" (that is, the attempt to control another).

Within a cybernetic epistemology though, the concept of power is a linear, epistemologically incorrect idea (Bateson, 1972) and does not "fit" with a systemic/constructivist view. "Bateson's epistemological disqualification of the concept of power is often understood to imply a corresponding systemic disqualification of the concept of violence [italics added]" (Dell, 1989, p. 1). Bateson's original ideas have found much support in the family therapy literature (for example, Keeney, 1983).

Recently, however, a reconsideration of Batesonian thinking, especially by the feminist movement, has shown that the idea of power is more complex than previously suggested.

The literature (Dell, 1986; Dell, 1989; Foreman & Dallos, 1992; Goldner, Penn, Sheinberg, & Walker, 1990; Goldner, 1991; Goodrich, 1991; Hare-Mustin, 1991; and Imber-Black, 1989) provides numerous examples of how power and control is possible (in linear terms), while Bateson offers the explanation that "probably most people in this world more or less believe in it"

(Bateson, 1972, pp. 486-487) and that power is self-validating because we believe in it.

Dell (1989, p. 8) believes that Bateson was pointing to a crucial distinction here:

I think that when Bateson speaks of power and linear control, he is speaking in a different domain than the rest of us do when we speak of power. Bateson is speaking in the domain of scientific explanation, whereas the rest of us, when we believe in "power," are speaking in the domain of experience and the domain of description.... When we describe our experience, we are permitted to use the metaphors of power and lineal control! [italics added]

Within the description domain, one merely describes what one is experiencing; what one sees to be happening. One may therefore say, "Mr Jones dominates his wife" - since this is what one sees happening. What was seen, for example, is that Mrs Jones' behaviour has repeatedly angered her husband. He then shouts at her; the result being that she stops what she was doing and complies with his plans. Thus, it is possible to say that Mr Jones dominates his wife.

While this is an adequate description of one's experience of Mr and Mrs Jones; claiming that Mr Jones dominates his wife is inadequate and an epistemological error in the scientific explanation domain. The inadequacy arises from the implication that Mr Jones has lineal, unilateral power over his wife. For the scientific explanation to be adequate, it must be systemic.

Thus, Mr Jones, and his anger, does not single-handedly cause Mrs Jones to back down. Rather, the behaviour observed is a circular interaction in which Mrs Jones responds to her husband's anger and bullying by backing down and complying with his plans for her - which, in turn, negatively reinforces him to mistreat his wife whenever he feels like it, and so on.

Thus, descriptions of our experience are usually lineal while explanation (of experiences we describe) is always systemic. The purpose of these dual domains also varies:

Describing experience has the purpose of portraying "effective actions [italics added]" (Dell, 1989) - something was done, and then something happened.

The purpose of explanation is to supply the cause or reason for the experiences that we have described. In order to provide a scientific explanation, we must take into account all of the contextual variables [emphasis mine] that support and permit the occurrence of events we have experienced. (Dell, 1989, p. 9)

This distinction has the following implications (Dell, 1989): If you observe Mrs Jones being dominated by her husband, then from your own experiential point of view you will see that he has power over her. If you are Mr Jones, then you will experience your power over your wife. If you are Mrs Jones, then you will experience the power of your husband over you. Finally, if you are a Batesonian watching Mr and Mrs Jones, then you may say that Mr Jones does not have power over Mrs Jones because

their fight "is a circular-causal interaction in which she participates as much [emphasis mine] as he" (Dell, 1989, p. 10).

To say this may be adequate in the domain of systemic explanation, but it certainly is completely inadequate [italics added] in the domain of human experience and in the domain of human empathy. (Dell, 1989, p. 10)

This is emphasised in more extreme examples such as child or adult rape or torture. Can we say that the child (victim) participates as much as the abuser? We must remember that (a) real pain and damage occur (b) the problem of individual responsibilities is not addressed well in the systemic view and (c) most people "(who give primacy to human experience and who hold individuals responsible for their actions) may deem our mutual-causal, systemic explanations to be unfair, unacceptable, and even inhuman" (Dell, 1989, p. 12).

For these reasons, Dell (1989) doubts that systems theory can provide an adequate understanding of violence. As the examples show, "violence exists in the domain of human lineal experience, not in the domain of systemic explanation" (Dell, 1989, p. 11). Power and control are very real concepts!

Fish (1990) has introduced the concepts of causality and power into the systemic paradigm based on the cybernetics of Ashby (1956) rather than those of Bateson (1972).

The cybernetics of Ashby (1956) allow for the appreciation both of patterns (systemic explanation) and the quantitative and qualitative differences (the human experience of power) which compose them (Fish, 1990). The incorporation of both

understandings of experience deepens our understanding of the experience as a whole. This expanded understanding implies different assumptions to those of Bateson's systemic explanations:

Two people reciprocally influence their interactions, yet "mutual interactions do not imply equal power" (Fish, 1990, p. 34).

At a given time, one person can act with more power than another: One person may be determining an outcome more than the other. The other may or may not wish this, and the outcome may be to their benefit or detriment. (Fish, 1990, p. 34)

Thus, within a certain context, one individual with more power enforces an effect on the outcome of their transaction. When power is abused, like during violence, it has no function for the victim, while it may, temporarily, for the perpetrator. Victims may gain accidental benefits or be pressed to function better, yet this does not justify or make up for the abuse. By understanding victims' constructions of violence in total institutions (which relates to this study) a description of violence within this context can be obtained. Once these descriptions have been analyzed, compared and reported, an explanation of violence can be entertained in systemic terms. Within total institutions, the basic premise of the explanation of violence revolves around the hypothesis that the function of violence is to acquire power (as will be discussed later).

According to Fish (1990), for abuses of power to be treated, further abuse of power must be prevented. This implies that the perpetrator's power should be lessened and the victim's power increased in relation to one another, at least in the domains where the abuse occurred. Fish (1990) feels that this power relationship change will usually be initiated and maintained by third-parties (for example, therapists or courts), until the power relationship has improved for the victim. This may even imply that the therapist must move from a therapeutic to an advocacy role - by informing authorities of abuse. In child-abuse cases for example, this may result in the child being temporarily or permanently removed from the abusing context. Within the prison context however, removal of victims from the context poses many difficulties, as will be mentioned later.

Before any attempt at treatment can be suggested, it is first necessary to understand the experiences of victims of power within the context of forced intimacy.

CHAPTER 5

REVIEW OF "FORCED INTIMACY" WITHIN CONTEXT

Although studies may not refer to the term "forced intimacy" per se, it may often be implied on the basis of what is studied and how this relates to the definition of personal distance and forced intimacy. Many studies revolve around the effects of crowding on behaviour while others revolve around privacy and the invasion thereof. There are also those which study more specific invasions of intimate distance, such as rape in prison. The above-mentioned situations vary in degree and context and affect different individuals in different ways.

Research mentioned is that of animal studies, human behaviour in open and closed systems and more specific studies of total institutions in the Antarctic, psychiatric hospitals and prisons.

Animal Studies

A frequently cited study, even though over three decades old, is that of Calhoun (1962). In this now famous laboratory study, Calhoun kept a large number of rats in four connected pens with the two pens on the "sides" not being connected to each other. They were connected to the central pens which were also connected to each other. Thus, most of the rats congregated in the two central pens. They were all provided with ample

water, food, and nesting material, and left undisturbed for 16 months.

The result showed that the end pens (which only had one entrance) were easily controlled by one dominant male who kept a "harem" of females and a population which did not get too large. These rats remained healthy and normal, while pathologies of various forms were noted in the two central pens which had become crowded.

Because there were two entrances to the central pens no one male could defend that pen, so periodic struggles for dominance took place and aggressive behaviour was thus frequent. While these "dominant" males were fairly normal they did at times attack juveniles or females in sudden outbursts of aggression. Others turned to bisexualism or made advances on immature rats. Others seemed depressed, slowly walking about aimlessly, ignoring and being ignored by others. The final group were those which were hyperactive, especially hypersexual, and were even occasionally cannibalistic. Females experienced difficulties in making nests and looking after their young. Pregnancy disorders also caused many deaths.

Relating to the above study, Southwick and Bland (in McCutcheon, 1976, p. 22) "demonstrated that dominant animals ('bullies') do not show the increase in adrenal gland weight characteristic of crowded animals", indicating that "crowding is less detrimental to dominant animals than to submissive ones" (McCutcheon, 1976, p. 22).

Research on animals who were relatively free and then suddenly confined to a much smaller area has also been conducted: Alexander and Roth (in Insel & Lindgren, 1978), conducted the following experiment with monkeys: After leaving monkeys undisturbed for two-and-a-half years in a two-acre enclosure, where they lived as a stable integrated group, the researchers placed them in a pen only 2.3 percent the size of the original enclosure. During four days of this acute crowding, they displayed both mild and severe aggression increases against one another.

The above-mentioned results are not necessarily the norm in all (or even most) species though - some being more sensitive to reduction of space than others (and usually under trying conditions such as limited food supply or protection of family necessity) (Freedman, 1975).

Merely being with other animals, but more so when stressed (due to trying conditions), increases activity levels, with activity and stress reflected in increased adrenal activity (Freedman, 1975). Increased adrenal activity suggests internal activity in the animal, such as faster heart beat and metabolism. When this is extreme, the animal appears excited and tense, which may have a direct influence on physical problems. Because they are excitable they also respond less calmly to situations and thus aggression may be more common. Increased aggression leads to more fighting with resultant wounding or even death. There is also a direct correlation to a decrease in reproductive activity. Thus, the aggressiveness and other

problems noted in Calhoun's (1962) research (and others) may be explained on the basis of overexcitement and nervousness. But,

a large cage with ten animals will produce larger adrenals than a tiny cage with a few animals, even though the smaller cage is much more crowded. This finding does not contradict the idea that adrenal activity is important, but it does argue strongly against the notion that it responds to density.

(Freedman, 1975, p. 34)

This theory does not singularly account for this behaviour then. More important is the fact that (with rats for example), when there are too many rats in a confined space there is not enough adequate space to build their nests - because rats usually build nests in corners or on the sides of the pen, and because there are only four corners and only so much space on the sides, they cannot live normal lives and thus

suffer disorientation and eventually a complete social breakdown. It is not anything mysterious, not an instinctive need for territory, not simply a dramatic increase in adrenal activity, but rather a perfectly natural reaction to the inability to lead normal lives. (Freedman, 1975, p. 39)

In conclusion,

the presence of other animals and an increase in density intensifies social interactions. Ordinarily this is stimulating without being stressful, but when resources are scarce [be it food, space, or what ever]

the competition is also intensified, and this produces negative effects. (Freedman, 1975, p. 40)

While experiments such as these are unethical with humans, less "severe" experiments and observations have been reported.

Studies Conducted in Open Systems

People in open systems usually only end up in crowded or "invaded" contexts by chance or circumstance, where they have the choice to leave immediately or within a short period. The key word is "choice". Even in severe forms of forced intimacy, they usually have the choice to leave that context even if they are fearful to do so. Examples of this severe form of forced intimacy could be a woman who gets raped by a man once, or by her husband (boyfriend, etc.) on many occasions. A woman who is raped by a known/unknown assailant usually goes through one traumatic experience and then never again. A woman who is abused by her husband, has the choice of leaving him and moving elsewhere, often securing herself with restraining orders, and so forth. As will be explored later, the person within the total institution cannot leave his context of his own free will when he desires.

As stated in the above paragraph, people often end up in crowded spaces, or contexts in which they feel that their privacy has been invaded. This may happen to most of us in our day to day living; but once again we can state that this may

only be for a short period of time, or one may leave that context.

It has been found, both in crowded city neighbourhoods and artificial settings, that the greater the amount of crowding, the higher the degree of stress (Insel & Lindgren, 1978), which can lead to irritation and aggression in various forms.

Yet, these results have not always been accepted by researchers (Freedman, 1975; McCutcheon, 1976). Causes of deviant behaviour in crowded cities may be difficult to determine - it is not just population density that differs between urban and rural living. "The frustration of living in a dehumanized world of smog, traffic jams, high rent, and red tape [amongst others] might also contribute to high crime rates" (McCutcheon, 1976, p. 24). Also, disadvantaged minority groups are faced with poor housing, schooling, and job opportunities which seems to be intensified by an urban environment (McCutcheon, 1976). These factors may all be to blame, as much as crowding, for deviant behaviour.

Freedman (1975) supported this notion by going so far as to have said:

In the real world, there is no relationship between crowding and pathology. With income and other factors controlled, cities... have no higher rates of crime, illness, infant mortality, venereal disease, suicide, mental illness, or any other pathology than comparable to areas with relatively few people per square mile.
(pp. 103-104)

Similarly, no more pathology is found in the homes of people with little space as compared to those with more space (Freedman, 1975).

The effects of crowding in open systems are thus difficult to determine with so many variables present. In an attempt to exclude some of these variables, research has been conducted in closed systems (which also bears more relevance to this study).

Studies Conducted in Closed Systems

In an attempt to see how people react to long periods of crowding in closed systems, researchers have used many different environments:

For example, some people involuntarily forced into proximity within a crowded elevator, have often shown immobility and rigidity (Altman, 1975). Sommer (in Insel & Lindgren, 1978) goes on to say that when people experience their personal space to be invaded, they may react with discomfort, anxiety, irritation, and even anger or aggression.

Crowded elevators are more constricting than what one expects in closed systems though - people have to stand while physically touching others (which may be a discomfort) and may be subjected to factors like heat and odours.

Freedman (1975) has confidently concluded that if the above factors (space to sit, odours, heat) are controlled, crowding does not produce stress. The effects of crowding on producing aggressiveness were researched in numerous fashions and on

numerous occasions (Freedman, 1975). One was conducted as follows:

Groups of all men, all women, or mixed (with a size of six to ten) were placed in small rooms or big rooms - those in the big rooms having just over double the amount of space than those in the small rooms. The subjects were played five brief tape recordings of simulated trials and asked, as a juror, to give a confidential (not discussed with others) verdict of guilty or not guilty. If the defendant was found guilty then a sentence should also be given.

For the last three trials, after individuals had made their decisions individually, they were told to discuss (with arguments arising) in detail the evidence and then come up with another private decision. They then answered questionnaires to assess their emotional reactions to the process.

The results indicated that firstly, there was no difference in the sentencing given between the large rooms and the small rooms taken as a whole, and thus "crowding has no general negative or positive effect on this behavior" (Freedman, 1975, pp. 86-87). The important finding was that there were significant differences between the gender groups. Crowding was responded to positively by women, seen by their giving of less severe sentences in the smaller room than in the large one. Their questionnaires also stated that they found each other more friendly and pleasant in the smaller rooms. The men on the other hand, responded more negatively, giving harsher sentences and finding others less friendly and pleasant in the smaller rooms

than in the larger rooms. The mixed-sex groups seemed unaffected by the room size.

Although Freedman (1975) has mentioned studies supporting this study of his, he also mentions some which contradict it. His answer is the following proposition: "Crowding by itself has neither good effects nor bad effects on people but rather serves to intensify the individual's typical reactions to the situation [emphasis added]" (pp. 89-90). If the circumstances are normally found to be pleasant by an individual - a positive reaction to having people around whom he would consider friendly - under conditions of high density, a more positive reaction is expected. In a similar sense, having a dislike for others or a negative reaction to their presence will result in negative reaction in high density conditions. Being indifferent to others has little effect if density is heightened. Thus,

People do not respond to density in a uniform way, they do not find it either always pleasant or always unpleasant. Rather, their response to density depends almost entirely on their response to the situation itself. Density acts primarily to make this response, whatever it is, stronger [- making a bad experience worse and a good experience better]. (Freedman, 1975, p. 90)

Johnson (in McCutcheon, 1976, p. 24) has pointed out that "crowding per se [emphasis added] might not be so crucial to humans as the quality [emphasis added] of crowding" - what kind

of people one mixes with/the experiences to which one can be expected to be subjected.

As Insel and Lindgren (1978, p. 20) state: "When we are physically close to the kind of people we like, we are inclined to feel less crowded than when we find ourselves in the midst of people who do not attract us". The important words in this sentence are "feel less crowded" - how each individual feels is idiosyncratic.

Thus, some people may feel "crowded" in a situation to which many others don't object. An example is an experiment conducted in men's public toilets - in which it was found that using a urinal next to another man may result in feelings of awkwardness due to an invasion of privacy (Insel & Lindgren, 1978).

Desor (in McCutcheon, 1976) found that partitioning a room led to subjects perceiving it to be less crowded. Perceptions of crowding may thus be determined by the individual's sense of privacy, or lack thereof.

Thus, when an individual is faced with a negative situation (as perceived by the individual), such as threatened or actual incursions of one's property or self, it will produce more negative reactions under high density.

With a lack of privacy, the chance of forced intimacy occurring heightens. This may be especially severe within total institutions.

Findings of Studies in Total Institutions

The first study does not quite fit Goffman's (1961) definition of a total institution, in that it is not a "large" number of individuals; yet "large" is not defined and all of the other characteristics apply.

The Antarctic - Members' Experiences at South Pole Station

At South Pole Station, approximately 18 members live in a "dome" dwelling, with little space, for seven to nine months during winter. During these months, isolation from the "outside world" is almost complete. Members cannot leave; there are no visitors, no mail, and no fresh supplies. Outside contact is primarily by high frequency radio and sometimes a satellite link.

The crew members must adjust to many stressors.... Absent are windows, privacy, living green things and animals, the sun, thick moist air to breathe, freedom to travel, or freedom to leave a rumor-infested, isolated human outpost. The "rumor-mill" can be quite potent. Cliques can develop and be quite cruel and stressful to an individual with a different background than the rest of the crew. Cliques can also be quite insensitive to their own kind. Lack of acoustic privacy in small "private" rooms can also lead to stress. Privacy becomes a cherished commodity. Time

away from the group is very important for "charging one's batteries." Lack of a partner of the opposite sex can also lead to stress.... Constant low light levels can cause stress, too. (Cornelius, 1991, p. 10)

Living in close contact to others, with poor acoustic privacy, often leads to stress, especially when individuals can hear the person next to them breathing, making love, going to the toilet, or listening to his music. One member described his irritation by indicating how other people's irritating habits eventually "tic" a person off, and when you cannot take it any more, you explode (Barabasz, 1991).

Members do work, and do have day-off activities though, which relieve stress. They listen to music, watch movies, talk and have parties, go on one or two short excursions outside, or look out of the only window.

Yet, being confined with others for so long takes its toll on members. Social withdrawal, self-reports of depression and hostility, feelings of helplessness, psychotic episodes and negative moods come about at Polar Station (Carrere, Evans & Stokols, 1991).

In terms of being separated from the opposite sex, Schwetje (1991, p. 393) states that: "The presence of no or few women in the Antarctic has led to some minor problems, a topic that was discussed by a panel at the conference. Such an unnatural condition may excuse or mitigate a criminal act."

Once again, it is important to note that this environment is not perceived the same for everyone. There are those who

found it less stressful than others and with this experience being a voluntary action as part of their chosen career, with not many people in the world having done what they have done, it is no wonder that we find some members saying "[This] was, without question, the greatest adventure of my life" (Levesque, 1991, p. 18).

Forced Intimacy Within Prisons

Beginning with the admission into prison and continuing for the entire duration of the prisoners' terms, they are faced with the possibility of "contaminative exposure" (Goffman, 1961); an invasion of personal space or forced intimacy.

The prisoner begins by supplying personal details to authorities; his possessions are examined and stored, while he is physically searched (in a dignified manner, according to Correctional Services Order B 1 [2] [d]) - which rarely, but sometimes, includes rectal examination. In the cell and dormitory section of the prison, the prisoners are subject to using open toilets and showers, while dormitory space forces close contact.

It is nothing new to note that prisons are violent contexts. Many inmates have violent histories; there are many well structured gangs which often use violence to achieve their means; and many individuals use or learn to use violence in order to "survive" or merely to make things more comfortable for themselves, especially if they have long terms, or life

sentences to endure. Not only are these prisons (which are often large) violent contexts but they are often overcrowded which gives rise to what Scacco (1975, p. 18) calls a "pressure cooker state of living."

The Department of Correctional Services has, on a number of occasions, expressed grave concern about the large number of violent assaults in South African prisons. During the six month period from 1 October 1985 to 31 March 1986, the prison authorities reported that 4152 cases of assault of varying degrees of seriousness had been noted.... This amounts to over 8000 incidents per annum. In other words, nearly one in ten prisoners will become the victim of assault, or be involved in an assault during a twelve-month period. (Glanz, 1992, p. 390)

During the period 1 July 1991 to 31 December 1992, 20 prisoners died as a result of their injuries, sustained from assault by fellow prisoners (Department of Correctional Services, 1993).

The figures of assaults not resulting in death are an under-representation of the true number of assaults that occur because many are not reported, for fear of further victimization. Assailants are often not identified or charged - and if charged - "convictions are rarely obtained since reliable testimony is unavailable" (Porporino, Doherty & Sawatsky, 1987, p. 125).

In South Africa, more than one-third of the prisons (i.e. 35%) were overcrowded by more than 50% and some by as much as 100% (Glanz, 1992). "On 31 December 1992 prisons in the Republic of South Africa provided accommodation for 108 698 prisoners, as opposed to the available cell accommodation for 84 791 prisoners" (Department of Correctional Services, 1993, p. 2). Understaffing (especially within structurally large prisons) usually means that violent assaults go unnoticed and unchecked.

As stated above, prisons are violent contexts. (This will be discussed in greater detail further on). The question then is, how do the individuals in this already violent context react to overcrowding?

Paulus (1988) stated that the number of potentially negative encounters and opportunities for personal interference increases with a heightened density, so much so that "the number of potentially violent incidents may increase at a rate greater than the rate of increase in density" (p. 85).

These negative encounters and personal interferences may take many forms, but one in particular is a severe form of forced intimacy - that of sexual victimization.

Sexual Victimization of Male Prisoners

Sexual victimization, involving forced sodomy, "sex between the legs," oral copulation and other physical and mental torture amongst inmates incarcerated throughout the western world, has not been researched much or mentioned in society. The extent of

the problem is very wide; an example being the study of Wooden and Parker (1982), with 14% of their sample prison population who had been sexually assaulted. Personal communication with prison guards and staff (1989; 1990; 1993; 1994), as well as communications and findings in other research (Bowker, 1980; Lockwood, 1980; McMullen, 1990; Nacci & Kane, 1983; Scacco, 1975; Sykes, 1958; Sylvester, Reed & Nelson, in Nacci & Kane, 1983; Vedder & King, 1967; and Weiss & Friar, 1974) indicate that sexual assault is a very common problem in prisons.

One of the reasons why this issue is such a problem has been described well by Weiss and Friar (1974, p. 76):

Women who are raped [in the community] often take a long time to overcome the shock. Their sexual attitudes, their feelings about men, have been badly shaken up. Frequently, raped women require psychotherapy to reassemble their sexual image of themselves. This extensive reconstruction happens after only one rape, with the rapist fleeing permanently from any further contact with them.

But the raped prisoner, most of the time, continues to be sexually attacked as long as he remains in prison. The raped inmate rarely has the opportunity to reassemble his lost male sex identity.

Of great importance here is not only the actual attack, but the continuous threat of being victimized. The literature is extensive concerning women who have been raped and what they go through both physically and psychologically; what male prisoners

go through appears similar, if not worse. "Victims commonly suffer such emotional reactions that they have physical consequences such as nausea, cramps, insomnia, and headaches" (Bowker, 1980, p. 16). Wooden and Parker (1982, p. 112) indicate that "their body language indicates defeat and humiliation." It is also reported that victims may attempt suicide or self mutilation in an attempt to be separated from the other prisoners, or to be sent to a psychiatric hospital (Bowker, 1980). Labelling, as an after effect of assault, is also mentioned.

Victims also describe feelings of humiliation and "demaling", especially after the common occurrence of group rape. Not only must the victim cope with such assaults, but is also faced with extremely difficult decisions thereafter. If he "snitches" on his attackers, (snitching is sacrilege in prison) then he will be faced with many assaults in various forms. If his offender/s are not found guilty (this is usually the case, due to lack of witnesses), then the victim will continue to be abused. If he is transferred, word travels fast along the prison grape vine and his label of "punk" may go with him.

Guards in American prisons often overlook what is happening most of the time and most tolerate all forms of homosexual behaviour (Wooden & Parker, 1982). Thus, protectors are often not there to protect those who need it - prisoners must look after themselves. This attitude is clearly seen in the words of an Assistant Superintendent of training in a training centre for men in Missouri: "You have three alternatives with rape. Submit,

fight, or go over the fence" (Weiss & Friar, 1974, p. 3). "Staff produce the perception in inmates that they are unable to anticipate and control inmate violence" (Nacci & Kane, 1984, p. 49).

Another alternative available is to "hook up with someone who will look out for them" (Wooden & Parker, 1982, p. 107). But for protection, the inmate must provide sexual favours to his protector on a regular basis and this is a form of sexual assault in itself because the victim is still doing something that he despises. There is also the continuous fear of being "ditched", being left without protection if the protector is transferred or released, and being left with the label of freely giving sexual favours to another man. The psychological impact of being someone's "punk" is not addressed in any of the literature consulted.

Sometimes inmates are faced with extreme decisions where they feel that they have to submit to others. An example is where inmates threaten their proposed victim, that their friends on the outside will harm his family in some way if he does not submit. Other inmates are tricked in various forms (see example, Wooden & Parker, 1982, p. 103).

In addition to that stated already, the victim may show sexual identity problems, strained family relations, and the possible sexual and emotional problems which could result upon the victim's return to society and family life. The ever present threat of contracting AIDS is also something which has not been mentioned in these studies.

In South African prisons, the spread of HIV and AIDS is at least lowered by separating HIV-infected prisoners from the rest of the prison population in respect to sleeping quarters, while they join the main population during the day. Prisoners also receive information, guidance, counselling and education with regard to this disease.

A possible consequence for society is that many victors and victims learn how to attack people and their property competently in their "professional schools for crime....[When] they are unleashed onto the community...their thirst for revenge on society knows no limits" (Weiss & Friar, 1974, p. 237). "Aggressive behaviour can become a way of life, a means to survive, an attitude and approach to relating to others that is not easily shed when the inmate returns to society" (Porporino et al., 1987, p. 126).

None of the research mentioned above goes into much more detail than stated above. The authors give extensive coverage of what actually takes place in the prisons, and formulate theories concerning the assaults, but do not focus attention on what the victims really go through (especially psychologically).

A problem with these studies is that most have not attempted solutions to the problem. Of the solutions that are offered, most do not really come even close to solving the problem.

Attempted solutions.

Literature from the United States of America suggested the following: Weiss and Friar (1974) mentioned vocational, educational, and athletic programmes; training in music, painting, drama and other arts; and being allowed out of the prison to go to work during the day. While these programmes have not been widely implemented in the United States of America, they are available (to a greater or lesser degree) in South African prisons. Not all prisoners may not be entitled to all of these programmes though (for example, recently incarcerated inmates who may be considered dangerous or an escape risk, may not be granted permission to leave the prison during the day, for work purposes). Despite the availability of these programmes, it is believed that sexual domination would continue.

Community treatments (such as social competence programmes for school children; neighbourhood programmes to reach drug addicts and trouble-makers, and their families; and treatment centres instead of reform schools) as primary prevention against any crime (Scacco, 1975; Weiss & Friar, 1974) are a good starting point but will never prevent the problem totally, and what about those in the system at the moment?

Weiss and Friar (1974) also mentioned conjugal visits for married men, as done in Mississippi, but this does not help these people from becoming victims and those who are unmarried 98have no such rights. Further problems concerning this area

were also mentioned by Scacco (1975) and Vedder and King (1967).

The furlough programme in which inmates are allowed home for the weekend may also help establish positive sexual and emotional relationships (Scacco, 1975), but since rape is usually an act of aggression and domination, rather than a sexual one, the problem is not resolved. Such a programme would probably also not be welcomed by the community and the staff of maximum security prisons.

Nacci and Kane (1983, p. 35) found that "targets and aggressors usually lived in the same unit or dormitory," and "assaults occurred most often in living quarters." Wooden and Parker (1982) conducted a study in a medium security prison in which there were only single-man cells, aimed at lessening the degree of sexual assault and activity. Yet sexual assault still occurred. The obvious problem with this model is that prisons are over-crowded and immense finances would be needed to build such prisons. Also,

Protective custody is not a viable alternative for someone with a lot of time to do since the isolation is psychologically devastating. Being separated from virtually all human contact for the full period of incarceration is a drastic measure, and most inmates would rather "take their chances" of being further sexually victimized than being separated and alone.

(Wooden & Parker, 1982, p. 108)

One proposed solution by Nacci and Kane (1984, p. 49), suggested that "officer motivation to deter and to protect would be improved if officers had more accurate information about homosexual activity and if they were more understanding about the process that leads inmates to become involved in the first place [italics added]." The guards also need accurate information concerning sexual aggression: "It is when the officers are free to construct their own theories about inmate sexuality that problems can develop" (Nacci & Kane, 1984, p. 51). Some detail is provided as to what the guards need to be informed of, and how they can act in solving this problem; yet this has also not helped in solving the problem.

The literature also provided no information concerning techniques or results of individual, group, family, or systemic therapy.

In South African prisons, prisoners who appear to be easy targets, especially of sexual victimization, are sometimes separated from the larger community in some way. These prisoners are usually young and/or attractive. This method of separation may prevent some victimization, especially that with a sexual motive, yet many prisoners are victimized from within an aggressive motive. Although young and attractive prisoners may be the target of abuse, their features do not necessarily exclude them from abusing others. This preventative method thus has value, although limited.

In South African prisons, there is no programme for victims per se, although there are services available to those who

require them. The full range of registered programmes are programmes for: (a) mental health; (b) prisoners with serious behavioural problems; (c) child molesters; (d) counselling programme; (e) social functioning; (f) alcohol and drug dependency; (g) education; (h) training; (i) juveniles; (j) career ability and interest; (k) recreation-education; and (l) life-skills (Department of Correctional Services, 1993).

Victims have the opportunity to contact a wide range of professionals, including psychologists, social workers, nurses, doctors and ministers of religion.

Although there is a shortage of psychologists in prisons (Department of Correctional Services, [1993]), prisoners may still have access to voluntary workers within the prison; they have access to the district surgeon; and when necessary, it can be arranged that inmates be transferred to another facility/prison where adequate help is available; or a psychologist (or relevant helper) from another prison may be requested to visit the inmates.

Help may be requested directly; by asking a professional or any other member of staff to refer one; putting a letter into a specially provided box; or making a note of one's request in the "Complaints and Request" book. If inmates wish for their request to remain confidential (and do not trust sending it by letter, for example), they may rely on others (such as family, friends, another inmate, or ministers of religion) to organize help.

Even with these psychological services available to sexually victimized prisoners, one may question the solution to

the problem as a whole, and even with "therapy", what will prevent further victimization from occurring again? It appears (in the literature and in personal communication) as if therapists feel helpless in this context - they help the individual as much as possible, but victimization will still continue.

This leaves the helping professions with an extremely difficult task. Prevention of victimization and empowering techniques before or after victimization has helped some victims/potential victims but on the whole it seems as if most victims are stuck without help. Even when help does arrive; if it arrives; adequate empowerment may not always be forthcoming.

The helping professions have also not made any dent in the prison subculture system, and victims perceive the helping professions as inadequate - as not having enough power to bring about a safe change (as will be seen in chapter 7).

As mentioned above, thus far the helping professions' work has been focused on some preventative work, some help with empowerment, and a limited amount of psychotherapy. Some individuals are "treated", but while they receive help, the system continues unchanged - the powerful abusing other victims. Secondary prevention, rather than primary prevention, is thus occurring on a wide scale.

This is unacceptable and challenges the basic premises of psychologists, especially systems therapists. Can people call themselves systems therapists (and some do) in the prison, or

other total institutions, if they do not work with the whole system?

Therapists are faced with a few dilemmas:

1. How are they going to live with trying to help victims in a context where victimization may continue. Thus, how are they going to stand providing the meta-communication: "If rape is inevitable, relax and enjoy it"? (Goodrich, 1991, p. 35).

2. Related to the previous dilemma is the question of how some therapists learn to tolerate being seen as non-helpful and non-healing - a result of attempting to treat the victim, while he remains in his traumatizing context. As will be discussed later, some victims present with symptoms which are in themselves coping manoeuvres/survival mechanisms, and they will thus "resist" change, because change may result in more severe trauma. Some victims are thus bound to remain "symptomatic". The question is whether all therapists take note of this, or do they merely attempt to treat the symptom, without favourable results.

3. It can also not be expected that the psychology of the oppressed can change before the condition in which they find themselves is changed.

These dilemmas manifest the limits of therapy and although they are quite defeating they do not allow resign, because psycho-therapists are still the ones to whom victims come.

A new outlook is needed. "To position ourselves differently means that we stop using our sessions to fix up people so the system works better and start fixing up the system so the people work better" (Goodrich, 1991, p. 33).

While the system has made positive changes over the years, it is still not "ideal". It is the researcher's contention that moves away from the traditional prison system (such as "house-arrest") appear to have many more benefits.

Shortly, the main incentive for such an alternate form of "incarceration" is that the individual attempts to change his behaviour in the community where his problem is. With some form of guidance, and being backed by family, friends and the community, the individual may perceive himself as having a valued purpose in the community. The individual is also not subjected to as much control/the possibility of negative control, and he may thus maintain meaning in his life. (Work also helps create a sense of meaning.)

All the alternatives available are, however, beyond the scope of this study. It is valuable to note that the Department of Correctional Services (1993) has begun implementing such integration programmes.

Attempts to change the system seem to have failed, while moves away from the traditional prison system (such as house-arrest) appear to have many benefits. These alternatives, however, are beyond the scope of this study.

Park (in Glanz, 1992) pointed out that the solutions to the prison violence are no more easily available than the solutions to the problems of violence in the outside society.

Wooden and Parker (1982) gave a realistic conclusion to most studies: "Scientific research is needed to further study the long-term psychological effects to men who have been

sexually victimized while in custody" (p. 116); and "The larger crisis of sexual assault, and the continued lack of programs for hetero-sexual youngsters who are sexually victimized, however, remain relevant concerns for all prisons" (p. 227).

The power to bring about change lies in the hands of the helping professions. The problem of sexual victimization cannot remain unaddressed and unchanged.

Sexual Victimization of Female Prisoners

Sexual victimization of female prisoners has received much less research than that for mens' experiences. Two authors who studied male victimization also mentioned female victimization (Bowker, 1980; Weiss & Friar, 1974), and the same critique thereof applies, as stated above.

Sexual assault by staff or inmates can occur. Females who are victimized by male or female staff members are at an obvious disadvantage within the confines of the prison. In some cases, males are too strong for them, or there are too many males or females, life can be made very difficult for them if they do not comply, and there is nowhere to run. Although the extent of staff-prisoner victimization is not known, it does occur; as stated by a female prisoner: "Everybody knows the guards are doing it to the inmates" (Weiss & Friar, 1974, p. 114).

Minimizing sexual assault on South African female prisoners has been accomplished due to the enforcement of the United Nations (1984) "Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of

Prisoners and Procedures for the Effective Implementation of the Rules", as well as two standing regulations, namely: Article 23 of the Correctional Services Act (1990) which prescribes that male and female prisoners are detained in separate parts of a prison/ different prisons; and Article 24 of the Correctional Services Act (1990) which permits only female staff to "treat" female prisoners. This leaves the only possibility being, females abusing other females.

Weiss and Friar (1974) claimed that women inmates are raped regularly. The homosexual rape of women in prison can be just as brutal and terrifying as that of men. A few examples are stated to indicate the nature thereof.

The two women throw Ms. X into a corner. A crushing blow on her mouth silences her.

Then they rape the helpless younger woman. They perform a variety of brutal, sadistic, sexual perversions on her. She sobs uncontrollably through the night, racked by the rape. (Weiss & Friar, 1974, p. 50)

She is forced to turn a deaf ear to the rape victims' frantic screams for help. (Weiss & Friar, 1974, p. 15)

"Problem is I'll get the shit kicked out of me or worse if I don't spread 'em in the next couple of days." (Fox in Bowker, 1980, p. 51)

Weiss and Friar (1974) gave the testimony of a woman who was raped and ended up being the rapist. She told of how she manipulated women into becoming her "fish".

Forced Intimacy Within Psychiatric Hospitals

Personal involvement and personal communication (1993) with psychiatric and nursing staff from a South African psychiatric hospital, indicate that forced intimacy does occur, with many similarities and differences to that of the prison context.

Patients also begin by supplying personal details to authorities, with their file information available to all. Their possessions are examined and stored, while physical and psychiatric examination are also conducted. In at least one South African psychiatric hospital, some wards still have open toilets and showers, and a few dormitories are overcrowded and under-staffed.

Sexual victimization does occur (Holbrook, 1989; personal communication, 1993), with both patients and staff abusing certain patients. The incidence of this kind of assault remains vague.

Within acute wards, patients are usually concerned with their own health, and making a good impression so as to be discharged as soon as possible. Due to many patients being admitted and discharged at various times, it appears as if there is not enough time and constancy to form gangs which function well and according to a specific modus operandi. Since patients

are kept together and observed in controlled settings, the chances of patients being abused without the incident being reported by the victim directly, or by other patients or staff, is minimized. With shortages of staff, especially at night, the chances are then increased.

Patients who show any form of hypersexuality towards others are often medicated to prevent any incidents from occurring.

Chronic wards, on the other hand, are generally overcrowded, have few staff members, and the patients spend quite some time (usually many years of their lives) within that ward. As stated by Holbrook (1989, p. 78):

Some male and female patients have been segregated by sex and kept locked in dormitory-style cubicles for many years. They have had little opportunity to interact with the opposite sex, and some have developed deviant sexual behaviors.

Many of these patients are not aggressive by nature, while others may be too mentally ill to get involved in gangs. Gangs do not appear to be the norm, especially not gangs with specific modus operandi. Yet, patients may individually, or in a "crowd," take advantage of fellow patients.

An example from a chronic ward in a South African psychiatric hospital, is of a patient who was psychiatrically ill and mildly mentally retarded who was sexually abused by one inmate and then others also took their turn (with others holding the victim). This continued to happen because the patient was either too ill to understand or communicate what had happened

and/or he was physically too small to do anything about it. This incident appears to have a sexual motive only because he was the only one who was continuously abused. The solution was to place him in isolation at night but abuse still occurred during the day, although less regularly, due to staff observation.

One nursing sister on this chronic ward stated that in over one year, she was aware of only one gang, (with very few members), which only lasted a very short time. On the whole, sexual victimization was the result of one on one, or two on one, assault. Weekends were the time when most assaults occurred, especially at night.

In chronic wards, staff may also abuse patients with relative ease. Once again, lack of staff, or access to doctors or authorities, enables evidence to be lost quickly, and even with a complaint, there is a chance that this may be seen as a product of the patient's illness.

Some victims may be easier targets, and may feel even more helpless due to being strongly medicated, often with extra-pyramidal side effects which do not enable them to physically protect themselves as well as they would hope they could.

Patients with the privilege of ground parole are also subjected to abuse on the hospital grounds.

Prison Sexual Violence: A Description and Explanation

When one looks at western societies based on capitalism, the generalized main aim of those residing therein is to achieve

wealth, power, and status. In effect these three concepts are synonymous because if a person has one of them the other two are usually acquired automatically as a result thereof: The acquisition of wealth gives rise to status and a relative amount of power. A person in a powerful position may use this position to acquire wealth with resulting higher status. A person with high status may use this position in the acquiring of wealth with relevant power associated to one's wealth.

The most "acceptable" way of achieving status, power and wealth (with resulting "comforts") is through legal monetary gain which, in a capitalist society, is accomplished through hard work. Society often dictates the use of power to achieve desired ends; this power is enforced through the use of aggression in sports, the military, and other male-dominated activities. Physical strength is still often associated with being a man which, in turn, creates the perception of power: The stronger the man the more power he has over other people (and especially women). It must not be forgotten, however, that these terms are relative and totally dependent upon the context in which they occur.

For most people it is unacceptable to gain power through the abuse of power itself, and especially by dominating others against their will. People who abuse power may increase their power especially if "harm" comes to those who do not "obey". In this sense, power which is abused may tend to be stronger than power which is not abused.

Within the prison context, inmates enter with this capitalist frame of reference but quickly find out (according to prison regulations) that they may not acquire power, wealth and status because the prison authorities are the only ones who may have power while all prisoners are to be treated the same, having the same role and status.

But, having entered with a capitalist frame of reference, inmates can hardly be expected to simply ignore this essential part of their lives. To obtain wealth within the prison (with all the resulting benefits which make "time" more bearable) inmates have to use power and because they cannot do so along acceptable channels they have to abuse power, with the "strong" victimizing the "weak".

Victimization can be seen as a process defined by Fisher (in Toch, 1977, p. 143) as "a predatory practice whereby inmates of superior strength and knowledge of inmate lore prey on weaker and less knowledgeable inmates."

Issues of "weakness" or "strength," "superiority" and "knowledge," must be seen as relative to victimization, and to no other transactions [italics added]. We don't know how "strong" or "weak" the victims or aggressors are in other settings... We know that aggressors select the arena of the victimization contest ("prison lore"), initiate the stressful encounter, and pick the indices of evaluation. The victim walks into situations where his presence lends itself to a game in which the aggressor arranges

things deliberately so he can make the victim look as helpless, "weak," and inferior as possible.

(Toch, 1977, p. 143)

This is usually easy, especially when the new inmates enter the prison, because they often already have feelings of helplessness (as mentioned above in the self-mortification process).

Inmates with small physiques and who appear afraid are often targeted because they are seen to carry little threat of successful retaliation. Inmates who are seen as "strong" may have to be targeted with a greater number of attackers or may rather be approached to join the attacking group and thus empower them more.

Because there is strength in numbers, gangs are very prominent in the prison context. When individuals are faced with the sheer power of a large gang there is little chance of standing up against this group. In order to avoid possible detection of any weak link in their armour, gangs have to reinforce their position every so often. If enough people are continuously shown the power a group/someone has over them, it enhances their susceptibility to the power over them. The threat of further victimization as well as seeing others being victimized enhances the feelings of powerlessness of the "victims". The more the gangs perceive others as being powerless, the greater they perceive their power over others (which becomes a vicious cycle of reinforcement: a circular causal interaction in which victims "create" their situation as

much as the perpetrators do - in Batesonian explanatory terms - and thus, violence can be seen as a symptom of the system).

This power hierarchy has become so powerful in many prisons that it resembles organized crime syndicates like the Mafia, in that even the law (the warders) are too afraid to venture into certain parts of the prison at certain times without enough of them in numbers; warders may be bribed to turn a blind eye to happenings; and those at the "top" are hardly ever convicted because those at the "bottom" actually commit the crimes upon instruction from those "higher up". The apparent lack of power amongst warders, psychologists, or others, may thus perpetuate/reinforce the situation.

Staff do not accept the problem lying down though - the negative behaviour of gang members being condoned.

The actions and attitudes of personnel towards gang members are regulated formally and prescriptively through:

- [1] identification and custody of gang members;
- [2] the manner in which specific gang behaviour is dealt with, such as the prevention of violent behaviour by gangs, searching, control of assault, hunger strikes, the smuggling trade, arson and mass violence; and
- [3] recommendations which are made with a view to the planning of prisons, manpower development, legal sanctions and sexual control. (Neser, 1993, p. 213)

Staff also attempt to build constructive relationships with gang members and encourage them to improve their behaviour.

Yet, the generalized power of the gangs as a whole facilitates their continued existence, and they continue enforcing power-tactics to maintain their positions.

The best way of showing power is to hit at the self. When one's physical body is attacked or threatened with attack it immediately affects one psychologically as well. Physical injuries may show the victim that those in power mean business. The impact must have the desired effect (reducing power amongst non-gang members) and this may be established through threats, assaults, and even murder.

Second to death, the most extreme form of power is that of sexual victimization. When an inmate is assaulted (not sexually) he may rationalise his defeat as there having been too many against him or that he only has to live with a few physical injuries, and so forth, but sexual victimization may "break" a man completely making him feel "unmanly" or "demaled". If he no longer feels like a man, how can he retaliate in future like a man? (Especially when society has set such strong norms for being male). If sexual victimization occurs "enough" times (which may be as little as once or even only threatened) the victim becomes powerless in his own eyes and in those of his attackers. Thus, control of sex leads to control of the relationship as a whole.

The victim's whole intimate, private domain has been invaded. How individuals experience this and how they cope with it forms the scope of this study.

The above explanation of gang violence may be linked to what Reid (in Nesper, 1993) named the "deprivation model", in which loss of goods and services, freedom, autonomy, security and no heterosexual relationships may to a large extent be alleviated through gang activity.

The "importation model" (Reid in Nesper, 1993) may also be incorporated into the above description. This implies that gangs are imported from the lower class and the criminal world in the free community, into the prison. This subculture thus reflects the values, norms and ideas of the outside subculture. Related to this, it has been found in American prisons that there is a definite reversal of minority and majority roles within the prison, in that "blacks appear to be taking out their frustrations and feelings of exploitation on the other inmates in the form of sexual attack and domination" (Scacco, 1975, p. 5). Underlying this aggression of the blacks "is the deep seated resentment which lower class blacks harbor against the white middle-class..." (Irwin in Scacco, 1975, p. 64).

Most gangs in South Africa were started by blacks and coloureds (Lötter, 1988) victimizing others in various forms, often according to the "official" modus operandi of the gang.

Prison Gangs in South Africa

The most common and powerful gangs are the "number gangs," especially the 26 and the 28 gang. The 27 gang has weakened a great deal (Lötter, 1988), while the Airforce and the Big 5 are still active. Others are much smaller and less well known.

While all gangs are feared and use violence or intimidation to maintain power they also work according to "official" modus operandi: the 26 obtain "money", which is any goods, mainly through trickery. The 27 enhance their power by the spilling of "blood" through assault, while the 28 use robbery with physical violence ("poison") as a means of providing for their "wyfies" (a male in a "traditionally" female role) or correcting problems within the prison. The above modus operandi may be "unofficially" found to a lesser extent within all gangs.

Gangs may infiltrate others to a degree but this is usually uncommon. "Codes of the number gangs... stipulate that their members may 'live off' unaligned prisoners or *mpatas* [italics added]" (Lötter, 1988, p. 70) who are entitled to nothing.

A quasi-military structure is present in all of these gangs, and rank, (imaginary) uniform and (imaginary) equipment is issued to recruits (Lötter, 1988).

Newcomers with sought-after qualities may either be invited to join the gang or be entrapped or coerced to enrol in the gang. If they do not join they may be faced with the label of "mpatas" and become targets of various forms of assault.

With so many gangs present in large numbers, all operating according to an official modus operandi, it is logical to expect that a new inmate will quickly be faced with the threat of being a victim of members from a particular gang. He may even find that he becomes the victim of more than one gang. He will also quickly experience the enormous power of the gangs in comparison to his extreme helplessness - a feeling established when he realises that he has no choice but to become a victim.

The following sections relate to narrative and elicited themes of subjects of the research who were targeted and sexually victimized, and thus subjected to forced intimacy.

CHAPTER 6

METHODOLOGY

The Problem

In the previously mentioned literature some clues were brought to light regarding the physical and psychological experiences of victims of forced intimacy. Many crucial issues were not addressed though.

In terms of sexually victimized prisoners, the following areas were not always addressed (especially as a whole): the context; the expectations of the victim prior to victimization; the events which led to the victimization; the experience of being victimized - as experienced by the victims themselves; the effects on related systemic levels (inmates, victims, offenders, warders, family and friends, society); and the means of adaptation after the incident.

Many studies described experiences of victims as generalized facts. An important note for the reader of this study is that the experiences of victims of forced intimacy are seen as relative to the individual. Constructed meanings therefore, as opposed to facts, are central to understanding behavioural acts.

None of the studies supplied techniques with favourable results indicating that they have helped victims substantially,

or that they can change the context so as to prevent incidents of forced intimacy from occurring.

All psychotherapeutic techniques offer methods of facilitating change in "patients", and suggest what needs to be accomplished before it can be stated that change has occurred. It is the researcher's contention (based on numerous personal communications) that many psychotherapists working from within a constructivist or ecosystemic epistemology (or any other therapeutic model), are not offering a "realistic" formulation of how a victim in this particular context can change. Although it is not the researcher's intention to debate means of bringing about change, it was felt that this problem, and its implication on the context and for psychotherapists, should be mentioned. This was discussed in chapter 5.

Aims of the Study

The aim of the study was to enter the phenomenological worlds of four prisoners and to investigate the human impact of being a victim of forced intimacy. The following issues were addressed, all pertaining to the context of the total institution:

1. The expectations and experiences of the victim prior to victimization.

2. The events which led to the victimization and the experience thereof.

3. The experiences during and following victimization - as experienced by the victims themselves.

4. The means of adaptation/empowerment after the incident.

The individual motive for doing this research is to go beyond "simplistic" research and examine a challenging field in its totality, from the eye of the participant - to understand his constructions and not frame everything merely from the researcher's constructions.

The issue being researched is so unique that DSM-IV (American Psychiatric Association, 1994) does not even have a category for a "complex post traumatic stress disorder" (Herman, 1992), which involves prolonged, repeated trauma. But, as stated above, it will be more beneficial to prevent labelling of a person and rather understand them from their constructions of reality. The more we understand each unique individual, the greater the chance of helping them.

Method

Subjects

The subjects were four male prisoners, three from one large South African prison while the fourth was from a smaller prison. They were all in their twenties, two being black and two white.

Subjects were mainly identified by a prison psychologist or nursing personnel, the only requirement being that the subject felt that he had been sexually victimized in some way.

Measuring Instrument

There was no measuring instrument per se, while a context was created in which subjects could tell their stories. This could be referred to as an "interview," which was unstructured, allowing the pace and the process to continue at a mutually defined, "comfortable" level.

Procedure

Subjects referred were seen during prescribed prison times. Two were seen in a private office while the other two were seen in a fairly sound-proof office which was linked to adjacent social worker offices by a large see-through window. Subjects claimed that they did not mind this setup... in fact, most inmates who have sought help have been seen in these "standard" offices. Their nature heightens staff members' sense of safety (because colleagues may observe any "problem" situations), while other uncondoned behaviour may also be prevented (for example, staff-inmate "friendships" or "abuse").

The initial session began with an explanation of the study so as to establish interest and commitment. This entailed telling the subjects that the researcher was a clinical psychologist who was interested in finding out about the experiences of inmates who had been sexually victimized in some way. The researcher stated that he perceived victimization of prisoners to be a serious problem and that he hoped that the

subject could enlighten him on what exactly it was that he had experienced. It was stated that other subjects were to be seen (or had been seen) and that the researcher would use the information that he got from them in order to get a clearer understanding of the problem, the results of which he was to make known through a research dissertation (or "book", which some subjects understood better). It was stated that the researcher hoped that the information elicited could be of some use in helping inmates in the future, but that the subjects themselves would receive no "special treatment" such as being transferred or being released earlier -this would be out of the researcher's hands. When the researcher felt that certain issues warranted special attention however, their case could be referred (with the subject's permission) to the appropriate prison staff who could help in that area (such as the laying of a charge or being placed in a single cell).

Confidentiality was highly stressed, as were answers as to who would be entitled to information provided by the respondent. This process enabled the respondent to know exactly where he stood in the research as well as to know that the researcher was competent in keeping confidentiality and that he would negate, or at least minimise "criticality dissonance". This means avoiding the "distortion of data due to data-giver's awareness of the data-collector's unawareness of the dangers ...[of providing such information]" (Maruyama, 1981, p. 234).

The subjects were then asked to sign an agreement stating their participation on a voluntary basis with the knowledge that information supplied would be used for research purposes.

With rapport established, the researcher explored the experiences of subjects who had experienced forced intimacy through the process of being sexually abused within the prison.

In order to establish good rapport with subjects the researcher attempted to avoid "relevance dissonance" (Maruyama, 1981), which is the discrepancy of goals between the subjects and the researcher as perceived by the subjects.

Prison inmates often perceive the purposes of the academic researcher as: testing an academic hypothesis; proving and perpetuating a theory; producing publications as a tool for recognition, reputation, and promotion; gaining prestige of having worked with 'criminals'; or simply earning a living from a research salary. (Maruyama, 1981, p. 232)

If inmates perceive the above factors as being the case the project may be counter-exploited, or they may provide inaccurate information to satisfy the personal needs of the researcher.

To avoid, or at least minimise relevance dissonance, the researcher kept in mind (and attempted not to negate) the goals which prisoners often perceive to be as important during research (Maruyama, 1981), which are:

1. To inform the public and prison authorities about inmates' physical and mental treatment, providing accurate

information of which the authorities may not be absolutely aware.

2. To open channels for rectifying injustice.

3. To be considered as a human being who is respected and will be listened to in all earnest in a one-to-one context.

4. To solve (or at least relieve) the inmates' psychological problems.

5. To provide contacts for self-improvement such as books or discussion groups.

6. To make society aware of the environmental conditions which perpetuate crime - a context from which most inmates come. This could provide incentives for young people to avoid becoming criminals.

Because inmates also have other means of "detecting" relevance dissonance, the researcher firstly avoided an "instrumentalizing attitude" (Maruyama, 1981), which entailed that he did not: (a) use pre-set questions, which do not enable the inmates to accurately convey that which is important to them; (b) consider the inmate as a statistical or clinical object; (c) rely on official records, and thus did not place more emphasis on the records than on inmates' accounts; (d) consider himself an expert and thus discredit the inmate; (e) distrust the inmates; (f) show insensitivity or lack interest in the inmates' feelings; (g) act patronizingly or apathetically; and (h) act naively regarding the way a prison operates.

The researcher also attempted to stay aware of "reaction tests" (Maruyama, 1981), in which the inmate may drop hints or discuss topics to detect the researcher's value orientation.

By also being aware of (and acting in accordance with) "action observation" (Maruyama, 1981), in which inmates observe whether the researcher promptly puts into action that which he advocates, it was felt that relevance dissonance was avoided.

During or following interviews, subjects were urged to inform the researcher of any harassment related to the study so that the issue could be dealt with - even termination with a particular respondent being considered if necessary.

The researcher took special care not to violate any rules or offend prison staff during the research process.

The researcher also attempted to avoid being seen in the presence of high-ranking officers for too much time during the study because inmates may have got the wrong idea of what was being discussed.

All sessions were recorded on a tape recorder with tapes being kept for both immediate and later analysis. Process notes were recorded after each interview.

Sessions were between 30 minutes and two hours in length, each subject being seen for a minimum of two sessions and for as many as five sessions. During these sessions, information for the research was gathered. The researcher made a further attempt to continue seeing subjects on a supportive or therapeutic basis after these sessions. These sessions spanned a few months from the beginning of 1994 to mid 1994.

Once all information had been elicited it was analyzed to obtain results.

Analysis of Data

Introduction

The methodology was conducted from a qualitative framework using a phenomenological research approach, which is "the systematic investigation of subjectivity" (Bullington & Karlson, in Tesch, 1990, p. 48). Emphasis was thus placed on the individual subjective experience and constructed meaning to being-in-a-situation. In order to do this, the researcher gained extensive descriptions from the subjects. These descriptions were explored by the researcher and "essential" themes which constitute the phenomenon were elicited.

"Data analysis" refers to a process which entails an effort to formally identify themes and to construct hypotheses (ideas) as they are suggested by data and an attempt to demonstrate support for these themes and hypotheses. By hypotheses we mean nothing more than propositional statements... (Bogdan & Taylor, in Tesch, 1990, pp. 113-114)

"The result of a phenomenological study is a narrative that delineates a pattern, or, expressed phenomenologically, a description of the structural invariants of a particular type of experience" (Tesch, 1990, p. 48). Stated differently, by investigating and understanding a number of subjects' constructs

of the meaning of being-in-a-situation and eliciting common themes between these constructions, a generalized meaning to being-in-that-particular-situation can be elicited.

The Mechanics of Data Analysis

All interviews were transcribed verbatim from the tapes. The researcher began by reading the entire set of data a few times so as to get a sense of the whole. Then, all material relevant to the phenomena being investigated was bound in "meaning units" - a meaning unit being "a part of the description whose phrases require each other to stand as a distinguishable moment" (Wertz, in Tesch, 1990, p. 93); or as "a segment of text that is comprehensible by itself and contains one idea, episode, or piece of information" (Tesch, 1990, p. 116). All segments that had a potential relationship with the aim of the study were "marked" as meaning units. These may have encompassed entire episodes or shorter segments within them. The content or theme of each meaning unit was then summarized by the researcher.

The next task was to "de-contextualize" (Tesch, 1990) which entailed separating relevant portions of data from their context (while retaining their meaning, even when encountered from outside their context). Those segments which shared commonalities were categorized into relevant categories (which were mostly constructed from the data itself). "A category is topical, i.e. it deals with one concept, representing one 'pool

of meanings'" (Tesch, 1990, p. 122). The meaning units of similar topic (that is, theme) are thus "re-contextualized" (Tesch, 1990) or grouped within certain categories. Throughout the research, themes were continuously modified and refined to accommodate later data.

Although "the goal of analysis is to find common themes" (Barritt et al, in Tesch, 1990, p. 93) across individuals' experiences, attention was also paid to unique themes - the range of meanings of the phenomenon investigated being illustrated.

Physical handling of data.

The actual method of physically handling the data was based on some of the work of Bogdan & Biklen (in Tesch, 1990) - "The-Cut-Up-and-Put-in-Folders Approach", as well as work on small data sets by Hammersley and Atkinson (1983).

As the researcher read a copy of the transcripts, comments about meaning units were written in the margin. Those themes which shared commonalities and could be categorized, were marked using a same coloured pen, each category having a different colour.

With a few of the larger categories, the researcher cut out the relevant marked sections (from other copies of the transcripts) and "shuffled" these sections, looking for commonalities, uniqueness, and contradictions - leaving them in

a logical order so that they and their relevant comments could be typed up.

With smaller categories, the researcher merely removed pages with the relevant colour (and thus, category), one category at a time, and typed up the information relating to that category. Pages were then returned to the pack and the following category sought.

Conclusion.

The process thus began at the "specific" level of description in that it included all specifics of an individual's experience and ended with all individuals' responses being compared to obtain a "general" description - thus enabling identification of the fundamental structure of the phenomenon being researched. The result shows the commonalities (consolidated picture) of the human experience of forced intimacy.

Examples of subjects' experiences are provided in a further effort to place the reader in their world. With the reader reading the subjects' reports, he/she may bring their tacit knowledge to bear, "...similar to being there and being able to sense elements too nebulous to be stated propositionally" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 214-215).

With the analysis of data completed, the reader should have a clearer understanding of the human experience of forced intimacy.

CHAPTER 7

FORCED INTIMACY: SUBJECTS' EXPERIENCES OF SEXUAL VICTIMIZATION

Experiences of Victims Prior to Victimization

Ignorance Within a New Context

All four subjects entered their new context proclaiming their ignorance of the context, especially since it was the first time that any of them had been in prison.

(L) I was new in prison, so I didn't know how to handle the situation.... I "sommer" got slapped right into another story.

With their ignorance came a sense of helplessness. This feeling could have been established before entering the new context as was the case with one subject who heard what happened in prison. A threatened privacy violation could turn out to be a true privacy violation because of the impact it had. He perceived himself as having no control over access to his intimate self and in a sense this became a self-fulfilling prophecy.

(M) So he pulled me onto the bed and okay, I don't know, I couldn't resist because if I resist, okay then, I know they will kill me - they will.

(T) How do you know they'd kill you?

(M) Um, before, okay, before I went into that cell, okay, when we came from court, you hear everything that goes on in jail - you hear that.

(T) Who told you?

(M) Some of the people that have been there, um, some of the wardens, they said to me: "Even if something happens just come to us, just tell us." Okay, so I couldn't resist.

(T) Did they say that there's a chance that you'll be raped?

(M) They told me straight. They told me straight.

In the same vein, "stories" within the prison, either before or after an assault, may enhance the victim's perception of his helplessness within a context where others have not succeeded in their own defence. Thus, generalizing from what one hears to oneself only enhances feelings of having no control over one's context.

(M) There is people; the people outside don't know it - the people outside the jail and all that; people get killed inside. Nobody knows about it on the outside - stays in the four walls of that prison - that's as far

as it goes. There's not only one person that died in there before. I know the situation. I saw pictures - a guy that was cut up - not like cut up, I mean, a hole in his stomach; everything was flushed down the toilet - that's why I would rather live.

(T) Who showed you the pictures?

(M) One of the warders. He wasn't supposed to do it but he showed me the pictures after I told him what happened, okay, that was after they put me into a single cell, but they told me about the other stories and all that.

Stories may be so severe that victims may have the perception that sexual victimization occurs throughout the prison and that they would not be safe anywhere, leaving them feeling vulnerable.

(M) I can promise you now, in each single cell here they do it; in each single cell they do it, there's no doubt about it.

Some victims' feelings of helplessness were enhanced by the impact of being alone in a cell surrounded by others of a different colour, culture, or gang (which is a culture in its own right). They may not understand what is being said (about them) and this enhances their ignorance. The two white subjects perceived their black fellow inmates to be dangerous and because

neither of them had any white inmates to turn to they felt alone and insecure.

(L) Then I went into "bandietskap", and then this number shit - I don't know whatever - it's the first time I'm in prison. 26's "slaan die wet". And I heard of this, and they ask me now, ...they sent me into a cell and there sits just blacks "sonder" whites; and I was in a cell with just blacks, and they come to me and they said to me don't I want to "hit wet" - in other words "slaan die wet". So they approached me about this and said do I want to, and I said I'll think about it. Okay, they gave me a days thinking. I thought about it. They came back to me, I said to them: "No, I don't want to 'hit wet.'" Then they said to me, don't I want to become a school-boy - that's part of the numbership, and I didn't know how it works; still as I'm sitting here I don't know what it means - it's just what I hear. And I said to them: "No, but what is a school-boy?" They said: "No, people look after you." And I said: "But I've got my parents who look after me, I don't need anybody to look after me." They said to me: "No fine." We went for breakfast - that was in the morning before breakfast - they came in after breakfast, lunch time; came out, master time, and that's when it happened, about [time] in the afternoon when they had locked up. They called me to

the bathroom and said to me: "Why don't you want to 'slaan wet?' Do you know anything about it?" I said no - I mean I'm a first offender, now must I know what does it mean? They said they want to "duty" me; they want me as a woman, and then I started clicking what was really going on here. And it's locked now; I'm in between blacks, I'm the only white person.

(T) How many were there?

(L) About 29, 30 in a bungalow. I was the only white.... And they got me into the bathroom and they started speaking to me - they want to "duty" me as a school-boy - they want to use me as a woman. Then I understand; I didn't know what a school-boy was until they told me now what is a school-boy, and they told me it's a woman in jail, and that's when I started backing off again and I tried to fight.

(L) It's worse than in Soweto. I've never been in Soweto but I think this is Soweto - it's bad.

(M) We were only two whites in the cell and there were 30 in a cell, so 28, no 26 turned around so they didn't see nothing.

Yet, being black and even of the same culture does not necessarily help because naive/ignorant inmates may be tricked into a situation in which their helplessness is reinforced.

(J) A guy came to me and he said there are some people who are older than us; as I'm a young person, you check; and they told me that I should join his gangster so that I will have the protection from other prisoners.

(T) Which gang was that?

(J) Is 28.

(T) 28s.

(J) Ja, 28s. I join the gang and then after joining the gang the person who called me to join the gang doesn't tell me that later I'm going to act like a woman, you see.... Right, another member which I'm with him now came to me about last week and telling me that if I'm a 28 and I'm too young I will not be able to go and fight for myself - I should act like a woman - they are going to use me as a girl, you see. When I refuse he took the knife and wanted to "scrap" [cut/stab] myself, and then what I do, afraid of my life I do that one [was raped].... When I see the member of our gang I ask them is this happen to our gang. He says no, won't allow this one: "If somebody ask you to do homosexual you should 'scrap' [cut/stab] him with the knife; it's not happening." So what I see here is that man is using the name of the gang and using it by his powers, by his powers, knowing that there is nothing I can do because I'm the younger one.

The power of the gangs may be highlighted by them assigning a new name to inmates and sending them on a "training" course. Inmates may be forced to become like slaves by washing, ironing and even singing for the gang members. They may be shown that they have no control over their lives even over such intimate detail as one's name. If the name assigned indicates ignorance it may heighten the possibility of being "accessed" by others because they perceive the inmate as being helpless.

The sense of helplessness felt is described well by one victim:

(L) They never gave me a chance - they're like vultures - they never gave me a chance.

With the perception that one was such an easy target goes the questioning of why it happened. If the inmate does not have a clear understanding of why it happened he may start doubting himself which only reinforces his perception of him being weak or even "unmanly".

(L) If I thought: "Yes, you actually brought this upon yourself", maybe I could live with it but I never brought it upon myself.... You know, I am a man, I'm not a gay or a... So why did they, you know, come on to me?

As can be seen from the above excerpts, inmates enter their context and quickly discover how ignorant they are about this context. Their ignorance is highlighted in various ways and an intense feeling of helplessness may occur especially if one feels alone. Their feeling of helplessness (having no sense of control) is heightened when confronted with sexual victimization, especially when they discover that they have no choice but to succumb, and secondly when they discover that their options at defending themselves are extremely limited. They are (initially) stuck in a double-bind.

Events and Experiences Leading to and Following Victimization

The Illusion of Alternatives

Three out of the four subjects were approached by their attackers-to-be who suggested that they partake in sexual activity. They could thus be "willing" participants. On the other hand, it was quickly made clear (at a more abstract level) that if they did not participate willingly, they would have to partake anyway, that is, unwillingly. (The fourth victim was offered no "choice" and was attacked and victimized.)

(L) They [gang] said to me, don't I want to become a school-boy.... and I said to them: "No, but what is a school-boy?" They said: "No, people look after you...." [Later that day] seven of them took me into

the bathroom.... and they started speaking to me - they want to "duty" me as a school-boy - they want to use me as a woman.

(M) [When] a gangster in the cell asks you to do something you must go to him and must talk to him - you have to do it. And okay, I went there and he started talking and talking, so he started talking about what he wanted to do and I said to him no.... He said I must sleep there for the night and I said to him no. He said to me: "No, don't worry, it won't be kinky or nothing", so I still said to him no, so he pulled me onto the bed and okay, I don't know, I couldn't resist because if I resist, okay then, I know they [gang] will kill me - they will.

(J) [A gang member was saying] that if I'm a 28 and I'm too young I will not be able to go and fight for myself - I should act like a woman - they are going to use me as a girl, you see. When I refuse he took the knife and wanted to scrap [cut/stab] myself, and then what I do, afraid of my life, I do that one [was sexually victimized].

(J) [When confronted a second time] I said no, and he [attacker] said I should go and think about it and then the final day is today; tonight.

Victims were thus placed in a double-bind with the primary negative injunction being: "You can choose between willing sex or unwilling sex." The secondary injunction at a more abstract level is that the victims don't have any choice. The tertiary negative injunction is the context of the prison which prevents fleeing from the situation.

The double-bind is the "choice" offered - victims don't really have a choice because either way they will be having sex. The word "choice" is also incompatible with the words "willing" and "unwilling" - that is, how can the victim choose to be unwilling and yet still participate; or choose to be willing to do something which he despises - which he is actually unwilling to do. Thus, choosing either one requires the subsequent choice of the other. In the words of Bateson (in Wilden & Wilson, 1976, p. 277): "Each half of the paradox proposes the other."

The choice available is also incompatible with the context: Willing sex is indicative of being homosexual and in a context where "manliness" is respected, being "unmanly" creates the possibility of further abuse. In a similar sense, the result of unwilling sex (domination through sexual victimization) labels one as being weak and therefore "unmanly" which again creates the possibility of further abuse.

The victims can also not not-choose. The power of their attackers forces the victims to face their alternatives (albeit an illusion of alternatives). The victim can also not (at this stage) physically leave the context (tertiary negative injunction) because he is within the confines of the cell.

(R) They [attackers] will hit me; what must I do, because the jail was locked.... It's very difficult for me you see, but there's nothing that I can do.

(L) I could give them money, you know, try to bribe them in a way, but it didn't work - they wanted what they wanted.

(L) They never gave me a chance [or a choice] - they're like vultures - they never gave me a chance.... They try to wangle [emphasis mine] themselves a "wyfie".

(M) I couldn't do anything about it; I couldn't. If I resist anything in there, they kill me, just like that.

(J) There is nothing I can do because I am the younger one.

Victims are thus caught in a double-bind, faced with the illusion of choice between alternatives - a situation where they can only and will suffer a traumatic experience (being sexually victimized). The effect of being caught in this double-bind is far-reaching, depending upon the duration of being submitted thereto.

Helplessness

Initially, victims reported feelings of helplessness because they realized that it was inevitable that were going to be victimized (as can be seen in the above excerpts).

After victimization, victims grappled with the "alternatives" in more detail, especially since they could plan for further abuse. Effective empowering techniques could be any of the following alternatives: communicating with the presenters of the double-bind, separation (physical; suicide), or homicide/fighting the presenters of the message. When faced with victimization for the first time only the "communication" and "fight" options are really available since they cannot create distance between themselves and the endangering situation at such short notice. Victims quickly learn that these techniques may not be possibilities at all (save suicide, which is not desired at all).

The Ineffectiveness of the Communication Approach

Two of the subjects tried this approach (one before the attack and one as an attempt to prevent future attacks). If these communications are done clumsily they may have very little impact and may even dramatize the victim's helplessness. Attackers may thus show more confidence and heighten the victim's susceptibility to abuse or fight - flight premises.

(L) They weren't lenient against me, you know, and I did plead, you know, saying come on wait for a visit, you know, but they weren't lenient to me - they still done what they done.

(T) What did you mean wait for a visit?

(L) You know, I could give them money, you know, try to bribe them in a way, but it didn't work - they wanted what they wanted.

(J) And then um, I tried to talk to him like a person because he's a person like me and I don't want to report him, you see. I tried to talk to him.

(T) What did you say to him, can you remember?

(J) Ja, I say to him: "What will happen if you can stay like the brothers - respect each other - not doing that one." And he didn't mind that one because one day he called me, said if I'm not going to do it today he is going to stab me, and I know, I'm sure that he's going to do that one because even now he's got knives - too many knives.

As may be seen in the above extract, once a victim has been victimized the attacker's sense of power is heightened and little, especially not talking, is going to have any impact on lessening his sense of power.

The Ineffectiveness of the Fight/Homicide Option

The option to fight, which depicts one as manly and therefore not helpless may be an option to the inmate but he quickly learns that being outnumbered (by the gang in general) entails others having control over him and doing as they please. Their helplessness is highlighted once again.

Two of the subjects chose the fight option only to have sexual victimization combined with severe bodily assault as the outcome.

(R) You see, when I tried to defend myself, okay right, I stabbed one, you see - there were plenty. After stabbing this one, "yiss-siss, amper" they're killing me. They hit me bad, bad, bad, you see; because when I stabbed this one I was thinking maybe if I stab one, they see one, they're going to run away from me. When I stabbed one, "haai" they came back and they hit me, they hit me, they hit me. But today in the prison I'm not guilty because I stabbed. They said I stabbed; yes, I stabbed. I didn't like to fight in prison..., I was defending myself - these people, they were eight, I'm alone; what must I do because after stabbing that guy they hit me badly and they were killing me.

(L) I didn't know they wanted to "dalla me a schoolboy" until they had told me that it works like this and that and that's when I stood against them, that's when I made up my mind and I said: "No ways, I'm not a woman, I can't do a thing like that, I can't go lay down on the bed, never, no, I can't.... I started backing off and I tried to fight.... I think I hit one or two of them, I don't know, but then after that I hit a blank because shots were coming from all sides. It's bad.

Two of the subjects who initially thought of fighting further abuse quickly found themselves in a paradoxical situation. They saw themselves as victims, but to fight would mean making victims of others which challenged their sense of being - possibly their being (charged and thus) labelled as the "attacker".

(M) I went to the kitchen, I took a knife, ag, not a knife, a spoon out of the kitchen, and I kept this spoon with me; the spoon is still here as well, I can even go get it if you want to; um, but I said to myself, the next time it happens I'll kill the guy, and I will, but to come to the push for me to kill somebody, it's difficult. [interrupted] Okay, I promised myself I'll kill the guy but I could never come to it, to kill the guy. I can't, there's not...

I'm not a murderer. In my eyes I don't think I'm a criminal.

(J) I've got money and I can buy a knife but I'm afraid of my life. I'm doing four years; I don't want that four years to be added again, you see. I'm just afraid of it, but my "angriness" and my "worriness" I'm thinking of doing that one, but I'm afraid.

Another victim was locked in his own debate. He had to decide between killing his attackers and risk losing (through extended imprisonment) that which was important to him (life with its luxuries upon release, and the fact that his mother was ill and that he may be expected to look after his younger siblings); or being abused and "feeling like death", to achieve the above-mentioned upon release, only to discover their meaningless due to his life being "destroyed".

(R) I think sometimes that [doing] something bad is good; sometimes I'm thinking [doing] something bad is bad.

Sometimes I think when I'm released from prison.... I can get my room, and then my video, I get my T.V.... So I must go to work, you see. But my problem now is those ones who raped me, now I'm thinking this one I must kill him. When I'm going to kill this one, I

can't work for these things when I'm going to kill some person, you see. I'm thinking like that you see. Now I don't get the answer. To buy video and what, what, what - you're still alive, but what they've done to me, it's better I must die.

In the same vein, most victims who are offered a place in the powerful gangs deny the offer even if it offers more security. They cannot identify with the role of "wyfie" where they would be "allowing" an invasion of themselves nor the label of being the attacker of others (with added consequences).

(R) They'll want me to stab the policeman and I'll get the bad record [and stay in prison longer].

(M) They can make you stab someone. If you don't, they do it to you.

So, fighting without "winning" results in further pain being inflicted, while being locked in the debate of "fighting" versus "not fighting" - which challenges ones basic belief system - is also ineffective because either choice results in further hardship for the victim.

The Ineffectiveness of the Fleeing Option

The degree of violation of privacy may be seen in victims' initial attempts to create distance (even though insufficient) between themselves and their attackers. The ever-presence of their attackers is too difficult to bear, every time that they are seen an invasion of privacy occurs. Because their attackers are present there is a continuous threat of violation and thus actual violation occurs because victims use "emergency" tactics to try and create distance.

(J) I removed my bed - my bed was next to him; then I removed my bed to another corner, and now he's following me again to that - my last corner. I try to move my bed to the other cell; got two cells; so I found that the second cell is occupied, it's full of people - then I failed on that one.

(J) I'm staying away from him; I don't want to talk with him but he is coming to talk with me, you see.

Even the presence of a staff member may not be perceived as security.

(L) If they want to take you out with the "bewaarder" or what, they'll take you; they'll take him out too.

Although all the subjects perceived being placed in a single cell as one of the safest "escape" routes one of the subjects still felt very afraid believing that victimization can occur just as easily here.

(M) There [single cells] you sleep one in a cell but we're open the whole day. Okay, it didn't happen to me in the single cells again, but there it can happen any time of the day. In the single cell you just corner the one guy in the room and you screw him.

All the subjects perceived being placed in another cell in the same section or even the same prison as being of little lasting help because gang members are everywhere and the prison grape-vine is very effective in communicating "information" about them.

(R) These guys are the gangsters - Airforce/Big 5 - cell X; cell Y; they are there; all the cells they are there. When I went there, the others they leave, they stand by the windows, and then they call them. They told them.... and then I'm going to get "accident" again, you see.

(M) The news gets spread around so quickly, so quickly.

They may even feel that transfer to another prison nearby won't help either. Thus, not just that cell, that section, and that prison, but all or many prisons may be seen as dangerous. This inhibits "flight" to a large degree.

(R) I want they must transfer me to X because this person, they're Airforce/Big 5. They can take me to P or Q prison - still there's Airforce/Big 5. Some of them they are from here... maybe they go that side. They know I was fighting; they know that I'm an informer. When they send one that side they're going to tell others again that I'm an informer. Now they're going to kill me again.

(L) I'm going to have problems here in prison. If I don't see my death, I don't know, because I'm going to have problems in prison. No matter where I go to, word travels - there's always someone that's been there that I've never seen.

Even if information about them is not passed along the prison grape-vine victims may be faced with new prisons where they may be victimized again by different people.

(L) "Ag," the prisons are "maar" the same you know, they're "maar" all the same - "gemors;" rubbish.

Thus, creating distance in a context where the attacker (or his "colleagues") are present is of no help. But, even if physical separation does occur, this may not be true separation, because victimization can still occur.

The Ineffectiveness of Submitting

Two subjects in this study chose not to fight, rather submitting to their attackers, due to an intense fear that their lives would be taken if they objected in any way. In a sense this is taking some control over the situation in that the victims believed that they had a choice in saving their lives. This option probably made them even more helpless in their attackers' eyes though.

The "choice" of submitting is thus ineffective, because victimization follows anyway, and inmates may be seen as easy targets and face further victimization.

(M) So he pulled me onto the bed and okay, I don't know, I couldn't resist because if I resist, okay, then I know they will kill me, they will.... If I stand up against one I might beat him; I wouldn't say I would but I might; but his... other buddies will step in - they will kill me.... Okay, so I couldn't resist, and um [sigh] okay, okay, he pulled me onto the bed, I couldn't re... I couldn't, because I'd rather, okay, at that stage I thought most of my life,

rather... not let him do it, but to spare my life so I can start over.

(J) I don't think my power can fight his power, you see.... and then what I do, afraid of my life, I do that one [was victimized].

A different form of submitting.

One victim was faced with another difficult choice, that of becoming a slave for his attackers or face the original double-bind. To him, the former was more acceptable than the latter and he thus submitted to this role.

Thus, the effect of submitting results in the victim not only having to face the consequences of the initial attack, but most probably the consequences of further (or threatened) attacks as well.

In the above section it can be seen how ineffective victims' (initial) attempts were at empowerment. Their sense of helplessness worsened (as will be shown), especially when seen in conjunction with other events and emotions experienced - from the outset of the victimization to some form of empowerment - occurring at differing times within this sequence of events.

Feeling Alone/Abandoned

No Help From Fellow Inmates

Not only can victims not protect themselves through fight or flight techniques but they cannot rely on their fellow inmates either - not as a source of protection or as a witness source to provide collaboration to staff or in a legal case, if needs be.

The inmate quickly learns that what applies in society (for example, a crowd helping someone in distress) does not apply in prison. Where one expects help, help is not forthcoming. When one takes drastic measures to prevent forced intimacy of any nature and these drastic measures (which one expects will help) do not pay off, a stronger sense of helplessness may prevail. Not only is the victim one against his attackers but he is alone in his experience - nobody helps and thus everyone can be said to perpetuate or play a part in the violence. More importantly, the victim has been abandoned by his fellow man - he has received no support and has been left to the wolves. This shock "rejection" with resultant feelings of abandonment may eat at the victim's basic belief structure, with it ending in disarray.

(R) I run away to escape; so they're still after me but nobody help me, not even one.... They were eight, I'm alone, what must I do?... Your neighbour is supposed to help you. I told myself that maybe if any

trouble can happen the neighbours can give me the help. So if my neighbours kill me, what then, you see.... They're supposed to defend me but they're killing me.

(R) When I'm thinking I'm crying inside. I'm alone. I think. I cry.

(T) So you're basically all alone in this matter - there's no-one in the cell who's going to help you?

(M) There is nobody who's going to help me.

Not only don't fellow inmates help in any way but at the same time by not helping, due to expressed fear of gangs, the power of the gang is reinforced tremendously (especially when a group of inmates don't protect a victim against one or two attackers).

(M) While we got raped nobody said nothing. Something like that happens, everybody turns their back and they look outside. They close their eyes, they don't see nothing, but if one of them told, they get killed.... There were 30 in a cell, so 28, no 26 turned around so they don't see nothing.

(T) So do you think that the other people in the cell will help you?

(J) They're not going to help me because we are staying so separate. You see, they are using some sheet like this one to cover their place, they don't see what is happened to another bed.

(T) So wouldn't the other people in the cell help protect you if you asked them?

(J) Okay, the other people they tried but they failed because there are some of other gangs - they are staying with Big 5, 26, and Airforce. They failed but they saw what happened.

(T) How did they try and protect you?

(J) In the first place they called me and then I told them all what is happened. Okay, they said they wish to help me but they afraid that that person is from another gang, you see.

(T) So they didn't want to make war with another gang?

(J) Ja, they didn't want to make war.... So I failed on that one because they said they won't [help].

(R) There was some people who were there who saw everything there. Now they said they can be mine - witnesses. Now they afraid because when they can witness me, that person is going to kill them, you see.

(T) Ja, they're scared.

(R) Ja, they're scared.

(R) The other person couldn't help me, they told me that they're afraid, because they are not gangster in the prison. These guys they're gangsters. When they came said they want to talk, they're going to die. Even now when they're supposed to witness me, they're afraid, they said they are going to die.

(J) Everybody's life will be in danger because that man, after that he will be hunt for me and for those who were witness. So other people they are afraid to give evidence.

With no witnesses, evidence is largely reduced and this decreases any possibility of making a successful case especially when it is so difficult to make a case even under "favourable" circumstances. Perceptions of no law enforcement and thus no law in general only enhance victims' fears because without the protection of others or the law they stand no chance. They also stand alone.

No Help From Staff (and No Law Enforcement)

Inmates may perceive prison staff as being insensitive to their needs from the outset of their sentence and this may reinforce their perception of their being alone in a new environment. There is a sense that certain staff members don't

care what happens to inmates and may even be reinforcing the possibility of abuse.

(R) They [staff] don't care who's right, who's wrong.

Both white subjects also felt that the black staff were prejudiced towards them.

(M) I was the only white in there [the cell] between the other coloureds and blacks.... Unfortunately they put me into one of those cells. I didn't want to go in there. I asked when I got there, I asked for a single cell, they said sorry they can't give me a single cell, but there was available. Other people that come in of their own nation like coloureds or blacks, they go into a single cell if they ask. Like me, a white guy asks: "Listen, I want to go into a single cell", they say: "Sorry can't."

(L) The black staff only look after the black, if you understand what I mean.

Reinforcement of abuse may occur due to warders being perceived as seeing inmates as liars - they almost need "proof" before taking any action. So help is present but unavailable.

(M) [After being raped repeatedly] I went to the warder and eventually the warders... I don't know if they saw... I think they thought ja, I was just trying to get out of the cell and I was lying, and eventually I think they could have seen listen here there's something going on here.

(T) None of those times you saw a doctor?

(M) No, because they thought ja, I was talking bullshit, and so eventually I went and spoke to one of the big guys, I think it was an adjudent; I didn't know the ranks at that stage; and I went and seen him and he organized me to go see a doctor, and the doctor said ja, he can see I've been raped.

Victims also got the impression that many staff members were uncaring, indicated by their lack of urgency in their actions (if any action occurred).

(R) Now when I'm going to the Sgt X to ask for P21, he just push me back you see, now I'm said: "Don't push me back like this, you're in charge of the section, I'm ask some help from you, whom I going to ask for help", you see. He said: "Go away, must come tomorrow", you see.

(T) Did you try and contact a psychologist or social worker before?

(L) Yes, a long time now, since I came from X (prison), when that happened to me, when they sent me here. From that time I've been trying my best to see someone like you, hey, until now.

(T) What actually happens when you try and contact someone, or how did you try and contact someone?

(L) Look, the "majoor" - I've tried my best to speak to him, but it fell on deaf ears. They say to you: "Yes, you've got a problem, now we must get professional help for you" - like very serious, and six, seven months after that you hear nothing. They come to you, you say to "majoor", [major says]: "Ek moet jou nog help, ek onthou dit, ja-nee, wag net 'n bietjie, ek dink, kyk dis 'n bietjie laat, ek sal vir jou môre help." Tomorrow never comes for you, and so it carries on and on.

(T) So that could actually reinforce anything from happening.

(L) Anything.

(T) If you get attacked or abused or anything, and you report and nothing happens about it, then others know they can just carry on.

(L) Yes, I mean that's how it is here, they don't listen to you.

(M) There [prison] you can't do anything - if you're sentenced it doesn't help you go to a warder or to a

doctor, like I said to you they don't do nothing about it, nothing.

Even if victims do get to see professional staff, help may not always be forthcoming (to the degree sought), even from professional people!

(L) I said I need help and she [social worker] said she agreed with me: "You need professional help", and she said she would call me in again, but she never did. I started getting frustrated again. Then she "ballsed" it up, and I told him [staff] and he sorted out like I said - two days ago - I'm here.

(M) He [doctor] said to me: "Come to me the next morning, I'll see what I can do for you." I went back the next morning, he said to me okay fine, he'll get me a psychiatrist to talk to. I'm still waiting. Okay, I've seen you now but I was waiting in X until the time I got here, since last year. To ask them for anything, I think I'll get a better response if I talk to the wall, that's the truth.

Staff insensitivity may lead to further victimization if the victim is labelled with the attached stigma thereof.

(M) Then the one day the one sergeant, Sgt X, he started hitting me and... he said to me: "Ja, whose 'wyfie' are you?" and that stripped me completely.

Even after a victim has managed to "escape" his situation, such as being put into a single cell, some staff were perceived to be that insensitive that they were willing to subject the victim to the same situation again after a period of time. Thus, even when being protected there may be the fear that protection doesn't last forever.

(R) I asked them they must transfer me to X where maybe I can get life that side because people that side they don't know me. So they said: "No you can't go to X." They're going to take me again to the section.... I said: "No, that person is going to kill me." They said no, I'm going back to the section. I ask Sgt X: "No, please don't tell me that." He said: "No, I'll take you there."

The above section must obviously be viewed very carefully. Although these are victims' perceptions of some (and by no means all) staff members, one must remember that there are always two sides to a story, so the nature and extent of staff interactions is debatable. (The "one rotten egg in a basket" story could also be applicable). The above section highlights instances in which victims felt alone and felt that they did not receive the

attention from staff that they thought they deserved. A later section discusses how staff members did help victims in their predicaments.

On the whole, this was a further twist of the knife, separating the victims from others. They had not only been abandoned by fellow inmates in a similar predicament, but also by some of those who were supposed to uphold the law and sympathise with their situation. For some, perceptions of abandonment were still to get worse.

Abandonment by Family

Victims who perceived their family to have abandoned them were very troubled thereby, especially when they believed that these were the people who understood them the most and who would offer unconditional support.

(L) Now I haven't got a visit for a long time - it's also bugging me. My parents - I told them; now I don't know if it's this what I told them that they're not coming.

(L) You know, it's very nice getting a visit. You know, you're sitting up here with all your problems.... you get a visit, it relieves you.... [it's] a weight off your shoulders.

(M) I needed to talk to somebody. I couldn't, I couldn't talk to anybody. [The priest contacted my mother] and he said my mom doesn't want to come visit; then I felt like killing myself.... I was very upset.... I feel like I've got nobody left; nobody; nobody.

When facing the options between the devil and the deep blue sea, it is more difficult when alone - no-one can offer advice or give support. This left the victims feeling more vulnerable.

Feeling Vulnerable

With victims feeling abandoned, their sense of vulnerability increases as well. If they are not adequately empowered, they may feel like "sitting-ducks" - their attackers, and possibly others, sensing their vulnerability.

(R) When they [attackers] saw me they [pointed] - they laugh.

(J) At the moment I'm just delaying him [but expecting the inevitable].

(J) I don't want to talk with him but he is coming to talk with me.

(M) I was petrified... terrified of everything; you could see everybody was looking at you, because there the news gets spread around so quickly, so quickly. Even if victims are empowered, there is a fear that this will not be long-lasting - that they will have to leave the single cell, for example. As long as this fear exists, they are left feeling vulnerable.

Anxiety

Feeling vulnerable may be experienced through feelings of anxiety due to an apprehensive expectation...

(R) I feel scared, you see, my heart is beating very fast, you see.

(L) Anything can happen any time - just never can predict when.

(M) I was too scared to go to sleep.... I was restless sleeping.

The Effect of Being Labelled

Being negatively labelled may heighten feelings of vulnerability because if others hear of this label, they may

attach their own meaning thereto, and victims may face further abuse - from those of whom they least expect it.

(R) They say I'm an informer.... When they send one [inmate] that side they're going to tell others again that I'm an informer.... Now they're going to "kill" me again.

(M) [Inmates say] that I'm a white guy, how can I allow a coloured or a black to rape me, why didn't I fight back to him.

(J) I'm a newcomer and I'm not allowed to go and fight [according to the gang].

(J) Prisoners who are older than me, they can use me as their boy for washing, ironing, cleaning the cell, singing their songs during the night, [and possibly more?]

Victims may also be perturbed by the label attached to them, which may lower their self-image, with resulting increased vulnerability. Names such as "dog", "wyfie" and "Francis" may leave victims feeling unmanly and more susceptible to abuse. Their self-image is dealt a severe blow.

Poor Self-Image

Victims reported a change in themselves - a change that entailed perceiving themselves in a poorer light than before. Their self-image had worsened and as a result they felt less confident in themselves. Their previous bases of self had undergone rapid change and they were faced with dealing with the "new" them in a context which demands using familiar strengths of one's personality. They were left with conflicting perceptions of themselves.

(L) It feels like everything has changed in me, you know, it's just through what happened to me.... I don't feel right; I just don't feel right.... I'm not the same person that I used to be, and I know myself how I used to be; I know myself as I used to feel. I don't feel right and I feel it's worse.... I want to be myself.... I feel dirty [and] I lose a lot of self-confidence.

(L) Other people wonder what's wrong with me, and so they call me a mental ("maletjie"), and I mean I don't feel proud of that.... I want my parents to see no, he's still the same... person - he hasn't changed a bit. But I don't want them to say: "Yo, prison's made this [guy] a mental." I don't want them to think that because I don't know what I think and maybe I'll

believe that, you know, that there is something wrong with me.

(L) What I'm actually also worrying about - when I come outside, am I going to be the same?... I want to look good again and forget about this whole problem.

Feelings of Degradation

When victims have been degraded extensively they may be so embarrassed and ashamed that their self-image takes on a new low.

(L) They kicked me, ...they swore me while they were doing that; spat on me - I mean, that's what makes me feel dirty - the fact that while I was still laying there, spitting on me and kicking me: "Ja jou wit hond." No, that's low down, what am I then? I am a human.

(M) In my eyes it was disgusting, how can I say, even like a disgrace to myself, because I was feeling dirty after that.... I felt ashamed for myself.... I felt horrible; I felt disgusting.... I didn't talk to anybody because I felt embarrassed.

Feeling "Unmanly"

As was stated earlier, victims may face being labelled as unmanly; this, along with their own questioning of their manhood can severely affect their self-image. If they relate what happened to them as something that usually happens to women, they may associate themselves with being similar to a woman (and thus all the norms/roles associated with being female, especially the common idea that women are weak).

(J) Ja, it's not nice for myself as a man, I know that now I've got a (?) like my girlfriend.

(L) I'm not a woman, I mean, God put me here on earth with testicles, I'm a man. I mean He never put me on earth to go sleep with other men - that's not me, I mean, it's totally wrong; and that's the point what I want to get over - is they used me as a woman.

(T) Did they make you feel like a woman?

(L) They made me feel dirty. No, they never made me feel like a woman, but I think to myself, when it happened to me, I always tell myself that I'm not a woman - why did it happen to me?

(T) So you do everything they say.

(R) I do it, everything they said I must do. When they said I must wash the window, I wash the window; when

they said I must clean the toilet, I clean the toilet;
when they said I must sweep the floor, I sweep the
floor.

(T) So you're a slave?

(R) Yes.

A big fear amongst many of the victims is the uncertainty of their manhood without the real possibility of confirming it through "normal" channels such as by courting a woman, sexual intercourse or through physical power.

Uncertainty leads to doubt and doubt is enough to cause worry.

(R) Sometimes I'm dreaming my girlfriend she shows me she's got another boyfriend.

(L) I don't think if I come out I'll have any problems with girls through this what happened to me, I don't know.

(T) Are you wondering about that?

(L) Ja, I've been wondering about it often - will it affect something, you know?

(T) In what way?

(L) I mean, look, going to a girl and this thought still popping up in your head - it could turn you around - I don't know what it could do....

(T) You talking about that you might not work sexually or something like that?

(L) Ja, I'm talking about maybe, you know, you're about to make love or something and this "pop"...

(T) Pops into your head.

(L) And this thought pops up into your head while you're busy, you know, what effect is that going to have, you know, what effect is it going to have on a person?

(L) When this thought does pop up I feel dirty. I lose a lot of self confidence.

(M) I'm scared I might turn gay.

Being left with conflicting perceptions of self, especially being unmanly or even mad, leaves the victims doubting the reliability of their usual abilities, which further depresses their self-image, once again leaving them feeling vulnerable, yet full of unexpressed hate at those who "made" them like this or had anything to do with it what-so-ever.

Unexpressed Hatred/Blame

(M) I didn't want to talk to anybody, I didn't want to see anybody, I hated everybody. I hated, but I couldn't do anything about it; I couldn't.

(J) I'm very much angry. What I'm only thinking is that if I've got the power or if I'm in the outside was going to shoot that man using a gun.

(L) They [court and family] say to me I'm coming here for rehabilitation. They never told me I was coming here to be raped.

If this hatred is not controlled in "acceptable" means the victim may explode at others and distance himself more. On the other hand "internalization" of the anger of being raped may result in thoughts of suicide. This behaviour in itself may actually be an effective form of empowerment (as will be discussed later).

While these feelings of homicide may be left unexpressed, at the same time the victim has to face the more realistic possibility that he may become the target of a homicide or assault.

Fear

(R) I go to the section, I find out they [gang] want to kill me; they're waiting for me.... I'm afraid to go [anywhere].

(M) I'm scared. I'm very, very, very scared about going back there. I feel I'll do anything, anything.

It's not in my power but anything I can do, I'll do anything to stay [where it is safe].

A different form of fear (experienced by one victim) was that associated with having an AIDS test - not knowing whether he was going to live or die. The fear of the unknown may cause one to dwell on it often and it thus becomes a thorn in one's side - a painful reminder of what caused it.

Painful Memories

Physical injuries also carry a physical reminder of what happened. Certain deformities, scars or pains which remain for some time and which are felt or seen daily have the effect of "bringing back" the event to the victim and the emotional pain associated with it. Having to explain to others what happened (whether truthful or not) may also leave the victim feeling insecure.

Other experiences which manifest in physical symptoms, such as symptoms of anxiety, insomnia, and psychosomatic complaints have the effect of reminding victims of their abuse. This reminder along with the proof of how it has affected them may serve as a thorn in their ability to empower themselves. It appears that the longer the symptoms last, the longer they have a sense of disempowerment.

Experiences which may be an even bigger reminder of what happened and cause the victim to "relive" his experiences, with

the resulting feelings of helplessness, may be experienced in nightmares, recurrent and intrusive distressing recollections or flashbacks of the event.

(T) What does the nightmare consist of?

(L) What happened to me. Like... it consists of everything - like pictures of what happened - me laying there, them spitting on me, swearing at me, and maybe the "ou" will come down - I can see his face clearly - you know; jump up with a little scream - you know, breathing hard and that.... I come up wet; my sheets have been wet, you know, through sweating.... Now you must know, when I wake up with a nightmare like that, with a cold sweat, I cannot go back to sleep, I cannot... I try and I cannot.

(M) For a couple of nights I didn't even sleep, even when I went out to single cell I couldn't sleep. Every time, just when I close my eyes I just see every movement that went on, everything, everything that happened and... okay, only time when I was sleeping was, sometimes I sleep for about half-an-hour to two hours in the daytime. At night I can't sleep.

(T) Were you too scared to go to sleep?

(M) I was too scared to go to sleep and I couldn't sleep because every time... how can I say, when I

close my eyes and I want to relax, you know, everything comes up. And still now.

(M) Okay, some days I might be alright, and then I might just sit down, even talking to somebody, and everything will come flashing back at me.... It's like a picture in front of me... I'm standing in front of the cell and I'm looking how they're doing it - this is the pictures I get.

(T) Tell me what you see.

(M) Okay, the picture I get, I'm standing at the door, okay, and from the door you can see the whole cell, um, then in the back we were. This is how I see it. In the back we were, okay, and everybody around us and they're looking and they're laughing, that is how I see it. Okay sometimes I get like um... okay, but some of the positions I see, he didn't take them with me, but sometimes it's like I don't want to describe it, it's horrible, like [shiver] wait; double drag [of cigarette]; like positions I can't even think about that comes up in front of me - I'm doing it over a chair, anything - it's horrible.

Possibly even worse than thoughts popping into their heads is the actual seeing of their attacker/s still freely roaming around in their presence.

(R) When I'm moving here I'm scared, when I see this person I'm scared, but that thing it does not come off my mind, it did not come off my heart.

(T) It's always there.

(R) Ja, it's always there, because that thing happened to me. I can't forget it. That men who done that to me, they forget it already, but me, because it happened to me, I can't forget it. It's very difficult for me, you see, but there's nothing that I can do.... [If transferred] maybe I can forget. When I'm sitting here with these people, they make this thing go on for me. When they saw me they laughed, so I can't forget. I can't forget you see, so it's better if I go.

Victims may even perceive others (general inmate population) as looking at them; thus, when anyone looks at them their privacy is once again invaded (even if other people know nothing, because it is the victim's perception of being invaded that counts). If many people "look" at the victim a reminder is constantly served and this places the victim in an inferior position, possibly heightening his chances of becoming the target of further victimization.

(M) I was petrified; well not p..., terrified of everything; you could see everybody was looking at you, because there the news gets spread around so quickly, so quickly.

(J) Everybody... recognized what is happening.

Not only have the victim's body and self been invaded but his thoughts as well. These thoughts may contaminate his whole being - the victim being "raped" every time he thinks of what happened. For this reason it is very difficult for victims to empower themselves because the negative is always forced back into their thoughts with the resulting feelings of helplessness. Victims become apprehensive - being uncertain how long they are going to suffer these recollections. Having so much time on their hands does not help either.

Apprehension About Future

Victims are apprehensive about their future because they don't know how long they are going to be affected by what happened.

(L) I don't think if I come out I'll have any problems with girls through this what happened to me, I don't know.

(T) Are you wondering about that?

(L) Ja, I've been wondering about it often - will it affect something, you know...

(T) In what way?

(L) I mean, look, going to a girl and this thought still popping up in your head - it could turn you around - I don't know what it could do.

(L) [An inmate may say]: "How's a light china", and I'll start swearing: "Bly weg. Los my uit" - know, unnecessary things like that. I was never like that before. I don't want to come out of prison one day and I'm staying at my mom and them and I'm like that. I was never like that - what's my parents going to think of me?

Apart from future apprehension, victims experience the frustration of being "stuck" in their present circumstances.

Frustration

Inmates may become frustrated about having no solution to their problems. This may be due to either the continued double-bind or the "reliving" of events.

(L) I go all "haywire" - I start getting frustrated. I start with my fellow inmates next to me; I start arguing with them - fairly hyperactive - I "strip" for anything.... I'm very moody and.... agitated.

On the other side of the coin, victims may become withdrawn.

Feeling Withdrawn and Despondent

(M) I was always alone, and then I just pulled back.... I didn't want to talk to anybody, I didn't want to see anybody, I hated everybody.... I even at that stage did not even talk to X [fellow victim]; I ignored him.... He said to me: "Listen, let's talk about what happened." I said to him: "I'm not interested in it, leave me alone."

(L) Sometimes... I just go and lay down and mope.... The boost isn't there - that motivation I used to have - it's not there anymore.

Even worse than despondency, is the feeling of defeat.

Defeat

Once again, either the impact of being caught in a double-bind or the pain associated with constantly remembering their trauma, led to three of the four victims having a strong sense of defeat. They had a sense that their suffering was going to last and last - they had been "terminally" infected - there was no cure for their symptoms.

(R) Nobody can help me.

(L) It's bugging me. I'm trying to forget about it, I mean I must get it out of me, but somehow I can't - there's always a little something behind me, pushing a little spark in front of me that, you know, that you see. I can still remember exactly what happened.... It's there. I can't forget what happened to me. Hell, I'm trying to, and I'm trying my best.

(T) How do you try? How does one go about trying to forget something that traumatic?

(L) Trying to forget about it - it's all in the mind, you know; saying to myself: "Come on here, you forget about it, tomorrow is another day", you know. And I wake up the next morning - sometimes I wake up and I'm not even thinking about it, and only later in the morning... it clicks me.... And that's where you break, you know, and I think to myself: "Gee L, you've been trying this, you've been doing this", you know. I mean, on myself, I've been working so hard on this problem, and that's what's been twisting me because I've been working so hard on the problem, and nothing is...

(T) No solution to it.

(L) Yes - no solution to it - and I don't know anymore.... I've tried enough. I've pushed myself. I can't push anymore.

(M) I can't handle it.... If I had money I would have drunk myself totally out of my mind.... [Victim expressed suicidal ideation]: I will kill myself.

Feeling defeated does not offer much "life" to the victims. They may be left facing continued trauma - which can only drain a person completely, or when hope distinguishes, so may their life end.

In the above extract, the victim expressed a suicidal ideation -something he was contemplating as an attempt to escape his predicament. This may be seen as a form of self-empowerment and various options (although not always adequate) are available to the victims. This will be discussed in the section "Forms of Empowerment Adopted".

Conclusion

Not all the victims faced all of the above feelings, depending on how they reacted to the situation and on what form of empowerment (if any) they adopted. To recap, the following situations with resultant feelings arose:

Three of the subjects (L, M, J) were approached by their attackers-to-be and placed in a double-bind in which they had no alternative but to partake in sexual activity. The fourth subject (R) was raped with no alternative offered initially, but later chose to become a slave for his attackers rather than be sexually victimized further.

During the first attack, various options were employed, none having the effect of preventing victimization:

L attempted to communicate with his attackers, and failing this attempted to fight them.

R attempted to flee within his cell and then realized that fighting would be more effective.

M submitted to his attackers and was victimized on numerous occasions.

J also submitted and then laid a charge against his attacker. As a result (pending an investigation), he was placed in a single cell, and for the time being was empowered.

None of these initial approaches (at the time of victimization) were effective in empowering the victims. Victims felt helpless - they could not prevent a traumatizing event from occurring.

They felt even more helpless when they discovered that their fellow inmates had abandoned them in their time of need. They were alone in their pain.

Some victims gained some form of empowerment following the attack, but most felt vulnerable because there was always the possibility that they could be victimized again. This feeling was heightened when they realised that staff members were uncaring about their situation and would not do much to bring about law enforcement. R, L, and M experienced anxiety as a result of this apprehensive expectation.

Vulnerability was also heightened as a result of a lowered self-image, especially feeling "unmanly". The effects of being

labelled by others, and self-labelling, heightened victims' fears of further victimization, as well as (in L and M) them wondering about how they would "be" in the future (especially in their relationships with women, upon release). Not being supported by family (in the case of L and M) heightened feelings of abandonment with resulting lowering in their self-image.

They were also all traumatized by the "reliving" of events, either by seeing their attackers in reality, or by having nightmares or "flashbacks". This served as a thorn in their side - proving how vulnerable and helpless they were and are. Because they cannot avenge their attackers, they are also left with unexpressed hatred toward them. The helplessness of the situation resulted in feelings of defeat (amongst all, save J).

Defeat is the result of a prolonged and repeated trauma - of living in apprehension of a fear so terrible, for a long period of time, which can be described as emotionally draining.

If victims are fairly well empowered, and they can look forward to eventual release, it appears that they will probably "survive" their time (hope offering some incentive) - even though unexpressed feelings may remain a thorn in their psyche.

If not adequately empowered, however, it seems likely that they will suffer more damage and even death at the hands of their attackers, or suicide/self-mutilation by their own hand. Either that, or it is expected that the person will go insane (as an effect of being subjected to a long-lasting double-bind) as supported by Watzlawick, Bavelas and Jackson (1967), and unintentionally by Lockwood (1982).

The forms of empowerment adopted, or those kept in the victims' "armourment" for possible future use, are now discussed.

Forms of Empowerment Adopted

The Flight Option

All four subjects felt that the best way to empower themselves (initially) was to separate themselves from their attackers either by themselves being placed in a single cell, the attacker being placed in a single cell, or themselves being moved to a "special" cell (which will not be named to protect identity).

(R) They asked me last time how is the life now. I said now it's better because now I'm staying in the single cells, there's nobody to disturb me there... Since I'm there I don't find it a problem you see.

(L) There are stabbings every day in the sections. They're hooligans. It's not like the y, that's why I don't even like going out the y. You know, I have my hassles in the y, but I feel safe there.

The single cell setup may be seen as the only safe place - a sub-context in which only limited disturbances occur, while

venture from there considered dangerous. Any necessity to leave to go somewhere requires protection.

(R) I'm staying on the single cell, because I'm afraid to go there, even to work here is very hard for me because sometimes I meet them [attackers], they're waiting here, you see. I supposed to run away, so I won't go even to "hospitaal". Since from last year I'm staying to the "enkelsel", even to the visit, when I come I'm supposed to have the escort.

Protection by staff members arouses mixed feelings amongst victims. As stated above, certain staff members were seen as uncaring - by placing victims in "disadvantaged" positions. If inmates define a situation as "disadvantaged", they may believe that they have ended up in such a position due to staff members' uncaring attitude. Yet, as discussed in chapter 2, staff do not intentionally place victims in "disadvantaged" positions.

On the other hand there were many staff members who helped the victims, such as by organizing single cells. It appears that when victims built good relationships with staff members then they generally felt safer, while differences led to feelings of insecurity.

(R) They came quickly. They opened quickly, they took that rope; they said: "Don't kill yourself, we'll try to fix your problem", you see, "You can't go back to

the 'seksie', you'll sit there; we'll look where we can send you", you see. Then X comes, said no I can't transfer, "I'll take you back to the sections."

(L) When I came out of hospital they batched me straight [to another prison].

(M) When I went to court, when I came back, I went straight into a single cell.

(T) How did that come about?

(M) Okay, when I came from court I said to the one warder listen here; I just said to him I want to go to a single cell, and it was a white guy I talked to, and he said to me: "Fine, you're going through now, immediately." Normally at night they don't take anybody through to the section, and okay, he took me through to the single cells, and the next morning Adj R asked me why am I here, I didn't ask his permission, so I said to him: "I didn't ask you, I asked someone else, he's got a higher rank than you."

While single cells offered a safe haven within the prison, three subjects wished to create greater distance either by them being transferred to another section or preferably another prison, or by their attacker being removed so as to minimize the disruption in their lives. They felt that being somewhere else

could give them the chance to start over - to start living again.

(R) When I'm sitting here with these people [attackers] they make this thing go on for me. When they saw me they laughed, so I can't forget. I can't forget you see, so it's better if I go [transferred].... I asked them they must transfer me to X where maybe I can get life that side because people that side they don't know me.... Maybe when I go to X I do some job, you see; ja, I can forget, you see.

(M) It's not in my power, but anything I can do, I'll do anything [to be in a different environment].

(J) They [members of cell] wish that if the members of the prison can take him [attacker], separated from us; and another guy was thinking if they can take him to A or B [prison] it will be better for us.

If extensive distance cannot be created and victims are forced to continue living in dormitory-style cells (whether still in the presence of their attackers, or not); two subjects tried to create some distance, and thereby some privacy, by spending time alone and doing personal things in the absence of others.

(M) I never went and showered when they showered; I never. Normally when they go out to go outside for an hour I go and take a shower. I was always alone.

(L) When I change, it's in the shower - there are curtains there.

On the other hand, being "too private" may cause suspicion and attempts to gain information about the victim which may again lead to a loss of privacy.

(L) I mean, look, to be with yourself you need to put up a tent [hanging blankets around your bed] because everyone's watching T.V. or talking to the next person, so you must put up a tent, you know, to be by yourself; but then the other thing is, you put up a tent and the other people think: "Why is he putting up a tent? What's he doing in there? Why's he going alone in there?" - things like that. So I can't be private, you know. I don't put up those things because, you know anything, they could think anything.

(T) Like what?

(L) Sexual ways.

(T) Like what - that you're busy with someone?

(L) Ja, I mean, you know, first thing what comes to your head, is like me when I walked in there I saw tents; first thing - what are they doing behind there,

you know. I also got a fright - is it happening here too. But maybe it does happen there, but I don't know, I haven't put my nose so far into the thing; but I don't put a tent.

(T) So how do you get time for yourself or how do you get a bit of privacy, or don't you?

(L) Ja, sometimes I'll slip into the cell [for half an hour].

(T) So what do you do in that half an hour, just relax...

(L) Relax, sit, you know, and try not to think, that's all. I do think where's my mom and them, what are they doing. That's nice, but I could never say, maybe that's a little bit of relaxation that you get, but further no; no, you're always busy, there's always another "bandiet", you know.

All four subjects found some relief from their vulnerability by being placed in a single cell or "special" cell for some time after their victimization had occurred. Their need for privacy and time to relax - not fearing what can happen at any given moment - is expressed. They almost needed a sub-context within the larger context of the prison, feeling safe only when alone, or when being protected by staff members. Any venture from the safety of this sub-context merely lead to feelings associated with being in the larger context.

Even though empowered by being separated, most of the subjects would have preferred to create greater distance between themselves and their attackers, and possibly even attempt a fresh start (with them not necessarily being the ones who have to be confined to a single cell).

One of the subjects (L) was transferred to another prison after having been victimized, and created a new "life", defending himself "unconsciously" by means of the "fight option".

The Fight Option

Two of the subjects thought about implementing the fight option but when it came to the crunch they could not empower themselves in this manner.

As stated above, one victim (L) who was moved to another prison after being sexually victimized managed to empower himself - by means of explosive outbursts every now and then (and usually in view of many people). He even retaliated once or twice when people caused trouble. This uncertainty in his behaviour with his preparedness to stand up for his rights "proved" him to be less of a challenge as a target. The victim believed that others may have seen him as "mentally ill" or unpredictable and thus not worth risking a fight with.

(T) So if a person comes and wants to pick a fight with you, you just explode, and then...

(L) Yes, that explosion, when, you know; I've seen it a lot when I've exploded - the people get scared because I freak, I mean the whole y hears me.

(T) So then they don't want to fight you anymore?

(L) Ja, then they "maar" just back off - you know, this is a mental or something like that; I don't know what they say. I've heard plenty of them saying this oke is mad, but I'm not mad.... I don't mix [with the 26s but] it's mainly with them that I freak out; I strip.... They know where they stand with me.

The victim's main concern was to establish control over his life and nullify access to himself.

(L) I want to show the people that I'm a different person but I also want to control [emphasis mine] it, you see, that I can also go mad again. Look, I mean, I want to be myself, but if someone ever has to see I'm myself and approaches me in that way again, I'll flip. Then I'll do something that I don't want to do; then I'll flip; then I'll use my hands, I'll use my head, I'll use my knees, I'll use everything. But that will never happen to me again... no, no.

He had realized how the fight option had empowered him and believed that this would be his method of empowerment if he had to defend his privacy again.

(L) Look, if you can handle yourself you've got a lot of respect, but if someone comes to you: "Gee my dié of dié", and you break down, you know, I mean you'll walk into the wall one of these days, so it's "maar" better that you stand up for yourself. Okay, I might be small but if push comes to the push, I can also strip.... Any little thing that I see is going to offend me, I'm going to stand up against them.... I stand up for my rights and my ways.

(L) Ja, it's true, very true. It could happen again, but I don't think in that way; I don't want to think in that way, because I don't know, next time - well I'm not saying next time; it could happen again, you know, I could do something back, maybe I could take a life, you know, maybe they could take me, because in that situation you'll do anything to get out of it; anything, no matter if it's murder and I don't need no murdering. I mean, I've never thought of that - I never thought I could kill another person, but I mean, if that has to happen to me again what other option have I got? What other option have I got?... I'm still young, I'll fight, believe you me, I'll fight back. While they're stabbing me I'll fight back. I'll fight back.

This victim further enhanced his self-perception as a man who could defend himself by training with weights and regularly practising his boxing on a punching bag. He could thus create an image while others observed him becoming more "dangerous". Occupying his time to a large extent with this activity helped shift negative thoughts to the back of his mind and enabled him to concentrate on present happenings.

Thus, the assault in itself, with the followed empowerment of being placed in another prison, resulted in an "unconscious" defence mechanism which seemed to have the "desired" effect - prevention of further abuse. While this defence mechanism was effective, the victim still showed anxiety because he was still vulnerable to an extent (he could still be attacked, and if there were many attackers, he would probably be victimized again). One consolation though, is that he was so "hyped up" that he felt that he could defend himself or at least die trying. He was thus still fairly restricted by the context.

The extreme restriction of the context is noted with three of the victims fantasizing about empowering themselves outside the prison, thus getting their revenge on their attacker/s in a context in which the attacker's power is reduced.

They also all chose an extreme yet reliable form of empowering themselves: by shooting their attacker/s. They chose a weapon which would give them a lot of power and they would use it to empower themselves to the highest extreme - by getting rid of the problem - death of the attacker.

(L) If I could be outside and I see one of them, I'll shoot him, I'll shoot him, not to say I'm a violent person but I'll shoot him, I won't think twice.

(T) Is that your own revenge?

(L) That's my own revenge - is to take them out because what he done to me, you know, that's bad, what he done to me is bad, is very bad. I ever have to be outside, if I've got a gun I'll shoot him, no two thoughts I'll shoot him, and I won't shoot him once.

(T) You'll make sure.

(L) I'll make sure he lays there because of what he done to me.

Two of the victims felt that they would first see if justice prevailed by laying a charge against their attacker but if this did not yield the desired results they would empower themselves as was stated above.

(J) What I'm thinking is that if I've got power or if I'm in the outside was going to shoot that man using a gun. Really, definitely, I was going to shoot him.

(T) Do you still feel like that?

(J) Ja, I still feel like to shoot him.

(R) I told myself God will forgive me, because when I am released to the family I was going to get 16-shooter and then I was going to kill them.... I'm

coming to his house; I knock nicely: "Knock-knock. Come in. Good afternoon, how are you. Fine. Where's Mr X, I want to talk to him." When he is coming, arrive at me, I hit him six at the head you see. Now that thing is bad because I told that I'm going to do that thing when I'm released because nobody helped me. One doesn't bullshit me - I must help myself. And this one too, I was going to kill all their family because I'm not cared, you see.... They are gangsters in the prison but outside I'm going to kill them....

(T) So if you get the case in court, then you will not do anything to them?

(R) Yes.

(T) But if it doesn't go to court, then you're going to kill them when you get out?

(R) Ja, because we stay at the same street, you see; and me I'm a person, I've got blood, I don't like somebody must do bad things to me because I've got feelings; I feel the pain, I can feel the pain, you see. If they don't go to court, when I meet them when I'm released they're supposed to feel that pain, so first they will be repaying that debt. His parents are going to feel that pain and then I'm going to tell them: "Your child did this and this and this, so I can't shoot for nothing."

(T) So you want their family to feel the same pain like your girlfriend felt?

(R) Ja, and my mother felt, you see, ja.... If I kill them I think the pain can go away or if they sentence them the pain will go away.

The above victim even justified his actions by claiming that others in his position would do the same thing.

(R) If outside I meet my friend, my friend is going to say: "You're mad", you see, "You can't leave that person that did this", you see. "Better kill them once; it's better they must die."

So, none of the victims actually empowered themselves by assaulting or killing their attacker/s. One (L) defended himself by means of explosive outbursts (against anyone whom he felt threatened by), whilst he and two other victims (J and R) fantasized about the day when they could disempower their attackers in a different context, and thus claim revenge.

While the above form of empowerment is against the law, as stated above, two of the victims felt that they would first attempt empowerment by means of a legal approach.

The Legal Approach

Rather than choose the more physical approach to empowerment, two of the subjects chose a legal attack by laying a charge against their attackers. They hoped that justice would

prevail (and why would it not, especially since it managed to convict them in the first place) with removal of the attacker to some other place.

(R) I want to do it the proper way, the way the law is working, you see. I want to work with the law.... I want them they must come to court and they must tell the magistrate what they were planning nicely to do with me.... I want they must get punished. If they don't get punishment I can help myself [by killing them].... If they can sentence them the pain will go away.

(J) If this case will be solved very soon and that guy removed away from me I will forget about it and I will forgive him even if I see him outside by the canteen.

In both the above cases the power of laying a charge was marked. The attackers perceived the legal system as being very powerful (because it convicted them). Upon telling some of the attackers their intention of taking them to court, the victims were immediately empowered (especially if they were conducting their "business" from the safety of a single cell which was organized upon the laying of charges).

(R) The men who raped me is A, B, C, and D - there were four who raped me, ja there were four. And this

other one, this one who raped me, A, he said: "No me, I'm very sorry with that thing I done to you", you see. When he witness me I must not say he raped me, you see. He said he going to witness me but when he witness me I must not put him in the case, I must take him out of the case, you see. Ja, he said he's very sorry, you see.

(J) I speak to him [attacker] and I told him that all what he's doing I'm deciding to make a case.

(T) And what did he say?

(J) He said to me he was playing.

(T) He was playing?!

(J) Ja.

(T) So you think he's trying to get out of it?

(J) He is trying to but he's now coming telling me why I'm deciding to open the case, leaving him, not to talk to him or to even to demand sum of amount he would give me to close the case.

(T) So he's scared of you now?

(J) He is scared because he knows that he is going to be charged for this what he is doing is not right.... I want him to be punished.... I want him to have a sentence, something which will always remind him to not do that thing which he did to me.

In the above case the threat of a court case was so severe that the attacker chose rather to apologise in front of the other gang members (because he had been abusing his power). The victim felt that this must have been difficult enough for him to do and thus forgave his attacker. The victim was thus in the power position and felt that things had been corrected.

While the legal approach has merits, it is important to remember that if a case ends up in court, it can be very difficult to prove that victimization has occurred (especially with lack of witnesses). For this reason, there must be a fast reaction to a claim of victimization, while helpers can dwell on the question of where to place a "victim", if victimization has not been proved.

Suicide

Three of the victims felt that if all else failed death could be an option - death being better than the pain that they would have to live with and face daily. By taking their own life they would at least be taking that choice and not leaving it up to someone else to decide whether they would live or die and how and when it would happen.

(R) I think to kill myself is better because nobody can help me....

(T) So it's better to kill yourself than go back to the section?

(R) Ja, because I know they're going to kill me badly. When I hang myself, I just put the rope there and then I jump. Only once you see; I'm going to feel pain only once. I don't care only once. Now, but they're going to stab me; other one they're going to take out my eye, you see. Look I'm going to feel the pain; they're going to treat me badly before I'm dying. So I don't like to die; I'm here, I'm feeling the pain.

(M) I'll kill myself. I will.... I would rather... go to hell before I go there. I would rather go to hell. I think it's better off in hell than in prison.

In a sense this is a flight option - fleeing the context permanently and empowering the self to the "life" here after.

While this was considered an option, it seemed that while there was some empowerment and hope available, victims would postpone this option. The importance of escaping the traumatizing situation is marked, with death possibly being preferred to continued trauma. Of all the options available, this is obviously the most drastic and least desired.

Religion

Two victims found some help, but not total empowerment, by turning to God.

(M) I can't say I felt more relieved, but I had more courage to live.

"Friends"

The word "friends" is placed in inverted commas relating to two of the victims who attempted to empower themselves by associating with others of their culture believing that these people would help them because they would identify with them.

Drugs/Alcohol

For two victims substance abuse helped to a degree.

The Degree of Empowerment of the Subjects

Upon completing all interviews and follow-ups the researcher felt that:

(L) was empowered and coping well using "explosive outbursts" to his favour.

(J) had brought his attacker down to size with the threatened court case and was coping well.

(M) was staying in a single cell but still had to face further court cases and possible imprisonment in another city.

(R) was being exploited as a slave but was not being sexually victimized as far as could be ascertained. He did not continue coming to the interviews, whether this was out of free

choice or not, is not known. It is also uncertain whether he was proceeding with a case against his attackers or not.

Conclusion

While the above forms of empowerment may help the victim to temporarily escape his traumatic experience, it is felt that the "fleeing" option is the most effective (save suicide, which should be considered a last resort, if considered at all). The other options (fighting or the legal approach) may be effective to a lesser degree, while some merely offer temporary relief and are not actually empowering (such as the use of alcohol or drugs, or relying on friends or a god).

Even when victims are "effectively" empowered, there is still a feeling of apprehension present because security is not guaranteed - the empowerment may be temporary. Living with first-hand experience of the power of the gangs only heightens these feelings. It is thus essential for empowerment to be maintained and for victims to be reassured that they will not be left in the lurch.

Thus, effective empowerment will lessen the traumatic experiences, while ineffective empowerment may be related to experiences of not being empowered at all - suffering will be continuous.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

The following process has been described: "Normal", autonomous individuals with a fairly well-developed conception of self - developed and modified to "perfection" through trial and error, and who as a result feel competent to cope with most situations which life presents, are suddenly faced with problems in a context where their usual coping manoeuvres may not be as efficient as previously considered. This includes the ability to create distance between themselves and the stressful event; by communicating with the person/s creating the stressful event, by asking or negotiating for change, or even demanding change; by "destroying" the person/s (such as in self-defence - especially if the "victim" is armed); by destroying or modifying the object causing stress; or by relying on others (to help) to carry out any of the above tactics. Others may even help a "victim" adapt to, or overcome (such as with psychotherapy), stressful situations.

Within this "unusual" context - the total institution - individuals find that if they cannot maintain privacy (as discussed in chapter 3), then they lose control over decisions concerning intimate matters. The "victim" may be forced to partake in behaviour considered intimate - some actions being considered more intimate than others. When the individual has no control over unaccepted invasion of his intimate self, this may

be defined as a problem and the individual will have to deal with this experience. However, when this invasion is repeated over a period of time and no effective empowerment is initiated (through coping manoeuvres, as mentioned above), the victim has been denied control over his emotional destiny - he has no choice but to be subjected to victimization by another.

It has been shown in this study that individuals may be exposed to various degrees of forced intimacy (and therefore "trauma"), which will be responded to with varying degrees of emotion. It is felt that victims of sexual victimization experience a severe trauma.

It is felt that there is a distinct difference between a one-off victimization as compared with repeated or threat of repeated victimization. In practical terms, this could be explained by comparing a survivor of a plane crash or a non-confined victim of rape (who has been diagnosed as suffering from "posttraumatic stress disorder" [American Psychiatric Association, 1994]) to victims of the Nazi Holocaust or to Vietnam veterans (who have also been diagnosed as suffering from "posttraumatic stress disorder"). This diagnosis applies to all examples because victims were "exposed to a traumatic event" (American Psychiatric Association, 1994, p. 427), with certain criteria resulting. But a very big difference is evident between the two poles named - the "event" in the latter examples comprised many events, not just one. Victims were subjected to repeated and prolonged stressful situations - a continued posttraumatic stress disorder - and it is felt that this is more

traumatizing and draining than dealing with one circumscribed event (due to its continued intensity, immobilization and resulting drastic change of "personality").

Also, because the trauma may be long lasting, it is not only after (post) the trauma that victims may start experiencing "posttraumatic stress disorder" symptoms. They may experience these symptoms during a long-lasting trauma, and one could possibly more aptly call it "current-traumatic stress disorder".

It has been shown above that victims experience (many of the following) extreme feelings of helplessness, vulnerability, abandonment, unexpressed hatred/blame, fear, apprehension about their future, frustration/hostility, withdrawal/depression, lowered self-concept, despondency, and defeat. Circumstances may be so severe that victims experience a personality change, psychotic episodes or even death.

While victims of "posttraumatic stress disorder" experience many of the above symptoms, the experiences of victims of continued trauma have added features:

Victims find it very difficult to avoid associating with stimuli associated with the trauma, as is a common practice of victims suffering posttraumatic stress disorder (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). They face a constant reminder of what has happened and of what can still happen - their vulnerability heightening the difficulty of overcoming their trauma.

A repeated stressful situation may also deny the opportunity of turning to one's fellow man, either during or

after the incident, because one's fellow man may be just as powerless or even not available. If a victim does get support, the support is usually ineffective (unless the victim is adequately empowered).

While victims of a single traumatic event may start "dealing" with the feelings they associate with it, soon after the event, victims facing a continued traumatic situation may be left "festering" in their feelings - they cannot deal with their feelings when threat of attack is continuously looming. There is no chance of putting the incident "behind" them.

They also experience drastic changes of their "personality" due to experiencing a continuous role - one in which they stand no chance of reaffirming their previous conception of self.

Victims' self-realization (meaning), freedom, autonomy, privacy, dignity, and security may be reduced to such an extent that they hardly feel human (in severe cases such as sexual victimization), because most of their human qualities have been denied. They lose their "voices" - their pro-active selves. And yet, behind this feeling may be an attempt at survival/self-empowerment, as seen in symptoms such as changed "personality", anxiety or depression (based on the work of Haley, [1963]).

Haley (1963, p. 4) defined a symptom as "a way of dealing with another person." Thus, symptomatic behaviour may be seen as an attempt to deal with the relationship between people. At the same time, the victim's behaviour should have a definite effect on his attacker, and the victim in some way denies his own ability to control his behaviour (Haley, 1963).

In this study it was seen how one victim "suffered" explosive outbursts, with him believing that he may be going "mad" - he could not help behaving in this way. Other victims mentioned feeling "unmanly" - also something which they could not help experiencing. The same applies to other feelings such as helplessness or depression.

When attackers make a manoeuvre to define the relationship (in which they have control over the victim), and with opposing manoeuvres being out of the question (such as fighting the attacker), the victim may qualify his acceptance of the manoeuvre with the message that he is letting his attacker succeed in his manoeuvre. In this sense, the victim takes control of the relationship, because he is allowing something to take place. This was seen with two subjects who "allowed" their attackers to victimize them, and thus took control over their lives - ensuring that they still came out alive. This can be seen as a survival technique/empowering technique.

At the same time, a message is conveyed about the relationship. If victims "act" fearful or depressed, they may be conveying the message that they are of no threat (to the power of the gangs), and should therefore be left alone. By "acting" mad (through explosive outbursts), the victim may also be defining what kind of relationship it is - the kind where he is to be left alone.

In this sense, both the attacker and the victim "make a contribution to perpetuating the symptom and each has needs satisfied by it" (Haley, 1963, p. 16). The victim may be

entitled to life (instead of death) or even discontinued victimization, while the attacker maintains his position of power within the institution.

Yet, the attacker cannot acknowledge that the victim is controlling his behaviour (such as his inability to control a mad person), because it is the victim's (involuntary) "madness" which is controlling the attacker's behaviour. The attacker cannot refuse the victim control over his behaviour, for the same reason. This may be applied to the victim's "unmanly personality", and other symptoms, which allow sex. "The primary gain of symptomatic behavior in a relationship could be said to be the advantage of setting rules for that relationship" (Haley, 1963, p. 19).

A symptom may represent considerable distress to a patient subjectively, but such distress is preferred by some people to living in an unpredictable world of social relationships over which they have little control. (Haley, 1963, p. 15)

As long as the victim "acts" symptomatic, he cannot be sure whether or not his attacker still wants to dominate him. The victim thus finds it difficult to become non-symptomatic within the institution context, because if he does, he loses his control over the relationship. If he were to be victimized again, it would be in the absence of his coping mechanism, with resulting negative consequences. Thus, perpetuation of the symptom is assured, unless some other form of empowerment is established.

Apart from the above-named symptomatic coping manoeuvres, it has also been shown above that there are more "practical", and sometimes more efficient, coping/empowering techniques available, ranging from listening to a walk-man in the Antarctic dome, to laying a legal charge against one's attacker in the prison, to living in a single cell within a prison). The problem arises when one sees that these are techniques which help a few victims while many others may be denied these options, or these options may not offer enough relief to a particular individual as they would to another.

While some victims/potential victims are saved from experienc-ing or re-experiencing forced intimacy, the system does not offer relief/protection to the majority of victims/potential victims. There are many who do not find adequate empowerment and who suffer repeated psychological trauma.

It is common knowledge that many Nazi Holocaust victims and Vietnam veterans suffered a repeated trauma in which life revolved around staying alive, with everything else becoming obsolete. As mentioned above, it is felt that victims of sexual abuse within prisons are also experiencing a similar situation. Society is "producing" prison "holocaust" victims who are being sent into society upon release (in dribs and drabs), and are neither being identified (or so it seems), nor receiving treatment for the effects of what they have been subjected to. Most of these victims must be sitting with unexpressed anger/blame toward their attacker/s, unresolved psychological

trauma as well as the effect of living with the label of criminal/misfit (and victim). If these feelings remain pent up within, their whole life may be led in emotional turmoil. On the other hand, if they express these pent up feelings without seeking help, it may be their family and friends, or society in general which bears the brunt.

It is also important for the helping professions (if they treat victims) to have adequate knowledge about what the victims have gone through. It is more than a rape; it is an extended suffering of feeling helpless, vulnerable, and undergoing self-concept change.

Helpers will also have to refrain from seeing victims as passive in the attack (such as with victims who offered no resistance to their attackers, "allowing" themselves to be victimized), and realise the effect of being controlled by those with power - being caught in a double-bind.

With a loss of autonomy (as a result of being punished for "independent" action - as defined by the gang, for example), helpers will have to be aware of this result, taking into account how it relates to the individual as he was before the attack (for example, a previously very independent person who has lost all of his autonomy over a long period of time). It is thus important to therapy, that the helper know at what level of independence the victim functioned before his attack, so that goals (in terms of change) may be realistic.

It will also be important to remember that victims may be feeling alone and abandoned, possibly more so than many inmates feel when released (if people outside have rejected them).

But the above section focuses on treatment after victimization has already occurred. Primary prevention is more important, and if one sees violence, in the form of forced intimacy, as being a symptom of the system, then the only conclusion (as mentioned earlier) is to change the system, that is, changing the prison in some aspects, or more practically, to design an alternative system.

First, we need to explore the possible, and practical, forms of empowerment already enforced within the current system, which offer some relief to victims. The most reliable form of empowerment is one in which separation from attackers is enforced (such as being placed in a single cell). The victim must feel safe within this context though - knowing that he won't be subjected to the larger context again, because if victimization occurs when a person is feeling safe, then he may as well be back in the larger context (with resulting negative feelings).

The single cell may thus be seen as a subset/sub-context of the larger prison context - having a different quality to the larger context. The victim may have an artificial boundary protecting invasion of his body, actions, thoughts, and some of his "possessions". If realization (meaning), "freedom", autonomy, privacy, dignity and security are reinstated in the victim's life, then life may continue (he may be pro-active).

If victims are fairly well empowered within this sub-context, it appears that they will probably "survive" their sentence (hope offering some incentive). Thus, if one removes (most of) the negative feelings experienced as a result of the continued trauma, then the victim may be left to deal with the one event (the initial victimization), which, as stated above, does not appear to be as difficult to cope with. Further, victims may be able to use many previous and "effective" attributes of their personality in dealing with the effects of the initial victimization.

The problem with the above approach to empowerment, is that it is a "secondary" preventative measure - victims have already been dominated, and may only establish some form of control after they have been subjected to a total loss of control.

If one extends feelings of loss of control (such as submission and dominance) to other areas of the inmate's life - not merely the result of sexual victimization - then one may observe that all inmates (to a greater or lesser degree) feel a loss of control over their "normal" lives, in some way having to submit to the context of the total institution (as discussed in chapter 2).

As was also stated, in order to gain some sense of control, many inmates attempt to control others or gain "privileges" not permitted within the institution. Success in these areas still leaves these individuals lacking some control over their context. Yet, it can be asked: "Is controlling others the only way that some inmates can experience any semblance of control?"

versus the question: "Is being controlled by others, the only way that some victims experience any semblance of control?" The ideal is that all inmates can experience control over their lives without having to resort to, or be subjected to such severe control.

Although society needs control over criminal activity (which it accomplishes by separating criminals from society, and having control over criminals' whereabouts), inmates still need some control over their lives - they still need to be entitled to certain fundamental human rights, such as dignity, privacy and security. It is the researcher's opinion, that these rights could only be established if all prisoners lived in single cells (while being strictly observed when out of the cell for any period, if desired). Yet, even this approach has flaws, if not implemented effectively (as was mentioned in chapter 5), and also relies on vast amounts to build such facilities.

It is the researcher's contention that an alternative system to detention is required (for most of the inmates); that of house arrest. There are numerous debates concerning this alternative form of punishment - enough for a study on its own. The main incentive is that the individual attempts to change his behaviour in the community where his problem is. If he experiences his fundamental human rights, and seeks help to bring about change in his behaviour, he may be able to still mean something to himself, his family and to society (instead of being "dumped" on society, labelled as a misfit who has been

subjected to forms of control - the effects of which may be taken out on family, friends or society).

If the majority of criminals live in the community context, then the prison system may be able to cope more effectively (by placing inmates in individual cells) with those who are not eligible for "community detention".

The helping professions within the community are thus left the task of helping all of its citizens adapt to an accepted way of functioning.

The debate continues...

While solutions to the problem of loss of control over one's actions remain a complex problem, the researcher has provided a description of victim's experiences within the context of the total institution. Although readers will be able to interpret excerpts provided in a different way to the researcher, it is hoped that the imagination of the readers will be stimulated so that they too may create further meaning and "relevance" from the research, helping them to see these victims in a new light, and to act "accordingly".

REFERENCES

- Altman, I. (1975). The environment and social behavior. Privacy. Personal space. Territory. Crowding. Monterey: Brooks/Cole.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed.). Washington, DC: APA.
- Ashby, W. R. (1956). An introduction to cybernetics. New York: John Wiley.
- Barabasz, A. F. (1991). A review of Antarctic behavioral research. In A.A. Harrison, Y.A. Clearwater, & C.P. McKay (Eds.), From Antarctica to outer space. Life in isolation and confinement (pp. 21-30). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Bateson, G. (1972). Steps to an ecology of mind. New York: Ballantine.
- Bowker, L. H. (1980). Prison victimization. New York: Elsevier.
- Calhoun, J. (1962). Population density and social pathology. Scientific American, 206, 139-148.
- Carr, J. B. (1988). Crisis in intimacy. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole.
- Carrere, S., Evans, G. W. & Stokols, D. (1991). Winter-over stress: Physiological and psychological adaptation to an Antarctic isolated and confined environment. In A. A. Harrison, Y. A. Clearwater, & C. P. McKay (Eds.), From Antarctica to outer space. Life in isolation and confinement (pp. 229-238). New York: Springer-Verlag.

- Cornelius, P. E. (1991). Life in Antarctica. In A. A. Harrison, Y. A. Clearwater, & C. P. McKay (Eds.), From Antarctica to outer space. Life in isolation and confinement (pp. 9-14). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Correctional Services Act, No 8 of 1959, (1990).
- Davies, C. (1989). Goffman's concept of the total institution: Criticisms and revisions. Human Studies, 12, 77-95.
- Dell, P. F. (1986). In defence of "lineal causality." Family Process, 25, 513-521.
- Dell, P. F. (1989). Violence and the systemic view: The problem of power. Family Process, 28, 1-14.
- Department of Correctional Services. (1993). Annual report for the period 1 July 1991 to 31 December 1992. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Fish, V. (1990). Introducing causality and power into family therapy theory: A correction to the systemic paradigm. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 16, 21-37.
- Foreman, S., & Dallos, R. (1992). Inequalities of power and sexual problems. Journal of Family Therapy, 14, 349-369.
- Foudraine, J. (1974). Not made of wood. A psychiatrist discovers his own profession. London: Quartet.
- Freedman, J. L. (1975). Crowding and behavior. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Goffman, E. (1961). Asylums. Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates. Middlesex: Penguin Books.

- Goldner, V., Penn, P., Sheinberg, M., & Walker, G. (1990). Love and violence: Gender paradoxes in volatile attachments. Family Process, 29, 343-364.
- Goldner, V. (1991). Sex, power, and gender: A feminist systemic analysis of the politics of passion. Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 3(1/2), 63-82.
- Glanz, L. (1992). Violence in South African prisons. In W. J. Schurink, I. Snyman, W. F. Krugel, & L. Slabbert (Eds.), Victimization : Nature and trends (pp. 387-410). Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Goodrich, T. J. (1991). Women, power, and family therapy: What's wrong with this picture? Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 3(1/2), 5-37.
- Haley, J. (1963). Strategies of psychotherapy. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). Ethnography: Principles in practice. London: Tavistock.
- Hare-Mustin, R. T. (1991). Sex, lies, and headaches: The problem is power. Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 3(1/2), 39-61.
- Herman, J. L. (1992). Complex PTSD: A syndrome in survivors of prolonged and repeated trauma. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 5, 377-391.
- Holbrook, T. (1989). Policing sexuality in a modern state hospital. Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 40, 75-79.
- Homer, J. (1981). Total institutions and the self-mortifying process. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 23, 331-342.

- Imber-Black, E. (1989). Maybe "lineal causality" needs another defense lawyer : A feminist response to Dell. Family Process, 25, 523-525.
- Inness, J. C. (1992). Privacy, intimacy, and isolation. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Insel, P. M., & Lindgren, H. C. (1978). Too close for comfort. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Keeney, B. P. (1983). Aesthetics of change. New York: Guilford.
- Levesque, M. (1991). An experiential perspective on conducting social and behavioral research at Antarctic research stations. In A. A. Harrison, Y. A. Clearwater, & C. P. McKay (Eds.), From Antarctica to outer space. Life in isolation and confinement (pp. 15-20). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Lockwood, D. (1980). Prison sexual violence. New York: Elsevier.
- Lockwood, D. (1982). The contribution of sexual harassment to stress and coping in confinement. In N. Parisi (Ed.), Coping with imprisonment (pp. 45-64). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Lötter, J. M. (1988). Prison gangs in South Africa: A description. South African Journal of Sociology, 19(2), 67-75.
- Maruyama, M. (1981). Endogenous research: rationale. In P. Reason, & J. Rowan (Eds.), Human inquiry (pp. 227-238). Chichester: John Wiley.
- McCutcheon, L. E. (1976). Psychology and the crowded environment. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.

- McMullen, R. J. (1990). Male rape: Breaking the silence on the last taboo. London: Gay Mens Press.
- Moon, S. M., Dillon, D. R., & Sprenkle, D. H. (1991). On balance and synergy: Family therapy and qualitative research revisited. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 17, 173-178.
- Nacci, P. L., & Kane, T. R. (1983). The incidence of sex and sexual aggression in federal prisons. Federal Probation, 47(4), 31-36.
- Nacci, P. L., & Kane, T. R. (1984). Sex and sexual aggression in federal prisons: inmate involvement and employee impact. Federal Probation, 48(1), 46-53.
- Neimeyer, G. J., & Neimeyer, A. N. (1993). Defining the boundaries of constructivist assessment. In G. J. Neimeyer (Ed.), Constructivist assessment. A casebook (pp. 1-30). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Neser, J. J. (Ed.) (1993). Penitentiary penology (2nd ed.). Johannesburg: Lexicon.
- Paulus, B. P. (1988). Prison crowding: A psychological perspective. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Popenoe, D. (1986). Sociology (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Porporino, F. J., Doherty, P. D., & Sawatsky, T. (1987). Characteristics of homicide victims and victimizations in prisons: A Canadian historical perspective. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comperitive Criminology, 31, 125-135.

- Reason, P. (1981). Issues of validity in new paradigm research. In P. Reason & J. Rowan (Eds.), Human inquiry (pp. 239-250). Chichester: John Wiley.
- Scacco, A. M. (1975). Rape in prison. Springfield: Charles Thomas.
- Schwetje, F. K. (1991). Justice in the Antarctic, space, and the military. In A. A. Harrison, Y. A. Clearwater, & C. P. McKay (Eds.), From Antarctica to outer space. Life in isolation and confinement (pp. 383-394). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Sykes, G. M. (1958). The society of captives: A study of a maximum security prison. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tesch, R. (1990). Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools. New York: Falmer.
- Toch, H. (1977). Living in prison. London: Free Press.
- United Nations. (1984). Standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners and procedures for the effective implementation of the rules. New York: United Nations Department of Public Information.
- Vedder, C. B., & King, P. G. (1967). Problems of homosexuality in corrections. Springfield: Charles Thomas.
- Watzlawick, P., Bavelas, J. B., & Jackson, D. D. (1967). Pragmatics of human communication: A study of interactional patterns, pathologies, and paradoxes. New York: Norton.
- Weiss, C., & Friar, D. J. (1974). Terror in the prisons. Homosexual rape and why society condones it. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Wilden, A. & Wilson, T. (1976). The double bind: Logic, magic, and economics. In C. E. Sluzki, & D. C. Ransom, (Eds.), Double bind: The foundation of the communicational approach to the family (pp. 263-286). New York: Grune and Stratton.

Wooden, W. S., & Parker, J. (1982). Men behind bars. Sexual exploitation in prison. New York: Plenum.

Personal communication:

The researcher "visited" three South African prisons on numerous occasions and over many years (1989-1994). During this time many staff members were "interviewed" unofficially and it was rather common statements which have been included and not verbatim accounts.

The researcher also worked in a psychiatric hospital (1993-1994) where psychiatric consultants, nursing staff, and patients were "interviewed" in the same manner.